

Engineering Management
Field Project

Marine Corps Leadership Lessons for the Workplace
A Case Study

By

Jeff R. Wiechmann

Fall Semester 2011

An EMGT Field Project report submitted to the Engineering Management Program and the faculty of the Graduate School of The University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master's of Science

Herb Tuttle

Committee Chairperson

Dr. Tom Bowlin

Committee Member

John Brickleyer

Committee Member

Date accepted: _____

Acknowledgements

Grateful thanks to my co-workers at the plant (both former military and not) who provided important inputs to my research and, of course, the United States Marine Corps who provided me a lengthy career and a life based on the valuable concepts presented in this paper. Just as important, thanks go out to my family and the great staff of the Engineering Management Program who have supported all my efforts along the way.

Executive Summary

The United States Marine Corps is a military organization and institution recognized for the past 236 years as the nation's finest fighting force. Their structure, traditions, and approach to leadership are emulated worldwide as the model for military excellence.

Although a military and government entity subject to bureaucracy, the Marines always seem to operate in the most efficient and effective manner possible. When the management principals, core values, planning, and decision making processes of the Marines are applied at different levels of the civilian business world, can cultural change occur resulting in a highly efficient and effective work environment? The challenge of this field project is to provide some recommendations that may or may not work at the plant, which is a real business unit that provides high rate, low technology products for the U.S. military at a local federal facility.

Page intentionally left blank

Table of Contents

| | | |
|----|----------------------------|----|
| 1. | | |
| | Introduction..... | 6 |
| 2. | Literature | |
| | Review..... | 8 |
| 3. | Procedure and | |
| | Methodology..... | 12 |
| 4. | Results, Summary and | |
| | Conclusions..... | 14 |
| 5. | Suggestions for Additional | |
| | Work..... | 25 |
| 6. | Bibliography..... | |
| | | 26 |
| 7. | Appendix A: Survey | |
| | Results..... | 27 |

1. Introduction

The plant (government owned/contractor operated) has seen tremendous growth in the workforce and product requirements since 9/11/2001 in the fact it produces critical need volume core products for the United States military. The workforce numbered around 700 at the start of this period and has grown to about 2800 over this 10 year timeframe. The rapid ramp-up in production required to support the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan were not without a steep learning curve and constant adjustment to change. Many of the original 700 were 20 year + employees who had relatives and family members who also worked at the Plant since it was opened in 1941 by then Senator Harry Truman. The manufacturing process in place at the start of this period (after 9/11) was very labor intensive using low technology, high rate machinery. As the rapid growth over the ten year period occurred, a whole new workforce came on board having to integrate with the experienced existing one, and machinery and processes had to be modernized in order to be able to produce the extra volume products required by the military

customer. With this increase in technology required to be implemented and maintained in the manufacturing areas, a strong need for a large and diversified Engineering organization came into being to support it.

The Engineering organization, required to support the day to day operations of the Plant as well as the development of new products, has been drawn from a broad spectrum of disciplines, some of which include: manufacturing engineers, electrical Engineers, metallurgical Engineers, facility Engineers, software engineers, research and development engineers, design engineers and, of course, the program and project managers for oversight.

The purpose of this field project is to research and provide recommendations to the Engineering organization and Plant as a whole regarding what proven leadership techniques and processes used by the Marine Corps may help them become more efficient and effective in the specific, as well as general, activities performed.

2.

Literature Review

A: **Leadership in General:** Wally Adamchik, in his book *No Yelling: The 9 Secrets of Marine Corps Leadership You Must Know to Win in Business* (2006, 1-20), states that Integrity and Honesty are the hallmarks of a successful leader. He goes on to break that down into the three areas of trustworthy, consistent and non-negotiables. Also included is delivering on commitments and always setting the example for others.

Dan Carrison and Rod Walsh, in their book *Semper Fi: Business Leadership the Marine Corps Way* (2005, 152-154), describe the use of a “core values” card listing the organization’s vision and, on the back, a list of conduct expectations for all employees. The card would be carried at all times by each person to reinforce these values and expectations while in the workplace. They also discuss the value of a leader having courage to overcome fear in a variety of situations with public speaking and competition being prime examples.

