



*Battlefield  
To Boardroom:  
How To Become A Leader  
In A Sea Of Managers*

*Prepared By:  
The 2 Percent Factor Inc.  
Phone: (905) 682-6476  
Toll Free: 1 (866) 807-6558  
Email: [info@the2percentfactor.com](mailto:info@the2percentfactor.com)  
[www.the2percentfactor.com](http://www.the2percentfactor.com)*

# **Battlefield to Boardroom: How To Become A Respected Leader In A Sea Of Managers**

A 2% Factor Publication  
All Rights Reserved



## **Table of Contents**

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Leadership Tools Used &amp; Abused...Examples</i>	<i>4</i>
<b>A Timeless Look At HOW To Be A Great Leader</b>	<b>9</b>
<i>Searching For A Root Source Of Leadership Thinking</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Major Bach's Address (With Commentary)</i>	<i>11</i>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Cooperative Action Leadership Program</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Cooperative Action Program</b>	<b>36</b>

# **Battlefield to Boardroom: How To Become A Respected Leader In A Sea Of Managers**

By: Gavin Rouble, The 2% Factor

## **Introduction**

History shows us just how difficult it can be to clearly define what it means to be a great “leader.” Leadership, it seems, is not black and white, as many “experts” would have us believe, but rather varying shades of grey with a few polka dots thrown into the mix just to further muddy the waters. There is a whole industry out there today that wants you to believe that they know the answer, that they hold the key which unlocks the mystical secret called “leadership.”

You know who these people are, it is unlikely that this is the first piece of “leadership” literature that you have read. Google “what it takes to be a leader” and you will get 420 million results, many of which start “6 Keys to...”, or “8 Traits of ...”, or even “10 Ways To Guarantee...” While these types of articles are fantastic sources for simple tips and nuggets of insight, (hey, we write them too! Check our blog out at <http://the2percentfactor.com/blog>) most (not ours, of course) are written as if to say, “Do these 5 things and you will become a great leader!” The problem is that becoming a great leader doesn’t result from WHAT you do, but rather HOW you do it!

Consider this: If great leadership was the product of what a person does, you would be surrounded in every area of your life by amazing leaders. However, few of us would make such a claim! The simple but hard reality is that even if you do everything the books and articles tell you to do to be recognized as a great leader, you won’t necessarily become the trusted and respected leader you desire to be.

This isn’t to say there will be absolutely no benefit for you to reading these articles as a starting point for your development into becoming a great leader. It is

to say, though, that the “what” can only take you so far along the “leadership learning curve” before it no longer yields you a return on your efforts to improve and change. The reason that “what you do” is such a limited avenue for improvement when it comes to leadership is that the “what” are simply the tools to use. Like any tool, the value is not in the tool itself but how you use them! (If you don’t agree, simply watch any do-it-yourself home renovation reality TV show and you will see that the quality of tools are irrelevant in the wrong hands.)

To illustrate this, a random article was chosen from a Google search entitled, “3 Characteristics of Being A Great Leader.” In it, the author outlines 3 things that, if done, will propel any leader to greatness...or so the article claims. Again, however, the focus is on the “what,” (i.e. the tools), as the key to good leadership. By examining each action outlined in the article, it will quickly become apparent, though, why relying on the tool instead of how that tool is used in no way leads to success in leadership.

## **Leadership Tools Used & Abused...Examples**

### **Leadership Characteristic #1: Accountability.**

#### *Positive Use:*

For any leader to successfully lead, they must demonstrate that they always accept responsibility and *accountability* for their decisions and actions. *Accountability* is a tool that can be used by anyone in a leadership role to build the trust, respect, and loyalty of their followers. However, how the tool of *accountability* is used by a leader will ultimately determine if a leader is held in high esteem or is dismissed as a tragic disappointment.

Howard Schultz, CEO of Starbucks provides a great example of how accountability, if used in an appropriate way, can build (or in Starbucks’ case, rebuild) trust with employees and customers. In 2008, Starbucks’ business success had declined dramatically. Schultz, who had stepped down as CEO previously, returned and took full responsibility for the company’s issues. He admitted to the entire company that mistakes were made and that the leadership team owned those mistakes.

He then held himself and his leadership team accountable for the company's mistakes and followed through on his commitment to fixing those mistakes. This demonstrated to his employees a high level of trustworthiness and integrity that has helped Starbucks regain its position as an industry leader and cultural influence.

#### *Negative Use:*

When a person in a leadership role accepts accountability for something negative, they are in effect saying, "I am at fault...I am to blame." This can lead to *accountability* being misused by leaders if it leads them to harming others or themselves as a result. The following example involves a situation where the *accountability* taken became a destructive, rather than constructive, force for a leader.

In 2012, Tsutomu Omori, an executive at Olympus Corporation, a Japanese manufacturer of cameras and medical equipment, took accountability for a scandal involving the cover-up of over \$1.5 billion in losses. Omori, who was, upon investigation, never directly linked to the scandal, took his accountability as an executive in the company so seriously that he committed suicide due to the shame that he felt.

Both examples demonstrate business leaders that acknowledge and accept accountability for the circumstances their companies were facing. One used the positive power of *accountability* to rebuild and succeed...the other succumbed to the negative side of accountability and self-destructed. Both used the leadership tool, but how they used it was very different.

### **Leadership Characteristic #2: Decisiveness**

#### *Positive Use:*

Being seen and recognized as *decisive* is important for any leader. Leaders are constantly required to make decisions and take action, often in the face of little or no information. They are also expected to make the RIGHT decisions and take the RIGHT actions!

One of the most decisive leaders in American history was Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Consider the state of the United States when FDR became president in

1933. The US was in the height of the Great Depression with 1 in 4 employable Americans out of work and either hungry or starving. Rather than take the easy path as many in industry would have preferred, FDR made difficult, but decisive decisions to implement his “New Deal”, a variety of programs designed to produce economic relief (in the form of government jobs for the unemployed), economic recovery and growth, and economic reform, through the regulation of Wall Street, banks, and transportation, to remedy the effects of the Depression.

Also consider the events of FDR’s second term, namely World War II. While FDR kept his word by keeping the US out of the conflict as long as possible, once it became apparent that the United States was at risk (i.e. the attack on Pearl Harbour), he made the decisive decision to enter the war.

In both cases, FDR took action and made decisions that weren’t terribly popular at the time. However, he clung to his principles and stayed the course despite the criticism he faced. He garnered the respect and trust of an entire nation of people in doing so.

#### *Negative Use:*

*Decisiveness* is defined as the act of making decisions quickly and effectively that produce a definite result. It is in this definition that the propensity for using this leadership tool for evil can be seen. Look closely at the final few words of the definition, “...produce a definite result.” It doesn’t state what type of result, only that the result must be identifiable.

It is because of this definition that many, to this day, believe that former Soviet dictator, Josef Stalin, was a great and decisive leader. He exercised his decisiveness when, similar to FDR, he led his nation to victory over Nazi Germany in World War II. However it was also this decisiveness that he turned on his own citizens, facilitating the period in Russian history known as the Purge. During this time, Stalin decisively ordered the death or imprisonment in labour camps of tens of millions of people for little reason more than a “perceived threat” to the soviet way.

