STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT: A 360 DEGREE APPROACH

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL BEVERLY A. P. POINTER
United States Air Force Reserve

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited

19960529 024

USAWC CLASS OF 1996

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 1

UNCLASSIFIED

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT: A 360 DEGREE APPROACH

by

Lieutenant Colonel Beverly A. P. Pointer
United States Air Force Reserve

Dr. Herb Barber
Project Advisor

U.S. Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

UNCLASSIFIED

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Beverly A. P. Pointer(LTC), USAFR

TITLE: Leadership Development: A 360 Degree Approach

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 15 April 1996 PAGES: 24 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The ability to develop and guide leaders to their full potential is the hallmark of an excellent military. This paper reviews the characteristics needed in future leaders and asks if the current system of leader development provides for the growth of those characteristics. It explores the possibilities offered by 360 degree assessments to the development of military leadership. And finally it reviews the future implications of a 360 degree assessment program offering a recommendation to improve the United States military's leadership development.

INTRODUCTION

"The ability to motivate, encourage, develop, and guide others to achieve their full potential is the hallmark of every good leader."[1] The ability to motivate, encourage, develop, and guide leaders to their full potential is the hallmark of every good military. While the United States military has traditionally done a good job developing its leaders, the time has come for improvement. Often the process of developing and selecting future leaders is wasteful of the tremendous pool of talent with which the military has to work. Waste is never desired but is tolerable during times of plenty. Waste is not at all acceptable under the austere environment faced by the military today.

This paper reviews the characteristics the military needs to develop in its future leaders and asks if the current system of leader development actually does provide for the growth of those characteristics. Then it will explore the possibilities offered by adding a 360 degree assessment to the military's leader development system examining both the potential benefits and drawbacks. Finally, this paper will review the future implications of a 360 degree assessment program and offer a recommendation to improve the military's leadership development program. Throughout this paper I will use the collective term the 'military' to encompass all the warfighting services, Air Force, Army, Marines and Navy. Leadership and leader development

is critical to each service component and is considered by each service component an enduring legacy to the future of the military and the nation. Quotations taken from an individual service document may be assumed to apply to all components unless otherwise specifically stated.

CHARACTERISTICS OF LEADERSHIP

> "As we discuss leader development, it is imperative that we remember the attributes of the professional leader we strive to develop. We must develop leaders who are loyal to the nation, the [military], the unit, and the [people]in it; who demonstrate selfless service; who always do their best to do their duty; and who are men and women of unquestioned integrity."[2]

Trying to define leadership characteristics is as difficult and slippery a task as picking up a twenty pound watermelon that is slathered with petroleum jelly. Once you think you've got a hold of the whole thing and make an effort to isolate it by lifting, invariably some aspect of it is off balance and your whole melon goes tumbling away. It is a near impossibility to do this alone. However, if you get several friends to help, you can eventually lift this whole, heavy 'concept' together. So I have drawn from several varied sources to help define leadership characteristics. I do not intend to recreate the volumes of studious literature on the subject of leader qualities, but will highlight a few points from both military and business sources which tend to reflect a consensus.

In an address given by Field-Marshal The Lord Harding of Petherton to his British Army's senior division in July 1953, he boils leadership down to these few characteristics: absolute

fitness of mind and body, complete integrity, enduring courage, daring initiative, undaunted will-power, knowledge, judgement and team spirit.[3] Gen. Maxwell Thurman as the main speaker for the Strategic Leadership Conference in 1991, was asked to describe the competencies he felt were essential for strategic leadership. He compared the FM 22-100 list of overall leadership competencies (on the left) with his own list of strategic level competencies (on the right):

- communications;	- communication (public speaking, persuasiveness, listening);
- soldier team development;	- opportunity recognition;
- teaching and counseling;	- integration/synthesis;
- supervision;	- visualization;
- tactical and technical proficiency;	- 2nd order consequence management (10 year horizon);
- use of available systems;	- resource trade-off analysis;
- and ethics.	- mentor the institution;
	- continue to learn;
	- set the tone - morally, enthusiastically, energetically.[4]

When successful leaders are asked to characterize leadership qualities they most often draw their definitions from their own experiences and personal traits. Another approach is to define these characteristics based on the concept of leadership itself rather than on individuals; a more academic approach.