David Freedman, in his book *Corps Business: the 30 Management Principles of the U.S. Marines* (2000, 126-127), as well as Carrison and Walsh in their book

(pp. 104-105), describe that being a role model for subordinates by setting the example is the preferred management tool of Marines. Joseph Santamaria, Vincent Martino, and Eric Clemons, in their book *The Marine Corps Way: Using Maneuver Warfare to Lead a Winning Organization* (2004, 169-174), also back this up by stating that leadership by example, taking care of those in your charge, and leadership development are key elements in being a successful leader.

B. Mission Accomplishment: Carrison and Walsh (pp. 196-200), describe that the leader has a responsibility to keep the significance of the mission at hand and how each person in the team plays a part in that is the prerequisite for organizational success. David Freedman, in his article “*Corps Values,*” *Inc. Magazine* (April 1998, 63-64), describes the importance of defining a clear end-state to allow for adequate planning and execution to ensure success. The details of execution are left up to the “doers.”

C. Troop-Welfare: Adamchik, in his book (pp. 85-109), describes how managers often do not pay enough attention to the needs of their employees. Often times, that is as basic as acknowledging their presence when encountered, or praising them when they do good work. It also involves showing respect by always being punctual. Freedman, in his book (pp. 115-137), describes how motivating Marines is the most respected skill in the Corps. John Carroll, in his article “*Command Performance*”, *American Way* (February 2004, 80-81), describes how a former Marine General, now a corporate CEO, blocks out one third of his busy schedule each day to engage/interact with his employees in all business areas in order to hear their concerns and recommendations.

d. **Mentoring/Cross Training:** Matt Daniel, in his article “*Leadership for the Battlefield of Business*,” TD Magazine (March 2006, 43-45), has a statement in it that the Marines develop leaders, not win battles, and that, if sound leadership development occurs, winning those battles can be the result. He also describes the theory of “trickle up” leadership that is that at each level of the organization the senior is responsible for the leadership training and development of their subordinates. This pattern should exist from the lowest to the highest level of that organization. Adamchik, in his book (pp. 93-96), describes how leaders/managers need to constantly strive to improve skills in delegation, coaching, counseling, etc. That also means identifying and providing opportunities to develop future leaders. He also describes the use of job exchanges and providing opportunities for subordinates to get exposure to other applicable areas outside of his expertise in order to get a better understanding of the “big picture.” Freedman, in his book (pp. 88-89), describes the concept of the “plug and play manager,” who has enough exposure to do well in several different functions outside of his/her primary responsibility.

e. **Planning:** Freedman, in his book (pp. 5-9), describes how speeding up decision-making processes is achieved by Marines. Planning starts with the “commander’s intent” on the desired end state, which drives a cost-benefit analysis of several identified key areas, often involving strengths and weaknesses. Such information allows planners to use judgment and initiative in generating courses of action or recommendations for getting to the end-state. Three alternative courses of action are presented to the decision maker, along with the

background analysis on each. That often allows the decision maker to make a sound decision without all the information available in a more rapid manner and is described as the “70% Solution” where it is decided which course of action has the best chance of success or none of them. This is also described in Carroll’s magazine article (p. 83) as well, where he describes that moving forward is better than staying in place, continuously analyzing details. It does require flexibility in being able to adjust as execution proceeds. Follow through and supervision is required throughout these processes.

f. **Teamwork:** Daniel, in his article (p. 45), states that Marines prefer to be called leaders instead of managers to emphasize the team concept. Freedman, in his article (pp. 60-63), describes how training and executing as a team is as important, if not more important, than individual development. In his book, Freedman (pp. 33-35) also describes how most organizational managers focus on how far up the ladder they are, but the Marines focus on the lowest level of leadership- the Non-Commissioned Officer (NCO)- as being most important for focus of skills development. Training low level leaders facilitates decentralized decision making throughout the organization and prepares leaders to assume more responsibility. Team and organization size should be dependent on what is needed to accomplish the mission, not more or less.