Known for holding little respect or value for individual human life, Stalin will forever be known for being a decisive leader whose policies resulted in the mass murder of millions and plunged the world into a Cold War.

### **Leadership Characteristic #3: Communication**

#### *Positive Use:*

It is generally accepted that great leaders need to communicate clearly and often with those they lead. Whether a corporate CEO communicating with employees or a state leader communicating with citizens regarding the economy, people need to hear from their leaders. Communication helps people feel involved and engaged, while reducing fear and uncertainty.

Perhaps this is why Winston Churchill will be remembered as a great leader and great communicator. Churchill was one of the first leaders to truly embrace the use of radio as a means of communicating with the population...and communicate he did. Entire books have been written on Churchill's famous speeches to the British people throughout the World War II era.

It was Churchill's rhetoric that hardened the British people's resolve against Nazi Germany and prepared them for the emotional challenge that would come fighting a long and difficult war. Using such memorable speeches as his, "I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears, and sweat" speech and his "...We shall never surrender" speech, Churchill used his communication skills to inspire and reassure a war-weary people. Through his words, a nation of many people became a nation of a single resolve...to survive and defeat Nazi Germany.

#### *Negative Use:*

Just prior to Winston Churchill becoming a household name in Great Britain, the man that would become his arch nemesis was already making use of the leadership tool, *communication*. Just as communication can inspire a nation's people to do great things, it can also be used to invoke a national pride so great that people are willing to commit some of the most heinous, horrendous acts in human history.



So was the case of Adolf Hitler who, through the misuse of communication, gained the adoration, loyalty, and support of the German people that would plunge the world into second global conflict in less than quarter of a century.

Hitler was a master at using the tool of communication to warp, mislead, and redirect away from the truth towards a carefully created fiction known as “propaganda.” Propaganda is the coordinated attempt to influence public opinion through the use of communication and media and its use by Hitler and the Nazis remains a key reason why the term “propaganda” continues to have negative connotations even today.

Hitler used propaganda to create and then reinforce the German peoples belief that they were superior to others. He communicated that others of non-German ancestry were weak, stupid, and generally inferior. Worst of all, however, was Hitler’s abhorrent misuse of communication to create the belief that people of the Jewish faith, gypsies, homosexuals, and Bolsheviks were sub-human enemies that were to be destroyed at all costs.

Few people in history have mastered (and perverted) the art of communication to the extent that Hitler and his regime had. Few leaders in history illustrate, to the degree that Hitler does, that leadership is based on how the tools of leadership are used. Hitler used communication extremely effectively but did so in a way that will forever be considered a pinnacle of evil and a scar on the history of our civilization.

From these examples, the lesson to take away is that simply developing the ability to effectively use a leadership tool is not enough. Leadership tools, like any tool, can be used, misused, and even abused. Managers that believe they are great leaders simply because they have incorporated the use of such leadership tools into their daily routine must more closely examine how they are intending to use each tool. From this, managers must also carefully and objectively examine if they are indeed using each tool as they intend, and if the use of each tool is achieving its intended effect on others from the perspective of others.

Now, if you have determined that you are not using leadership tools as effectively as you would like or you simply don’t know if you are, you are now ready to be introduced to a different perspective on leadership...

# A Timeless Look At HOW To Be A Great Leader

## Searching For A Root Source Of Leadership Thinking

When it was decided that this book was going to be written, the exhaustive task was undertaken to search for, and ultimately find, a true “source” for original contemporary thinking in the field of leadership. What we were looking for was something that was a first...a starting point, and from which subsequent leadership theory and literature blossomed. This source, if it existed, had to reflect unique or original thinking, not merely a synthesis of existing contemporary leadership thinking.

Needless to say, this proved harder than expected. Our researchers combed through leadership books, articles, whitepapers, essays, and even speeches. The internet was searched, university libraries visited, and one team member even broke out old microfiche (and a machine that still worked to read it!). Each time we thought we found a possible contender, we were able to trace its origins back to yet an earlier book, article, etc.

Not wanting to go too far back (the idea was to focus on contemporary leadership ideas, after all), we finally came upon a somewhat obscure address on leadership from 1917 by Major C. A. Bach of the United States army. This wonderful piece of writing represented the Major’s analysis of ***how to be a leader***. His words were the farewell instructions given to the newly commissioned officers at the Second Training Camp at Fort Sheridan, Illinois.

It is this speech that we finally selected to build for you a clear explanation of how you may become a great leader. The following pages contain Major Bach’s address, with our analysis and commentary interspersed where appropriate (in bold, italicized lettering) to provide you with a detailed path towards being seen as a truly great leader.

### *Author’s Note:*

Please see Major Bach’s address for what it is, an address by a male soldier to other male soldiers in 1917. As such, the terminology used represents the

lexicon of the day. To accomplish the purpose of the book you are reading, we chose not to update, adjust, or modify the address in any way - even where the words may no longer be politically correct. Every word of the address you will read remains authentically Major Bach's.

## **Major Bach's Address (With Commentary)**

In a short time each of you men will control the livelihoods of a certain number of other men. You will have in your charge loyal but untrained citizens, who look to you for instruction and guidance. Your word will be their law. Your most casual remark will be remembered. Your mannerism will be aped. Your clothing, your carriage, your vocabulary, your manner of command will be imitated.

*This opening is very powerful and telling of Major Bach's overall view of leadership. He immediately stresses the weight of responsibility encapsulated in being a leader by pointing out that leaders "control the livelihoods" of others...This is a fact forgotten or ignored by many so-called "leaders" that treat those in their charge as commodities rather than human beings with goals to achieve, families to support, and mortgages to pay. Notice also how the need for "instruction and guidance" is mentioned for the "untrained citizens." In this simple statement, Major Bach poignantly states what he believes is the primary role of true leaders - to develop, direct, and guide those they lead. It was no coincidence that the Major did not use the term "order" rather than "instruct" despite being a part of an institution where orders are a part of every day life. Major Bach finishes his opening statement by drawing attention to how leaders are scrutinized, looked up to, and even imitated by those they lead. This is just as relevant in the board rooms of today as leaders set the tone (or "culture") and workers eventually follow suit (i.e. they mimic the mannerisms, attitudes, and perceptions of their leader).*

When you join your organization you will find there a willing body of men who ask from you nothing more than the qualities that will command their respect, their loyalty, and their obedience.

They are perfectly ready and eager to follow you so long as you can convince them that you have those qualities. When the time comes that they are satisfied you do not possess them you might as well kiss yourself goodbye. Your usefulness in that organization is at an end.