Using this academic way of defining in his essay "Thinking and Learning About Leadership", Thomas E. Cronin gives these key

leader qualities:

- People who know who they are and know where they are going;
- leaders set priorities and mobilize energies;
- provide the risk-taking entrepreneurial imagination for the organization;
- have a sense of humor and a sense of proportion;
- have to be skilled negotiators and mediators but they also have to stir things up to encourage healthy and desired conflict;
- must have integrity;
- has to have brains and breadth.[5]

Although this list is not focused entirely on military leadership, it is widely applicable to strategic military leaders. Some of the common threads found in the definitions so far are integrity, communication and interpersonal skills, understanding of team approach, intellectual abilities, managing the task and the people doing the task.

Since leadership is not unique to the military, a few examples of leader characteristics are taken from the business world. Within the human resource development (HRD) community the American Society for Training and Development National HRD Executive Survey gathered results from 144 top-level companies. They were asked what leadership-development characteristics they see as important over the next three years, the following categories emerged:

- teams (self-directing, negotiating, cooperation);
- quality focused;
- strategic planning;

- visioning;

- competencies (interpersonal and communication skills, analysis, planning, mentoring, management);

- organizational issues (empowerment, succession planning, values and business ethics);

- managing diversity;

- managing change.[6]

When you meld all these nebulous thoughts, contemporary leadership seems to be a matter of aligning people toward common goals and empowering them to take the necessary actions to reach those goals. This overarching understanding of contemporary leadership applies equally to military and business. "Ultimately [it] means a leader must become worthy of respect. As you start to relinquish the command-and-control model of leadership...your job is to get people to follow you voluntarily."[7]

At first glance, relinquishing command and control seems directly opposed to a military view of leadership. But the concept of selfless-service is woven throughout the fabric of military leadership and a true understanding of the meaning reveals many great military leaders have ultimately done just that. This does not mean they give up command, an order issued is always expected to be followed. It means their leadership has elicited a voluntary response, out of deeply held respect, from all those under their command.

Those who rise to great leadership have usually discovered this characteristic on their own, because selfless-service or servant leadership, as it is also called, is not cultivated

formally in the military. Individuals are simply expected to have or develop servant leadership characteristics on their own. The military misses a great opportunity to guide future leaders to their fullest potential by ignoring any formal development of this crucial aspect of leadership.

Among businesses that have more experience in the practice of Total Quality Management, I have found a clear understanding of the concept of servant leadership.

> "In our zeal to examine, direct and control the behavior of others, we've ignored the most important component of leadership - the ability to examine, direct and control our own behavior. That's where true leadership begins. Managers control and outwardly direct the behavior of others; leaders control and inwardly direct their own behavior....It means admitting that manipulating the behavior of others isn't what leadership is about. Leadership is about supporting others in their growth and improvement. Servant leadership means having the courage to put our egos aside. It means caring enough about others to facilitate their success."[8]

The great leaders of the world have the courage to take a personal, inner journey, to evaluate who they are and what are their motivations. They value a sense of wholeness and community and recognize that a soft touch is the strongest kind. For them, leadership becomes a calling. They are inspired to lift others up.[9] While active development of servant leadership is absent from the military, history records many examples of it in personal vignettes about some of its greatest military leaders.

Servant leadership is valued in military circles, but the qualitative rather than quantitative nature of it makes it difficult to teach. It is more often left to the realm of philosophy. As an example, one of the required reading's during

the first course on responsible command at the US Army War College alludes to this very fuzzy component of leadership. Cronin, in his article "Thinking and Learning About Leadership" says,

> "Above all, students of leadership can make an appointment with themselves and begin to appreciate their own strengths and deficiencies. Personal mastery is important. So too the ability to use one's intuition, and to enrich one's creative impulses....Would-be leaders learn to break out of their comfortable imprisonments; they learn to cast aside dull routines and habits that enslave most of us. Would-be leaders learn how to become truly caring, sharing people - in their families, their professions and in their communities."[10]

DOES THE MILITARY GROW SERVANT LEADERS?

Can this elusive leadership quality be developed? What does the military do to actively develop such traits as inner journeying, personal mastery? How does the military help growing leaders break out of their comfortable imprisonments? Is there any guidance to conducting an appointment with yourself so you can objectively learn about your strengths and deficiencies?