3. Procedure and Methodology

A. **Survey Procedure:** An email survey sent out to a variety of plant employees at was used to collect pertinent information for this field project. The contributors selected were chosen in order to get a broad perspective on Plant administration and operations specifically focusing on leadership experiences. The following individuals, by job title, participated in the survey:

- Program Manager, retired Marine officer
- Program Manager, retired Army officer
- Machine Operator, former enlisted Marine
- Supply Chain Manager, former enlisted Marine
- Engineering Manager, no military background
- Operations Engineer, no military background

- Department Director, no military background
- Program Manager, no military background
- Project Manager, no military background
- Quality Manager, no military background

B. **Survey Questions:** Developed survey questions were fairly open ended in order to encourage personalized responses, were comprised of the following:

- For the former Marines: “What things from your time in the Marine Corps do you find applicable to what you do here at the Plant and what things do you think we could use more of?”
- For the former Army officer and those with no prior military experience: “What is your definition of Leadership?”

C. **Paper Topics:** There were fifteen different traits identified through the survey responses which were further narrowed down to the six most pertinent to the case study that are described in the Literature Review and the Results sections.

D. **Timing:** All of the requests were made and received via Plant email in a period of two days in order to gain information on each individual’s thoughts in a steady Plant state.

E. **Additional Input:** The author of this field project is also providing personal thoughts and observations incurred over ten

years of employment at the Plant, as well as a twenty two year career in the Marine Corps (both Active Duty and Reserve).

4. Results, Summary and Conclusions

A. Leadership in General: Leadership, as described in Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, Eleventh Edition (2005, 707), is defined as: "the capacity to lead; the act or instance of leading". Management, on the other hand, is defined in Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, Eleventh Edition (2005, 754) as: "the conducting or supervising of something (as a business); the judicious use of means to accomplish an end." From the survey conducted, it was interesting that three of the respondents (one former military and two not) described a clear distinction between "Leadership" and "Management." Two of them (one of each) even made the same statement that "you lead people and manage things." That could not be truer. Leadership is a learned trait and relies heavily

on specific attributes displayed at the individual level that result in people responding in a desired way. Management is more the assurance of adherence to policies, procedures, and requirements to achieve an end-state. It also involves the coordination of resources, both human and material. A good manager may not necessarily be a good leader, and vice versa.

The Marines are renowned for their ability to train leaders through both schooling and on-the-job training at all levels. That means from the newest Private at Boot Camp to the Commandant of the Marine Corps (General Officer), leadership is to be displayed and reinforced. Why is this emphasis on leadership in the Marines so important? The strength of leadership is what often dictates whether you, or your opponent, will win on the battlefield. Combat is the ultimate test of leadership in that it is high risk, and life and death of subordinates is at issue. When a required Fitness Report evaluation on a leader has a statement such as “his Marines only follow him out of sheer wonder what he will do next”, that almost always results in a career ender for that person. Performance feedback should be continuous, not an annual thing.

It was commented on more than once in the survey that a true leader must “talk the talk and walk the walk”, meaning that they must follow through on what they say and not ask their people to do anything they, themselves, would not be willing to do. At the Plant, the strong leaders do adhere to this philosophy, and it does clearly show in productivity of those they lead. On the other hand, many of the not-so-strong leaders manage more than lead. They tend to focus more on personal gain and how others perceive them than actual productivity, resulting in their organization mostly meeting requirements, but seldom exceeding them. This creates a chain reaction in the Plant,

since it is process-to-process driven, resulting in production delays, the generation of defective product, and potential shortfalls in the delivery of end product to customers.

The Engineering Department, with the support of the Plant General Manager, is well known for being rather weak when it comes to leadership development. Although it is constantly said by the Human Resources Department that, in regards to staffing, the approach for the salaried personnel is always “the best fit for the position”, what is actually done is regularly not the case. In the Engineering Department this is most often done as a “shotgun” approach, where an engineer is put in a leadership position outside of their core expertise as a means for future potential individual opportunities. A recent observation made was in the case of a mid-level manager position opening up in the Testing Group. There was an applicant that had a high level of expertise in the area, a strong leadership background, and a strong desire to excel in it if selected. Instead of selecting that person for it, an upper level engineer, with no expertise in that area, was chosen to fill it as a leadership development opportunity.

Engineers often tend to be tunnel visional and fully focused on their core discipline of expertise (Mechanical, Electrical, Design, Safety, Manufacturing, etc.), instead of grasping and understanding the “big picture” of how the organization as a whole is run. It is common knowledge that good engineers do not necessarily make good managers, and, more importantly, leaders. In regards to the Testing Group fill, the chosen engineer quickly showed a lack of management and leadership skills, resulting in a degradation of productivity of the Group over six months. That person was thus ultimately removed, the most qualified person was brought in to fill it, and productivity of the Group is now at record levels. In regards to hourly personnel, the approach to

filling supervisor positions is often done through Company time seniority and thus has similar problems in that the best person for it may not be the person that ends up filling it.