*One of the fundamental principles or "tenets" of The 2% Factor's Cooperative Action Model is that we should always - without qualification - treat others with mutual trust and respect. The importance of this is reinforced by Major Bach*

*(although he uses the term “loyalty” rather than “trust”) and is a lesson that anyone who desires to develop as a leader should take to heart. Whether one is a new manager, an experienced manager in a new workplace or department, or simply have new staff, the not-so-secret “secret” to starting any relationship off on the right foot, regardless of preconceived expectations by the manager or the employees, is to immediately treat workers with trust and respect.*

*If trust and respect does not currently describe the work environment you are in, then know that - as a manager or leader - the responsibility for taking the first step (by showing workers trust and respect) is yours! To think, “They have to make the first move” is to strip yourself of the role of leader and lose any chance you might have of your workers working both for you and with you in a cooperative way. As Major Bach puts it, “When they [your workers] are satisfied you do not possess [the qualities to garner respect and trust back from your workers] you might as well kiss yourself [and any chance of being seen as a leader] goodbye.”*

From the standpoint of society, the world may be divided into leaders and followers. The professions have their leaders, the financial world has its leaders. We have religious leaders, and political leaders, and society leaders. In all this leadership it is difficult, if not impossible to separate from the element of pure leadership that selfish element of personal gain or advantage to the individual, without which such leadership would lose its value.

*This is perhaps one of the most important single paragraphs of the entire address. Every individual that feels the desire to lead should ask themselves, “Why do I want to lead other people?” Pure leadership is derived from such reasons as “duty”, “responsibility”, or “commitment.” All too often, however, this is where very capable, qualified individuals fall down. Even when they start out with the best of intents, the pull of ego (or as we call it, mego, because it makes us believe everything is about “me”) becomes too great to resist and the motivations behind their leadership become selfish.*

*When this happens, the motivation to lead has more to do with “power”, “control”, “authority”, “greed”, or even a misguided sense of “superiority.” This is what ultimately creates the greatest divide and leads to much of the conflict between management and labour. When labour perceives management*

*is acting selfishly, (and perception is reality, for all intents and purposes), a chasm is created that can take years to repair. When a manager goes on a power trip, makes decisions that will reflect poorly on others to build up their own image, blames their employees for mistakes by throwing them “under the bus”, or makes decisions that are seen to benefit them financially at the expense of workers, the manager has sowed the seeds of an “us versus them” mentality that will quickly grow and spread throughout the work environment until it takes over as the dominant workplace culture. These are the conditions where labour quickly votes to become unionized and tend to be the workplaces that experience the most internal strife.*

It is in the military service only, where men freely sacrifice their lives for a faith, where men are willing to suffer and die for the right or the prevention of a great wrong, that we can hope to realize leadership in its most exalted and disinterested sense. Therefore, when I say leadership, I mean military leadership.

In a few days the great mass of you men will receive commissions as officers. These commissions will not make you leaders; they will merely make you officers. They will place you in a position where you can become leaders if you possess the proper attributes. But you must make good—not so much with the men over you as with the men under you.

*A common mistake many managers make, especially new managers that have not yet developed the human skills that will make them leaders, is not acknowledging the divide between being a “manager” and a “leader”. Manager is a position on an organizational chart. Managers are hired or appointed. Leader, however, is a role that someone willingly accepts, regardless of their position in the company. Unlike managers, leaders only become “leaders” when others recognize leadership traits in them and consciously choose to follow them.*

*To Major Bach’s last point in the paragraph, people will only follow someone (and bestow upon them the role of leader) if the leader is seen acting in the best interest of their followers. This again is reason why many managers fail to become true leaders. When a manager is seen to put more time and energy into satisfying the needs of their bosses than serving the needs of their subordinates, they will never be acknowledged as a leader and will be forced to resort to using the authority of their position to coerce workers into doing as they instruct.*

Men must and will follow into battle officers who are not leaders, but the driving power behind these men is not enthusiasm but discipline. They go with doubt and trembling, and with an awful fear tugging at their heartstrings that prompts the unspoken question, “What will he do next?”

Such men obey the letter of their orders but no more. Of devotion to their commander, of exalted enthusiasm which scorns personal risk, of their self-sacrifice to ensure his personal safety, they know nothing. Their legs carry them forward because their brain and their training tell them they must go. Their spirit does not go with them.

Great results are not achieved by cold, passive, unresponsive soldiers. They don’t go very far and they stop as soon as they can. Leadership not only demands but receives the willing, unhesitating, unfaltering obedience and loyalty of other men; and a devotion that will cause them, when the time comes, to follow their uncrowned king to hell and back again if necessary.

*The preceding 3 paragraphs speak to the limiting effect on performance that can result when a manager, who is not recognized as a leader, attempts to lead. Yes, managers are endowed with the authority to force employees to work on tasks they have been instructed to carryout (although this is not without limitation in itself). Most often, workers will do these tasks regardless of how they view the efficacy of their manager’s leadership.*

*However, when a worker is ordered by a manager rather than instructed by a leader, they will perform at a level which is below that which they are capable of performing at. Under these conditions, even the most conscientious employee will do exactly as they are ordered, no less but certainly no more. They will also perform their work in the safest fashion, not willing to take a risk or a chance at achieving great success for themselves and their manager because they know that the flip side, failure, will bring harm to only them and not their manager. As Major Bach explains, when a manager is forced to rely on the authority of their position rather than the respect and loyalty of their people, their people “won’t go very far and they stop as soon as they can.”*

You will ask yourselves: “Of just what, then, does leadership consist? What must I do to become a leader? What are the attributes of leadership, and how can I cultivate them?”

Leadership is a composite of a number of qualities. Among the most important I would list self-confidence, moral ascendancy, self-sacrifice, paternalism, fairness, initiative, decision, dignity, courage.

Let me discuss these with you in detail.

Self-confidence results, first, from exact knowledge; second, the ability to impart that knowledge; and, third, the feeling of superiority over others that naturally follows. All these give the officer poise.

***It should be pointed out that “superiority” refers to the leader’s feeling of capability or effectiveness that results from having extensive knowledge, and experience in using that knowledge. It does not refer to the negative connotation of “superiority” whereby the leader is intrinsically “better” than those they lead.***

To lead, you must know—you may bluff all your men some of the time, but you can’t do it all the time. Men will not have confidence in an officer unless he knows his business, and he must know it from the ground up.

The officer should know more about paper work than his first sergeant and company clerk put together; he should know more about messing than his mess sergeant; more about diseases of the horse than his troop farrier. He should be at least as good a shot as any man in his company.

If the officer does not know, and demonstrates the fact that he does not know, it is entirely human for the soldier to say to himself, “To hell with him. He doesn’t know as much about this as I do,” and calmly disregard the instructions received.

***Conceptually, in today’s knowledge-based economy, this remains true but with a slight adjustment to its interpretation. To effectively lead, a manager must no longer have superior technical knowledge than all of their employees. Instead, a leader must have superior operational (including procedural) knowledge (i.e. they above everyone else must know what must be done and when) and strategic***



***knowledge (i.e. they must have more and better insight into how their operational efforts affect the bigger picture) than those they lead.***

There is no substitute for accurate knowledge. Become so well informed that men will hunt you up to ask questions that your brother officers will say to one another, “Ask Smith—he knows.”

