University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
ScholarWorks@UARK

Theses and Dissertations

12-2011

Army Transformation: What does it mean?

David Jerome
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd

Part of the Military and Veterans Studies Commons, Other Political Science Commons, Public Administration Commons, and the Public Policy Commons

Recommended Citation
Jerome, David, "Army Transformation: What does it mean?" (2011). *Theses and Dissertations*. 176.
http://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/176

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact scholar@uark.edu, ccmiddle@uark.edu.

ARMY TRANSFORMATION:

WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

ARMY TRANSFORMATION:

WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

A dissertation in partial fulfillment
Of the requirement for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Public Policy

By

David Jerome
University of Central Missouri
Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, 1981
Florida Institute of Technology
Master of Business Administration, 1985

December 2011
University of Arkansas

ABSTRACT

The way in which senior U.S. Army leaders such as the chiefs of staff define transformative change is important, especially if the meaning of that term is to be interpreted as originally intended by Army field grade officers. An Army chief of staff is responsible for creating a vision and establishing goals for the future, and field grade officers are responsible for pursuing that vision and those goals by implementing objectives that endeavor to arrive at the desired ends. By using both qualitative and quantitative methods, this research analyzes what each of the three chiefs of staff, who have served from 1999 through 2011, have said about their vision and goals for transforming the U.S. Army. Additionally, this research analyzes what field grade officers have said about transformation and how they view the Army has transformed over the last decade. The findings in this research indicate that there is a significant gap in how the chiefs of staff have defined transformation and how field grade officers view that same term.

This mixed-methods research employed a case study analysis of what the chiefs of staff have said about transformation; a survey of field grade officers who attend the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College (CGSC) at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas and how they view transformation within the Army; and, individual open-ended interviews with CGSC field grade officer students, faculty and staff. The literature that largely informed this research centered on how difficult it is to implement significant change in a large bureaucratic organization; there will always be some level of goal failure. If transformation means different things to different groups within the U.S. Army then the vision and goals may not be achieved as originally intended; a problem that could potentially result in future increased national security risks.

This dissertation is approved for Recommendation
to the Graduate Council

Dissertation Director:

_____

Dr. William D. Schreckhise

Dissertation Committee:

_____

Dr. Christopher J. Lucas

_____

Dr. Bradley A. Thayer

DISSERTATION DUPLICATION RELEASE

I hereby authorize the University of Arkansas Libraries to duplicate this dissertation when needed for research and/or scholarship.

Agreed _____
David Jerome

Refused _____
David Jerome

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to my wife, Kathy, and to our two children, Julie and Mark, as well as all of our friends and family who have gone through this experience with me.

I would like to thank those in my family who have served in the military: My dad, Robert C. Jerome (U.S. Army – Korean War); my uncle, Bill Jerome (U.S. Navy – World War II); my great-uncle, Bob Nimmo (career U.S. Army beginning in World War II); my cousin, Estel "Skip" Jerome (career U.S. Army beginning in Vietnam); my brother-in-law, James Jackson (career U.S. Army serving in the two gulf wars); and my cousin, Jay Mitchell (career U.S. Coast Guard). Thanks also to those that I may have missed.

Thank you Dr. William D. Schreckhise for your patience in working with me over the last six-plus years. Not only have you been a great academic advisor and dissertation chair, you have been a great mentor and teacher and I will forever be thankful. Sir, you are the college professor that I hope to become. I truly appreciate your friendship.

I would like to thank Dr. Christopher J. Lucas and Dr. Bradley A. Thayer for serving on my committee. I especially want to thank you for your contributions not only to this project, put to the body of literature in your respective areas of expertise.

Thanks also go out to Dr. Will Miller, Dr. Margaret Reid, Dr. J. Brinck Kerr, Dr. Todd Shields, Dr. Val Hunt and others in the Political Science Program and the Public Policy Program who, together, made this possible. I am particularly grateful for the graduate assistantship that made this entire experience possible.

I would like to thank all of my colleagues at Missouri Southern State University. In particular, I appreciate both Dr. Conrad Gubera and Dr. William Delehanty for their wisdom which caused me to remain focused. Dr. Gubera serves as a great role model of what a classroom professor should be to students. I would also like to thank Dr. Norton Wheeler, Dr. Ann Wyman,

Dr. Jill Greer and Dr. Bob Markman for their friendship and encouragement throughout. Dr. David Locher, Social Sciences Department Head, thank you for allowing me to be a part of your team and for the friendship that you have extended to me.

Thanks to Dr. Ralph O. Doughty (MG USA, Retired), Ms Maria Clark and Mr. Ralph Reed as well as Mr. Terrell Bruner and Dr. David Bitters at the United States Army Command and General Staff College for assisting me in this research. I would also like to thank all of the anonymous survey and interview participants. Without your support, this would not have been possible.

Finally, I would like to thank Nick Myers, CPA, Matt Blunt, former governor of Missouri, and Dr. Roy Shaver, as well as a special thank you to Carolyn Sorrells, Brenda Lasiter and Linda Sprague, all of whom made it feasible for me to pursue such a path in the first place.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is first and foremost dedicated to my loving wife, Kathy. We have been married since we were 18 years old, and all I ever wanted to do was the best I could for you. You understand all of my strengths and weaknesses, and you understand that I am passionate about the things that I believe are important. Thank you for supporting me throughout this and all that we have been through together.

My wife understands how much I care about the U.S. Army and for those who have served and are serving now - this dissertation is also dedicated to you. It is my sincerest hope that this research might be used as at least a single data point that will serve to make our Army just a little bit better. Thank you for your service and thank you for your sacrifice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	A. Implications of U.S. Army Transformation	2
	B. U.S. Army Transformation Research Goals	4
	C. U.S. Army Transformation since 1999	6
	D. Problems in Defining Army Transformation	8
	E. The U.S. Army as a Bureaucracy	12
	F. Policy Implications	15
	G. Limitations of the Study	16
	H. Research Approach and Overview of Relevant Work	17
	I. Organization of this Research	18
	J. Conclusion	20
	K. References	21
II.	HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF ARMY TRANSFORMATION	23
	A. Military Transformation: A History of Change	24
	1. World War I	24
	2. The Inter-war Period: 1918 – 1941	27
	3. World War II	29
	4. Vietnam: A Commander-In-Chief's Unconventional Vision	31
	5. Post-Vietnam Era	33
	6. Post Desert Storm (1991 – 1997)	35
	B. The Road to the Current Transformation Effort	37
	C. Conclusion	40
	D. References	44
III.	LITERATURE REVIEW	46
	A. The Difficulty of Defining Goals	48
	B. Army Transformation: A Principal-Agent Challenge?	50
	C. Bureaucratic Aspects of Army Transformation	55
	1. Bureaucratic Culture	56
	2. Bureaucratic Innovation	58
	3. Bureaucratic Communication	60

4. Bureaucratic Consensus 62
5. Army Transformation as a Wicked Problem 65
D. Army Transformation: Problem Definition 67
1. Conceptually Defining Army Transformation 68
E. General Limits of Change in the Military 72
F. Past Commentary on Current U.S. Army Transformation Efforts 76
1. The Role of Future Combat Systems 80
2. The Role of the Entire Organization 82
G. Previous Empirical Examinations of Military Change 84
H. Conclusion 95
I. References 98

IV. HYPOTHESES AND METHODS 102

A. Type of Study 102
B. The Case Study 111
C. The Survey Instrument 112
D. The Open-ended Interview 123
E. Research Considerations 126
1. Data Analysis 126
2. Limitations of the Research 127
3. Ethical Considerations and Reciprocity 128
F. Summary 129
G. References 130
H. Appendix A 132
I. Appendix B 136
J. Appendix C 143

V. ARMY TRANSFORMATION: THE CASE OF THE THREE CHIEFS OF STAFF 147

A. General Eric. K. Shinseki: The Army Must Remain Relevant 148
B. General Peter J. Schoomaker: A Modular Approach to Transformation 155
C. General George W. Casey, Jr.: Transformation is a Process 164
D. Army Transformation: An Analysis 171
E. Conclusion 178
F. References 182

VI. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS 185

A. A Description of the Survey Participants 186
B. Participants' Views of Army Transformation 191.
C. Participants' Perceptions of the Basis of Transformation 198
D. Participants' Perceptions of Technology in Army Transformation 211
E. Participants have a Critical Perception of Army Transformation 219
F. Interview Results 226
G. Conclusion 235
H. References 237
I. Appendix A 239
J. Appendix B 246

VII. CONCLUSION 250

A. A Summary of the Five Hypotheses Statements 250
B. The Broader Implications of Army Transformation 255
C. National Security Documents Need to be Specific 261
1. The Future and National Security 266
D. Army Transformation Continues, But what is it? 268
E. Summary 269
F. References 271

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Since the end of the Cold War the United States Army has been in the process of identifying what it must look like in order to meet the threats of the 21st Century. Over the last two decades the Army has been in the process of transforming itself from a "heavy" fighting force necessary to counter the threats of an of an opposing peer (such as the Soviet Union), to that of a "lighter" more lethal, and mobile force needed to defeat nontraditional and non-state threats (such as the Taliban and Al Qaeda). The Army is similar to other bureaucracies in the United States Government where individuals may serve in very senior leadership positions for a relatively short period of time. When a large bureaucratic organization, such as the Army, is endeavoring to institute considerable organizational change, will successive senior leaders of the same organization be consistent in their vision of what the organization is to become? As important, will mid-level policy implementers within the Army's organizational structure understand that vision?

The Army is changing, but what is the nature of this change? The answer to this question is not only important for senior level policy makers but it is also relevant to those who implement policy within the Department of the Army. The purpose of this research is to determine if there is a gap between how senior Army leaders define "Army Transformation"[1] and the way in which Army lieutenant colonels and majors understand it. Do U.S. Army lieutenant colonels and majors understand Army Transformation in same way as both uniformed

[1] It is useful to have a working definition of what "Army Transformation" means. According to the "Army Transformation Roadmap 2003", page ix, "Transformation is a process that shapes the changing nature of military competition and cooperation through new combinations of concepts, capabilities, people and organizations…The Army's Transformation Strategy has three components: the transformation of Army culture, the transformation of processes – risk adjudication using the Current to Future Force construct, and the development of inherently joint transformational capabilities."

and civilian senior Army leaders do, notably the three Army Chiefs of Staff who have served since 1999? Might there exist a gap between how the senior Army leadership endeavors to achieve the "right" force and how the middle-level officers view transformation? My dissertation seeks to answer these questions empirically. The ability of the Army to transform to the "right" force should be of significant interest and importance to both policy makers and national security experts.

Implications of U.S. Army Transformation

The U.S. Army is a large bureaucratic organization and may not respond well to significant organizational change over a relatively short period of time. As will be discussed in Chapter 5, the Army appears to be most effective in incorporating change during times of war. Historically, however, the Army was not adequately prepared as it entered into most wars of the twentieth century. Harold R. Winton (2000) argues that one of the consistent themes of military history is the lack of preparedness of the military at the onset of war. While the U.S. Army may have superior technological and weapon systems capability, it may not possess the capability to fight a war on the terms of a sub-state threat. As will be discussed in this dissertation, the Army preferred to fight a conventional war in Vietnam and had a difficult time adjusting to the enemy's counter-insurgency (COIN) strategy. The Army had to re-learn that same lesson again beginning in 2003 in both Iraq and Afghanistan. The Army's conventional weapons systems derived largely from the World War II model of conflict may not be appropriate for modern day adversaries. If the Army had been willing or capable of changing in order to meet prospective non-conventional threats such as COIN then rather recent outcomes, including the Vietnam War, may have ended more favorably. In order for the Army to be ready for future conflicts likely

scenarios and expectations may need to be considered well in advance and then effectively planned for accordingly.

The U.S. Army prepared for war in the 20th Century based almost exclusively on a large-scale conventional threat, most notably defeating the Soviet Union in a European engagement. That threat appears to no longer exist. However, the U.S. Army must now plan for future conflict in a more uncertain world. It is difficult to determine what any future confrontation with a large nation-state, such as China, may include. According to Zeb Bradford and Federic Brown (2008) U.S. national security policy must include more specific factors that include the ability to function effectively within the environment that represents the 21st Century battlefield. Bradford and Brown (2008) argue that any new strategy and any new missions assigned to the Army must realistically acknowledge that many of the assumptions of previous national security policies are no longer valid. According to these authors, the problems that are faced by the Army are more complex and more difficult to plan for (Bradford and Brown 2008). This complexity and difficulty makes it imperative that the U.S. Army plan appropriately. The national security planning process is vital in determining the proper roles and missions of the U.S. Army. However, Amy Zegart (1999) argues that with a national security apparatus that was inadequate during the Cold War, how can the U.S. expect to be any better at planning for new and unfamiliar threats? Without a clear concept of what the Army's role is in national security, the more difficult any planning may be and the more assumptions senior Army leadership may be forced to make. This reality should be of considerable importance to both public policy makers and defense analysts.

As the Army, or all of the military branches for that matter, prepares for future contingencies it may be important that the goals and objectives that the Army is seeking to

achieve are made clearer to field grade officers, and indeed to as many within that branch of the military as practicable. As will be discussed in this dissertation, many of the Army field grade officers today will be in senior leadership positions in the next 10 – 20 years. It may be very important, if not crucial, for them to understand the reasoning and implications of the planning processes that are occurring at the present time. For instance, new weapon systems take a long time to develop, and the weapon systems that are available are the ones that are used for war at that time. The justification for a new weapon system is based on some perceived threat that must be confronted. Many of the Army field grade officers serving at the present time have considerable combat experience. Their thoughts and ideas of what is needed in order to confront the enemy of the twenty-first Century may be important as the Army plans ahead. Hopefully the challenges that the U.S. Army faces in transforming for the future will be brought to the attention of policy makers.

U.S. Army Transformation Research Goals

A summary of how the research will fit into the policy environment will be addressed. Policy implementation, problem definition, stakeholder analysis and the role of research in policy making are all relevant public policy components pertaining to this research. Furthermore, this research may provide policymakers with information that might be useful in identifying any gap that might exist between policy goals and policy implementation. In addition, this research can provide a policy advocacy mechanism if there appears that a gap does indeed exist between how the senior-level Army leadership defines “Transformation”, and how it is being perceived by field grade officers. By determining the nature of this potential gap this research could inform policymakers as to how to best address it.

There are two additional questions this dissertation seeks to answer. The first simply asks how do U.S. Army planners, in fact, define "Army Transformation." Army planners are specialists who take the directives that are provided by senior-Army leaders and express those directives by way of changes to Army doctrine and organizational structure. The second asks whether Army Transformation needs to be defined in the first place. By answering the primary research question, and seeking to answer the two additional questions, it is hopeful that this research will be a useful tool that the U.S. Army might consider as it plans for the future.

In additional to addressing the practical questions listed above, this research should add to the body of knowledge centering on the use of Principal-Agent Theory. Specifically, this dissertation will examine how difficult implementing significant change in a large hierarchical and bureaucratic organization can be. Principals seek to manipulate and mold the behavior of agents so that they will act in a manner consistent with the principal's preferences (Waterman and Meier 1998, 174; Moe 1984, 756; Sowers 2005, 388; Shapiro 2005, 271). If the Chief of Staff of the Army is "the principal" and the field grade officers are "the agents", then an assumption might be that the field grade officers would carry out the desires of the Army Chief of Staff.

Following the events of 9/11, President George W. Bush expressed the need for transformation this way: "In September 1999, I said that America was entering a period of consequences that would be defined by the threat of terror, and that we faced a challenge of military transformation. That threat has now revealed itself, and that challenge is now the military and moral necessity of our time."(Bush 2001). Following that statement by the President, the Bush Administration had identified transformation as a major goal for the Department of Defense (DoD) and has used the concept to justify many initiatives to Congress.

Ronald O'Rourke (2006) mentioned that some observers were concerned that the Bush Administration's regular use of the term "transformation" had relegated the term into an "empty slogan or "buzz phrase". Others were concerned that the Administration had invoked the term as an all-purpose rhetorical tool for justifying its various DoD proposals, whether the proposals were directly related to transformation or not, and instead proceeded to tie the concept of transformation to the need to fight the war on terrorism (O'Rourke 2006, 38). In light of these concerns, there does exist the possibility that Transformation is merely a symbolic effort, hindering the ability of senior Army leadership from succeeding in effecting change within the organization.

Significant attempts to dramatically overhaul the U.S. Army are nothing new. Several efforts to redesign the government's capacities to deal with the new security challenges have been undertaken in the last 25 years, including the Goldwater-Nichols Act of 1986, the 1995 Commission on Roles and Missions, the National Defense Panel of 1997, the Hart-Rudman Phase III Report of the U.S. Commission on National Security, and, the final report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States (i.e. the 9/11 Commission) (Murdock, et al. 2005, 139). As part of their focus, each of these efforts sought to significantly change the structure and operations of the U.S. Army. The Goldwater-Nichols Act of 1986 provided for the most consequential and successful example of defense reform in the Cold War era (Murdock, et al 2005, 140).

U.S. Army Transformation Since 1999

General Eric K. Shinseki was committed to transforming the Army as soon as he became Chief of Staff in 1999. He believed that the reason it had not been accomplished since the end of the Cold War, some nine years earlier, was that the originators of such previous initiatives had

left office without completing it. He believed that by the time he departed as Chief of Staff, his efforts would be so firmly rooted that transformation would have to occur under future leaders (Kagan 2006).

An important component to transformation is mobility. In testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, General Shinseki indicated that the Army must be able to deploy a combat-capable brigade anywhere in the world within 96 hours after receipt of an order to execute lift-off; a division on the ground within 120 hours; and, five divisions in 30 days (Shinseki 2000, 6). The forces would need to be "light" enough to deploy, lethal and survivable enough to fight and win, agile enough to transition from peacemaking to war-fighting and back again, and versatile enough to enforce peace or fight wars. And they would be lean and efficient enough to sustain themselves, whatever the mission (Shinseki 2000, 6).

General Shinseki's vision for the transformed force was: "Soldiers on point for the Nation transforming the Army into a strategically responsive force that is dominant across the full spectrum of operations (Shinseki 2000, 5)." In order to achieve this vision, he indicated that it would require the entire Army to commit to a comprehensive transformation. It would be necessary to immediately turn the Army into a full spectrum force that is strategically responsive and dominant at every point on the spectrum of operations. He added that it would be necessary to invest in new equipment that will stimulate the development of doctrine, organizational design, and leadership training as a search is made for the new technologies that will deliver the new materiel (this refers to weapon systems and equipment), for the objective force (Shinseki 2000, 8-9).

General Shinseki expressed the need to invest in new weapon systems and equipment that would drive changes in doctrine as well as organizational design and training (Shinseki 2000, 7).

Although General Shinseki described the full-spectrum force, it may be difficult for the rank and file to synthesize the true meaning. In other words, senior leaders set broad objectives regarding doctrine, strategy, operations, tactics, and procurement. Subordinates are responsible for implementing more specific tasks to achieve those objectives. The success of the Army is dependent on all systematic levels within its structure operating more or less in unison. However, senior leaders know more about what they want to achieve and the subordinates know more about their tasks. The conflict caused by the separation of responsibilities between different levels of a bureaucracy, such as in the case of the Army, may result in an implementation failure, as the principals (the senior army leadership) are frustrated with the efforts of the agents (the field-grade officers) (see Stulberg, Salomone and Long 2007, 38). Therefore, this research will focus on how transformation was formally initiated in the U.S. Army in 1999, and how transformation, under generals Eric K. Shinseki, Peter J. Schoomaker and George W. Casey, Jr., has been defined since that time, both by senior Army leaders and field grade officers.

Problems in Defining Army Transformation

The term "Army Transformation" appears to have different meanings to different people within the U.S. Federal Government and within the structure of the U.S. Army. Until there is an understanding of what the term actually means throughout the rank and file of the Army, planning for and achieving the end-state readiness necessary for supporting foreign policy objectives may be difficult to achieve. James Carafano (2004) describes what tasks future U.S. Army forces must be able to perform: "homeland security; assisting other countries in developing anti-terrorism measures; war fighting, including conventional military operations as well as special forces missions such as raids, hostage rescue, search and recovery, and non-combatant evacuations; and post conflict operations (pg. 3). Carafano goes on to say that "long-

term needs to fight the global war on terrorism, and meet other demands as well, will be difficult to predict. Unlike determining requirements to fight major regional conflicts, future counterterrorism operations could vary significantly in number, size, scope and duration (Carafano 2004, 3). In the absence of clear mission goals for the Army of the future, or of the 21st Century, how is it possible for there to be a clear definition of what "Army Transformation" is and, by inference, for there to be a universal understanding of what the Army is to become in the 21st Century? Not only may there be a significant gap in what Army Transformation means among senior government officials, there may also be a significant gap that exists in how the term is defined by the Army rank and file.

If this mindset still exists, then there may be little progress being made in defining "Army Transformation", and therefore effective implementation of Army Transformation could be falling short of the intended goal. If there is not a clear definition of what "Army Transformation" means, this could be more indicative of some level of goal ambiguity that may exist. Y. H. Chun and H. G. Rainey (2005) define goal ambiguity as "the extent to which an organizational goal or set of goals allows leeway for interpretation, when the organizational goal represents the desired future state of the organization…therefore, organizational goal loses clear meaning and becomes ambiguous when it invites a number of different interpretations" (Chun and Rainey 2005, 2).

As addressed previously, there appears not to be a single interpretation available of what "Army Transformation" means, for purposes of changing the U.S. Army from what it was in the 20th Century to what it may need to be for effectively addressing the threats of the 21st Century. The purpose of this research is to address three specific questions that will determine whether a "gap" currently exists between top-level policy makers (notably, the three Army Chiefs of Staff

over a period of over ten years) and Army planners and implementers (specifically, Army lieutenant colonels and majors). This gap may exist because there may not be a relevant or an acceptable definition of what "Army Transformation" means. There are literal definitions available: Army Transformation can be defined as large-scale, discontinuous, and possibly disruptive changes in military weapons, concepts of operations (i.e. approaches to war-fighting), and organization that are prompted by significant changes in technology or the emergence of new and different international security challenges" (O'Rourke 2006, 3). From a strategic or visionary level this definition provided by O'Rourke may be meaningful, but is it definitive and clear enough for policy implementers?

As mentioned above, the primary research question addressed in this dissertation is simply to determine if field grade officers (i.e. lieutenant colonels and majors) understand Army Transformation in the same way as the three Army Chiefs of Staff who have served since 1999. A secondary question examines how Army planners define Transformation. The reason that this question is relevant has to do with the lengthy amount of time that is involved in developing weapons systems that are necessary to defeat future threats. Policymakers must recognize that the decisions that are made now, in the name of Army Transformation, will be the ones that unidentified future political leaders will have to live with for carrying out foreign policy decisions years from now. Kevin Reynolds (2006) indicates that it takes anywhere from 12 to 20 years to develop a weapon system. Since foreign policy objectives may change every four years, there is likely to be a "policy lag" in planning horizons, budgeting cycles, and predictability forecasts between foreign policy/national security development on the one hand and weapon systems/force structure on the other (Reynolds 2006, 2).

A third question challenges the need to define Army Transformation in the first place. Specifically, does Army Transformation need to be defined? Does the term indicate that there is some sort of end-state to be achieved, or does the term mean that Army Transformation is a process and that the journey may continue indefinitely? If policy makers themselves are subject to wholesale change every six to eight years then should there be a specific concern of what "Transformation" means to implementers in DoD in general, and the U.S. Army in particular? Policy decisions are governed by the structure of the federal government and its political processes, whereas weapon system and force structure decisions tend to be relatively isolated from this process (Reynolds 2006, 21). Reynolds (2006) argues that foreign policy and national strategy formulation systems and force structure planning and execution decisions, on the other hand, revolve around the military's preferences (Reynolds 2006, 21). Moreover, foreign policy and national security decisions have greater visibility or are more salient to the public, while weapon systems are seldom subjected to public scrutiny (Reynolds 2006, 21). So if politics and defense planning are to co-exist as just described, is there even a need for a definition of Army Transformation?

Unless Army Transformation, as a policy problem, is well understood and clear, then political forces throughout the large organization will use their "re-definition" as a tool to gain advantage over other groups (Portz 1994). Any problem definition, in the context of a large military organization, will be interpreted in a framework of standardization in order to guard against uncertainty and the possibility of unchartered and uncoordinated action. The Army, like other branches of the American military, is cautious about change and the idea of introducing a new means to achieving new ends. This presents a significant challenge since transformation involves a dynamic process of translating vague visions of war into mature, innovative outcomes

(Stulberg, Salomone and Long 2007, 14). A "vague vision" provided by senior leaders would be a reason for why political forces would be able to define the problem in terms that best suits their cause. On the other hand, if everyone understood Army Transformation in the same context, this would reduce the amount of discretion that may occur within the Army bureaucracy as a result of an ill-defined problem.

The U.S. Army as a Bureaucracy

The Army, as an organization within the Department of Defense, is a part of the largest bureaucracy in the U.S. government. In any large bureaucratic organization, it may be difficult to implement new policy or direction throughout the organization and expect everyone to have a clear understanding of what needs to be accomplished in the same way. Since the messages from the three Chiefs of Staff have been largely consistent with regard to transforming the Army over the last ten years, then there might be an implementation problem associated with achieving large scale change. James Q. Wilson (1989) says that here are two ways to look at government agencies: from the "top down" and from the "bottom up". In the "top down" approach, there is a requirement for senior leaders to know what is going on day-to-day. Goals of an agency can be precisely specified in advance and progress towards those goals can be readily measured by its top officials. In other cases of the "top-down" approach, leaders do not assume that they know exactly what the members of the agency do. Leaders assume that organizational members' behavior results from rules, laws and organizational structure, and so leaders change that behavior, when seeking organizational change, by changing the rules, laws and structures (Wilson 1989, 11).

The U.S. Army is a hierarchical organization that identifies actors, whether uniformed or civilians, based largely on the rank they hold. There is a significant sociological and status

distance between the “four star” level and the lieutenant colonel and major level within the Army. The differences in rank and the deference accorded to people of different rank operate, by the clear and obvious differences in rank in a very hierarchical organization such as the U.S. Army, as a divisive element in many organizations by filtering and distorting communications upward and downward. Subordinates may only tell their superiors what they think they want to hear, when given perhaps a rare opportunity to convey information (Kaufman 2006, 69). Senior leaders tend to be effectively insulated from operating levels of the organization. This insulation may occur due directly to differences in rank, or the status that is associated directly with rank. Additionally, many leaders may not be receptive to ideas provided by subordinates; the thought that an idea coming from someone of lower rank will not be treated with the same respect or seriousness as one coming from a person of higher status. Senior leaders, on the other hand, make casual comments, inquiries, and tentative observations that may be emphasized, reinterpreted and applied in ways never intended (Kaufman 2006, 69). If Kaufman is correct, and if Army Transformation has not occurred as General Shinseki had intended, there might be a communications gap that exists between senior Army leaders and field grade officers.

Since the U.S. Army is a very large hierarchical organization, there is some distance between senior Army leaders, with the four-star chief of staff residing in the Pentagon, and field grade officers serving in assignments throughout the world. Kaufman (2006) refers to this separation in terms of both a “status distance” and a “social distance”. Kaufman says that difference in rank creates a “social distance” that may serve as a discriminator in that it acts as a filtering element which may distort information traveling upward and downward throughout the organization. Superiors are not always receptive to ideas submitted by subordinates because those ideas are not typically received with the same level of respect as those ideas coming from

someone with senior status. Conversely, observations and comments provided by senior level officers may be re-interpreted, emphasized, and applied in ways, by field grade officers, not necessarily intended by senior leaders (Kaufman 2006, 69-71).