Performance evaluations generated annually are most often not taken seriously, and the permeating belief across the Plant is that what that person's "boss" personally thinks of them truly decides promotions and pay adjustments. The result is a much lower level of trust and loyalty within the organization.

B. Mission Accomplishment: The Marines have a strong 236 year reputation and tradition of mission accomplishment. The nation expects nothing less from this elite organization. In budgeting the military services (Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines), Congress always looks at the Marines to give them the most "bang for the buck". The primary reason for this is strong leadership being exercised at all levels. In regards to an operation, a Commander provides big picture guidance on the reason for, and the required end state for an operation to be deemed successful. That may not be set in stone though, and, as execution occurs, changes to that mission also often occur. The Marines are very well known for flexibility and the ability to decisively react to such changes as they occur. This all depends on strong leadership being utilized throughout. The overall mission is always briefed, but is also narrowed to unit specific mission requirements as it filters down the organization from top to bottom. This is not most important at the senior officer level as one might suspect, it is rather at the small unit level where this is most critical. That small unit leader, most often the NCO (Corporals and Sergeants) at the tactical level, thus has the ability to react real-time to events as they occur on the battlefield. That is why the NCO is often described as "the backbone of the Corps".

Every person, from top to bottom, clearly understands his/her role in their unit and that mission accomplishment, whatever it takes, is always the primary focus.

At the Plant, the overall mission of providing consistent quality product to the warfighter is not everyone's focus, it is more individualized. Sure, most employees are patriotic and proud to work there as an American, but the focus tends to be more of just doing their piece in the manufacturing process (i.e. getting product to the next step). It is more oriented on individual performance and not the performance of the organization as a whole. In the current economic state, job security is the primary concern of most, not mission accomplishment as a whole. Processes tend to be very rigid as well with procedures in place describing in detail step by step how to execute them. There is little or no room for flexibility and real-time reactions to occur throughout the organization. It is often stated that it is that way due to safety concerns since the products made are inherently dangerous, although the Marines often operate in a direct life threatening environment while always excelling in doing this.

C. Troop Welfare: In the Marines, knowing your subordinates as persons is an important element of strong leadership. The lower the level, the more important this is. The leader strives to understand what drives the person, what issues he/she is dealing with on and off the job, and what development training is needed to get them to the next level or rank. As the unit gets larger, the Commander may only be able to do this with his/her staff and small unit leaders, but the expectation is that this is done to greatest extent possible at all levels. The Marine at the lowest level, not the top, is the most important. A good example of this is that officers always allow their enlisted Marines to get food first at a meal to ensure that their welfare comes first. The goal of every leader

is to develop those with potential, and to see them be promoted to their level and higher if possible. Loyalty and trust throughout the organization are thus developed. The result is high performance of both the individual Marines and the unit as a whole. That is critical on the battlefield, where no Marine is left behind, even if dead. It is expected that ensuring the welfare of each and every Marine is a requirement and not an option.

The Plant, on the other hand, approaches employee welfare in almost an opposite approach. Plant Management and Human Resources are expected to meet the welfare needs of the workforce, not the leadership and management structure. The approach has resulted in several attempts to unionize the workforce over the past several years, where the plant has had to keep level salaries higher than standard to counter. Pay alone does not address individual employee welfare, although it is the most utilized tool to do so. It is almost taboo for a supervisor/manager to discuss personal issues outside of work or their actual work assignment. That is considered personal, although such issues directly dictate employee performance, good or bad. Leadership of employees is thus considered not as important as management of actual resources and product.

D. Mentoring/Cross Training: The Marines expect that every individual receives continuous mentoring, from senior to junior, or even vice versa, due to actual experience. Although every Marine is considered to be a rifleman (Infantryman) first, each one is assigned a primary specialty when they leave Boot Camp or Officer Basic School. They then go through a period of formal school training to learn the basics of that specialty. Upon completion, they then report to their assigned unit where the real training and development occurs. Mentoring by experienced Marines in that unit is expected and required upon every reassignment. Mentoring is not just on-the-job training. It creates

the one-on-one relationship required to integrate that Marine into the organization. Mentoring passes on lessons learned over time, which sustains the high level of constant unit performance. For Marines, most unit tours are around three years, so this is even more important due to constant turn-over of positions.

