Andrews University

Digital Commons @ Andrews University

Dissertations   Graduate Research

2014

John Bruce, Jr. : a Sixty-Nine Year Leadership Journey Throughout Change in the United States Army

Joseph Rakocy
Andrews University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations

Part of the Military History Commons, and the Psychology Commons

ABSTRACT

JOHN BRUCE, JR.: A SIXTY-NINE-YEAR LEADERSHIP
JOURNEY THROUGH CHANGE IN THE
UNITED STATES ARMY

by

Joseph Rakocy

Chair: Shirley Freed

ABSTRACT OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH

Dissertation

Andrews University

School of Education

Title: JOHN BRUCE, JR.: A SIXTY-NINE-YEAR LEADERSHIP JOURNEY
THROUGH CHANGE IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY

Name of researcher: Joseph Rakocy

Name and degree of faculty chair: Shirley Freed, Ph.D.

Date completed: April 2014

Problem and Purpose

The U.S. Army has changed radically in the 68 years since World War II ended,
from uniforms to vehicles, from weaponry to organizational changes. While still the
Army, its workforce has changed greatly in gender, ethnic, and age composition. John
Bruce, Jr. saw many of these changes during his 69-year career as both soldier and
executive. How this leader responded to the changes in the U.S. Army over nearly seven
decades was the problem I explored.

The purpose of the study was to describe how 94-year-old John Bruce, senior
executive at the U.S. Army's Tank-automotive and Armaments Command Life Cycle
Management Command (TACOM-LCMC), responded to change in the U.S. Army
environment during his career. This exploration revealed how Mr. Bruce continued to

function for the entire length of his career through his leadership, loyalty, and learning, and showed how these qualities influenced his work, his associates, and his extraordinary length of service.

Research Method

This was a single case study of one of the U.S. Army's longest-serving civilian leaders, Mr. John Bruce Jr. The methodology of this study design was five comprehensive interviews of peers of John Bruce, plus a similar interview of Mr. Bruce himself. The interviews were structured around questions designed to bring out the life, core beliefs, leadership style, and motivation of a man who served his nation for the length of time that would be considered the entire lifespan of another man. Interpreting John Bruce's evolving leadership vision, core beliefs, style, skills, adaptation to organizational and life changes, philosophy, and role within the organization, as well as his lifelong contributions and personal motivation through the revelations obtained in the interviews, were the particular challenges of this study.

Findings

Well into his 90s, John Bruce is a man of many talents, blessed with great health and a sharp mind. He came from a sound family background where he learned to love his family, his heritage, and his country. He was instilled with the principles of hard work, thrift, honesty, and integrity, all of which contributed to Mr. Bruce's long, productive career. He enlisted in the U.S. Army during World War II and afterwards, became a civilian employee of the Army, and was able to successfully respond to the Army's many changes by adapting to whatever the Army demanded of him. He made the transition from Accounting to Procurement, climbed the ladder of executive leadership, oversaw

vast technological changes brought on by the computer and paperless contracting, and was a valued leader and role model to the changing workforce. He held deep loyalty to family, duty, the soldier, and his staff, and evolved with the Army as it became a 21st century organization. He oversaw the training and mentoring of his staff and kept himself motivated because of his strong desire to serve his country, and his drive for continual learning. He demanded the best of his workers as he demanded the same of himself, and proved throughout his career to be an exceptionally good steward of the public trust.

Discussion

The life of John Bruce Jr. aligns with several theories as frameworks to interpret his life. He progressed through the many levels of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs: After attaining the basic needs of food and shelter (Level 1), he secured safety by fitting into society (Level 2). He found love and fulfillment in his family (Level 3). He achieved esteem and responsibility through his career (Level 4). His great success in his career helped him to achieve self-actualization (Level 5) as he put his personal leadership style on the day-to-day workings of TACOM-LCMC. John Bruce's life also aligns with elements of Erikson's Eight Stage Theory of Human Development. He developed trust in family and teachers early in life (Stage 1), developed autonomy as a young child (Stage 2), and took initiative in learning at school (Stage 3). Success in school provided competence (Stage 4), and as he gained independence (Stage 5), he chose advanced education in college. He took initiative by joining the Army, and developed an identity as a soldier in the Army, and, after his military service, as a civilian executive of the Army. He chose the intimacy in married life (Stage 6). He gained great success in his career as an executive and came to guide the careers of the next generation of leaders (Stage 7). He

stayed life-affirming well into his 90s (Stage 8). John Bruce's career also aligns with the Herzberg Motivation-Hygiene Theory for job satisfaction, particularly through positive work experiences. He gained recognition as he advanced in his career, achieved many successes in program accomplishments, held a position of great responsibility, was promoted many times, attained an excellent salary, grew in competency along with his career promotions, and enjoyed his job, doing it well. John Bruce's development aligns with Kotter's 8-Step Process in Leading Change through his sense of urgency to accomplish the mission, developing a successful coalition of teammates and staff, developing a change vision that refined itself as he remained in his position, and communicating his vision to his staff and peers for buy-in. He brought about broad-based action in vehicle acquisition, achieved many short-term wins through incremental successes, never let up in his drive to succeed, and incorporated change into the culture. John Bruce's development aligns with Scharmer's U-Shaped Theory in that he achieved "presencing" through growth from a limiting institutional vision of leadership to a fuller connection with the world. Finally, John Bruce's career training was in line with accepted literature: He was a highly motivated learner who held a variety of assignments, acquired on-the-job training and a broad, big-picture perspective; cultivated an expanding skill set; and accepted a position and assignments that involved change and continuing education. His was a high-profile job with associated high job stress; and he willingly accepted the responsibility that came with it.

Conclusions and Recommendations

John Bruce Jr.'s long and exemplary career may never be repeated but we can take away a strong lesson from his life. A willingness to respond to the changes that life

will inevitably bring and to work hard at the varied tasks that life throws our way, a great devotion to family, country, and fellow man, and a strong motivation to learn and to be successful, offers a blueprint for success.

We can gain new leaders with the qualities of Mr. Bruce, just as he directed or mentored many in his leadership style, if we continue to create a sense of honor and loyalty towards family, country, and duty, while promoting selflessness. This needs to be promoted throughout the United States. We should permit leaders to gain the training and experience they need to discover for themselves that great leaders will need to respond to change many times along the path of their careers in order for them to remain motivated to serve. We should promote healthy living that will permit our best leaders to serve longer, and celebrate older workers for their positive contributions and their knowledge, wisdom, and experience. Finally, I recommend similar studies be undertaken on especially long-serving executives.

Andrews University

School of Education

JOHN BRUCE, JR.: A SIXTY-NINE-YEAR LEADERSHIP
JOURNEY THROUGH CHANGE IN THE
UNITED STATES ARMY

A Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Joseph Rakocy

April 2014

JOHN BRUCE, JR.: A SIXTY-NINE-YEAR LEADERSHIP
JOURNEY THROUGH CHANGE IN THE
UNITED STATES ARMY

A dissertation
presented in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by

Joseph Rakocy

APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE:

_____   _____
Chair: Shirley Freed   Dean, School of Education
                                         James R. Jeffery

_____
Member: Duane Covrig

_____
Member: Subir Dass

_____   _____
External: Bradley Sheppard   Date approved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

4-F	U.S. Selective Service classification designating a person physically, psychologically, or morally unfit for military duty
AFAR	Army Federal Acquisition Regulation
BRAC	(Defense) Base Closing and Realignment Commission
CAD	Computer-aided design
CPFF	Cost-plus-fixed-fee (type of contract)
DAWIA	Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act
D-Day	Deployment Day: The start of Operation Overlord in World War II on June 6, 1944
DoD	Department of Defense
FAR	Federal Acquisition Regulation
FMS	Foreign Military Sales
GWOT	Global War on Terror
ILSC	Integrated Logistics Support Centers
IRB	Institutional Review Board
MBA	Masters in Business Administration
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NDRC	National Defense Research Council
OPSEC	Operations Security
OSD	Office of Secretary of Defense
PEO	Program Executive Office
PPBS	Planning Programming Budgeting System
R&D	Research and Development

SDI	Strategic Defense Initiative
SEATO	Southeast Asia Treaty Organization
SES	Senior Executive Service
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
TACOM	U.S. Army Tank-automotive and Armaments Command*
TACOM-LCMC	U.S. Army Tank-automotive and Armaments Command Life Cycle Management Command*
TARDEC	U.S. Army Tank Automotive Research, Development and Engineering Center
TPP	Total Package Procurement
TQM	Total Quality Management
UN	United Nations
USCENTCOM	United States Central Command
WWII	World War II
ZBB	Zero-Based Budgeting

*TACOM and TACOM-LCMC are used interchangeably throughout the dissertation although TACOM was the earlier and commonly used designator for the tank command before LCMC was added several years later; the original name of the tank command was Ordnance Tank & Automotive Command

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Tree, and in particular Jack Wallace and Brad McNett. I thank those closest to me, Nancy Lang, who never stopped encouraging me along the way, and Linda Rakocy, who always helped me to believe that this effort would have a successful conclusion. I am grateful to all of these who sacrificed much in time and company while I worked on a seemingly endless effort that, now that it is finished, seems less a struggle and more a steady journey toward growth. Through it all, from the first day to the last, I have trusted in and continue to thank God, who surely was with me every step of the journey.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

"The people are the true strength of this country. We can talk about government all we want but the thing that makes this country great is our people." Had he been living now, Theodore Roosevelt might have been thinking of John Bruce when he made this statement. Mr. John Bruce began his public service in 1942 as an enlisted soldier in World War II, one of millions of unsung American heroes (Underwood, 2001). Following his honorable discharge after the war, he began work for the U.S. Government in the civil service as a civilian employee for the U.S. Army. As of 2011, he was still working for the U.S. Army until he retired on his 94th birthday, December 3, 2011. Mr. Bruce is a legend at the United States Army's Tank-automotive and Armaments Command Life Cycle Management Command (TACOM-LCMC), one that had grown with every passing year. What Ronald Reagan said in 1985 (F. Ryan, 1995, p.25) might have been said by John Bruce: "I am no longer young. You might have suspected that. The house we hope to build is one that is not for my generation, but for yours. It is your future that matters. And I hope that when you're my age, you'll be able to say as I have been able to say: We lived in freedom; we lived lives that were a statement, not an apology."

To understand Mr. John Bruce's career as a leader requires "an understanding of leadership as the evolution of perspectives imbedded within a wider historical frame"

(Goodall, 2001, p. 20). Mr. Bruce had risen through the ranks in federal service and was, at the end of his career, a Division Chief in the Contracting Center of the U.S. Army's TACOM-LCMC in Warren, Michigan. In his 69-plus years of government service, Mr. Bruce had seen tremendous change in the organization within which he has worked. During those years, he had been figuratively forced to "adapt or die." At age 94 (born December 3, 1917), he is not yet ready to die and, as a consequence, is still handling change in an ever-shrinking world of time and space. In his lifetime, Mr. Bruce has seen the world change from carrier pigeons and horse-drawn mail carts to email and Smart phones; from trans-Atlantic steam ships and bi-winged planes to the Concord and the space shuttle; from pen-and-ink and typewriters to word processors and personal computers. Through it all, Mr. Bruce has managed to change in his workplace. He is as conversant today with computers and email as he was 40 years ago with typewriters and the government forms "crib" or cabinet. He continues to grow because experience has shown him that failure and, ultimately death wait for those who stop growing. When asked about the future and his place in it, he always told one candidly, as he had done for the last 30-plus years of his career, that he had "no immediate plans for retirement."

Background to the Problem

The U.S. Army has changed radically in the 68 years since World War II ended. Today there is constant change in all organizations. People have to respond to these changes. There is much to be learned from how people live with change. From uniforms to vehicles, from weaponry to deployment methods, from advanced training to organizational changes, the Army, although outwardly similar to its World War II counterpart, is vastly different operationally (S. Brown, 2005). Modern weapons and

equipment have replaced most of the rifle and kit of the modern soldier but inward

changes would be more dramatic to the time-traveling WWII "dogface" (ordinary)

soldier. While the Army retains its vertical chain of command, in many areas it is quite

often replaced operationally with a flattened, horizontal organization (S. Brown, 2005).

This often present in the Program Manager Offices, where the Army's organizational

pyramid flattens to become functionally a team that includes civilian contractors.

Diversity has changed the face of the Army, with gender, ethnicity, and a wide range of

age differences now the norm rather than the exception. Training has become ongoing, a

requirement lasting an entire career under the Defense Acquisition Workforce

Improvement Act (DAWIA) (Edgar, 2005). To quote the familiar, the only constant in

the U.S. Army is change.

If the Army has changed, then it can be assumed that its people have changed.

Stated simply, the military and civilian members of the U.S. Army work and live in an

environment of constant change. As Army policy changes, its people are forced to

respond to change in order to comply (Edgar, 2005). Change is often stressful (Rosenblat,

2013). Recent programs within the U.S. Armed Forces target job stress and suicide in the

military that reflect the anxiety of soldiers and civilian employees of all service branches.

To illuminate how people respond to these changes is the goal of this study.

Statement of the Problem

In the 68 years since World War II, the U.S. Army has seen change as dramatic as

the smart bombs that have replaced mortar shells, but has kept one constant. As Stephen

Ambrose said at Omaha Beach (Underwood, 2001, p. 135), "at the core, the American

soldier knew the difference between right and wrong, and didn't want to live in a world

where the wrong people prevailed." The soldiers and civilians who work for the U.S. Army want their organization to be on the right side of the fight for freedom in their nation and throughout the world. Change in the U.S. Army has to measure against the determination of that organization's fight to do the right thing to protect the citizens of the United States and to be on the right side of the fight to defend the nation. The many changes that happened in the U.S. Army had to be brought about by the people who worked within it. Army leaders developed that change and were also changed in the process but kept their core principle, to remain true to the task of national defense. The changes wrought in the U.S. Army itself in terms of organization, technology, and culture, were myriad. Just how Army leaders have managed to successfully respond to the changes in their careers, despite the difficulties that these changes often present, and how they continue in this, is the problem I sought to explore.

Purpose of the Dissertation

The purpose of the dissertation was to assess how 94-year-old John Bruce, senior executive at the U.S. Army's TACOM-LCMC, responded to the changing U.S. Army environment during his 69-year career. How Mr. Bruce responded to these changes was revealed by him and by those who knew him well, those whom he has nurtured, mentored, and groomed for future leadership roles, and was further demonstrated in his motivation to continue to work full time while most of his peers had retired.

Research Question

How did John Bruce Jr. respond to change and remain motivated for 69 years of service to the U.S. Army?

General Methodology

The chosen methodology for this study is a single "case study, an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident" (Yin, 2003, p. 13). A case study relies on multiple sources of data and represents a unique or revelatory purpose. Mr. John Bruce Jr., a 94-year-old senior manager and leader at TACOM-LCMC, has lived a long and colorful life—World War II soldier, university student and graduate, husband, father, entry-level employee, rising star in management, senior-level executive, widower, grandparent, great-grandparent, and ongoing asset to his organization. I conducted interviews with John Bruce and with his employees, associates, superiors, and those who know him best, and reviewed the facts that support his life history, in order to gain insight into the life and times of Mr. Bruce.

Delimitations

Only people who work or have worked at TACOM-LCMC and have an extensive knowledge of John Bruce and TACOM-LCMC were interviewed. The number of people interviewed was six. Three of these six people answered follow-up questions.

Limitations

Limitations in this study were the availability of the subjects to be interviewed who worked with and knew John Bruce well. Many of his contemporaries are deceased or physically or mentally incapable of participating in an interview. Younger subjects have greater accessibility. For all participants, the accuracy of their memories, the precision of their recall, and the coping mechanisms that may have affected their

memories are possible limitations along with their degree of willingness to participate in the study.

Definitions

Bounded system: The "case" selected for study has boundaries, often bounded by time and place. It also has interrelated parts that form a whole. Hence, the proper case to be studied is both "bounded" and a "system" (Creswell, 1998). In this study, it is the lifespan of John Bruce Jr. and chiefly his service to the U.S. Army.

Case study: In qualitative research, this is the study of a "bounded system" involving multiple sources of rich context (Creswell, 1998). Stake (1995) defines the case as the object of the study. This study is a case study of response to changes in the U.S. Army by a long-serving senior executive.

Context of the case: To analyze and describe the case, it is set within its own setting, whether physical, historical, or economic; broad or narrow (Creswell, 1998). In this case, the context was aspects of the U.S. Army at war and peace from the reference point of TACOM-LCMC.

Data analysis: Seeking patterns or correspondence between two or more categories to establish a small number of categories (Merriman, 1998).

Epiphany: A special event in an individual's life that represents a turning point (Creswell, 1998; "Epiphany," 1986).

Qualitative research: "An umbrella concept covering several forms of inquiry that help us understand and explain the meaning of social phenomena with as little disruption of the natural setting as possible" (Merriman, 1998, p. 5). This is an inquiry process of understanding based on a distinct methodological tradition of inquiry that explores a

social or human problem. The researcher builds a complex, holistic picture, analyzes words, reports detailed views of informants, and conducts the study in a natural setting (Creswell, 1998).

Thick description: "The complete, literal description of the incident or entity being investigated" (Merriman, 1998, pp. 29-30). It creates writing that seems to come alive and produces an emotional response in the reader.

Significance of the Study

This dissertation study is significant because it is focused on change, the many changes that a 94-year-old senior U.S. Army executive faced throughout his active career. These changes are identified in the background of the life and work habits of an individual who has experienced many decades of change. In a world of accelerated change, a study that focuses primarily on change during a lengthy career can offer insight into one of modern life's greatest challenges. This study also focuses on motivation, since it must be considered to be essential in a career that extends to nearly 7 decades in an environment where retirement after 30 years is considered to be common.

Summary

The introduction discussed John Bruce, Jr., a 94-year-old, senior executive at TACOM-LCMC with 69 years of government service. The study explores how this man was able to respond to changes and influence others during his long career with the U.S. Army, and what motivated him to continue his career at an age when most of his contemporaries are retired. While the U.S. Army changed during the past 69 years, John Bruce's leadership vision also developed in the face of time and change. The study also sought to discover what motivated the man to continue his career as an active civilian

employee of the U.S. Army for as long as he did. The study sought to understand about

how leaders respond to changes in the workplace and their lives. Interviews were

conducted with Mr. Bruce himself and with those who have known him well during his

career at TACOM-LCMC. These interviews were the key to discover and understand

how the process of change and motivation was reflected in the life and leadership of this

long-serving executive.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

Introduction

Several areas of literature help to elucidate this study of the 69-year journey of a

U.S. Army Acquisition Executive. First, I review post-World War II U.S. military history

since it is the time frame of this study. Additional literature follows with an overview of

leadership and change. Next is a conceptual framework for modern leaders which

supplies a foundation for the career of the study's subject. The literature review next

includes change in the U.S. Army, Army leadership, and defense acquisition. I then

review the U.S. Army organization and other organizations, followed by the history of

management, training, and learning, and conclude with the motivation of workers. This

literature review supplies an essential foundation for the career and era of the study's

subject.

Post-World War II U.S. Military History

Introduction

There are three major sections to the military history section: the Cold War, the

Post-Cold War, and the Global War on Terror. These will describe the major conflicts of

the times and the U.S. military actions that were concurrent with the civilian career of

John Bruce, Jr.

The Cold War

As it had done after all U.S. wars (Gundersen & Smelser, 1994; Webster, 1997) but especially after World War I and in other interim periods between major wars, the U.S. Army downsized its army directly following World War II and the Japanese surrender on September 2, 1945. This immediate and practical action has been done universally throughout history. This downsizing, however, was different for the U.S. in that it emerged from World War II as a superpower. With this status came the obligation to continue to be, when confronting the imperialism of the Soviet Union, a dominant military force in the world. The competition between the two giants became known as the Cold War (Black, 2005; P. Johnson, 1997; Webster, 1997; Wright, 1993). Going face to face with the Soviets required maintaining the U.S. Armed Forces, if not as large as it was during World War II, at least much more ready and responsive to meet global threats than it had been in its rather defenseless state in the decades prior to World War II. In its favor, the U.S. possessed the nuclear bomb. For 4 years after the bombing of Hiroshima, the U.S. remained the only nuclear power. When the Soviet Union exploded its first nuclear bomb in August of 1949, it unhappily surprised an unsuspecting world. The dangerous competition between the two nuclear superpowers had begun, with threats, diplomacy, espionage, propaganda, and economic pressure.

The National Security Act of 1947 established the Department of Defense to replace the Department of the Navy and the War Department (S. Brown, 2005). The Act established the Air Force (previously a component of the U.S. Army), the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), and the National Security Council. Its effect was the timely reorganization that the United States needed to streamline its Armed Services and intelligence in its role as a superpower.

The Korean War

In the summer of 1950, North Korean forces overran South Korea, capturing the capital, Seoul (Black, 2005; Wright, 1993). Since the United States and other UN allies were teamed with South Korea against Communist North Korea, China, and the Soviet Union, they endeavored to help the beleaguered country. The South Korean Army had been driven nearly to the sea. U.S. forces, under General Douglas MacArthur's brilliantly unorthodox strategy, successfully invaded the port city of Inchon behind enemy lines, cutting off the North Korean Army and driving the retreating North Koreans back across the 38th Parallel and into their own country. MacArthur and the allies continued the fight into North Korea to the border of China. Endeavoring to enlarge the war by taking the offensive into China and even proposing using nuclear bombs against North Korea and China, the overzealous MacArthur was relieved of his command by President Truman (Webster, 1997). Negotiations ended the war in 1953 with the two Koreas remaining divided at the 38th Parallel. (It is noted that, officially, the Korean War is considered a police action, as Congress never declared war on North Korea.) To this date, U.S. troops have remained deployed in South Korea after the treaty ended direct hostilities. The peace remains uneasy with North Korea, a target of trade restrictions by the U.S. and its allies. North Korea remains bellicose with its unregulated nuclear program and missile testing and a cause for world concern. As recently as 2010, North Korea provoked South Korea and world peace by sinking a South Korean submarine in neutral waters, resulting in the death of its 46 seamen ("North Korea Attacks," 2010). In 2013, North Korea threatened to deploy missiles against South Korea, Japan, and the United States.

Lebanon

In 1958, Lebanese President Camille Chamoun opposed Sunni Muslims who wanted to join the United Arab Republic. President Dwight Eisenhower sent U.S. Marines to keep President Chamoun's pro-Western government in power (Korbani, 1991). The mission was successful, and the most fractious country in the incendiary Middle East, an immediate neighbor to Israel, remained under the tenuous control of President Chamoun.

Dominican Republic

In 1965, President Johnson sent 400 U.S. Marines to Santo Domingo in the Dominican Republic to evacuate the U.S. Embassy after an attempted coup against the ruling government (McPherson, 2003). Eventually, nearly 42,000 American troops were deployed to evacuate Americans and foreign nationals from the beleaguered country and to distribute food to the affected Dominicans. The mission was deemed a complete success and the Dominican Republic remains calmly at peace in the Caribbean.

Vietnam

What began with the United States sending military advisors in 1957 to South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, eventually ended in 1975 after nearly two decades of conflict with North Vietnam. In that year, the U.S. abandoned South Vietnam and its capital, Saigon, after thousands of American lives were lost and billions of dollars were spent (K. Davis, 2003; P. Johnson, 1997; Wright, 1993). Serving in a minor capacity in the 1950s, the major American presence in Vietnam didn't really happen until the 1964 Gulf of Tonkin Incident involving an altercation between U.S. ships and North Vietnamese torpedo boats. The Tet Offensive of 1968 was a major defeat for the Viet

Cong. As the war dragged on, it became more unpopular with the American public. After the deaths of more than 57,000 American soldiers (while the U.S. killed an estimated 13 times as many enemy soldiers), the U.S. withdrew from South Vietnam under the Nixon administration in 1973. In 1975, the U.S. Embassy was evacuated as North Vietnam captured Saigon. This was the war that launched thousands of protests across the United States with one unified goal of ending the war. During the Vietnam War, the Department of Defense and American industry ramped up production of war materials to its highest level since the Korean War, testing the U.S. military and its industrial base to its limits.

Tehran Hostage Rescue

In 1979, captured by radicals and students in Tehran, the capital of Iran, 26 members of the U.S. Embassy during the Carter administration were taken into custody and held as prisoners. Intense negotiations failed to release the hostages until January 20, 1981, just minutes after the inauguration of President Reagan and on the 444th day of captivity (Bowden, 2006). The timing of the release was interpreted as an affront to President Carter. The incident led to the creation of the Special Operations Command (SOCOM), a branch of the U.S. Armed Services for covert military operations.

Grenada

Grenada, an island in the Caribbean, was invaded by the United States in 1983 after a violent power struggle between competing factions for control of the government threatened U.S. medical students attending college there (Wright, 1993). The 6,000 troops that the United States sent under President Ronald Reagan quelled the upheaval and assured the safety of the medical students and the interests of the U.S. in that region of the world.

Beirut

President Reagan sent troops to Beirut, Lebanon, to quell an erupting armed

conflict in this Middle Eastern hot spot (Korbani, 1991). In an act of terrorism, the

barracks that housed U.S. Marines were blown up. As a result, 241 U.S. Marines lost

their lives in 1983. Shortly afterwards, President Reagan recalled all troops from

Lebanon.

Panama

In 1989, the U.S. invaded Panama in the Canal Zone after civil unrest threatened

the stability of the country that contained the territory of the Panama Canal Zone and the

Panama Canal, vital to the shipping interests of the United States and the world (Wright,

1993). U.S. troops subdued the capital and quieted the unrest to bring calm to the

country.

Post- Cold War

The Dissolution of the Soviet Union

The economic struggles of the Soviet Union, coupled with their defeat in

Afghanistan and unrest in the Baltic satellites, caused the eventual demise of the United

States' chief antagonist (P. Johnson, 1997; Wright, 1993). Forced into an accelerating

arms race with the United States in the 1980s under President Ronald Reagan, the Soviets

began to weaken economically and to lose their grip on their extensive empire. When the

Berlin Wall fell on November 9, 1989 in Berlin, Germany, it was a harbinger of the

upcoming fall of the Soviet Union. Despite the reforms introduced by Soviet Premier

Mikhail Gorbachev, the collapse was inevitable and finally occurred on December 25,

1991, when Boris Yeltsin, President of Russia, seized power after a failed attempted coup to topple Gorbachev ended in Gorbachev's resignation.

Gulf War

When Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1991 and threatened to disrupt the flow of oil to the West, the United States, under President George H. W. Bush, began Operation Desert Storm (P. Johnson, 1997; Webster, 1997; Wright, 1993). The U.S. and 34 of its allies recaptured Kuwait from Iraqi occupation and drove President Saddam Hussein's army back into Iraq, freeing Kuwait from the grip of the dictator. During their retreat, Iraqi troops torched hundreds of oil wells, blackening the air and the polluting the environment for months while oil-well fire fighters attempted to put out the fires. Because of the delicate balance of power in the Middle East, Hussein was left in charge of the defeated country as a buffer against a volatile Iran, hostile to the United States' interests in the region. This decision was greatly criticized by the American public but proved to be the right diplomatic choice for the time. Despite occasional attacks on Allied planes patrolling the "No-Fly Zone" over Iraqi airspace, the situation in Iraq remained calm. Saddam Hussein's blustering caused no actual incidents that led to regional war. Diplomatically, Hussein's failure to cooperate with United Nations (UN) weapon inspectors caused the UN, with the support of the United States, to declare sanctions against Iraq with the exception of food and humanitarian aid.

Somalia

During President William Clinton's administration in 1993, under Operation Restore Hope, badly under-supported U.S. troops were sent to the lawless country of Somalia on the horn of Africa, to free the U.S. Embassy (Bowden, 1999). During

scattered and poorly coordinated operations, the U.S. lost dozens of soldiers to hostile forces in Mogadushu, Somalia's capital. Military actions were ordered to be stopped and the U.S. ended the conflict by rapidly pulling out its troops from the troubled region once its embassy was secured.

In the wake of the U.S. withdrawal from Somalia, the country remains a chaotic region, weakly ruled. Incidents of piracy by armed Somalis against trading vessels and private ships, many in international waters outside Somalia's internationally agreed maritime boundaries, have caused tensions to rise in the region to the present. Several incidents of attempted piracy have been met with attack on or capture of the pirates. International tribunals and trial of the pirates continue to create diplomatic headaches.