Kaufman (2006) goes on to argue that there is also a “social distance” at work in a large hierarchical organization. There are attitudinal barriers that may appear when people perceive communications in a totally different manner than what was intended. Even people serving within the same organization may have difficulty understanding the intended message based on their specialties and assignments within the organization. Social distance, therefore, can result in variants of the same policy being executed within the organization, when in fact the senior level leader had only intended that only one be pursued (Kaufman 2006, 70).

Following on Kaufman’s description of distance, James Q. Wilson (1989) says that change which is consistent with existing tasks within the organization will be accepted, and those that require a redefinition of tasks will be resisted (Wilson 1989, 222). The inference here is that field grade officers might be able to close both Kaufman’s “status distance” and the “social distance”, when a task is consistent with what they are used to performing. Conversely, the inference is that if a new task is unclear, then there is a possibility that it will be misinterpreted at best, or rejected at worse.

John P. Kotter (1996) argues that if transformation is to be successful within any organization, then executives (i.e. senior Army leadership) need to lead the overall effort and leave most of the managerial work and the leadership of specific activities to their subordinates (i.e. field grade officers). Kotter adds that good leadership from above helps everyone understand the big picture, the overall vision and strategies, and how each of the projects, being managed and led by subordinates, fits into the whole transformation process (Kotter 1996, 140-141).

Kotter's view of successful transformation might not be attainable if there is some status or social distance that distorts communications between senior leaders and subordinates, or if the transformative tasks are inconsistent with tasks already being performed by subordinates (Kaufman 2006; Wilson, 1989).

Any U.S. Army Transformation goals initiated in 1999 by General Eric Shinseki may have been altered in January 2001 with a new presidential administration and a new Secretary of State beginning in January 2001. Former Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld will be remembered by his attempt to transform the military into a lighter, nimbler force better able to take advantage of new technology and respond to new threats. He may be given credit for shaking up an institution perceived as being inflexible that, if left to its own devices, would prefer to endlessly refight the 1991 Gulf War (Boot, 2005, 103). This assertion may or may not be accurate, but the message is clear: the Army is a bureaucracy defined by a culture that will implement change within the context of its existing framework. That existing framework includes the relationship between senior Army leaders and the lieutenant colonels and majors, mid-career officers who play a significant role in implementing policies within the Army.

Policy Implications

The research question posed in this research, when answered, should serve as an input to senior level policy makers within Congress, and the various departments within the executive branch such as the Defense Department, Department of Homeland Security, State Department and the National Security Agency. Reynolds (2006) mentioned that neither the executive nor the legislative branches of government have the time or the inclination to master the arcane concepts, processes and jargon associated with weapon systems development. But, those two branches of government should understand how policy decisions are subject to played out in the

bowels of the Pentagon in the name of Army Transformation. The Senate and House Armed Services Committees would benefit from the results of this study for purposes of providing clarity to policy goals. The reason that Congress, in particular, is such an important target audience for this dissertation centers around the need for perhaps a greater oversight of the military's decision making process. As Reynolds (2006) provides, this is important for purposes of reducing the inconsistencies both between and within presidential administrations (Reynolds 2006, 49).

Limitations of the Study

The purpose of this research is to explore the gap that may exist between senior U.S. Army leadership and field grade officers in defining the term Army Transformation. The purpose of this research will not be to provide a definition for Army Transformation, but the purpose will instead seek to determine if policy implementers believe that there is clear definition already in existence; to understand how U.S. Army planners define transformation; and, in the absence of a definition, to determine whether there is even a need for a definition of Army Transformation in the first place.

This research will not provide a course of action for how policy-makers should proceed with Army Transformation strategies, whether those strategies are based on clear policy guidance or not. This research will also not provide a solution for bringing U.S. Army planning in line with foreign policy or national security priorities. Resolving any planning gap that may exist between "defense policy" and "foreign policy" is well outside the scope of this work.

The purpose here, instead, is to provide answers to the three research questions. The answers will provide a good starting point for policy leaders as they consider how the Army is being transformed to meet future national security threats. Congress, in particular, should have a

good appreciation for how transformation is being implemented, or not, within the Defense Department. Perhaps the most important aspect of defining Army Transformation has to do with agency discretion. The more ambiguous terminology is in describing a policy the more likely there is a chance of "goal ambiguity", which could result, especially in the case of Defense planning, in inefficiencies that could cost billions of dollars and may or may not result in appropriate weapon systems being developed along with the requisite force structure.

Research Approach and Overview of Relevant Work

The constructivist paradigm is the best framework to use in answering the research question associated with this study. As in the case of Army Transformation, elements of what that term means, as argued in Hatch (2002), is shared across social groups, and multiple realities may exist that are inherently unique because they are constructed by individuals who experience the world from their own vantage points. Realities are understood in the form of abstract mental constructions that are experientially based, local and specific (Hatch, 2002, 15). This may be especially true for U.S. Army planners who make their decisions on their interpretations of public policy. The constructivist paradigm argues that knowledge is symbolically constructed and not objective; that understandings of the world are based on conventions; that truth is, in fact, what we agree it is (Hatch, 2002, 15). This description of the constructivist paradigm may be useful as this research proceeds to determine if there actually is a clear definition of Army Transformation.

The products of the constructivist paradigm are important for purposes of this study. Case studies or rich narratives that describe the viewpoints of senior U.S. Army leadership are keys to understanding why field grade officers may have the views they do regarding Army Transformation. Sources that address changes in bureaucracy will be reviewed in order to frame

the significance of "transforming" an organization the size of the U.S. Army. Because the discretion of how the Army is to be transformed rests primarily with that service's Chief of Staff, and the implementation of that directive is carried out largely by field grade officers, the Principal-Agent Theory will be used for purposes of addressing the three research questions. The Army Chiefs of Staff comments on Army Transformation will be reviewed in papers and documents published by think tanks, such as the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS); the Congressional Research Service (CRS); the General Accountability Office (GAO); and, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO). This review will be conducted in order to determine what information the legislative branch might be using for purposes of viewing Army Transformation efforts by the senior leadership of the Army.

A review of Government documents that have specific language that justifies priorities for transformation authorization and appropriation purposes will be helpful as well. Specifically, the President's Budget (PB) includes the Defense budget and priorities, as well as the National Security and Foreign Affairs budgets. The term "justifies" is the operative term here. The agency and department financial and program experts are the ones that put the respective budgets together and provide for the argument in support of, in this case, transformation funding. However, if their definition of "Army Transformation" is inconsistent with the intent of the policy, then a gap may exist in critical Government planning documents.

Organization of this Research

This introductory chapter serves the purpose of identifying why this research is important to senior Army planners. It also sets the stage for the fact that a significant gap may actually exist between how senior Army leadership defines "Army Transformation" and how mid-career, field grade officers define "Army Transformation". Why is this important? Any gap that may exist has

not only costly fiscal implications, but the gap could suggest that significant change remains very difficult to execute and that large bureaucracies, such as the U.S. Army, have a way to go in order to create mechanisms to facilitate changes in organizational goals.

Chapter 2 will provide an overview of military transformation and how significant change is difficult to achieve in a large bureaucratic organization. The chapter will highlight the complexities of principal-agent relationships which are critical in achieving the organizational synergy and buy-in necessary for a “transformed” bureaucracy.

Chapter 3 is the literature review that will provide the theoretical basis for addressing significant change in a large bureaucratic organization. This chapter will address the literature that explains why the U.S. Army is having a difficult time in achieving its transformational goals. The literature review will provide an overview of the research techniques employed in this study and why they are relevant for answering the research questions. Finally, the literature review will highlight the relevancy of the principal-agent model for purposes of changing a large organization such as the U.S. Army.

Chapter 4 describes the methodology used in this research. This is a mixed-methods research project in that it combines case study analysis with open-ended interviews and a survey of field-level U.S. Army officers. The case study will focus on directives provided by the senior Army leadership. The interviews and survey will identify how lieutenant colonels and majors interpret those senior level directives.

The open-ended interviews will be conducted with eight lieutenant colonels and majors selected by the administrative staff at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College (CGSC) at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. The survey will be issued by the CGSC Quality Control Office using the centers internal e-mail system.

Chapter 5 will be the case study pertaining to the three Army chiefs of staff that served from 1999 – 2011. The case study is collected from speeches, senior level policy statements, and testimony before Congress. Chapter 6 will be the results and analysis that will be conducted in order to use the survey results and the open-ended interview responses to answer the research question. The data analysis will combine the qualitative analysis associated with senior level directives with the more quantitative data resulting from the survey and the open-ended interviews. Chapter 7 will be the conclusion of the study. A synthesis of the data and literature will occur that will demonstrate the significance of any gap that may exist in how senior Army leaders and mid-career field grade officers define Army transformation. Any gap that may exist will also be addressed in order that senior level policy makers may have at least one more data point to consider for future considerations.

Conclusion

There is an inherent need to define and to understand what is meant by "Army Transformation. Without a clear definition of transformation, there will continue to be a "goal ambiguity" and waste associated with pursuing programs and priorities that may or may not support foreign policy and national security priorities. Agencies pursuing individual interests in the name of "transformation" cannot be the answer to a top level policy matter. The policy needs to be clear and concise so that agencies can be held accountable for fiscal and performance goals.

The desired outcome of this research is to provide empirical information to policy makers, at all levels of Government, which will assist in effectively addressing the problem of defining "Army Transformation".

References

Boot, Max. 2005. "The Struggle to Transform the Military." *Foreign Affairs* 84 (March/April): 103-118.

Bradford, Jr., Zeb B. and Frederic J. Brown. 2008. *America's Army: A Model for Interagency Effectiveness*. Westport: Praeger Security International.

President George W. Bush. 2001. "The World Will Always Remember September 11." December 11. Speech at the Citadel. http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/12/20011211-1.html

Carafano, James J. 2004. "Missions, Responsibilities, and Geography: Rethinking How the Pentagon Commands the World." No. 1792, Washington, D.C.: The Heritage Foundation.

Chun, Y.H. and H.G. Rainey. 2005. "Goal Ambiguity in U.S. Federal Agencies." *Journal of Public Administration* 15: 1-30.

Dombrowski, Peter J. and Eugene Gholz. 2006. *Buying Military Transformation: technological innovation and the defense industry*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hatch, J.A. 2002. Doing *Qualitative Research in Education Settings*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Kagan, Frederick W. 2006. *Finding The Target: The Transformation of American Military Policy*. New York: Encounter Books.

Kaufman, Herbert. 2006. *The Forest Ranger: A Study in Administrative Behavior.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kotter, John P. 1996. *Leading Change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Moe, Terry M. 1984. "The New Economics of Organization." *American Journal of Political Science* 28: 739-777.

Murdoch, Clark A., Michele A. Flournoy, et al. 2005. "The Quest for Reform, Beyond Goldwater-Nichols: *U*.S. Government and Defense Reform for a New Strategic Era." Washington, D.C.: Center for Strategic and International Studies.

O'Rourke, Ronald. 2006. Defense Transformation: Background and Oversight Issues for Congress. *Congressional Research Service Report for Congress*. Order Code RL 32238. Washington, D.C.: The Library of Congress.

Portz, John. 1994. "Plant Closings, Community Definitions and the Local Response." In David A. Rochefort and Roger W. Cobb (Eds.), The Politics of Problem Definition: Shaping the Policy Agenda (pp. 45). Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.

Reynolds, Kevin P. 2006. "Defense Transformation: To What, For What?" Strategic Studies Institute, The U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA, November.

Shapiro, Susan P. 2005. "Agency Theory." *Annual Review of Sociology* 31:263-284.

Stulberg, Adam N., Michael D. Salomone and Austin G. Long. 2007. *Managing Defense Transformation: Agency, Culture and Service Change.* Burlington: Ashgate.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Airland Subcommittee on Armed Forces. 2000. *General Eric K. Shinseki Statement on Army Transformation*. 106th Congress, 2nd sess. 18 March.

Waterman, Richard W. and Kenneth J. Meier. 1998. "Principal-Agent Models: An Expansion?" *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 8 (April): 173-202.

Wilson, James Q. 1989. *Bureaucracy: What The Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It.* New York: Basic Books.

Winton, Harold R. 2000. *The Challenge of Change: Military Institutions and New Realities, 1918 – 1941*. Harold R. Winton and David R. Mets, eds. Lincoln: University of Nebraska.

Zegart, Amy B. 1999. *Flawed By Design: The Evolution of the CIA, JCS, and NSC*. Palo Alto: Stanford.

CHAPTER 2

HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF ARMY TRANSFORMATION

Transforming a large organization such as the U.S. Army will most likely be challenging. If the U.S. Army is not well suited for transformational change, what happens when senior Army leadership announces a requirement for transformational change? What does this mean to the career Army officers who are then expected to implement and support that change? To what extent do those tasked with much of the responsibilities in executing transformation actually understand how transformation is to be undertaken?

The primary research question in this dissertation is to assess the United States Army's transformation efforts by determining if there is indeed a gap between how senior Army leaders define Army Transformation and the way in which Army lieutenant colonels and majors understand it. Specifically, I seek to determine if field grade officers understand Army Transformation in the same way as the three Army Chiefs of Staff who have served in that top senior leadership position since 1999. Might a gap exist in how the senior leadership is endeavoring to transform the Army in order to achieve some objective end-state and how field grade officers visualize that end-state? To begin answering these questions, it would be useful to first identify the background leading up to the on-going Army Transformation efforts. In doing so, I will in this chapter examine the historical context of Army transformation by providing a brief history of how the Army has attempted to implement significant change throughout the 20th Century, beginning with the years prior to World War I.

Military Transformation: A History of Change

Peter J. Roman and David W. Tarr (1998) argue that the most powerful institutions in the American national security arena are the Army, Navy and the Air Force, and not the Department of Defense as a whole, and that these individual services have their own distinctive and enduring personalities (Roman and Tarr 1998, 91). Roman and Tarr (1998) continue by arguing that the individual military service identities and personalities make then impervious to change from the outside; therefore they continue acting autonomously and in a self-interested manner (Roman and Tarr 1998, 91). For much of the twentieth-century, Roman and Tarr (1998) argues, the command, control and coordination problems associated with the America's organizationally separated armed forces have been the object of institutional reforms (92). The authors suggest that separate service interests and distinctive service personalities constitute the ideological, psychological, and doctrinal basis for parochial service orientations (Roman and Tarr 1998, 92). These authors describe the nature of the American military that existed for most of the twentieth-century, which may explain why transformative change has been difficult to achieve, beginning as early as World War I.

World War I

David E. Johnson (2000) argues that at least one U.S. Army Major General in the War Department's general staff was unable to predict events on the eve of War World War I, because of the culture in which he had served throughout his career. Major General Johnson, a member of the War Department general staff before World War I, Johnson (2000) continues, was immersed in the day-to-day realities of the Army by making the difficult cultural and institutional transition from frontier constabulary to the modern Army, from absolute faith in man and animal to reliance on machines and science, a transition that began after the Spanish American War and

continued during and after World War I (Johnson 2000, 163). Johnson argues that Elihu Root, the Secretary of War, was the primary actor that caused fundamental change to occur within the Army. Indeed, President McKinley selected Elihu Root as Secretary of War because he believed he understood best how the Army would need to undergo a fundamental change in organization, administration, and training in order to meet the expectation of the United States becoming a world power (Jones 1969, 347).

David Segal and Mady W. Segal (1983, 164) argue further that Elihu Root reviewed the experiences of the Spanish-American War and decided that most of the mistakes the Army had made in that conflict were caused by basic organizational problems. Root's most significant challenge was the creation of the general staff, with a chief of staff as its leader. Implementation of the General Staff Act of 1903 took a decade to implement due to the in-fighting associated with the position of commanding general and the powerful bureaus of the time (Johnson 2000, 164).

According to Douglas A. Macgregor (1997) the General Staff Act of 1903 to transform the Army allowed Elihu Root to form the general staff met with universal opposition by senior leaders within the military; largely because the bill weakened their positions (229). Despite Root's efforts, the American Army entered World War I ill-prepared to meet the challenges of raising mass armies, delivering mass firepower, and providing for the substantial support materiel needed for the war effort such as ammunition, food, and petroleum (Johnson 2000, 165). Johnson argues that in hindsight, World War I proved that the constrained general staff and the autonomous bureaus could not meet the demands of mobilizing, deploying, or supplying the Army Expeditionary Force largely because it had no such previous experience. Johnson (2000) argues that under the leadership of Elihu Root the Army began to transform itself from a frontier

constabulary. The author continues by arguing that the army had been augmented in time of crisis by an infusion of non-professional volunteers, to what eventually became the modern army that did not change all that much, at least organizationally, throughout the twentieth century following World War I (Johnson 2000, 164). Since the Army was not ready by all accounts for what was to be experienced during World War I, it may not have understood what future force it was supposed to transform into.

Russell F. Weigley (1973) argues that up until World War I, no one in the United States had developed a better method of warfare than that of General Ulysses S. Grant's war of annihilation (a strategy that provided for an overwhelming defeat of enemy forces) during America's Civil War (Weigley 1973, 194). The generals and bureaucrats, on the eve of World War I, did not appear to embrace change. Weigley argues that the internal combustion engine had advanced to the point of making armored vehicles viable in war, and in fact the tank made its first appearance about midway through World War I. The generals were not receptive to such rapid technological change, and mass armies like the ones that appeared in World War I cost so much that statesmen and generals alike were reluctant to spend large sums of money on experimental programs to build new systems, such as the tank (Weigley 1973, 195). However, there were weapons that had been developed and would have been useful in a war that included mass armies. Vincent C. Jones (1969) argues that the Gatling Gun was used by the Army since 1866 and had been employed successfully in the Indian and Spanish America War. Jones also points out that the although the Army had developed the automatic machine gun, it was not effectively employed by the Army until World War I fighting commenced; and only then was it understood how important the automatic machine gun would become to modern tactics (Jones 1969, 345). There would be other lessons learned as a result of World War I, however. Even

with legislation from Congress mandating change in the decade after the war, the Army still resisted significant change, or at least found significant change to be challenging.

The Inter-war period: 1918 - 1941

The National Defense Act of 1920, according to Jones (1969), governed Army organization and regulation until 1950 and is thought to be among the most important pieces of military legislation in United States history (Jones 1969, 407). According to Johnson (2000), the 1920 National Defense Act reflected the need for the Army to prepare for modern and total war. Johnson argues that the officer corps, who had experienced the Army Expeditionary Force in Europe, believed that the act established a system that would correct two shortcomings experienced by the U.S. Army in World War I: mobilization of a mass army and the sustainment and supply of such an army in the field (171). General John J. Pershing became Army Chief of Staff in 1921 and he reorganized the War Department General Staff on the model of the Army Expeditionary Force (AEF) which he commanded in Europe during World War I (Jones 1969, 408). The most significant change that occurred as a result of that 1920 National Defense Act occurred in 1926 with the establishment of the Airs Corps as an equal combat arm and with the provision for its enlargement and modernization (Jones 1969, 408) The United States Navy would also take full advantage of the new air technology to transform itself from a battleship based fleet to that of an aircraft carrier fleet before World War II.

The Unites States Navy, according to Stulberg, Salomone and Long (2007), was initially very reluctant to transform from a well established and traditional battleship fleet to that of an aircraft carrier based fleet. Proponents for sea-based aviation initially lacked a strong institutional base that gave traction to new ideas about carrier innovation (114). The Navy was a

battleship-focused service and that service senior leadership in the World War I era and shortly after was predisposed to give carrier plans subordinate status (Stulberg, Salomone and Long 2007, 114). The Navy did overcome its initial reluctance to transform its fleet and integrated technologies, extensive experimentation, entrepreneurial leadership, and a coherent service-wide vision of future warfare that included more than just battleship warfare, and doctrinal and organizational adjustment; all key ingredients to effective military change (Stulberg, Salomone and Long 2007, 101). Stulberg, Salomone and Long (2007) argue that the reason the Navy was successful in transforming itself from a battleship-based fleet to that of a carrier fleet was that it was able to effectively fund new technologies, provide extensive experimentation, allow for entrepreneurial leadership, make available a coherent service-wide vision of future warfare, and provide the necessary doctrinal and organizational adjustment (101). Additionally, these authors argue, the Navy created a career path for officers so that they could ascend to senior level rank as aviators, an opportunity that was traditionally reserved for officers in the battleship fleet (Stulberg, Salomone, Long 2007, 104). Like the inter-war Navy, the U.S. Army may have a difficult time transforming from a force based on Cold War era heavy combat systems to a twenty first century Information Age military force if field grade officers are uncertain about promotion opportunities.

David E. Johnson (2000) argues that throughout most of the interwar era, planning at the War Department remained largely theoretical, and any planning that was conducted was done for the sake of the exercise itself since there appeared to be no imminent threat to the United States (179). Indeed, according to Johnson (2000), not until 1939, as the world was at the brink of war, did strategic planning begin to become more realistic (180). In the interwar period, much of the active Army's needs came from the stockpiles of equipment left over from World War I (183).

Military leaders of the time were certain that in the event of military emergency, American industry could respond to the needs of the Army (183). The Army Chief of Staff, General Malin Craig, beginning in 1935, made a decision that in effect stopped the research and development of new weapons, and decision that came at a time when new military technologies was changing at a very rapid pace (183). Instead of funding programs to modernize the Army with new weapon systems, General Craig instead chose to spend the Army's very limited budget on funding an Initial Protective Force of some four-hundred thousand Regular Army and National Guard units that would defend the country at the beginning of an emergency. During this period, senior leaders appeared to reject significant and innovative suggestions coming from junior officers. For instance, according to Johnson (2000), Major George S. Patton, Jr. and Captain Dwight David Eisenhower both argued for a greater tactical role for tanks, beyond serving as simply a supporting component to the infantry. Eisenhower was censured and told to keep his ideas to himself, while Patton returned to the cavalry where he wrote about the relevancy of the horse in battle (Johnson 2000, 189).

World War II

By rejecting suggestions such as those made by Eisenhower and Patton, it appears that the Army may have been ill-prepared for what was really needed for purposes of World War II. Regardless, the United States Army was successful in World War II as it employed General Ulysses S. Grant's war of annihilation strategy, a hard fighting strategy that may have been better supported with an earlier regard for the tank in battle (Weigley 1973, 313).

The changes began on February 28, 1942 when President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9082 which directed the wholesale reorganization of the War Department (Johnson 2000). Johnson states that the intention was to streamline the General Staff and

subordinate elements of the Army in order to facilitate speedy and most effective control of mobilization and operations (200). This order eliminated an inefficient and decentralized structure created by the National Defense Act of 1920 that resulted in some sixty agencies having the authority to report to the Chief of Staff (Johnson 2000, 200). This significant change of course, while the United States was already involved in the early stages of World War II, allowed for an immediate mobilization of resources, training, and supplying of a rapidly expanding army of millions, existing weapons design were rushed into mass production (Johnson 2000, 200). The Army appeared to change significantly in a rather short period of time; the reason being perhaps that it simply saw no other choice.

Larry H. Addington (1994) argues that the National Security Act of 1947 created, in addition to the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and the National Security Council (NSC), the basic structure of post-war national defense by creating the departments of the Army, the Navy and the Air Force (269). Addington (1994) states that the 1947 Act also created the Secretary of Defense, along with civilian secretaries that would preside over each of the new departments. These individual service secretaries would report to the Secretary of Defense (269). Additionally, Addington (1994) argues that the National Security Act of 1947 also provided statutory recognition of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which would consist of the chiefs of staff of the Army and the Air Force, as well as the Chief of Naval Operations (Addington 1994, 269). However, according to Amy Zegart (1999) the Joint Chiefs of Staff that resulted in 1947 was weak by design; it had not budget authority, no chairman, and offered no incentives among its members to think in joint service terms (Zegart 1999, 133).

In 1949, Addington (1994) argues, an amendment to the 1947 Act was provided that formally created the Department of Defense, which in effect gave more power to the Secretary of

Defense and also created the position of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (Addington 1994, 269). It appears that this would be the most significant change in Defense Department organization until the Goldwater-Nichols Act in 1986, or some 37 years later.

Vietnam: A Commander-In-Chief's Unconventional Vision

Russell F. Weigley (1973) argues that President John F. Kennedy ignored the objections of the United States Army when he showed preference for elite forces, or those forces that are apart from the mainstream operational forces (456). Kennedy gave the special forces their distinctive emblem, the green beret (Weigley 1973, 456 – 457). The Green Berets were trained primarily in unconventional warfare, but they were also trained in community organization and leadership, preventive medicine, construction techniques, and in nation-building (457). In 1960 the Communist leaders in Vietnam had established the fight against the anti-communist regime in Saigon through the use of subversion and guerrilla war (Weigley 1973, 456). Kennedy believed that guerilla warfare required a whole new kind of strategy, apparently a strategy that the Army as an institution was not willing to embrace (Weigley 1973, 457). The Army may have been more focused on conventional warfare, and not the unconventional warfare President Kennedy was anticipating.

Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow (1999) argue that when the international environment cannot be negotiated, organizations deal with remaining uncertainties by establishing a set of standard scenarios that constitute the contingencies for which they prepare (Allison and Zelikow 1999, 171). The authors continue by arguing that the U.S. Army in the 1960s prepared for large-scale ground operations that would emphasize American advantages in firepower, and when scenarios did not materialize in Vietnam allowing for that emphasis, the Army found it agonizingly difficult to adapt (Allison and Zelikow 1999, 171).

The culture of the Army may have been the primary reason for that service not being able to adapt to the requirements associated with Vietnam. Stulberg, Salomone and Long (2007) argue that Vietnam was largely a counterinsurgency conflict which was considered outside the mainstream of the more conventional approach to war; which provided no material benefits that encouraged servicemen to invest their careers (163). There were no senior officers with counterinsurgency expertise who were permitted to ascend to the four-star rank because they were also considered to be removed from the mainstream (Stulberg, Salomone and Long 2007, 163). Officers that did ascend to the rank of general officer did so in spite of their counterinsurgency views and were promoted based on their more conventional experiences in World War II and Korea (Stulberg, Salomone and Long 2007, 164).

Creating a career path opportunities to senior level rank may be a necessary ingredient in achieving transformation within the Army. By all appearances, the Army would still not focus on counterinsurgency after Vietnam for more than 20 years. One of the reasons the Army may have failed to adapt to unconventional warfare following Vietnam may have had more to do with a larger and more impending threat. Eric A. Hollister (2010) argues that in 1968 the Soviet Union invaded Czechoslovakia which led to the issuance of National Security Decision Memorandum 95 in 1970; which conclude that a credible defense posture in NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) was vital and that conventional forces required an increased emphasis (Hollister 2010, 2) This direction may have caused the Army to resume its preference for conventional war and could therefore be justified, perhaps, in giving little consideration to unconventional war preparation.

Post-Vietnam Era

According to David Cloud and Greg Jaffe (2009) at the end of involvement in Vietnam the U.S. Army removed from the curriculum of its war colleges all classes pertaining to counterinsurgency, as well as eliminating all field exercises involving counterinsurgency (Cloud and Jaffe 2009, 26). The Army reverted back to its comfort zone of planning for a conventional war against its Cold War adversary, the Soviet Union (26). Richard A. Lacquement, Jr. (2010) argues that the Army's response to Vietnam was to declare as a matter of institutional preference that it should not have to fight that sort of war in the future (Lacquement 2010, 30). The author goes on to say that society's needs matched that of the Army's role, so the Army focused on preparing for conventional war against similarly structured armies and so recommended to its civilian leaders that use of military force be limited to this particular conception of war (Lacquement 2010, 30).