Cross training is also expected, in that every Marine is supposed to be trained in and know the positions two levels above them as well as those with different specialties at their own level. The emphasis in the Marines requires that the individual Marine is not just an expert in his/her specialty, but is good in several areas in addition to that specialty. Why is this so important? The bottom line is the consideration of battlefield attrition where there is high probability of Marines being wounded or killed, thus causing a void that another Marine is required to fill. Cross training is the only way to sustain operational momentum in such a scenario.

In regards to cross training, it would be assumed to be important in a process to process manufacturing environment, but that is not the case. At the Plant, the new employee goes through a one day classroom orientation of the Plant in general and employee benefits. Once complete, they report to their assigned area and normally get one to two days of on-the-job training with an experienced equipment operator, at which point they are considered qualified to perform that work assignment. Employees are expected to just know the step in the process they support, not how all of the processes flow and interact to get to the end products. Knowing the process before and after theirs as well as the different personnel roles within their own process is not required. There is no formal mentoring program whatsoever and the only real interface is normally from the new employee to the experienced one with any questions, not the passing on of lessons

learned from the senior to the junior. Although work center procedures are used as a reference for step-by-step job execution, they never address the “what ifs” that always seem to occur. Often, employees just come in to work, operate their individual machine for a shift, and go home. If they happen to have machine problems resulting in the generation of defective product, it is often not discovered until later on in down-the-line processes, resulting in additional cost added to material that has to be scrapped out.

Many front line managers consider it a threat to their position if they pass on all of their experience and knowledge to subordinates, and therefore rely on the subordinates to learn as they go over time.

E. Planning: In the Marines, planning is a formal process based on the acronym BAMCIS, the letters standing for; begin planning, arrange reconnaissance, make reconnaissance, complete the plan, issue the order, and supervise. In regards to formal operations on a Headquarters staff, there is a Planning Team and an Execution Team. The Planning Team is comprised of those with operational expertise, who researches and puts together an initial plan for how to accomplish the mission at hand. The Execution Team then takes that plan and puts it into action, having the responsibility of refining and changing that plan as the situation dictates in order to accomplish the mission.

For the actual passing of the plan to the executors, the format follows the acronym “SMEAC”, which letters stand for; situation, mission, execution, administration/ logistics, and command/signal. The plan is issued at every unit level throughout the organization. A key component of planning in the Marine process is the 70% solution, as described in the Literature Review. The 70% solution approach facilitates an accelerated

planning and decision-making process, resulting in rapid implementation of the execution phase. Plans are always built to allow for the executors to determine the actual details of how to achieve them. Once again, strong leadership at all levels is required to ensure that both teams complement each other resulting in mission success.

At the Plant, planning is haphazard at best. Most all execution planning is done on a month-to-month cycle, where delivery requirements for each month drive operational quotas. That produces execution that creates an environment where product flow across all lines starts slow the first two weeks, and turns into a frantic rush to meet quotas the last two weeks of every month. The result is unstable, although consistent, month-to-month flow of product. Lean/Six Sigma principles have been implemented over the past few years to help streamline this product flow, but results to date have not been significant enough to achieve orderly, stable monthly product flow.

Another example of how planning seems to be ineffectively utilized is when manufacturing “problems” occur in processes, resulting in defective or non-acceptable product being generated. These situations often result in Failure Analysis efforts, which are formal processes normally led by the responsible Engineers assigned to the areas where the problems were encountered. Although very structured in nature through the use of a fishbone diagram or other format, the Failure Analysis often requires a 100% identification of root cause before any corrective action can occur. Often times, there is not a single root cause, and it is found that several variables contributed to the failure condition. Therefore, this process can take a lot of time to go through- even months, during which processes and products may be held up in a limbo status. This often results in upset Plant Management, along with the government customer.