While the debate over whether leadership can be taught or is born in only a few will probably never end in some scientific and academic circles, the military has long held that individual leadership characteristics can be developed. To that end the Army's pamphlet 600-32, Leader Development for the Total Army, identifies three equally important pillars of development for all leaders: (1) institutional training, the formal education and training all personnel need to develop job-related skills and basic leadership skills; (2) operational assignments, experience

through duty assignments requiring leaders to use and build on the institutional training; (3) self-development, individual initiative and self-improvement are keys to training and developing every leader. The pamphlet recommends formal training be expanded upon by the individual through Army correspondence courses, civilian education, reading programs, or numerous self-study programs.[11] So institutional training is provided, operational experience is provided, but the individual is left to struggle with the third pillar of leader development, self-improvement. The Army does not understand how difficult such personal development is nor how crucial to servant leadership, illustrated by this bold but unsubstantiated statement which follows the outlining of the pillars of leadership. "Evaluations of existing...leader development programs clearly indicate that the Army's progressive, sequential, and doctrinally based approach to leader development is sound and produces the quality leaders our nation requires."[12]

Some have criticized the Army for its lack of understanding of how to develop servant leaders. LGen(ret) Walter F. Ulmer, Jr. wrote about some serious leadership deficiencies within the same Army that appears in DA Pamphlet 600-32 to be perfectly sound. He specifically addresses problems in senior leadership. "It is strange that although our Army has devoted enormous efforts toward leadership development, it remains unable or unwilling to articulate a meaningful leadership model that applies to senior leaders....As proximate causes of the

persistent phenomenon of erratic, uneven leadership there are three possibilities."[13] I'll briefly mention his first and third possibilities; a crop of colonels and generals who don't really care and a lack of skills. Not much can be done about the first cause because, "there is always a group of utterly self-serving officers of unreined ambition"[14] The third cause, a lack of skills, is an area the services eagerly address with their many formal training programs. The second possible cause of erratic, uneven leadership Gen. Ulmer addresses is the one with the greatest relevance to servant leadership.

> "A second possibility is that our senior leadership, while mostly solid, has a good share of well-intentioned non-leaders who cannot perform at the executive level. This seems to be confirmed by Army-wide surveys which repeatedly depict significant numbers of seniors as self-protecting, untrusting, and overly managerial. The highly respected 1985 Professional Development of Officers Study...revealed significant misgivings within the ranks concerning the leadership style of some senior officers and the health of the command climate in some units. The solution to the problem of the well-intentioned non-leader may be a refinement of our evaluation system through some form of *leadership assessment by the led. This would supplement the presently exclusively top-down system, which has not been sufficiently effective in weeding out non-leaders.*"(emphasis added)[15]

Although the concentration above is on the Army and it's leadership problems, the other services use essentially the same methods of leadership development with the same resulting, endemic problem of self-protecting, untrusting, and overly managerial leadership as the Army. The Navy is facing ingrained ethical problems as evidenced by the Naval Secretary's remarks to the Joint Services Conference on Professional Ethics, "In what way does our leadership contribute to the failure of the men and

women we supervise to speak the truth when they know it isn't what we want to hear?...No family works well if its members can't tell one another the truth."[16] If you cannot hear from subordinates about problems in the organization, how will you tolerate hearing about your own deficiencies.

Leaving individuals to pry open their own souls and carefully examine their own weaknesses in an effort to be all they can be, is a foolish course of action. A vital link for leadership development has been ignored by most in the military and stumbled upon by only a few in their personal growth endeavors. These few individuals have taken it upon themselves to ask in a non-threatening way for feedback about their leadership, from those who would know best. Subordinates have been in the best position to know the strengths and weaknesses of their leaders since they've been led. The truth of this statement is unquestionable, but most often thought to be inappropriate or counterproductive, or worse yet, threatening. Threatening because our weaknesses are exposed to others and to ourselves. It punctures our inflated egos. It cuts to the very core of our beings to be humble enough to take advice from those you lead.

