

and its personnel will be assigned directly to spaces in Third Army headquarters.

During peacetime, 95 members of the Active Army and 41 members of the Army Reserve will staff the headquarters on a full-time basis. Additionally, 150 people currently assigned to FORSCOM headquarters will be predesignated as members of the Third Army for planning, during exercises, or in the event of mobilization. (The activation of the Third Army will not require an increase in

the Army's force structure.)

If the Third Army is mobilized, it will have an assigned strength of 662, organized under the Field Army Table of Organization and Equipment. The Deputy Commanding General of FORSCOM also serves as the Commanding General, Third Army, which gives him both a mobilization and a peacetime role.

Because of the various roles the units of the CENTCOM will have on any future battlefield, the Third Army can be expected to continue to

serve with distinction in the future as it has in the past.



CAPTAIN DANNY M. JOHNSON, U.S. Army Reserve, holds a master's degree from Northeastern University and has published several division histories in *Soldiers* and *Army* magazines. He presently serves as a manpower specialist with the Office of the Army's Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence.

Able and Willing

DANDRIDGE M. MALONE

A really good soldier is both able and willing. But that's not really news. You probably already know that developing soldiers means building skill and will. And you know that building skill, or training, is the primary task and the principal responsibility for any company-level leader this side of the battlefield. You know, too, that every time you build skill, you automatically build will.

In general, these things apply to developing all soldiers. But because each soldier is different, you may need some *how-to's* for developing the individual soldier, because what works well for building skill and will in one soldier may not work at all for the next. (It would if soldiers were machines, but they're not.)

Your goal, then, is a simple one — to produce a man who is both able and willing. Some soldiers are always able and willing. They have the skill and the will, no matter what task you give them to do. Others, of course, have the will (they try hard) but not

the skill (whatever they touch turns to mud). Still other soldiers have the skill to do a task you give them, but not the will — you have to stand over them and make them do the task.

If you want to develop soldiers as individuals, you have to start by sizing each one up in terms of how able he is and how willing he is. You have to check his headspace with an "able and willing gauge."

So if you want to develop soldiers as individuals, you have to start by sizing each one up in terms of how able he is and how willing he is. In short, make an estimate; check his headspace with an "able and willing gauge." This simple basic estimate

works, and it can save you time, help you do the right things right, and — in addition to all that — it's logical. It makes good sense for a leader to come down hard on a soldier who has the ability to do a task but won't do it. On the other hand, it makes no sense at all to come down hard on a man who is trying his best but has never really been taught the skills he needs to do a given task. Knowing how to judge a soldier in terms of "able and willing" is the first step in developing soldiers as individuals.

Listed below are some traits and characteristics of soldiers in each of the four different categories of "able and willing." As you study these, think about the immediate subordinates you have right now, about each one as an individual. Few individuals will fit clearly and completely in any one category. But if you'll think about a man, you'll see that one of these four categories seems to describe him better than the others.

An able and willing soldier

- Has done the task right before.
- Does many other tasks without being told.
- Never seems satisfied until a job is done "right."

• Accepts the need to put in extra time when necessary to get the job done.

• Works out ways to get the job done better.

• Has been satisfactory in his performance recently.

An unable but willing soldier

• Has never performed the task before, or can't recall it if he has.

• Has been enthusiastic, particularly in performing tasks similar to what you want him to do now.

• Pays close attention to your instructions.

• Watches others doing same task; asks questions.

• Spends some of his own time learning or practicing.

An able but unwilling soldier

• Has performed recently off and on — sometimes to standard, sometimes below standard.

• Has done the job right before, but keeps asking for instructions and assistance.

• Doesn't appear to be concentrating; work is sporadic, poorly planned.

• Lacks confidence in himself and his work.

An unable and unwilling soldier

• Has never performed the task to standard.

• Has performed below standard recently, even when he has received a lot of assistance and instructions.

• Works only when closely supervised.

• Seems satisfied with below standard results.

• Pays little attention to instructions; half-listens.

Go ahead and try it. In which category does Smith fit best? And Jones? And so on down the line. If you know your man, as the Sixth Principle of Leadership requires, you'll get the right man in the right category about 90 percent of the time.

The descriptions under each of

these four categories are only rough indicators, of course, because each soldier is different. A big part of your job is knowing the differences, then using that knowledge to be a better and smarter leader. The ability to judge a subordinate on how well he measures up on both sides of the "able and willing" scale is another of those basics that you have to learn, practice, think about, and turn into an instinct.

But once you have decided generally which category each soldier fits into, how do you work with each different type?

QUARTERBACK

A soldier who is fully "able and willing" should be your living standard in the task of developing soldiers. You should work with an able and willing soldier as if you were a coach with a good quarterback. He can operate with mission-type orders and probably call most of his own plays. He does the right things right. He should not be given close supervision. What this soldier does best is to get your job done and save you time. He earns your trust. This is the kind of man you want to start growing to bring into the leadership ranks. And, finally, if you want to do the tricky business of developing your soldiers right, delegate important jobs only to soldiers like him — to the men you feel are able and willing. The others will seldom get the job done.