Yugoslavia

In 1999, under President Clinton, the United States began a bombing campaign in Yugoslavia, with North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies' support, against this fractious, war-torn region (Judah, 2002). During the nearly hundred days of bombing and air strikes, the infrastructure of the country was devastated. Hostilities ceased when the rulers of the beleaguered region capitulated.

Global War on Terror (GWOT)

9/11

On the morning of September 11, 2001, 19 Middle-Eastern, radicalized Islamic terrorists hijacked four passenger jets within the United States with the aim to destroy key U.S. targets (Farmer, 2009). Two of the planes were deliberately flown in suicide missions into the two towers of the World Trade Center in New York City, causing both towers' collapse. A third plane was similarly flown into the Pentagon and, fortunately,

caused less damage and loss of life than at the World Trade Center. A fourth plane, with the terrorists under siege by resisting air passengers and crew, crashed in Pennsylvania before hitting its likely target of the Capitol building or the White House in Washington, DC. President George W. Bush proclaimed that the attacks were "more than an act of terror; they were an act of war." Over 2,000 people, most U.S. citizens, died in the attacks. As a result, the United States began the still-ongoing Global War on Terror.

Afghanistan

Following the 9/11 attacks in 2001, the U.S., along with dozens of allies including those from NATO, invaded Afghanistan, vowing to attack the places where the terrorists of 9/11 were given training, support, and sanctuary (Christ, 2009). President George W. Bush declared that "we will make no distinction between those who committed these acts and those who harbor them" ("Bush," 2013). The invasion succeeded when Allied forces formed a coalition with Afghan sectarian fighters: In less than 1 month Afghanistan was in the hands of the United States and its allies. For the long term, however, this rugged country, deemed "the crossroads of the world," has never been fully conquered, as its long and bloody history will relate. In the subsequent years since 2001, the United States and its many allies have seen the country retreat into the fractious chaos that it currently remains, the graveyard of its would-be conquerors. This status has continued to the present, despite changes in strategy, commanding generals, revised time tables for withdrawal, and decreasing ally support.

Iraq War

In 2003, after a refusal by Iraq to surrender its weapons of mass destruction (WMD) to the United Nations, the United States invaded Iraq (Filkins, 2008). U.S. troops

17

controlled the capital city, Bagdhad, in less than a month, but resistance continued for more than 7 years. During that time, President Saddam Hussein, former leader of Iraq, was captured, tried, and hanged. Although most acts of resistance are now random bombings and detonations of roadside bombs, the fractious country remains with a rather shaky government and an uneasy peace between the U.S. and its allies, rival sects of Sunni Moslems and Shiite Moslems. The United States withdrew all active combat troops in September 2010, leaving 50,000 troops in place in Iraq as military advisors.

Leadership and Change

The characteristics of the best leaders are many. These leaders are constantly checking the pulse of their organizations and have keen awareness of day-to-day operations (Yukl, 1998). They are able to interpret company business through the full departmental spectrum, assess their co-workers, and understand the technical language of the company's many business groups (T. Wren, 1995). These leaders bear the brunt of their decisions, right or wrong, all the while learning from their experiences to become better future leaders (Butler, Scott, & Edwards, 2003). They exhibit courage when their decisions are questioned or when they fail. They seek the long view and the more distant target, accepting setbacks in order to accomplish the larger goal (Kouzes & Pozner, 1995). Kouzes and Pozner go on to say that leaders don't wait for change: They initiate it themselves. This active leadership often accounts for the greatest gains when it strikes out in a new direction, often at great personal and organizational risk. But although change is often the overriding issue in these types of challenging projects, the effective leader will need to evoke many traits of leadership in addition to change agent, including effective communicator, teacher, and facilitator.

A change agent has two areas of concern: initiating change and maintaining it (Kendra & Taplin, 2004). Initiating change can occur at the beginning of a project or during a particular cycle of the project. Essentials for this are creating and building positive performance along the new pathway and supporting that change during the next section of the project. In order to implement and maintain change, the adept leader will know what kinds of mind-sets will oppose the change (Yukl, 1998), and whom to enjoin to build a coalition for support for the change, while placing change agents in key positions of the newly changed process. Sometimes, it is important to go outside of the organization to bring in people already using the changed process; other times, a convincing and symbolic change, such as a move to another location, will convince those resistant to the change (Kendra & Taplin, 2004) that there is no going back to "the old dispensation" ("Journey," 2013).

A recurring theme in leadership literature is that those credited with effecting change and leading in new directions have the ability to extend their vision to others with proper communication (Butler et al., 2003; T. Wren, 1995; Yukl, 1998). This vision extends the image of the organization into images beyond the present reality (Hesselbein, Goldsmith, & Bechhard, 1996). Associates are made aware of the future organization with clear, effective communication, a grand vision which extends down to the fine details when fully communicated. This is essential in spreading the vision to change the status quo into the new organizational reality. With today's economic reality to produce more with less, the innovative leader must respond with vision and speed. Differing levels of discretion within organizations can be empowering or inhibiting (Yukl, 1998).

Depending on the circumstance and in varying degrees, leaders can work to inspire employees to improve adaptation to new operating procedures (Ferren & Kaye, 1996).

Wartime leadership offers exceptional challenges; peacetime leadership is often less demanding. For the U.S. Army executive, this duality and transition offers unique challenges (Bardwick, 1996). Peacetime lacks the life-or-death pull that wartime thrusts upon leaders (Krantz, 2006). Peacetime managers, born in quiet times, will often lack the training or opportunity to make quick, decisive decisions with attention to the ultimate costs of these decisions. Wartime presents the furnace of adversity that will test and prove out leadership (Underwood, 2001).

Today, peacetime leaders can find circumstances to become effective because recent economic times have been dangerous for corporate and organizational survival (Bardwick, 1996). With rampant globalization, the times have become perilous for businesses and organizations to stay in their comfort zones. Aggressive strategies for the global market have replaced business-as-usual for small-niche companies. These types of business operating conditions can be readily applied to the U.S. military. Vehicle platforms for the U.S. Army's new hybrid truck, an economical fuel saver that was developed in 2010 by the U.S. Army Tank Automotive Research, Development and Engineering Center (TARDEC), were praised by the Hybrid Truck User's Forum as universal platforms able to accommodate dozens of different vehicles' configurations ("HTUF," 2010). Based on three common chassis, the trucks will require their myriad components supplied from hundreds of manufacturers, many of which are not domestic. Those that are domestic may be from the far-flung regions of the United States. It takes

responsive leaders to put together a Program Manager's platform, operating under global-market conditions.

Leadership at the executive level is in continuous evolution. Changes in the marketplace dictate the changes in leadership and organization (Stotler, 2007). Research indicates that leadership must react to change to ensure that each stakeholder in a changing organization understands the change, the reason for the change, and his or her role in a changing structure. Leaders must focus on attaining organizational goals and mandates. This is essential in promoting positive social facilitation of the change. Leaders must be sensitive to the stress to workers that change in the workplace or personal change can cause (Nalbandian, 1985). Effective collaboration between leaders and employees can empower the employees of the organization to effectively integrate the change into their relationships within the organization or outside of organization. This facilitates organization-wide transmission of change.

Conceptual Framework

Introduction

There are many reasons that some leaders remain effective in lengthy careers. Psychological factors have been explored in many related theories. The work of Skinner (1953) in behaviorism and operant conditioning pioneered learning theories, with complex behavior deemed the outcome of simple behaviors that grow from repeated, successful simple behavior. Reinforcement and reward are used to perpetuate a learned behavior, leading to continued growth toward self-sufficiency (Skinner, 1957).

Later behavioral-change theories explain changes in people and their patterns of behavior. Driving factors for change are environmental, social, and behavioral. Understanding why people change can lead to improvement in education and society.

Studies of behavior change in the 1970s and 1980s were performed by several scientists (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Bandura, 1989; Prochaska & DiClemente, 1983). At the same time, the U.S. National Institutes of Health helped advance studies in health and education. Applications of behavior change in criminology during this era sought to prevent recidivism in convicts and ex-convicts.

Social Learning Theory as described by Bandura (1989) recognized that change was influenced by people's behavior and environment. Each of these elements affects the other through continuous interplay. As personality is shaped through individual behavior, it is tested against the boundaries of the circumstances of situation. This feedback loop brings about continued refinements in behavior as the individual's character is formed.

Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) introduced their Theory of Reasoned Action, in which a person reasons through the outcomes and consequences of his actions before performing them. In this theory, it is the intention behind the action and change that shows itself in the individual's behavior. How a person views the action as good or bad, according to his personal code, will affect his choice of path. Ajzen (1988) amended this theory to include the factors of the amount of control that a person has over his situation and the pressures to change. Thus, the strength of the intention to change will be measured against the amount of control that that person has to change.

The Trans-theoretical Stages of Change concept was originally developed as a model by Prochaska and DiClemente (1983). They posited five chronological stages for

achieving intentional change: pre-contemplation, contemplation, preparation, action, and maintenance. The earliest stage of change may find the individual unaware of his need or desire to change. Eventually that desire to change surfaces in contemplation and preparation. Action to change takes place during the initial period of any change. The individual must maintain that change for at least 6 months for the change to become established.

Although the theories discussed above relate to common behavior modification, five more complex theories offer a greater possibility for coinciding with the motivation for the career of older employees. These are the theories of Maslow, Erikson, Herzberg, Scharmer, and Kotter. They involve "self-actualization" (Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs), self-growth (Erikson's Eight-Stage Theory of Human Development), satisfaction (Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory), developing a sense of urgent leadership (Kotter's Eight-Step Process for Leading Change), and having an open mind and open heart with one's organization while experiencing "presencing" or experiencing the future while it is being born (Scharmer's Theory U),. Each theory has potential for elucidating the career of older employees.

<center>Maslow</center>

Maslow begins with Level 1, basic animal needs such as food, water, and oxygen. As we all do in order to survive, we learn at a young age that each of these needs must be met and is essential to life (Maslow, 1954). Children learn that even while they try at play to hold their breath as long as they can, they are forced by natural reaction to breathe; water isn't always conveniently accessible; and food isn't always available. Maslow posits safety as Level 2, essential need. Children feel greater insecurity in civilized

<center>23</center>

society as they deal with issues like separation from parents, bullying from peers, and perceived dangers such as great heights (Huitt, 2007). The drive for satisfaction in these two areas would have begun when a person was relatively young. Level 3 in Maslow's theory is the need for love and belongingness. A long career of devotion to family, job and country would reflect a strong move in that direction years ago. A climb up the ladder of leadership meets the definition of Maslow's Level 4, the need for esteem through his achievement of status, responsibility, and honored reputation. Finally, Level 5 of self-actualization in personal growth and fulfillment defines the successful limits of a life or career. These kinds of accomplishments are a bridge to the future demonstrated through encouragement, training, supporting, and mentoring younger employees along the course of change.

Maslow includes a layer of personality dimensions in his theory, recognizing that some personalities did not follow his theories (Simons, Irwin, & Drinnien, 1987). When an introvert responded to belongingness, for instance, he was more concerned with how he felt rather than how others felt, the opposite of what an extrovert would feel. Introversion or extraversion (Huitt, 2007; Wahba & Bridgewell, 1976) reveals itself in how much a leader demonstrates concern for his employees when they respond to different situations, like change, separation, or trauma in their lives. This evidence of self-transcendence is common in a life dedicated to service.

Maslow and Lowery (1998), in later years, differentiated the growth need of self-actualization. These were cognitive or the need to explore; aesthetic or a search for order and beauty; self-fulfillment; and self-transcendence or connection beyond the self to help others. Discovery of these kinds of growth modalities in careers in leadership

demonstrates a connection with these expanded theories of Maslow (Daniels, 2001). When an exceptional level of caring is demonstrated, it suggests evidence of self-transcendence that is suspected in a life dedicated to service, with, as Norwood (1999) suggests, the fulfillment of self-actualization leading to the quest for even greater self-actualization.

<div align="center">Erikson</div>

Erik Erikson's Eight-Stage Theory of Human Development of 1950, as related in the previous section, presents a theory that demonstrates connection to the life of a leader. Given that Erikson's (1950) theory, in its simplest form, is a series of lessons and challenges that foster growth, in conformity to it, the life of a successful leader would show that growth in ways that support the theory. Erikson lists the eight stages: Stage 1: trust vs. mistrust; Stage 2: autonomy vs. shame; Stage 3: initiative vs. guilt; Stage 4: industry vs. inferiority; Stage 5: identity vs. role confusion; Stage 6: intimacy vs. isolation; Stage 7: generativity vs. stagnation; Stage 8: ego integrity vs. despair.

In Stage 1, an infant will develop trust in his parents if his care is good, or mistrust, if care is poor. In Stage 2, the young child up to age 3 will develop autonomy or shame, depending on the degree of encouragement he receives and independence he develops. In Stage 3, up until age 5, a child will learn to take initiative and grow accordingly if he is not made to feel guilty for his behavior. In Stage 4, up to age 12, a child will grow in skills and ability and should be made to feel competent and not inferior, whenever possible. In Stage 5, up until age 18, a child will grow in independence and develop his identity and should move away from role confusion. In Stage 6, the adult, up to age 40, will develop intimacy through commitment to another

and move from isolation. In Stage 7, up until age 65, a person will develop a career and build a family to gain membership in society, instead of stagnating in life. In Stage 8, the final stage of life over 65, a person will reflect on his life and develop integrity instead of despairing. Coming to terms with life and making attempts to succeed will lead a person away from deflating despair.

Early in life (McLeod, 2013), leaders develop the trust on which to build a career where that trust in others, and their organization, is essential, as is encouraging others' reciprocating trust in them. Erikson hedges on absolutism (Davis & Clifton, 1995) and describes degrees of positive or negative trust and mistrust, autonomy and shame, initiative and guilt, industry and inferiority, and identity and role confusion. Because of this, there is generally a degree of movement toward completion as a person progresses through the first five life stages between birth and age 18. The last three stages of Erikson's theory take a person from young adulthood to advanced age while he customarily builds intimacy over isolation, advances in career and stability over stagnation, and finally, in his last years, achieves a measure of self-reflection and accomplishment instead of despair. During this time, we can assume that a leader knows who he is but given that people continually redefine themselves (Gross, 1987), even nonagenarians continue to self-analyze.

As Erikson's eight stages unfold from their latent presence at birth (D. Davis & Clifton, 1995), they build on each stage as a basis for the next. Following Stage 4, initiative, a person moves toward industry as opposed to inferiority. Bringing about a productive effort, through the development of use of technology, leaves behind the realm of play that sets the child onto the path of adulthood (Kail & Cavanaugh, 2004). This

stage can be viewed as setting the foundation of a leader. We are less concerned with

Erikson's Stage 6, intimacy vs. isolation, for a leader's private life than for his public

face. As an important measure of a leader's career, however, Erikson's Stage 7,

generativity vs. stagnation, will tell us the degree of success that any leader has had in

establishing and guiding the next generation of worker. Erikson's Stage 8, ego integrity

vs. despair, explores the ego's capacity for order. Despair is the fear of one's own death,

loss of those close to us, and loss of autonomy. What is discovered to be the current

mind-set of a leader will declare his present degree of equanimity or concern for his

future. Erikson's theory is difficult to prove in that his research took little note of

statistical models in order to generate the basis for it. His theory has Freudian aspects in

that he uses the term "ego" in the way that Freud used the term; however, Erikson departs

from Freud in sexual aspects, focusing less on sexual development and more on

individual growth in his theory (D. Davis & Clifton, 1995).

Herzberg

Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory revolves around positive workplace

situations that create job satisfaction and less positive or negative situations that create

job dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1959). He declared that these situations are independent of

one another, each generating its own motivation separately. The theory was derived from

the results of workers' interviews. If a long-serving leader's work experience adhered to

Herzberg's theory, he or she naturally would have likely have gained more positive

experiences from the workplace than negative experiences: Positive experiences could

account for a decision to stay with a career for a longer period of time. Herzberg's

preparation in developing his theory was extensive; he scrutinized and compared the

results and methodologies of 155 previous studies of job attitudes from 1920 to 1954. This preparation caused Herzberg's study to be regarded as a sophisticated piece of work. Building on previous studies, Herzberg used open questions instead of the more common closed questions requiring a "yes" or "no," and thereby gained more insights from workers' interviews by allowing workers a chance to take the discussion in directions that they wished it to go. Hackman and Oldham (1976) assert that there have been few challenges to Herzberg's theory over the years. This fact serves as a measure of validation of the theory.

Since the six factors that lead to job satisfaction in Herzberg's theory are recognition, achievement, responsibility, promotion, growth, and the work itself, these factors, when they are revealed, can serve as possible correlations for motivation being aligned with Herzberg's theory. The fundamental part of Herzberg's theory was stated when he wrote (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 2009, p. 82), "We can expand . . . by stating that the job satisfiers deal with the factors involved in doing the job, whereas the job dissatifiers [*sic*] deal with the factors which define the job context." When interviews with and about a leader demonstrate a leader more interested in doing the job, or more interested in defining the job context, these are revelations that will likely affirm out Herzberg's theory (Hackman & Oldham, 1976).

For job context and dissatisfaction, the seven telling factors are unwanted policies, friction with supervision, work conditions, relationship with immediate supervisor, compensation, security, and relationship with co-workers ("Human Relations," 2010; "Principles," 2011). As references to these mount during the course of

any research, the relationship to job dissatisfaction in Herzberg's theory as it relates to motivation is revealed.

Herzberg's work parallels that of Maslow in that Herzberg also discusses the needs of human beings. Herzberg theorizes two sets of needs for people ("Principles," 2011): first, animal needs for pain avoidance; and second, as a human being for psychological growth. Herzberg made a biblical reference to illustrate this point regarding motivation ("Frederick," 2010, p. 3): "Adam, once expelled from the Garden, seeking hygiene: Food, shelter, clothing and protection; and Abraham, fulfilling the need for self-development through his following God's directives to become the father of a nation." Like Abraham, the modern executive has motivational concerns which are now generally described as the global concerns for good business: responsibility, fairness, justice and compassion, and the issues of ethical management.

Herzberg posits that, like Maslow, people will seek first to satisfy their basic hygienic needs (Herzberg, 1959; "Principles," 2011). A review of a successful leader's life will typically reveal comfortable means, with possessions all well above average. Earning the perquisites of corporate leadership, with the status of being an upper-level executive with a satisfying measure of respect from his employees, moves most leaders well into the realm of Herzberg's hygienic or maintenance factors (Herzberg, 1959). A leader's office walls attest to his degrees, advancement, achievements, recognition, and responsibilities, which are all motivating factors declared by Herzberg. These are clear evidence of growth areas, not simply the possibility of growth that Herzberg differentiates from actual growth.

Herzberg's motivators include money, but Herzberg relegates money and salary to a lesser degree of motivation (Herzberg, 1959; Khalifa & Truaon, 2009) than achievement or recognition. Herzberg declares ("Frederick," 2010, p. 4): "It appears as it does in the low sequences; however, in the low sequences it is found almost three times as often." Inadequate salary will lead to dissatisfaction much more often than adequate salary will lead to satisfaction. Thus, when one views the effects of salary on the motivation factors, one may see this as a driver early in careers that diminishes with time in careers, especially in the later stages. For all people, there are bigger motivators than money. Edward G. Robinson attested to this as the character Johnny Rocco in the classic film *Key Largo* (Wald, 1948): "More! Yeah, that's what I want. More!" His meaning, even though he was a high-level crime boss and a despicable human being of the lowest order, was clear: He craved power, prestige, growth, all of Herzberg's higher motivators, and not just money.

Kotter

John Kotter (1996) of Harvard Business School strongly urges that our greatest leaders must actively lead change, and he conveys a sense of urgency that the world needs immediate change through committed and informed leaders. He offers his Eight-Step Process for Leading Change: Step 1: Establish a sense of urgency; Step 2: Create a guiding coalition; Step 3: Develop a change vision; Step 4: Communicate the vision for buy-in; Step 5: Empower broad-based action; Step 6: Generate short-term wins; Step 7: Never let up; Step 8: Incorporate changes into the culture. His institute, Kotter International, states that the sense of urgency for change is real and is needed now to escape the chaos of our world, from corporate failure to imminent dangers from war and

terrorism, hunger, poverty, and disease. H. Lee and J. Lee (2008) discuss the value of fostering a feeling of crisis to initiate change and bring about new work methods that value time as another resource. Kotter (2005) shares a sense of urgency for action like many great men who have accomplished much. Leonardo da Vinci is cited ("Leonardo da Vinci," 2013) as believing strongly in the urgency of doing, and is quoted as having said, "Knowing is not enough; we must apply."

Scharmer

Otto Scharmer's Theory U (2009) describes a new collective leadership to meet the massive institutional failures of our world. Such problems as hunger, poverty, AIDS, terrorism, violence, destruction of nature, and loss of spiritual values are some of our world's biggest problems. Theory U describes a way for collective leadership to attempt to solve these challenges. It seeks to explore the inner place of leadership and how it operates at a deep level. Scharmer describes the sensation of his coined word, "presencing," when leaders approach the source of that core. It is described as akin to be waiting to be born. Presencing is a process of five movements of a "U"-shaped journey. Leaders must learn to move away from a limiting institution (upper left side of the "U") and attempt to connect with the world. This leads the process down the left arm of the "U," to connect with the world emerging from within, to the bottom of the "U" at which point self merges with the world. Here the leader gains resonance with the world and emerges up the opposite arm of the "U." The leader grows under a heightened energy of possibility in concert with a new outlook with group members (Scharmer, 2013). At the top of the right side of the "U" is our highest possibility, a leader in true connection with the world.

Change in the U.S. Army

Introduction

This section discusses the changes that have occurred in the U.S. Army since World War II. It describes the U.S. Army's organization, Army leadership, and concludes with defense acquisition.

Organization of the U.S. Army

An organization is a complex myriad of interacting people and departments, each contributing his or its specialty toward the success of the organizational goals. A well-run organization is often compared to a healthy human body. How leaders direct the engagement of the interacting and cooperating departments directly results in the success or failure of the organization. An understanding of the organization of the U.S. Army is helpful for understanding the framing organization for this study's subject.

"The current United States Army is organized into six worldwide commands. Without the institutional Army, the operational Army cannot function. Without the operational Army, the institutional Army has no purpose" ("United States Army," 2010). This statement typifies the reasoning behind the tightly hierarchal United States Army. The chain of command used by the Army is not new; it was used by the armies of ancient Greece and Rome and some of their predecessors. The hierarchy of organization within the U.S. Army ensures that command will flow down the organized ranks in an orderly manner to help prevent misdirected orders.

In the United States, the U.S. Armed Forces are restricted to military actions and are not permitted to enforce civil law. The U.S. Army is ultimately commanded by the Chief Executive of the United States, the President. Authority for actions within the

Army flows from the President, as Commander-in-Chief, through the Secretary of Defense, second in command. Through the Secretary of Defense, orders go to the Secretaries of the Army, Navy (which includes Marines and Coast Guard), and Air Force. Members of the military execute these orders through the chain of command, with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff acting as chief military officer (J. Brown, 1999).

Major Commands, which are a collection of smaller units, are central to global control of the U.S. Armed Services ("United States Army," 2010). The U.S. has six major commands situated throughout the world, roughly corresponding to the six major continents, plus a Central Command (USCENTCOM), in order to achieve rapid situational control over a region of the globe. Each of these commands is controlled by a single commander (Powers, 2010).

Organization in the U.S. Army has evolved since World War II ("United States Army," 2010). Although the vertical structure of command is still present today, a newer, flatter, and more horizontal organizational structure is evolving in many of the Army's subgroups. Program Executive Offices (PEOs) are responsible for weapons systems and deterrent development, and work intimately with U.S. industry. The PEOs and industry team closely together to bring newly designed weapon and vehicle platforms through the evolution of development, ensuring a cradle-to-grave approach in tune with green practices. Each PEO works with the Army's support business offices to achieve their objectives. Major business offices within the U.S. Army include, among other, the Acquisition Corps (Procurement and Pricing), Integrated Logistics Support Centers (ILSC), Research & Development, and Legal Offices. The Army team of today stresses smooth interaction among these segments of the largely civilian support team that

initiates and administers the materiel requirements of the Army. In a global marketplace, in which information is of ultimate importance, collaboration achievement within a team of diversely skilled people becomes not only desirable but necessary and inevitable (Bennis & Biederman, 1997).

<div align="center">U.S. Army Leadership</div>

Throughout the decades, the leadership of the U.S. military perennially remains the place to earn the U.S. public's highest esteem for leadership, significantly within both the military and the civilian ranks (Garamone, 2006; Sheliga, 1990). Respected military leaders have been a continuing object of study. Ladislas Farago captured the life and person of General George S. Patton in his biography, *Patton, Ordeal and Triumph* (Farago, 1969). The passion and dedication of the flamboyant leader became widely recognized as a type of boldly aggressive Army leadership. Another such leader, General Douglas MacArthur, led aggressive campaigns for victories in two world wars and the Korean War. Lesser known and much less flamboyant figures living equally valuable lives are more the pattern for this study.

Lieutenant General Henry S. Aurand worked behind the scenes of the Army's major conflicts, unheralded yet superbly effective in improving the armaments of the U.S. Army in his tenure from 1915 to 1952 (Ruppenthal, 2013). He was a new type of army manager, who used his mechanical engineering background to improve the efficiency of the organization and its support of the soldier. Similarly, the quietly overachieving Lieutenant Clarence R. Huebner led the U.S. Army's 1st Infantry Division in both the First and Second World Wars, gaining impressive victories in France, especially in the assault on Omaha Beach on D-Day (Flaig, 2006). His attention to detail

and insistence on organization and planning contributed largely to his success as a leader, and to the victories that the 1st achieved that saved so many of American soldiers (Resteigne & Soeters, 2009). A further example of this type of soldier was the up-from-the-ranks World War II General Walter Krueger (Holtzimmer, 1999). Krueger's deeply detailed planning and genuine concern for the life of every soldier under his command, based on his experiences as a private fighting in the Spanish Civil War, led him to become a brake for the overly impetuous Commander he worked for, Douglas MacArthur. He knew that battles won through careful planning and coordination generally save lives and materiel.

Robert S. McNamara was the Secretary of Defense under President John F. Kennedy. His leadership style was in stark contrast to the Senators who heard his periodic reports (Hunsaker & Alessandra, 1980). Using statistics, computer printouts, charts and graphs, and copious data, he overwhelmed the Congressmen who wanted only the pertinent facts and did not care to venture into the minutia upon which a former automotive executive like McNamara had based so many of his commercial decisions. Such different styles of leadership can lead to difficulties for leaders (Hewes, 1975).

President Dwight D. Eisenhower, as an Army General (Hammond, 1977; Hunsaker & Alessandra, 1980), preferred to use a staff of experts upon whom he counted to provide him brief summaries and reports. These became the basis for his decisions. He recognized his limitations in his ability to gather data and left it to the specialists in several fields to provide the background for his decisions. This method carried over into his Presidential style, with "Ike" relying heavily on his cabinet and close advisors.

The Cold War thrust itself intrusively and demandingly upon American Presidents from Truman to Reagan (Robin, 2001). The reality of the Cold War was intimately involved with every military decision and affected Army leadership from the Commander-in-Chief down. Leaders had to be overly prepared for an enemy of unknown dimensions and unknown intentions, and the ramifications of different war outcome scenarios (Porter, 2010). The public was aware of the war of ideas and psychological aspects of the Cold War (anti-communism scares, atomic bomb drills and bomb shelters) and relied on Army leadership through military might and advanced weaponry to keep the Soviet wolf at bay. Ambiguity of leadership decisions often led to management puzzling how to carry out the orders from the top (Bender, 2004; March, 1986; Meier & O'Toole, 2009). This brought about a chain effect of disillusionment of junior officers, leading to the necessity of maintaining morale in the overall officer ranks (Lewis, 2004).

The United States partnership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has caused additional complication among allied leadership as decisions from the top are attempted to be disseminated among the various military organizations of diverse countries, often leading to confusion and misdirection (L. Kaplan, 1988). Pauchant, Mitrof, and Lagadec (1991) discuss crisis management strategy in the U.S., Canada, and France and methods to alleviate worst outcomes. Listening and being fully understood is a logical first step to international cooperation. Andreski (1968) and Durant (2007) further illuminate other problems including language barriers, non-conforming equipment, and the necessity for commonality in ordnance and munitions, automotive issues, environmental issues, and even basic measurement units themselves (metrics vs. U.S. standard measurements).