A true selfless leader is able to remove the ego stumbling blocks that prevent this kind of inner journeying. The personal mastery mentioned earlier is mastery of ego and it's comfortable imprisonments. No one, in their natural human condition finds this an easy task. It is usually imposed upon individuals by

painful circumstance or humiliation or through great personal failure. The few who brave such personal changes and growth on their own are rare, not enough to support the leadership needs of our nation's military. Recognition of both the difficulty and the need for this type of leadership development has been slow. But the need is still there and the answer to active development of servant leadership lies in something called 360 degree feedback.

360 DEGREE FEEDBACK

The Total Quality movement taking place in business and recently in the military has begun to open our eyes to a method of personal development called 360 degree feedback or multirater assessment. It is, in essence, personal development done participatively. A team approach to the growth of leaders, rather than the autocratic approach of the boss training, assessing and selecting the next generation of leadership. This approach is relatively unknown in the military, so for an understanding and evaluation of 360 degree feedback, as it may be used to develop leaders, I must turn to the business community. The assumption here is that leadership and its development are similar enough in business and military to allow a transfer of concepts.

The name, 360 degree feedback, comes from the fact that feedback is collected from all around a person - from his or her supervisors, subordinates, peers, and even customers. A 360 degree assessment provides a comprehensive summary of a person's

skills, abilities, styles, and job related competencies. It allows individuals to compare their self-perceptions of their personal abilities and development with the perceptions of others. It allows many companies to know for sure whether their *best* people are on the *right* path to leadership.[17]

The level of dissatisfaction with traditional, one-on-one performance appraisals has only increased with downsizing and other corporate realities of the '90s, such as: (1) a need for cost effective alternatives to assessment centers; (2) the increasing availability of assessment software capable of summarizing data from multiple sources into customized feedback reports; (3) the need for continuous measurement in continuous-improvement efforts; (4) the need for job related feedback for employees affected by career plateauing, similar to the military up or out system; (5) the need to maximize employees' potentials in the face of technological changes, competitive challenges [read, increased operations tempo], and increased work force diversity.[18] With the exception of the first need, each of these applies to the military. The need to maintain combat readiness in the face of congressionally imposed, fiscal constraint could replace the first business need making the entire list relevant. The military also needs to prevent the deadly grip of a zero-defect culture[19] from choking off the essential creativity of continuous improvement. Forming a new culture where critical feedback from others is accepted, even valued for it's potential to improve oneself, would eliminate the fear of career death from

one mistake. A mistake can be valued as an opportunity for personal change and improvement.

In order for developing leaders to change and improve, the first step is to have them accept, in a nondefensive way, critical feedback from others. Each of the feedback providers (supervisor, subordinates, peers) offers a unique perspective on the person's performance and potential. But they don't have the same opportunities to observe every aspect of the way the person performs the job. The goal of a 360 degree feedback should be to give an objective, comprehensive and accurate feedback. When using this approach as a leader development tool, it's important to gather as many diverse perspectives as possible.[20] Without getting too involved in the mechanics of what a 360 feedback program would look like for the military, a task well beyond the scope of this paper, a sampling of feedback programs used by business will introduce the variety of possibilities.

MODELS OF 360 DEGREE FEEDBACK

Many organizations develop their own 360 degree feedback assessments based upon their corporate goals and values. Some rely on off-the-shelf assessment products available through management consulting firms. Different assessments measure different knowledge, skills and abilities(KSA) but most are designed on five basic models. (1) Job analysis, measures KSAs specific to a particular job. (2) Competency based, measures competencies by comparing behaviors of low and high performers to create a standard. (3) Strategic planning, measures KSAs based

on an organization's strategic plans and needs for future success. (4) Developmental theory, measures KSAs using theoretical and conceptual models of growth and development, and can identify critical KSAs for different developmental stages. (5) Personality theory, measures KSAs related to personality such as, traits, temperaments, and styles in communication, leadership, interpersonal relations and cognition.[21] When using 360 degree feedback for leader development, veteran users and advocates recommend integrating the assessment with existing classroom and on-the-job training.[22] Classroom and on-the-job training are areas in which the military excels. Combining these already rich resources with a 360 degree feedback program is just what's needed to make the most of the military's leadership development potential. But, knowing what assessment tool to use is only a piece of the puzzle needed to effect a worthwhile 360 degree feedback program.