Clark A. Murdoch, et al (2004) argues that by the mid-1980s, and after a series of operational failures in the field – such as the botched attempt to rescue the American hostages in Iran, the bombing of the U.S. embassy and Marine Corps barracks in Beirut, and the interoperability (joint operations or military services working together) problems during the invasion of Grenada – the Congress became convinced that the Department of Defense (DoD) was broken and that corrective action needed to be taken. Despite intense resistance from DoD, more than four years of Congressional hearings, investigation, and analysis culminated in the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 (Goldwater Nichols Act or GNA-1986) – served as a statutory landmark of U.S. defense reform (Murdoch et al 2004, 14)

.

Amy Zegart (1999) argues that the GNA-1986 was successful because it had the support and backing of key members of both the House and Senate. Senator Barry Goldwater and Congressman Bill Nichols were both highly respected within the Congress and defense community and made good use of their political prestige and capital to influence others, such as Senator Sam Nunn and Congressman Les Aspin (146). According to Zegart (1999) GNA - 1986 was successful for two other reasons:

First, the Act passed because some of Congress's most honored leaders and military supporters staked their careers on it. Second, President Ronald Reagan stayed out of the political fray (146). The president made no grand public stand, issued no strong personal appeals, and invested no major presidential capital in either opposing or promoting Pentagon reorganization (Zegart 1999, 147).

Zegart (1999) argues that Goldwater-Nichols 1986 became a reality because all of the right factors converged (147). The success was a result of those rare and unpredictable moments when the political stars aligned (Zegart 1999, 147). According to Amy Zegart (1999, 140) the Goldwater-Nichols Act of 1986 provided the most significant change to United States defense policy since the National Security Act of 1947. Regarding Goldwater-Nichols, Douglas A. Macgregor argues the act fundamentally rearranged power on the strategic level among institutions within the Department of Defense (Macgregor 1997, 187). Congress' primary purpose in GNA-1986 was to strengthen the power of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, and to reduce the influence of the service chiefs, including the Army Chief of Staff (Macgregor 1997, 187)[2].

[2] According to Macgregor (1996) this change did not occur as intended. The author argues that the individual service chiefs still exert a degree of influence over national strategic decisions which may be disproportionate to what was envisioned in the original GNA-1986 reforms (Macgregor 1997, 189).

Zegart (1999) argues that GNA-1986 also improved the composition and administration of the Joint Staff. She argues that the Act requires officers to have a joint service assignment before promotion to general officer, which was intended to weaken service parochialism by allowing the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs to have a say in the promotion of officers, even over the objection of their respective service chiefs (Zegart 1999, 141). Finally, Zegart (1999) argues, GNA-1986 granted the unified and specified four-star combatant commanders (CINCs) more autonomy and authority over their units; units that are comprised of personnel from all services, including the Army (Zegart 1999, 141). Congress believed, according Murdock, et al (2004, 14), that by implementing GNA-1986, as just described, it would promote a more unified and joint Defense Department.

Murdock et al. (2004) argue that although GNA-1986 may be perceived as successful given the numerous military successes since its enactment, there are some unintended consequences that must be addressed. In 1986, the authors continue, the U.S. was still engaged in the Cold War with a conventional but not necessarily predictable opponent, the Soviet Union. Today, although the U.S. is the sole superpower, it is involved in a war on terror and must cope with widespread uncertainty at both the nation-state and sub-state levels.

Post Desert Storm (1991 – 1997)

Frederick W. Kagan (2006) argues that Army Chief of Staff General Gordan Sullivan began a significant effort to transform the Army immediately following the first Gulf War in 1991(Kagan 2006, 201). General Sullivan believed that the current Army was well configured to fight and win in the industrial-age and it could also win an agrarian-age foe as well in the 21st Century (203). The Chief of Staff said that the Army had begun to evolve into a new force for a new century and he referred to the Army as Force XXI (203). Thomas K. Adams (2008) argues

that Army leadership believed that Desert Storm in 1991 was the model for future wars of the Twenty-first Century, and that the Army of the Twenty-First Century, or Army XXI, would best be a capabilities-based rather than a threat-based Army since there was no pending threat in a new uni-polar world (Adams 2008, 34).

Kagan (2006, 203) argues that General Sullivan believed that Force XXI would synthesize the science and computer technology as well as the art of integrating doctrine and organization. The Chief of Staff said, according to Kagan (2006, 202), that the goal was to create new military units or organizations within the Army that operate at even greater performance levels in speed, space and time and that Force XXI would use command and control technology to leverage the power of the information age. According to Kagan (2006) both the National Defense Panel (NDP) and the Congressionally-mandated Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR)[3] in 1997 rejected the Army's defense of its own role in major war (233). Nevertheless, Kagan (2006) argues, General Sullivan as Chief of Staff, Dennis Reimer, continued Force XXI initiatives, largely because Reimer had been involved in developing Force XXI as Commander of the U.S. Army Forces Command (Kagan 2006, 239). It appeared that Congress wanted the Department of Defense to change in order to meet current and future threats; a change that may have included the departure from the more conventional Cold War strategy. Adams (2008) argues that the QDR mandated change and that the contemplative approach of the Army lacked such urgency (51). While Force XXI, which involved digitizing existing heavy combat systems, would still be the vehicle for the Army's pursuit of a capabilities-based military in the future, Adams (2008, 51) argues that the mandate for change in the QDR left the Army without a clear understanding of how it would implement such change. Adams (2008) argues that ultimately the Army could not afford to sustain the heavy Force XXI weapon systems while at the same time

[3] Both the NDP and QDR will be discussed in greater detailed below.

investing in a lighter more mobile force capability that was required for the Twenty-first Century. Transformation away from the existing weapon systems, which included Force XXI initiatives, of the Twentieth Century became a path the Army would attempt to follow (76).

The Road to the Current Transformation Effort

Frederick W. Kagan (2006) argues that the Congressionally-mandated Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) in 1997 served as the catalyst that drove the current Defense transformation efforts. The 1997 QDR was required under Section 923 of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1997 (Military Force Structure Review Act of 1996, Section 923). This Act required that the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to conduct a comprehensive examination of the defense strategy, the force structure of the active, guard and reserve components, force modernization plans, infrastructure, and other elements of the defense programs and policies in order to determine and express the defense strategy of the Unites States. Subsequent reports would be issued at the beginning of each newly elected Presidential administration; the first report would be required in 1997 (10 U.S.C. § 111[4]). Kagan (2006) adds that QDR-1997, the first such report, proposed to reduce the size of the military while at the same time sustaining a two-war fighting force; this apparent contradiction was no mistake. The QDR recognized that the military's role was growing, but it proposed a reduction in troop strength to pay for the information technology that would be needed in a "transformed" military (Kagan 2006, 233-235).

According to Kagan (2006), the National Defense Panel (NDP) in 1997 suggested that DoD was focusing on an unlikely two-war scenario in order to justify its current force structure. The NDP was also required under Section 924 of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1997. This panel was composed of a chairman and eight other individuals appointed

[4] Military Force Restructure Review Act of 1996, P.L. 104-201, Section 925

by the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives (Military Force Structure Act of 1996, Section 924). Thomas K. Adams (2008) argues that the 1997 NDP criticized the QDR, issued the same year, as being too weak. Adams argues that the NDP believed that the Defense Department was focusing too much on traditional threats using conventional means as an assumption that would inhibit transformation of the American military (Adams 2008, 49). Adams (2008) continues by arguing that Congress believed the 1997 QDR represented "business as usual" and not what they had in mind when Congress passed the 1997 Defense Act. While the NDP recommendations were much more provocative in what they suggested for the future, the actual findings were vague and did not provide Congress with a good idea of what the force structure needed to be for the future (Adams 2008, 49). The NDP opined that resources should be directed to requirements for any future military force needs and that current threat scenarios, a low-probability, will be supported by our allies (Kagan 2006, 238). Kagan argues that the NDP demanded that the Army focus on becoming lighter, more deployable, and more strategically agile (Kagan 2006, 239).

Later in this chapter, and more specifically in Chapter 5, we will see that achieving a lighter and more agile force may have been a goal of the Army Chiefs of Staff over the last decade, but defining how that goal was to be achieved may have been, and indeed may remain problematic. In addition to responding to the findings of the QDR and NDP, the Army may have been influenced in its transformation efforts from a political aspect.

Andrew J. Bacevich (2005) argues that George W. Bush campaigned in 2000 on the promise of transforming the Department of Defense if he were to be elected president of the

United States (172). Mr. Bush did win that election and immediately directed his Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, to proceed with transforming the military.

He did not get very far. Bacevich argues that the generals and admirals were engaged in efforts of what they deemed to be transformation for their respective services; however, they were largely wedded to their existing weapon systems, force structure and strategies. Adams (2008) argues that generals may have been on a course to modify existing weapon systems, a path that the NDP advised against when it suggested that nothing less than a transformation of the entire U.S. military was needed to meet challenging threats (49). The generals were more than willing to allow Secretary Rumsfeld to talk about transformation so long as he did not interfere with their priorities (Bacevich 2005, 173).

John Yoo (2009) argues that Secretary Rumsfeld and the uniformed military struggled over the Bush administration's transformation policy to make America's military forces lighter, faster and better equipped for unconventional conflict by relying on high-technology and information advantages (Yoo 2009, 2288). Yoo (2009) argues that U.S. Army Chief of Staff General Eric Shinseki may have favored keeping the focus on the large armored units designed for a broad conflict against a major power in the early months of the Bush Administration (2296). If Yoo's view of General Shinseki's preference for heavy armored systems is accurate, then it appears to contradict General Shinseki's vision of a lighter and more mobile military forces. According to Yoo (2009) there was a conflict between Bush administration officials who preferred a force shaped for smaller conflicts, civil wars, nation building, and humanitarian missions that better reflected the realities of the 1990s, while military leaders, such as General Shinseki, preferred the conflicts that emphasized defeating an enemy quickly with an overwhelming force, defined goals, and a clear exit strategy (Yoo 2009, 2296). General

Shinseki's plan to achieve a lighter force for the future may not have been aggressive enough for Secretary Rumsfeld.

Andrew F. Krepinevich (2008) argues that General Shinseki envisioned a more expeditionary force that would be achieved as technology became available; a force that would still concentrate on decisively winning conventional style battles and giving little consideration to the other capabilities highlighted by Bush administration officials (Krepinevich 2008, 9 – 10). Jeremy Shapiro and Lynn Davis (2003) argue that General Shinseki wanted to create a light armored force capable of being deployed very quickly anywhere in the world. In order to achieve this vision, General Shinseki wanted to keep the current heavy force, buy an interim but lighter set of weapon systems that had already been developed (off-the-shelf), and design a future force (the Future Combat Systems) that would be lighter but equivalent to the current heavy weapon systems (Shapiro and Davis 2003, 22). Efforts to transform the Army early in the Bush administration appeared to pit civilian authority against military expertise. The effectiveness of that same authority may be necessary if the Army is to be successful in achieving such radical change in the future.

Conclusion

By all appearances the United States Army is now attempting to transform from the heavy fighting force of the twentieth century to a lighter, modular, and more mobile force needed to confront the threats of the twenty-first century. In order to fully transform, or to achieve radical change the culture of the Army may first need to be changed. According to Richard Lacquement, Jr. (2010) in order to get the large bureaucracy of the Army to understand fundamentals requires an apparatus to organize, train, equip, maintain and operate. Lacquement

(2010) argues that the Army must build flexibility and versatility into its very nature; that it must see "modularity not only as a way to organize forces but also as a way to organize itself as an organization (Lacquement 2010, 31). If what Lacquement (2010) provides is true, then an inference may be that the Army, after over a decade of effort, has not transformed itself as General Shinseki had envisioned.

If the Army is to depart from its focus on conventional warfare, then what evidence is there that the focus has indeed shifted to the non-conventional threats of the twenty-first century? Andrew Krepinevich (2009) argues that the Army has proposed spending over $150 billion on the Future Combat Systems (FCS) family of combat vehicles. Krepinevich (2009) argues that the FCS is optimized for traditional conventional warfare rather than the persistent irregular warfare that is being confronted in the 21st Century. Although Secretary of Defense, Robert Gates, has in effect cancelled all procurement of FCS, as Krepinevich (2009) continues, the Army's senior leadership is still stuck in the 20th Century and planning against what it knows best; the conventional threat of another heavy force sponsored by a nation-state? If this is true then this could present a problem. If senior leaders refuse to let go of conventional methods of warfare while framing them in the context of Army Transformation, and field grade officers are considering Army Transformation through a paradigm of warfare in the 21st Century then there could be a significant gap.

Christopher Paparone (2004) argues that the Army assumes that strategic leaders, or those in the highest positions, are its most influential members. There is no way of knowing, Paparone argues, if members of the Army organization will understand or even act on strategic leaders' intentions. Paparone says it is doubtful if military leaders in positions of authority can control how people make sense of the world. This top-down Army Transformation process may

be a problem in dealing with the cultural transformation that also needs to occur (Paporone 2004, 4). There may be a gap in how Army Transformation which may be indicative of a much broader concern.

The Army is a culture that may not respond to change very easily. According to Paul Yingling (2007) America's defeat in Vietnam is the most egregious failure in the history of American arms. Yingling blames general officers for not preparing the Army to fight unconventional wars, despite warnings that such preparations were necessary. Yingling says that President Kennedy warned of "another type of war" new in its intensity, ancient in its origin – war by guerillas, subversives, insurgents, assassins, war by ambush instead of by combat, by infiltration instead of aggression, seeking victory by evading and exhausting the enemy instead of engaging him. Yingling goes on to argue that President Kennedy undertook a comprehensive plan to prepare U.S. armed forces for counterinsurgency. America's generals, led by then Chief of Staff of the Army General George Decker, failed to prepare the army for counterinsurgency, insisting that soldiers could handle guerilla tactics and therefore proceeded into Vietnam with a conventional mindset (Yingling 2007). This is an example of at least one broader concern if senior level leaders, namely the Chief of Staff of the Army acting in his role as principal, and mid-career officers, namely lieutenant colonels and majors in the role of agents, are not in agreement on what Army Transformation means.

This gap could be significant in the context of trying to radically change a large bureaucratic organization. The research questions remain relevant. Is there a gap between how senior Army leaders define Army Transformation and the way in which Army lieutenant colonels and majors understand it? Does the term Army Transformation indeed have a different meaning based on whether you are the Chief of Staff of the Army or whether you are a lieutenant

colonel or a major? This difference in definition, if there is one, could result in a communication problem throughout this large bureaucratic organization. If there is a gap in how Army Transformation is defined or understood, then how do U.S. Army planners define Army Transformation? Do Army planners focus on the well established conventional aspect of twentieth century warfare, or do they take into consideration the irregular scenarios that may exist in the twenty-first century? If planners are supporting the Army Chiefs of Staff in preparing the Army for future scenarios, then how do the planners define Transformation? If there is no clear threat scenario that can be identified in the context of the twenty-first century, does Army Transformation need to be defined in the first place? Does the Army simply plan for what it knows how to do best and within the cultural framework that currently exists? If transformation does not need to be defined, then perhaps the senior leadership of the Army should not use transformation in describing what it is trying to achieve. The complexity associated with trying to transform a large bureaucracy is a challenging undertaking for any public or private organization. How the goal of transformation is conveyed by senior leadership, and how that goal is understood by mid-career actors, is the purpose of this dissertation.

References

Adams, Thomas K. 2008. *The Army after Next: The First Postindustrial Army.* Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Addington, Larry H. 1994. *The Patterns of War since the Eighteenth Century,* 2d ed. Indianapolis: Indianapolis University

Allison, Graham and Philip Zelikow. 1999. *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis,* 2d. ed. New York: Longman

Bacevich, Andrew J. 2005. *The New American Militarism: How Americans are Seduced by War.* New York: Oxford University

Cloud, David and Greg Jaffe. 2009. *The Fourth Star: Four Generals and the Epic Struggle for the Future of the United States Army*. New York: Crown.

Hollister, Eric A. 2010. A Shot in the Dark: The Futility of Long-Range Modernization Planning. *The Land Warfare Papers No. 79*. Arlington: The Institute of Land Warfare

Johnson, David E. 2000. "From Frontier Constabulary to Modern Army: The U.S. Army between the World Wars." *The Challenge of Change: Military Institutions and New Realities, 1918 – 1941,* Harold R. Winton and David R. Mets, eds.. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press

Jones, Vincent C. 1969. Transition and Change, 1902 – 1917. *American Military History*, Maurice Matlof, gen. ed.. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Army

Kagan, Frederick W. 2006. *Finding the Target: The Transformation of American Military Policy*. New York: Encounter Books.

Krepinevich, Andrew F. 2009. "The Pentagon's Wasting Assets: Washington's Fading Ability to Project Power – and What to Do About it." *Foreign Affairs* 88 (July/August): 18-33.

Krepinevich, Andre F. 2008. *An Army at the Crossroads: Strategy for the long run*.Washington, D.C.: The Center for Strategic and Budget Assessments

Lacquement, Jr., Richard A. 2010. "In the Army Now." *The American Interest* VI. (September/October): 27-31.

Macgregor, Douglas A. 1997. *Breaking the Phalanx: A New Design for Landpower in the 21st Century*. Westport: Praeger

Military Force Structure Review Act. 1996. National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997, 10 U.S.C. § 111, P.L. 104-201, Sections 921 – 924.

Murdock, Cark A., Michele A. Flournoy, Christopher A. Williams and Kurt M. Campbell. 2004. *Beyond Goldwater-Nichols: Defense Reform For a New Strategic Era.* Washington, D.C.: Center for Strategic and International Studies. Phase 1 Report. March

Roman, Peter J. and David W. Tarr. 1998. The Joint Chiefs of Staff: From Service Parochialism to Jointness. *Political Science Quarterly* 113(1): 91–111.

Segal, David R. and Mady Wechsler Segal. 1983. "Change in Military Organization." *Annual Review of Sociology* 9: 151 - 170

Shapiro, Jeremy and Lynn E. Davis. 2003. The New National Security Strategy. Chapter 2 in The U.S. Army and the National Security Strategy, Lynn E. Davis and Jeremy Shapiro, eds. Santa Monica: Rand Arroyo Center

Stulberg, Adam N., Michael D. Salomone and Austin G. Long. 2007. *Managing Defense Transformation: Agency, Culture and Service Change*. Burlington: Ashgate.

Weigley, Russell. 1973. *The American Way of War: A History of United States Military Strategy and Policy*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press

Wilson, James Q. 1989. *Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It*. New York: Basic Books

Yingling, Paul. 2007. A Failure in Generalship. *Armed Forces Journal*. May http://www.armedforcesjournal.com/2007/05/2635198. (December 11, 2010)

Yoo, John. 2009. *Administration of War*. Duke Law Journal. 58:2277. June. 2278 - 2311

Zegart, Amy B. 1999. *Flawed By Design: The Evolution of the CIA, JCS, and NSC*. Stanford: Stanford University

CHAPTER 3

LITERATURE REVIEW

The first chapter of this dissertation identified the problem that exists in defining Army Transformation and discussed the gap that may exist in the literature pertaining to significant change in a large bureaucratic organization. The second chapter provided a background of transformation efforts within the U.S. Army throughout the Twentieth Century. In this chapter, I will review past research which could prove useful when examining the transformation of large bureaucratic organizations such as the United States Army.

The current literature will be reviewed in order to determine under what conditions effective transformative change may occur within a large bureaucracy. Specifically, the literature will be reviewed in order to determine what may cause transformation to either succeed or fail. This literature review will address the theoretical aspects associated with bureaucracies and how they plan for significant or radical change. Stulberg, Salomone and Long (2007) argue that military transformation is a dynamic process that translates vague visions of war into mature, innovative outcomes resulting in changes of goals, existing strategies and the military organization itself (Stulberg, Salomone and Long 2007, 14). The ability to execute this dynamic change may face a number of difficulties inherent in changing large organizations.

This literature review will also examine how experts on the topic of military organization change view Army Transformation. As much as the Army seeks to transform itself from that of the Cold War era, the organizational culture of this particular bureaucracy may only serve to limit the successes that may be achieved. Failure may be possible if goals are not well defined and understood throughout the bureaucracy.

Transforming the United States Army from that of the Cold War era to an army that is needed to confront the international threats of today may involve a significant policy challenge. The purpose here is to determine how the United States Army senior leadership has confronted transformation and how field grade officers view those efforts. Engaging in significant organizational change, or transforming, from what currently is to what needs to be is perhaps the most significant issue facing the United States Army today. Due to the high investment of resources necessary to achieve Army Transformation, it is important also to know if senior Army leaders and field grade officers view transformation similarly. It is also important that Army planners understand the meaning of transformation so that the directives that are provided by senior-Army leaders are expressed accurately by way of changes to Army doctrine and organizational structure.

The literature may show that by using a term such as "transformation" to describe how a large bureaucracy is changing significantly may not necessarily be clear to mid-level leaders within such an organization. If the term "Army Transformation" has a different meaning to different actors, especially over time, is it important to even define the term within the bureaucracy? The subcultures that may exist within the culture of the Army may never agree on the meaning of Army Transformation. Any agreement within the Army may be especially difficult to achieve if senior leaders refer to transformation as both an end-state tied to a specific goal, or as a process for which there is no specific goal. According to Graham T. Allison (1969), the government consists of organizations with each having standard operating procedures (SOPs) and established programs. The behavior of these organizations, Allison argues, is determined by routines that have been previously established. Graham states that change does occur but that learning takes place gradually over time.

Graham (1969) argues that dramatic organizational change, or transformative change, occurs in response to a major crisis but that both learning and change occur based on existing organizational capabilities (Allison 1969, 698). It is difficult to determine what specific major crisis, as Allison argues, the Army may be responding to that would necessitate dramatic organizational change. The Army appears to be attempting transformative change in order to avert a major crisis for which it believes it is currently not prepared to address. Radical change may therefore be difficult to achieve.

The Difficulty of Defining Goals

Radical change as a goal may not only be hard to define, but it may also be difficult to achieve once it is understood. Greenwood and Hinings (1996) argue that radical change occurs when an organization moves from one template to another, in that this radical change represents the breaking of the mold defined by an interpretive scheme associated with what may be currently known (Greenwood and Hinings 1996, 1026). The authors continue by adding that the more embedded processes are the more problematic the achievement of radical change may become. If U.S. Army officers tasked with implementing aspect of transformation are unclear about what radical change means to them, then they may be more committed to the status quo, or the prevailing institutional template of which they are more familiar (Greenwood and Hinings 1996, 1035).

Additionally, Adrianna Kezar (2005) argues that radical change involves the busting loose from an existing orientation and the entire transformation of organizing principles and structures (Kezar 2005, 636). The author continues by stating that radical change is complex and wide-ranging, requiring dramatic changes in strategy and abrupt departures from traditional

work, structures, job requirements, and cultures which in turn necessitate a complete overhaul of the way things are organized (Kezar 2005, 636). If this is accurate, then field grade officers may prefer the status quo if they cannot grasp the complex nature of transformative change.

Louis C. Gawthrop (1969) argues that in any large and complex bureaucratic organization, goals can rarely be stated in clear and precise terms. Gawthrop states that goals are not intended to provide objective and rational definitions of purpose, but are intended to provide the basic elements needed to gain an emotional, ethical, or normative commitment from the individual manager within the bureaucracy (Gawthrop 1969, 13). Gawthrop continues by offering that goals in large organizations represent broad generalizations which are quite ambiguous but are at the same time easily adaptable throughout the organization.

But are these goals being adapted as intended? Gawthrop (1969) argues that goals must be expressed in terms that are understood by the different subcultures that may exist within the organization. Gawthrop continues by arguing that in order for all of the subunits to adapt, the organization must lose some control over its component subunits, largely as a result of those subunits implementing new goals with some level of discretion (Gawthrop 1969, 13). If goals at the top of the bureaucracy are ambiguous, as provided by Gawthrop (1969), then there may be a conflict in how well top-down policy implementation works within a large bureaucracy. When field grade officers, or mid-level bureaucrats, are allowed to implement new goals with some level of discretion, then the true meaning of transformation, as intended from the top levels of the organization, may be lost.

Janet Coble Vincent and Lane Crothers (1998) argue that the top-down implementation model assumes that policy directives are to be turned into programs with as little deviation as

possible (Vincent and Crothers 1998, 57). These authors argue that policy makers provide only important decisions and that street-level actors may only serve to follow the correct implementation process, or to thwart it by making changes. Vincent and Crothers argue that any deviation from the policy would be seen as illegitimate (Vincent and Crothers 1998, 57). Changes in policy may be made by field grade officers, or street-level bureaucrats, as they endeavor to implement programs as a result of not understanding what the policy truly means. The field grade officers may therefore be integral to the success of transformation by having an understanding of the actual intent of senior level officers, and then implementing their respective programs that will result in successful transformation throughout the Army..

Army Transformation: A Principal-Agent Challenge?

The relationship between the Army Chief of Staff and the lieutenant colonels and majors may best be described in the context of Principal-Agent Theory. Thomas Sowers (2005) argues that Principal-Agent Theory began in the area of microeconomic analysis and was used in the context of business (388). Sowers states that Principal-Agent Theory is primarily concerned with hierarchical relationships between two sets of actors, principals and agents (Sowers 2005, 388). Principals are the actors, Sowers continues, within a hierarchical relationship in which authority ultimately resides; agents are the actors hired by the principals and delegated a certain level authority to perform actions on the principal's behalf (Sowers 2005, 388).

Terry M. Moe (1984) makes a similar distinction by offering that the principal and agent is an analytic expression of the agency relationship in which the principal enters into a contractual relationship with the agent with the idea that the agent will produce results that are desired by the principal (Moe 1984, 756). There are numerous examples of a principal-agent

relationship, according to Moe, that include: lawyer-client, doctor-patient, broker-investor; politician-citizen, and employer-employee (Moe 1984, 756).

The last example, that of the employer-employee relationship within a hierarchical structure, may be representative of the Principal-Agent association shared by the Army Chief of Staff and lieutenant colonels and majors. Sowers (2005) argues that the way higher military authorities influence subordinate commands are representative of power, delegation, monitoring and punishment found in the principal-agent model (Sowers 2005, 391). Sowers (2005) continues by stating that higher military principals delegate power to subordinate military agents; these agents in turn become principals, delegating their power to their military subordinates. At each level, relationships with subordinates meet the criteria of an established hierarchy and a delegation contract (Sowers 2005, 391).

If the Chief of Staff of the Army (only one senior leader at a time fills that particular role in the Army) is the principal and the lieutenant colonels and majors (of which there are several thousand serving in uniform at any given time[5]) are the agents, then Principal-Agency Theory may be useful in addressing the relationship between these two levels within the Army. Although there are many colonels as well as general officers between the Chief of Staff of the Army and these two levels of field grade officers (lieutenant colonels and majors), one may accept that the Chief of Staff, as a principal, provides the vision and goals for the lieutenant colonels and majors, the agents, to achieve.