F. Teamwork: The Marines are organized with administrative designators for each size unit (Fire Team, Squad, Platoon, Company, Battalion, Regiment, Division, etc.) which dictates management functionality. In regards to the utilization leadership though, these are more approached as teams, where every member of that team is as important as the next regarding mission accomplishment. The common descriptions apply: “There is no I in Team” and “The team is only as strong as its weakest link”. All members of the team have to trust and rely on each other, especially in the high stress nature of combat. The senior member of each of these teams at each level is often like a “coach” who ensures that the team executes as one in all endeavors. Due to the constant turnover of these teams, leadership exercised throughout dictates team success or failure.

At the Plant, the different levels are oriented more towards administrative or process requirements and are headed up often times more by managers than leaders. The process is the focus, and each member has their piece of it to do on a daily basis. Teamwork is not emphasized as much as individual productivity. The Plant is pretty much operational 24/7, with three different work shifts a day. With the orientation the way it is, there are often production breakdowns in that there are not clean pass offs shift to shift regarding status. The shift does it’s work and goes home with little vested interest regarding the what the other shifts do until the next time they come back on. Of course, with 24/7 operations, there are strong shifts (i.e. Week Day, which is most desirable and primarily comprised of the senior, most experienced employees) and there are not so strong shifts (i.e. Week Nights and Weekends which are the least desirable and are primarily the newer, less experienced employees). Production Support (Engineering, Quality etc.) is less on the not-so-strong shifts, resulting in throughput differences shift to shift.

G. Summary: There are obvious differences between the Marines (a military service) and the Manufacturing Plant (operated by a for-profit commercial company) described in this field project. Leadership, and how it is used throughout the organization at all levels down to the individual, is critical in the Marines due to the nature of its existence, which is fighting and winning wars. In the business world, leadership is a desired, but often not a required trait in order to be effective. Management of resources is often deemed more important, in that it will often dictate actual money flow (i.e. profit) for the organization to compete and grow in that environment. As described earlier, leadership is more people oriented and management is more resource allocation oriented. There are ways to work around these differences though and still accomplish your “mission” and business goals.

A good example of this was experienced on a military deployment to a location overseas. The organization of interest came together with service members from all four of the military branches (Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines). This organization of about 60 persons was brought together with few members knowing any other. A Marine was put in charge of the organization. From the start, the Marine leadership principles described in this field project were applied. Instead of a focus on learning the different material resources at hand, the Marine instead focused on the organization personnel.

A team approach was applied from the start which fostered an environment of being a part of something bigger than the individual. Along with that, bottom-up (vice top-down) leadership was utilized to the fullest extent, thus emphasizing the contributions of all members, not just direction from the top. The techniques were not considered “standard” by the members from the other services, but did prove quite effective in quickly bringing a “high performing team” together, with all members focused on mission

accomplishment, before figuring out the needed means and material resources. The organization's performance resulted in nearly all of the team members receiving personal recognition for their part in contributing to the overall success of the organization.

H. Conclusion: Although deemed different, several of the Leadership techniques used by the Marines could be utilized at the plant, ultimately resulting in better employee relations and improved operational efficiency/effectiveness. It would entail a degree of change in the cultural mindset and doing things somewhat different than they have "always been done". By reviewing the employee handbooks for salary/wage, as well as Plant policies and procedures, it would probably be discovered that the implementation of the techniques described in this field project would not be in violation of any of them.

5. Suggestions for Additional Work

A. Leadership Training: Generate and present to Plant Management and the Plant Training Department a course generated from Marine Corps leadership methods to have all supervisors and managers go through. This could easily be done at one of the quarterly offsite all-managers' sessions done.

B. Mission Accomplishment Focus: Attempt to emphasize a singular mission focus within a singular organization, which will hopefully spread across the Plant over time. This would obviously require Plant Management Team engagement.

C. Employee Welfare: This will be tough to make improvements to, since this is currently more of an administrative process controlled by Human Resources. It can be done at the lowest levels fairly easily though, through supervisor training.

D. Mentoring/Cross Training: Can and should be implemented as part of new employee orientation as well as being done via the supervisors at the lower levels.

E. Planning Improvements: Will also be tough to address, in that the current way of doing things follows current industry standards. It will require a clear understanding of Plant goals, vision, and mission by all employees.

F. Teamwork Emphasis: This could produce the greatest results across the plant, through the orientation of high performing teams at all levels, and the Plant as a whole. A good example of such an approach was provided in the Summary section, above.