Before the military can add this approach toward leader development to its toolkit, it must resolve issues of confidentiality, validity, usefulness, and effectiveness. Specifically, the well developed program will: (1) Ensure that people willingly provide honest feedback. (2) Ensure that the data remain confidential. (3) Verify that the data are accurate. (4) Ensure that people can use the data to improve their performance. (5) Determine how the system will affect the military overall.[23] How have leading corporations managed to persuade their leaders and employees to embrace 360 degree

feedback as an assessment tool?

> "It starts at the top. Often, high-level managers make the decision to implement a multirater system. To build trust and win participation among the lower ranks, senior-level executives must visibly and enthusiastically support the process. They also should be the first to serve as the loci of the 360 degree feedback process."[24]

Not only is it a good example to have the top leaders start the 360 degree feedback but they are typically the individuals who benefit the most by this assessment because their status isolates them from many of the informal sources of feedback they may have used earlier in their careers. For all leaders, "feedback from 360s can signal opportunities to learn. Growth begins when individuals reach a more objective understanding of their strengths and weaknesses, enabling them to take responsibility for their own development."[25] Unwillingness to accept feedback is one of the reasons many talented executives fail as found by a professor who studied derailed careers. "That danger increases with rank, says Ellen Hart, head of Gemini Consulting's leadership practice: 'The higher executives get in an organization, the less direct feedback they get about their behavior.'"[26]

A very modest introduction of 360 degree feedback is used for senior military leaders selected to attend the Army War College. Prior to attending, as a student, I was asked to select three or four people from each category of supervisor, peer and subordinate. I was told to give them a survey to fill out about me and I was also asked to fill out a self-survey. The answers were sent back anonymously to the College. After I arrived, I

eagerly anticipated the results and discussion that would open my eyes to others' view of my leadership, but none followed. The results were mailed to me and I was invited to make an appointment if I wanted any help interpreting them. A great opportunity was missed to help senior leaders develop. The fears and self-doubts initially stirred by the questionnaire were laid to rest by allowing each individual to opt out of this potentially painful, self-awareness journey. Few in this class took the time to make that appointment and no further mention was made of this expose'. More work needs to be done to make this a worthwhile tool for senior leadership development at the Army War College.

In addition to starting the 360 degree feedback program with the top-level leaders and then introducing it down through the organization, there are additional steps to take to protect confidentiality and create an atmosphere which is safe enough to encourage honest feedback. (1) Distribute the feedback instrument in sealed packets. (2) Use optical scan codes to identify the rater's relationship to the individual. (3) Include an addressed envelope in each packet so that raters can mail their completed questionnaires directly to the person or group that will organize the data. (4) Combine feedback collected from the same type of source, such as all peers or all subordinates. (5) Do not include feedback from peers or subordinates unless at least three representatives of the group are polled. The more respondents, the greater the accuracy of feedback. (6) Do not

provide the manager being assessed with the individual responses. Some organizations hire an outside consultant to administer multirater feedback. It can help employees feel comfortable and certain that it is a confidential process.[27] Even with these important safeguards some 360 feedback programs are having problems.

DRAWBACKS TO 360 DEGREE FEEDBACK

> "Even if it doesn't find its way into your personnel file, make-you-better feedback can still hurt. Though it often contains pleasant news, feedback can be surprising, powerful and uncomfortable stuff, as conversations with a dozen feedback recipients - ranging from corporate CEOs and division managers to second-tier supervisors - reveal. What probably wounds deepest are bad reports about interpersonal skills. If your buddies think you're lousy at budgeting, no huge deal. But several feedback experts singled out 'untrustworthy' as the most devastating single criticism for most people. 'Bad listener' stings. Word that your judgement and thinking are subpar will rattle almost anyone too, says Susan Gebelein, a vice president at Personnel Decisions Int., a big human-resources consulting company in Minneapolis."[28]

Aside from the personal pain caused by a tough look in the mirror, there are difficulties with getting the feedback to reflect accurately. When it is designed to provide information you can use to become a better leader, scores from handpicked pals or from randomly chosen associates turns out remarkably the same. But when used as the basis for formal performance evaluations, results are often not reliable. Friends tend to pump up scores, rivals become lukewarm and the person you've had difficulty correcting finally has a chance to retaliate.[29] One of the main fears expressed in the military is that using subordinate feedback will cause the leader to pull punches. The

power of rank will be diminished as a leader second guesses what needs to be done, said or required of someone. Fear of retaliation undermines leadership and ultimately undermines military discipline.