A senior Army officer is appointed to serve as the Chief of Staff of the Army by the President of the United States. That appointee is then confirmed by the United States Senate for

[5] CGSC estimates that there are between 15,000 and 17,000 lieutenant colonels and between 20,000 and 22,000 majors serving on active duty in the Army at any given time.

that position. Although the Chief of Staff is the most senior uniformed actor in the Army, he may not be able to change everything that he desires. Susan Shapiro (2005) argues, it is not necessarily the case that the principal is "in the driver's seat" on all matters pertaining to specifying preferences, creating incentives and making contracts that agents must follow. Shapiro argues that when principals are "one-shotters", as in the case of Army Chiefs of Staff (that is to say that being an Army Chief of Staff is in effect a four-year political appointment and that those actors come and go and serve at the pleasure of the president) and agents are repeat players, as in the case of lieutenant colonels and majors (these field grade officers may serve at these two levels for up to 10 years total), then the asymmetry of power shifts from the principal to the agents (Shapiro 2005, 267). As agents outlast their principals, Shapiro continues, the balance of power between principal and agent may shift in favor of the agents (Shapiro 2005, 269). The inference is that just because someone is appointed Chief of Staff of the Army does not mean that person will have complete knowledge, or indeed control, over all aspects of the organization; in the case of the United States Army, the field grade officers, as agents, may possess an information advantage. The complex Principal-Agent relationship between these two levels of officers within the Army may be exacerbated when civilian leaders are involved.

Terry M. Moe (1984) argues that the principal-agent model is an analytic expression of the agency relationship, in which two parties consisting of a "principal" and an "agent" enter into a contractual relationship with one another. The agent is therefore expected to produce the outcomes desired by the principal (Moe 1984, 746). However, the principal may be at a disadvantage with regard to knowledge. The principal seeks out agents, Moe argues, for a variety of reasons, but one notable reason would be due to the size and complexity of a certain task requiring coordinated action, such as in the case of Army Transformation.

Shapiro (2005) argues that although principals delegate authority to agents, the goals of principals and agents may conflict due to asymmetries of information. Principals therefore, according to Shapiro, cannot be assured that agents are carrying out their will (Shapiro 2005, 271). Despite these information asymmetries, Moe (1984) argues, bureaucratic superiors try to control bureaucratic subordinates. Moe provides also that different types of bureaucrats will exercise control toward different ends, depending on which motivational methods are appropriate for their purposes. Political appointees, such as in the case of the Army Chiefs of Staff, will not exercise control in the same way as career officials. (Moe 1984, 764).

Andrew J. Bacevich (2005) argues that the military is led by an officer corps that has evolved its own and well-defined worldview and political agenda. Senior military officers have sought to wield clout well beyond the realm falling within their normal purview. Bacevich (2005) states that they not only want to execute policy but they want a large say in its formulation. These senior officers, Bacevich continues, have demonstrated considerable skill at waging bureaucratic warfare by manipulating the press as well as playing the executive branch off against the legislative branch in order to achieve their ends (Bacevich 2005, 30). Career officials who operate within the Army's bureaucracy may be less inclined to seek control in the same way as the Chief of Staff. The manner in which Army Transformation is pursued may be different from one Army Chief of Staff to the next. These changes in leadership may cause field grade officers to receive mixed messages about what is truly intended.

Richard Waterman and Kenneth Meier (1998) argue that the principal seeks to manipulate and mold the behavior of agents so that they will perform according to the principal's expectations. The authors also suggest that there is a likelihood of shirking if the preferences of principals and agents diverge, if there are high levels of uncertainty, or if the agent has a distinct

information advantage (Waterman and Meier 1998, 176-177). Waterman and Meier continue to argue that because there is goal conflict between principals and agents, agents have the incentive to shirk, or to engage in activities that do not meet the expectations of the principal. The information asymmetry allows bureaucrats to be unresponsive. A problem may exist, argues Waterman and Meier, when there may be multiple principals that may not agree on goals. Goal conflict among principals makes the relationship between principals and agents exceedingly complex (Waterman and Meier 1998, 179). Army field grade officers, at the lieutenant colonel and major level, may view there being numerous principals consisting of the complete command structure that exists within the Army between these field grade officers and the Chief of Staff, which may cause some confusion regarding what the Army Chief of Staff really intends by Army Transformation.

Stulberg, Salomone and Long (2007) argue that in order to be successful, military transformation must develop from a strategic interaction between service entrepreneurs, serving as the principals who decide new general directions and how to evaluate their progress, and their subordinate organizations, or agents that possess the expertise and responsibility for refining and carrying out innovative practices (Stulberg, Salomone and Long 2007, 184). That is, the principals who are empowered to introduce fundamental (revolutionary, transformative, or reform) change and to set performance targets within an organization depend on agents, those with greater technical expertise and that are closer to the practical effects of change. These agents will be best for refining, assessing and implementing new visions and forms of behavior (Stulberg, Salomone and Long 2007, 38). In order to maximize the effect of this relationship, the agents (field grade officers) will most likely need to clearly understand and support the intent of

the principal, in this case, the Chief of Staff of the Army. However, agents may not always be willing to support the principal even if the goal is well understood by them.

Agents may adversely affect Army Transformation efforts that have been either clearly expressed or vaguely conveyed by the principals. According to Stulberg, Salomone and Long (2007, 42) agents can fail to put forward a good faith effort in support of the principal's interests, even colluding with other agencies to slow the effects of transformation. If senior leaders are not clear where they are headed with transformation, agents can exploit that lack of specific direction by withholding information, providing inadequate advice, and presenting analysis and technical data that either supports the status quo or generates questions about the new direction (Stulberg, Salomone and Long 2007, 42). Agents behaving in this matter would be regarded as unethical and would not generally be tolerated in the Army, but how would a principal know that this sabotage and/or foot dragging even occurred in the first place? Without a clear understanding from senior leadership, what responsibilities are the agents shirking? Transformative change may be more difficult to accomplish within a relatively short timeframe, whereas an incremental approach may produce more favorable results for a large organization, over a longer period, because it may be more clearly understood by the agents.

Bureaucratic Aspects of Army Transformation

The previous section described the relationship between principals and agents. Arguably, principals and agents exist in their relationship with one another in the context of a large organization or institution. It is helpful also to look at the bureaucracy as the venue in which these principals and agents must operate. Any significant change in the Army most likely will need to occur within the existing bureaucratic structure of the Army. The accomplishment of significant change will rely on the bureaucratic culture, the innovative capability of the

bureaucracy, communication processes of the bureaucracy, and the ability of the bureaucracy to build consensus throughout the organization. Additionally, achieving significant or transformative change may be difficult if not impossible to achieve, within the framework of a large bureaucratic organization where there are many actors involved with differing interests. Finally, difficulties of identifying problems and defining transformation within a large bureaucracy may hinder any large-scale change. Each of these important points will be discussed in the following section.

Bureaucratic Culture

James Q. Wilson (1989) argues that all government organizations have one or more cultures. He holds such cultures are comprised of the predisposition of its members, which are made up of different personalities. The technology of the organization, and the situational imperatives with which the agency must cope, give an organization a unique way of seeing and operating in the world (Wilson 1989, 105). Wilson argues that the imperatives of the situation more than the attitudes of the worker may shape the way tasks are formed (Wilson 1989, 53). Wilson goes on to say that the further managers (i.e. senior leaders within the Army) are removed from the actual work of the agency, the more their lives are shaped not by the tasks being performed, or the goals the agency is serving, but by the constraints placed on the agency by the political environment (Wilson 1989, 260). If senior Army leaders are influenced more by the external environment that includes Congress, other executive agencies and departments, as well as the Department of Defense, then there is perhaps little room, comparatively, to consider the opinions of field grade officers within the Army framework on matters pertaining to transformation.

Wilson (1989) states that tasks that are not part of the agency culture will not be supported with the same level of energy and resources as are devoted to traditional tasks. For instance, Wilson uses the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) as an example of an agency that resisted the new tasks of investigating organized crime and narcotics trafficking, even though these two areas were clearly federal violations and could easily have been within the FBI's jurisdiction (Wilson 1989, 107). Investigating these two areas, Wilson argues, required FBI agents to behave in ways that ran counter to the agency's culture and was therefore deemed to be too risky by some key officials.

Where two or more cultures struggle for supremacy there will be a serious conflict as defenders of one aspect of the organization endeavors to dominate representatives of the other. Agencies will tend to resist taking on new tasks that seem incompatible with its dominant culture (Wilson 1989, 107-109). Using Wilson's (1989) argument, there may be a hesitancy of some within the Army to accept the Future Combat Systems (FCS) as the panacea for Army Transformation. If a bureaucrat's program (i.e. a weapon system) does not fit into the FCS model, then it may be reasonable for them to assume that their program may be at risk and therefore they may be resistant to change.

In a bureaucratic organization such as the Army James Q. Wilson (1989) argues that standard operating procedures (SOPs) are pervasive. In fact SOPs are so pervasive that how operators go about their jobs is more important than whether doing those jobs produces the desired results (Wilson 1989, 164). In other words, there is little opportunity to "change" a method of operation and to make recommendations up the chain of command to senior leaders. This perhaps best represents the environment of the peace-time Army. In war the SOPs, or procedural methods, are replaced by craft organizations. A craft organization, Wilson argues, is

one in which members do not operate under the direct guidance of managers. A craft organization, unlike a procedural organization where a manager can observe what subordinates are doing but are not necessarily able to observe a particular outcome, consists of subordinates whose activities are hard to observe but whose outcomes are relatively easy to evaluate (Wilson 1989, 163-165). If Army Transformation is occurring in the context of a peace-time Army dominated by SOPs and procedures, then how do senior leaders engage in effective communication with the operators at the lieutenant colonel and major level? Allison and Zelikow (1999) argue that organizations, such as the U.S. Army, are so large that they prevent any single central authority from making all important decisions or directing all important activities (167). This fact may add credence to the need for standard operating procedures, which allow for procedures to be standardized but prevent them from being changed quickly or easily (Allison and Zelikow 1999, 169).

Bureaucratic Innovation

James Q. Wilson (1989) argues that government agencies resist innovation because they are supposed to resist it. The author argues that SOPs are not the enemy of the organization, they are instead the very essence of organization and that organizations will readily accept inventions that facilitate the performance of *existing* arrangements (Wilson 1989, 221- 222). For example, Wilson argues that improvements in communications tend to be used by higher-level commanders to reduce initiative and the discretion of lower-level commanders. Wilson continues by arguing that armies that are most successful are those that did not attempt to control everything from the top, and instead allowed subordinate commanders considerable latitude (Wilson 1989, 228). If one of the attributes of FCS, as the transformation centerpiece, is to provide top-level commanders with complete battlefield information, thereby encroaching on the

discretion of subordinate commanders to make on-the-ground decisions, then lieutenant colonels and majors may be resistant to this type of intrusive capability.

A case in point, Wilson (1989) argues, is that the American Army might have been more effective in Vietnam had it not been organized around technological innovations that turned out to be inappropriate to the circumstances. Wilson says that the availability of the helicopter, the computer and sophisticated communications systems made it very convenient to centralize control of the war in the hands of a distant headquarters. Jobs once performed by sergeants, captains and majors, Wilson argues, were being performed by colonels, generals and politicians (Wilson 1989, 43). If lieutenant colonels and majors view the Army Chief of Staff's intentions of fielding FCS, or any other high technology capability, as an ability to centralize control at the highest level, then there may be a resistance in complying with senior leadership's goals.

Donald Van Meter and Carl Van Horn (1975) argue that a reason reform may fail has to do with the amount of change that is actually required and the level of consensus that is required. Van Meter and Van Horn suggest that implementation will be most successful where only marginal change is required and goal consensus is high. If Army senior leadership intends to make broad sweeping changes in doctrine, weaponry and force structure, over a relatively short period of time, then there is less likelihood of success because of the magnitude that may be involved and the general lack of consensus on the part of bureaucrats and street-level actors. Herbert Kaufman (1960) argues that a high degree of conformity presents a certain set of risks, where in a dynamic world where changes occur, policies and procedures must change if an organization is to survive and prosper (234). Kaufman states that flexibility depends on the conception of new ideas and the adoption of the best ones. Middle-managers and street-level bureaucrats who are committed to an established organization's goals and customary ways, and

dedicated to its traditions, are not likely to experiment a great deal (Kaufman 1960). This means that actors at this level may be comfortable with the status quo, because they at least understand it and are not threatened by validating something new that they do not entirely understand or endorse.

Senior Army leadership may not be overly concerned with creativity and receptivity at the middle-level management level. The three and four-star level Army officers, along with senior level bureaucrats and political appointees, may not be interested in the opinions of middle-level managers or street-level bureaucrats. Status, or differences in rank, serves as a divisive element in many organizations which cause a filtering and a distorting of communications up and down the chain of command (Kaufman 1960, 235 – 236). Because most career officers do not want to rock the boat, they may tell senior Army leaders, when given the opportunity, only what they think they want to hear. Additionally, senior officials may not even be concerned with or take seriously what subordinates have to say, and do not give them the same level of respect as information received from another senior official (Kaufman 1960, 66). If this is the case, then the degree to which middle-level managers and street-level bureaucrats can impact successful implementation in the Army will always be less than optimal unless the culture is changed.

Bureaucratic Communication

Jeffrey L. Pressman and Aaron Wildavsky (1984) argue that successful implementation depends upon some collaboration between different organizations and departments at the local level. If there is action that is required by a number of agencies or organizations, as in the case of Army Transformation, then the degree of cooperation between those groups needs to be nearly perfect if there is to be successful implementation. Pressman and Wildavsky (1984) argue that if linkages between organizations is less than 100%, then those small deficits will accumulate and

create a large shortfall, or implementation deficit. The Army, up and down and across the chain of command, may be in general agreement that transformation needs to occur, indeed they may be in general agreement about what needs to occur, but if there is any lack of commitment and or availability of resources then there may be an implementation deficit that could cause significant problems, not the least of which is some level of goal failure.

Pressman and Wildavsky (1984) argue that a policy's content shapes implementation by defining the arena in which the process takes place, the identity and role of the principal actors, the range of permissible tools for action, and supplying of resources (Pressman and Wildavsky 1984, 174). This framework sets the stage for what should result in successful implementation, or goal success. All participants should be ready to contribute, as a result of effective coordination, to achieve a common purpose at the right time and in the right amount. If this does not occur, the authors claim, then it is possible that actors are ineffective because of ignorance, or they may disagree with how the goal is to be achieved, thereby demonstrating some level of disobedience. If actors A and B disagree with goal C, then they will only coordinate by being told what to do by someone in the chain of command (Pressman and Wildavsky1984, 133). This type of coercive power may not be ideal when "buy-in", collaboration, coordination and understanding may be needed for effective implementation in an organization the size of the United States Army.

The Army may need to depart from existing "Cold War" standard operating procedures and begin the process of considering what is needed for a non-bipolar world environment; where there is only one hegemonic force (the United States) faced with uncertain threats. Stulberg, Salomone and Long (2007) argue that military organizations are run by commanders who set doctrinal, strategic, operational, tactical, procurement objectives; and sub-units that are

responsible for implementing these tasks. The success of the military, these authors provide, depends on the senior levels of the military operating in unison with the sub-units, thereby permitting a smooth implementation of recognized new ways of war (Stulberg, Salomone and Long 2007, 184). The authors indicate that there is a natural conflict of interest, however, between these two levels within the military. The sub-units seek to maintain professional autonomy and are committed to performing their tasks subject to the constraints imposed by commanders; while commanders are primarily interested in those tasks performed by the sub-units that bear directly on their preferred objectives (184 – 185).

Stulberg, Salomone and Long (2007) add that when a new task is added it serves to be even more problematic. Senior leaders must therefore put in place mechanisms that lower the costs of monitoring and enforcing change for the commanders and that increase the incentives and inclinations for compliance among sub-units (Stulberg, Salomone and Long 2007, 185). Any new organizational change, especially significant change, may then be met with resistance and necessary coordination may not be achieved.

Bureaucratic Consensus

Charles Lindblom ([1959] 2005) argues that for complex problems to be solved there is an assumption that intellectual capacities and sources of information exist, along with the necessary time and money, as needed. Lindblom states that public administrators are most often discouraged from tackling complex problems and are instead encouraged to address problems by using a more incremental approach (Lindblom [1959] 2005, 27). Army Transformation, according to Lindblom's incremental theory, may have a better chance of success if it is executed over a longer period of time. John Kingdon (2003) argues that proposals that call for change are more likely to survive if they are compatible with the specialists, or those individuals who will

assess the technical feasibility of the proposed change. According to Kingdon, proposals may not be taken seriously if it does not represent any mainstream thinking. Any proposal that does not fit with the specialists' values have less of a chance for survival than those that do (Kingdon 2003, 132-133). If Army lieutenant colonels and majors can be substituted for Kingdon's term "specialists", then Army Transformation may be difficult to achieve if these field grade officers do not incorporate this change into their existing set of values.

Charles Lindblom ([1959] 2005) argues that policy-makers, or public administrators along the line of senior Army leaders, realize that policies will only achieve some of what was intended and at the same time produce unintended consequences that they would prefer to avoid. By taking a more incremental approach to policy implementation or in implementing change, mistakes can be avoided. Lindblom says that (1) past experiences will provide foresight regarding consequences of further steps; (2) they need not take such big steps that would require predictions beyond anyone else's knowledge because a single step is not the last step; (3) they are able to test their previous predictions as they move on to the next step; and, (4) they can resolve an earlier error rather quickly, certainly more quickly than if there were more steps spread out over a longer period of time (Lindblom [1959] 2005, 37). This step process may be helpful as policymakers and implementers learn more about the change that they are trying to achieve. Charles Lindblom argues that most people approach policy problems within a framework given by their view of a chain of successive policy choices made up to the current time. Finally, Lindblom argues that the policymaker and the implementers do not share common knowledge, and consequently they may be thinking about the policy in different ways that may be puzzling to both (Lindblom [1959] 2005, 39). This difference in understanding between the policymaker and implementers may be quite costly because the consequences could result in

significant policy failure. Policy failure in terms of Army Transformation may be quite costly in terms of dollars spent and time wasted on programs that may not be relevant to Army Transformation. Even if a change is executed incrementally, there still may be many actors with their own interpretation of what needs to be accomplished in order to achieve a goal.

Charles E. Lindblom ([1959] 2005) advocates that policy should be achieved through a process he refers to as Successive Limited Comparisons. That is, policy is continually building out from the current situation, step-by-step and in small degrees. Changes in policy should be limited to those policies that differ in relatively small degrees. Since he refers to only small changes, Lindblom argues that it is only necessary, then, to study those aspects in which the changes or alternatives differ from the status quo. The status quo, regarding military transformation may need an overhaul and may require more than an incremental approach to policy change. Public bureaucracies, according to William Lowry (2008), are unlikely to pursue controversial policy changes to traditional goals except under particular circumstances. They are: (1) formal authorities must endorse the changes in real, explicit, resourceful, and binding ways; (2) non-statutory variables including socioeconomic conditions, media attention, public opinion, and target-group compliance, must be receptive to change (290). The "formal authorities" to whom Lowry refers may include the important political actors referred to by Kingdon (2003) earlier. The "non-statutory" variables may include Kingdon's (2003) specialists in the policy community who may have a stake in the outcome of any significant change. Since transforming the Army may be a rather large undertaking for a public organization to pursue, then formulating the policy that will allow that to happen may also be considered a mammoth undertaking.

Army Transformation as a Wicked Problem

To the degree that there are divergent views regarding Army Transformation, a certain level of social complexity may exist. Complexity, along with SOP's, culture and communication, is yet another factor that could hinder the understanding that lieutenant colonels and majors should have about transformation. The more actors that are involved in collaboration, the more socially complex activities become.

Similarly, the more different the actors are, the more socially complex things become (Conklin 2005, 3). According to Conklin (2005), Rittel argues that with a wicked problem you do not understand the problem until you have developed a solution. Wicked problems have no stopping rule and solutions are not right or wrong. Every wicked problem is essentially unique and novel, thus every solution is a one-shot operation; and, wicked problems have no given alternative solutions (Conklin 2005, 10). Horst Rittel and Melvin Webber (1973) suggest wicked problems do not have the clarifying traits relative to those associated with natural sciences or mathematics, which are definable and separable and may have solutions that are finable (160). Rittel and Webber (1973) continue by arguing that government planning, specifically in the areas of social or policy planning, is ill-define and relies upon political judgment, which may be inadequate, for resolution. In effect the there is no solution to a Wicked Problem, according to Rittel and Webber; the most that can be expected is that they are re-solved over and over again (Rittel and Webber 1973, 160).

The authors continue their argument by suggesting that wicked problems include nearly all public policy issues which may include the location of a freeway, the adjustment of a tax rate, the modification of school curricula, or the confrontation of crime (Rittel and Webber 18973, 160). Rittel and Webber argue that wicked problems, as stated earlier, are different from the

natural science, mathematics or engineering problems in that one cannot understand the problem without knowing its context; one cannot meaningful search for information without the orientation of a solution concept; and, one cannot first understand, and then solve (Rittel and Webber 1973, 162). According to Rittel and Webber (1973) there are no true or false answers regarding planning for wicked problems. The authors argue that there are many parties that are equally equipped, interested or entitled to judge the solutions; although none truly has the power to set formal decision rules to determine correctness (163). The judgment of the numerous parties are likely to differ widely in order to remain consistent with their group or personal interests, their specific values, and their ideological preferences; the assessments coming from these different are expressed as "good" or "bad" or, as "better or worse" or, as "satisfying" or "good enough" (163).

Rittel and Webber (1973) argue that any wicked problem solution that is implemented will result in significant consequences over an extended period of time (163). The authors argue that every implemented solution is consequential and will leave outcomes that cannot be undone. Rittel and Webber argue, as an example, that large public works programs are effectively irreversible and that the consequences of such projects will irreversibly influence people, and will also irreversibly result in the expenditure of a large amount of money (Rittel and Webber 1973, 163). The authors conclude by adding that when actions are effectively irreversible, and that every trial counts in attempting to arrive at the desired solution, every attempt to reverse a decision or to correct for the undesired consequences poses another set of wicked problems, which are in turn subject to the same dilemmas (Rittel and Webber 1973, 163). The solution for effecting Army transformation by one Army Chief of Staff may have irreversible consequences

for any subsequent chief of staff who may have a desire to engage in another and perhaps more appropriate course of action.

According to Rittel and Webber (1973) planners (such as an Army Chief of Staff or political actors) may terminate work on wicked problems for external reasons such as running out of time, money or patience; justifying a decision as "that's good enough" or "this is the best that I can do with limited resources' or, "I like this solution" (Rittel and Webber 1973, 162). Army transformation may ultimately be defined by a point in time when resources are no longer available for transformative programs. As indicated by Rittel and Webber, defining a wicked problem (Army transformation is arguably a wicked problem as described by these authors, above) may be impossible to accomplish. It may be impossible to arrive at the same definition of a problem within a large bureaucratic organization where interests may either be competitive or in opposition with one another, and for a variety of reasons.

Army Transformation: Problem Definition

Unless the policy problem is well understood and clear, then political forces throughout the large organization will use their "re-definition" as a tool to gain advantage over other groups (Rochefort and Cobb 1994, 5). Problem definition, in the context of any large organization, will be interpreted in the framework of standardization in order to guard against uncertainty and the possibility of unchartered and uncoordinated action. This may present a significant challenge since transformation involves a dynamic process of translating vague visions of war into mature, innovative outcomes (Stulberg, Salomone and Long 2007). A vague vision provided by senior leaders may be a reason for why external political forces would be able to define the problem in terms that best suits their cause. On the other hand, if everyone understood Army Transformation in the same context, this would reduce the amount of discretion that may occur

as a result of an ill-defined problem. Any gap between how senior Army leaders and how field grade officers define Army Transformation may exist as a result of an ill-defined problem.

Conceptually Defining Army Transformation

A definition for Army Transformation was provided in Chapter 1 of this dissertation. However, if Army Transformation means radical change then more discussion is needed in describing how an organization goes from one state of affairs to a fundamentally new one. Adrianna Kezar (2005) argues that radical change includes busting loose from an existing orientation and the entire transformation of organizing principles and structure (Kezar 2005, 636). The author states radical change is complex and wide-ranging, requiring dramatic changes in strategy and abrupt departures from traditional work, structures, job requirements, and cultures. This all results in a complete change in the way things are organized (Kezar 2005, 636). Unlike others who may describe radical or transformative change as a process, Kezar argues that radical change can be both evolutionary and revolutionary. The author states that while evolutionary radical change occurs slowly over time, revolutionary change happens quickly and affects all parts of the organization at once. Kezar (2005) goes on to argue that change within an organization involves the alteration of values, beliefs, habits, myths, and rituals, which are rarely abandoned completely. History and traditions bind an organization and they are very difficult to alter. Radical change will only occur, according to Kezar (2005), if traditions or values are no longer serving individuals. In fact, Army Transformation has been referred to alternatively as a Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA). If Kezar (2005) is correct when she argues that radical change happens quickly, is considered revolutionary and has an end-state, then Army Transformation may be more incremental in nature and less radical or transformative. The three Army Chiefs of Staff, who will be addressed in more detail in Chapter 5, may be describing both

an evolutionary and revolutionary change in the Army which could result in some level of ambiguity. Perhaps the term Army Transformation is a combination of a revolutionary end-state and an evolving process.

A definition of Army Transformation that combines an evolutionary process with a revolutionary end-state might be useful. If transformation means a significant change from the status quo then it may be inferred that such change is radical in nature; it may therefore be useful to begin with that premise as a definition. Army Transformation, or indeed transformation involving any large bureaucratic organization, may mean to radically change a current organizational structure, doctrine, technology, or culture. Transformation may mean to fundamentally and completely change from one state of affairs to another; to be different from what was before. This may be a process that evolves over time or it may be a revolutionary new goal where there is a defined end-state. Army Transformation may need to be framed by the Army Chiefs of Staff as either being evolutionary or revolutionary in order for there to be a clear understanding of what goal is being pursued.

As John P. Kotter (1996, 143) argues, changing anything of significance in highly interdependent systems often means changing nearly everything. Transformation can become a huge exercise that plays itself out over years. Kotter argues that transformation can become a decade-long process in which hundreds, or even thousands of people help lead and manage dozens of change projects. Outstanding leaders, Kotter argues, will think long-term; decades or even centuries are not impossible to consider. Kotter argues that leaders should take the time to ensure that all the new practices are firmly grounded in the organization's culture before moving on to another assignment (Kotter 1996, 143-144). While firmly grounding new practices into an organization's culture, as provided by Kotter, it may still be difficult to actually change the

culture of the organization from one Chief of Staff to the next. Kotter's arguments may add credence to the definition of transformation that has been constructed here.

Leaders may need to first cause a revolutionary thought process to occur regarding significant change, and then ensure through evolutionary practices that the new state of affairs becomes embedded in the organization's culture. G. Royston and C.R. Hinings (1996) argue that radical change occurs when an organization moves from one well established set of procedures and practices to another. These authors continue by arguing that if an organization were to move from one template to another, the change would be radical because it represents the breaking of the mold defined by some interpretive scheme. For instance, the authors provide an example that if members of a professional accounting organization hired a non-accountant as chief executive officer, charged with the responsibility of monitoring and evaluating senior professionals, there may be a possible movement toward a new template; the new structure and responsibilities would not fit the established clan orientation, or existing interpretative scheme (Royston and Hinings 1996, 1026). This interpretive scheme, albeit it somewhat different within the Army where senior leaders tend to rise up through the existing rank structure, to which Royston and Hinings refer is key in trying to determine if field grade officers interpret Army Transformation as the Army Chiefs of Staff had intended.