And not only should each officer know thoroughly the duties of his own grade, but he should study those of the two grades next above him. A twofold benefit attaches to this. He prepares himself for duties which may fall to his lot at any time during battle; he further gains a broader viewpoint which enables him to appreciate the necessity for the issuance of orders and join more intelligently in their execution.

Not only must the officer know, but he must be able to put what he knows into grammatical, interesting, forceful English. He must learn to stand on his feet and speak without embarrassment.

***Many managers have lost the respect and confidence of both their colleagues and their subordinates when they have failed to speak in an intelligent, contextually relevant manner. This is not to say that the individual leader is unintelligent, but rather they appear limited in their ability to use their knowledge in a way that is applicable to the challenge at hand or in a way that is meaningful to anyone else involved.***

***Within the work environment, by studying and gaining the knowledge of other managers and senior managers, a leader can determine how best to speak to any issue affecting his or her department in a way that is meaningful and relevant to everyone involved. Doing so, a leader will find it easier to lead as they more easily obtain buy-in to their ideas and proposals.***

I am told that in British training camps student officers are required to deliver 10-minute talks on any subject they may choose. That is excellent practice. For to speak clearly one must think clearly, and clear, logical thinking expresses itself in definite, positive orders.

While self-confidence is the result of knowing more than your men, moral ascendancy over them is based upon your belief that you are the better man. To

gain and maintain this ascendancy you must have self-control, physical vitality and endurance and moral force.

You must have yourself so well in hand that, even though in battle you be scared stiff, you will never show fear. For if you by so much as a hurried movement or a trembling of the hand, or a change of expression, or a hasty order hastily revoked, indicate your mental condition it will be reflected in your men in a far greater degree.

In garrison or camp many instances will arise to try your temper and wreck the sweetness of your disposition. If at such times you “fly off the handle” you have no business to be in charge of men. For men in anger say and do things that they almost invariably regret afterward.

*Generally speaking, people don't like surprises. They prefer things to be predictable and stable. This applies to their leaders as well. A common trait embodied by great leaders of people is a steadiness in mood and demeanor when leading others. Great leaders are the ones that, even in the face of tremendous adversity, are able to remain calm, continue to think straight, and respond rather than react to the situation. As Major Bach already stated, one's success in leadership is dependent on the extent to which those being led have confidence in their leader. When a leader loses their cool, flies off the handle, or exhibits any other unpredictable behaviour, subordinates lose confidence in their leader's ability deal with the situation. This in turn has a ripple effect whereby subordinates will begin to give in to fear and uncertainty, both of which are toxic to productivity and performance.*

An officer should never apologize to his men; also an officer should never be guilty of an act for which his sense of justice tells him he should apologize.

*This is NOT to say that a leader will never apologize to those they lead for making an error. Rather, it is saying that true leaders must constantly hold themselves to a much higher standard than everyone they lead. By doing so, leaders must at all times be fully aware of their behaviour, both what they say and what they do, so as to never behave in a fashion that would require them to apologize. However, when a leader falters and does or says something for which*

***they should apologize they take ownership over their behaviour and apologize to those harmed in an unqualified, genuine way.***

Another element in gaining moral ascendancy lies in the possession of enough physical vitality and endurance to withstand the hardships to which you and your men are subjected, and a dauntless spirit that enables you not only to accept them cheerfully but to minimize their magnitude.

Make light of your troubles, belittle your trials, and you will help vitally to build up within your organization an esprit whose value in time of stress cannot be measured.

***While “physical vitality” may not be a requirement for today’s corporate leaders, the more comprehensive, over-arching terms of “health” and “wellness” are. In the workplace, managers that are seen to be lacking in physical, emotional, or mental health and well-being are far less likely to gain and retain, from their employees, sufficient confidence to effectively lead. One suggested reason for this is that a “leader” either is or is not. What this means is that a manager is unlikely to be perceived as a great leader if they are successful in, say, their business or professional life but a catastrophic failure in their personal life. Where this is the case, subordinates will follow their leader with reservation. They will only go so far as to not end up suffering the same pitfalls in their own personal lives that their leader has fallen into.***

***To be a true leader, one must reflect above average levels of the traits and characteristics deemed by those they lead to be “healthy” in all areas of life. In other words, a leader must be a reflection of their subordinates’ highly subjective “ideal.” It is for this reason that wise managers quickly learn what their subordinates’ ideal is by speaking with them, asking for their input, and then actually listening to them.***

Moral force is the third element in gaining moral ascendancy. To exert moral force you must live clean, you must have sufficient brain power to see the right and the will to do right.

Be an example to your men. An officer can be a power for good or a power for evil. Don’t preach to them—that will be worse than useless. Live the kind of life

you would have them lead, and you will be surprised to see the number that will imitate you.

A loud-mouthed, profane captain who is careless of his personal appearance will have a loud-mouthed, profane, dirty company. Remember what I tell you. Your company will be the reflection of yourself. If you have a rotten company it will be because you are a rotten captain.

*Gandhi is quoted as saying, “Be the change you wish to see in the world.” In other words, leaders must at all times be the living example for those they lead. Management philosophies of, “do as I say, not as I do” are just that - management philosophies, not leadership philosophies. Leaders are the first to adopt change or abide by a new policy. In a corporate setting, this means that senior management must be the first to tighten their financial belts, abide by the new dress code, or work longer hours if they are to expect employees to do the same without having to resort to coercion.*

*This is perhaps one of the greatest areas that managers fail to make the “leadership” grade. Too often during times of economic challenge, management imposes financial restrictions on employees (e.g. wage freezes, lay-offs, etc.) while still accepting their management bonus, enjoying lavish dinners with clients, or accepting a pay raise. The correct course of action for a leader would be to impose the financial restriction on themselves first. This is a significant source of differentiation between a manager and a leader. A leader gets out in front of their people and shouts, “follow me” while waving the proverbial flag. A manager stands behind their people and orders them forward “or else.” See the difference?*

Self-sacrifice is essential to leadership. You will give, give all the time. You will give yourself physically, for the longest hours, the hardest work and the greatest responsibility is the lot of the captain. He is the first man up in the morning and the last man in at night. He works while others sleep.

*Major Bach’s reference to “self-sacrifice” implies that the role of leader is one of service. Service, or “giving of oneself” brings the leader back down to ground level. Previously, it was stated by Major Bach that the leader must feel “superior” to those he or she leads. However, what keeps this feeling in check*

*and prevents it from becoming “ego” is the philosophical belief that a leader best leads by serving others.*

*A leader willingly works longer than those they lead. This does not mean that to be a leader, one must stay at the office until after all employees leave. Instead, a leader must expect that their role does not end just because they leave the office for the day. They may be called upon at any hour and they must answer that call. By doing so, they may sacrifice a small amount of time outside the office but they will gain significant returns in the form employee respect and loyalty.*

*A leader must also accept the greatest responsibility and not attempt, under any circumstances, to download that responsibility to an employee out of convenience, laziness, or a desire to avoid failure. Leaders must have strong shoulders because bearing heavy loads of responsibility is a part of the job.*

You will give yourself mentally, in sympathy and appreciation for the troubles of men in your charge. This one's mother has died, and that one has lost all his savings in a bank failure. They may desire help, but more than anything else they desire sympathy.