Defense Acquisition

The year 1945 saw the end of World War II in both theaters, the European

Theater in May and the Pacific Theater in September. With the end of war came the

inevitable dismantling of the network that had been delivering war materiel at a frenetic

pace for 4 years. The Acquisition Corps in World War II was controlled chaos at best. So

much was needed at once that laws of exigency were passed. At the end of 60 years of

dynamic change, J. Ronald Fox, Assistant Secretary of the Army, summed up the

evolution of U.S. Army Acquisition.

> Defense acquisition has evolved over several decades, slowly improving, but not
> without moving through painful periods of re-creating and re-experiencing
> acquisition management problems of the past. I believe that painful periods have
> occurred to a significant degree because of the absence of comprehensive history
> of defense acquisition or even of record of lessons learned. I want first to
> acknowledge that there is much that is right with defense acquisition. As most of
> you know, the Defense Department develops and produces the most sought-after
> weapons and equipment in the world. These products are often designed to
> achieve performance levels never before realized, with many components and
> some material never before used in military or commercial applications. Beyond
> these significant acquisition accomplishments, the Defense Department has also
> had notable successes in systems engineering, logistics, contraction and many
> other areas. But the complexity and first-of-a-kind nature of major acquisition
> programs places them among the most difficult industrial management jobs in the
> world. Problems are inherent in the nature of this work. (S. Brown, 2005, p. 19)

As far back as 1948, during the early stages of the Cold War, the U.S. sought to

integrate acquisition with science to meet its needs (S. Brown, 2005). In the publication

How Re-armament Affects Your Business, the Department of Defense sought to make

early strides in preparing for the next possible war, a war of technology, with the

improvement to the acquisition process. Sensing that the next war could be a nuclear war

even before the Soviet Union had built a nuclear bomb, the U.S. sought to gain the edge

in size and scope of its technologies. This required an Army Corps capable of working

with industry from the ground up and meant that acquisition would be redefined to mean

explicitly "acquiring the best, fastest and most efficient forms of technology" (S. Brown, 2005, p. 6) and in the best manner possible.

The foundation of modern acquisition began with the passage of the Air Corps Act of 1926. This Act permitted negotiated contracting within the Air Corps and was used in areas such as parts supply. The Act's applicability was strengthened under Franklin Roosevelt's administration in 1940 when Congress improved many national defense measures. Henceforward the U.S. Navy and U.S. Army could use negotiated contracting methods. Following the attack on Pearl Harbor, the First War Powers Act of 1941 "authorized the president to empower federal agencies to 'enter into contracts without regard to existing provisions of law'" (S. Brown, 2005, p. 7). This opened the throttle and allowed the accelerated acquisition of war products. The Second War Powers Act of 1942 was basically an amendment that increased the powers of military acquisition.

The end of World War II saw a vast curtailment of the procurement of war materiel. New laws passed between 1947 and 1950 were aimed at the quality of collaboration between the military and industry. In an age that emphasized threat and saber rattling over bullets, the beginnings of "scientific" acquisition showed first evidence. Acquisition combined management and analysis within a legal and regulatory framework to unite the military with industry. With the Cold War as a spur and the Korean War the reality of when a war turns hot, Dwight David Eisenhower spoke emphatically about the dangers of Soviet aggression in his 1958 State of the Union speech (S. Brown, 2005). This speech led Congress to enact the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958.

From 1945 to 1958, and although historically used interchangeably, "procurement" was the term used in place of "acquisition." Central to procurement aims was the pursuit of advanced technologies driven by Cold War fears of sudden attack (S. Brown, 2005; Collins, 2005). Jet fighters and missile delivery systems, and advanced radar and mega-ton nuclear weapons were the most sought-after prizes. Funding outlays followed the high-tech products, greatly outstripping funding for conventional weapons. Research and development (R&D) rose from $750 million in 1945 to more than $5 billion in 1960. Soviet detonation of a nuclear bomb in 1949, a hydrogen bomb in 1953, and the launch of Sputnik in 1957, spurred the race for better technology.

Eisenhower reorganized the Department of Defense in 1953, abolishing R&D boards. He emphasized the improvement of the military acquisition process. The Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD) was central to acquisition. Plainly evident by the end of the Eisenhower administration was the movement of acquisition from entirely within the military to an actual partnership with contractors.

When John F. Kennedy assumed the office of the President of the United States in 1961, he assessed the state of military acquisition as broken. During the Eisenhower administration, cost-plus-fixed-fee (CPFF) contracts accounted for 34% of the military funds spent (S. Brown, 2005). Under Robert McNamara, Kennedy's Secretary of Defense, the growth of private-sector acquisition strategy would find a home in the Department of Defense. McNamara's Planning Programming Budgeting System (PPBS) was introduced to maintain budgets and force a cohesive strategy in acquisition programs throughout the branches of the military. With such tools in place, out-of-control costs fell as CPFF contracts began to be contained, expenditures dropping 36% in 7 years under the

improved use of this contractual instrument alone. McNamara had gained his reputation

as a scientific whiz kid at Ford Motor Company and his push for scientific methods

continued with the military. Another tool introduced by the McNamara team, Total

Package Procurement (TPP), greatly reduced in-buying and hidden (iceberg) costs, by

forcing companies to remain longer in the qualification process rather than buying in

early and springing additional costs on the unsuspecting military later.

Throughout the Vietnam War, these acquisition improvements proved effective to

contain the costs of new weapons systems (S. Brown, 2005). Acquisition was involved

with ground-up development of new systems and now had advanced warning when

difficulties with a particular system became evident. McNamara made the development

of systems used by all branches of services, a joint exercise. While problems could arise,

such as in the development of the F-111 Bomber, these would become visible early in the

game when they were cheaper to fix. Acquisition had found its respected place within the

modern military.

The 1970s marked the ending of the Vietnam War and the retrenchment and

reform of the acquisition process (S. Brown, 2005). Following Vietnam, the mood in the

United States was one of distrust. Military budgets and defense acquisitions were given

more scrutiny than they had in earlier years. Under Nixon, Ford, and Carter, the

Department of Defense would reach out to its global partners, NATO and the Southeast

Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), to coordinate its acquisitions from an allied

perspective. The Nixon doctrine allowed greater Foreign Military Sales (FMS) and

initiated co-production programs with foreign allies. This approach led to the production

of the F-5 aircraft in Taiwan and an eventual co-production of the M1 tank in Egypt. In

Saudi Arabia, F-5 jet production began in the early 1970s and was superseded by F-15 production. The United States' policy was to ensure at least a 5-year technological lag with the weapons they were permitted to sell to its global partners.

David Packard, Secretary of Defense under Nixon, issued memoranda to attack the acquisition monster piecemeal with such admonitions as "'fly before you buy,' language used to ensure that acquisition executives were doing their best to observe the memo's contracting guidance" (S. Brown, 2005, p. 146). Subcontractor statistics were ordered to be kept in order to track which companies were getting a preponderance of Department of Defense (DoD) work. Extending this tendency into the Carter years, Zero Based Budgeting (ZBB) was introduced to help gain management overview on budgeting decisions. ZBB did achieve some control over costs while its watchdog administration increased the amount of accounting information and paperwork. Greater transparency early in the acquisition process was the major benefit of ZBB.

While the 1970s saw greater reform and oversight of military acquisition, that decade also ushered in quantum leaps in technology (Landau, Drori, & Porras, 2006) and a change in vision for government research and development. This included a revolution in electronics and computers. Computer-aided design (CAD) shaved months off design times for new products. Development of advanced ground vehicles, such as the M2 and M3 Bradley Infantry Fight Vehicles, M113 Armored Personnel Carrier, and M1 main battle tank, saw a re-emphasis on conventional-war capabilities for the United States. With the coming of the Reagan administration, conditions were ripe for a major rebuilding of the U.S. Army.

Under Ronald Reagan, initiatives to redirect misspent resources flowed from his Deputy Secretary of Defense's assistant, Vincent Puritano, through the Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger. These initiatives included streamlining the acquisition process and eliminating needless paperwork. Puritano felt that budget and weapons acquisition were closely intertwined and not unrelated. Actions taken, deemed the Carlucci Initiatives after Deputy Secretary of Defense Frank P. Carlucci III, emphasized long-term planning and program stability as central pillars of cost reductions. The government acquisition process would be run more like a business. Similarly, the Grace Commission of 1982 (S. Brown, 2005; Sherry, 2008) flowed naturally from the Carlucci Initiatives and attempted to survey the costs of government and report them to the President.

Senator Gary Hart of Colorado founded the Military Reform Caucus, a bicameral group dedicated to making recommendations to improve the military. The caucus exposed spare parts scandals such as a $700 toilet seat and a $435 hammer, which focused attention on waste in the military acquisition process. In the era of overwhelming programs such as the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) proposed at billions, the reform wave was something that the public could instantly embrace (Sherry, 2008).

The end of the Cold War in the late 1980s, hastened by Ronald Reagan's military build-up that caused the Soviet Union to spend its way into bankruptcy, brought the United States to a situation that the end of wars typically does. The build-up of the U.S. military, now without an adversary, left U.S. leaders with the necessity of restructuring their forces (Sherry, 2008; Shiman, 2000). Congress demanded a "peace dividend" and a decrease in military spending. The military agreed that what was now needed was a more

flexible, smaller, responsive force with greater technological capabilities that could serve when and where needed (Marens, 2008). Within the military, the Acquisition community needed to streamline as well as respond to the new vision of the Army. The Goldwater-Nichols Act of 1986 and The Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act (DAWIA) of 1990 came into being to improve the operations of military acquisition and make control of research and development a more focused operation. While Goldwater provided corrections for materiel acquisitions and joint strategic planning, DAWIA would provide for development of a professional acquisition workforce to enable these changes to happen.

DAWIA had far-reaching implications (S. Brown, 2005). It went beyond other acquisition reform measures before it. The Military Reform Caucus of the early 1980s had been the driver behind Public Law 98-369, which required the head of each executive agency to ensure professional workforce development. The 1986 National Security Directive 219 required changes to strengthen contracting procurement. DAWIA spelled out specific changes in the Program Management system, the development of a professional contracting corps, a mix of civilian and military in Acquisition, and a spelling out of impediments to the acquisition process. DAWIA's major themes were quality, professionalism, and empowerment as related by Paparone, Anderson, and McDaniel (2008). It was a reaffirmation of President Eisenhower's assessment that the only way to improve DoD Acquisition was to improve DoD's people. Henceforward, management within DoD would know their limits of responsibility; civilians would team with military to improve the understanding of military in regard to acquisition; and new

standards would mandate the type of training that the acquisition staff would require (August, 1995).

In the end, DAWIA brought about a cultural change in the acquisition process and in those who worked within the Acquisition Corps, requiring a well-educated, professional staff in tune with the technologically advanced Armed Services that post-Cold War America would require in its new global role of sole superpower (S. Brown, 2005; Sherry, 2008). Employees with Masters in Business Administration (MBAs) became common in the Acquisition Corps of DoD and in TACOM-LCMC.

History of Management

There are three major sections to a history of management: the Early History of Management, Modern Management, and the Scientific Management School. These will describe major management theories that are integrated into this study.

Early History of Management

Greek and Roman Armies: The ancients knew that management of vast armies depended on the control that leaders could provide ("Roman Army," 2010; "Structure," 2013). Their systems called for units of soldiers to be controlled by leaders. The smaller units were combined into progressively larger units, with each leader of a smaller group reporting to a new leader up the chain of command. Plans and directives were dispersed down the chain; field conditions were reported up the chain. This system provided necessary control to the commanding generals and field commanders down to the battle front.

Roman Catholic Church: The Roman Catholic Church began with a hierarchal model of management (Norman, 2007). The pope, the head of the Church, brought his

authority and teachings to those under him through his bishops, priests, and deacons. Today, the Catholic Church is entrenched in its own country, Vatican City, a tiny enclave within the city of Rome, Italy. The hierarchy is much the same as in ancient time, with the pope ruling through his cardinals (senior bishops raised to special office), archbishops, bishops, priests, and deacons.

Sun Tzu and The Art of War: This Chinese philosopher, who lived roughly 2,000 years ago, developed principles from his observations of military campaigns that have been applicable to management systems throughout the centuries (Tzu & Sawyer, 1994). Some of these are: When the enemy advances, we retreat; when he halts, we harass; when he seeks to avoid battle, we attack; when he retreats, we follow. These principles and others that Sun Tzu observed and brought forth in this work have been applied successfully in the planning of the "battle campaigns" of corporations. Japanese corporate management style, often accused of waging corporate warfare, has been strongly influenced by Sun Tzu.

Machiavelli and the Prince and Discourses: Niccolo Machiavelli lived in 16th-century Italy and espoused the republican form of government (Machiavelli & Mansfield, 1998). Around the year 1513, he laid out in *The Prince* principles that have been prized for their pragmatic, sometimes cunning, advice for the survival and growth of organizations. Some of these called for open forums for conflict resolution, better control through management throughout the organizational tree, and keeping in touch with past principles that brought success whenever change is contemplated. In solving conflicts, many people are typically sought and needed to maintain the organization. Machiavelli

thoughtfully espoused that weak managers must be backed by strong managers in the chain of command.

East India Company: Chartered by the queen of England in 1600, the East India Company was a joint stock company that came together to trade in the Far East, chiefly trading with India and China (Auber, 1965; Dalrymple, 2012). Originated for commercial trade, it eventually gained ruling control in India and China. Merging with smaller companies and exercising increasing private military power, the company kept their near-monopoly in trade of tea, silk, cotton, dyes, and drugs, especially opium. The East India Company eventually disbanded in 1874. The company was an early practitioner of common commercial practices employed today, including mergers and acquisitions with smaller companies to increase trading advantages. East India Company also acquired great political favors from the British government through lobbying efforts that mirror the efforts of today's modern corporations.

Hudson Bay Company: Like the East India Company, the Hudson Bay Company was chartered by the Crown of England, although 70 years later, in 1670 (Dalrymple, 2012; Morton, 1965). The Hudson Bay Company's story somewhat parallels that of the East India Company. In contrast, however, this oldest corporation in North America is still in existence and is based in Toronto, Ontario. Originally a fur-trading company, the company held vast tracts of land and often operated as the sole government in the vast wilderness of Canada, wielding military power when needed. With the decline of the fur trade, brought about by the fall of European fashion demands for the beaver hat, the company became a trading company that supplied trade goods and supplies to settlers in Canada and parts of the United States.

Modern Management

Modern management theory is based on understanding the organization, communicating throughout the organization efficiently, and utilizing continuous feedback for learning, correcting, and improving the organization and its business (T. Wren, 1995). Effective management depends on effective relationships with workers throughout the varying levels of management. Because the rise of large manufacturing organizations is a rather recent phenomenon, little more than a hundred years old, management often has no historical trend to follow (Cox, 1997). What happened a hundred years ago is in the realm of history. What happens today, faced in the same stark way, is often cutting-edge new.

Scientific Management School

Frederick Taylor, an American who lived from 1856 to 1915, developed a theory of management he termed the scientific management theory (T. Wren, 1995). His ideas were simple yet bold for their time: study management as a science in order to improve each task from a scientific basis; select workers scientifically to find the most suitable job for each worker; educate each worker; and finally, build cooperation between workers and managers.

Taylor's principles were aimed at increasing production so that profits would naturally follow (Tanz, 2010). Taylor developed time and motion studies that broke down each job into their simple movements, analyzed them, and developed better ways to perform the tasks. He also sought methods to match workers to the work they were best suited to perform. He encouraged paying more effective workers a higher salary based on output. This method incentivized workers to perform better but eventually led to friction

when increased efforts by workers led to on-the-job injuries or repetitive-motion injuries, or caused disputes among workers, especially when layoffs happened.

Henri Fayol was a French mining engineer who lived from 1841 to 1925 (T. Wren, 1995). He developed his 14 principles of management which were based on planning, organization, coordination, and control. These 14 points were a common-sense approach to management in organization which fostered, among other things, effective planning, forecasting, command, discipline, order, cooperation, and initiative.

Henry Gantt, an American, followed in Frederick Taylor's footsteps (T. Wren, 1995). He developed tracking charts to follow workers' outputs and incentivized both workers and their supervisors through monetary rewards for increased production. Gantt is best known today for his production and process flow charts, today known as the Gantt chart. This chart was the basis for other charts much favored by management today.

Frank and Lillian Gilbreth were married partners who studied worker fatigue and movement to improve worker conditions (T. Wren, 1995). The Gilbreths used cameras to record and analyze workers' motions to improve production and reduce worker fatigue. Their efforts are hailed for their improvements to workers' health.

Mary Parker Follett, an American whose life bridged the 19th and 20th centuries, advocated that persons were not whole unless they belonged to a group (D. Wren & Bedeian, 2009). For organizations, this meant that the group dynamic was important and that distinctions between management and workers were blurred. Her theories advocated a potentially global role for management, within and outside of the organization. Theories of Follett have been used by Home Depot as it has sought to integrate its staff into a team with blurred distinctions between workers and managers. Home Depot goes to greater

lengths to train their employees than do most corporations, reserving the first month after an employee's hiring for training. Weekly training meetings are telecast, available universally to all employees. Home Depot is known for offering customers in-store training sessions in home improvement skills.

Max Weber, a German sociologist who lived from 1864 to 1920, developed an organization of bureaucracy with rational objectives and effective divisions of labor (D. Wren & Bedeian, 2009). Weber believed in a benevolent bureaucracy in which management worked cooperatively with workers for a common goal.

Behavioral studies in the mid-20th century place human relations at the core of the organization. Changes in the workplace to improve the workers' conditions were made with, among other things, resilient flooring and adequate lighting, as suggested by the Hawthorne Experiments at Western Electric Company (D. Wren & Bedeian, 2009). These kinds of tests revealed that influences such as improved lighting can improve production and comfort of workers. Results, however, were not always able to be interpreted consistently.

The importance of improving quality in production came to the forefront in the late 20th century. The contributions of W. Edwards Deming in production methods, using a statistical approach, have been enormous (Tanz, 2010). Deming taught that quality needed to be built into a product early in its production. If the quality is planned for and built into the product at the onset, the need for lengthy and expensive inspection processes becomes superfluous.

Lean Theory involves planning operations, processes, and logistics (Womack & Jones, 2003). Efficiency derives from these. Time spent in any processes beside actual

production time detracts from efficiency. Time spent in effective production increases efficiency. Led by the Japanese firm, Toyota, and the Danish firm, Danfoss, the driving principles behind Lean Theory are to increase production and output on the factory floor, and decrease production area footprint and workforce. Any identified waste in production or processes should be reduced or eliminated. Production should be free of any obstructions so that the focus remains on planning, meeting schedules, improvement, and maximum efficiency. Customer feedback is central to providing the product that the customer wants, made to the standards that the customer needs, for the price the customer can afford. Company feedback loops are held to review processes and to allow the retention of what works and the elimination of what impedes production efficiency. All groups from within the organization should be involved in the planning and improvement of the processes that lead to maximum efficiency. Tools such as value-stream flowcharts, which detail the big-picture process from cradle (i.e., mining ore for metal parts) to grave (recycling metal parts from scrapped end products), are used as blueprints for eliminating waste and improving efficiency.

Total Quality Management (TQM) is a concept that encourages managers and workers to continually provide better products to higher standards (Marcus, 2008; Tanz, 2010). This approach is interactive and continually seeks to improve. Barriers between management and workers are torn down with access for all team members to each member of the team as necessity dictates. The larger concept of TQM is that organizations and corporations are a vital part of the global community and contribute to the health and well-being of the entire planet.

Training and Learning

This section details training for managers and executives who are in leadership positions.

Much of the skill necessary for effective executive leadership is learned on the job (Espedal, 2009; Yukl, 1998). Generally, the road to top executive positions takes many diverse paths. Young managers being groomed for upward mobility typically will be offered or will take assignments in many different departments in order to gain "the big picture" of the organization. The experience of working under many supervisors and leaders who will offer their varying approaches to leadership and management provides real-life lessons to the insightful executive and contributes to overall learning. Expanding skill sets are a huge benefit to those executives who seek or accept varied, challenging assignments, as they go up the corporate ladder.

The degree of challenge in job assignments has been found to be greatest in those assignments that require some type of change (McCauley & Hughes-James, 1994). The greater the change, whether it be to the organization, business methods, personal changes, supervisor or co-worker conflicts, or in battling business failure, typically the greater the overall value of the assignment. Rosenblat (2013) encourages embracing change through awareness and recognition of change while remaining flexible and positive as one looks for the big picture. He recognizes that "great leaders don't resist change; they embrace change, often causing breakdowns when they initiate it" (p. 3C). During times of high job stress or challenge, the effective leader will look deeper for answers and will stretch and grow with the challenge. In these types of situations, success will breed self-confidence in the leader but failure may become even more of a confidence builder if the leader is able to profit from it failure through the recognition of the degree to which he has

contributed to the failure. Taking responsibility is a major key to profiting from failure where there were bad decisions or ineffective direct actions on the part of the leader that led to the failure. Gaining feedback from supervisors is another way to grow from the trial of difficult assignments, but this is generally harder to get from many managers unless it is specifically sought by the leader in training (R. Kaplan, Kofodimos, & Drath, 1987).

In recent times, direct education has become more tailored to the busy executive. Many major private corporations, as well as the U.S. Armed Services, offer partial to complete financial support for advanced degrees (Yukl, 1998). Executive MBA and Masters in Management programs accommodate the working supervisor with after-work classes in accelerated programs. Often, a business-oriented Master's degree can be earned in 1 to 3 years. Classes aimed specifically at developing leadership skills are offered by organizations to supervisors as a group training experience to enhance individuals, somewhat akin to mentoring (Ensher & Murphy, 2005; Johnson & Ridley, 2004). While mentoring is typically one mentor to one mentee, these classes offer a way to build better group cooperation within a management team. Behavior modeling, role modeling, simulations, problem-solving exercises, and case studies are familiar methods to the executive who has taken leadership training (Yukl, 1998). Effectiveness of training is often improved by bringing together not strangers but people who already know each other. When people have worked together for a time, they develop standard manners of behavior that help interactions (Stubbs, 1988). These norms include comfortable behavior and communication, and an attitude that fits the organization they belong to. In this case, the awkwardness associated with working with strangers and the hesitancy to speak up

will not be present and the group dynamics have already become comfortable; more time will be devoted to learning rather than in gaining social ease. A sterling example in government training is the National Defense Research Council (NDRC), a national agency created before World War II that served as a buffer between the U.S. government and science and industry (Bennis & Beiderman, 1997). Its originating purpose was to facilitate bringing forward ideas that might be of military or humanitarian importance. Because of this agency, many ideas that contributed to the development of nuclear science in the Manhattan Project were brought together when they could have been lost.

Motivation of Workers

This section is entirely devoted to the motivation of workers with emphasis on the motivation of older workers.

Older workers give surprising benefits to the employers who hire them (Paton, 2005). While generally considered more productive, loyal, and customer oriented than their younger counterparts, workers over age 50 offer other advantages. Higher levels of motivation and engagement were shown in a study by consultants Towers Perrin, to correspond to higher profitability in corporations (Feinsod, Davenport, & Arthurs, 2005). Surveys revealed that companies with greater employee engagement generally outperformed companies with lower employee engagement. Such studies are vital to human resource awareness in the assessment of the aging worker. The importance of this is demonstrated in the fact that in 2012, workers over age 55 represented 20% of the workforce compared to 13% of the workforce in 2000. This trend of older workers in the workplace is expected to continue well into the 21st century.

The Towers Perrin study also revealed that the cost of hiring older (more than 45 years old) employees compared to younger employees was negligible and the older workers were more motivated to exceed expectations on the job than were younger workers (Claes & Heymans, 2006). Additionally, time loss through sickness was only marginally above that of younger workers.

The Towers Perrin study of the benefit of hiring and retaining older workers was backed up by the Claes and Heyman (2006) study done in Belgium. Research indicated that older workers are motivated by company loyalty, often largely due to their length of service to a single firm. Older workers gain motivation by being involved with projects that will more fully consume their time while, at the same time, offering a chance to learn something new. Additionally, the study revealed that pride of accomplishment drives older workers as much as economic gains. Recognition and approval by supervision is considered highly important for the older worker. The study declared that, generally, older workers are viewed as competent and able to take care of themselves within an organization.

Motivation by senior employees is often greater due to their usually higher salary compared to younger employees ("Process Theories," 2010; R. Ryan & Deci, 2000). Contrarily, younger employees may experience de-motivation if they compare their salary to that of senior employees who are earning more and yet effectively producing no greater value to the company. Senior management, in this case, needs to ensure that they are giving full or extra effort for value received in order to maintain overall morale, thus creating realistic equity in the minds of younger employees. Team playing is crucial, whereas egocentrism by senior staff can be damaging to the group. Younger employees

can feel that the credit for their hard efforts will be taken by senior management when they work with self-aggrandizing senior management or older teammates (Quick, 1982). Older and younger employees are motivated by the expectancy that employees can anticipate success given the reasonableness of the challenge of the task at hand, their training to handle the task and the effort made to achieve success. Therefore, the design of the job as a proper fit for employees, older or younger, is of critical importance in maintaining motivation.

Motivation can be inspired by the understanding leader whereas the closely controlling manager can stifle motivation (T. Wren, 1995). The savvy leader can inspire others to share his vision and become self-motivated themselves through the process and the evolving success of the project. For the experienced leader, this approach becomes nearly second nature (Quick, 1982).

Summary of the Literature

The literature review for this study began with a review of post-World War II U.S. military history to present as the time frame for this study. Next was a review of leadership and change. Following that was a conceptual framework for modern leaders which supplies a foundation for the career of this study's subject. After that was a review of change in the U.S. Army, Army leadership, and defense acquisition. Following that was a review of the U.S. Army organization and other organizations. The next sections were a review of the history of management, training, and learning, and the review concluded with the motivation of workers. This literature review supplies an essential foundation for the era, background, and career of the study's subject. Literature searches for leadership and change revealed much in the way of that leaders adapt to changes in

55

career requirements. Fewer studies have been made on leadership and change specifically for older executives, particularly those who work for the military. The lack of literature in this particular area is an invitation to explore and expand this area of increasing concern with the aging of the 21st century workforce.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

A major problem the United States faces today is change in the workplace and the response to that change. The purpose of the study and key to understanding the life of John Bruce is to know how he responded to change during his nearly seven decades of government service, how he grew his leadership vision for himself and those he influenced during his years of service, and what motivated him to continue his service until age 94. It is hoped that this investigation provides a better understanding of change in organizations, the evolution of leadership vision, and motivation, especially in older workers.

I sought to answer the following question in my study:

How did John Bruce Jr. respond to change and remain motivated for 69 years of service to the U.S. Army?

Because he has been with the U.S. Government, serving in the military during World War II and as a civilian employee for nearly seven decades, he is a prime candidate to detail response to change in the U.S. Army within the Department of Defense.

This study has its own degree of interest due to the unusually long and productive work life of the subject, but it is also a story that needs to be discovered and told from a

historical standpoint ("World War II Veterans," 2008). The chance to tell the story of this man and preserve this record is a great opportunity to record the life of a most unusual public servant who is a role model for long-serving contribution to the United States of America.

Following the introduction, this chapter details the general research design, the setting of the study, and explores self as a research instrument. This is followed by data collection, data management, and data analysis. A review of validation of material and a chapter summary conclude the chapter.

Research Design

This is a single case study (Creswell, 1998), a study of one of the U.S. Army's longest-serving civilian leaders, Mr. John Bruce Jr. The methodology of a qualitative inquiry (and aspects of case study being, perhaps, the most "qualitative"), not a quantitative study, has no "one-size-fits-all" codified body of procedures to produce an insightful study (Beck, 1997; Eisner, 1998; Firestone, 1986; Mashhadi, 1996). This presents a challenge and an opportunity to observe things in different ways (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006). The presentation of the data is told in the manner that best fits the data (Yin, 2003). Cole (1994) discusses case studies, relating that a long history may reflect cultural, societal, personal, and institutional themes.