This line of thinking fails to recognize the true nature of leadership. People facing the extreme conditions of combat are more likely to follow orders without question, from someone they deeply respect rather than one who has forced his will upon the troops. Today's military is an all-volunteer, intelligent force that seeks unity of effort through discipline. As stated earlier the leader's role is to align people toward a common goal and provide what they need to take action toward that goal. Individuals who subvert the unit's discipline are dealt with by the leader on behalf of the unit.

Subordinate feedback, taken as a blended, averaged response can reflect accurately so long as care is taken not to react to extremes. Experts warn that,

> "highly competitive situations can bring out the worst in a 360 degree process and that feedback can get pretty brutal. Most people using 360s make sure the feedback is useful and accurate instead of merely antagonistic by focusing their synopsis on core patterns of behavior. Extreme feedback originating in malice is left out of the final evaluation. 'If only one person says something,' notes one consultant, 'I'd probably throw it out.' While no one enjoys getting negative feedback, with proper controls and supports the process can be worth the discomfort. 'I call it a shaking loose experience,' says Lynn Summers, a Raleigh, N.C., organizational psychologist and consultant. 'Each of us is tooling along for years, thinking we're doing OK, though we all harbor a secret fear. Maybe I think I'm not very good at making decisions. But I just go, pushing down that nagging anxiety. Suddenly, with 360, it's all out on the table, and I'm relieved rather than threatened. Now I can talk to people about what I'm weak at and do something about

it.'"[30]

Also, many companies have made mistakes in implementing a 360 degree feedback program. Some view the multirater process "as a special event, using it one time only as part of a training or coaching session. As a result they don't take the process beyond the initial goal of providing feedback to individual employees."[31] This does not allow the individuals time to improve and be reassessed. No learning benefit is gained in the long run when feedback is applied only once. This is part of the problem with the assessment I received as a student at the Army War College.

A 360 degree feedback program is not a panacea. Whether it permanently improves the leadership ability of those who receive it is hard to evaluate. "Even Walter Ulmer (LGen, ret), retiring president of the Center for Creative Leadership agrees that measuring its effectiveness is difficult."[32] Still its use is expanding. Increasingly, chief executives are using 360 degree feedback "to promulgate their own special vision of the company to the troops."[33] Efforts to quantify subjective observations into hard feedback positively invite skepticism. It is true that processes like this often do not produce useful results at first. "But by remaining committed year after year and learning from mistakes, companies have found they can improve their soft processes until they become wellsprings of competitive advantage. Those that shy away at the first sign of doubt learn nothing."[34]

FUTURE IMPLICATIONS

Instead of telling people what to do, future leaders must focus on helping people find their own way through problems without readily apparent solutions. Today's standard of leadership, influencing human behavior in an environment of uncertainty, is dauntingly difficult to teach.[35] However difficult, we must strive to continually improve the ways in which we develop the future leadership of our nation's military. Following the lead of some great corporations may be just the improved approach that's needed.

Hewlett-Packard, Fuji Xerox of Japan, General Electric, McKinsey and PepsiCo "have been experimenting with an idea powerful enough to transform leadership development. All are building quantifiable processes that command the attention of employees and bring discipline to the mysterious art of human development."[36] Companies ranging from Alcoa and DuPont to Levi Strauss and UPS are increasingly turning to 360 degree feedback.

The United States military needs to get on board this train. Not because it's the current and popular thing to do, but because it makes sense to actively develop servant leadership using 360 degree feedback. Incorporating feedback into the self-improvement pillar of leadership development will ensure the military has the effective leaders it needs to meet an unpredictable future. The services have embraced the principles of Total Quality.[37] It is through the ideas of continuous improvement and participative management that we have come out at

the narrow end of the downsizing tunnel, as a compact, efficient fighting force able to successfully handle the increased operational requirements of the 90s with less. Applying those same principles to our leadership development programs is a natural and necessary next step.

CONCLUSIONS

It will undoubtedly be a difficult task to effect a cultural change of this magnitude. Not only is it tough for each individual to receive a 360 degree evaluation, the entire concept is a hard one for the military to accept. A portion of the cultural shift may involve a change in the way leaders view subordinates; from people who must be made to do what is right, to people who look for opportunities to contribute. Nevertheless, the potential benefits far outweigh the pains of change.