*Since Major Bach's time, the importance of empathy - even more than sympathy, has become critical for good leadership. Sympathy implies that a leader must “feel the pain” their subordinate is going through. However, this can result in a leader making bad decisions as they lose their objectivity. Empathy, or the ability to understand the pain a subordinate is going through will allow the leader to show compassion and care while avoiding poor courses of action that could do more harm than good.*

Don't make the mistake of turning such men down with the statement that you have troubles of your own, for every time that you do, you knock a stone out of the foundation of your house.

*Here, we can bring another “-apathy” into the analysis. At some time or another, every employee has gone (or will go to) their manager for help and be told, “I don't care” one way or another. When a manager strives to become a leader, they must learn to put all of their own “stuff” behind them. As soon as one dons the leadership hat, they exist for their people. When an employee*

*comes to a leader for help, a leader will listen, empathize, offer advice where appropriate, take action where possible, but never ever indicate to the employee in any way that the employee's problems or concerns are less important than their own.*

*This isn't to say that a leader never deals with their own problems. Quite the opposite. Leaders take decisive action to resolve any issue they may have and they do this quickly. However, they don't focus on and/or resolve their own issues at the expense of the problems of their staff. The key is to learn how to compartmentalize the issues and fires that may be burning to know which ones require more immediate attention, which ones can be put out immediately, and which ones can be left to burn until after the employee's concerns are dealt with.*

Your men are your foundation, and your house leadership will tumble about your ears unless it rests securely upon them. Finally, you will give of your own slender financial resources. You will frequently spend your money to conserve the health and well-being of your men or to assist them when in trouble. Generally you get your money back. Very infrequently you must charge it to profit and loss.

When I say that paternalism is essential to leadership, I use the term in its better sense. I do not now refer to that form of paternalism which robs men of initiative, self-reliance, and self-respect. I refer to the paternalism that manifests itself in a watchful care for the comfort and welfare of those in your charge.

Soldiers are much like children. You must see that they have shelter, food, and clothing, the best that your utmost efforts can provide. You must be far more solicitous of their comfort than of your own. You must see that they have food to eat before you think of your own; that they have each as good a bed as can be provided before you consider where you will sleep. You must look after their health. You must conserve their strength by not demanding needless exertion or useless labor.

*Major Bach, again, speaks to an area where manager after manager fall down and fail in their attempts to achieve the title "leader." When a manager places himself or herself first, ahead of their employees, he or she will most certainly lose the trust, respect, and commitment of their employees. A part of "self-*

*sacrifice”, leaders must act towards those under their care, their employees, as they would their own children.*

*Any typical parent that loves their child will ensure their needs are taken care of first. Parents will always go to great lengths to ensure their children have enough food to eat, even if it means not eating themselves. Parents will ensure their child sleeps someplace safe, warm, and dry even if it means sleeping in the rain. Parents sacrifice for their children and so too must a leader be willing to sacrifice for their employees. This can be accomplished in any number of ways in the workplace, from vacation time to recognition to dealing with problems. The employee must always come first.*

*Of course, this requires one critical fact to be true. A leader must genuinely care about the well-being of his or her employees. A leader must genuinely want them to succeed and thrive in the workplace. If this isn’t the case either the employee must change (in cases where it is an isolated incident) or the manager must change (where managers are indifferent to the well-being of any of their employees).*

And by doing all these things you are breathing life into what would be otherwise a mere machine. You are creating a soul in your organization that will make the mass respond to you as though it were one man. And that is esprit.

And when your organization has this esprit you will wake up some morning and discover that the tables have been turned; that instead of your constantly looking out for them they have, without even a hint from you, taken up the task of looking out for you. You will find that a detail is always there to see that your tent, if you have one, is promptly pitched; that the most and the cleanest bedding is brought to your tent; that from some mysterious source two eggs have been added to your supper when no one else has any; that an extra man is helping your men give your horse a super-grooming; that your wishes are anticipated; that every man is Johnny-on-the-spot. And then you have arrived.

*Major Bach calls this “esprit,” but in the workplace this would be synonymous with “culture.” When a leader “gives of themselves”, they create a workplace culture where everyone looks out for everyone else. This sense of care for each other goes beyond that of mere teamwork and instead takes on more of the*

*characteristics of family. Yes, at times family members may disagree and even fight with one another, but when it matters, they are there for one another and bind together when necessary as a single force to accomplish great things.*

Fairness is another element without which leadership can neither be built up nor maintained. There must be first that fairness which treats all men justly. I do not say alike, for you cannot treat all men alike—that would be assuming that all men are cut from the same piece; that there is no such thing as individuality or a personal equation.

*Many managers, in their attempt to show better leadership, unintentionally perpetuate the false notion that all employees must be treated equally. As Major Bach clearly states, however, leadership requires treating subordinates “justly”, not equally. Why is this? Very simply put, all employees are not equal. Employees that demonstrate an ability and a willingness to perform in the absence of direct supervision can be offered, quite justly, greater leeway to work on their own than employees that have demonstrated they are not able or willing to work hard and complete their tasks without supervision.*

*This touches on a concept at the heart of The 2% Factor’s methodology. To treat all employees equally is to unfairly harm the 98% of employees that want to work hard and do a great job. Most rules, regulations, and policies are aimed at preventing the 2% of employees that cannot be trusted from engaging in inappropriate and unacceptable behaviours. However, by treating everyone “equally”, a manager undermines the trust and respect that so many of their great, conscientious employees have worked hard to gain. Instead, leaders recognize the difference between the 2% and 98% and are able to treat all employees as they - individually - deserve to be treated while dealing with the 2% of employees as needed.*

You cannot treat all men alike; a punishment that would be dismissed by one man with a shrug of the shoulders is mental anguish for another. A company commander who for a given offense has a standard punishment that applies to all is either too indolent or too stupid to study the personality of his men. In his case, justice is certainly blind.



Study your men as carefully as a surgeon studies a difficult case. And when you are sure of your diagnosis apply the remedy. And remember that you apply the remedy to effect a cure, not merely to see the victim squirm. It may be necessary to cut deep, but when you are satisfied as to your diagnosis don't be divided from your purpose by any false sympathy for the patient.

*As mentioned above, one of the worst mistakes a manager can make is to create "blanket" reactions that paint all employees with the same brush. Employees are individuals and therefore should be treated as such, even when being "punished". This isn't to say that leaders shoot from the hip and apply punishments to employees on a whim. However, true leaders always ensure the punishment fits the crime. Many managers worry that they will be accused of not treating everyone fairly if they don't treat everyone equally. This is FEAR, or false evidence appearing real. No where is it written that leaders must treat people equally, only that they must treat people fairly and justly. What is fair and just in the case of one employee may not be the case for another.*

*This does not just apply to negative consequences, but also positive consequences (or rewards). What one employee may value as a reward may be unwanted by another. It is for this reason that leaders will ask their employees what they value rather than assume.*

Hand in hand with fairness in awarding punishment walks fairness in giving credit. Everybody hates a human hog.