In interpretive case study, the author is present in the study (Denzin, 1989). It is openly recognized in the work that the case study is at least in part guided by the experiences of the author. As I conceived this case study at this time, I also attempted to pursue my approach from an interpretive direction. The writing is situated in my experiences working for the Department of the Army as well as those of Mr. Bruce. The

person written about in this type of case study is created by the narrative of the subject himself as well as the narrative of the researcher (Creswell, 1998). Within this case study, I explain the problem, describe the setting, discuss key elements of the experiences of the subject, and explore the lessons to be learned from the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

The process of case study research involves several research steps (Denzin, 1989). The first is to develop a chronology of important life stages (Merriam, 1998) to serve as a framework for the study. This chronology will include early life, family situation, education, career choices, marriage and children, and employment (Cole, 1994). Beyond the bare facts, understanding the context and assumptions behind it is imperative in case study. The next step is to gather interviews to develop stories about the study subject's life (Robinson, 2006). Because this case study has access to the man behind the facts, the opportunity for full explication of the facts is present (Merriam, 1998). The recorded stories detail the highs and lows, the commonplace and mundane, and the turning points or epiphanies (Denzin, 1989) in the life of the subject. Special events or moments of revelation in a person's life can lead to significant change in action or mind-set (Creswell, 1998). They can be major or minor, positive or negative, but are often the keys to understanding the paths taken by an individual. Often these epiphanies are written in "thick description" to bring intricate details and emotions to the reader (Creswell, 1998). The researcher seeks to explore the meanings of the stories with the subject and those close to the subject. Finally, the researcher places the meanings of the stories within the historical and social context, interpreting the changes to the world view of the subject within the framework of interest (Angrosino, 1994; Denzin, 1989).

Given the approach of this study, the key challenge was to collect accurate information and candid, trustworthy interviews. These kind of data lead to a solid understanding of the times and historical background of the subject (and the extent of the understanding of this history by the study's interviewed subjects) and the correct approach to correlating the subject's life to the times that he lived in, as revealed in the overall interpretation of the collected stories from the interviews (Meloy, 1994). The completed work depends on how well the study captures the changes to the subject made in regard to the life changes (Denzin, 1989) and challenges of the history he faced and lived through, how these changes affected his leadership abilities and how they affect his ability to continue to motivate himself to perform at the level worthy of a his position in life.

Interpreting John Bruce's evolving leadership vision, style and skills, response to organizational and life changes, his philosophy and role within the organization, as well as his lifelong contributions and personal motivation, was the particular challenge of this study. Histories can be of contemporary events and will blend with the case study (Yin, 2003). Famous studies have attempted to capture the spirit of acclaimed leaders of the military or connected to the military as well as the complexity of the person himself. Somewhere between the poles of very opposite yet valuable, military-related lives, such as the boldly aggressive and mercurial generals Patton and MacArthur, and the more cautious Bradley, Walter Krueger, Henry Aurand, and Clarence Huebner, the study of the life of John Bruce finds its own place as a case study of the kind that applied research manages to accomplish (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006).

Setting

The primary setting of the study was the TACOM-LCMC in Warren, Michigan. All participants have known, worked with, and interacted with John Bruce at TACOM-LCMC, presently or in past decades. This central location served to focus the experiences of the participants to a manageable field yet offered different points of view of shared experiences. It also helped to achieve a familiar and natural setting (Robinson, 2006) for those who have worked at TACOM that best served the interview process. The type of setting, familiar to the subject with some relevance to the subject of the interview and free of distractions (Creswell, 1998), helped the flow of conversation for the interviews. It is noted that while the office setting may enhance the interview regarding the office, distractions can interfere with the process (Yin, 2003). An increase in privacy can often improve the quality of obtained information. Wherever possible, the location for interviews was kept comfortable, informal, private, and quiet. The various departments within TACOM-LCMC that John Bruce has worked in added to the variety of insights and approaches of the interviews. The meanings of the experiences were given by those who lived them (Creswell, 1998). It is not possible to isolate the approximately 50 hours per week devoted to formalized work out of the week's 168 hours, nor would one want to. Some elements of life with family and friends, at leisure, and interacting in private (Yin, 2003), were also reflected in this study, with a view to capture the humanity in the man of the business office when the setting changes and he is outside of the office.

Self as a Research Instrument

This case study contains the researcher's interpretation where material gleaned in interviews is attempted to be woven into the fabric of the life of the subject (Creswell,

1998). In case study, as in any study, the thoughts and impressions of the researcher invariably blend with the data. Fact and fiction can blur, with validity issues arising from the researcher drawing inferences (Yin, 2003). The researcher's perspectives are blended into the work, with the author somehow creating the work. The researcher must be careful to disclose these biases in the study in order to grant the reader the proper viewpoint. While some elements of interpretation are unavoidable, it is important to let the facts speak against the speculations of the researcher. Unlike this study, historical case studies are grounded in presenting and interpreting records (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006) but always retain, in the background, the researcher's interpretation. In this case, not historical records but historical context becomes a moderating influence to limit the injection of researcher bias and to provide the basis for interpretation (Creswell, 1998).

When an individual writes a case study, the reader is aware that the events are related through the prism of the author. The reader can interpret this distinction between subject and writer (Edel, 1984) when the writer clarifies those times when conjecture and subjectivity are present within the study. I used my lengthy background in the Acquisition Center, Production Management Division, and the Industrial Base Management Group in an attempt to interpret with frankness the interviews and to present a full picture of the life and times, skills, insights, and competencies of John Bruce within the U.S. Army. I was careful to distinguish those instances that my interpretations of the interviews and data could be slanting the stated results when hearing matters discussed that differed from my memories of them. I acknowledge that my impressions of the Acquisition Centers have their own biases. I noted my viewpoint within the study when opinions differed from my own (Creswell, 1998; Edel, 1984). Each

business group has its own appeal or dislike for every person according to their tastes, facilities, and weaknesses. These all can color the study and must be considered in light of possible biases (Dexter, 1959). Where this is present, the author must acknowledge his biases in the interpretation of the study and try to open his mind to the testimonies presented (Creswell, 1998).

Data Collection

A case study which introduces source material must authenticate it in order to confidently admit evidence in a case study if it is sought. Merriam (1998) presents a battery of questions for authenticating documents, including asking what is the history of the document, how it came to me, is there a guarantee of authenticity, is it originally constructed, has it been edited, who is the author, and what was his purpose. Although this study did not seek historical documents or secondary sources, many were observed in the office of John Bruce and his associates. When these were used, follow-on questions explored the author's intent, the presenter's overall proclivity to be truthful, the maker's sources of information, and the supporting documents that bear evidence. Secondary sources, those prepared at a later date than the original, were similarly judged.

This research project chiefly used the interviews of John Bruce and his associates, with permission, to serve as the backbone of the study. Before any interviews were given and recorded, it was necessary to prepare. "Preparing for data collection can be complex and difficult. If not done well, the entire investigation can be jeopardized and all the earlier work—in defining the research questions and designing the study—will have been for naught" (Yin, 2003, p. 57). Preparation starts with developing skills. A list of acquired skills is: asking good questions, becoming a good listener, developing the ability

to be adaptive, fully understanding the issues at hand, and remaining unbiased by preconceptions. The researcher must be able to review the full sweep of revelations received in the interviews, categorize them, check them for truth, and deal with the revelations that are different from what is anticipated (Becker, 1998).

Interviews were made with supervisors, associates, team members, and support staff of TACOM-LCMC. These were made before the interview with John Bruce and served to supplement and flesh out, clarify, and verify the reflections of John Bruce. The insights from managerial superiors and peers gave verification of managerial and leadership development, along with insight into the subject's personality (Meloy, 1994). Those provided by subordinates of the leader, quite often, offered more intimate and personal details and were quite candid. Supervisors to John Bruce were from the ranks of Senior Executive Service (SES), one degree higher in supervision than John Bruce, himself a GS-15 Division Supervisor. Peers were GS-15 Division Supervisors. Subordinates were GS-14 Branch Supervisors, GS-13 Section Supervisors, and Government specialists, GS-12s and below. These subjects were encouraged to grant candid interviews (Yin, 2003) with reflections designed to illuminate the character, skills, and competencies of John Bruce as far back as their shared history allows.

The interviews were conducted with the subjects detailed above, most of whom are either currently employed at TACOM-LCMC or formerly employed there. The six interview subjects were each interviewed for 1 to 2 hours or more, as needed. The subjects were given the interview questions in advance. Approximately 12 hours of total interviews were made over the course of about 5 months, as availability of subjects permitted.

Because the questions were given beforehand to the subjects, there was time for reflection and review for the subject before the interviews (Robinson, 2006). Three subjects wrote detailed answers to the questions and of these three, two turned in a copy for the record. The interviews were conducted one at a time. Background information on the life of John Bruce was freely discussed to enrich the recollections. When they were completed, all interviews were fully transcribed.

Wherever possible, I conducted these interviews face-to-face and, with one exception, at TACOM itself. It was recognized, however, that sometimes participants are too nervous or shy to allow this type of interview. Telephonic interviews were offered as an alternative to overcome geographic distances and time considerations, but no telephonic interviews were given (Robinson, 2006).

In order to effectively conduct the interviews, I needed an interview format (Meloy, 1994; Robinson, 2006). This was a set of formulated questions that were contained in the Institutional Review Board (IRB) application. Acceptance of the application was granted by Andrews University on June 10, 2011, and is contained in the Appendices. The questions were reviewed by the IRB to ensure that they were ethical and would do no harm to the subject or participants. It is with this as background that I developed a line of questioning that led the interview subjects to uncover the essential John Bruce. In this, I asked questions to reveal who is the man behind the lengthy career. Why did he start in government service just after World War II? What was his leadership vision in the early years and how has it transformed throughout the years? What factors were instrumental in leading to the way that John Bruce adapted to change throughout his 65 years at TACOM as developing leader and senior leader? At his bedrock core, how

has he remained the same, or has he? What were his motivations as a young executive on the rise? Equally telling, what are his motivations today? Has he mentored young, future leaders? What does he consider his greatest failures? What do others see as his failures and shortcomings? What does the future look like to John Bruce and others? (Sub rosa: Is having an active executive near age 100 a good thing for the Army?)

Follow-up and other related questions rounded out these key questions, especially as they were triggered during interviews (Meloy, 1994). I explored the outlook of the young man just starting his career, his early leadership vision, the evolution of that vision, and his method of mentoring young leaders. I sought to learn the epiphanies that changed or crystallized his outlook; how the loss of his wife changed his plans for retirement; what part family and friendship played in his life; and what kept him going.

Methods for establishing question sequence include use of a funnel-shaped pattern (general to specific) or inverted funnel (specific to general) (Robinson, 2006). Before the formal interviews were given, the final sequence of questions was determined with a view of seeking the most effective pattern in order to reveal this particular subject. I used a funnel shaped, general to specific, line of questions in order to bring thoughts to the big picture, and later in the interview, focus on details. The success I found in the interviewing process seemed to verify that the pattern used was effective (Meloy, 1994). As a rule, good questions are imperative in order to have a good interview (Yin, 2003). Keeping the mind open and flexible during interviews helped the formulation of better follow-up questions.

The interviews for this study were structured to the degree that questions regarding change in the U.S. Army, its organization and management systems and their

evolution, and the subsequent changes in John Bruce, were used for the basic outline. The interviews asked questions to address the business executive and his leadership growth and contributions. This format, however, was kept fluid to allow for the unexpected stories, the significant and often secret impressions that are often coaxed out of those being interviewed.

Interview Subjects

People who were interviewed included John Bruce, Jr., Division Chief, TACOM Contracting Center; an SES and chief in TACOM Contracting Center designated Mr. Abel; an associate chief, in TACOM Contracting Center, designated Mr. Baker; a former Procurement Contracting Officer at TACOM Contracting Center, designated Mr. Charles; a contract specialist at TACOM-LCMC, designated Mr. David; and a second contract specialist at TACOM-LCMC, designated Mr. Edward. See Appendix A, Table 1, for interview subject data.

Data Management

To process the interview, it was important to not only hear the spoken words but to see those words written (Meloy, 1994). The human mind processes information in many ways but to develop a written manuscript, the exact record of the words of an interview is absolutely necessary for accuracy. This permanent record is the basis needed to prove or reprove poorly remembered assertions, should these arise. Accuracy is essential to the transcription process (Carney, Joiner, & Teagon, 1997; Robinson, 2006), but the researcher's notes and memories are necessary to capture and relate insights that the nakedly transcribed words will not readily reveal: mood, reactions, tendency towards guardedness or uneasiness, fear of giving offense, free-flowing freedom of expression,

manner, extended pauses, and emotive reactions of the interviewee. These were kept for the record when reviewing the transcriptions of the interviews. A well-practiced transcriptionist was used in order to minimize errors and to have transcriptions available in a timely manner.

These transcriptions provided the basis for interpretation and analysis of my study subjects' interviews. Transcriptions were reviewed with attention to accuracy and notation of other notable conditions of the speaker.

Care was taken to summarize each interview soon after it is given, which included the state of the subject and the interviewer (Robinson, 2006). These summaries included the perceived willingness of the interviewee to speak freely on the subject. Since the interview process includes more than words but also the feelings and preconceptions of the interviewer and the person interviewed, it was important to note the mind-set of the subject as it is revealed through conversation (Creswell, 1998). The collection of data was therefore twofold: the transcribed data and the report of the reporter in whatever form it takes (Lapadat & Lindsey, 1999). Transcribing the interview into words can miss much of the nuance of conversation; that is why having a separate report about the interview is essential and was made for each interview, in that it summarizes what lies beneath the words, to the best ability of the interviewer.

All of the recorded interviews, as well as the interview transcriptions, were kept for later reference. For proper data identification, each person interviewed was identified with a code name (Robinson, 2006). Each participant's background, relationship to John Bruce, grade level, current organization, and organization when working with John Bruce were recorded. The date of the session, duration, location and if the interview was face-

to-face, were indicated. The actual digital and taped sound recordings will be kept on file a minimum of 3 years as required by Andrews University's IRB as a record and to resolve any possible questions regarding the same. Lacking this formal database is a major flaw in research and it needs to be provided to achieve a successful research project (Yin, 2003).

Data Analysis

This study reflects interview statements in the light of the historical background of the times and conflicts of the U.S. Army. Literature sources were used to place statements correctly within historical context. Further, prevailing management trends linked to their appropriate time period helped to ground the study in the popular disciplines and philosophies of the times. A review of training and educational trends through the past few decades and studies on motivation of workers, especially older workers, was used as reference for comparison.

The interviews sought insight into responses to war or build-up to war, organizational changes and managerial trends, special programs within the Army, training, changes in the workforce, illness, and life-changes. Interviews that shared common insights or reference and that reinforced a particular characteristic or change were especially insightful. Since interviewing different professionals brings into play different preconceptions, it was important to recognize the background of the interviewer and the interviewed. Dexter (1959) asserts that difficulties in interviewing business leaders by behavioral scientists are often due to attitudes of suspicion or distaste. It is important to be aware that these special preconditions can exist.

Besides that of John Bruce himself, who was of key importance, all of the other interviews were judged on their own merits: The researcher did not anticipate or try to infer. Mr. Bruce was encouraged to reveal his unique story, along with those who served alongside of him, in no restrictive length of time. The experiences of life, set through people's own choices and those that are thrust upon them, always reveal a path that is never quite the same as the next person's and often are wildly divergent (Eisner, 1998). Surprises in the revelation of case study come often. I recognized the need to remain neutral to the telling rather than leading the interview subject in a set path to support a favored line of reasoning, and thus avoided the "signature" of the inquirer of the study wherever possible.

Problems with interviews can include many factors, including health conditions, fatigue, and motivation. Other problems are lack of clarity, unusual deference to the subject, and reliability (Ives, 1980). Data were always questioned in the light of these shortcomings of the interviewing process.

All research collects data; in order to make sense of the data, it must be analyzed ("Why Coding," 2010). The first step in analysis is to identify the source, the how and when of its collection, the kind of information it contains, and a multiplicity of other variables. In order to avoid the cumbersome task of sorting through lengthy transcriptions repeatedly looking for quotations that bear strongly on the subject, general themes, and even contradictory statements, it was necessary to use a tool to compress information and make it readily accessible. Through coding, the challenge of accessing reams of transcripts for details becomes much less a challenge (Meloy, 1994). It is noted that when approaching coding for qualitative research, the data from transcripts are often hard to

codify. The basic element for analysis is the word (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006); these can be counted as a basic unit. Themes are the next rung of the ladder of analysis. The frequency of themes can be counted. Characters, as they occur, can similarly be counted, as well as concepts. Items associated with documents or speeches can also be counted. Qualitative research involves process and meaning that are not always equally measured in terms of amount, intensity, or frequency (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). By its very nature, qualitative research will review its research in the prism of social constructs. The analysis will be lightly tinged or deeply saturated with the researcher's predilections. From a qualitative perspective, inquiry is multi-faceted, not planar. Data, which are sometimes easy, sometimes hard to collect, especially in the area of personal interviews, need to be the central star of the relationship between researcher and subject matter (Chenail, 1995). Inference should properly be secondary.

A method to overcome the difficulties of deciding how to codify data is a three-part model of qualitative data analysis (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996; Seidel, 1998). Data analysis is noticing, collecting, and thinking. Properly coded data will, like an assembled puzzle, have color, shape and form, and telltale particles of interesting things that can be assigned codes derived from themes within the body of the research.

In the answers I received to the interview questions that I asked, I searched for like words, themes, characters, concepts, and items given by subjects (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006). These themes were given a common denotation in the transcribed manuscript. Various highlighted, color coding within the manuscripts allowed these themes to stand out. Having an index of similar themes permitted cataloging common words, themes, characters, concepts, and items (Robinson, 2006). These types were then

staged and arranged in an inverted pyramid fashion. Hancock and Algozzine (2006) suggest a model for content analysis that builds through the research question to determine analytical categories. Reading through data helped determine categories. Revisions were made when they were warranted. Entries in each determined category were reviewed, seeking patterns or non-patterns. The patterns were reflected against existing theories and literature. From these came explanations and analyses (Yin, 2003). Following these steps became an appropriate path to gain insight on how comparatively well John Bruce succeeded as a leader, loyal employee, and learner (see Appendices, Table 2, for coding data).

Reviewing different transcripts allows the researcher to find the common themes that interviewed subjects have referenced regarding the common subject (Meloy, 1994). Combining the common themes within the transcripts helped in recognizing trends throughout the subject. The themes that were most numerous built the framework (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006) for deciding the type of personality and characteristics that the main subject has developed and projected, in the opinion of those who were interviewed. However, there is a recognized danger in trying to organize the correct themes into a framework (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). Thinking about themes is an important step to take while formulating the study, but during the course of data analysis, the "right" themes often reveal themselves unexpectedly. Permitting this to happen forestalled an a priori focus that is deemed incompatible with qualitative research (Meloy, 1994). As themes began to emerge, recurring themes were noted in the index and combined within categories. Raw numbers serve as a good indicator of what is most strongly noted about the subject of the study. However, Creswell (1998) warns that in

72

qualitative studies, raw numbers alone will not reveal the complete story. Eventual

convergence of evidence from multiple sources served to lead to data reduction, as

related by Goetz and LeCompte (1981). This convergence and reduction pointed

naturally to the conclusions of the paper.

Validation

In proving out interviews with supporting interviews and attestations, I aimed to

keep the case study's narrative grounded in fact. Statements were thus scrutinized for

their accuracy to enhance the validity of research finding (Yin, 2003). Ensuring validity

and reliability in qualitative research involves conducting the investigation in an ethical

manner (Merriman, 1998), which was done.

Case study requires verification (Creswell, 1998). Member checking and

triangulation of information (Stake, 1995) is key to gaining a convergence of information

to bear out the facts of the study.

Personal interviews give the researcher a certain advantage in seeking validation

(Creswell, 1998). We can hardly doubt the author's own words unless there is glaring

evidence against it.

A method used for validation is triangulation for proving trustworthiness of data

(Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Triangulation is broadly defined (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994) as a

combination of methodologies of the same phenomenon. Differing sources that include

collaborating interviews and observations are used to verify data. Much like a ship at sea

reckoning its position from multiple positions through its changing distances from two

different known fixed points, data are used to reckon or verify the record (Jick, 1979).

For my study, I used triangulation with the transcribed interviews of John Bruce and with other participants in the study. Multiple citations from different subjects detailing specific events and characteristics were granted greater weight during analysis as they provided convergence (Yin, 2003). Records of vital statistics, photographs, awards, employment history, and other artifacts used in some case studies can provide corroborative records for triangulation; however, in this study, only readily observed awards and photographs were reviewed. Triangulation techniques such as lengthy engagement at a site (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), peer debriefing, and establishing corroboration improve the validity of findings. These three methods were used in this study to see a convergence of evidence in order to show verification (Jick, 1979). This popularly used type of triangulation is typified as between methods, or cross method (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). Denzin and Lincoln (1994) state that "the effectiveness of a leader may be studied by interviewing the leader, observing his or her behavior, and evaluating performance records. The focus always remains that of the leader's effectiveness" (p. 302), even though the data collection varies. In this study, I had observed the subject's behavior and noted performance accomplishments during award ceremonies. Triangulation supports a finding through independent measures to agree with it, or, at a minimum, not contradict it (Creswell, 1998).

Validation for this study extended to a review by a regional group of Ph.D. students involved in similar doctoral dissertation studies in the Department of Leadership at Andrews University. Members of this group reviewed results with a view toward the validity of findings with the aim of keeping the study on track.

Generalization can be regarded not only as going beyond the information given, but also as transferring what has been learned from one situation or task to another (Bruner, 1973). Sometimes this type of generalization means transferring skills and applications from one situation into a dissimilar situation. This requires a leap of insight. Time, complexity, and situational awareness all contribute to making apt generalizations, but it is important for the researcher to stay within the evidence discovered; the reader may infer generalizations. In evaluating the transcribed evidence in this study, it was necessary to gain insight through interviews about response to change in one employee of the U.S. Army over the last 69 years against a large and often vastly different work force and environment of today's Army. The caution was to recognize that people do vary over the course of 69 years, yet to realize that certain core values of human beings have remained constant over millennia.

Summary

In developing the chosen methodology of this single case study, I sought to make an inquiry to investigate the case of John Bruce Jr. His career, which continued until the age of 94, offered a unique opportunity to study an unusual contemporary phenomenon within its own context, a career that spanned 69 years in war and peace. I used multiple interviews to gain insight into this rare circumstance in order to reveal the subject. In order to explore this unique situation, I interviewed people who had known and observed the subject for decades. I used frank and open questioning, often letting the conversation flow in the direction that the subject cared to follow as long as it remained germane (Robinson, 2006). Selected questions were used to spark the conversation toward the key questions of my research (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006; Yin, 2003). The totality of the

interviews and subsequent analysis revealed that John Bruce, Jr., at age 94, senior

executive and leader at TACOM-LCMC, had lived a long and colorful life, from World

War II soldier to senior-level executive. John Bruce himself and his employees,

associates, superiors, and those who know him best brought forward the facts that support

this case study. Each question regarding leadership and management style, change, or

motivation sought insight and perspective into the subject within the time period to which

it belonged (Meloy, 1994). Responses were transcribed and categorized in order to find

common themes and impressions. I built the subsequent analysis into this case study. The

analysis of the collected data enabled me to draw conclusions over the overarching

framework of my study. In order to preserve this unique case, I sought to get the details

of my subject's record written and preserved (Chenail, 1995; Richardson, 1990) with all

reasonable dispatch.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to assess how 94-year-old John Bruce, Jr., senior

executive at the U.S. Army's TACOM-LCMC, responded to the challenge of a changing

U.S. Army during his 69-year career. In showing this response to change, this chapter

study uncovers how this has influenced the careers of those whom he has worked with

and how he was motivated to continue to work full time while most of his peers had long

since retired. This chapter reports the data assembled from six interviews regarding the

career of Mr. Bruce, from five associates and co-workers who served the U.S. Army as

civilian employees and have intimate knowledge of Mr. Bruce and his career, and from

Mr. Bruce himself. In this chapter, I initially present a short background of John Bruce's

life. This is intended to be a character sketch of the man, not a life history. In particular, it

shows how his life and career in the U.S. Army relate to the three major themes that

emerged from the interviews: leadership, loyalty, and learning.

Background to Mr. John Bruce, Jr.'s Life

Born on December 3, 1917, in Los Angeles, California, John Bruce, Jr. grew up in

the period just before and during the Depression. From an early age his parents taught

him to have a deep appreciation for his resources and his life: his family, his Scottish

heritage, his friends, the community in which he was raised, and the United States of

America, the country of his birth. He grew up with a scarcity of things, when people valued everything of worth that they had to sustain their lives and to make the best of hard times. Siblings slept in the same beds and used the warmth of their kin to substitute for central heating, and Mr. Bruce was no exception in his close-knit family, although in his case the Southern California climate of his youth kept the chilly nights to a minimum. This close attention to resources, from his early years as a newsboy and onward, stayed with him for the remainder of his life.

Before he entered the service in World War II, he finished his bachelor's degree in accounting in 1941 at University of California, Los Angeles. After Pearl Harbor, he realized that he had to get into the war. He tried desperately to join the Marines, Navy, and Coast Guard, but failing the medical exams, he just managed to pass the exam for the Army. Despite having a college degree, he chose not to become a junior officer but entered service as a buck private in the enlisted ranks. He soon gained firsthand knowledge of the Army's organization.

His early exposure to leadership style was traditional, top-down authority and a belief in strict order. As he rose through the ranks of non-commissioned officers, he earned the privilege of leadership. Promoted to sergeant, he commanded his squad of radio corpsman. As a leader in war needed to do, he passed down orders from the top to his men or gave them his orders as the situation required. After he was honorably discharged at the end of World War II, his leadership lessons born in the U.S. Army remained with him. When Mr. Bruce went to visit his uncle, who had begun to work at Detroit's Ordnance and Tank Command (TACOM-LCMC's former name), immediately following the War, the man helped his nephew to get a job at the same place in 1946. The

Army leadership style proved a good fit for Mr. Bruce in his early days as a U.S. government employee.

With a degree in accounting, it was natural that he would start as a cost-pricing analyst in the Accounting Department. He began to move up the ranks in Accounting but was given an opportunity to work in the Procurement Division in 1950. This procurement center of TACOM did the negotiating, buying, and contracting for the entire fleet of U.S. Armed Services tracked and wheeled vehicles, from the tiniest spare part to entire vehicles. This was to be his home for the rest of his nearly 70-year career. Mr. Bruce soon became the office "gopher," tackling many jobs as a young and eager, aggressive intern. His promotions came quickly. By 1956, he had risen from being a Procurement Contracting Officer to Division Chief at age 38, a very early age to become a Division Chief at TACOM. As Chief of the Tracked Vehicle Group, he was in charge of half of the buying group, with nearly 250 employees under his direction.

At the time that Mr. Bruce decided to work at TACOM, he had recently met a woman who had been asked by a friend of his uncle to give him a ride from the railroad station upon his arrival in Detroit in 1946. That lady, a definite part of Mr. Bruce's decision to remain and work in Detroit instead of returning to sunny California, became Mrs. Jean Bruce in 1948. Mr. Bruce and his wife built their marriage and had two daughters and, eventually, four grandchildren. Sadly, Jean Bruce passed away in 1980, leaving Mr. Bruce feeling tremendous loss. Ever the family man, Mr. Bruce remained extremely close to his daughters and grandchildren. In addition to the comfort he found with his family, many at TACOM felt that he helped to heal the deep wound of this loss through his career at TACOM. His TACOM family grew to become close, even

intimates, to the man who was once feared for his demanding personality and occasional short temper. Happily, his temper became a relic of the past as John Bruce entered the new century, mellowing as he advanced toward his later years. Less than a year after his retirement, Mr. Bruce's great joy was to be present at the birth of his great-grandson, Jonathan Bruce Webster, born August 7, 2012.

Mr. Bruce followed orders from the top in his early years. As he took on the mantle of leadership, his leadership style, from the 1940s through much of the 1980s, was authoritative through top-down autocracy. Living through years of the realities of practical leadership taught Mr. Bruce a more flexible style of leadership, where give-and-take was essential to work through the complexities of the procurement processes. This evolution of leadership style became apparent to his staff in the 1990s and beyond who noted the mellowing of style and temperament in the formerly stern leader.