Is there a gap between how senior Army leaders define Army Transformation and the way in which Army lieutenant colonels and majors understand it? If "transformation" is a term that is comparable to the term "radical," then a definition of Army Transformation may not be all that easy to determine, and therefore it is unlikely that all members of an organization have the same understanding. This difference in understanding may be as a result of differing sub-cultures, norms and practices that may exist within a large bureaucratic organization.

T. Mahnken and J.R. FitzSimmons (2003) argue that radical change in a military organization may in fact be open to interpretation. Possibly due to their views of what transformation means, officers within a military service may consider any transformation to be only marginal improvements to current weapon systems, force structure and doctrine, as opposed to a fundamentally new organizational structure and capability (Mahnken and FitzSimmons 2003, 143). Mahnken and FitzSimmons also argue that it is difficult to implement "radical" or "transformative" change unless there is broad support within the officer corps (2003, 113). Since the military will be the practitioners of any new method of fighting, those service members need to be enthusiastic about any new technology, operational concepts, or organizational structure that they are asked to embrace. Indeed, officers are experts in military matters and perhaps should be leading efforts in adopting new and transformative methods of war-fighting (Mahnken and FitzSimmons 2003, 114).

These authors also argue that few officers will arise as true innovators. However the existence of a climate that promotes innovation within the officer corps may encourage individuals both to generate new ideas and to remain in the service to bring them about (114). Mahnken and FitzSimonds (2003) argue that a large percentage of career oriented officers (i.e. field grade officers) will rise to senior leadership positions within their services in the next ten to twenty years. Career officers are the recognized experts, the authors continue, in military affairs in the United States. They should be expected to take a leading role in determining the need for any change (Mahnken and FitzSimonds 2003, 114). However, these authors argue that currently most officers in the U.S. military are uncertain about what needs to be done for the U.S. to compete effectively with future adversaries (138). Mahnken and FitzSimonds argue that a large percentage of officers are not confident in their understanding of radical change and what

technology, concepts and organizations might be needed (Mahnken and FitzSimonds 2003, 138). If the future senior leaders have a difficult time understanding what is needed in the way of a Twenty-First Century force, based on current transformation efforts, then the Army may be at risk in not achieving its desired goals. The immediate problem may have more to do with a principal (the Chief of Staff of the Army) not enjoying positive results from agents, or field grade officers. Perhaps there is a need for a change in the decision making process that is currently being used at an attempt to achieve transformation.

General Limits of Change in the Military

In order to address how military reform is being accomplished through existing decision making efforts, it is useful to move away from the more theoretical discussion and into an area that describes the general limitations of military transformation. Transformation, by definition, indicates that such change is most likely not incremental in nature. Stulberg, Salomone and Long (2007, 15) argue that transformation does not merely encompass the development and use of new technologies, but constitute qualitative changes in organizational strategies, procedures and measures of effectiveness for performing critical tasks. Unless the lieutenant colonels and majors recognize the course for change then achieving transformative change may be very difficult to achieve.

According to the authors, military service learning is incremental, which is manifested by the combination of experimentation and the updating of ideas on one hand, and the changes in core tasks, training and education procedures and mission requirements on the other (Stulberg, Salomone and Long 2007, 23). An incremental change process may also allow for a clearer understanding of how field grade officers will be able to advance for the remainder of their careers. The authors argue that radical military change is successful if senior commanders, such

as the Army Chief of Staff, create promotional pathways for junior officers that encourage the latter to spearhead new ways of war and provide avenues for them to eventually dominate the service (Stulberg, Salomone and Long 2007, 21). Although the Army may desire some transformative change to occur some outside intervention, such as legislative action, may need to intervene in order for the rank and file of this military service to understand any radical change in the same way.

Murdock, et al (2004) argue that a Defense Department designed for a massive, industrial-era opponent is clearly not suited for combating covert, non-state actors in the Information Age (Murdock, et al 2004, 17-19). Murdock, et al (2004) argue that the U.S. military has outdated organizational structures that remain problematic. The authors indicate that the Defense Department is plagued with redundancies and unnecessary bureaucracy that consume resources that would be better utilized by operational troops. More to the point, Murdock et al (2004) argue that these duplicative procedures and very large headquarters staffs have created a wasteful bureaucracy that is drug down into continuous coordination processes (Murdock et al 2006, 19). These continuous coordination processes, that Murdock and his colleagues identify, may result in some level of confusion of what senior Army leadership intends by Army Transformation. If the bureaucracy in the Defense Department is a reason for not achieving Army Transformation, then perhaps the issue needs to be addressed more specifically through the legislative process.

Frederick Kagan (2006) is instrumental in defining how the military will, at the same time, provide for the national security interest of the United States as well as transform the military for the Twenty-first Century. The author argues that the military must incorporate political objectives at all levels of planning. He uses the aftermath of the Vietnam War to make

the case that the Army may have been in the transformation process since that era. If the Army has been in the transformation process since the Vietnam era, then it is clear that the process and goals may need to be better defined by the policy makers and political leaders. He argues that transformation is a rather weak concept; the term is based almost entirely on the defense policy it was coined to describe. Kagan (2006) argues transformation means change; it is used to imply large change, but it is difficult to identify what large change means. It is also not clear what the objective of transformation is: Is the goal to change the nature of war, or does it seek to change the U.S. military as an organization (Kagan 2006, 311)? Kagan continues by arguing that transformation is what someone says it is, and nothing more than that (Kagan 2006, 311). If Kagan is accurate, then there may be no need to define Army Transformation unless it is used primarily to justify new technology and weapon systems.

Kagan (2006) argues, again, that Army Transformation is what someone says it is. If that someone includes both the Army Chief of Staff and any field grade officer currently serving in the Army then there may a difference in how Army Transformation is defined. Chun and Rainey (2005) argue that an organizational goal loses meaning and becomes ambiguous when different interpretations are either allowed or provided (Chun and Rainey 2005, 2). In this context Kagan (2006) as well as Chun and Rainey (2005) both suggest that Army Transformation may very well be defined differently depending on which level of leadership position an officer might occupy. This difference could also be a challenge when the Army Chief of Staff, in his role as a "principal", has a goal in mind that he expects field grade officers, as agents, to achieve. When the mission statement is easier to understand, explain, and communicate, there will be less leeway for interpretation and more shared agreement about its meaning (Chun and Rainey 2005,

3). Any mission statement that might be available regarding Army Transformation may not be adequate enough as to inform the agent of the principal's intent.

Andrew J. Bacevich (2005) argues that lieutenants, captains, and colonels know their business on an operational battlefield, whether the leaders at the uppermost echelon of command understand the operational and strategic imperatives of war may be another matter (Bacevich 2005, 230). While the U.S. involvement in Iraq has generated great controversy, the performance of three-and four-star U.S. commanders have received little attention; yet Bacevich contends their performance has been at best mediocre (Bacevich 2005, 230). If this is descriptive of the internal culture of the Army, then it is unlikely that general officers will want to attract the attention of political actors, and therefore threaten the discretion that they have been given by Congress in determining what the Army should look like for the Twenty-first Century. The bureaucracy within the Defense Department in general, and within the Army in particular, may need to be revisited if true transformation is to be accomplished.

Max Boot (2006) argues that the key to successful innovation is having an effective bureaucracy. Boot cites the Prussian military's success in the nineteenth century as not being based so much on technology, but more on the general staff which determined how best to use new innovations (Boot 2006, 463). The author states that the bureaucracy is very important in the realization of transformation, or in a revolution of military affairs, which requires more than just new technology. He argues that radical change also requires revolutions in organization, doctrine, training, and personnel; in short, the bureaucracy as a whole. Boot goes so far as to suggest that successful adaptation includes changing the kinds of people who are rewarded within the military structure.

Boot argues that in the nineteenth century, with the rise of railroads and steamships, the importance of logisticians and engineers increased; two groups that had previously been despised by traditional army officers. Boot continues by offering that there is no rule of thumb to suggest how much or how little a military should change in response to technological developments. Each era is presented with its own peculiar set of challenges, but the questions are generally the same. They are: (1) should a country pay for more traditional infantrymen, or push resources into transformational programs; and, (2) should they continue to build traditional tanks or switch to other platforms (Boot 2006, 466)? Boot argues that the wisest course of action is to feel one's way along with a careful study, radical experimentation, and freewheeling war-games; as somewhat of a paradox, revolutionary transformation often can be achieved in evolutionary increments. Transformation need not sweep aside all old weapons or old ways of doing things, the idea is to think about how to make the transition, not about how to eliminate current weapons. How the challenges are effectively addressed may rely on the agility of the bureaucracy. Boot (2006) argues that the U.S. military is hindered by a sluggish, bloated bureaucracy that has resisted countless reform efforts. If this argument is true, then past military success may have occurred not so much based on planning, but as an "ad-hoc" response to an emergency or other important set of events that could not be ignored.

Past Commentary on Current U.S. Army Transformation Efforts

The discussion that was just provided addresses the general limits of change in the military, but it is also useful to examine how current efforts to transform the Army are being viewed. This section will review the commentary and criticisms that are being made regarding current transformation efforts within the Army. Additionally, this section will review the

literature of more scholarly and empirical examinations of both past and present transformation attempts.

Since before the Revolutionary War, the United States has often taken an "ad hoc" approach to winning wars (Carafano 2007, 1). James Carafano (2007, 2) provides this quote by Winston Churchill who said, "Americans can always be counted on to do the right thing…after they have exhausted all other possibilities." The United States has successfully engaged in peacekeeping operations after it has fought a war, but when transitioning from "war-fighter" to "peacekeeper" the Army appears to naturally start all over again as if it had never done it before (Carafano 2007, 1). Carafano calls this the rhythm of habits, every time we do "peacekeeping" we basically have to learn how to perform that role all over again, because the U.S. military appears to have purged lessons that might have been learned previously. For instance, Carafano argues the U.S. has traditionally done a poor job of doing post-conflict planning before and during conflict. The military has normally taken its warfighters, who are not well suited for post-conflict operations, and has attempted to convert them to a peacekeeping role. Eventually, Carafano argues, the U.S. figures out that the military forces that fought so well in battle are not well equipped, trained and organized to win the peace (Carafano 2007, 2). Army transformation, by all indication, will include being able to respond to the full spectrum of battlefield requirements, which include peacekeeping operations after any battle has been fought. Carafano argues that the U.S. has never accomplished that part of the mission very well, if the U.S. plans for that scenario in the future then some transformation may actually occur in at least this regard.

However, Peter Dombrowski and Eugene Gholz (2006) believe current transformation efforts will only succeed if they are supported by the nation's leaders. They argue that contemporary military transformation cannot emerge spontaneously as Carafano argues. Instead,

it must be nurtured, encouraged, and promoted by civilian and military leaders who are well-placed to influence national strategy, military doctrine, and the various implementation processes by which the armed forces are trained, organized and equipped (Dombrowski and Gholz 2006, 7).

Military transformation appears to be rather open-ended regarding how services will define "transformation" for their own purposes. According to Carafano, Spencer and Gudgel (2005), the "capabilities-based planning" component of transformation was embraced by Secretary of Defense Don Rumsfeld, and emphasized developing new military means not tied to any one national security threat, but instead focused on what military forces could accomplish with different operational concepts[6], organizations, and technologies. The authors argue that this rather open-ended nature of transformation allowed the services to define for themselves what the processes would be to arrive at transformation. There were no measurements or metrics provided that would hold anyone accountable for progress, or the lack thereof. Carafano, Spencer and Gudgel (2005) argue, therefore, that the services, to include the Army, could label acquisition programs that had begun before the end of the Cold War as "transformational", or define their goals and rationale that had the appropriate adjectives of "faster", "lighter" and more "lethal" (Carafano, Spencer and Gudgel 2005, 2). In this sense, transformation becomes simply a buzzword to justify decisions Army leaders have made.

Combat Arms (CA), Combat Support CS), and Combat Service Support (CSS) officers as sub-groups within the Army may each have a different perception of what transformation

[6] The operational concept frames how Army forces, operating as a part of a joint force (in association with the sister military services) conduct operations. It describes how Army forces adapt to meet the distinct requirements of land operations. The concept is broad enough to describe operations now and in the future. The Army's operational concept is full spectrum operations; it includes the concepts of offensive, defensive and stability or civil support operations simultaneously (Army Field Manual 3-0 2008, 1-31).

means to them. All officers may view transformation in the context of new equipment and weapon systems that are being fielded. However, doctrine that includes changing tactics and other new techniques and procedures may cause subgroups to view transformation somewhat differently. Some officers may serve most of their entire careers in tactical organizations (TOE or table of organization and equipment) while others may serve most of their careers in administrative organizations (TDA or table of distribution and allowances).

Although one's branch is a clear indication of who an Army officer is, an officer's perception of transformation may be influenced more by his or her history of assignments within the Army. However, officers tend to be personally associated with a subculture within the Army based primarily on their branch insignia (infantry, armor, artillery, quartermaster, etc).

If Army officers do not share the same view of transformation due as a result of any subcultures differences that may exist within the Army, then those differences may be representative of a larger problem that defense organizations experience when trying to implement change. Amy Zegart (1999) makes the point that if National Defense focused agencies have a hard time collaborating and cooperating, how will we be able to determine the force that is necessary to deal with various contingencies in the future? She argues that agencies and departments have their own agendas, missions, cultures, routines, and ways of viewing the world – resources, goals, and incentives of various agencies all differ from the president's goals and objectives. This embedded culture will make transformation a difficult and complex task; assuming it can be achieved without an emergency which causes an ad-hoc solution that will then be institutionalized for the future (Zegart,1999). The difficulty in achieving Army Transformation may be in part as a result of policy makers and political leaders not providing clear planning guidance.

The Role of Future Combat Systems

Senior Defense Department leaders, such as former Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, believed that the military of the Twenty-first Century will be more heavily dependent on high-technology information systems and less reliant on ground troops, such as infantrymen (McNaugher 2008). Others in the defense establishment believe, however, that high-technology is but one aspect of the equation needed to successfully transform the Army for the Twenty-first Century. Max Boot argues that for there to be a successful revolution in military affairs (i.e. transformation) the adaptation of the military organization (which includes infantrymen), along with requisite changes in training and doctrine, will also need to adapt in order to meet Twenty-first Century threats (McNaugher 2008). These two differing positions are the reason for the primary research question: What does the term Army Transformation mean to both senior leaders and field grade officers?

Greg Jaffe (2006) argues that four-star generals, the Army's top-ranking military officers who entered the military in the early 1970s, spent most of their careers rebuilding an Army that had been damaged by an unpopular Vietnam War. Jaffe (2006) points out that these officers were shaped by the Cold War and their focus was on how to defeat a Soviet-style army. Conversely, Jaffe (2006) adds, today's younger officers up to and including majors and lieutenant colonels, have been shaped by experiences in Iraq and Afghanistan and they may see the world differently. The research question directly addresses these separate views and how those views may result in a divergent definition of what Army Transformation means to these separate groups. Does the development of a new weapon system that can address both a conventional threat more closely aligned with past experiences, as well as any perceived threat of the future serve as an adequate indication for how senior Army leaders view transformation?

Under President George W. Bush's administration, Defense Department research, development, test and evaluation funding increased significantly with the intent of creating battlefield technology is needed for the future. The guiding principle is that if significant advances are made in precision munitions, real-time data dissemination, and other modern technologies, combined with appropriate war-fighting doctrine and organization, then the U.S. can transform warfare (O'Hanlon 2005). The inference that can be made is that if the Defense Department provides new technological capabilities, then the doctrine and military organization required to support the new technologies will follow. The Army's response to this new technological mandate is the development of the Future Combat Systems.

Other authors have suggested that current efforts transformation are about more than just about FCS. FCS is important to Army transformation because, as we will see in Chapter 5, the Army chiefs of staff have so indicated. While FCS may indeed be very important in achieving transformation, there are other factors that are also relevant. David Kassing (2003) argues that in the context of transformation, the FCS is but one piece (277). To the degree that there is a lack of consensus as to whether FCS represents the preponderancy of the Army's transformation efforts, then there may be a gap that exists in the meaning of transformation. Kassing argues that the overarching goal of Army transformation is to make the Army's heavy forces more responsive and its light forces more sustainable in combat operations. (276). The author argues in 2003 that the Army had originally intended to proceed along three paths toward transformation: 1. To modernize and maintain readiness with the Current Force (i.e., today's army); 2. To develop an Interim Force that can be obtained rather quickly by purchasing weapon systems that have already been developed; and 3. Preparing for the operational and organizational concepts of the Objective Force, the army of the future (Kassing 2003, 276). While others, including the chiefs

of staff that will be discussed later in this dissertation, may have the viewpoint that FCS is either the centerpiece of or at least a very key component of transformation, Kassing (2003) argues that transformation includes more than just the FCS; it includes new helicopters and the artillery's Indirect Fire program (277). Kassing argues that there will also be significant costs for new command, control, computer and communications equipment, along with intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance capabilities. These new capabilities are in addition to what is formally known as the FCS program (Kassing 2003, 277).

Andrew Krepinevich (2009) argues that the Army has proposed spending over $150 billion on FCS; yet the FCS systems are optimized for traditional conventional warfare rather than the persistent irregular warfare the Army now confronts (Krepinevich 2009, 31). As Krepinevich (2009) argues, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates cancelled the eight combat vehicles portion of the FCS program which in effect terminated the procurement program (31). Kassing (2003) argued that Army transformation included more than just FCS; if FCS is no longer, then what other initiatives have also ceased to exist? Again, as we will see in Chapter 5, the chiefs of staff view FCS as the major component of transformation. Others, including field grade officers and defense experts, may have a different view of how FCS drives transformation. If FCS does not survive as a program but the Army remains resilient in its efforts to transform, then it appears that the Army may have gone down a long road, over the last decade or so, having indicated that transformation was mostly about FCS.

The Role of the Entire Organization

While FCS may be viewed as the centerpiece of Army Transformation by senior Army leaders, transformation is fundamentally an organizational issue, according to Stulberg and his colleagues (Stulberg, Salomone and Long 2007). To them, Army transformation involves

changes in goals, actual strategies and/or the structure of a military organization. The way to measure success is based on the adoption of a new primary mission, new technologies, and new operational methods that, taken as a whole, lead to a major restructuring of the existing organizational landscape. They argue that transformation consists of a new way of war, with new ideas of how the components of the organization relate to each other and to the enemy, and new organizational procedures conform to those ideas (Stulberg, Salomone and Long 2007, 15). These authors clearly indicate that Army transformation is far more than just a family of new military vehicles, for example, the standard operating procedures (SOPs) of a peace time bureaucracy must also be re-considered in order to reflect new and projected organizational needs. SOP's must be revised to reflect a transformed military. SOP's represent processes and procedures that describe how tasks are to be accomplished within a large bureaucracy like the U.S. Army. If an army transforms itself into a new or different organization, then new SOP's will need to be available that reflect that transformed organization. However, being able to consider Army Transformation in the context of more than just a new family of weapon systems may be restricted by the experiences of senior Army leaders; and well established processes and procedures may not be all that easy to change.

Andrew Bacevich (2010) argues that the planning that preceded Operation Desert Storm in 1991 looked to the past more than to the future. This was going to be a conventional war in that the Army would disregard experiences in Vietnam and instead focus on heavy combat operations. The Army, Bacevich provides, had incrementally developed heavy weapon systems, such as the tank, that would have impressed any officer who had served from the 1940s to the 1980s. Additionally, those same officers would have also recognized the organizational structure, operations, and institutional culture that went with these newer systems (Bacevich

2010, 156). The point is that the Army organization during that era, to include its weapon systems, was clearly understood by all; this clarity would not be the case as the Army departed from the well established organizational structure that was familiar to so many. According to Bacevich (2010), the institutional Army has changed so much that it is barely recognizable. Specifically, those solders who served from the 1940s to the 1980s, or even the 1990s, would find the language being used by senior Army leaders today incomprehensible. According to Bacevich, the Army's senior leadership is using terms that are completely divorced from historical experiences and may in fact be at radical odds with what is going on right now (Bacevich 2010, 175-177). If the author is correct, then there is good reason to believe that Army Transformation may indeed mean something different up and down the chain of command.

Previous Empirical Examinations of Military Change

Having discussed past attempts to reform the U.S. military in Chapter 2, and having discussed some of the potential limitations to organizational change, generally, and commentary on Army transformation attempts, specifically, in this chapter, it would be useful at this point to examine scholarly empirical examinations into the effectiveness of military transformation efforts. Three studies provide some insight into how the military manages transformation. The first study provides an overview of how the Defense Department prepares for war during peacetime generally, focusing primarily on the late- and post-Vietnam eras. The second study endeavored to determine whether Army personnel believed the current Army transformation effort is either revolutionary or evolutionary in nature – that is, whether junior and noncommissioned officers believe transformation is leading to a radical shift in how the Army operates, or is instead simply resulting in incremental changes. The last study sought to

determine the things that serve as facilitators and as obstacles in achieving significant change within the Department of Defense.

Suzanne Nielsen (2003) conducted the first study examining how the U.S. military prepared for war. In this work she looked at the dynamics of peacetime military reform and was able to provide a good comparison of how previous military transformation efforts have fared. She takes a "structured, focused comparison[7]" approach and draws out lessons in interrelated case studies by applying them to a single comprehensive analytical framework. She employs "process-tracing[8]" making the decision-making process the center of the investigation. This may be an important consideration when viewing how senior leaders make decisions regarding Army transformation matters. Nielsen used the U.S. Army environment of the late 1960s and 1970s as the timeframe for her research. The author specifically looked at the efforts of General William C. Westmoreland (1968-1972), Generals Creighton W. Abrams and Frederick C. Weyand (1972-1976), and the United States Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC)[9] from 1973-1982. Nielsen chose these three generals who served as Army chiefs of staff, along with TRADOC, for purposes of her dissertation largely because these individuals and this Army organization, in the timeframe of the 1970s and the early 1980s, were involved in the process of

---

[7] A structured, focused comparison is an attempt to draw out lessons available in the interrelated case studies in Nielsen's dissertation by applying to them a single comprehensive analytical framework (Nielsen 2003, 43).

[8] A decision-making process that is the center of investigation. It attempts to uncover what stimuli the actors attend to; the decision process that makes use of these stimuli to arrive at decisions; and the actual behavior that then occurs; the effects of various institutional arrangements on attention, processing, and behavior (Nielsen 2003, 44).

[9] TRADOC is a four-star level organization within the Army that was established on July 1, 1973 for the initial purpose of redirecting the Army's effort in training and force modernization after the end of the Vietnam War, and the need to respond to the lessons of the 1973 Arab-Israeli War in the Middle East. By making General William E. DePuy, the former Army Vice-Chief of Staff, the first commander of TRADOC, there was an expectation that this new senior command would have immediate legitimacy throughout the Army.

the Army recovery following Vietnam and what it needed to accomplish in any future war that might occur in Europe.

Her focus centered on the dynamics of peacetime military reform, in this case, the change that was pursued by the U.S. Army toward the end and after the Vietnam War. She compared other reform efforts that included the U.S. Army in the 1950s (following World War II and the Korean War), the French Army between the Franco-Prussian War and World War I, and the British and German Armies between World War I and World War II.

Nielsen (2003) presents four basic findings. First, she finds that uniformed military leaders are essential to the process of military reform. Although this point may be intuitively obvious, Nielsen argues serious problems result when uniformed leaders disagree about an army's role within a country's national security strategy . Nielsen may be suggesting that uniformed military leaders need to form some consensus in order to effectively support the national security strategy.

She uses the U.S. Army during Eisenhower Administration of the 1950s as an example. President Eisenhower's viewed the Army's role in a future war was largely to provide the needed police force after nuclear devastation. However, this view conflicted with the view held by senior officers in the military. This conflict contributed to a disconnect within the Army leadership and ultimately led to dysfunctional efforts to change the structure of its combat divisions (Nielsen 2003, 468).[10]

[10] In 1956 General Maxwell D. Taylor, Chief of Staff, formed the new Pentomic Division and would have them fielded by the end of fiscal year 1958. This required the Army to change the structure of all of its combat divisions. Pentomic refers to a division's grouping of 5 for subordinate commands (brigades, battalions, companies), while the second half refers to the division's organic nuclear capability (Nielsen (2003, 352).

According to Nielsen, General Matthew B. Ridgway, Army Chief of Staff from 1953 – 1955, did not agree with Eisenhower's view of the Army's role and was not re-nominated to continue as chief of staff. His successor, General Maxwell D. Taylor, Army Chief of Staff from 1955 – 1959, responded by creating the Pentomic divisions. The dysfunctional aspect that Nielsen refers to may be a result of the fact that the Pentomic divisions were structured to take advantage of advances in communications technology, as well as vehicle and equipment modernization efforts that were not forthcoming. Additionally, in these new divisions there were fewer opportunities for field grade command and staff opportunities, which created a morale problem within the officer ranks. To make matters worse, as a result of budget cuts during the 1950s, the Army went from the 20 divisions it had during the Korean War to 14 divisions in 1961; this made even fewer command and staff opportunities available for field grade officers. In the end, the Pentomic division experiment would prove to be a failure and the Army would return to its traditional division structure during the Vietnam War (Nielsen (2003, 355–360).

In the 1950s the chiefs of staff appeared to have rejected the president's vision for the Army's role, and when the Army did respond by fielding Pentomic divisions, it produced a divisional organization that was not fully functional and had to be replaced with a more traditional divisional organization. Ridgway did not respond in the way the president expected and was not allowed to continue as the chief of staff. Taylor responded by fielding a divisional model that was not effective. It is difficult to determine if the senior Army leadership was entirely responsible for not meeting the expectations of the Commander-In-Chief, in Nielsen's illustration, or if the institutional Army rejected the idea as a whole. The army that would fight the Vietnam War in the 1960s and 1970s would also have its challenges.

The era beginning with General Westmoreland as Army Chief of Staff, to be followed by General Abrams and General Weyand and the establishment of TRADOC, may be viewed as a period of significant change within the Army. The Army had engaged in an unconventional war based largely on counterinsurgency operations, it wanted to now return to its more conventional roots where it would focus on the likely scenario of a large Soviet force engaging in large offensive operations in Western Europe. Nielsen mentioned that Army Chief of Staff General William Westmoreland focused on the threat to the Army's claim on manpower that stemmed from the all-volunteer manpower policy and his awareness of the Army's internal problems. The internal problems had more to do with re-building an army that had been seriously strained during the course of a long and protracted war in Vietnam (Nielsen (2003,75-76).Westmoreland described his tasks as "building a force structure to support national strategy; developing professional competence; restoring standards weakened by the stresses and strains of a lengthy war; making Army life more attractive by providing adequate facilities and amenities; and developing the weapons, equipment and tactical doctrine necessary to deal successfully with conflicts of the future (Nielsen (2003, 76). Westmoreland accomplished much of what he achieved as chief of staff by commissioning studies and then following up on programs. His reforms involved personnel management systems as well as professional education and training. According to Nielsen, Westmoreland made less progress in implementing organizational recommendations and in modernization efforts. The reason that Westmoreland may not have achieved his plans had to do with the overall condition of the Army and the political landscape at the time (Nielsen (2003, 151-153).