When one of your men has accomplished an especially creditable piece of work see that he gets the proper reward. Turn heaven and earth upside down to get it for him. Don't try to take it away from him and hog it for yourself. You may do this and get away with it, but you have lost the respect and loyalty of your men. Sooner or later your brother officer will hear of it and shun you like a leper. In war there is glory enough for all. Give the man under you his due. The man who always takes and never gives is not a leader. He is a parasite.

*In business, reward is often the outcome of superior results. Unfortunately, the desire for reward can lead some managers to treat the achievements of their workers as their own. However, any rewards gained by taking credit for the accomplishments of one's team will be short-lived as doing so strips away the*

*worker's motivation to work hard and excel. Employees will quickly realize that their hard work and sacrifice yields little benefit to them personally and will lower their level of performance to the minimum employable level - that point where the employee satisfies the requirements of their role, no less and certainly no more.*

*Taking credit and/or accepting recognition and reward more deserved by others will most certainly also undermine any attempt a manager makes to develop into a leader. Managers will immediately lose the trust and respect of their subordinates and experience greater resistance and resentment towards themselves and their instruction.*

There is another kind of fairness—that which will prevent an officer from abusing the privileges of his rank. When you exact respect from soldiers be sure you treat them with equal respect. Build up their manhood and self-respect. Don't try to pull it down.

*One of the fundamental tenets of the Cooperative Action Model©, Tenet #5, speaks to the importance of always treating others, regardless of their station in life, their position in the company, or the letters after their name, with mutual trust and respect. True leaders realize that a leader without followers is as useful as a pen without ink. It is for this reason (amongst others) that they show the utmost respect to their people. Some may even argue that the single most important duty of a leader is to build the people who follow them up into something "better" or "more" than they previously were. This is accomplished in no easier way than through offering trust and respect.*

For an officer to be overbearing and insulting in the treatment of enlisted men is the act of a coward. He ties the man to a tree with the ropes of discipline and then strikes him in the face, knowing full well that the man cannot strike back. Consideration, courtesy, and respect from officers toward enlisted men are not incompatible with discipline. They are parts of our discipline.

*Another hard fact to accept for many that desire to be leaders is the truth that a leader only succeeds when their subordinates succeed. A leader does not exist independently or discreetly from the people they lead any more than our head exists independently or discreetly from our body. For this reason, leaders can*

*never achieve any success in their role without it being a success earned by and shared with their team. While the leader may issue the directive, it is the employee that must carry out the actions required to successfully execute that directive.*

*However (and possibly even more difficult for some to accept), the same is not true of failure. The old management adage that “stuff” flows downhill is foreign to a true leader. For a manager to demonstrate their subordinates that they are ready to embrace a leadership role, they must demonstrate they are willing to take 100% of the responsibility for the actions of their people. The mistake of the employee is the mistake of their leader. To own this failure requires a leader to accept responsibility and not retaliate against the employee. This isn’t to say that a leader will never terminate the employment of a worker that is not able to perform. It is to say, however, that a leader will take ownership over the mistakes of the worker early on and take steps to prevent those mistakes from being repeated whenever possible. Therefore, the old management adage above, can be re-written for leadership as, “stuff” flows uphill!*

Without initiative and decision no man can expect to lead. In maneuvers you will frequently see, when an emergency arises, certain men calmly give instant orders which later, on analysis, prove to be, if not exactly the right thing, very nearly the right thing to have done. You will see other men in emergency become badly rattled: their brains refuse to work, or they give a hasty order, revoke it; give another, revoke that; in short, show every indication of being in a blue funk.

Regarding the first man you may say: “That man is a genius. He hasn’t had time to reason this thing out. He acts intuitively.” Forget it. “Genius is merely the capacity for taking infinite pains.” The man who was ready is the man who has prepared himself. He has studied beforehand the possible situation that might arise, he has made tentative plans covering such situations. When he is confronted by the emergency he is ready to meet it.

*When an individual accepts the role of leader they must accept as a part of that role the fact that their behaviour will at all times be carefully watched by those they lead. This close observation is not so that a subordinate may later criticize the behaviour of the leader but rather because this observation is deemed the easiest way to determine how they, themselves, should behave.*

***When facing an unexpected challenge, a leader that is able to respond to the situation by remaining calm and calculating the best course of action to take will instill a sense of calm and confidence amongst those they lead. Managers that get rattled in a time of crisis, who quickly make questionable decisions, and reverse those decisions with little explanation or transparency will not only create a sense of crisis amongst their people but also cause their people to call into question that manager's competency in their role. Leaders consistently act proactively and not reactively to best accomplish this.***

He must have sufficient mental alertness to appreciate the problem that confronts him and the power of quick reasoning to determine what changes are necessary in his already formulated plan. He must have also the decision to order the execution and stick to his orders.

***Here, the idea of self-sacrifice rises again as individuals that choose to lead sacrifice their time and energy in order to prepare themselves to excel at the tasks ahead. By doing this, leaders will have more knowledge and greater competence to draw upon when facing unexpected or challenging situations (i.e. 2% incidents). Leaders, when properly prepared, will then be able to respond quickly and effectively to any changes in circumstances that could render their past decisions useless. By responding calmly with carefully calculated decisions, leaders can avoid the pitfalls of decision change that so often falls upon the heads of untrained managers.***

Any reasonable order in an emergency is better than no order. The situation is there. Meet it. It is better to do something and do the wrong thing than to hesitate, hunt around for the right thing to do and wind up by doing nothing at all. And, having decided on a line of action, stick to it. Don't vacillate. Men have no confidence in an officer who doesn't know his own mind.

***When managers over-think or over-analyze a problem or situation that must be addressed, it is often because the manager is afraid of being wrong. This fear could be the result of any number of reasons. They could be afraid they will lose their job if their decision is wrong. They could fear criticism from their peers if they take the wrong course of action. They could even fear the (often imaginary) ridicule they may experience from themselves if they error in their judgement. Regardless of what causes this fear, the end result is the same, a manager that is***

*afraid to make, and stick with, a decision. Excuses are made such as, “I didn’t have sufficient information to make an informed decision.” Herein lies one of a leader’s greatest challenges, to confidently make a decision with incomplete or insufficient information. However, even in the absence of information, the decision MUST be made. To be regarded by employees as a leader, a manager can never allow fear or excuses of any kind to cause inertia or paralysis in their decision making.*

Occasionally you will be called upon to meet a situation which no reasonable human being could anticipate. If you have prepared yourself to meet other emergencies which you could anticipate, the mental training you have thereby gained will enable you to act promptly and with calmness.