His background as a child of the Depression and the young, patriotic soldier resulted in his working devotedly and setting an outstanding example to the troops in the mud and the workers at their desks. His childhood taught him that resources could suddenly become scarce and were to be carefully valued, that hard and honorable work was the key to preserving value, and this close attention to resources and work carried through into the Army and the office. In the years past, his peers knew without saying directly what those younger than he openly acknowledged: that he was a product of his time, and, as such, a man with a strong set of values. It is an obvious assumption that can be reached for a 94-year-old who would not have to work for a living as his resources and pension would keep him at a comfortable income level close to his current salary level. It meant for the Army a man whose insight and years of experience often saved time and

trouble as he steered his staff away from problematic areas in contracting and into safer approaches. And it meant that his division and ultimately the Army would utilize a valued asset.

John Bruce's leadership style was born in the historical U.S. Army but continued to develop late in the 20th century and beyond. He was a traditional leader who responded to change when the Army changed, learning to utilize the newer theories of leadership and teaming concepts. He continued to evolve throughout his career.

Three Defining Themes: Leadership, Loyalty, and Learning

The interviews with the five coworkers and John Bruce show that he responded to the changes in the U.S. Army primarily through leadership, loyalty, and learning. Each of these themes had components related to the main theme. These are discussed under each theme.

Leadership

Mr. Bruce responded to the many changes in the Army three distinct ways but first through his strong leadership, which is further described by a number of subtopics.

Leadership describes the ability to influence others in a positive way to gain their cooperation in accomplishing a goal. Leaders show their vision as they interact with others to affect their behavior, values, and output. A leader often possesses charisma, intelligence, and a strong personality but, most importantly, a great leader will guide others by good example. This section will present key characteristics of Mr. Bruce's leadership, including leader, contributor, adaptable, communicator, people-oriented, mentor, and compliant with regulations.

Leader

Mr. Bruce was acknowledged as a good leader with the right skills and the ability to get the job done. His staff noted that, and felt they were working for a man who was taking them in the right direction. Mr. Edward states, "He was a good leader back then as he still is now. He always encouraged his employees to help the Army and the war fighters." Mr. Edward and others returned to this aspect of Mr. Bruce several times. They noted he had leadership skills and abilities, especially in getting the right people to handle problems. Mr. Bruce was seen as having real insight into the needs of his organization and making sure that he had the right talent to produce the results he needed to have. Mr. Abel believed that Mr. Bruce was a leader and "a definite asset to the organization; as a leader, he's one of a kind!" Mr. Bruce was recognized with deference as a TACOM leader and a TACOM institution for decades.

Mr. Baker states,

Of course, I go back, 20 to 25 years when we were still talking about using management techniques, leadership techniques that were still evolving. And it wasn't that John had gone off and learned all this stuff at local management leadership institutes like we do today. There are so many opportunities to go to these different programs. John wasn't doing that. He was basing his leadership on 50 years of managing and leading. Back in the 90s, the guy had already been at the division chief level for 30-plus years.

Mr. Bruce did have the unique advantage of 50 years of experience by the time he was directing Mr. Baker. The vast storehouse of knowledge that seemed so ready at hand to apply to the day's problems was extremely impressive, especially to the much younger team of junior supervisors.

Mr. Bruce led by example. He fully accepted his leadership role by showing that he had mastered early the things that his upper-level staff needed to learn. His staff recognized this. In this manner, John Bruce came to be thought of as a real leader by his

staff and by his superiors. Originally viewed as autocratic, he evolved his style to a more participative or democratic style that was in keeping with the times of his later years of leadership.

Contributor

Mr. Abel gave this thumb-nail sketch regarding Mr. Bruce that was apropos of his ability to constantly contribute. "His main pursuit is his intelligence and savviness and continued relevance to Army Acquisition." Mr. Bruce remained a relevant, key supervisor in the Acquisition group, continuing to impress with his day-to-day high level of detailed performance. Mr. Abel continued, "There's a special understanding that Mr. Bruce has of what we do because, let's face it, a lot of folks don't understand what we do. Even the soldiers don't." Mr. Abel believes that because Mr. Bruce had seen military action firsthand and realized the life-and-death decisions that were routinely made about a soldier's equipment, Mr. Bruce's contribution took on special insight and poignant meaning. "Soldiers often think their equipment arrives from fairies in the night and they don't understand the effort. They don't have to understand it but I think that he has an understanding of that because of what he went through as a soldier." Mr. Abel believed that the occasional letters of appreciation Mr. Bruce and his employees received from the field meant a lot, so not all the soldiers were in the dark about the work TACOM does. Mr. Abel went on to state, "The people who do this business and thrive in this business understand what it is we're doing, why we're doing it and for whom and because of this, he had it in spades."

Mr. David recalled that Mr. Bruce often teamed with Mr. Henry Jones, the head of TACOM Procurement. It was "good cop, bad cop." "He could play the bad cop, and

then the buyer and contractor could go to Henry Jones and then that most polite of gentlemen would come up with the solution that he and John Bruce had already probably talked about beforehand." Mr. Jones's honeyed, Southern drawl would present the solution that pleased all parties as a compromise or a workable method of overcoming a seemingly impossible difficulty, but he often did this with the complicit cooperation of John Bruce. In this capacity, Mr. Bruce strongly contributed to help achieve major procurements.

Mr. Edward states, "I talked to Ellen Dennis who recently said that John Bruce challenges her every day they have a meeting, so he's still got it." Mr. Bruce remained an acknowledged, vital force with fresh ideas and an enthusiasm for the job into his final years on the job. Mr. David states, "His skills and abilities are not diminished by the fact that he is 94. I just find that phenomenal. He has forgotten more about how the Army works and contracting works than most of the people here know." All agree that Mr. Bruce always contributed. This characteristic may have become occasionally excessive as some used the term "micro-manager" to describe Mr. Bruce and his zeal to get "the best for the buck." Originally an accountant, he is characterized by Mr. Charles as having "wrapped his arms around the accounting portion of what the government spent."

In every interview, John Bruce continued to actively contribute in many ways late into his career: with knowledge, strategy, planning, and in conserving resources. Mr. Bruce did not waste the taxpayer's resources and his strong work ethic affirmed that he was the kind of man who wouldn't have stayed as long in his career if he himself felt that he was no longer contributing. If he had ever felt this way, he clearly would have left TACOM a decade or two earlier, but his contributions were never in question by him or

those he worked with. His latest supervisor, Mr. Abel, noted that Mr. Bruce continued to add value to the organization even after 60-plus years on the job. "He is still a contributing member of the workforce."

Adaptable

John Bruce needed to quickly adapt as a buck private in World War II in the radio corps to his first leadership role as a corporal and, later, a sergeant. The ability to adapt and learn to handle the demands of additional leadership challenges was recognized and rewarded as the young radioman in World War II rose in rank. This same skill in adaptation was recognized in the young executive who rapidly climbed the leadership ladder.

With respect to Mr. Bruce's ability to take on new challenges and successfully adapt to them, Mr. Abel stated:

> He has seen many, many organizational constructs come and go. He must have seen just about every organizational style and philosophy in his career, from centralized to decentralized management, employees treated as chattel to empowered employees, closely monitored and supervised to self-directed teams, and just about every management philosophy you can think of. He also saw the formation of what is known today as the TACOM-LCMC from its original designation as the Ordnance Tank & Automotive Command, and saw it physically move from downtown Detroit on Beard Street to the present-day arsenal in Warren. He is a man of his time, yet intelligent and savvy enough to adapt as times changed in order to keep himself relevant and vital to the Army's acquisition mission.

Mr. Bruce is recognized as a man who grew with TACOM-LCMC and benefited from it as he gained knowledge from the old organization and helped to oversee its transition to a modern organization. He understood that adaptability was essential for his career path. He knew that every change that came along in his job purview was a new challenge to be met. He even remarked about his own need to be adaptable:

Being low man on the totem pole, whenever they had a dirty job, they would put me in so I became chief of payroll and chief of the allotment counting. These are different steps. And happily, by doing that, I got a doggone pretty good understanding of the controller's office. So I would say on the whole I've been through basically everything in the contracting side of the house.

Mr. Bruce was not afraid to roll up his sleeves and learn in the trenches, which were often new jobs with work requirements he often had little familiarity with. He recognized the value that the knowledge of different jobs gave him.

Mr. Abel acknowledged that he had seen many people fail to make career changes at TACOM and elsewhere. These lived in dread of change. These changes often were forced on people and, ultimately, were accepted as agreeable changes in hindsight. He affirmed that he did not see that fear of change in Mr. Bruce, who made the changes in his career that he needed to in order to learn, to survive, and to advance.

Although Mr. Bruce's early career of learning many different aspects of his organization demonstrates that he was adaptable, he showed strong resistance to change that was not validated. In other words, like a careful man of his time would do, he always needed to take a car for a test drive before he would consider buying it. An example of the major changes that Mr. Bruce had to deal with involved the automated processes and the abandonment of the Category 4 or Cat 4 control report that was very dear to him. As Mr. Charles stated, "He fought against the elimination of it, which got imposed on us." Despite wanting to keep the Cat 4 report as a tracking tool (which he did do for some little time even after it was officially eliminated), Mr. Bruce eventually let it go when he finally determined that the computerized report that had replaced it would give him the accountability figures he wanted to effectively manage his division's workload.

Mr. David discussed that in response to Mr. Bruce's seeking to gain a way to adapt various work efforts to a standard work measurement, he acknowledged inherent

difficulties and accepted them. But, as Mr. David stated, "he would prefer it to be otherwise because his accounting background says that you can define everything, you could write it in a ledger. One plus 1 always equals 2." However, Mr. Bruce learned that sometimes the Army had trouble defining exactly what was "1" and what was "2." A work effort one thousand times more demanding as another action could be quantified as just one action. In Mr. Bruce's clinician's mind, it shouldn't be so. However, Mr. Bruce was savvy enough to know that he was dealing with an imperfect system and accepted that work measurements could be less than definitive. He adapted to and used the newly required system of reporting as well as he could to comply with new reporting requirements. Here again, he responded to change when the requirements were forced on his organization. He may have scratched his head at some of the changes, but he made sure to comply with them.

Instead of top-down direction, the teaming approach introduced to TACOM in the 1990s provided alternate points of view to the procurement process. With this call for give-and-take in place, Mr. Bruce again had to adapt to a new directive of the Army. He learned from it, too, as good ideas will always help a good leader. When policy officially changed to require that upper management use frequent, formalized input from his team, he was able to smoothly transition to these new work requirements and methods. Mr. Abel acknowledged that Mr. Bruce may have felt some discomfort at first with the drastic changes in management styles and the new teaming aspects that brought workers in closer proximity to upper management. As he put it, it may not have been "in his comfort zone." Mr. Charles considered it an "imposition and another stress on management." And

yet, he stayed within the organization and accepted the new relationship with the staff, remaining a valuable member of the "new," more lateral organization.

Mr. Bruce talked about his adaptation from his being flat-out demanding to his becoming more understanding. It was an evolution that took patience for a leader to gradually convert his style from being strictly demanding to be more understanding.

It was more or less gradually. I started out real tough. And people say, 'you know, damn that guy really is tough' but after a while, you get to the point, did you actually accomplish what you wanted by being tough, even though I had the advantage of having [the cooperation of] tremendous branch chiefs and section chiefs.

Mr. David stated: "He has changed over the years, from the 80s to the Oughts [first decade] in the 21st century. He is much more easy-going. He doesn't have the temper he used to have." It was frequently noted in the interviews that Mr. Bruce had mellowed with age, becoming more affable and displaying less of a temper when dealing with difficult or stressful situations. Mr. Bruce was noticeably more approachable and patient in offering his time for the interview for this paper than would have been expected in former times. In short, he was more willing to work with others on their terms later in his career than he had been early in his career. This was perceived as a positive change, for his disposition showed a measure of equanimity that people acknowledged they had not seen in earlier times.

Mr. Bruce's last supervisor at TACOM affirmed that John Bruce was able to be adaptable even at the end of his career, when he took on the challenge of the 2005 Defense Base Closing and Realignment Commission (BRAC). BRAC was a means to eliminate redundancy in operations for the U.S. Military and John Bruce was tasked with moving nearly a thousand people from other bases, chiefly Rock Island Arsenal in Rock Island, Illinois, to TACOM at Warren, Michigan. This was no easy task as TACOM's

infrastructure at the time would not support so great an influx of people. Mr. Bruce was instrumental in his work with base engineers and architectural firms to bring to realization a new, eight-story building and six-story parking structure that could help accommodate an extra thousand employees who found their new home at TACOM. It was a move that could challenge a leader of any age, and Mr. Bruce took the challenge with a full measure of enthusiasm, bringing the project to a successful conclusion as his final mission for TACOM, which was completed in 2011.

Mr. Bruce's enduring good health was essential for his long career and permitted him to be prepared for the task of adapting to the many changes he faced in his career. Mr. Baker was most impressed that Mr. Bruce had been dealing with change within the Army from about 1945 on:

> It's mind-boggling how he could fit in, continuously selling himself to people and also get people to buy in and then understand what their needs were. It's just amazing. What a testimony to him, to his good fortune to have the health—right off the bat to be able to do this, but that is just the resiliency of someone to still be in here and contributing. As we were going through all of the changes, he had to go through all of those and he had kind of gone through them already when you think of him coming in here in the early '40s. He came in here working so everything I've seen and had to deal with, he's seen and dealt with, and I don't mean that in a negative way. You've just got to go through the changes and you have to adapt, kind of assimilate it into how you're going to work with the work force and lead the work force and manage the workload. He's had to do that exact same thing and he had to do it at a more advanced age and, again, it's hard from what I understand.

Interestingly, Mr. Baker followed up with a reference to a change in law that made Mr. Bruce's long career possible. "Good for him that Ronald Reagan came along and dropped the mandatory retirement age." It was the November 30, 1986 Amendment to the Age Discrimination and Employment Act of 1967, effective January 1, 1987, that permitted employees to remain in executive positions beyond age 69. Previously, the law required retirement of an employee upon reaching the age of 70. As Ronald Reagan was the

President of the United States in 1986 at age 75, it was the proper thing for him to ask Congress to do. Mr. Bruce's 69-year career was partially based on a fortuitous change of law, as he would have turned 70 on December 4, 1987.

Mr. Bruce is generally admired for his adaptability as he aged, and at his current advanced age, he is given added acknowledgment and praise in that change is often harder to deal with as a person ages. Mr. Bruce is admired for managing to adapt to the changes as they came. Ironically, the changes came quicker when Mr. Bruce had already passed 70 years of age and, unlike many before him, he did not choose retirement as his escape from the changing culture. Some workers retire because they don't like or can't cope with changes that are happening in the workplace; Mr. Bruce managed all of the changes and kept working. Mr. Abel summed up his acknowledged great capacity for change and personal growth by stating that Mr. Bruce continued to adapt in his career even as he neared the end of his career. "Even today, he still is a growing member of the work force," he stated.

Mr. Abel learned a valuable lesson from Mr. Bruce. He stated, "There are all sorts of things in our lives we don't think we will or can do until we get put into a situation that we're forced to do something we didn't think we could and it's amazing, that capacity to adapt and thrive." With Mr. Bruce, Mr. Abel didn't think there was ever a question for him to adapt because "he has such love for the job, a love for the Army."

Although most remarked that he managed to adapt, towards the end of his career, Mr. Bruce may not have thrived. He was always a contributor but some thought he did not find the right balance between work and personal life. All agreed that within the halls of TACOM, Mr. Bruce was admired as a successful leader through many decades.

Communicator

Mr. Bruce was noted to be a gifted communicator. In speculating how the process

would differ if there were a dozen John Bruces, Mr. David states:

> There would be more get-togethers at the higher levels of management with their
> customers. Back in the 80s and the 90s, there were scheduled meetings between
> Mr. Bruce and the head of combat spares, the head of quality, the head of combat
> and TARDEC [research and development group], although it wasn't TARDEC
> then. And they would discuss from a strategic level what's going on and then they
> would get down into the tactical level that their people were having a real problem
> with a particular action by saying, 'What can your people do about this for me?'
> So there was always an interflow at higher levels, an informal interflow. They
> didn't come in with charts. They didn't come in with someone to brief them. They
> would just sit there and talk about what was going on in their areas. And that, I
> think – again, I don't know – I think that's pretty much disappeared. There is not
> much face-to-face communication anymore. Now I know with BRAC, which has
> been his life since 2006, he's always insisted on a lot of conversation and not a lot
> of email trading.

Mr. Bruce used his position as a leader to bring together collaborative, face-to-

face meetings that would not have ordinarily happened and to bring together diverse

elements to get the needed outcome. He brought the necessary components of the team

together to have the right skill sets to solve business problems. He would telephone the

key people he needed or call them to his office. He realized that you get more done with

conversation. With the advent of email, it is generally acknowledged that there is not as

much face-to-face communication as there was before. To illustrate, Mr. David stated, "I

have seen email trails of 24 separate messages and if someone had called me after one

message it would have been settled." As a leader, Mr. Bruce was in a unique position to

do this type of communicating and managed to use his skills often to gain insights,

strategy, and solutions in the procurement process. Throughout his employment, Mr.

Bruce effectively used face-to-face meetings and the telephone to communicate. His

communication skills carried over into the computer age. Mr. Edward states: "I was

telling you about the emails he sent, a very good communicator, a very good vocabulary." A learned man, his command of the English language was recognized by all who knew him. Concise and appropriate language was and is his hallmark.

Mr. Abel recalled Mr. Bruce's frequent use of colorful language. He was able to articulate well and express his planning with the use of well-reasoned language, sprinkled with many quaint and interesting descriptions. For Mr. Bruce, ineffectual Army officers were termed "strap-hangers," his beloved wife was often termed "the little snip," the proper English were "very very, you know," and the fall guy "got the hell kicked out of him." The well-chosen word, sometimes sophisticated, sometimes stark and unvarnished, served to make John Bruce an effective and colorful communicator.

Nearing the end of his career, he approached his last big challenge, putting forth a logical argument and selling his boss on it. Mr. Abel recalls Mr. Bruce saying, "'I'll provide whatever support you want to Ellen Dennis, my supervisor, and to the contingent from Illinois and then, when the Rock Island part moves here, I'll retire.'" Although it sounded simple in this understated way, everyone understood that realistically, the effort, with its communication requirements, would take several years to accomplish. Mr. Bruce would need to provide the planning and communication to bring 1,000 displaced workers from another state to TACOM-LCMC in Michigan. The effort that provided a fitting ending for a long and productive career was dictated by the ageless leader himself.

Mr. Bruce was recognized as an excellent public speaker as well. Whether he spoke with prepared notes or extemporaneously, he always delivered a strong, effective message. Mr. Edward states,

You could put him in front of two or three hundred people in the auditorium, cold, like when he got his 60-years award there. He didn't expect it. It was a surprise. He did well, the job he was doing to get in front of the whole 300 people there.

Mr. Bruce demonstrated his skills in varied situations. He was comfortable speaking in one-on-one communication, as a team member, or to a crowd of hundreds, whether impromptu or with a prepared speech. He addressed the heads of organizations, including Congressional leaders, as well as the lowest level associates of his staff. This is one of the most important skills of a good leader, permitting him or her to disseminate information to their organization and across agencies. He was able to persuade, defend, and negotiate; and to do so with color and style, as Mr. Bruce did, was an added bonus to all of those who came to deal with him.

People-Oriented

Mr. Bruce was noted to be a person who got along well with people and sought to put together a team of the required skill sets that would be a complete functioning entity. Mr. Edward states, "If you had a question, he would say, 'Well, talk to so-and-so,' and even if he didn't know exactly the person to talk to he would get you indirectly to the person that did know."

Mr. Baker states, "I did get a slightly different view about John as someone who did care about the people who were there and especially the folks who had situations in their lives that make their overall advancement opportunities less available to them." He cared about the people, as the consensus agreed. It may have taken time to discover that, however, as Mr. Bruce was not a man who called attention to his deeds. An observer had to watch closely to see that his concern was always there. Mr. Baker continued:

I remember that we had some individuals that were physically disabled and John was very compassionate to the needs of those individuals and made sure that I

was doing what I needed to do to give them the best opportunity to succeed. You know, I thought about that and it really hit me: it was a real eye opener that yes, he was tough and he wanted to get the job done but he did have a soft spot too, to make sure that folks were being treated fairly and equitably and that we were doing everything we could to help people, especially people who had some special needs, to be successful, so that's pretty great.

He encouraged and influenced careers by helping people make more of themselves through education and advancement. Mr. Bruce put together a team and enhanced the skills of that team through training and education. He demonstrated a soft side toward people that may not have been always easy to see, but for those who were close to Mr. Bruce, his kindness to his fellow human beings was evident. John Bruce summed it up to say, "You know, everyone has to have at least their own minute and their deal." He let his staff have their moments in the limelight or their moments of extra consideration when personal problems hurt their ability to perform the job. He understood these times and supported his staff through them.

Mentor

Mentoring is a term meaning someone who imparts wisdom or knowledge to a less experienced colleague. Mentoring is akin to executive coaching work with the clients moving toward specific professional goals and to improve their performance as careerists in communication, organizational effectiveness, managing change, advancing strategic thinking, and dealing with teaming, among others. Regarding people John Bruce may have mentored or coached, Mr. Baker states:

> I think he did a little. I think that John still had a lot of that 'show me the results' kind of thing but, when I worked directly for him, he definitely would take the time and give me some insight on how to deal with it. So, in terms of a mentor, I would definitely say that yes, he'd mentor his leaders, and I would have conversations with my fellow group chiefs when we worked with and for John and we'd talk about his approach. Of course, everyone wants to get their boss with them.

94

Others dispute that John Bruce was indeed a mentor or executive coach in the common understanding. Mr. David states, "As far as I know he never has had a close mentoring relationship with anyone. I think he thought that hands-on experience was the best mentoring you could have." He would ensure that his staff had different experiences to handle. He always ensured that military Procurement Contracting Officers (PCOs), the agent that co-signed the contract with the contractor, had a great variety of challenging things to do and not just routine spare-parts contracts. They would be involved with complex systems buys and command-wide undertakings. The task might be to buy an entire ambulance, not just a spare tire that sat on the back of it. The challenge would be to assess several vehicles and be part of the team that made the selection based on a broad range of factors. Mr. David agrees that "he influenced them with the work he assigned to them rather than by bringing them into the office by chatting, although he may have influenced some people with his stories." Mr. David went on to state:

> I am looking at a chart of the Army Contracting Command of March, 2011: There are eleven division chiefs and three directors, associate directors, 14 high level managers. Of those 14, nine have worked for John Bruce. So I would say he may not have influenced their careers by mentoring them, but 9 out of 14 having climbed the ladder and had some rungs under him, I would say that's a pretty fair indication that he certainly didn't hurt them.

In regard to a classic mentoring or coaching approach, Mr. Bruce was not as interested in developing that kind of relationship because his overwhelming desire was to accomplish the mission, whatever it was, and to develop his staff through their performing work.

Mr. Charles supports this when he states, "I would say if there was a flaw about him, mentoring would be his Achilles heel. He was more concerned with the output you could give rather than what your career goals would be." Mr. Charles laments this: "It's a

shame that he did not do more mentoring because he had such a vast knowledge accumulated through the years that could have been shared more with his workers." More evidence points to Mr. Bruce's not being a traditional mentor or coach to employees than exists to support his being one. He was not the classic mentor in that he didn't really directly sit down with his employees individually and help them to build their career goals, to set their educational targets, or to gain insight into climbing the ladder. What he did do was see that his staff was being trained effectively with broad-based, on-the-job training. He made sure that when his staff reached journeyman level, they would have the skills they needed to support all of the procurement actions that could come along from the simplest to the most complex. He achieved his goal of building teams of highly competent people who he felt could handle any business challenge. He showed that he was people oriented in what he gave to his team members.

Mr. Bruce committed to contribute personally to the people who worked for him. He set a good example through his own strong work ethic, and this was a prime way to influence other people in their careers. Most agreed that John Bruce was not a typical mentor for people. He gave people the work that he thought would train them in the way they would grow as employees. But he would make sure that the work was aimed at varying the challenge to each employee and to see that they would run the gamut of different types of procurements to make them familiar with a wide range of challenges.

Compliant With Regulations

Mr. Bruce was a man who believed in following the rules. He would not defy the systems of the organization that he served. He learned the rules so as to properly and beneficially apply them to the challenges he faced. Mr. Edward states, "John Bruce really

helped us out. The way things evolved with Federal Prison Industries in 2002, we could

go competitive. Before that, from 1934, the law said that we had to go to them, even if we

didn't know that until 1986." Even though he and his organization were not following the

rules laid down regarding Federal Prison Industries, rules that had been in effect for the

50 prior years, upon learning this John Bruce took immediate corrective action and began

to follow that law in 1986. As the laws changed, he made sure to follow the latest

version. Government contracting is inherently a confusing business with myriad laws

replacing other laws. John Bruce made sure to keep current on business laws and

regulations and had the value of his extraordinary years of knowledge when reviewing

contracting matters. Mr. Charles confirmed Mr. Bruce's unflagging following of the rules

by characterizing him as "a perfect civil servant." On this matter, Mr. Bruce stated,

"Sometimes you would say, 'Well, this is a stupid thing,' but the law says do it, and so

we would do it."

 Mr. Bruce revealed that a thorough knowledge of the rules often helped him in his

business:

> I'm going to say what helped me was the changes, the directions that came down.
> We used to have what we call the OPIs, the Ordnance Procurement Instructions.
> And then they became the Federal Army Regulation (FAR) and the Army FAR,
> the AFAR, and so forth. But, there might have been a couple of times that we
> might have scurried the deal but on the whole, you know, we also used it in our
> advantage against the contractors. We said, 'well gee, you know, we can't do
> much about it. Here's the law. Read it yourself.' And they'd say, 'well, that
> doesn't say that.' And we'd say, 'read this.' And I'd use that a lot of times.

 In all of the interviews, the sense that John Bruce followed the law was always

expressed or implied. The law could be a friend or a foe to the desired outcome of a

business deal and Mr. Bruce made it integral part of his preparation to know the rules of

the law and to follow them. Wherever possible, he used the law to the best advantage of the government.

Loyalty

Running deep within John Bruce was his strong loyalty to his family, his country, his organization the U.S. Army, and the soldiers and people who made up that organization. This loyalty seemed to have been embedded since his youth and indicates the strong influence of his parents in instilling these values. The next sections explore this deeply embedded loyalty to family, to duty, to the soldier, and to staff displayed by Mr. Bruce that stood out strongly in his character. In return, Mr. Bruce required similar loyalty from his staff as well as requiring that they, like he was, be honorable stewards of the public trust.

To Family

Mr. Bruce often related the depth of his love for his late wife. He states regarding his late wife and their fortunate, accidental meeting, "This lady, little snip, I married her. It was kind of interesting too: when I got off the train, I came into Detroit and met her by accident." He often referenced the good fortune that brought him to a chance meeting with his wife. Mr. Bruce readily divulged his lasting love for his deceased wife and claimed that he always acted kindly and devotedly to his family because of his love and family honor, a trait that grew to include his work family as well.

Mr. Baker states, "I worked for him when his wife was ill and he took the time. He was gone *a lot*. I think that he took the time that he needed and that she needed." This is a demonstrated aspect of being supportive to those around you and shows the kind of loyalty that will often extend itself beyond family in truly magnanimous individuals.

Mr. Charles states, "He said very seriously, 'I took a vow on my wife's deathbed I would never be in the company of another woman alone.' So, he settled that some years back. So he was very focused on the work family." Mr. Bruce frequently mentioned the loss of his wife. After her passing, he subsequently turned toward his work as a possible place of refuge from that loss. However strongly he was affected at the time of his wife's death, the consensus was that Mr. Bruce soldiered on at work and kept his emotions under control regarding his bereavement without loss of efficacy in the office.

Regarding Mr. Bruce's loyalty to his wife and family, Mr. Edward states, "They really clicked. If his wife was still living I think he would have retired much earlier." Others frequently noted his strong family ties. They pointed to that as a reason that motivated him to do his best in order to honor his family. Many believed that the main drive was still about family, protecting his family name during all of the time he spent at TACOM. Mr. Abel states, "I think he feels very strongly he needs to live up to those standards or needs to carry the family name in a positive light." The consensus is that Mr. Bruce is proud of his Scottish heritage and his family name, and is motivated to represent his family to the best of his ability. It is expressed as a strong value of his generation.

To Duty

John Bruce tells the story of the beginning of his great devotion to the U.S. Army. In fact, he thought at one time that he couldn't even get into the Service.