Generals Abrams and Weyand were U.S. Army Chiefs of Staff from October 1972 – September 1976. Nielsen refers to both of these chiefs of staff in a single era because General

Abrams died in office in 1974, or halfway through his appointment as chief of staff, and Weyand, the Vice Chief of Staff under Abrams, would serve the remainder of his time, or until 1976. Abrams and Weyand were able to benefit from the actions General Westmoreland took to evolve from a military of conscription to that of a volunteer army, and the plans that he made for rebuilding a war-fatigued army. The issues that Abrams and Weyand had to address were the threats to the Army in the areas of resources and stability, while at the same time enabling the Army to be able to respond to the demands of the current national security strategy and the nature of future conflict. (Nielsen (2003, 469). These officers developed strong relationships with civilian leaders in DoD, set clear priorities, avoided staffing key decisions through a consensus-oriented process, and developed and articulated a strategic rationale for the role of the Army. Abram's, as well as Weyand's. major reforms included the reorganization and the streamlining of the Army's staff and command structure, creating a 16 division army, reinvigorating the active Army's relationship with the reserve components, and setting the stage for the Army's future modernization. Part of the reorganization efforts of 1973 included the creation of TRADOC (Nielsen (2003, 218-221).

Nielsen also found that peacetime military reform is about more than doctrinal change, or the way in which an army prepares for, conducts and concludes military operations. In order for a military organization to be able to implement its doctrine successfully, reform must also come with appropriate training practices, personnel policies, organization, equipment, and leader development programs in place in order to implement the change. Because of the importance of comprehensive change, military organizations require an entity with broad authority over the development of the organization to bring it about. Nielsen uses the transformation of the German Army as an example of how an entity with broad authority made a positive difference

for change. Nielsen argues that the German Army embarked on a comprehensive program that would effectively the German army as an organization (Nielsen (2003, 439). She points out that at the top of the organizational structure there was a single individual, the army commander-in-chief that had broad authority over the development of the entire army and a budget office that worked directly for him. Additionally there were two entities below him, the general staff and the weapons office. The general staff was responsible, largely, for controlling the military's day-to-day organization. The weapons office was responsible for research and development as well as equipment purchasing. Under a single authority, Nielsen argues, a single individual ensured that the general staff and weapons office pursued a coherent program. In addition, a system of personnel rotation between the general staff and the weapons office further insured that their efforts would be closely integrated (Nielsen (2003, 440).

Suzanne Nielsen's research indicates that successful transformation within the Army depends largely on senior leadership creating an environment that promotes and encourages ideas leading to significant change. Additionally, she describes an army that pushed back from the Commander-In-Chief and his vision for a post-nuclear army, and instead concentrated on promoting a conventional and more traditional division-based army that would address all future threat scenarios. Because of the Army's preference for conventional warfare, it was ill-prepared for the guerilla and counter-insurgency tactics of the Vietnam War. Nielsen's findings are consistent with this research and the Army's initiative to transform itself over the last decade. Beginning in 1999, the chiefs of staff appear to have a vision for transforming the army that may not have been consistent with that of political leaders, up to and including the Commander-In-Chief. At the same time, it is important that the chief of staff, or a single senior actor with broad authority to effect change, ensures an environment for change and mitigates any conflict that

may occur during the process. Nielsen indicates that there will be disagreement within the Army for how change occurs; that appears to be the case as transformation encounters similar difficulties in the 21st Century.

John M. House (2005) provides a study to determine whether current U.S. Army transformation efforts is evolutionary or revolutionary. He mentions that revolutionary change can give the U.S. Army the opportunity to obtain an operational capability advantage over an opponent. The enemy will therefore be hard-pressed to match such an advantage in the short-term. House (2005) argues that evolutionary transformation takes a longer time to achieve. If evolutionary transformation is possible then it would not offer the Army the same advantage in that an opponent could become familiar with such change over time.

House argues that the Army has experienced a mixture of evolutionary and revolutionary change throughout its history. Most combat development programs produced evolutionary change with a focus on conventional ground combat. House also argues that the Army has modernized its weapon systems many times. However these modernization programs have not brought a revolution in military operations (House 2005, 260). House argues that the Army might have engaged in revolutionary change in the 1950s had it followed through on adopting the Pentomic divisions by having nuclear weapons as an integral part of the battlefield. However, a lack of resources and a general lack of enthusiasm by the Army prevented that revolutionary event from occurring (House 2005, 260). House argues that the Department of Defense should provide a definition of evolutionary and revolutionary change in order to clarify discussion in military circles and enhance the understanding of the impact of such change in the military environment (Nielsen (2003, 264). He states that a key factor in maintaining any vision for change is retaining senior leadership. Changing senior leaders puts any program of change at

risk. New leaders may choose to alter the vision or change the implementation of a program of change. If retaining senior leaders is not possible, then it is important, House argues, for the replacement leadership to share their predecessor's vision (277). If the program does not transcend from one senior leader to the next (in other words, programs that do not survive when senior Army leadership changes), then transformation will become evolutionary and hence become simply a modernization program rather than an opportunity to fundamentally change the nature of warfare (271).

House sought to develop a definition for the term "revolutionary change" by examining other literature on change. His findings conclude that the views between commissioned officers and noncommissioned officer ranks, regarding transformation differ significantly. The noncommissioned officers considered the characteristics of transformation as being more revolutionary in nature than did the commissioned officers. While the author did not specifically address what may have contributed to significant difference in the views of commissioned and noncommissioned officers, he did argue that these two groups are the leaders who implement the directed changes that do come down from the top. The perceptions that these two groups may have of transformation may be an indication of the success or failure the senior Army leaders have had in translating their vision into useful concepts that can be understood at this level (253). Thus, it appears that "transformation" may indeed mean something different to different people.

Marzena Majewska-Button (2010) conducted a qualitative meta-analysis of 76 different case studies prepared by other authors to examine the dynamics of large-scale organizational change and to document the presence or absence and relative strength of certain factors that can help or hinder these change efforts (46). She selected authors who were in some way affiliated with the DoD with 38% of the authors being directly associated with the U.S. Army and the

remainder affiliated with the other military services. Most of the papers written by authors directly associated with the Army came from students at the U.S. Army War College as well as those who had written a master's degree thesis (53).

In her analysis, Majewska-Button found that revolutionary change occurs in leaps, spurts and disruptions, and not in an incremental or linear fashion. She argues that there are both barriers and enhancers to transformative change within a DoD organization. Barriers to successful change can occur for the very reasons the transformation process was undertaken in the first place. For instance, Majewska-Button argues that the ideas of transformation may ignore the problems of a complex structure or an inefficient work organization, She states that organizations will turn to basic thinking and will focus on the bare minimum of what is not working and then fix that piece. In effect, the intended transformation does not occur (Majewska-Button 2010, 157).

According to Majewska-Button, leadership plays a role, or specifically the leader's personality and the leader's decisions play a role in whether they are barriers or enhancers to transformation. She also found individuals in the organization are important, as is effective communication, and an organizational culture that embraces change. Majewska-Button argues that both leaders and employees within a DoD organization are important in that they can serve as either enhancers or as barriers to transformative change. She states that leaders are the number one barrier to transformative change, while employees (the rank and file of a DoD organization) are ranked number two for being both barriers and enhancers.

Regarding leadership, she argues that DoD experiences issued with authority responsibility, freedom of deciding and command and control. She states that unity of command is the most important issue in that only one responsible commander should be the rule and that

any violation of this creates confusion, undermines authority and threatens stability (78). Leadership as a barrier occurs when the leader does not embrace change.

Majewska-Button argues that employees are the most valuable assets of the organization. Employees have enough collective power to either help the organization transform or to cause the effort to fail (49). Leaders and employees within DoD organizations operate within a structure that is not common to civilian agencies or private organizations. This author states that DoD organizations, most often, operate within an old and law-regulated structure, chain of command, specific ways of working, and tones of other procedures and policies. Civilian leaders may be free to adjust things such as communicating strategies, or to reorganize what is not working, while military commanders are heavily restricted on picking up an idea and applying it to their units. If transformation is not perceived as being in line with established procedures (such as SOPs), then it will not be accepted. Similarly, if transformation is not perceived as beneficial in at least some aspects, the employees, and perhaps the leaders as well, they have a strong motivation to oppose it Majewska-Button 2010, 2-7). Leaders and employees, together, use a communication process as a matter of course in order to get tasks completed; this established communication process may represent a culture that will either enhance transformative change, or will seek to serve as a barrier.

Majewska-Button's finding included that barriers to organizational change are largely pre-existing, which means that they do not occur during the change and are not new issues. They were in the organization previously and worked well in the "old" environment, except for some employees and their resistance to change. She has also found that since the organization's operating environment has often changed in many respects (as a result of geopolitical, technological or financial reasons or pressures) the previous structure's procedures and cultures

all of the sudden have lost their effectiveness (Majewska-Button 2010, 107). Once a barrier is identified, and adjustments are made based on the new situation, it usually undergoes a transformation process and becomes a change enhancer. Once the barriers endured during the change process in DoD were identified there were attempts to eliminate them, which in turn made them enhancers to change as opposed to obstacles. Unlike House (2005) who advocated for longer-serving senior leaders who would see transformative change through to the end, Majewska-Button argued that since leadership is among the most important variables and may serve as either an enhancer or as a barrier, the Army's policy of changing leaders on a regular basis is a good one in the event that any one leader is, in fact, a barrier to change.

Conclusion

Douglas A. Macgregor (1997) states that in 1947 Army Chief of Staff General James Gavin mentioned that "we professional soldiers are traditionally laggard in facing and adopting changes, especially radical changes that upset proven methods and the ways in which we have been doing things for years past" (Macgregor 1997, 167). For more than a decade, the U.S. Army's leadership appears to be have been committed to changing the Army. It is not clear whether that change is truly transformative or radical, in the context of authors that have been discussed here. If transformation is the goal, then the Army may be failing in achieving that goal. Roper and Kiper (2010, 38) argue that there are three different types of failure, they are: (1) failure to learn; (2) failure to anticipate; and, (3) failure to adapt. The authors suggest that the Army has failed to anticipate by citing former Army Vice-Chief of Staff General Jack Keane: "We put an Army on the battlefield that I had been a part of for 37 years. It doesn't have any doctrine, nor was it educated and trained, to deal with an insurgency. After the Vietnam War, the Army purged itself of everything that had to do with irregular warfare or insurgency, because it

had to do with how the U.S. lost the war; in hindsight, that was a bad decision" (Roper and Kiper 2010, 38).

Richard A. Lacquement (2010) argues that in the wake of the Vietnam War, which was for the most part a counterinsurgency, the Army chose to return to the more conventional force, modeled after the success of World War II, to continue its confrontation of the Soviet Union. The Army focused on preparing for conventional war and therefore recommended to civilian leaders that any military force be limited to this concept of war (Lacquement 2010, 30). The author argues that it cannot be assumed that the lessons-learned in recent conflicts will be automatically integrated into the Army as a whole (Lacquement 2010, 31). If formulating and implementing radical change still remains a challenge for the Army, then identifying what transformative change means may continue to be a challenge as well.

This literature review demonstrates that transformative change may be difficult to achieve in a large bureaucratic organization. The Principal-Agent Theory was used to describe the relationship between each of the Army Chiefs of Staff and field grade officers. There is an expectation of the principal that the agent will seek to accomplish the objectives of the principal. Agents may perceive the objectives as being vague, for whatever reason, and may not accomplish those expected outcomes. Additionally, the framework of the bureaucracy may contribute to the difficulty with accomplishing Army transformation. The sub-cultures that exist within the organization may interpret transformation goals differently. Large bureaucracies tend to resist innovation and prefer standard operating procedures that do not change all that much, especially within a relatively short period of time. It is difficult to achieve a consensus of what transformation means and how it should be accomplished within a large bureaucracy.

Army transformation may be difficult to achieve because it may be too complex and hard to define. Some experts view transformation as being too open-ended and not well defined, which may in turn allow senior Army leaders to define transformation in their own terms. Others view Army transformation efforts as too centered on a technological solution while transformation may include all aspects of the organization. The challenge of Army transformation is well represented in the literature of Principal-Agent Theory and the theory of how the bureaucracy adapts to change.

The research presented in the following chapters of this dissertation will add to the body of knowledge on Army transformation. It does so with an eye on what is needed to change such a large and complex organization. The question is specific: I seek to determine whether a gap exists between how senior Army leaders define Army transformation as compared to the definition that Army lieutenant colonels and majors might possess. Such an examination can shed light on whether transformation is actually occurring, whether it is either evolutionary or revolutionary, whether majors and lieutenant colonels are serving as effective agents in carrying out the Army chief of staffs' visions, or whether the bureaucratic obstacles identified by scholars are indeed hindering the translation of vision into action.

References

Adams, Thomas K. 2008. *The Army after Next: The First Postindustrial Army.* Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Allison, Graham. 2005 [1969]. "Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis 1969." In *Classics of Public Policy*, eds. Jay M. Shafritz, Karen S. Layne and Christopher P. Borick. New York: Pearson Education, 248 - 278.

Allison, Graham and Philip Zelikow. 1999. *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis.* 2d ed. New York: Longman.

U.S. Army Posture Statement. Strategic Context http://www.army.mil/aps/08/strategic_context.html (May 17, 2008)

Bacevich, Andrew J. 2010. *Washington Rules: America's Path to Permanent War*. New York: Metropolitan.

Bacevich, Andrew J. 2005. *The New American Militarism: How Americans are Seduced by War.* New York: Oxford University.

Boot, Max. 2006. War Made New: Technology, Warfare, and the Course of History 1500 to Today. New Work: Gotham Books.

Carafano, James J. 2007. "*Thinking Differently About Winning the Peace*." Heritage Lectures No. 987. Washington, D.C.: The Heritage Foundation.

Carafano, James J., Jack Spencer, and Kathy Gudgel. 2005. "*A Congressional Guide to Defense Transformation: Issues and Answers*." Backgrounder No.1847. Washington, D.C.: The Heritage Foundation.

Chun, Young Han and Hal G. Rainey. 2005. "Goal Ambiguity in U.S. Federal Agencies." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 15: 1-30.

Dombrowski, Peter, & Gholz, Eugene 2006. *Buying Military Transformation: Technological Innovation and the Defense Industry*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Feaver, Peter D. 2003. *Armed Servants: Agency, Oversight, and Civil-Military Relations.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gawthrop, Louis C. 1969. *Bureaucratic Behavior in the Executive Branch: An Analysis of Organizational Change*. New York: Free Press.

Government Accountability Office. 2010. *Defense Acquisitions: Opportunities and Challenges for Army Ground Force Modernization Efforts*. GAO-10-603T. Washington, D.C.: The Congress of the United States. pp. 1-16.

Haire, Dennis Reed.2003. *An Ethnography of a Federal Agency Enterprise: Social and Technical Change* Ph.D. diss. University of Texas.

Hill, Michael & Peter Hupe. 2005.*Implementing Public Policy: Governance in Theory and in Practice*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

House, John M. 2005.*A Study of Army Operational Transformation Strategy: Evolutionary vs. Revolutionary Change*, Ph.D. diss., Northcentral University, Prescott, AZ

House, Charles H and Raymond L. Price. 1991. "The Return Map: Tracking Product Teams." *Harvard Business Review* 69 (January/February): 92 – 100.

Jaffe, Greg. 2006. "Despite a $168 Billion Budget, Army Faces Cash Crunch." *Wall Street Journal*. December 12.

Kassing, David. 2003. "Resourcing the Twenty-First Century Army." In *The U.S. Army and the New National Security Strategy*, eds. Lynn E. David and Jeremy Shapiro. Santa Monica: Rand Corp.

Kaufman, Herbert. 2006 [1960]. *The Forest Ranger: A Study in Administrative Behavior*. Special Reprint ed. Washington, D.C.: RFF Press.

Kezar, Adrianna. 2005. Consequences of Radical Change in Governance: A Grounded Theory Approach. *The Journal of Higher Education*. 76 (6): 634- 668.

Kingdon, John W. 2003. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. 2nd ed. New York: Longman.

Lacquement, Jr., Richard A. 2010. "In the Army Now." *The American Interest* VI (September/October): 27-31.

Lindblom, Charles E. 2005 [1959]. "The Science of Muddling Through." In *Classics of Public Policy* eds. Jay M. Shafritz, Karen S. Layne and Christopher P. Borick. New York: Pearson Education, 26-40.

Macgregor, Douglas A. 1997. *Breaking the Phalanx: A New Design for Land Power in the Twenty-first Century*. Westport: Praeger.

Mahnken, Thomas G. and James R. FitzSimonds. 2003. "Revolutionary Ambivalence: Understanding Officer Attitudes toward Transformation." *International Security* 28 (Autumn): 112-148.

Majewska-Button, Marzena. 2010. *Factors Influencing Organizational Change in the Department of Defense*, Ph.D. diss. University of Oklahoma, Norman

Matland, R.E. 1995. "Synthesizing the Implementation Literature: The Ambiguity Conflict Model of Policy Implementation" *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 5 (2): 145-174.

Moe, Terry M. 1984. "The New Economics of Organization." *American Journal of Political Science* 28(November): 739 – 777.

Nielsen, Suzanne Christine. 2003. *Preparing For War: The Dynamics of Peacetime Military Reform*, Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

O'Hanlon, Michael E. 2005. *Defense Strategy for the Post-Saddam Era***.** Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press.

Pressman, Jeffrey L. and Aaron Wildavsky. 1984. *Implementation: How Great Expectations In Washington are Dashed in Oakland*, 3rd ed. Berkley: University of California Press: Berkley.

Reynolds, Kevin, 2004. "How the Weapons we Buy Shape the Policy we Make: Military Technology, Foreign Policy and Civilian Control of the Military." Ph.D. diss., , Temple University.

Reynolds, Kevin. 2006. *Defense Transformation: To what, for what?* Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, Carlisle, PA: Department of the Army http://www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil/

Rittel, Horst W. J. and Melvin M. Webber. 1973. Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning. *Policy Sciences* 4: 155 – 169.

Roper, Daniel S. and Richard L. Kiper. 2010. The Rediscovery of Doctrine: The U.S. Army and Counterinsurgency. *Security Challenges* 6 (Autumn): 23 – 42.

Royston, Greenwood and C. R. Hinings. 1996. "Understanding Radical Organizational Change: Bringing together the Old and the New Institutionalism." *The Academy of Management Review* 21 (October): 1022-1054.

Shapiro, Susan P. 2005. "Agency Theory." *Annual Review of Sociology* 31: 263-84.

Sowers, Thomas S. 2005. "Beyond the Soldier and the State: Contemporary Operations and Variance in Principal-Agent Relationships." *Armed Forces & Society* 31 (Spring) 385 – 409.

Stulberg, Adam N., Michael D. Salomone and Austin G. Long.2007. *Managing Defense Transformation: Agency, Culture and Service Change*. Ashgate, Burlington, VT.

Van Meter, D. and Van Horn, C.E. 1975. "The Policy Implementation Process: A Conceptual Framework." *Administration and Society* 6 (4): 445-88

Vincent, Janet Coble and Lane Crothers. 1998. *Street Level Leadership: Discretion & Legitimacy in Front-Line Public Service*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Wagner, Ruth Scogna.2006. "The Human Element of Organizational Transformation: A Phenomenographic Study of how Internal Stakeholders in Federal Defense Organizations Experience and Make Sense of Planned Organizational Change." Ph.D. diss. Fielding Graduate University, Santa Barbara, CA.

Waterman, Richard W. and Kenneth J. Meier. 1998. "Principal-Agent Models: An Expansion?" *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 8 (April): 173-202.

Wilson, James Q. 1989. *Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do And Why They Do It*. New York: Basic Books.

Zegart, Amy B. 1999. *Flawed By Design: The Evolution of the CIA, JCS, and NSC*. Palo Alto: Stanford University.

CHAPTER 4

HYPOTHESES AND METHODS

The first three chapters of this dissertation focused on the challenges to implementing transformative change in large bureaucratic organizations such as the United States Army. Chapter One presents the purpose of this research which is to determine the extent to which field grade officers understand how senior Army leaders define Army transformation. Chapter Two presented a historical context of Army transformation and how any such change is challenging. Chapter Three established both a theoretical framework that largely described the difficulty associated with significant change within a bureaucracy, as well as a description of how other scholars view Army transformation. In this chapter I will generate and test five hypotheses. Additionally I will describe the methods that were used to collect data for the case study of the three Army chiefs of staff in Chapter 5, and the survey the results of which are presented in Chapter 6. The case study and the survey results will be used to confirm the validity of the five hypotheses statements in Chapter 6.

Type of Study

This research evolved into a mixed-methods study in that it consists of both qualitative and quantitative components. The qualitative part of the study included an ethnographic protocol that was developed to explore the shared culture of a group of people. The ethnography was best represented in the open-ended interview process whereby participants included officers attending Command and General Staff College (CGSC) at Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas, as well as current CGSC faculty and staff members.

The second qualitative component consisted of narrative research. In this case the narrative research consisted of an examination of what the U.S. Army chiefs of staff have stated regarding Army transformation through official documents and speeches. The second part of this mixed-methods study is the quantitative component, which consisted primarily of an electronic survey that provided objective results and frequency counts. Specifically, a survey of student officers attending the United States Army Command and General Staff College (CGSC) at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas was conducted. J. Amos Hatch (2002) argues that a Constructivist paradigm, while acknowledging that elements are often shared across social groups, provides that multiple realities exist that are inherently unique because they are constructed by individuals who experience the world from their own vantage points (Hatch 2002, 15). In the Constructivist paradigm, researchers work with informants to co-construct understandings; in this case by using the open-ended interview as the mechanism for developing those understandings (Lucas 2007). The three components of this mixed-methods study (case study, survey, and interviews) will provide a triangulation of information that will be useful in answering the research questions, as well as developing a better understanding of Army Transformation in general. The primary research question guiding this dissertation is:

> Do U.S. Army lieutenant colonels and majors understand Army transformation in the same way as the three Army chiefs of staff who have served since 1999?

If field grade officers believe they understand what is meant by Army transformation as defined by senior level leadership, it may be possible that there exist numerous views of what

transformation means among field grade officers. Kaufman (1960) argues that attitudinal barriers appear when people have totally different frames of reference; the same facts may be apparent, but differing perspectives may lead to different conclusions. Therefore, there are often wide discrepancies, even among people with the same values and attitudes within an agency, between what members of organizations communicate to each other and what they actually convey (Kaufman 1960, 69-71).

It is an important component of this research to determine if field grade officers even acknowledge that significant change has occurred since 1999. Vincent and Crothers (1998) argue that there is an assumption that top-down policy directives will be implemented with as little deviation as possible. The authors argue that any deviation from the policy is considered to be illegitimate. The Army may be restricted in achieving transformation based on differences that may exist in how senior Army leaders and field grade officers in general view such significant change efforts. Field grade officers may need to visualize any significant change that is being pursued in the context of the missions and duties they are currently performing.

Wilson (1989) argues that new tasks will not be supported with the same level of energy and resources as are traditional tasks. Agencies, including the U.S. Army, will tend to resist taking on new tasks that seem incompatible with existing or dominant practices (Wilson 1989). Therefore, when an Army chief of staff expresses a vision for some transformative change, it may not be accepted by field grade officers across the board because they may be heavily involved in implementing current operational requirements.

Given the evidence established in Chapter 3, Literature Review, resistance may be a logical reaction to perceptions of significant change. Resistance may act as a mechanism that

causes field grade officers to perceive change as being significant change. Over the last 12 years the U.S. Army has been on a course to transform itself. The three chiefs of staff that have served since 1999 have all indicated that the U.S. Army must transform (This will be discussed further in Chapter 5 of this dissertation). Transforming a large bureaucratic organization such as the U.S. Army may be viewed as a significant occurrence. Adrianna Kezar (2005) argues that radical (i.e. transformative) change requires dramatic changes and radical departures from traditional work (636). Such change would most likely be viewed as significant by field grade officers. Small changes in an organization may be less intrusive whereby transformative change may be viewed as being both significant as well as intrusive. Thomas K. Adams (2008) argues that serious changes in a military organization are often contentious in that militaries are notoriously committed to tradition and can be counted on to resist radical change (13). The contemporary army dating back to the end of World War II, Adams (2008) continues, made no fundamental changes in 60 years. The author argues that armies have preferred incremental changes in force structure and in command and control processes, and have preferred to incorporate new technologies as they were developed. Only recently has there been recognition to do things differently (Adams 2008, 13). If incremental change has been preferred by the Army, then any transformative change may be viewed as significant in the minds of field grade officers. This leads to the first hypothesis statement:

H_1: Field grade officers will view the Army's transformation as being significant.

While field grade officers as a group may define transformation in a variety of ways, they may therefore define the term differently as compared to the Army chief of staff. Kagan (2006)

and Chun and Rainey (2005) suggest that Army Transformation may be defined based on which level of leadership position an officer might occupy. These differing points of view could be a challenge when an Army chief of staff, in his role as a "principal", has a goal in mind that he expects field grade officers, as "agents", to achieve. Shapiro (2005) argues that when principals are "one-shotters", as in the case of an Army chief of staff who serves only a relatively short period of time and therefore has little time to effect policy changes, and agents who are repeat players, or individuals who serve as field grade officers for 10 years or more, the asymmetry of power shifts from principals to agents. Field grade officers may therefore have an information advantage and as a result may define transformation differently than does the Army chief of staff.

Additionally, Douglas Macgregor (1997) argues that professional soldiers are slow in facing and adopting changes, especially transformative and radical changes that go counter to established methods and the processes that have been used for doing things for years (167). If field grade officers have been trained to perform certain tasks a certain way throughout the course of a career, it may be difficult for all field grade officers to then suddenly change (if that is what transformation calls for) and then perform significantly different tasks that they may not fully understand.

Macgregor argues that for such significant change to occur the anticipation of how the prior experiences of the rank-and-file professional military that is resistant to change, but will nevertheless be responsible for leading the Army through a slow or otherwise misdirected period of change, will need to be taken into consideration (Macgregor 1997, 229). The Army's perceived resistance to change that Macgregor refers to may be a result of the differences in how change is defined within the Army among field grade officers and senior level leadership. The

possibility that field grade officers may define transformation differently among themselves, and that field grade officers may define transformation differently than do the chiefs of staff leads us to the second and third hypotheses statements:

H_2: Field grade officers will define transformation differently from one another.

H_3: Field grade officers will define transformation differently than the chiefs of staff.

The degree to which field grade officers define transformation differently among themselves, as well as how field grade officers, collectively, define transformation differently than the Army chiefs of staff may have to do with how technology and innovation influences the perception of significant change. General Shinseki made it clear that the in order to achieve the Objective Force, the Army was going to have to make significant investments in science and technology. Shinseki (2000) stated that "the critical path of the transformation leads to the Objective Force…a major science and technology effort to develop technologies that will give the Objective Force its desired characteristics – responsiveness, agility, versatility, deployability, lethality, survivability, and sustainability." General Shinseki makes it clear that technology will be a key component in achieving the Objective Force which is to say, from his point of view, Army transformation. The results of the evolving technology to which General Shinseki refers would include the Brigade Combat Team (BCT), consisting of newly developed Future Combat Systems, that would meet the characteristics that he outlined above. Those characteristics were not only emphasized by General Shinseki, but by his successors, General Schoomaker and

General Casey, as well. In short, the need to obtain new technology and innovation, in pursuit of transformation, has been an emphasis of senior Army leaders for the last decade.

Peter Dombrowski and Eugene Gholz (2006) corroborate General Shinseki's 2000 statement by arguing that the Army's transformation is billed as the most significant change for the service since World War I that is to result in an Objective Force that will meet the characteristics of being responsive, deployable, agile, versatile, lethal, survivable, and sustainable by using the network-intensive Future Combat System (8). The emphasis on technological innovation made by the chiefs of staff, along with these authors and other writers, could not have been lost on field grade officers, which brings us to the fourth hypothesis statement:

H_4: Field grade officers believe that Army transformation is determined primarily by technological innovation.