The current leadership development programs fall short of their potential because they rely on the individual to go against his nature, subjugating ego for an intense self-assessment. The crucial development of servant leadership can be more easily and thoroughly effected by using 360 degree feedback. It has proven to be a great development tool in a vast array of business environments. And since leadership characteristics are essentially the same for business as for military, especially at the senior leader level, the military needs to find a way to incorporate 360 degree feedback assessments.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The military services should jointly explore 360 degree feedback as a means to develop future leaders. Some guidelines will be helpful in this effort. Both implementation and acceptance must begin at the top. The Joint Chiefs and service Chiefs need to be the first to receive 360 degree feedback. They stand to benefit from it more than anyone else by virtue of their positions, because as senior leaders they are much more isolated from honest personal assessments. It should quickly follow throughout the senior leaders before moving to junior leaders. This is most important for gaining a momentum for support.

Also, I recommend that 360 degree feedback be targeted to enhance personal leadership development rather than used as an evaluative tool for promotions. It should not, in any way, be used to derive a rating or used as part of an efficiency report. Keeping the same focus as outlined in DA Pamphlet 600-32, that is the three pillars of leader development, the 360 degree assessment should be used to facilitate self-improvement. Ideally, a neutral third party would be the best for processing and balancing the evaluations and for giving the feedback results to the individual. Supervisors may be able to give the feedback if they do not incorporate it into the person's rating.

One of the best places to begin is at the senior service schools. Tying 360 degree assessments into existing professional development courses would eliminate the possibility of using the assessment as a rating, but it would not allow the individual to

receive regular evaluations or to track personal improvements. As a minimum, the existing program at the Army War College must be written in to the classroom curriculum, not just left for individual follow up.

Field grade officers and above, as well as senior NCOs, should comprise the full range of the feedback program. The junior ranks are busy enough learning many other aspects of leadership and are most often in closer contact with a diversity of casual feedback about themselves. Targeting leadership development feedback in this way would maximize the money spent on the program by ensuring individuals are mature enough to develop senior leader qualities through intense introspection and are sufficiently committed to a military career.

The military has always been at the forefront of leadership development. Throughout American history, industry has turned to the military as a resource for future leaders. We can continue this proud legacy if we make the effort to improve our development of servant leadership. We can expect to operate in an environment of continued austerity. We can expect to defend United States' interests across a varied and unpredictable spectrum of conflict engagements. To do this, we must develop leaders who know their people, know their mission, and can guide their people by knowing themselves.

ENDNOTES

1. Gen Dennis J. Reimer, "Empowerment, Environment and the Golden Rule," US Army, Military Review (January-February 1996): 4.

2. Department of the Army, Leader Development for the Total Army: The Enduring Legacy, DA Pamphlet 600-32(Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 31 May 1991), 7.

3. Royal Military Academy, comp. Serve to Lead: An Anthology. (Sandhurst, England: Royal Military Academy, no date), 26-29.

4. General Maxwell Thurman, "Strategic Leadership Conference Presentation," US Army War College Selected Readings Academic Year 1996 (Course I, Vol I, 6 July 1995): 206-207.

5. Thomas E. Cronin, "Thinking and Learning About Leadership," US Army War College Selected Readings Academic Year 1996 (Course I, Vol I, 6 July 1995): 232-238.

6. Craig Steinburg, "Leading Questions," Training and Development Journal 47, no. 3 (March 1993): 12-14.

7. Stratford Sherman, "How Tomorrow's Best Leaders Are Learning Their Stuff," Fortune, 27 November 1995, 92.

8. Victoria R. Saunders, "A Few Good Leaders," Training and Development 47, no. 2 (February 1993): 4-6.

9. Ibid.

10. Cronin, 241.

11. DA PAM 600-32, 5-6.

12. Ibid., 9.

13. Walter F. Ulmer, Jr., "The Army's New Senior Leadership Doctrine," Parameters (December 1987): 12.

14. Ibid.

15. Ibid.

16. John H. Dalton, "The Character of Readiness: The Ethics of Moral Behavior," delivered at the Joint Services Conference on Professional Ethics, National Defense University, Washington DC, Vital Speeches of the Day, 27 January 1994, 298.