> That's a long story. I was rejected by the Marines, Navy, and Coast Guard by the same doctor in all three services, so I figured if I'm a "4-F" [a U.S. Selective Service classification designating a person physically, psychologically, or morally unfit for military duty], I'd better go down and see the Army. So I went down there and the guy says, 'You've got a high pulse.' And I said yeah. I went upstairs to the 17th floor of the building and the doctor said, 'Don't come back.' So I said okay. So what does he do? He knocks off at least 15 points and 30 points on my blood pressure. By the way, what I had done was that I had actually gotten some

Phenobarbital from my doctor. He said, 'That will knock your pulse down, so don't worry about it.' So I didn't but it came back that my pulse was normal but my blood pressure had gone way up and that's the reason he knocked the 30 points off. But the funny thing was, he said, 'You know, I've seen some people here who've been blind in one eye but could still shoot out of the other, so, I figured, okay.' But anyway, that's what happened. I came to work here as a civilian for the Army in March of 1946 and I've been here ever since.

When he was just out of college, the humble young Mr. Bruce decided that he would not use his degree to get a commission but would serve in the ranks of the enlisted men. What followed Mr. Bruce's induction into the Army was nearly 70 years of loyal service. Regarding this loyalty to duty, Mr. David states, "He was always dedicated anyway. Always!" Others thought there was never a question for him to adapt because he has such love for the job, a love for the Army. Mr. Baker states, "John and his values on dedication and work and gaining value from being a productive, contributing member of a work organization, went obviously right to his core. That defines him." It is universally acknowledged that Mr. Bruce had deep, bedrock devotion to his duty to serve. It was always apparent. Mr. Baker states, "On top of that, he made a conscious choice to dedicate his life to his profession. He dedicated it as a public servant to the nation."

Mr. Abel recalled Mr. Bruce's frequent use of a colorful expression "I bleed Army green." He was expressing that he was devoted to the Army to the very core of his being. No one who knew John Bruce disputed that. All concluded that Mr. Bruce set an example of dedication and reliability that is unmatched, with a genuine commitment that was undeniable. Mr. Bruce was always at work and hadn't missed a beat in nearly 70 years except during his wife's illness that led to her untimely demise. Mr. Baker summed it up: "I think it's just commitment to performance. It's an obligation to something greater than him so he keeps working. He's got to do what he does—it doesn't matter." People were usually flabbergasted by his longevity and his ability to stick to it and to do the job.

It was obvious that this man was here because of his personal commitment to serve. Mr. Charles related an incident that aptly demonstrated this:

> I remember it was on Organization Day. Everybody was out at the picnic, on the grounds, as I was leaving for the picnic where just about everybody in the place was at. And I asked John Bruce, as I stuck my head into his office as I was leaving, "Aren't you going outside to join the fun?" And John Bruce answered, 'There are workers and there are picnickers.' And he stayed in there working as I left. That is dedication.

Mr. Baker recalled that when he started in Procurement at TACOM, he was a young man recently out of college and he recognized that at the time, Mr. Bruce had already served in war and peace for nearly 40 years. He acknowledged Mr. Bruce's strong work ethic then, and now, after 69 years of government service; he describes his continuing work ethic as "just remarkable."

To all who knew him, Mr. Bruce was an ethical worker who knew his job and never shirked his duty. He had displayed this desire to serve by trying several times to enter military service in World War II. In this regard, Mr. Abel as head of the Acquisition Center, affirms, "I'll take as many of his type as we can get." Mr. Bruce often served above and beyond the call of duty. He came in on weekends during Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm during the First Gulf War in the early 1990s, always in a suit and tie, well groomed but ready to roll up his sleeves. His focus went beyond sitting behind his desk: He ventured into offices, effectively rallying the troops. Mr. Charles attested to "his digging in to give more of his energy whenever possible," especially when the job demanded it. He seemed to work harder as the job got tougher, displaying his grit under deadlines. That is why all saw in him a tremendous asset, asserting that they would welcome a dozen like him. Even at 94, he was in demand and well respected and, when contrasted to younger workers, stood head and shoulders above

all but the most overly zealous. Acknowledgment of this loyalty to duty is seen as a steady theme throughout all of the interviews. He had a drive that was unmatched by anyone else in these recollections.

To the Soldier

Mr. Edward states, "He was always dedicated to the soldier, in everything he did. He had been a 'green-suiter' too. The Pacific Theater of Operations during World War II in which he fought as a soldier was foremost in John Bruce's mind: 'What we do here is for the soldier.'" Others intimated that this perspective carried from the top down by his saying, "Once you get it done and you realize you are doing something for the troops, it is worth the sacrifice." Mr. Bruce knew that he was the boss, but he understood and inculcated in his workers that people really needed to do a good job for the soldier and not just to look good for the boss or to blindly accomplish a task. Everything in Mr. Bruce's world revolved around helping the troops. He made his staff feel like they were an intimate part of the nation's vital force, doing their work to protect the lives of the soldiers in the field throughout the world.

Mr. Abel related many instances when John Bruce made a special effort to provide for the soldier in the field. He was well aware that Mr. Bruce had served in combat in World War II and had special insight into the soldier's world. He knew that troops couldn't will equipment to be there when a situation called for it and that it was often a life-or-death matter if equipment was in short supply or if it failed. Ultimately for the soldier, as Mr. Abel expressed it, "they don't need to understand it, they just need it when they need it." Mr. Bruce, in his opinion, was not going to let a fellow soldier down

in the exigencies of service or war. His great love for the soldier, the face of the U.S.

Army, was universally recognized.

Mr. David states:

Even though we didn't talk about it at the time, we really started sensing about his being for the soldier after 9/11, but it was apparent we didn't use the word customer and we didn't use the word war fighter but I don't think we consciously recognized that that's who we were supporting. We did know these products are important, these contracts that we buy are important and needed to be done in a timely manner.

Mr. David thought that Mr. Bruce paid much more attention to the directing

Colonel than the civilian Director of Procurement, that he "always had, for lack of a

better word, a soft spot for the soldier. He knew when you get the captains and majors

that would come in, that in two months they would be a boss." No one thought it was fair

because they knew they couldn't pick up in 3 months what it took others years to pick up.

Yet, throughout the years of dealing with soldiers, he fully enjoyed having them work for

him and he thoroughly enjoyed having them become Procurement Contracting Officers.

He did his best to train them in the short amount of time he had with them by giving them

lots of varied things to do since Mr. Bruce knew that as soldiers, they were on duty 24

hours a day, or at least at the office for a full 1-8-5 shift (1 shift, 8 hours, 5 days a week).

It is likely that Mr. Bruce might have retired rather than work for an organization

other than the Army. He felt strongly about it, with intense loyalty. All recognize Mr.

Bruce's Army-related loyalty to the soldier as the ultimate customer and the person who

deserved the most attention in work efforts. Mr. Baker acknowledged that Mr. Bruce had

purposely delayed his retirement when he stated, "He'd be leaving the Army after being

drafted into the Army in 1942 and after almost 70 years of Army green, and he probably

didn't want to leave the fold."

Mr. David knew that Mr. Bruce would give you an opinion about every commanding general who had been at TACOM. Most were favorable but some of these showed that he really had no use for a few of the commanders. As Mr. David states, "He was not blinded by the military into thinking that 100% of them are god-like. He never said, I do this for Joe Smokey, but I think that's what it is." In his final assignment at TACOM as BRAC officer, Mr. Bruce's concern, according to those around him, was "what will these changes do for the soldier in the field? How can we mitigate the harm that they are likely to cause?" Mr. Bruce did not and could not hide his deep loyalty to the Army nor could he make a decision without bringing the soldier's perspective into that decision.

John Bruce talked about his service humbly and succinctly: "I did my bit." He was quoting a British soldier he had met well after World War II in England who had been evacuated at Dunkirk, was subsequently captured, and escaped to fight again. "You know, here's a real hero, by golly, and he was so doggone stoic; he didn't consider it to be that important. It was "'very very, you know, I can do that,' and 'I can understand it.'" Reverence for the soldier, for the fighting man, was deeply instilled in Mr. Bruce, a worker-warrior. He had seen battle firsthand and that lesson never left him. He could never forget that the ultimate customer was the soldier.

To Staff

Mr. David gave insight into how Mr. Bruce viewed his staff. "He acknowledged that there are different skill levels in people in the same grade. He would find a task that the person could handle and be successful in." It was a rule of Mr. Bruce, wherever possible, to match work to each person's ability. "He was not interested in seeing them

fail." He was always interested in seeing his workers accomplish the task of properly making the award of the contract.

Regarding advanced education for his work staff, Mr. Edward states of Mr. Bruce,

He always encouraged people to take classes and to get Master's Degrees. He's encouraged and influenced careers by helping people make more of themselves through education and advancement. Well, we have our own training here too at Defense Acquisition University and you can take any number of classes, which [under Mr. Bruce's approval] we did.

Some people worked on their Master's degree at TACOM. Lawrence Tech sent to TACOM various instructors to teach classes in finance or technical subjects. Mr. Bruce was happy to encourage this opportunity for government-funded education. Others thought otherwise. Mr. Baker states, "I think that as an organization we weren't so strong on education. We had our interns and when they came in they had classes, but I think that as an organization we weren't that strong about doing that."

John Bruce was strongly focused on his workers getting work experience. His philosophy was that if you're doing the work, it's going to teach you what's going on around you. Get the experience and you'll be able to master the business. It was how John Bruce had approached his own career. Mr. Bruce had no advanced college degrees and although he did encourage education, it was not always done enthusiastically because he felt that work itself brought a good measure of necessary knowledge. Again, he was a practical man, born and raised in the Depression and in World War II, and always did what was necessary to accomplish his aims.

Some of the interviews noted the loyalty of Mr. Bruce to the handicapped of his staff. He wanted to give them the help they needed to succeed. He seemed to grow more in his relationships with his staff over the years. Many acknowledged that later in life Mr. Bruce viewed coming to work and being with the workers as being with his family. And,

even though he wouldn't say that he loved them as a family, he gained more of their respect as the years rolled by. His staff was no longer mere employees but integral parts of who he was. The death of his wife left a hole in Mr. Bruce's life that increasingly filled itself with the relationships he developed at work. He showed his love for his work family demonstrably. When employees had illnesses or their family members had illnesses, he was deeply sympathetic and strongly supported them. His concern was apparent in his repeated inquiries about that person's health. Mr. Bruce became known for being strongly supportive and devoted to family, friends, and coworkers.

Required Loyalty

Mr. Bruce was never seen as a pushover by any of his employees. He was acknowledged as demanding a certain level of competence, performance, and loyalty from his staff. Mr. Baker states:

> I think he was pretty consistent in the time I worked with him. Now it's probably been about 14 years since we've worked together but during the time that I worked for him, I'd call him demanding. He expected the work to get done, he expected it to get done correctly and he brought his own approach. In my initial contact with him, he had a real commitment to the chain of command and authority and working in a military organization like we do, that fits in pretty well.

Mr. Bruce retained his military-styled regard for authority, chain of command, and sense of performing his duty to the U.S. Army, his employer, and he expected no less from his staff. People at TACOM universally knew Mr. Bruce was a demanding division chief who was going to get productivity out of his employees.

Mr. David states:

> He would demand the facts. If a buyer went to a team chief and said, 'I have a lot of work,' and the team chief went to the group chief and said 'all my buyers have a lot of work' and the group chief went to his chief and said 'I have way too much work,' each level accepted those statements. John Bruce would say, 'Make me a

list of all this work and bring it back to me and we'll see what we can do about it.'
And the list would never come back. Once you sat down and wrote it out, it didn't
turn out to be that much work, at least the amount of work that you would have to
assert that you couldn't get done.

Mr. Bruce was not a pushover; he demanded an honest accounting of the facts to back a

claim.

Mr. Charles states, "He more or less looked at you more as a worker bee: You had

your duties, your job description, and he expected you to perform those duties and do

them well under his tutelage." Along the way, he would support you and help you, but

the expectation of performance was always there.

Mr. Bruce would support you but he demanded a staff member's support in

return. This trait, as interpreted here, can be seen as sometimes negative. Having a loyal

staff is essential to conducting good business but holding back employees from

advancing or improving themselves through rotation to another group of the organization

was interpreted as detrimental by Mr. Bruce because it could affect the efficient

operations of his organization. However, Mr. Edward states, "There were some people

that got on his bad side and needed to go somewhere else to get a promotion. He did not

like the idea that you would attempt to leave and, what they call, broaden their

experience." This approach was often attributed to his task-orientation. Mr. Bruce was

driven to see that the mission entrusted to him was completed correctly. He relished

support from his staff to complete assignments for him, and did not encourage his staff to

leave for other opportunities.

Mr. Abel alludes to the early business groups of TACOM as "fiefdoms." He

started out in the Wheeled-Vehicle Division and when he applied for a position in the

Tracked-Vehicle Division, "I was told that that probably might not be a smart career

move and I definitely got the impression that you just didn't do things like that; you sort of stayed in your division." There was a historical and cultural show of loyalty based on the personalities of the branch and division chiefs in the 1960s through the 1980s, who were strong-willed people. "When you think of Ed Mathias, Dick Marttila, John Bruce, Gil Knight, they were all strong-minded people." Mr. Bruce seemed to follow the convention of the time, keeping people who worked for him in his organization and not allowing them into other areas, feeling that the expertise they gained would be most useful if they stayed where they were. Reinforcement of this matter came from Mr. Charles: "He relished loyalty. If you indicated that you might have an opportunity to go to a different area for an advancement or promotion or for some cross-fertilization, he had a tendency to accept that as a sort of affront, a disloyalty trait." It was commonly accepted by Mr. Bruce and his staff that if an employee started working for his division, that employee should be loyal and satisfied in his position and duties. People often stayed within their same organization for their entire careers, a situation that Mr. Bruce did not oppose in that it produced employees with more specialized, local knowledge that would benefit and better serve his organization. A negative consequence of this practice was that it kept employees from gaining broader perspective.

John Bruce was demanding in that he required that people do their job and do it well, appreciating as well that his staff was a talented staff. He expected loyalty to whatever his goals were. This meant getting things on contract in what was the best and quickest way possible. In this regard, he could be somewhat oblivious to others' personal goals. He recognized that he was tough as a leader early in his career but had a leader's introspection to question if that was an effective strategy for getting the best out of his

employees. He asked, "Did I actually accomplish what I wanted by being tough?" He subsequently learned to be more collaborative by realizing that being a "tough so-and-so" did not always get the best result for him. He saw that he was missing some of the value that his employees could contribute and that it often made his staff so afraid to make a mistake that they failed to try a new approach that might bear fruit. This improved leadership approach in his later years at TACOM led to a better working relationship for both Mr. Bruce and his employees, so much so that Mr. Bruce became one of those rare employees honored by leadership and staff having the John Bruce Conference Room named after him while he was still an active employee at TACOM.

Steward

John Bruce was man who was ever conscious of his trusted role as a steward of the public funds. He fully believed it was his mission to perform this service as faithfully as possible. To the fullest measure, he followed the oath he had sworn to follow to preserve the public's treasure and property as well as he could.

Mr. Bruce was raised during the Depression as one who didn't waste resources but rather conserved and saved them. His conservative parents taught him the value of a dollar. This saving nature was often described. Mr. Charles states,

> To be blunt, he would make Bernie Madoff and Ken Lay look like pikers because his approach, when you're spending the government dollar, is almost like spending his own money. He was a very good steward of the budget that was afforded to our group. He zealously wanted to use it for the ultimate benefit of the government and he treated it as if it was his own money. So from that standpoint he was a very good, diligent steward of public funds.

Mr. Charles relates an incident that emphasized the nearly excessive good stewardship of Mr. Bruce:

It was just a little laptop and it was on the hand receipt and he said, 'I'm getting calls and I can't account for this laptop.' I said, 'Mr. Bruce, I've never seen it. I knew that it was kept in some cabinets. I don't know which cabinets.' So, I had to say I can't account for that. That ground him so badly because he was getting badgered by the property people and all this. I couldn't produce it. I didn't know where it was. So he gave me nothing [no bonus incentive] that year. I was chief and an [acting] branch chief. I said, 'I'm not getting what the other people got who did less work throughout the year than I did.' He said, 'that hand receipt deal, you know, that property that you were responsible for, you flunked it!' I said, 'Mr. Bruce, come on, you can do something about this even at this stage of the game.' And his words were, 'John, I wouldn't give you my sweat ___.'

Mr. Bruce prided himself on getting the best deal. Others elaborated that he was a terrific steward of government funds and he would never fear any backlash against him. He often said, "Doggone it, you could have gotten more out of this deal. It could have been negotiated or your people could have negotiated a better deal." If he was involved, TACOM got the best possible deal. And even though Mr. Bruce wanted to get the job done and posted quickly, he held the caveat that perhaps TACOM could get it for a better price. That superseded doing fast but not necessarily efficient business.

John Bruce was possessed of the strong desire to be protective of government funds, and no one denied that he took seriously his duty to do just that—without fail. Lessons that he learned in times of deprivation during the Depression stayed with him to guide his entire career. He was an unwavering good steward for the American taxpayer.

Learning

Mr. Bruce was a lifetime learner whose keen intelligence, sharp memory, and knack for technology were the perfect tools he used all during his career. These skills were nurtured and refined as he adapted his knack of being a quick learner to becoming a continuous learner. The next sections explore how these characteristics of learner, possessing a finely developed memory, and being technology oriented were optimized in

the long career of John Bruce and gave him the leader's ability to see the big picture during his career.

Continuous Learner

Mr. David describes Mr. Bruce as a man who learned from the experiences he underwent. An incident occurred years ago in Washington, D.C., where a young Mr. Bruce learned an indelible lesson when he was left without an answer to a difficult issue. TACOM's senior staff evidently had refused to make a decision. In Mr. David's words:

> He was sent to the Pentagon to tell the person there asking the question what we were going to do about this, and he explained to the general that it appeared to be an unsolvable problem. The general replied, "You know young man, you've got a problem. You ought to tell someone about that." And he went back home from the Pentagon with that great advice ringing in his ears, "You ought to tell someone about that." He had thought he was. And I think he learned from that, that he was going to have to solve his own problems his own way.

This stark lesson left an immense impression on the young Mr. Bruce. It caused the young leader henceforth "to look at the big picture." It was an epiphany. If he had not been the man of intelligence that he was, Mr. Bruce could have come away feeling let down and left without direction, a ship without a rudder. But he understood that, henceforward, he was to steer his own ship. His personal brilliance left him aware that he had just learned a key piece of the puzzle of how to be an effective leader and when to take the initiative to make a decision when others refused to do so.

All interviews contained attestations to Mr. Bruce's intelligence. He has the ability to look at issues from many different perspectives. Mr. Edward states, "The guy is still very sharp, very articulate. You see the way his mind works. He'd say, 'oh, I've got another question to ask you,' one that no one else would think of. They were always great

111

questions." Mr. David states, "He always saw the much bigger picture. He always saw steps ahead."

All agreed that it is highly unusual that Mr. Bruce's skills and abilities are not diminished by the fact that he is 94. Mr. Abel depicts Mr. Bruce as "a man of his time, yet intelligent and savvy enough to adapt," and "his main pursuit is his intelligence and savviness and continued relevance to Army Acquisition." Mr. Baker states, "He just wanted to understand what value something was going to bring. I think that's amazing." He had a vast knowledge accumulated through the years. John Bruce proved to his staff that his intelligence was unquestioned and significant. During his interview, his great recall of facts and names and breadth of knowledge were impressive. He revealed an intellectual control of his world as intelligent leaders do.

Throughout his career, Mr. Bruce had taken classes and training. He always came into the classroom with the attitude that he was there to learn, not just there to get out of the office for a few hours or a few days. His strong focus and penetrating questions during those classes were noted by those who had taken training alongside him. He continued to take classes with the same eagerness to learn well into his 90s.

Memory

Mr. Bruce was roundly commended for having a sharp mind and excellent memory. Mr. Edward states, "He had a good memory. He didn't really forget much." Others, like Mr. David, felt that Mr. Bruce was one of those often-praised people who have "forgotten more about how the Army works and how contracting works than most of the people here know because he has been through more." John Bruce's insights into a

rich history of experience steered him and others in the right direction during difficult procurements and tricky negotiations.

At age 94, Mr. Bruce did not assert, as many people in their 80s or 90s often do, that he was losing his memory or couldn't seem to recall an event. A name that escaped him for the moment would be recalled by him soon afterwards, during the flow of conversation. His demonstrated his own perspective on memory and the softening of the realities of the past when he philosophized, "When you get around to it, you sometimes wonder, were the good old days the good old days? I don't know. I just don't know." He recognized that our memories of past events will tend to ignore the harsh incidents in favor of the pleasant, yet his own recall seemed not to reflect this general tendency of people to ameliorate the past. His memory remained undiminished in his recall of details of his past.

Technology Oriented

For a hobby, John Bruce was a ham radio operator. He liked to learn about new electronic gadgets and had taken classes to gain technological proficiency. Mr. David states, "As a ham radio operator, he was always interested in technology. He was in the signal corps back in the Army, so he carried that back with him." On one trip Mr. Bruce made to the Pentagon, he made a special point to go to the basement of the Pentagon to see the ham radio station there. To his great personal satisfaction, he saw how the Pentagon continued to keep ham radio as a communications back-up for emergency situations.

Mr. Bruce, however, was not universally accepting of new technology, especially as it applied to the workplace. He had a healthy skepticism of new technology. He tested

113

it to see that if something was in the early developmental stage, it would truly help the workers at TACOM do the job. When the desktop computer replaced pen and ink and typewriters in the office, he ensured that he understood this new tool first. Mr. Charles states, "I know he'd be on that computer doing that seemingly all day long and he'd take things home and he'd play with it there while most of us were trying to integrate that into our work. He wanted to show that, okay, I'm going to embrace this new tool" but only if it were worthwhile. From the time that practical home computers became available, Mr. Bruce had a computer at home and was using a modem. It is worth noting that when computers were first introduced at TACOM in the 1990s, Mr. Bruce was already in his 70s. Neither his age nor those sometimes puzzling devices were a stumbling block for him. Mr. David recalls, "One manager I know had his secretary print out his email. John Bruce did not need his email printed out. He took to that like a duck to water." He was acknowledged by all who knew him to be good with computers.

Mr. Abel states: "Well, all of us old timers, and he just happens to be a little older, were raised in the era of no computers so that was a tough adaptation. What was fascinating to me about John is that he made the transition along with the rest of us without skipping a beat." To the surprise of many, John Bruce mastered the computer quickly and seemingly effortlessly. Frankly, everyone admits to having had their problems adapting to the computer when it was first introduced as an office tool, but John Bruce, who must have had his own frustrations in this regard, managed, to the outside observer, to do it seamlessly. He often was a computer advisor to younger people in TACOM. Mr. Abel noted that John Bruce made the change from using paper contracts to having an entire contract with its attendant clauses all available electronically. It was a

major change in doing business for people from the 1980s and 1990s but John Bruce was not left behind. He was a leader in going "paperless," as the Army initiative described it. It was a difficult transition and one that, even after 20 years of implementation, is not completely accomplished, but it has mostly been accomplished and is the common way to do business. Paper contracts remain as a legal tool but most correspondence is done electronically through the computer. Mr. Abel summed up this aspect of Mr. Bruce by stating, "Just by not being afraid of it [new technology like the computer], you have a big advantage over others and you caught on a little faster. It's a shock, but I think he had a computer at home, one of the first people to have one." John Bruce, former radio man, ham operator, and ever that tech-savvy enthusiast, was a natural to be one of the first to join the computer age among his peers.

Mr. Baker was equally impressed with Mr. Bruce's technological skills. He states:

> He has seen all of this and I think the biggest one is technology, just thinking about how my own parents dealt with technology. And it takes time and I would not put them anywhere near the proficient category. He has seen it come and he has grabbed on and he has just kept moving. I think that's amazing.

Mr. Bruce was concerned about making sure that the computer wasn't just an office toy. It had to be a useful business tool. Eventually, after giving it a fair trial period, he embraced it. All acknowledged that Mr. Bruce adapted well to the major change of the automated processes. All interviews share the consistent theme of Mr. Bruce's technological proficiency and ongoing efforts to stay current with the computer and other new and evolving technology. He was a leader who was not afraid to take the challenge first in his organization and review it in his leadership capacity, after he had seen first-hand that it proved to be useful to his organization.

Summary

John Bruce was raised by upright, loving parents in the early part of the last century. He spent the latter part of his boyhood in the Depression and grew into manhood knowing the value of a dollar and the reward of hard work. He graduated from college, an exceptional thing to do in those lean times, and persevered to enter the Army as soon as he could after graduation at the start of World War II. He served honorably as an enlisted man and, upon decommission, set out to make his way through life as well as he could. He was a man of varied talents. He was a leader who led by example.

Mr. Bruce built his career on leadership, loyalty, and learning. He led his organization as a strong contributor to his organization, readily adaptable, a clear communicator, strongly people-oriented, and uncompromising in his demands for good service. His ability to change with the times served him well during his long career, as did his exceptionally sharp mind and strong constitution. He was loyal to family, duty, the soldier, and his staff, constantly keeping the needs of the soldier in his sights as a leader at TACOM. His desire for lifelong learning gave him the motivation to continue to work long after others his age had set aside their careers. It led him to help others also learn. He never forgot his duty to the people who trusted him and was a good and worthy steward for the American people. He remains an uncommon man who lived an exceptionally long life of service in exceptional times.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS,

AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter begins with a brief introduction to the study. I next present the

background and the research design of the study. I follow with a summary of the

findings. I next present the discussion with interpretation in light of the study. I conclude

the chapter with the summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

This is a case study of the life of an unusually long-serving, 94-year-old senior

executive at TACOM-LCMC, Mr. John Bruce Jr. He has lived a long and colorful life—

World War II soldier, university student and graduate, husband, father, entry-level

employee, rising star in management, senior-level executive, widower, grandparent,

great-grandparent, and ageless asset to his organization. In addition to having spent 4

years in military service during World War II, Mr. Bruce served at TACOM for 65 years

and is the longest-serving member of the Army Executive Corps.

The U.S. Army has changed greatly since World War II. As the modern M1

Abrams main battle tank shows itself vastly improved over the Sherman tank that helped

defeat Germany in World War II, so do the present changes wrought in Army operations

and culture since the 1940s reflect tremendous differences today in the Army and its

workforce. How Army leaders have managed to successfully respond to changes in the

Army, affect the lives of coworkers, and how they motivate themselves to work in a

changing environment, are the subjects I explored.

Research Design

This is a single case study of the leadership style of Mr. John Bruce, Jr. I

conducted interviews with John Bruce and with his employees, associates, and superiors

(see Appendix A, Table 1), people who know him best, and reviewed the facts that

support his life history in order to gain insight into the life and times, and qualities of the

man. Interviews were recorded in digital audio format with taped recordings as a back-

up. Recorded interviews were transcribed. Transcribed interviews were analyzed and

coded using index cards. More than 300 indexed characteristics were determined to

define Mr. Bruce's profile (see Appendix A, Table 2). These were analyzed and reduced

into emerging patterns by clustering similar characteristics. Eventually, three main

themes—leadership, loyalty, and learning—emerged that contained 16 minor themes that

were posited as the ultimate strengths of Mr. Bruce's leadership profile. These were the

basis for the presentation of Chapter 4, the Findings of the Study.

Summary of Findings

Three major themes emerged from the interviews. These themes describe how

John Bruce responded to changes in the U.S. Army: He responded through leadership,

loyalty, and learning.

Chapter 4 of this study began with a brief sketch of the life of John Bruce. This

sketch presented John Bruce as a man of many talents, blessed with great health and a

sharp mind. He came from a sound background where he learned to love his family, his

heritage, and his country. He was instilled with the principles of thrift, honesty, and

integrity. These all contributed to Mr. Bruce's long, productive career. Insights into his career showed him to be a leader who led by example, always contributed, supported, and mentored the people who worked for him, communicated well, demanded the best of his workers and adapted to the many changes required of him in his nearly 70 years of service. He was strongly loyal to his family, his duty, his country, the soldier, and his work staff. He possessed a strong desire for continual learning and had a keen memory. Finally, he proved to be an exceptionally good steward of the public trust who always followed the rules.