Military equipment may be viewed as very important by field grade officers regarding any success on the battlefield; therefore significant changes in military equipment may be a key in how transformation is defined by this group of officers. Field grade officers may also look at changes in technology as intrusive. Wilson (1989) argues that improvements in communications tend to be used by higher-level commanders to reduce initiative and discretion of lower-level commanders as they proceed to execute missions. If a goal of transformation is to provide top-level commanders with complete battlefield information, thereby encroaching on the discretion

of subordinate commanders to make on-the-ground decisions, then lieutenant colonels and majors may have a negative view of this type of intrusiveness.

Goal ambiguity may cause field grade officers to form a negative perception of transformation. According to Pressman and Wildavsky (1984) all participants should be ready to contribute, as a result of effective coordination (the assumption can made that this also includes effective communication) to achieve a common purpose. The authors argue that if this does not occur, then it is possible that actors are ineffective because of ignorance, or they disagree with how the goal is to be achieved; thereby demonstrating some level of disobedience (Pressman and Wildavsky 1984, 17). The disobedience these authors refer to may be as a result of a negative perception of either what the goal includes or an uncertainty of the goal itself.

Waterman and Meier (1998) argue that if there is a goal conflict between the principal and agents then agents have an incentive to shirk, or to engage in activities that do not meet the expectations of the principal. These authors argue that shirking may occur if the preferences of the principals and agents diverge, if there is a high degree of uncertainty, or if the agent has a distinct information advantage (Waterman and Meier 198, 176-177). If the goal is not clear, then field grade officers may hold a high degree of uncertainty which could indicate a negative view of transformation. If lieutenant colonels and majors view the Army chief of staff's intentions in fielding new high technological capabilities in order to centralize control at the highest level then field grade officers may have a negative view of those goals.

Field grade officers may be more inclined to operate within a system that they know and understand as opposed to changing to something that they do not clearly understand or embrace. Greenwood and Hinings (1996) argue that the more embedded processes become the more

problematic the achievement of transformation will become. As stated in the literature review, if U.S. Army officers tasked with the implementing aspect of transformation are unclear about what radical change means to them, then they may be more committed to the status quo, or the prevailing institutional template of which they are more familiar. Mahnken and FitzSimmons (2003) argue that it is difficult to implement "radical" or "transformative" change unless there is broad support within the officer corps. Since the military will be the practitioners of any new methods of fighting, those service members need to be enthusiastic about any new technology, operational concepts, or organizational structure if they are being asked to depart from the status quo, or from what they currently know. This leads to the fifth hypothesis statement:

H_5: Field grade officers will view Army transformation efforts critically.

These five statements of hypothesis will be tested with the survey data and interviews results in Chapter 6, Chapter 7. When tested, these hypotheses will examine whether indeed a gap that exists between how Army chiefs of staff and field grade officers define transformation. The research question is representative of a problem that may exist in the larger topical area of implementing significant change in a large bureaucracy. The problem may be as a result of the relationship between a principal and an agent, or it could have to do with the cultural aspects of how actors within the organization both understand and respond to the need for significant change.

The Case Study

The case study is used to investigate the contextualized contemporary phenomenon of describing what Army Transformation might mean in a practical context (Hatch 2002, 30). J. Amos Hatch (2002, 30) argues that defining boundaries and specifying the unit of analysis (i.e. what it is you want to be able to say at the end of the study) are the key decision point in case study design (Hatch 2002). John Gerring (2004) argues that a case study is an intensive study of a single unit for the purpose of understanding a larger class of similar units. The statements that have been made by each of the three U.S. Army chiefs of staff may be viewed as a unit of analysis, while the three chiefs of staff, collectively, may fit Gerring's description of a larger class or similar units. Since it was not practical to seek an interview with each of these three senior Army leaders, Chapter 5 of this research examines their comments in speeches, testimony and official documents in order to determine what they have stated regarding Army transformation.

The primary sources of information regarding the views of the chiefs of staff were speeches, testimony before Congress, and statements and directives they have made within the Army itself. Appendix A lists all of the primary and secondary sources included in the analysis. For instance, U.S. Army publications were reviewed which included Army manuals that specifically addressed transformation efforts. These documents were prepared by Army planners who served to articulate the vision of the Army Chief of Staff serving at the time. These documents included the Army Transformation Roadmap, Army White-Paper Studies, and official directives and announcements. The speeches that were made over the last decade by the three chiefs of staff, such as at the annual meeting of the Association of the United States Army (AUSA), also provided information about the future direction that they had in mind, individually,

for the Army. In addition to the specific views of the chiefs of staff, it was also relevant to include the views of other observers and their thoughts of how effective the chiefs of staff were in achieving Army transformation goals.

There were numerous sources of secondary information. The Congressional Research Service (CRS), the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) and the General Accountability Office (GAO) all provided useful information regarding the initiatives and progress of Army transformation under the chiefs of staff.

The Survey Instrument

On May 20, 2008, my dissertation chair, Dr. William D. Schreckhise, and I met with Dr. Ralph O. Doughty (Major General, USA Retired), the Transformation Chair at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. The purpose of the visit was to provide an overview of the proposed research, which included an in-depth discussion of the research questions listed above, and to gain his support for allowing me to conduct a survey and interviews at CGSC. Dr. Doughty did refer me to the Quality Assurance Office for purposes of constructing and launching the survey that eventually took place in the fall 2009 and winter of 2010.

In order to determine how lieutenant colonels and majors view Army transformation it was necessary to conduct a survey. Unlike the Army chiefs of staff, where there is only one at a time, there are thousands of lieutenant colonels and majors serving throughout the Army at even given time. As compared to the Army chiefs of staff, these field grade officers' views towards transformation are not well known.

A survey allowed for a great deal of information to be collected over a relatively short period of time from a target group of field grade officers. The field grade officers who are serving now have the potential of becoming the senior Army leaders over the next decade, up to and including becoming the Chief of Staff of the United States Army. Officers who are selected to attend the Army's Command and General Staff College (CGSC) at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas may have a better chance of attaining senior level rank than those officers not selected for attendance. Since officers who graduate from CGSC will live with the affects of any Army transformation that may occur, it was important to know how they might define Army transformation now. The field grade officers attending CGSC are selected based on their future potential for advancement, because those that attend CGSC come from a variety of experiences and assignments throughout the Army, and accessibility to such a population of field grade officers is rare. While there is no guarantee that those officers who attend Military Education Level 4 (MEL 4) training such as CGSC will become a general officer, those officers not selected for MEL 4 training will, in all probability, not attain general officer rank. In other words, the pyramid for promotional opportunities gets narrower the more senior an officer becomes. If an officer did not attend MEL 4 training, then the selection for senior rank is most likely reserved for those officers who are more competitive due in part to the fact that they did complete such training. At the same time, because of other considerations such as performance in past assignments and other training experiences, there is no guarantee that an officer will rise to the rank of general officer even if MEL 4 training was completed.

The principal tool employed to gather quantitative data was the survey instrument (See Appendix B). This survey was developed throughout the summer of 2009 and was approved by both the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Arkansas and the Quality

Assurance Office (QAO) at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. I received IRB approval on July 28, 2009 and the survey was formatted to meet QAO guidelines in August 2009. The QAO required that the survey be put into a format (Inquisite Survey[tm] software[11]) that is common to all research conducted at CGSC. The original intent was to issue the survey via e-mail over the CGSC intranet system, in September 2009 and collect data over a two to three week period. As it turned out, there was such a small sample size and a correspondingly low response rate that it became necessary to seek out a larger group of students at CGSC. There were some information systems issues occurring at Fort Leavenworth, between September 2009 and January 2010, which may have affected the low response rate in the initial attempt. The QAO determined that for students living off-base in the Fort Leavenworth area, accessibility to the survey may have been problematic. The problem appeared to have been fixed by February 2010.

On Friday, February 19, 2010, the survey was e-mailed to 837 student-officers via the CGSC intra-net system. Although there were over 1,000 officers in this particular group of officers, a portion of them come from the armed forces of other countries and from the U.S. Navy, Air Force, and Marines. I requested that the survey be sent only to Regular U.S. Army, U.S. Army Reserve and U.S. Army National Guard officers. There was a follow-up reminder issued on Tuesday, February 23, 2010. The survey period closed at midnight, March 1, 2010. Ideally, it would have been preferred to have had at least one more week with at least one more follow-up, but QAO believed it would not serve a useful purpose. Additionally, QAO indicated that there were four other surveys from other researchers issued at the same time as this one and they feared that students might experience some survey fatigue if we continued any longer.

[11] Inquisite Survey[tm] software is the standard method by which the QAO at CGSC launches and manages all surveys in support of independent research efforts. All surveys must be configured into this format before QAO agrees to support any survey needed by external researchers.

Regardless, out of the 837 officers who were sent the survey, there were 216 officers who responded, which provided a response rate of 25.8%. Of the 216 officers who responded to the survey, 19 of those officers identified themselves as other than Active Army, Army Reserve, or Army National Guard. That would have brought the response rate down to 24.3%. This response rate represents 197 respondents which is consistent with the maximum number of officers who responded to any one survey item.

Although a higher response rate would have been preferred, Dr. David Bitters (2011)[12], a statistician at CGSC, indicated that a response rate of between 20 – 25% is normal, based on his experience of over 15 years in working with surveys at CGSC. Bitters mentioned that response rates were somewhat higher at the beginning of a new class of CGSC students (in this case the fall of 2009) and by the time that officers received this survey (February 2010), they may have reached some level of "survey fatigue," given the large number of surveys that are issued on behalf of a variety of researchers. Hal G. Rainey and Barry Bozeman (2000) argue that there are many studies that compare public and private organizations with relatively low survey response rates of 35-45 percent, while this research does not necessarily seek to compare private and public organizations, I am concerned about how a large public organization addresses significant change. Rainey and Bozeman argue that much if not the majority of the published organization research have rather low overall survey response rates (Rainey and Bozeman 2000, 465). Dr. Bitters confirmed that the results of the survey regarding Army transformation provides for just under a 95 percent confidence level by using 197 respondents from a population of 837. The 217 actual respondents provide for a greater than 95% level of confidence. The management of the survey was largely out of my control. The QAO manages all surveys that are issued to CGSC

[12] David Bitters, telephone interview and e-mail correspondence, July 1, 2011

students. It is difficult to determine that if the survey would have been available for an additional week, with an additional follow-up request being issued by the QAO via e-mail to the student population, whether a greater response rate would have been achieved. The QAO forwarded the survey results to me on Friday, March 5, 2010, in SPSS, excel, and MS Word formats. The survey results will be presented in Chapter 6 of this dissertation.

The survey participants were military officers attending a military school and literally all data collection resources were provided by the Quality Assurance Office at CGSC. For these reasons, it is necessary to regard the survey section of the data collection as "quasi-experimental". Campbell and Stanley (1963) argue that final interpretation of an experiment and the attempt to fit it into a developing science is imperfect; however, the idea is to design the very best instrument which the situation allows. It is necessary to seek out those artificial and natural laboratories which provide for the best opportunities for control (Campbell and Stanley 1963, 34). This provides for the basis in selecting a quasi-experimental approach for conducting a survey at CGSC. The other relevant aspect of the survey as a tool for data collection relates to the expert nature of the informants. Rossi, Lipsey and Freeman (2004) argue that the easiest approach to estimating the extent of a social problem is to ask key informants or persons whose experience should provide them with some knowledge of the magnitude and distribution of the problem. These informants can provide useful information about the nature of target populations, in this case O-4 and O-5 field grade Army officers, and the nature of their understanding of a military service need, i.e., a clear understanding of Army Transformation (Rossi, Lipsey and Freeman 2004, 114-115).

The survey specifically addresses areas of interest emerging from the literature review in presented in Chapter 3, as well as in the case study that was conducted in Chapter 5 of this

research. After the demographic information was determined, Table 4.1 illustrates the survey items that cause the participants to acknowledge whether significant change has actually occurred over the last decade, if the term significant and transformation have the same meaning, and if the participants understand the meaning of transformation. The empirical information is useful in determining whether the participants acknowledge the occurrence of significant change, whether the transformation goals that have been provided by senior level leaders are understood, and if the term transformation is understood by them. For nearly all questions on the survey, respondents choose from a five-point Lickert scale the option that most closely matches their opinions, ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree."

Table 4.1

Views of Army Transformation

The U.S. Army has experienced significant organizational change since 1999.
Significant change and transformation are synonymous relative to current U.S. Army goals.

The survey then moves into the area of leadership. Table 4.2 provides statements that pertain directly to the Army chiefs of staff and the combatant commanders and how they view transformation. Combatant commanders are the four-star generals or admirals who are responsible for military operations in specific regions of the world, such as the Central Command (CENTCOM) Commander who is responsible for military operations in the Middle.

These items aim to determine to what extent the respondents believe the Army chiefs have been consistent and clear about defining transformation's goals, and to what extent they have influence vis-à-vis the operational combatant commanders.

Table 4.2

Basis of Army Transformation

U.S. Army transformation is based largely on the integration of technology into weapon systems.
U.S. Army transformation is based largely on changes in force structure.
U.S. Army transformation is a process and not an end-state.
U.S. Army transformation addresses the complete "battle-space" (all aspects of the battlefield before, during and after combat operations).
U.S. Army transformation addresses all aspects of the U.S. Army mission

If significant or transformative change does exist, it is important to know how the informants interpret the basis for such change. Table 4.3 provides the five areas of the survey that addresses the basis for transformative change within the Army. In Chapters 2, 3 and 5 of this dissertation, technology is prominent in the discussion on transformation (FCS, information

systems, modularity, etc.). Similarly, force structure, or how the Army as an organization is structured, may be a key determinant for how transformation is implemented. A topic of specific interest has to do with whether Army transformation is a process or an end-state. The Army chiefs of staff have all indicated that transformation is both an end-state (fielding FCS in order to meet the threats of the Twenty-first Century) and as a process (transformation is a journey and will be continuous). Whether field grade officers view transformation as either a process or an end-state may help determine the gap that may exist in how the term is intended by senior Army leaders. Additionally, it is important to determine if field grade officers view transformation as being a part of all aspects of the battlefield. The "before part" of the battle-space has to do with those capabilities that are required in advance of heavy combat involvement (surveillance, low-intensity operations, etc.); the "during part" of the battle-space has to do with the capabilities that are needed to execute combat operations; and, the "after part" addresses the Army's capabilities that are needed for peacekeeping operations once hostilities have ended.

It is also important to know whether the informants view Army transformation holistically. Does transformation include everything that the Army does in the context of its vast variety of missions (roles and responsibilities)? The Army is involved in research, development, test and evaluation of new technology; it is involved in the procurement of weapon systems and a variety of goods and services; and, it is involved in recruiting and retention of soldiers, just to name a few of the missions that are not directly related to battlefield operations.

Table 4.3

Perceptions of Technology's Role in Army Transformation

The weapon systems development time-line is a key aspect of determining successful transformation.
The U.S. Army will rely on technology to drive transformation goals.
Field grade officers believe that Network Centric Warfare is a significant component of transformation.
Field grade officers believe that Future Combat Systems is a significant transformation factor.

The respondent's perception of Army transformation on an organizational level is important to determine. Table 4.4 provides a variety of organizational components that have been addressed throughout this dissertation. There is a question of whether the Army can even remain relevant if it fails to achieve its transformation goals. Perhaps one of the obstacles in achieving transformation has to do with the development and fielding of new weapon systems. Does the Army's vast educational system clearly express the chief of staff's goals for achieving transformation?

The Army may rely on technology that may be late-breaking or that has not yet been developed in order to achieve its future transformation goals. It is important to determine whether the informants perceive the Army chiefs of staff goals for Army transformation as being clear and understood. As discussed in Chapter 3, a clear expression of what transformation

means from the top may be impossible to achieve as the goals expressed by senior leaders are filtered down through the various subcultures that may exist within the Army. Indeed, the informants may be indicating that in order for the Army to transform, the culture within the Army may first have to change.

Table 4.4

Views of Leadership on Army Transformation

The term transformation is well understood by field grade officers in terms of U.S. Army change objectives.
The meaning of Army transformation changes from one chief of staff to the next.
The Combatant Commanders (CINCs) have greater influence in defining transformation than does the Army chief of staff.
I believe senior Army leadership has been clear in defining transformation goals.
The U.S. Army transformation goals should be more clearly stated by senior Army leadership.
Field grade officers have an opportunity to provide input in determining what Army transformation means.

Field grade officers have flexibility in implementing Army transformation goals.
Significant change in U.S. Army organizational goals are clearly understood by field grade officers.

Finally, it is important to determine from the informant's perspective how field grade officers, in general, view transformation. The responses may be considered rather normative based on the informant's collective experiences and associations with other field grade officers over the course of a career, and most particularly over the previous decade. It is very possible that a bias may occur as the informants, as field grade officers, may interject their view, and not take into consideration what field grade officers may believe. Table 4.5 represents that part of the survey that seeks to determine how, in the opinion of the informants, field grade officers view transformation. The Literature Review revealed the possibility that senior level officials within a bureaucracy may not be all that interested in what mid-level officials think about significant change; it will be interesting to know if field grade officers feel any different. Also, it may be useful to determine if field grade officers have a certain amount of flexibility or discretion in how transformation is implemented within their area of control. It is also important to determine if field grade officers believe that transformation is even needed at all as the Army prepares for the threat scenarios in the future. Do field grade officers believe that information technology, along the lines of Network Centric Warfare, is a must if the Army is to truly transform? A Network Centric Warfare capability was to be a major component of the FCS program; it is important to determine if field grade officers still view FCS as a key component of transformation. Finally, if it is possible for the informants to represent the views of their

colleagues throughout the Army, do field grade officers believe transformation is a process or an end-state.

In addition to the informant's response to the objective items in the survey, there was an opportunity for the informants to provide comments that should allow for more insight into their views. In summary, the survey provides an efficient way to gather information from a large number of key informants, in a very controlled environment and within a relatively short period of time. As will be addressed in Chapter 6, these key informants have considerable and relevant military experience, and many have previously formed some opinion of what transformation means to the Army. The important aspect here is to determine whether the officers' perceptions are the same as those expressed by senior Army leadership. In addition to the analysis of the survey results, another way to determine whether that perception is similar is to conduct an open-ended interview with individual field grade officers.

The Open-ended Interviews

This research is interested in a phenomenon that includes a few specific questions, with one being "What does Army transformation mean to you?" Because Army transformation may appear to be ambiguous, using an open-ended interview method will allow for digressions in the interview that may provide additional insight by the informants or participants. Hatch (2002) argues that "qualitative interviewers create a special kind of speech event during which they ask open-ended questions, encourage informants to explain their unique perspectives on the issues at hand, and listen intently for special language and other clues that reveal meaning structures informants use to understand their worlds" (Hatch 2002, 23). Additionally, the interviews moved

in a positive direction because of the subject matter expertise possessed by the informants. Flexibility is needed to create interaction and a shared responsibility for both the questions and the answers that are needed for a meaningful interview (Hatch 2002, 23).

According to Christopher J. Lucas (2007) the open-ended interview process allows the researcher to get to the important question by creating a monologue. Lucas argues that open-ended questions encourage informants to explain unique perspectives and requires the researcher to listen intently to better understand "the world". In addition to the basic demographic information, Lucas (2007) recommends that the interview consist of 8-10 questions. Lucas suggested that up to 20 interviews are usually too much, but 8 – 10 may be good enough (2007). Interviews with student officers, as well as staff and faculty, all of whom were in the grade of lieutenant colonel or major were conducted on Wednesday, January 13, 2010.

The Quality Assurance Office referred me to the Deputy Chief, U.S. Student Division, at CGSC to arrange for the interview participants. The Deputy selected eight officers to participate and consisted of four staff/faculty and four student officers. I did not have any influence in determining how officers were asked to participate in the interviews. There were no female or minority officers selected to participate. The interviews consisted of open-ended questions that allowed for greater benefit of the informants' insight and experience (see Appendix C for the interview protocol). There were eight interview participants; however the record of one of the participants did not survive.[13] The interviews were conducted individually beginning at 8:00 a.m. The Deputy Director of the U.S. Student Division reserved a classroom in which the interviews

[13] One of the mini-cassette tapes used to record an interview could not be used for purposes of transcription; the information on that particular tape could not be retrieved due to an equipment malfunction.

were conducted. Individual interviews lasted between 45 and 60 minutes; there were four interviews in the morning and four in the afternoon.

Before the beginning of each interview, an informed consent form was presented to the participant, one signed copy was given to the officer and another signed copy was placed in my file. The interview questions ensured that basic demographic information would be collected from each officer. The interviews allowed for a confidential interchange to occur between the interviewee and the informant. The opportunity to have this interchange would not only allow for me to triangulate this information with that provided in the surveys, it allowed for a personalization to occur on a subject that is extremely important within the Army itself. Case study and survey analysis is very good in the research process, but actually talking with individuals who live the reality of the research at issue is irreplaceable.

The results of the interviews are included in Chapter Six. It is important to discuss why these particular open-ended questions were relevant for purposes of addressing the research questions. In Appendix C, interview questions five through seven causes each participant to take a position on any change that may have occurred within the Army since 1999. Has the Army experienced any organizational change since 1999? Questions eight through 11 ask the informant to identify the individual he/she believes is responsible for change within the Army, and whether or not a vision for that change has been established. Questions 12 through 14 give the informant the opportunity to determine a reason for why change occurs within the Army. The national security threat that is different than that of the Cold War, along with terms such as faster, mobile, lighter, more lethal, and one with less of a logistics footprint were purposely excluded in anticipation that the informant would present his/her own terms in this open-ended format. Finally, questions 15 and 16 provide the informant the opportunity to acknowledge any

difference in how senior Army leaders and field grade officers define Army transformation. Although these questions may appear to direct an informant in a pre-determined direction, this open-ended interview did result in gaining considerable insight from the informants.

Research Considerations

Having discussed the data collection process, it is important now to briefly discuss what is expected as a result of the data analysis in Chapter Seven. Additionally, there are some limitations to this study that need to be highlighted. Limitations need to be addressed in order to keep the research findings in a proper perspective. Regardless of the results of this study, hopefully the findings here will be relevant for future research. Finally, there were ethical issues that needed to be taken into consideration throughout the course of this study. While acts of reciprocity may not be available in the short-term to the officers who participated in the surveys and interviews, perhaps the benefits of this research will provide some benefit in the future.

Data Analysis

Analyses will be conducted that links the case study, the survey and the interview results together. This analysis will be provided for in Chapter Seven of this dissertation. Hatch (2002, 148) argues that data analysis is a systematic search for meaning. The author continues by arguing that data analysis provides the researcher with a way to see patterns, identify themes, discover relationships, develop explanations, make interpretations, mount critiques or generate theories. Therefore, for the purposes of this research, should provide insight into the degree to which field grade officers understand transformation in ways similar to how senior Army leaders define it.

Limitations of the Research

The analysis of the case study in Chapter Five and the survey data and interview results of Chapter Six will be the focus of Chapter Seven. The case study does include primary material that provides for statements and directives that were made by the Army chiefs of staff regarding transformation. However, those statements do not account for all of the other possible statements and comments that were made in various meetings within the Army that are publicly available. Additionally, whereas senior civilian leaders of a large bureaucracy may be in a position for many years, those serving as Army chief of staff are only in that position for about four years. Because of this relatively short tenure, transferability of the findings in this study may be limited if used in another context where leaders serve for longer periods of time. Finally, the military bureaucracy simply may be different than civilian bureaucracy.

The survey was conducted at the U.S. Army Command and General College over a relatively short period of time of two weeks. There was a rather low response rate of 25.8%. While such a response rate may be adequate for most social science research, ideally a higher response rate would have increased confidence from this particular population. Additionally, this survey may be viewed as a survey of convenience given that it was conducted in a rather short period of time and where there was a rather high population of field grade officers in a single location. Although there may be a high selection rate for attendance at CGSC, not all field grade officers attend this school at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. Some Army officers who are selected for this level of training may attend similar programs sponsored by the Air Force, Navy or Marines, in which case their viewpoints would not have been available. Some officers may not attend this level of training at all, which again would prevent their viewpoints from being known.

The interviews were conducted in one day. As stated earlier, I did not have any influence in who was selected to participate. All interview participants were white males. Out of eight participants, it would have been ideal to have had at least some representation of female and minority officers. Because of the limited amount of time, and the confidentiality of the interviews, a verification of comments was not pursued with the participants. Some officers were faculty and staff and some officers were students attending CGSC. There may have been a certain level of apprehension in revealing personal viewpoints, depending on if you represented one group or the other. Students may have been much more reserved and apprehensive as compared to faculty and staff.

Regardless of which of these two groups represented here, they still only represent a small group of field grade officers who happen to be stationed at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas; their opinions may not be absolutely reflective of all field grade officers serving in the U.S. Army.

Ethical Considerations and Reciprocity

An informed consent form was provided to all participants prior to the survey or prior to the interview. The informed consent form was approved by the Compliance Coordinator, in the Research and Cosponsored Programs Research Compliance Office, at the University of Arkansas, as well as by the Quality Assurance Office and the U.S. Student Division at the Command and General Staff College. The informed consent form appeared at the beginning of the survey, and by selecting to take the survey informed consent was granted by the participants. For those officers that participated in the interview process, an informed consent form was provided to them for their review and signature. The officer being interviewed kept a copy and I kept a copy for my files. The interviews were recorded with the officers' permission. All notes

made by me, along with the tapes of the interviews, have been retained in my possession and are not accessible by anyone else.

The officers who are either attending CGSC as a student or who are assigned there as a faculty or staff member will benefit as a result of this research. Individuals that are currently serving as U.S. Army lieutenant colonels and majors will be senior leaders in the future. The officers who participated in this study will benefit directly if this research is a part of a larger process that better defines what the Army needs to look like in the future. The senior Army leaders who might review this research may consider it as at least one more data point as transformation efforts continue. If this research results in a better flow of information and communication within the current Army structure, then it will have served its purpose.

Summary

The methodology used for collecting the data for this research has resulted in a study that should provide greater insight on how significant change occurs in a large bureaucracy. Specifically, the case study, survey, and interviews have all revealed information that addresses the research questions. As a result of the methods that have been used here, Chapter Seven could reveal that some gap exists between how senior Army leaders define transformation and what that term means to field grade officers. It is important that the lieutenant colonels and majors serving now understand what senior leaders mean by transformation. The transformation initiatives that are pursued now will result in programs that future senior leaders will implement, whether they agree with those programs or not. A common understanding of transformation may result in goal congruence in this vital area, which may increase efficiency and reduce the costs associated with pursuing programs that do not support transformation.

References

Adams, Thomas K. 2008. *The Army After Next: The First Postindustrial Army*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Bacevich, Andrew J. 2005. *The New American Militarism: How Americans are Seduced by War.* New York: Oxford University.

Campbell, Donald T. and Julian C. Stanley. 1963. *Experimental and Quasi-experimental Designs for Research*, Houghton Mifflin, Co., Boston, MA.

Dombrowski, Peter and Eugene Gholz. 2006. Buying Military Transformation. New York: Columbia University Press.

Gerring, John. 2004. "What is a Case Study and what is it Good for?" *American Political Science Review* 98(2): 341-354.

Greenwood, Royston and C.R. Hinings. 1996. "Understanding Radical Organizational Change: Bringing together the Old and the New Institutionalism." *The Academy of Management Review* 21:41022-1054.