Bibliography

Adamchik, Wally. *No Yelling: The 9 Secrets of Marine Corps Leadership You Must Know to Win in Business*. James & Brookfield Publishers, 2006.

Beck, Gannon. "At All Costs: Accomplish the Mission". *American Military University*. <http://www.oo-rah.com/store/editorial/edi42.asp> (accessed February 9, 2009)

Carrison, Don and Rod Walsh. *Semper Fi: Business Leadership the Marine Corps Way*. New York: AMACOM-American Management Association, 2005.

Carroll, John. "Command Performance". *American Way* (February 1, 2004): 80-83.

Clark, Scott. "Marine Corps Principles Can Help Your Business". *Puget Sound Business Journal* (December 17, 2004).

Daniel, Matt “Boom”. “Leadership for the Battlefield of Business”. *TD*. (March, 2006): 43-46.

Dillon, Karen, and Joshua Macht. “The Few, The Proud, The CEOs”. *Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania* (2004).

http://leadership.wharton.upenn.edu/l_change/trips/Dillon_and_Macht.shtml (accessed June 8, 2011).

Freedman, David H. *Corps business: The 30 Management Principles of the U.S. Marines*. New York: Harper Business, 2000.

Freedman, David H. “Corps Values”. *INC.*, (April 1998): 54-65.

Freedman, David H. “A Few Good Principles”. *Forbes ASAP*, (May 29, 2000).
http://www.forbes.com/asap/2000/0529/201_print.html (accessed June 8, 2011)

George, Michael L. *Lean Six Sigma for Service: How to use Lean & Six Sigma Quality to Improve Services and Transactions*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, 2003.

Santamaria, Jason A., Vincent Martino and Eric K. Clemons, Ph.D. *The Marine Corps Way: Using Maneuver Warfare to Lead a Winning Organization*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, 2004.

Townsend, Patrick L. and Joan E. Gebhardt. *Five-Star Leadership: the Art and Strategy of Creating Leaders at Every Level*. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 1997.

Appendix A

1. Survey Questions

- a. Former Marines:** “What things from your time in the Marine Corps do you find applicable to what you do here at Lake City and what things do you think we could use more of?”
- b. Non Former Marines:** “What is your definition of Leadership?”

2. Responses

- a. Former Marines:**

i. “Leadership, defined in its simplest terms, is providing the mentorship, example and motivation to others so they exceed their personal expectations and goals. Additionally, it is the ability to remain calm in a subjective environment and make sound decisions that accomplish the mission while simultaneously having compassion for those you lead and holding them accountable for their actions. Leadership vs. Management: I believe some of our managers at Lake City do not understand there is a big difference between managing and leading people. I believe the saying “you manage things but you lead people” is very true. My experience from my Marine Corps career is it takes an enormous amount of time to lead people. You have to honestly care about them, understand their strengths and weaknesses, and work them towards self-improvement. When you attempt to manage people, that caring factor is missing. Accountability: In the Marine Corps, we are taught to hold ourselves accountable for everything. From my experience at Lake City, few people are held accountable. Example: As a Program Manager, there are numerous accounting errors that are made that affect my overall costs. I recently had a \$278K error tied to an old usage rate. When we held the Nov 08 inventory, the error was found that equated to this loss. However, the Accounting folks combined with the ERP experts didn’t make the change in a usage rate error that they were aware of back in

2005. Bottom line, no one to my knowledge was held accountable for the error; the accountability rolls over as a challenge to me. If people are not held accountable for their actions, then the overall morale breaks down in any organization. Setting the Example: If you are going to talk the talk you must walk the walk. I believe this is why Marines are so effective because we do what we say. I believe there is a large majority of managers who set the example. However, I have noticed that those who do not, especially on the Production floor, lose so much respect from the Wage Roll. My example, I was enlisted for ten years and, at the time, I did not realize how important it was for officers to be the epitome of setting the example. When I was commissioned, I realized that every waking moment, Marines were watching me and expecting me to be a good example. Setting the example in your professional and personal life builds confidence and trust in your team. When your team trusts you, they will go above and beyond to accomplish the mission.” **Program Manager, Retired Marine Officer**