17. Sherman, 102.

18. Kenneth M. Nowack, "360-Degree Feedback: The Whole Story," Training and Development, January 1993, 69.

19. Reimer, 5.

20. Nowack, 70.

21. Ibid.

22. Ibid.

23. Allan H. Church, "First-Rate Multirater Feedback," Training and Development, August 1995, 42.

24. Ibid.

25. Sherman, 102.

26. Ibid.

27. Church, 43.

28. Brian O'Reilly, "360 Feedback Can Change Your Life," Fortune, 17 October 1994, 94.

29. Ibid., 93-94.

30. Marcie Schorr Hirsch, "360 Degrees of Evaluation," Working Woman, August 1994, 21.

31. Susan H. Gebelein, "Multi-rater Feedback Goes Strategic," H R Focus Newsletter, January 1996, 1.

32. O'Reilly, 100.

33. Ibid.

34. Sherman, 90.

35. Ibid.

36. Ibid.

37. Gen Ronald Yates, "Total Quality Leadership: An American Tradition," delivered at Computing Devices TQM Conference, Minneapolis, MN, Vital Speeches of the Day, 15 January 1995, 212.

COMPREHENSIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barrier, Michael. "Who Should Get How Much-And Why?" Nation's Business 83, no. 11 (November 1995):58-59.

Challans, Tim. "Autonomy and Leadership." US Army, Military Review (January-February 1996):29-34.

Chilcoat, Richard A., Maj.Gen. "Preparing Strategic Leaders In the Age of Information." Army, October 1995:163-169.

Church, Allan H. "First-Rate Multirater Feedback." Training and Development, August 1995:4242-43.

Cronin, Thomas E. "Thinking and Learning About Leadership," US Army War College Selected Readings Academic Year 1996 (Course I, Vol I, 6 July 1995): 232-238.

Dalton, John H. "The Character of Readiness: The Ethics of Moral Behavior," delivered at the Joint Services Conference on Professional Ethics, National Defense University, Washington DC, Vital Speeches of the Day, 27 January 1994, 296-298.

Department of the Army. Leader Development for the Total Army: The Enduring Legacy, DA Pamphlet 600-32. Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 31 May 1991.

Department of the Army. Leader Development Action Plan, Leader Development Study Final Report. Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, April 1988.

Gebelein, Susan H. "Multi-rater Feedback Goes Strategic." H R Focus Newsletter 73, no. 1 (January 1996):1,4+.

Hirsch, Marcie Schorr. "360 Degrees of Evaluation," Working Woman, August 1994, 20-21.

Nowack, Kenneth M. "360-Degree Feedback: The Whole Story" Training and Development, January 1993, 69-72.

O'Reilly, Brian. "360 Feedback Can Change Your Life." Fortune, 17 October 1994, 93-100.

Reimer, Dennis J., Gen. "Empowerment, Environment and the Golden Rule." US Army, Military Review (January-February 1996): 4-9.

Riley, Don T., Maj. Serve Your Soldiers To Win. U.S. Army War College, 22 April 1986.

Royal Military Academy. comp. Serve to Lead: An Anthology. (Sandhurst, England: Royal Military Academy, no date):26-29.

Saunders, Victoria R. "A Few Good Leaders," Training and Development 47, no. 2(February 1993):4-6.

Sherman, Stratford. "How Tomorrow's Best Leaders Are Learning Their Stuff." Fortune, 27 November 1995, 90-102.

Steinburg, Craig. "Leading Questions." Training and Development Journal 47, no. 3(March 1993):12-14.

Taylor, Robert L. and William E. Rosenbach, eds. Military Leadership: In Pursuit of Excellence. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1984.

Thurman, Maxwell, Gen. "Strategic Leadership Conference Presentation." US Army War College Selected Readings Academic Year 1996 (Course I, Vol I, 6 July 1995):206-207.

Ulmer, Walter F., Jr. "The Army's New Senior Leadership Doctrine." Parameters (December 1987):10-17.

Yates, Ronald, Gen. "Total Quality Leadership: An American Tradition." delivered at Computing Devices TQM Conference, Minneapolis, MN, Vital Speeches of the Day, 15 January 1995, 211-213.