The "willing but unable" soldier is the one who usually comes to you in the replacement stream, the new guy. You work with this man as if you were a teacher. There will be a lot that he doesn't know. His initial entry training will have given him only two-thirds of the skills that his MOS calls for. And he's probably never seen an operational unit. This soldier needs careful handling. He believes most of the rumors he hears, and can easily become discouraged and frustrated. He can be led off on the wrong track. He needs patient instruction and a lot of feedback. He will eat up much of

your time but, in his case, putting in the extra time is like putting money in the bank.

The "able and unwilling" soldier is your main challenge. You know you have a good horse, but when you take him to the water, he just won't drink. You work with this man as if you were a father. His unwillingness may be only a lack of confidence. If so, all he needs is a nudge — an opportunity and some encouragement. On the other hand, this able and unwilling soldier may have a real problem — maybe with a young wife, or with a big debt, or with himself. The best thing you can do is let him tell you about it. Listen to him carefully. About five percent of the time, the able but unwilling soldier may just be shirking. In either case — the man with the problem, or the shirker — insist that he complete the task, and make him do it to your standards. The man with the problem will feel he's done something worthwhile; the shirker will learn that, with you, the "shirk" won't work.

The "unable and unwilling" soldier shouldn't be in your unit in the first place. But somewhere along the line, the poor leader knowingly passed him on, or just let him slip through. You work with this man as if you were a warden. He doesn't know how to do his job, and he doesn't care about learning. He is a "quitter." But you don't punish him. If you punish a quitter, that means he's smarter than you are. Why? Well, if he doesn't want to do his job, and you punish him instead of making him do it, then he gets what he wants — he gets out of doing the job. You are actually rewarding him. He has outsmarted you. So, instead of punishing him when he quits on you, make him complete the task.

Making the unable and unwilling soldier complete a task to standards has another advantage. Maybe you'll lead him to something he's never learned much about — success at some skill. And maybe that success will build a little more willingness, and he'll try another skill. And there he goes, a finally turned-on soldier.

He is salvaged. That will happen about one time out of five, after you've invested more hours in these five problem soldiers than in all of your other men put together.

Putting a lot of time in with the unable and unwilling soldier is noble and human. But it is not "leadership effective" in terms of the effort you must invest and the return the Army gets on that investment. Your other soldiers will benefit far more from your time and effort. But don't pass this man on or let him slip through.

There is no place for him on the battlefield when that "thing" we call a unit does its work.

There it is — a simple and practical tool for identifying four different categories of soldiers, and a simple strategy for developing the individual soldiers in each category. The differences between them have nothing to do with race, creed, color, sex, or anything else. The differences have to do simply with skill and will, which is what you as a leader are responsible for developing in your soldiers. Skill

plus will equal performance. Performance is what gets the job done. And the purpose of leadership is, after all, to do the job.

DANDRIDGE M. MALONE, a retired Infantry colonel, has published numerous articles, books, and technical reports. He holds a master's degree in social psychology from Purdue University and has completed several military schools, including the Armed Forces Staff College. In addition to his Infantry leadership assignments, he has also served in either staff or faculty assignments at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, the U.S. Military Academy, and the U.S. Army War College.

Building Morale Through PT

CAPTAIN DAVID H. PETRAEUS

In recognition of the need for its soldiers to be physically ready for any future conflict, the Army is emphasizing physical training more than ever. As a result, more units are running and exercising as a group. Unfortunately, too many of them fail to make the most of the opportunity to build morale, esprit, and cohesion at the same time they are developing stamina and fitness.

The problem is that PT is often seen as a boring, tedious activity, usually performed at an early hour, often before sunrise, and occasionally when it is quite cold. In the grey chill before dawn, the members of many organizations stumble out of their barracks or their automobiles and shuffle through the daily routine without ever gaining a feeling of togetherness or enthusiasm. On the other hand, units with high levels of motivation and spirit normally shout and sing their way along, helping each other and developing a close-

knit feeling and considerable pride in their units. More than likely, such units will carry this same positive attitude throughout the day in performing their other duties.

Knowingly or not, units that effectively build morale through PT usually practice several basic principles. These are principles that other units can use to improve their own programs.

MANDATORY

First, attendance at PT sessions should be mandatory. If the program is to be effective, everyone must participate, especially the company commander, the first sergeant, the company clerk, the commander's driver, and the motor sergeant. Certainly, there should be an allowance for exceptions on a day by day, mission by mission basis, but these should be granted sparingly and only by the

commander or the first sergeant.

At the beginning of each regular PT session the instructor should announce the exercise and the number of repetitions to be performed as well as the distance and time for the run that is to follow. This lets everyone in the group know the program for that day and allows them to pace themselves through it.

The PT instructors must be thoroughly professional. They must know the exercises they will conduct and lead their units in these exercises crisply and with confidence. They should never act self-conscious or unsure of themselves, but neither should they show off their superior fitness at the expense of others. They need to be in complete control of the formation and should not tolerate marginal performance by any member of it.

Other leaders in the unit must support them completely in this by never allowing their soldiers' unsatisfactory performance to go uncorrected. In