- ii. “I can think of many different things, like, for instance, as failure to accomplish a mission-if your production machine goes down and you can’t get it back up in time to make the daily run rate. Marines never quit-therefore, you never really give up trying to make it run. Self-Confidence-to say that Marines lack this would be laughable. You believe you can do it, even if time constraints

tell you otherwise with the shift ending etc. Team work-still performing daily tasks that may not be done by others.” **Machine Operator, former Marine Enlisted Non-Commissioned Officer**

- iii. “The USMC gave me the opportunity to develop personal discipline, accountability for my actions, a sense of duty, and the importance of finishing the mission; while looking out not only for you, but for those around you as well. These have served me very well throughout my personal life, and business career. In my opinion, personal accountability and personal discipline are sadly lacking in our society today; there is far too many who consider themselves ‘victims’ in our society with an attitude of “you owe me”. We see this more and more as new workers enter the work force each year. All of them could benefit from spending 8 or 12 weeks in USMC boot-camp. If you look at some of the older Marine Corps handbooks (my vintage), you will find “what to do in case of nuclear attack: stay calm, seek cover, and finish your mission”. My definition of leadership would be: leading by example, actions/style that results in superior achievements from average people, strategic/forward thinking at all times for all issues and doing the right thing, in the right way, at the right time.”

Supply Chain Manager, former Marine Enlisted Non-Commissioned Officer

b. Non Former Marines:

- i. “My one sentence definition of leadership would be: The ability to guide and influence people. I’ve always been taught that you manage things and Lead People. One of the books that I enjoyed reading on leadership is Leading Change by John P. Kotter. Kotter describes an eight-stage process for leading change that I think would be useful in a paper focusing on leadership.” **Program Manager**
- ii. “Establishing a clear vision/sharing (communicating) that vision with others so that they will follow willingly/providing the information, knowledge and methods to realize that vision/accountability for all, entrusting your subordinates and having fun along the way.” **Building Manager**
- iii. “Leading by example. Listens to inputs from his team, but ultimately has to make the final decision with, or without his team’s consensus. Willing to take reasonable risks.” **Quality Manager**
- iv. “This really depends on where in the management ladder someone is at (formal or informal), but here are some quick thoughts:
 1. Manager:
 - a. Leads by example-would never ask a subordinate to do something he/she was not willing to do.
 - b. Ability and willingness to make unpopular decisions when necessary.

- c. Integrity (I believe this applies both at work and outside of work-you can't be two different people, no matter how hard you might try).
- d. Takes the "big picture" into account-can operate in a fire fighting mode, but does not lose sight of the goal.
- e. Considers the needs of the company, as well as the needs of his/her subordinates and is able to manage both without compromising the other.

2. Leader (not necessarily a supervisor or manager):

- a. Leads by example
- b. Integrity
- c. People naturally trust him/her"

Engineering Manager

- v. "To answer that question, I thought about who I would consider a leader. Some of the traits that I think help in a leader are someone who is trustworthy, honest and true to one's self, is willing to take an unpopular stance, is a teacher and is someone who people are willing to follow. I think it is someone who truly leads a group of people using the above traits to get to one's objective."

Manufacturing Engineer

- vi. "I think a quote from Bernard Montgomery, a British Field Marshall, says it best for me-Leadership is the capacity and will to

rally men and women to a common purpose and the character which inspires confidence. Leadership requires the ability to cast the vision and then have the quality of character that gains the respect and confidence of those you want to lead. A great vision will never be realized if your team does not trust you.”

Department Director

- vii.** “Leaders **MUST** lead from the front-set the example in words, actions and deeds; dress the part, speak the part and set the highest standards of performance for oneself. Leaders must have operating knowledge of the tasks they assign. Leaders must make the hard decisions. In combat, you may have to order soldiers to their death; in industry, you may make the hard decisions on personnel so the company succeeds. If you need to reach \$300K total revenue per employee and you are at \$150K, some very good people are going out the door. A leader has empathy with those he leads. You need to have walked a mile in the shoes of the folks you lead. When you lay someone off, it is easier to empathize if you have been unemployed. It is easier to push production if you have spent time on the floor. Leaders **MUST** earn the respect of their subordinates or they will never be able to lead. In the military, we all heard that expression “I’d follow that Captain to hell and back” or “I would not follow that Major to the latrine.”

You gain their respect through the above actions. **Program
Manager, Retired Army Officer**

Page intentionally left blank