John Bruce's length of career is impressive as a number, but what makes his career stand out is that he was always exceptionally productive and valuable, as affirmed by so many who knew him well. His peers and associates gave no small notice to his adaptability in the light of change in the U.S. Army and unwavering loyalty to family, to duty, to the soldier, and to his staff. They all noted his leadership skills, high intelligence, and exceptional eagerness to learn that motivated him during his entire career. All emphasized this combination that made him an extremely effective senior executive for the final 55 years of his career. He was deemed a perfect civil servant.

Evidence supplied in the interviews showed that Mr. Bruce possessed an ability to adapt to the changing conditions in his life whether they were personal or professional. He endured a changing world when the Roaring Twenties culminated in the decade-ending start of the Great Depression. John Bruce, 11 years old at the time, had to have seen economic life scaled back all around him. With 25% of the nation unemployed, the good times had ended. John Bruce adapted to the lean times of a world in contraction. He sold newspapers and did what he needed to do to help his family and himself make it

through the tough 1930s. Just as finances were improving, John Bruce saw the beginning of World War II break out in Europe. He had just completed his Bachelor's degree in accounting when the United States was drawn into the war after Pearl Harbor. The life he expected, a professional career in the financial world, suddenly changed. John Bruce knew that his country, and therefore his way of life and that of those he loved, his family and friends, was threatened. He knew he had to get in with his contemporaries who were enlisting in the Armed Services by the thousands. After facing initial rejection from other branches of the Service, he managed to be accepted by the Army. His life changed again. Wanting to serve as an enlisted man rather than an officer, he became Private John Bruce.

For U.S. solider John Bruce, World War II meant the Pacific Theater and his specialty was radioman. He advanced in the ranks to assume the leadership role as sergeant. He was now accountable for his squad of radio corpsmen and learned the Army's hierarchal organization. He took orders from above and passed them down to those below. As a sergeant, he had to use his judgment when he was called upon to do so to protect his men and those his squad supported. He served honorably through the end of hostilities with the signing of the Armistice with Japan on September 2, 1945.

Peacetime meant a change of venue. Sergeant Bruce returned to the United States. Although born and raised in California, he found himself seeking an opportunity in Michigan when he visited his uncle who worked for the Army at the Tank Command. The Michigan winter was a shock to the man who had lived in southern California and served in the steamy jungles of the South Pacific. He adapted to it, his Scottish heritage holding him up as a buffer against the cold.

John Bruce was given a chance to work where his uncle worked, at the Ordnance Tank and Automotive Command in Detroit. He made the most of it. His early years were served with the accounting group. As the junior member of the office, he learned whatever job needed to be done. This flexibility helped him when he had a chance to change to the contracting group. He took the offer and learned about Army contracting.

In the contracting group, John Bruce found a real home. He again did the jobs that the lowest man was forced to do. His agreeing to take on difficult jobs and learn them effectively made him a valuable team member. Promotions came quickly for the bright young man. His service in the Army suited him well when leadership duties presented themselves. He knew the Army style of management, top down and unequivocal.

John Bruce advanced through the ranks of leadership in the Procurement Directorate, becoming one of the youngest Division chiefs at age 38. He was challenged to use his skills and intelligence to lead the Tracked Vehicle Division.

His early style was autocratic, tough, and demanding. He had his orders to follow to achieve the buying mission. He oversaw every kind of change that the contracting group had to make. John Bruce showed that he was adaptable as his leadership style changed. Over the years, he moved from autocratic to cooperative, from having a temper that would blaze quickly, to one that rarely showed. He always worked closely with his peers, but at the end of his career he really teamed with them. He became a man who mellowed with age but whose fire had not gone out. He still sought to be the best leader that he could be, earning his last paycheck proudly at age 94. He had accomplished the task of living through and adapting well to nearly a century of change.

Despite the superficial changes, however, at his core John Bruce always remained the same man that he had been when he entered the service. His principles remained intact after all of his years of service. He was ever a loyal and honorable man who gave his best, honest effort on the battlefield or on the job, in the boardroom, or in the classroom. He retired from TACOM with the same integrity and values with which he had been hired 65 years earlier.

As a leader of junior executives, John Bruce was positioned to directly mentor or coach his staff. Some believed that John Bruce directly mentored or coached his junior supervisors. He took the time to give insight on how to deal with leadership issues. He had conversations in which he would give practical insight to mentor his supervisory team of leaders. This was his special approach to his younger, supervisory inner circle. This encouraged them to pass on this approach when they were leading his business groups and to work in concert with him to achieve positive results. Most of those who knew John Bruce did not see his direct mentoring or coaching of junior employees. John Bruce had climbed the ladder by learning on the job, and his years of experience led him to rely on hands-on experience as the best mentor and teacher one could have. He saw that his staff had different experiences through a great variety of challenging work to do. John Bruce had a personal stake in this. He knew as a leader that his branch's performance would only be as good as the people who served under him. He brought his skills of communication, team building, and people-orientation into creating a great staff. His staff and the soldiers who trained under him excelled as individuals and on their teams. A story he might share with his colleagues about his career would be instructive and might stick with his staff, but their strongest takeaway was the work experience they

learned on the job. They came to be involved with complex systems buys and command-wide undertakings. Most who knew him agreed that John Bruce influenced people more with the work he assigned to them than by directly telling them what they needed to do. He was mission oriented and developed his staff in this manner. Some may have seen his lack of obvious mentoring as an Achilles heel but he nevertheless effectively trained many hundreds of workers in the necessary skills they needed to be career Army purchasers or future supervisors.

John Bruce showed that he was people oriented in what he gave to his team members. He strongly contributed to the people who worked for him by setting a good example through his own strong work ethic. It was a prime way to influence other people in their careers. In summary, on the issue of mentoring, most agreed that John Bruce was not a typical mentor or coach for people but nevertheless influenced their careers positively. The evidence of this may lie in the fact that at TACOM-LCMC's Warren Army Contracting Command in March 2011, there were 11 division chiefs and three directors or associate directors, equaling 14 high-level executives. Of those 14, 9 had worked for John Bruce. His influence must have been felt as 9 out of 14 climbed the ladder and had many rungs under him, a strong indication that he helped them in a positive way.

Other reasons for Mr. Bruce's motivation were strong loyalty to duty, his family and family name, to the soldier, and to his staff. Mr. Bruce did not take lightly what he considered an obligation. His long service to his country was directly motivated by this strong devotion. He showed unusually strong loyalty to duty when he first tried to enlist in the Marines, then the Navy and Coast Guard, and, subsequently, the Army when the

first three branches rejected him for medical reasons. John Bruce sought and accepted medical treatment for high blood pressure in order to pass his physical. Many a less devoted man had welcomed the designation of "4-F" to keep out of military service. Quite the opposite, Mr. Bruce was determined to get into the fight against the Axis powers who had delivered to the U.S. what he felt to be a personal attack. Despite having a bachelor's degree, he entered the war as an enlisted man, wanting to keep close to the fight. The radio corps he served with in the South Pacific saw a great deal of combat. He was often in the thick of the action. He served his country devotedly and chose to continue to serve as a civilian employee following his honorable discharge from the Army. During his years of service, he was known for keeping regular hours and was always prompt, dependable, and prepared. He also served special duties, testifying before Congress on more than one occasion. He did his best to answer fully and truthfully the Congressmen and women who would periodically investigate one of the high-profile vehicle purchases originating at TACOM, as they did with other programs in other branches of the Service. John Bruce maintained his motivation that often kept him late at his desk because it was an obligation to something greater than he. He seemed to feel that he simply had to do what he did; other distractions did not matter.

He was especially proud of his Scottish heritage and famous surname. He did his best to honor the family name for his heirs through his service. He served his immediate family in this by serving his nation well. His deceased wife had been the center of his world, along with his children and grandchildren, who filled his world after his wife's departure. After standing faithfully by his wife's side during the illness that eventually claimed her, he postponed his retirement in order to keep serving his country.

He did his best to keep the soldier, his brother-in-arms, protected. After having

served honorably in war, there was no stronger way for John Bruce to help the American

soldier than by procuring the world's best fighting vehicles. When soldiers came directly

under his supervision, he trained them in procurement methods, realizing that although

they were given less training than civilians typically were given, they would soon be the

leaders directing the purchase of military equipment. He gave them a crash course in

training, offering a great variety of challenging procurement actions. He made sure that

the soldiers who came under his purview would be able to handle the varying contracting

instruments and challenges that later came their way. He gave special attention to the

Army colonels who shared the duties of the Head of the Procurement Directorate,

keeping them informed of all of the pending decisions of the important acquisitions in

progress. He developed rapport with the military heads of TACOM he had contact with,

and had a cultivated opinion of each of the commanding generals, dozens of men who led

TACOM-LCMC from 1946 onward, offering his help and insight whenever he was able.

Throughout his career, it was likely the Pacific Theater of Operations in which he fought

as a soldier during World War II that was foremost in John Bruce's mind when he

realized: "What we do here is for the soldier." Mr. Bruce understood and instilled into his

workers that his staff really needed to do a good job for the soldier and not just for the

boss or in order to blindly accomplish a task.

Remarkably, John Bruce remained enthusiastic about coming to work for nearly

70 years. Few who have served in much shorter careers can boast that. If there was a

constant in his approach that made him eager to "punch the clock," to continue his career,

the greater evidence points a strong devotion to duty, to honor and protect his family and

family honor, the soldier, and his staff, along with his strong desire for continuous learning. His desire to learn extended to the organization he oversaw. He wanted to understand the value of a new process or new technology that was being introduced to TACOM. He was the gatekeeper whose approval a proposed innovation for his division would need to gain. His healthy skepticism of new technology always led him to ask if it would truly help the workers at TACOM do the job. He ensured that he understood fully the desktop computer before he allowed it to replace pen and ink and typewriters in his office. He worked on the computer during the day at TACOM and invested his time at night to learn to operate the early model with a modem he had purchased for his home use. It is notable that when computers were first introduced at TACOM in the 1990s, Mr. Bruce was already 70 years old. Neither his age nor those often difficult early devices were a stumbling block for him. John Bruce did not need his secretary to use the computer or write his emails for him, as other executives did. He was acknowledged by all who knew him to be a computer expert.

John Bruce was at the front of the change from using paper contracts to having an entire contract with its attendant clauses available electronically. Through all of the major changes in doing business for people from the 1980s and 1990s, he was a leader in going "paperless," as the Army initiative described its bid to use more electronic media for records keeping and communications. His support for new technology, such as teleconferencing and video conferencing, is another aspect of his penchant for technology. He was a leader who was not afraid to take the challenge first in his organization and pass it on in a leadership capacity to his organization, but only after he had seen that it had effectively proved out.

John Bruce kept his love of radio communications during his adult life as a ham radio operator for a hobby at home. He did not limit his fondness for learning to technology alone. Throughout the years he attended classes ranging from leadership to office management, procurement, to Army innovation. He was an interested student who took his education seriously and believed his duty was to learn all that he could to help him in his job. His devotion to his desire and obligation to keep learning continued throughout his entire career.

John Bruce served his staff in the same way he served the soldier, directly guiding them to perform as well as possible. He offered challenging opportunities for work-oriented training and approved of educational opportunities. He was especially helpful to the physically challenged, offering extra help for special needs. His staff of the Tracked Vehicle Branch responded in turn, serving with the knowledge that they were working for a unique man, the long-serving John Bruce, whose motivation through leadership, loyalty and a desire for learning kept him eager to come to work during the course of his long career of service.

Discussion

The life of John Bruce, Jr. conforms to several of the theories discussed previously. In relationship to Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (1954), John Bruce went through the rudimentary phases of basic needs during the Depression. He worked as a young boy to deliver newspapers to help his family gain food and shelter (Level 1). He sought safety by learning to fit into society and to take care of himself (Level 2). Having advanced through the first two steps, John Bruce sought and found love and fulfillment in his family and friends and, later, in his marriage with his wife and children (Level 3). At

this time he also continued his quest for esteem and responsibility through his career at TACOM, advancing in that career rapidly and earning the respect of those he encountered (Level 4). His successful career assured, he moved on to Maslow's final step (Level 5), self-actualization. Honors and accomplishments like having the John Bruce Conference Room named after him while he was still an active employee at TACOM, or revising standard operating procedures (SOPs) in his business office as Army policy changed, helped him realize this fulfillment as he put his personal stamp on the day-to-day workings of his Tracked Division within the Procurement and Production Directorate. He continued in self-actualization, serving until late in life, the transcendence of living an especially dedicated life, giving the vast depth of his knowledge to TACOM, forming the careers of those who would serve in his place after he had retired.

John Bruce's life also aligns with Erikson's Eight-Stage Theory of Human Development (1950), a theory that illustrates a connection to the life of a leader. Essentially a series of lessons and challenges that foster growth, the life of a successful leader demonstrates that growth in ways that support Erikson's theory. John Bruce developed trust in family and, later, his teachers early in his life (Stage 1). This trust brought him into greater and closer love with his family and young friends. He grew to develop autonomy as he became a young child (Stage 2) and advanced to early schooling, learning initiative (Stage 3). His success in school gained him competence (Stage 4), and he developed independence (Stage 5), that led him to choose college and an advanced education. He chose intimacy through commitment to voluntary service in the U.S. Army, to be trusted by the soldiers in the front lines of the battles he fought during World War II and, after the service, he chose marriage and family (Stage 6). His strong career

success brought him advanced status in society (Stage 7) and in his later years, he maintained his integrity with faithful service to his career in continued service of the Army (Stage 8). As an older adult, the wisdom he gained kept him serving despite the loss of his wife. At Stage 8, Erikson's highest stage of development, his wisdom caused him to accent the positive in his life and remain positive and proud that he had accomplished a long and distinguished career that would be a guiding star to keep him from the despair that many feel at the late stages of life. Although we assume that at an advanced age a leader knows who he is, even nonagenarians continue to self-analyze. Fortunately for Mr. Bruce, his self-doubts, if any, did not appear to have troubled him.

Herzberg's (1959) extensive research led him to form his Motivation-Hygiene Theory. It describes both positive workplace situations, that create job satisfaction, and negative situations, that create job dissatisfaction. We can view John Bruce's career within this framework. Mr. Bruce was fortunate to have climbed the ladder and become a senior executive at the early age of 38. As a leader whose successes led him to an advanced position, he was fortunate to have gained more positive experiences from the workplace than negative experiences. Herzberg's Theory determines six factors that lead to job satisfaction: recognition, achievement, responsibility, promotion, growth, and the work itself; and seven factors that lead to job dissatisfaction: unwanted policies, friction with supervision, work conditions, relationship with immediate supervisor, compensation, security, and relationship with co-workers. Herzberg declared that positive experiences could account for a decision to stay with a career for a longer period of time. John Bruce definitely stayed by choice at his career for a long time, which points to his feeling significant job satisfaction. His high achievement in position and rapid

promotions, great responsibility, growth in his abilities through continual learning, and enjoyment of the work itself make Herzberg's Theory an obvious selection to affirm that John Bruce was greatly satisfied with his job and stayed long beyond early retirement because of that satisfaction. The factors that contributed to satisfaction are borne out in the interviews. John Bruce had few areas of job dissatisfaction that were revealed. He seemed to accept unwanted policies and work with them. He got along well with his immediate supervisors, especially Henry Jones, who he mentioned by name. He had comfortable work conditions: a private office and a secretary. He had great compensation in a six-figure salary. He was secure in his position and he got along well with his supervisors and his co-workers.

Herzberg theorizes two sets of needs for people—animal needs for pain avoidance and human needs for psychological growth. Beyond his physical needs, John Bruce felt the psychological satisfaction, as Herzberg said satisfied workers would, that leaders find through greater cooperation in global alliances. John Bruce spoke glowingly about our allies from Great Britain and Australia during World War II and down to the present day. This is an insight into deeper levels of satisfaction and higher motivators for John Bruce than mere financial compensation.

John Bruce's ability to respond to change fits some of Kotter's Eight-Step Process for Leading Change (1996). He began his career with a sense of urgency (Step 1), joining the U.S. Army to serve his country in World War II. He created a guiding collation with the men he served with in arms and led in his platoon (Step 2). He traveled to Michigan from California for a chance at a job, even though he had worked in California before World War II, and in Detroit at TACOM, he began to develop his sense of vision (Step 3)

to serve through loyalty, leadership, and learning. He communicated that vision as a buy-in (Step 4) as he showed he was eager to work any assignment in order to advance. He empowered broad-based action (Step 5) as he advanced from the accounting group to the contracting group within the organization and was subsequently able to direct more people. He generated short-term wins with each success in thankless jobs that built into the greater successes of his career (Step 6). He never let up in his advancing career or in developing like-minded individuals who formed his staff (Step 7). Finally, as leader of the Tracked Vehicle Division, he was able to incorporate changes into the culture (Step 8). His methods of doing business were followed by those he supervised, as he championed good principles into the culture. This helped to ensure organizational success for TACOM-LCMC and the Army, through his long and productive career and from those who would follow in his footsteps.

Newer literature advances theories that align with the life of John Bruce in certain ways. Otto Scharmer's (2009) Theory U describes a new collective leadership to meet the massive institutional failures of our world that include hunger, poverty, AIDS, terrorism, violence, destruction of nature, and loss of spiritual values. Theory U describes a way for collective leadership to meet these challenges through exploring the core, inner place of leadership and how it operates. Scharmer describes "presencing," when leaders come close to the source of that core, a feeling akin to waiting to be born. Presencing, a process of five movements, is a "U" shaped journey as leaders can learn to move away from a limiting institution to connect with the world, down the left arm of the "U," to the bottom of the "U" where self merges with the world. At this point, the leader gains resonance with the world. Emergence up the opposite arm of the "U" gains the leader a heightened

energy of future possibility that is reached at the top of the "U" as the leader acts in concert with this new world for an emerging future of unlimited possibilities. John Bruce's journey as a leader took him away from the historical, hierarchal organization of the old Army and brought him face to face with new leadership theories that including broad-based teaming and a flatter, much more horizontal business structure. In accordance with Scharmer's Theory U, he began in the old, top-down management system of little teaming and "orders from the top." Later, Mr. Bruce came to show evidence of merging with a new world. He displayed signs of being forward thinking when he had built teams of specialists in years past. As he evolved, he grew to be less autocratic and more a team member with a view of a global set of ideas. He is a general fit for Scharmer's theory, despite being less invested in the new vision, still clinging in some ways to his older, hierarchal style of leadership. His journey is best described as a partial buy-in of Scharmer's "Theory U."

The five theories that formed the theoretical framework of this study, the self-actualization of Maslow, the integrity of Erikson, the responsibility of Herzberg, the urgency of Kotter, and the "presencing" of Scharmer, seem to naturally combine as outcomes of the career of John Bruce. John Bruce in the later stages of his career felt the self-actualization of leading his organization and putting his personal stamp on the organization. His integrity and achievement are continued today in the Acquisition group at TACOM, integrity that is the final stage of Erikson's Theory and that has been the cornerstone of Mr. Bruce's character. The responsibility described by Herzberg and the urgency described by Kotter were apparent in his approach to work, carefully crafting the best business teams, and always seeking the best value in contracting while completing

the job expeditiously. Finally, as Scharmer described in his Theory U, Mr. Bruce experienced growth in vision by embracing modern methods to experience a world of greater possibilities than his earlier business vision.

John Bruce's training seemed to be in line with that recommended in relevant literature. Yukl (1998) posits that the best executive training starts with solid on-the-job training and job assignments that offer a variety of assignments. This leads to executives who gain broad, big-picture perspective and constantly expanding skill sets, which is evident in John Bruce's early career at TACOM-LCMC. Assignments that involve change, high job stress, stretching one's abilities, and even learning from failure have been shown to produce the best leaders (McCauley & Hughes-James, 1994). The literature also finds that leaders who accept responsibility for their actions and are able to gain feedback from supervisors profit greatly. Mr. Bruce's career training fit that of the presented literature: a variety of assignments; on-the-job training; a broad, big-picture perspective; expanding skill sets; and assignments that involved change and, sometimes, advanced education. His was a high-profile job with associated high job stress. Through this, he managed personal growth. He revealed in his interview that he was the type of man who would accept responsibility for his mistake and would be willing to gain feedback from supervisors, as recommended from L. Kaplan (1988). When he had the epiphany in Washington, D.C., when an Army general told him, "You have a problem; you ought to tell someone about it," he correctly inferred that it would be he himself who would have to solve that and future problems. Although he was a highly motivated learner who took many work-related classes, he did not feel, like most of his generation,

the need to earn an advanced degree. He had learned most of the skills he needed on the job, with experience as his best teacher.

Summary

The life of John Bruce Jr., demonstrates a devotion to serve that combined leadership, loyalty, and learning. These three aspects of his leadership style reinforced each other. He was a leader able to respond to the continuous change in the post-World War II Army. He had deep loyalty and strong motivation to serve his country. He was ever adaptable in being a life-long learner, changing with the times and acquiring the new skills that are required in each ensuing era. His was an obligation to remain motivated to lead others to the proper training and skills that workers in an organization need to successfully perform allotted tasks. Motivation to serve is related to loyalty in the desire to do the right thing and to learn to acquire the skills to better serve. Through it all, at his center, John Bruce's core principles served him throughout his career. Despite the many changes he adapted to in his lengthy career, at his core John Bruce always remained the same honest, worthy man that he had been when he entered the service. When he walked out the door of TACOM on December 4, 2011, at age 94, he left with the same integrity he had brought to the U.S. Army as a raw recruit nearly 70 years earlier, recalling the day he raised his right hand in a sworn oath to bear truth, faith, and allegiance to the United States, as he enlisted in the U.S. Army, when he said: "I, John Bruce, Jr., do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign or domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that

I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

Conclusions and Recommendations

John Bruce Jr.'s long and exemplary career may never be repeated but we can take away a strong lesson from his life. A willingness to respond to the changes that life will inevitably bring and to work hard at the varied tasks that life throws our way; a great devotion to family, country, and fellow man; and a strong motivation to learn and be successful offers a blueprint for success.

It may be a long while before we see another like John Bruce in any organization. However, many of the lessons of the life and career of John Bruce are apparent. How do we gain new leaders with the qualities of Mr. Bruce? As Major General Michael J. Terry, Commanding General, TACOM- LCMC (personal communication, July 1, 2013), said in his July 4, 2013, holiday message: "Each generation bears the responsibility to sustain and promote the vision and ideals so boldly set forth in the fundamental document of the American political experience, The Declaration of Independence." In keeping with this ideal, we can:

1. Help foster a sense of honor for family, country, and duty. This needs to be not just an Army program but a national program.

2. Permit leaders to gain experience they need to discover that great leaders will need to respond to change many times along the path of their careers.

3. Continue to invest in robust training for our future leaders.

4. Promote selflessness in an age of selfishness.

5. Promote healthy living that will permit our best leaders to serve longer.

6. Celebrate older workers for their positive contributions: knowledge, wisdom, and experience.

7. Accept that limiting others only limits yourself and your world.

While I note that when I entered into this challenge to study what I saw as a life of leadership with its strong underpinnings of loyalty to duty and remarkable motivation that led to a more than successful career, I felt I was able to stand aside and let the interviews and the record present the facts without steering them to neatly fit my preconceptions. The many surprises that presented themselves in the interviews were a constant reminder that no person's life is a simple, open book but that there are discoveries to be made in the lives of all of us. This granted me insight into my personal perspectives and how I needed to come to terms with my fixed ideas about the lives of others.

APPENDIX A: TABLES

INTERVIEW SUBJECTS AND CHARACTERISTICS

I reviewed the characteristics of the Interview Subjects: age, degree, seniority at TACOM and years knowing John Bruce, Jr. Of the six subjects, all were older than 50 years old; all subjects had a Bachelor's degree and one held a Masters degree; all subjects had worked for TACOM at least 28 years and all subjects have known John Bruce, Jr. for at least 28 years. The subjects who were interviewed are listed in Table 1.

Table 2 details the characteristics, found in Column 1, ascribed to Mr. John Bruce in the six interviews by highest number and in descending order. The number of references in the interviews is found in Column 2. Column 3 presents the major categories into which the characteristics were clustered. This was an initial process that led to discovering the clustering of characteristics found in the Findings section of Chapter 4. Characteristics that fit into more than one cluster were referenced at random throughout Chapter 4.

Table 1

Interview Subjects

INTERVIEW SUBJECT	YEARS SENIORITY	DEGREE	YEARS KNOWING JOHN BRUCE, JR.
Mr. Abel	31	MASTERS	31
Mr. Baker	32	BACHELORS	32
Mr. Charles	32	BACHELORS	31
Mr. David	35	BACHELORS	32
Mr. Edward	28	BACHELORS	28
Mr. Bruce	69	BACHELORS	94

Table 2

Characteristic Counts and Clusters

CHARACTERISTIC	NUMBER OF REFERENCES	COMBINED INTO
Devoted to Soldier	13	Loyalty
Adaptable	11	Leadership
Intelligent	10	Learning
Family oriented	9	Loyalty
Devoted to duty	9	Loyalty
Tech savvy	9	Learning
Good leader	7	Leadership
Good communicator	7	Leadership
People oriented	6	Leadership
Highly motivated	6	Learning
Strong work ethic	5	Loyalty
Good health	5	All
Loyal	5	Loyalty
Demanding	5	Loyalty
Persistent	4	Learning
Good steward	4	Loyalty
Supported education	4	Loyalty
Followed rules	4	Leadership
Contributor	4	Leadership
Supportive	3	Loyalty
Good mentor	3	Leadership
Formal	3	All
Good memory	3	Learning
Demanded loyalty	3	Loyalty
Sense of humor	3	All
Stubborn	3	Loyalty
Being at right place/time	3	All
Not a good mentor	2	Leadership
Delegating	2	Leadership
Strategist	2	Leadership
Good negotiator	1	Leadership
Brave	1	Leadership
Good speaker	1	Leadership
Encouraged romance	1	Leadership
Reliable	1	Loyalty
Discomfort with change	1	Leadership
Frustrating	1	All

APPENDIX B

IRB APPLICATION

Andrews ◊ University

Office of Research and Creative Scholarship
Institutional Review Board
(269) 471-6361 Fax: (269) 471-6246 E-mail: irb@andrews.edu
Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI 49104-0355

APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH

Please complete this application as thoroughly as possible. Your application will be reviewed by a committee of Andrews University Scholars, and if approved will be for one year. Beyond the one year you will be required to submit a continuation request. It is the IRB's responsibility to assign the level of review: Exempt, Expedited or Full. It is your responsibility to accurately complete the form and supply the required documents. Should your application fall into the exempt status, you should expect a response from the IRB office within 2 weeks; a full review will require 4-6 weeks.

Please complete the following application:

1. Research Project
a) Proposed Title: A US Army Executive's 69-Year Leadership Journey Through Change in the US Army: John Bruce
Will the research be conducted on the AU campus? ☐ Yes ☑ No If no, please indicate the location(s) of the study and attach an institutional consent letter that references the researcher's study. The study will be conducted at TACOM-LCMC in Warren, Michigan and telephonically. Other private locations will be used as is required.

b) What is the source of funding (please check all that apply)	
☑ Unfunded	
☐ Internal Funding	Source:
☐ External Funding	Sponsor/Source:
Grant title:	Award # / Charging String:
If you do not know the funding/grant information, please obtain it from your department	

2. Principal Investigator (PI)		
First Name: Joseph **Last Name:** Rakocy **Telephone: 586-282-7013 E-mail:** joseph.rakocy@us.army.mil		
☐ I am a student. x If so, please provide information about your faculty advisor below.		
First Name: Shirley **Last Name:** Freed **Telephone: 269-471-6163 E-mail:** freed@andrews.edu		
Department: Leadership **Program: PhD**		

3. Co-investigators (Please list their names and contacts)			
First Name:	**Last Name:**	**Telephone:**	**E-mail:**
None			

4. Cooperating Institutions			
Is this research being done in cooperation with any institutions, individuals or organizations not affiliated with AU?			
☐ Yes x ▬ No If yes, please provide the names and contact information of authorized officials below. The US Army, TACOM LCMC, Contracting Center has given its permission for the study to conduct interviews with its employees.			
Name of Organization: US Army TACOM LCMC Contracting Center **Address: 6051 E. 11 Mile Rd., Warren, MI 48397-5000**			
First Name:	**Last Name:**	**Telephone:**	**E-mail:**
Harry	Hallock	586-282-7025	harry.hallock@us.army.mil
First Name:	**Last Name:**	**Telephone:**	**E-mail**
Elaine	Hartung	586-282-9974	elaine.hartung@us.army.mil
Have you received IRB approval from another institution for this study? ☐ Yes ▬ No If yes, please attach a copy of the IRB approval.			