*A leader makes decisions based on the best information possible at that time. This decision may be completely wrong, as discovered when new information arises. However, the decision was not arrived at using that new information. A leader must be seen to make good decisions based on all available information at any given moment, make that decision, and then stick with it (save for a few minor course changes here or there).*

You must frequently act without orders from higher authority. Time will not permit you to wait for them. Here again enters the importance of studying the work of officers above you. If you have a comprehensive grasp of the entire situation and can form an idea of the general plan of your superiors, that and your previous emergency training will enable you to determine that the responsibility is yours and to issue the necessary orders without delay.

*The leadership trait that Major Bach is speaking of here is “self-reliance”. Too many managers fail to make critical and time sensitive decisions because they have not received the appropriate direction or authorization from their own boss. Managers who fear taking action without first gaining the approval of their senior manager are lacking in self-reliance. Where this occurs, a manager’s attempts to gain recognition as a leader are fully undermined because workers will see the manager as little more than an unnecessary obstacle between them and their perceived “real boss”, the senior manager. This invariably limits a manager’s ability to earn the respect of their team, which in turn, will lead to team performance and productivity issues.*

The element of personal dignity is important in military leadership. Be the friend of your men, but do not become their intimate. Your men should stand in awe of you—not fear. If your men presume to become familiar it is your fault, not theirs. Your actions have encouraged them to do so.

And above all things, don't cheapen yourself by courting their friendship or currying their favor. They will despise you for it. If you are worthy of their loyalty and respect and devotion they will surely give all these without asking. If you are not, nothing that you can do will win them.

*Major Bach shines the spotlight on another source of failure for aspiring leaders. Managers that attempt to be the close friend of their employees can never and will never be viewed as a leader by those employees. This isn't to say that leaders should not be friendly with their employees, but rather care must be taken to avoid being too friendly and familiar. Becoming too familiar will result in employees viewing their manager as a peer, at best. This can be especially difficult where the manager has risen through the ranks and previously was a peer of those they now manage.*

*This will backfire the moment the manager is put in the position of having to direct their team to do something the team doesn't want to do, discipline a worker, or terminate a worker's employment.*

*By becoming too familiar, subordinates can quickly forget that their manager is "the boss" and may be required to make difficult decisions that inconvenience the team but are in the best interest of the company as a whole. Familiarity may also lead to employees adopting the misguided belief that, due to their friendship with their manager, they are no longer required to abide by the same company policies and procedures as other employees.*

*Becoming too familiar may also cause managers to hesitate making important decisions that could negatively affect the friendship they have struck with their staff. A basic human need is acceptance and when a manager believes their decision could harm the level of acceptance they have with their friends/employees, important decision or actions may be avoided.*

*Leaders, on the other hand, rely on the mutual trust and respect they have established with their employees to be the basis of their friendly relationship. This ensures that employees do not expect to receive special treatment based on the friendship, nor will they feel personally betrayed when the leader makes decisions that affect them. By forging a relationship based on trust and respect, leaders are also able to socialize and enjoy the friendship of their staff, as employees will understand the nature - and therefore the limits - of that friendly relationship.*

And then I would mention courage. Moral courage you need as well as physical courage—that kind of moral courage which enables you to adhere without faltering to a determined course of action which your judgment has indicated as the one best suited to secure the desired results.

Every time you change your orders without obvious reason you weaken your authority and impair the confidence of your men. Have the moral courage to stand by your order and see it through.

Moral courage further demands that you assume the responsibility for your own acts. If your subordinates have loyally carried out your orders and the movement you directed is a failure, the failure is yours, not theirs. Yours would have been the honor had it been successful. Take the blame if it results in disaster. Don't try to shift it to a subordinate and make him the goat. That is a cowardly act.

Furthermore, you will need moral courage to determine the fate of those under you. You will frequently be called upon for recommendations for the promotion or demotion of officers and noncommissioned officers in your immediate command.

*Moral courage, as Major Bach puts it, represents a leader's unfaltering courage to always do what they feel is the right thing to do, even when it is unpopular with employees, not supported by senior managers, uncomfortable, or damaging to the leader's own career. True leaders exhibit morale courage at all times, not just when it is convenient or beneficial to their own career. This means that true leaders always hold themselves to the same or higher standards as those they lead. Leaders recognize they are not exempt from the rules that guide all other employees. In fact, they believe the exact opposite.*

***The news is filled with stories of senior managers and executives that put their own well-being ahead of their people's by breaking the vary policies they created to guide the behaviours of employees. These are not leaders. And it is likely they will never be seen as leaders by their company's employees regardless of any actions they take in the future to atone for their indiscretions.***

Keep clearly in mind your personal integrity and the duty you owe your country. Do not let yourself be deflected from a strict sense of justice by feeling of personal friendship. If your own brother is your second lieutenant, and you find him unfit to hold his commission, eliminate him. If you don't, your lack of moral courage may result in the loss of valuable lives.

***Here, Major Bach is in full alignment with what The 2% Factor teaches. Too often, management fails to show true leadership to their employees by failing to effectively deal with 2% managers (i.e. those managers that engage in behaviours that are a polar opposite to the behaviours of a leader) or 2% employees. True leaders never lose sight that their single greatest obligation is the well-being of the company, not the well-being of the management team or the well-being of their department or even the well-being of their own position.***

If, on the other hand, you are called upon for a recommendation concerning a man whom, for personal reasons you thoroughly dislike, do not fail to do him full justice. Remember that your aim is the general good, not the satisfaction of an individual grudge.

***Major Bach again speaks to the importance for leaders to hold themselves to a higher standard, one elevated above the pettiness of personal grudges.***

I am taking it for granted that you have physical courage. I need not tell you how necessary that is. Courage is more than bravery. Bravery is fearlessness—the absence of fear. The merest dolt may be brave, because he lacks the mentality to appreciate his danger; he doesn't know enough to be afraid.

Courage, however, is that firmness of spirit, that moral backbone, which, while fully appreciating the danger involved, nevertheless goes on with the understanding. Bravery is physical; courage is mental and moral. You may be cold all over; your hands may tremble; your legs may quake; your knees be ready to



give way—that is fear. If, nevertheless, you go forward; if in spite of this physical defection you continue to lead your men against the enemy, you have courage. The physical manifestations of fear will pass away. You may never experience them but once. They are the “buck fever” of the hunter who tries to shoot his first deer. You must not give way to them.

A number of years ago, while taking a course in demolitions, the class of which I was a member was handling dynamite. The instructor said regarding its manipulation: “I must caution you gentlemen to be careful in the use of these explosives. One man has but one accident.” And so I would caution you. If you give way to the fear that will doubtless beset you in your first action, if you show the white feather, if you let your men go forward while you hunt a shell crater, you will never again have the opportunity of leading those men.

***For a leader to do what they feel is the right thing despite their fear, only to have their decision questioned, criticized, or even reversed by a more senior manager is to lose the battle. For a leader to give in to fear and not do what right in the first place is to lose the war.***

Use judgment in calling on your men for display of physical courage or bravery. Don’t ask any man to go where you would not go yourself. If your common sense tells you that the place is too dangerous for you to venture into, then it is too dangerous for him. You know his life is as valuable to him as yours is to you.

Occasionally some of your men must be exposed to danger which you cannot share. A message must be taken across a fire-swept zone. You call for volunteers. If your men know you and know that you are “right” you will never lack volunteers, for they will know your heart is in your work, that you are giving your country the best you have, that you would willingly carry the message yourself if you could. Your example and enthusiasm will have inspired them.

***A hard lesson learned by many managers that wish to be leaders is that a leader never asks of their subordinates what they, themselves, are not willing to do. As Major Bach states, this doesn’t imply a leader actually does everything, but rather that a leader is willing to do whatever is necessary. For managers finding it difficult to gain the respect of their employees, those managers may find it beneficial to repeatedly “get their hands dirty” at every opportunity and***

***demonstrate to their staff they they are willing to do what it takes no matter how big or small the task.***

And, lastly, if you aspire to leadership, I would urge you to study men.

Get under their skins and find out what is inside. Some men are quite different from what they appear to be on the surface. Determine the workings of their minds.

Much of Gen Robert E. Lee's success as a leader may be ascribed to his ability as a psychologist. He knew most of his opponents from West Point days, knew the workings of their minds, and he believed that they would do certain things under certain circumstances. In nearly every case he was able to anticipate their movements and block the execution.

You do not know your opponent in this war in the same way. But you can know your own men. You can study each to determine wherein lies his strength and his weakness; which man can be relied upon to the last gasp and which cannot.

Know your men, know your business, know yourself.

***Know your people, know your business, know yourself. Major Bach's address ends by summarizing the 3 sources where leaders find strength. It also brings this analysis into the requirements of a leader full circle. Leadership isn't easy. Leadership isn't necessarily fun. Leadership is a duty, one that can yield great rewards and tremendous defeats...yet leaders will always stand up to the task with integrity, honesty, and a show of respect for others.***

## Conclusion

Coaching legend Vince Lombardi once said, "Contrary to the opinion of many people, leaders are not born. Leaders are made, and they are made by effort and hard work." Anyone can become a truly great leader, complete with the respect and trust of those they lead, simply by putting the right leadership tools to use in the right way. For some, this transition from manager will be an easy one as they may already have naturally developed the human skills a leader requires to succeed. For others, the learning curve may be steep but if they make the conscious effort to reflect honestly on where their human skills are today, they can formulate a clear plan for learning how to use the skills, traits, and behaviours they must adopt and exhibit to reach the status of "leader" they want to achieve tomorrow.

It isn't enough, however, for leadership hopefuls to have knowledge of "what" to do to become a leader. They must also have a full understanding of "how" to use that knowledge in any number of situations, some predictable and some not, to instill confidence in those that may - or may not - choose to follow them.

In the end, it will be a prospective leader's willingness to place the welfare of their people in front of their own welfare that will prove to those who may follow them the authenticity of their leadership. It will be a manager's demonstrated level of support, service, and sacrifice that will reveal over time if he or she is worthy of the confidence and commitment necessary to make the transition to "leader".

Leaders are not born, they are created. While the starting point and learning curve is different for everyone, each person has within them the ability to develop into a great leader. To succeed where so many have failed, and accomplish this goal, requires one to adopt a perspective that few are able to embrace. This perspective is one of service, for a leader's job is one of service. When a manager truly understands this, they are well positioned to garner the trust and respect of those that may call them leader.

# Cooperative Action Leadership Program

If you are ready to begin taking the next critical steps towards becoming a true leader, one that is respected and trusted by your team, ask yourself two important questions:

First, what would it be like if you went into work each day **KNOWING** that the day was going to be **positive and productive for both you and your team**? Second, how would it feel if you could leave work each day **KNOWING** that, as a leader, you had been **decisive, motivating, and appreciated**?

**The Cooperative Action Leadership Program©** is an **accelerated online leadership development program** that includes:

- 12 weeks of Executive access to The 2% Factor's exclusive Cooperative Action Program© website;
- Access to 24 concise, 8 to 12 minute session videos with summaries and exercises;
- An accelerated learning schedule requiring less than 60 minutes each week of your time;
- 6 topic-specific group coaching calls with other managers and led by 2% Factor president, Ted Mouradian!
- 1 private executive coaching session each month with 2% Factor president, Ted Mouradian to focus on your unique concerns, challenges, and needs;
- Certification as a Cooperative Action Leader upon successful completion of the Cooperative Action Comprehension Exam - (OPTIONAL).

By **investing only minutes each week**, the Cooperative Action Leadership Program© will show you how to:

- Dramatically reduce or eliminate work-related stress by improving the quality of all of your professional relationships;
- Be seen as a leader by increasing the level of trust and respect your workers have in and for you;
- Increase the amount of respect that other members of the management team, including your boss, have for you;
- Improve your ability to effectively, successfully deal with challenging people whether they be a boss, worker, or any other stakeholder;
- Improve your productivity by reducing the amount of time you waste when having to deal with worker conflict, employee complaints, or union grievances;
- Increase team performance and productivity by getting buy-in to new ideas and projects faster and easier;
- Improve your ability to communicate easily and effectively while reducing the harmful effects of unnecessary miscommunication;
- Overcome the fear and uncertainty that may prevent you from being the decisive, courageous, action-oriented leader you could be.

For more information, go to:

<http://the2percentfactor.com/cooperative-action-leadership-employee-engagement-training>

# Cooperative Action Program

The **Cooperative Action© Program** focuses on **providing employees and managers** with the **sustainable conflict management solutions** they need to deal with any person and any situation in a positive, effective way no matter what the other person does!

Based on the **The 2% Factor's successfully proven conflict resolution tools & strategies**, the Cooperative Action© Program will:

- Improve the quality of the relationships between management and employees
- Increase employee productivity and effectiveness
- Improve communication between management and employees and amongst employees themselves
- Reduce the non-productive employee costs such as sick time/stress leave, short term disability, and employee absenteeism
- Reduce the cash outflow resulting from employee severance payouts and WSIB claim
- Reduce employee turnover/recruitment expenses
- Improve customer service levels
- Create or enhance a feeling of community within the organization
- Improve overall employee morale and performance

Your **Cooperative Action© Program** includes:

- A corporate membership code to THE 2% FACTOR members-only website
- Full access to the THE 2% FACTOR program training modules for your entire location
- A weekly instructional and support email for program Champions offering valuable tips and exercises
- Support to find the best “champion” for implementing the project within the organization
- Complete, cost effective training for the selected Champion(s) to ensure they have the knowledge and understanding to successfully implement and facilitate the program
- THE 2% FACTOR Recommended Program Implementation Guide to maximize the effectiveness of delivering THE 2% FACTOR lessons and exercises to large groups
- A unique content-rich program that is customizable to all levels of the organization with no additional cost
- Complete and ongoing support for your organization’s Champion(s) by highly trained 2% Factor specialists at no additional cost
- A single monthly payment starting at \$500\* no matter how many employees participate or how often the program is run
- No restrictive engagement contracts
- Money back guarantee

For more information, go to:

<http://the2percentfactor.com/cooperative-action-corporate-wellness-program/>