5. Participant Recruitment
Describe how participant recruitment will be performed. Include how and by whom potential participants are introduced to the study *(check all boxes below that apply)*
☐ AU directory   ☐ Postings, Flyers   ☐ Radio, TV
☐ E-mail solicitation. Indicate how the email addresses are obtained:
☐ Web-based solicitation. Specify sites:
☐ Participant Pool. Specify what pool:
☐ x   Other, please specify: I will contact / have contacted each member (of the 6 to 10 total participants) in person or by telephone to assess them of the nature of the study and to ask their approval to include them in the study and interviews. My approach will be to phrase my request for an interview in approximately these words: "You have been suggested as a person who may be able to provide valuable information the life and work of John Bruce. I am gathering data concerning his contribution to the US Army. I have been given permission by the chief of the Contracting Center at TACOM LCMC and the interviews will take place approximately between May and December of 2011. If you agree to be interviewed, I will send you the interview questions before we meet."
Please attach any recruiting materials you plan to use and the text of e-mail or web-based solicitations you will use.

6. Participant Compensation and Costs		
Are participants to be compensated for the study? Yes ☐ No ▬ If yes, what is the amount, type and source of funds?		
Amount:	Source:	Type:
Will participants who are students be offered class credit? ☐ Yes ▬ No ☐ NA		
Are other inducements planned to recruit participants? ☐ Yes ▬ No If yes, please describe.		

7. Confidentiality and Data Security

Will personal identifiers be collected? ☐ Yes ■ No

Will recordings be made (audio, video)? ■ Yes x☐ No If yes, please describe. Audio recordings

Who will have access to data (survey, questionnaires, recordings, interview records, etc.)? Please list. Researcher and transcriptionist (if one is used). In the event that a transcriptionist is used, that person will be under strict instruction to treat the study with utmost confidentiality and not to release or share any information from the study with anyone other than the researcher.

8. Conflict of Interest

Do you (or any individual who is associated with or responsible for the design, the conduct of or the reporting of this research) have an economic or financial interest in, or act as an officer or director for, any outside entity whose interests could reasonably appear to be affected by this research project:

Yes ☐   No ■

If yes, please provide detailed information to permit the IRB to determine if such involvement should be disclosed to potential research subjects.

9. Results

To whom will you present results (check all that apply)

☐ Class   ☐ Conference   ☐ Published Article   ■ Other   If other, please specify:
Doctorate dissertation (published).

10. Description of Research Subjects

If human subjects are involved, please check all that apply:

☐ Minors (under 18 years)   ☐ Prison inmates   ☐ Mentally impaired   ☐ Physically disabled

☐ Institutionalized residents   ☐ Anyone unable to make informed decisions about participation

☐ Vulnerable or at-risk groups, e.g., poverty, pregnant women, substance abuse population

■ All participants will be over 18 years of age, employees or former employees of TACOM-LCMC possessed of their full mental faculties and able to give informed consent to the study and interviews.

11. Risks

Are there any potential damage or adverse consequences to researcher, participants, or environment? These include physical, psychological, social, or spiritual risks whether as part of the protocol or a remote possibility.

Please check all that apply (Type of risk):

☐ Physical harm   ☐ Psychological harm   ☐ Social harm   ☐ Spiritual harm   ■ None Known

12. Content Sensitivity

Does your research address culturally or morally sensitive issues? Yes ☐ No ■ If yes, please describe:

13. Please provide (type in or copy - paste or attach) the following documentation in the boxes below:

Protocol (maximum 1500 words):

1. The purpose of the study is to discover how 93-year-old civilian executive leader in the US Army, John Bruce, adapted to changes in the US Army during his sixty-plus years employed at TACOM LCMC. The study will also seek to find how he shared his knowledge with employees of the US Army and what continues to motivate him to remain an active employee of the US Army.

2. The study will benefit the human subjects and humanity by detailing organizational change and how organizations and individuals deal with change, as well as what motivates employees of organizations.

3. The subjects will be given a verbal explanation of the study, which details the purpose of the study, and a full set of interview questions prior to the interviews. They will have the liberty to decline to answer any question they prefer not to answer. They will be presented with the Andrews University informed consent form to initial and sign and can ask for any clarification of any of the issues contained within it.

4. This study will involve no more than minimal risk of physical, psychological or social injury to the subjects. Interviews will be conducted under comfortable surroundings and no pressure will be exerted upon the subjects to answer any question that they do not care to answer.

5. The privacy and confidentiality of the subjects will be maintained. All subjects will sign an Andrews University informed consent form. Interviews will be transcribed and recordings will be kept as a record of the interviews. Subjects not comfortable with their interviews will be able to request that their interview and transcript not be used in the study and be deleted. All recordings and transcripts will be kept secure, under lock and key, following the interviews. The final dissertation report will be vetted through the military clearance department for public documents. (Preliminary contact has been made with the TACOM LCMC Historical Department and initial review indicates that this material does not contain sensitive material and should be approved but they have the final authority to clear its publication).

Survey instrument or interview protocol:

Research Questions

Interview Questions for John Bruce:

1. Tell me how long you have you worked at TACOM or for the US Army?

2. In which career tracks have you have served?

3. Think back over the past several years. How do you think the Army has changed over the years? Give me some examples.

4. How have these changes impacted you? Give me some examples. (Probing questions: How did the changes affect your attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, knowledge?)

5. Do you have a story of when you felt the most confident in your work? When have you felt the least confident? (Probing: successes/regrets/failures.)

6. What do you think keeps you going—motivates you to continue to serve the US Army like you do?

7. How do you pass on to younger employees the things that you've learned?

8. Is there anything else you would like me to ask you or that you would like to add at this time?

9. If you remember something that you would like to talk about at a later date, feel free to call or contact me. I would be happy to hear more of your thoughts.

Interview Questions for John Bruce's Associates:

1. How long have you worked at TACOM or for the US Army?

2. In which career tracks have you served?

3. How long have you known John Bruce?

4. In what capacity have you served with him?

5. What are some of the changes you have seen in the US Army during your career?

6. What are some of the major changes you have seen John Bruce deal with at TACOM?

7. What would you tell your best friend or family member about him – or - what would you say if you got together for dinner with TACOM associates and the conversation turned to John Bruce? What would you say at his farewell dinner (if there ever is one)?

8. How would TACOM be different if we had a dozen John Bruces?

9. How has he influenced the careers of others here at TACOM?

10. What do you think motivates John Bruce? How can you explain his capacity to continue to serve to work at age 93?

11. Is there anything else you would like to say?

12. If you remember something that you would like to talk about at a later date, feel free to call or contact me. I would be happy to hear more of your thoughts.

Institutional approval letter (if off AU campus):

A formal, signed letter of approval will be signed by the head of the TACOM LCMC Contracting Center, Mr. Harry Hallock. It is in process and will be mailed to Andrews University on approximately 5/23/11 and hand-delivered to the IRB Office by Marji Bates of Andrews University's Leadership Office upon receipt.

Consent form (for interviews and focus groups):

Informed Consent Form

1. I am Joseph Rakocy, a PhD student in the leadership program at Andrews University. I am conducting a study that seeks to discover change in the US Army since World War II and the manifestation of those changes reflected in the person of the associated 93-year-old subject of the study, US Army civilian executive Mr. John Bruce. The study is done in partial fulfillment of my doctorial studies. Your participation in this study will help me gather the necessary data for this purpose. The research will be conducted primarily at TACOM-LCMC, 6051 E. 11 Mile Road, Warren, Michigan 48397-5000. If an interview is not able to be held at TACOM LCMC, an alternative site in a private setting or telephonic interview may be substituted.

2. ___ I have been informed that the purpose of the study is to discover change in the US Army since World War II and the manifestation of those changes reflected in the person of the associated 93-year-old subject of the study, Mr. John Bruce. Research into changes in the US Army and interviews with Mr. John Bruce and approximately five to nine people who have insight into his career will be the methods of approach for the study. Each subject will be interviewed for an interval expected to last for 30 to 90 minutes, as necessary.

3. ____ I have been informed that there will be no direct benefits to me for my participation in this study.

4. ____ I have been informed that this study involves no alternative procedures or anything beyond minimal risks or discomforts.

5. ____ I have been informed that the confidentiality of records identifying subjects will be maintained, and that only the researchers and transcriptionists will have access to the data except in unusual cases.

6. ____ I have been informed that an offer to answer any questions the subjects may have about the research, the subject's rights or related matter, and the name of the person (together with the address and telephone number to whom the subjects may direct question s or must report an injury), are given as: Dr. Shirley Freed at Andrews University, Bell Hall, Suite#173, Berrien Springs, MI 49104 or call (269)471-6163 or contact freed@andrews.edu. Also, I may contact Joseph Rakocy at TACOM LCMC, 6051 E. 11 Mile Road, AMSTA-LC-IO, MS 419, Warren, MI 48397-5000 or call (586)282-7013 or contact joseph.rakocy@us.army.mil.

7. ____ I have been informed that my participation in this study is voluntary, that refusal to participate involves no penalty or loss of benefit to which the subjects are otherwise entitled, and that I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss to which the subjects are otherwise entitled if they had completed their participation in the research.

8. _____ I have been informed that "in the unlikely event of injury resulting from this research, Andrews University or TACOM-LCMC is not able to offer financial compensation or to absorb the costs of medical treatment. However, assistance will be provided to research subjects in obtaining emergency treatment and professional services that are available to the community generally at nearby facilities should the need arise. My signature below acknowledges my consent to voluntarily participate in this research project. Such participation does not release the investigator (s), sponsor(s) or granting agency (agencies) from their professional and ethical responsibility to me."

9. By signing below, I hereby acknowledge and give my consent to participate in this study.

_____   _____

              Signature of Subject   Date

_____   _____

          Signature of Investigator   Date

Participants recruitment documents: None

Principal Investigator's Assurance Statement for Using Human Subjects in Research

▬ I certify that the information provided in this IRB application is complete and accurate.

▬ I understand that as Principal Investigator, I have ultimate responsibility for the conduct of IRB approved studies, the ethical performance of protocols, the protection of the rights and welfare of human participants, and strict adherence to the study's protocol and any stipulation imposed by Andrews University Institutional Review Board.

▬ I will submit modifications and / or changes to the IRB as necessary prior to implementation.

▬ I agree to comply with all Andrews University's policies and procedures, as well as with all applicable federal, state, and local laws, regarding the protection of human participants in research.

REFERENCE LIST

Ajzen, I. (1988). *Attitudes, personality, and behavior*. New York, NY: Open University Press.

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Andreski, S. (1968). *Military organization and society*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.

Angrosino, M. (1994). On the bus with Vonnie Lee. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *23*, 14-28.

Auber, P. (1965). East India Company. In *Encyclopedia Brittanica*, Vol. 7 (pp. 877-878). Chicago, IL: Encyclopedia Brittanica.

August, D. (1995). *Army life v. life in the Army: The relationship between quality of life program utilization and Army career intentions* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://rand.org/pubs/rgs_dissertations/ RGSD125.html

Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory. *Annals of Child Development*, *6*, 1-60.

Bardwick, J. (1996). *Peacetime management and wartime leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Beck, C. (1997). Developing a research program using qualitative and quantitative approaches. *Nursing Outlook*, *45*(6), 265.

Becker, H. (1998). *Tricks of the trade: How to think about your research while you are doing it*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bender, M. (2004). *Operation excellence: Succeeding in business and in life, the U.S. military way*. New York, NY: AMACOM.

Bennis, W., & Biederman, P. (1997). *Organizing genius*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.

Black, J. (Ed.). (2005). *World history*. Bath, UK: Parragon.

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (1982). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bowden, M. (1999). *Blackhawk down: A story of modern war*. New York, NY: Grove Press.

Bowden, M. (2006). *Guests of the Ayatollah: The first battle in America's war with militant Islam*. New York, NY: Atlantic Monthly Press.

Brown, J. (1999). *Organizational history*. Washington, DC: U.S. Army Center of Military History.

Brown, S. (2005). *Providing the means of war*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Bruner, J. (1973). *Beyond the information given: Studies in the psychology of knowing*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton.

Bush: No distinction between attackers and those who harbor them. (2001, September 11). Defense.gov news. Retrieved from http://www.defense.gov/News/ NewsArticle.aspx?ID=44910

Butler, J., Scott, F., & Edwards, J. (2003). Evaluating organizational change: The role of ontology and epistemology. *TAMARA: Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science*, *2*(2), 55-67.

Carney, J., Joiner, J., & Teagon, H. (1997). Categorizing, coding, and manipulating qualitative data using the WordPerfect(R) word processer. *Qualitative Report*, *3*(1), 1-5.

Chenail, R. (1994). Presenting qualitative data. *Qualitative Report*, *2*(3), 1-10. Retrieved from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR2-3/presenting.html

Christ, J. (2009). *The bone yard*. Chandler, AZ: Battlefield.

Claes, R., & Heymans, M. (2006). *HR professionals' views on work motivation and retention of older workers: A focus group study presenting qualitative data*. Ghent University, Belgium. Retrieved from http://www.tilburguniversity.nl/faculties/ fsw/departments/HRS/SGM/papers/Claes.pdf

Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. (1996). *Concepts in coding*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cole, A. (1994, April). *Doing life history research in theory and in practice*. New Orleans, LA: American Educational Research Association.

Collins, M. (2005). *Weapons, "weak" states, and the military contract system: The case of RAND and the Air Force, 1945-1950*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Cox, J. (1997). Manufacturing the past: Loss and absence in organizational change. *Organizational Studies*, *18*(4), 623-654.

Creswell, J. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dalrymple, A. (2012). *Plan for promoting the fur-trade, and securing it to this country, by uniting the operations of the East-India and Hudson's-bay companys* [*sic*]. Charleston, SC: Nabu Press.

Daniels, M. (2001). *Maslow's concept of self-actualization.* Retrieved from http://www.mdani.demon.co.uk/archive/MDMaslow.html

Davis, D., & Clifton, A. (1995). *Psychosocial theory: Erikson*. Retrieved from http://www.haverford.edu.psych/ddavis/p109g/erikson.stages.html

Davis, K. (2003). *Don't know much about history*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Denzin, N. (1989). *Interpretive biography*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.). (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dexter, L. (1959). Interviewing business leaders. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *2*(25), 24-29.

Durant, R. (2007). Toxic politics, organizational change, and the "greening" of the U.S. military. *Administration & Society*, *39*(3), 409-446.

Edel, L. (1984). *Writing lives: Principia biograhica*. New York, NY: Macmillan & Sons.

Edgar, J. (2005). *The origins and impact of the Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement ACT (DAWIA)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Eisner, E. (1998). *The enlightened eye*. New York, NY: Prentice-Hall.

Erikson, E. (1950). *Childhood and society*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

Ensher, E., & Murphy, S. (2005). *Power mentoring: How successful mentors and proteges get the most out of their relationships*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Epiphany. (1986). In *Webster's new world dictionary*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Espedal, B. (2009). Maneuvering space for leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *16*(2), 197-212.

Farago, L. (1969). *Patton: Ordeal and triumph*. Boston, MA: Mayflower.

Farmer, J. (2009). *The ground truth: The untold story of the America under attack on 9/11*. New York, NY: Riverhead Books.

Feinsod, R., Davenport, T. & Arthurs, R. (2005). *The business case for workers age 50+: Planning for tomorrow's talent needs in today's competitive environment.* Retrieved from www.assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/econ/work.pdf

Ferren, C., & Kaye, B. (1996). *New skills for new leadership roles*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Filkins, D. (2009). *The forever war*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Firestone, W. (1986). Meaning in method: The rhetoric of quantitative and qualitative research. *Research for Better Schools*, *1*, 1-22.

Flaig, S. (2006). *Clarence R. Huebner: An American military story of achievement* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of North Texas, Denton, TX. Retrieved from http:www.unt.edu.arc:/67531/metadc/5281/m2/1/high_res_d/thesis.pdf

Frederick Herzberg motivational theory. (2010). *Businessballs.com*. Retrieved from http://www.businessballs.com/herzberg.htm

Garamone. J. (2006, March 8). *U. S. military still the most trusted institution*. Retrieved from http://usmilitary.about.com/od/theorderlyroom/a/06harrispoll.htm

Goetz, J., & LeCompte, M. (1981). Ethnographic research and the problem of data reduction. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 12*, 51-70.

Goodall, H. (2001). *Leadership reconsidered as historical subject: Sketches from the Cold War to Post-9/11*. New York, NY: Random House.

Gross, F. (1987). *Introducing Erik Erikson: An invitation to his thinking*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Gundersen, J., & Smelser, M. (1994). *American history at a glance: From the exploration of the new world to the present*. New York, NY: Perennial Library.

Hackman, J., & Oldham, G. (1976). Motivation through design of work. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance*, *16*, 250-279.

Hammond, P. (1977). *Organizing for defense: The American military establishment in the twentieth century*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Hancock, D., & Algozzine, B. (2006). *Doing case study research: A practical guide for beginning researchers*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Herzberg, F. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (2009). *The motivation to work*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Hesselbein, F., Goldsmith, M., & Bechhard, R. (1996). *The leader of the future*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hewes, J. (1975). *From root to McNamara: Army organization and administration: 1900-1963*. Washington, DC: Center of Military History, U.S. Government Printing Office.

Holtzimmer, K. (1999). *A soldier's soldier: A military biography of General Walter Krueger*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University.

HTUF. (2010). *The hybrid truck user's tenth anniversary edition forum*. Retrieved from www.htuf.org

Huitt, W. (2007). Maslow's hierarchy of needs. *Educational Psychology Interactive*. Valdosta State University. Retrieved from http://www.edpsyinteractive.org/ topics/regsys.maslow.html

Human Relations Contributors. (2010). *Accel-team*. Retrieved from http:/www.accel-team.com/human_relations/hrels_05_herzberg.html

Hunsaker, P., & Alessandra, A. (1980). *The art of managing people*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Ives, D. (1980). *The tape-recorded interview: A manual for field workers in folklore and oral history*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press.

Jick, T. (1979). *Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation in action.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Johnson, B., & Ridley, C. (2004). *Elements of mentoring*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Johnson, P. (1997). *A history of the American people*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Journey of the Magi. (2013). *Blight.com*. Retrieved from http://www.blight.com/ ~sparkle/poems/magi.html

Judah, T. (2002). *Kosovo: War and revenge*. New Haven, CT: Yale Nota Bene Books.

Kail, R., & Cavanaugh, J. (2004). *Human development: A life-span view*. Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.

Kaplan, L. (1988). *NATO and the United States: The enduring alliance*. Boston, MA: Twayne.

Kaplan, R., Kofodimos, J., & Drath, W. (1987). Development at the top: A review and prospect. *Research in Organizational Change & Development*, *1*, 229-273.

Kendra, K., & Taplin, L. (2004). Change agent competencies for information technology project managers. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice & Research*, *56*(1), 20-34.

Khalifa, M., & Truaon, Q. (2009). The relationship between employee perceptions of equity and job satisfaction in the Egyptian private universities: Management challenges in an environment of increasing regional and global concern. *Eighteenth World Business Congress*, *18*, 405-413.

Korbani, A. (1991). *U.S. intervention in Lebanon, 1958 and 1982: Presidential decisionmaking* [*sic*]. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Kotter, J. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Kotter, J. (2005). *Our iceberg is melting*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (1995). *The leadership challenge: How to keep getting extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Krantz, J. (2006). Leadership, betrayal, and adaptation. *Human Relations*, *59*(2), 221-240.

Landau, D., Drori, I., & Porras, J. (2006). Vision change in a governmental R&D organization. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *42*(2), 1-27.

Lapadat, J., & Lindsey, A. (1999). Transcription in research and practice: From standardization of technique to interpretive positionings. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *5*, 64-86.

Lee, H., & Lee, J. (2008). Time to change, time for change. *Time & Society*, *17*, 363-384.

Leonardo da Vinci quotes. (2013). Goodreads. Retrieved from http://www.goodreads. com/author/quotes/13560.Leonardo_da_Vinci

Lewis, M. (2004). Army transformation and the junior officer exodus. *Armed Forces & Society*, *31*(1), 63-93.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Machiavelli, N., & Mansfield, H. (1998). *The Prince*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

March, J. (Ed.). (1986). *Ambiguity and command: Organizational perspectives on military decision making*. Boston, MA: Pitman Press.

Marcus, A. (2008). 'Would you like fries with that, sir?' The evolution of management theories and the rise and fall of total quality management within the American federal government. *Management & Organizational History*, *3*(3-4), 311-337.

Marens, R. (2008). Going to war with the army you have. *Business & Society*, *47*(3), 312-342.

Mashhadi, A. (1996). Complementary, not contradictory: The spurious conflict between qualitative and quantitative research methodologies. Proceedings from November 19-25, 1996. *Conference on Educational Research*, *1-10*. Singapore: CER.

Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York, NY: Harper Press.

Maslow, A., & Lowery, R. (Eds.) (1998). *Toward a psychology of being* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.

McCauley, C., & Hughes-James, M. (1994). *An evaluation of the outcomes of a leadership development program*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

McLeod, S. (2013). Erik Erikson. *Simply psychology*. Retrieved from http://www.simply psychology.org/Erik

McPherson, A. (2003). Misled by himself: What the Johnson tapes reveal about the Dominican Intervention of 1965. *Latin American Research Review*, *2*(38), 127-146.

Meier, K., & O'Toole, L. (2009). The proverbs of new public management. *American Review of Public Administration*, *39*(1), 4-22.

Meloy, J. (1994). *Writing the qualitative dissertation: Understanding by doing.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Morton, W. L. (1965). Hudson Bay Company. In *Encyclopedia Britannica,* Vol. 11, pp. 807-808. Chicago, IL: Encyclopedia Britannica.

Nalbandian, J. (1985). Human relations and organizational change: Responding to loss. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, *6*(1), 29-43.

Norman, E. (2007). *The Roman Catholic Church: An illustrated history*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

North Korea attacks South Korean submarine. (2010, March 26). *BBC News*, *1-2*. Retrieved from http://www.bbc.co.uk.news/10129703

Norwood, G. (1999). Maslow's hierarchy of needs. *The truth vectors (Part I)*. Retrieved from http://www.deepermind.com/20maslow.htm

Paparone, C., Anderson, R., & McDaniel, R. (2008). Where military professionalism meets complexity science. *Armed Forces & Society*, *34*(3), 433-449.

Paton, N. (2005, December 23). Engagement and motivation increase with age. *Management-Issues*. Retrieved from http://www.management-issues.com/2006/8/24/research/engagement-and-motivation-increase-with-age.asp

Pauchant, T., Mitrof, I., & Lagadec, P. (1991). Toward a systematic crisis management strategy: Learning from the best examples in the U.S., Canada, and France. *Organization & Environment*, *5*(3), 209-232.

Porter, L. (2010). *Defense support of civilian authorities (DSCA): What emergency managers need to know*. Washington, DC: George Washington University.

Powers, R. (2010). *United States Army Chain of Command (Organization)*. Retrieved from http://usmilitary.about.com/od/army/l/blchancommand.htm?p=1

Principles of management or VBM. (2011). Retrieved from http://scribd.com/doc/40294137/Principles-of-Management-or-VBM

Process theories of motivation. (2010). *Blacksacademy.net*. Retrieved from http://www.blacksacademy.net/content/3634.html

Prochaska, J., & DiClemente, C. (1983). Stages and processes of self-change of smoking: Toward an integrative model of change. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology*, *51*, 390-395.

Quick, T. (1982). *The persuasive manager*. Radnor: PA: Chilton Book.

Resteigne, D., & Soeters, J. (2009). Managing militarily. *Armed Forces & Society*, *35*(2), 307-332.

Richardson, L. (1990). *Writing strategies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Robin, R. (2001). *The making of the Cold War enemy: Culture and politics in the military-intellectual complex*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Robinson, W. (2006). *Research methods*. Retrieved from http://web.utk.edu/~wrobins/540.html

The Roman Army. (2010). Retrieved from http://www.roman-empire.net/army/army/html

Rosenblat, B. (2013, August 19). Seven tips to embrace change. *Detroit News*, 3C.

Ruppenthal, R. (2013). The last offensive February-May 1945. *U.S. Army in World War II*. Retrieved from http://www.ibiblio.org/hyperwar/USA/USA-E-Logistics2/ USA-E-Lo...4

Ryan, F. (1995). *Ronald Reagan: The great communicator*. New York, NY: Random House.

Ryan, R., & Deci, E. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, *55*(1), 68-78. Retrieved from http://www.psych.Rochester.edu/SDT/publication/ documents/2000RyanDeciSDT.pdf

Scharmer, C. (2009). *Theory U: Leading from the future as it emerges*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Scharmer, C. (2013). *Otto Scharmer publications*. Retrieved from http://www.otto scharmer.com/publications/summaries.php

Seidel, J. (1998). *Qualitative data analysis: The ethnograph manual*. Retrieved from http://www.qualisresearch.com/

Sheliga, V. (1990). *Army wives with young children: Motherhood, market work, and the significance of Army family policy*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Sherry, M. (2008). *The Army command post and reshaping1987-1997*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Shiman, P. (2000). *Defense acquisition in an uncertain world: The post-Cold War era, 1990-2000*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Simons, J., Irwin, D., & Drinnien, B. (1987). *The search for understanding*. New York, NY: West.

Skinner, B. (1953). *Science and human behavior*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Skinner, B. (1957). *Verbal behavior*. New York, NY: Knopf.

Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stotler, R. (2007). *Principles of organizational culture change in health care: The magnet model*. Phoenix, AZ: University of Phoenix.

Structure of the Roman army. (2013). *History Link 101*. Retrieved from http://historylink101.com/2/Rome/roman-army-structure.html

Stubbs, S. (1988). *A systems approach to small group interactions*. Toronto, ON: Random House of Canada.

Tanz, J. (2010). *A brief history of management*. Retrieved from http://cnn.com/
magazines/fsb/fsbarchive/2003/10/01/353427/index.html

Tzu, Sun, & Sawyer, R. (1994). *Art of war: History and warfare*. Boulder, CO: Westview
Press.

Underwood, L. (Ed.) (2001). *The greatest war stories ever told*. Guilford, DE: Lyons
Press.

United States Army organization. (2010). Retrieved from http://www.army.mil/info/
organization/

Wahba, A., & Bridgewell, L. (1976). Maslow reconsidered: A review of research on the
need hierarchy theory. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance*, *15*, 212-
240.

Wald, J. (Producer), & Huston, J. (Director). (1948, July 16). *Key Largo*. United States:
Warner Brothers.

Webster, O. (1997). *American history library (Vols. 1-3)*. Santa Monica, CA: Santa
Monica Press.

Why coding? (2010). *PPA research methods*. Retrieved from
http://www.Csulb.edu/msaitg/ppa696codes.htm#Steps_data_management

Womack, J., & Jones, D. (2003). *Lean theory*. New York, NY: Free Press.

World War II veterans are dying at rate of more than 1,000 a day, numbers dwindling.
(2008, May 24). *Fox News*. Retrieved from http://www.foxnews.com/story/
0,2933,357941,00.htm/

Wren, D., & Bedeian, A. (2009). *The evolution of management thought*. San Francisco,
CA: John Wiley.

Wren, T. (1995). *The leader's companion*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Wright, E. (Ed.). (1993). *An illustrated history of the modern world*. New York, NY:
Barnes & Noble.

Yin, R. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations*. New York, NY: Prentice-Hall.

VITA

Name:	Joseph Rakocy, B.A., B.S., M.S., Ph.D.
Telephone:	(586)282-4029
Education:	Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI Doctor of Philosophy, Leadership
	Embry-Riddle University, Daytona, FL Master of Science, Technical Management
	University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI Bachelor of Science, Biological Sciences
	University of Detroit, Detroit, MI Bachelor of Arts, English
Employment: 30 years	U.S. Army Tank-automotive and Armaments Command-Life Cycle Management Command, Warren, MI
Awards:	Production Capitalization Team award
	TACOM T: Stratford Army Engine Plant Closure team member
	Hammer Award (signed by Vice-president Al Gore) for Streamlining Acquisition: SNAP team member
Community Service: 13 years	Choir member: St. Cletus/Our Lady of Grace, Warren, MI
12 years	Catechism teacher: St. Cletus/Our Lady of Grace, Warren, MI