Hatch, J. Amos.2002. *Doing Qualitative Research in Education Settings*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Kagan, Frederick W. 2006. *Finding the Target: The Transformation of American Military Policy*. New York: Encounter Books.

Kaufman, Herbert. 2006 [1960]. *The Forest Ranger: A Study in Administrative Behavior*. Special Reprint ed. Washington, D.C.: RFF Press.

Kezar, Adrianna. 2005. Consequences of Radical Change in Governance: A Grounded Theory Approach. *The Journal of Higher Education*. 76 (6): 634- 668.

Lucas, Christopher J. 2007. *Class Lecture Notes from EDFD 6533, Qualitative Research in Education*. University of Arkansas. Spring.

Macgregor, Douglas A. 1997. *Breaking the Phalanx: A New Design for Landpower in the 21st Century*. Westport: Praeger.

Mahnken, Thomas G. and James R. FitzSimonds. 2003. "Revolutionary Ambivalence: Understanding Officer Attitudes toward Transformation." *International Security* 28 (Autumn): 112-148.

Pressman, Jeffrey L. and Aaron Wildavsky. 1984. *Implementation: How Great Expectations In Washington are Dashed in Oakland*, 3rd ed. Berkley: University of California Press: Berkley.

Rainey, Hal G. and Barry Bozeman. 2000. "Comparing Public and Private Organizations: Empirical Research and the Power of the A Priori." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 10(2): 447-469.

Rossi, Peter H., Mark W. Lipsey and Howard E. Freeman. 2004. *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach*. 7th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Shapiro, Susan P. 2005. "Agency Theory." *Annual Review of Sociology* 31: 263-84.

Shinseki, Eric K. General. 2000. Testimony before the U.S. Senate Airland Subcommittee on Armed Services. 106th Cong. 2nd sess. March 8. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Stulberg, Adam N., Michael D. Salomone and Austin G. Long. 2007. *Managing Defense Transformation: Agency, Culture and Service Change*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Vincent, Janet Coble and Lane Crothers. 1998. *Street Level Leadership: Discretion & Legitimacy in Front-Line Public Service*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Waterman, Richard W. and Kenneth J. Meier. 1998. "Principal-Agent Models: An Expansion?" *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 8 (April): 173-202.

Wilson, James Q. 1989. *Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do And Why They Do It*. New York: Basic Books.

APPENDIX A

ARMY CHIEFS OF STAFF PRIMARY SOURCES

The following represents the principle sources of primary information, used in this research that provides a record of what the chiefs of staff have stated regarding transformation since 1999. In reviewing other closely associated research, I am confident that the following primary documents provides for a comprehensive view of how the chiefs of staff have each expressed their vision and view of what a transformed army means. While there were numerous secondary sources who provided direct quotations of the views of the chiefs of staff on transformation, those are not included here. Finally, while FM 3-0 is an official manual of the U.S. Army, it is approved for distribution by the chief of staff.

Brownlee, Les and Schoomaker, Peter J. General. 2004. *U.S. Army Posture Statement*. Office of the Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, Special Actions Branch. February 5.

Brownlee, Les and Schoomaker, Peter J. General. 2004. *Serving a Nation at War: A Campaign Quality Army with Joint and Expeditionary Capabilities*. Parameters. Summer

Casey, Jr., George W. General. 2008. "Chief of Staff Speaks at the Eisenhower Luncheon, Association of the United States Army." http://www.army.mil/speeches/2008/10/10/13213-chief-of-staff-speaks-at-eisenhower-luncheon (2/28/2009)

Casey, Jr., George W. General. 2010. U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Armed Services. *Chief of Staff of the Army Testimony*. 111th Cong. 2d sess. February 23

Casey, Jr., George W. General. 2007. "*Chief of Staff Speaks at the Eisenhower Luncheon, Association of the United States Army*." http://wwws.ausa.org/webpub/DeptHome.nsf/byid/WEBP-77ZUXW (2/28/2009)

Casey, Jr., George W. General. 2007. U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Armed Services., *Chief of Staff of the Army Statement*. 110th Cong. 1st Sess. November 15.

Casey, Jr., George W. General. 2004. U.S. Congress. Senate Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support. 108th Cong. 2nd sess. March 9.

Geren, Pete and George W. Casey, Jr. General. 2009. U.S. Congress, Committees and Subcommittees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. *A Statement on the Posture of the United States Army 2009*. 111th Cong. 1st sess. May 7. http://www.army.mil/aps/09/ (3/17/2011)

Harvey, Francis J. and Peter J. Schoomaker. General. 2006. U.S. Congress. Committees and Subcommittees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives. A Statement on the Posture of the United States Army 2006. 109th Cong. 2nd sess. February 10.

Hollister, Eric A. 2010. A Shot in the Dark: The Futility of Long-Range Modernization Planning. *The Land Warfare Papers No. 79*. Arlington: The Institute of Land Warfare

Schoomaker, Peter J. General. 2007. U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Armed Services. *Chief of Staff of the Army Statement*. 110th Cong. 1st sess. February 15.

Schoomaker, Peter J. 2006. U.S. Congress, House Committee on Armed Forces. *Chief of Staff of the Army Statement*. 109th Cong. 2nd sess. June 27.

Schoomaker, Peter J. General. 2005. U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Armed Services. *Chief of Staff of the Army Opening Statement*. 109th Cong. 1st sess. June 30.

Schoomaker, Peter J. General. 2004. U.S. Congress. House Committee on Armed Services. *Chief of Staff of the Army Remarks.* 108th Cong. 2nd sess. January 28.

Schoomaker, Peter J. General. 2004. *United States Army Transformation Roadmap*. Department of the Army.

Schoomaker, Peter J. General. 2003. *United States Army Transformation Roadmap*. Department of the Army.

Schoomaker, Peter J. General. 2003. *Address during the Eisenhower Luncheon of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association of the United States Army*. Washington, D.C. October 7.

Shinseki, Eric K. 2002. U.S. Congress. Senate Committee on Armed Services. *Chief of Staff of the Army Statement.* 107th Cong. 2nd sess. May 16.

Shinseki, Eric K. 2001. U.S. Army *White Paper: Concept for Objective Force*. Washington: Department of the Army.

Shinseki, Eric K. General. 2000. *CSA Sends – The Army Black Beret*. November 11 http://www.army.mil/features/beret/beret.htm (April 1, 2011)

Shinseki, Eric K. General. 2000. U.S. Congress. U.S. Senate Airland Subcommittee on Armed Services. *Chief of Staff of the Army Testimony*.106th Cong. 2nd sess. March 8. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Shinseki, Eric K. 1999. U.S. Congress. U.S. Senate. Committee on Armed Services. *Chief of Staff of the Army Testimony*. 106th Cong., 1st sess., October 26. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Shinseki, Eric K. General. 1999. *Address during the Eisenhower Luncheon of the 45th Annual Meeting of the Association of the United States Army*. Washington, D.C. October 12.

United States Army Field Manual 3-0. 2008. The Army Operations and Doctrine Smartbook: Guide to FM 3-0 Operations & the Six Warfighting Functions, 4th ed. Lakeland, FL: Lightening Press.

White, Thomas E. and Eric E. Shinseki, General. 2002. U.S. Army Posture Statement. (http://www.army.mil/aps/html/letter.html)

White, Thomas E. and Eric E. Shinseki, General. 2001. U.S. Congress. Senate Committee on Armed Forces. *Joint Statement by the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Staff of the Army.* 107th Cong. 1st sess. July 10

APPENDIX B

United States Army Command and General Staff College

Army Transformation Survey

Researcher(s): Administrator(s):
David H. Jerome, Graduate Student, Public Policy Ph.D. Program

Researchers:

David H. Jerome, Graduate Student
William D. Schreckhise, Ph.D., Faculty Advisor
University of Arkansas
College of Arts and Sciences
Public Policy Ph.D. Program
428 Old Main
Fayetteville, AR 72701
479-575-3356
djerome@uark.edu

Compliance Contact Person:

Ro Windwalker, Compliance Coordinator
Research & Sponsored Programs
Research Compliance
University of Arkansas
120 Ozark Hall
Fayetteville, AR 72701-1201
479-575-2208
irb@uark.edu

Description: The present study will investigate the meaning of "Army Transformation" as defined by senior U.S. Army leaders and U.S. Army lieutenant colonels and majors. You are asked to voluntarily participate in this survey.

Risks and Benefits: The benefits include contributing to the knowledge base pertaining to the meaning of the term "Army Transformation". By engaging in the survey you should continue to consider the meaning of "Army Transformation", perhaps throughout your career, and its importance to senior level planners and decision-makers. There are no anticipated risks to participating in the survey.

Voluntary Participation: Your participation in the research is completely voluntary.

Confidentiality: All information will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law and University policy. Results from the research will be reported as aggregate data.

Right to Withdraw: You are free to refuse to participate in the research and to withdraw from this study at any time. Your decision to withdraw will bring no negative consequences — no penalty to you.

Purpose of the survey: The following survey is a part of a doctoral research project concerning United States Army transformation efforts that have occurred since 1999. The survey will take roughly 15 minutes to complete. The questions below will be used to understand differences in perception among different groups. There will be no attempts to identify individual responses. The aggregated summary information will be used by the researcher but will otherwise remain confidential. If you do not feel comfortable answering a question, leave it blank. Your participation in this survey is very much appreciated.

Demographic Information

1. Current rank

   A. O4

   B. O5

   C. 06

   D. Other, specify: _____

2. Army Component

   A. Active Army

   B. Army Reserves

   C. Army National Guard

   D. Other, specify: _____

3. Current Duty Position

   A. CGSC Student Officer

   B. CGSC Staff

   C. CGSC Faculty

   D. Other, specify: _____

4. Total number of years of active duty service: _____

5. Gender

   A. Male

   B. Female

6. Age: ____

7. Race: _____

8. Highest level of education achieved:

   A. Bachelor's Degree

   B. Master's Degree

C. Doctorate

D. Other: _____

9. Source of U.S. Army Commission:

A. Military Academy

B. OCS

C. ROTC

D. Direct

E. Other: _____

10. Branch (i.e. Infantry, Artillery, Acquisition Corps):_____

Please respond to all of the remaining survey comments by using the following scale:

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
5	4	3	2	1	

Terminology

The purpose of this section is to gain an understanding of what the term "transformation" means to you

1. The U.S. Army has experienced significant organizational change since 1999.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

2. Significant change in U.S. Army organizational goals by field grade officers.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

3. "Significant change" and "transformation" are synonymous relative to current U.S. Army goals.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

4. The term “transformation” is well understood by field grade officers in terms of U.S. Army change objectives.

5 4 3 2 1 Don’t Know

5. I believe senior Army leadership has been clear in defining “transformation” goals

5 4 3 2 1 Don’t Know

6. The meaning of Army transformation changes from one Army Chief of Staff to the next.

5 4 3 2 1 Don’t Know

7. Combatant Commanders (CINCs) have greater influence in defining Army Transformation than does the Army Chief of Staff.

5 4 3 2 1 Don’t Know

Comments

What “transformation” means to the Army

The purpose of this section is to gain an understanding of what transformation means to the Army.

8. U.S. Army transformation is based largely on the integration of technology into weapon systems.

5 4 3 2 1 Don’t Know

9. U.S. Army transformation is based largely on changes in force structure.

5 4 3 2 1 Don’t Know

10. U.S. Army transformation is based largely on information technology.

5 4 3 2 1 Don’t Know

11. U.S. Army transformation is a process and not an end-state.

5 4 3 2 1 Don’t Know

12. U.S. Army transformation addresses the complete “battle-space” (all aspects of the battlefield, before, during and after combat operations).

5 4 3 2 1 Don’t Know

13. Transformation addresses all aspects of the U.S. Army mission.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

14. The U.S. Army will remain relevant even if transformation goals are not achieved.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

15. The weapon systems development time-line is a key aspect in determining successful transformation.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

16. Military training and educational institutions clearly express a senior level description of what "Army Transformation" means.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

Comments

Field Grade Officer views about transformation

The purpose of this section is to get your perceptions of what other field grade officers think about "transformation"

17. Field grade officers have an opportunity to provide input in determining what "Army Transformation" means.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

18. Field grade officers have flexibility in implementing "Army Transformation" goals.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

19. Field grade officers believe transformation is necessary based on 21st century threats v. 20th century threats

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

20. Field grade officers believe that Network Centric Warfare is a significant component of transformation

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

21. Field grade officers believe that the Future Combat System is a significant transformation factor

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

22. Field grade officers believe that the U.S. Army transformation is a "process" as opposed to an "end-state"

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

Comments

What the U.S. Army should consider for Transformation in the future

23. The U.S. Army will rely on technology to drive transformation goals and objectives

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

24. U.S. Army Transformation goals and objectives should be more clearly stated by senior Army leadership.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

25. U.S. Army leadership must change the culture within the Army in order to achieve transformation.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

Comments

APPENDIX C

OPEN-ENDED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Informed Consent

Title: Army Transformation: What does it mean?
Researcher(s): Administrator(s):
David H. Jerome, Graduate Student, Public Policy Ph.D. Program

Researchers:
David H. Jerome, Graduate Student
William D. Schreckhise, Ph.D., Faculty Advisor
University of Arkansas
College of Arts and Sciences
Public Policy Ph.D. Program
428 Old Main
Fayetteville, AR 72701
479-575-3356
djerome@uark.edu

Compliance Contact Person:
Ro Windwalker, Compliance Coordinator
Research & Sponsored Programs
Research Compliance
University of Arkansas
120 Ozark Hall
Fayetteville, AR 72701-1201
479-575-2208
irb@uark.edu

Description: The present study will investigate the meaning of "Army Transformation" as defined by senior U.S. Army leaders and U.S. Army lieutenant colonels and majors. You will be asked to participate in an open-interview.

Risks and Benefits: The benefits include contributing to the knowledge base pertaining to the meaning of the term "Army Transformation". By engaging in the interview you should continue to consider the meaning of "Army Transformation", perhaps throughout your career, and its importance to senior level planners and decision-makers. There are no anticipated risks to participating in the study.

Voluntary Participation: Your participation in the research is completely voluntary.

Confidentiality: You will be assigned a code number that will be used to match the responses to the interview questions. Only the researcher will know your name, but will not divulge it or identify your answers to anyone. All information will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law and University policy. Results from the research will be reported as aggregate data.

Right to Withdraw: You are free to refuse to participate in the research and to withdraw from this study at any time. Your decision to withdraw will bring no negative consequences — no penalty to you.

Informed Consent: I, _____, have read the
(print your name)
description including the purpose of the study, the procedures to be used, the potential risks and side effects, the confidentiality, as well as the option to withdraw from the study at any time. Each of these items has been explained to me by the investigator. The investigator has answered all of my questions regarding the study, and I believe I understand what is involved. My

signature below indicates that I freely agree to participate in this experimental study and that I have received a copy of this agreement from the investigator.

_____

Signature/Date

Open-Ended Interview Questions

U.S. Army Command & General Staff College

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas

Demographic Information

1. What is your rank?

2. How many years have you served in the Army?

3. Are you a student of staff member at CGSC?

4. Male/Female

Core Questions

5. Has the Army experienced any organizational change since 1999?

6. If yes, has that change been significant or incremental since 1999?

7. If no, has there been a need for the Army to make any changes since 1999?

8. In your opinion, who is responsible for expressing what organizational change is needed for the U.S. Army?

9. Has a vision for change in the U.S. Army been expressed?

10. If yes, would you consider that expressed vision for change as incremental or significant?

11. If no, is it important to have an expressed vision for change?

12. What role does technology play in U.S. Army organizational change, if any?

13. What role does force structure play in U.S. Army organizational change, if any?

14. What role does the Defense Budget play in U.S. Army organizational change, if any?

15. Do field grade officers and senior leaders view change in the same way?

16. What does “Army Transformation” mean to you?

CHAPTER 5

ARMY TRANSFORMATION: THE CASE OF THE THREE CHIEFS OF STAFF

The purpose of this chapter is to examine how the three U.S. Army Chiefs of Staff who have served since1999 viewed Army transformation. The focus will be on what was actually said by these senior Army leaders. A comprehensive review was made of Congressional testimony, public speeches and documents, that were either prepared by the chiefs of staff or for them, pertaining to what they have stated relative to Army transformation.

There is but one U.S. Army Chief of Staff at any given time. The person that serves in that position may arguably be the most influential person in the U.S. Army. Because the U.S. Army Chief of Staff has the ear of the Executive and Legislative branches of government, regarding matters pertaining to the Army, it is reasonable to assume that the Chief of Staff may have an opportunity to influence high-level decision makers along a path that he prefers. If this level of influence does exist, then how does the Chief of Staff effectively communicate a preference for how transformation will occur within the bureaucracy of the Army?

The three chiefs examined are: General Eric K. Shinseki (June 1999 – June 2003), General Peter J. Schoomaker (August 2003 – April 2007), and, General George W. Casey, Jr. (April 2007 – April 2011). These three Army Chiefs of Staff have been the principals who have been responsible for their military service's ability to respond to any current national security contingency, as well as preparing the Army for any future threat. All three of the Army Chiefs have expressed the need for the Army to transform. It is important, here, to review what these senior Army leaders have actually stated in terms of why and how the Army needs to be able to transform.

General Eric K. Shinseki (June 1999-June 2003): The Army Must Remain Relevant

General Eric Shinseki appears to have concluded, in the 1990s, that there was a significant mismatch in what the Army was capable of performing and what it needed to be able to respond to in the Twenty-first Century. Prior to becoming the Army Chief of Staff, and while serving as the Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. Army Europe (USAEUR), which included responsibility for the peacekeeping operations in Bosnia, Shinseki must have been able to clearly observe the shortcomings of the current military force attempting to fulfill the requirements of that role. If peacekeeping operations and counter-terrorism were going to be issues that the Army would need to address, then Shinseki believed the Army would need to transform itself in order to fulfill those mission requirements.

Kagan (2006) corroborates this point by arguing that the National Defense Panel (NDP) in its 1997 report demanded that the Army focus on becoming lighter, more deployable and more strategically agile. Operation Applied Force in Bosnia convinced the Army leaders such as General Shinseki that any previous attempts to change the Army would have to be fundamentally re-directed. Shinseki, according to Kagan, observed that his predecessors had talked about changing the Army since the end of the Cold War, but had left office with the task uncompleted. General Shinseki was determined to make his efforts so rooted in place that any successor would need to continue his transformation initiatives well into the future (Kagan 2006, 242).

General Shinseki appears to have been the first chief of staff that specifically addressed transforming the Army. In his statement before Congress in March 2000 he expressed that "the critical path of the transformation leads to the Objective Force (Shinseki 2000). He may not have known in 2000 what would result in the Objective Force. He continued by stating that "a major science and technology effort to develop technologies that will give the Objective Force its

desired characteristics-responsiveness, agility, versatility, deployability, Lethality, survivability and sustainability (Shinseki 2000). In short, it appears in this statement that the Objective Force was still on the drawing board and perhaps no one at this time knew for sure what it would consist of in the end. Just a few months after becoming Army Chief of Staff he made this proclamation on October 12, 1999: **"…**Our commitment to meeting these challenges compels comprehensive transformation of the Army. To this end, we will begin immediately to transition the entire Army into a force that is strategically responsive and dominant at every point on the spectrum of operations. We will jumpstart the process by investing in today's off-the-shelf technology to stimulate the development of doctrine, organizational design, and leader training even as we begin a search for new technologies for the objective force" (Shinseki 1999a).

Two weeks later in testimony before Congress, General Shinseki expressed the vision for the transformed force as: "Soldiers on point for the Nation transforming the most respected Army into a strategically responsive force that is dominant across the full spectrum of operations" (Shinseki 1999b, 5). In order to achieve this vision, Shinseki said that it "would require the Army to commit to a comprehensive transformation." Shinseki added that the Army would be turned into "a full spectrum force that is strategically responsive and dominant at every point on the spectrum of operations." The General knew that the Army was capable of successfully performing heavy combat operations (based on the overwhelming success of Operation Desert Storm in 1991). But in order to satisfy the full spectrum of Army responsibilities it was necessary for a transformation to occur in order to effectively engage in broader areas such as peacekeeping operations and counter-terrorism. By all indication, General Shinseki believed that the U.S. Army was ill-suited to accomplish those two critical

responsibilities, along with others, that would most likely be prevalent in the twenty-first century.

General Shinseki may have believed that Army would be in a better position to meet the new demands being placed on the U.S. military by deploying smaller self-sustaining Army units more quickly. In testimony before Congress in October 1999, he expressed that the Army's "goal is to deploy a combat-capable brigade of 3,000 to 5,000 soldiers anywhere in the world within 96 hours after receipt of an order to execute lift-off; a division on the ground within 120 hours; and, five divisions in 30 days" (Shinseki1999b, 5). He went on to argue that "these forces will be light enough to deploy, lethal enough and survivable enough to fight and win, agile enough to transition from peacemaking to war-fighting and back again, and versatile enough to enforce peace or fight wars. And they will be lean and efficient enough to sustain themselves, whatever the mission" (Shinseki 1999b, 5). In 1999 the U.S. Army did not possess the capability to deploy smaller units that were able to sustain themselves for long periods of time. General Shinseki believed that this capability would be key to any transformation that the Army would pursue beginning on his watch as chief of staff.

General Shinseki believed that in order to transform the Army it would be necessary do to three things simultaneously. First of all, in order to ensure that current Army capability was in no way diminished, the current or "legacy force" that was derived based on Cold War era conventional warfare requirements would need to be maintained and upgraded. Additionally, the Army would pursue an "interim force" based primarily on weapon systems and technology that could be purchased off-the-shelf that would help shape future Army doctrine and training; and finally, the Army would achieve an "objective force", based largely on technology that was

emerging, that would enable the Army to effectively respond to all known possible threats early in the new millennia.

Specifically, the three forces referred to by Shinseki are described as follows:

1. Legacy Force: This will be composed of current weapon systems that will maintain the capabilities the Army currently has and add others that soon becoming available (Shinseki 2000, 7).

2. Interim Force: Successfully fielding the Brigade Combat Team (BCT)[14] is the first step in achieving the interim force. The BCT will give the Army an enhanced capability for operational deployment to meet worldwide requirements. The initial BCT will validate an organizational and operational model for the Interim Force. The interim force will possess some Objective Force characteristics, those that are available within the constraints of current and emerging technology. These interim BCT's will be the vanguard of the future Objective Force (Shinseki 2000, 7).

3. Objective Force: The full-spectrum force that is organized, manned, equipped and trained to be more strategically responsive, deployable, agile, versatile, lethal, survivable and sustainable across the entire spectrum of military operations from Major Theater Wars through counter terrorism to Homeland Security (Shinseki 2001, iv).

The message that General Shinseki delivered in October 1999 would remain constant as he continued to make the argument for Army transformation throughout his tenure as chief of

[14] The Brigade Combat Teams are the basic building block of the Army's tactical formations. They are the principal means of executing engagements. Three standardized BCT designs exist: heavy, infantry and Stryker. These are modular organizations that begin as cohesive combined arms teams that can be further task organized. Commands often augment forces for a specific mission with capabilities not organic to the BCT structure. Augmentation might include lift or attack aviation, armor, cannon or rocket artillery, air defense, military police, civil affairs, psychological operations elements, combat engineers, or additional information systems assets. This organizational flexibility allows BCTs to function across the spectrum of conflict (Army Field Manual 3-0 2008, 2-8).

staff. He expressed the Army's transformation strategy in testimony before the U.S. Senate as the need "to maintain a legacy force that will allow the Army to maintain capabilities that are currently needed; to establish an interim force that will allow the Army to respond to immediate operational requirements; and, an objective force that will give the Army the desired characteristics of responsiveness, agility, versatility, deployability, lethality, survivability and sustainability. He added that it would be necessary to invest in off-the-shelf (i.e. commercially developed) equipment to stimulate the development of doctrine, organizational design, and leadership training as a search is made for the new technologies that will deliver the new materiel for the Objective Force, the force that would represent the attainment of Army transformation (Shinseki 2000b, 6).

It may be clear as to what the legacy forces consisted of, since they were either fielded or about to be fielded. However, by the descriptions given above of what the interim and objective forces would be able to provide in the way of new capability, it is not altogether clear what the force would look like. General Shinseki, in all fairness, may also not have known what those two forces would look like since much of the technology was either in the process of being integrated or had not been discovered.

It is apparent that General Shinseki knew that transformation would be difficult to achieve in a large bureaucracy such as in the U.S. Army. General Shinseki argued that change in a large organization is not easy (Shinseki 2001, 20). He stated that leaders must embrace the Army vision for transformation and become agents and disciples themselves. In order to effect such significant change, leaders must establish an environment of innovation and encourage initiative that will harness the creative energy required in the development of the Objective Force concept (Shinseki 2001, 20).

Shinseki may have understood that intermediate steps would need to be taken first lest moving right to the Objective Force would cause some level of culture shock within the Army. In testimony before the U.S. Senate, General Shinseki (Shinseki 2000b, 8) argued that in order to evolve to the Objective Force, the Army must first establish intermediate objectives and conditions that must be met before implementing subsequent changes. He believed that by achieving these interim capabilities, while on the path to the Objective Force, there will be an enhancement of readiness as well as for the development of doctrine, training and organizational structures that will eventually result in the Objective Force (Shinseki 2000b, 8). He may have understood that some incremental change was necessary in order for the Army as a whole to understand and accept his vision for transformation.

Although General Shinseki knew that achieving the Objective Force was going to take time, he also viewed that future force as an objective, or in other words, as an end-state. He described the Future Combat System (FCS) as "a new family of ground systems…networked system-of-systems – a key to fielding the Objective Force – will allow leaders and soldiers to harness the power of digitized information systems" (Shinseki 2002, 17). To corroborate this point, the Congressional Budget Office (2009) states that the FCS program was a means for transforming all of the combat units in the Army. If this is true then General Shinseki must have had known that by developing a new family of weapon systems that was somewhat dependent on the development of future technology would result in his vision of Army transformation. This may especially be true since General Shinseki introduced the Future Combat Systems which was expected to be available as early as 2009 (CBO 2009, 1). Andrew Krepinevich (2008) corroborates this point by adding that General Shinseki initiated the Future Combat System (FCS) program and added that if the systems are not fielded by the end of the decade (i.e. 2010),

then the Army would lose its relevancy (39). Maintaining the Legacy Force and acquiring the Interim Force were necessary for both maintaining and improving Army capability, but they appear to be simply the means to achieving an end: transforming the Army to an Objective Force. General Shinseki may have envisioned that Objective Force based on some concept of the Future Combat System.

Although General Shinseki (2000b) described the full-spectrum force[15], it may be difficult for the rank and file to synthesize the true meaning of what full-spectrum really means to them personally. General Shinseki's strategy for accomplishing Army Transformation may not have been, therefore, all that clear to field grade officers. In order to ensure that everyone in the U.S. Army knew that the organization was pursuing transformational change, General Shinseki made an emblematic change to the head gear worn by all soldiers by directing: "To symbolize the Army's commitment to transforming itself into the Objective Force, the Army will adopt the black beret for wear Army-wide" (Shinseki 2000a). General Shinseki (2000a) went on to state that the Army must change to maintain its relevance for the evolving strategic environment and that as technology allows, the Army will begin to erase the distinctions between heavy and light forces. Shinseki (2000a) expressed that "we are transforming the most powerful Army in the world from a Cold War Legacy Force to an Objective Force with early entry capabilities that operate jointly, without access to fixed forward bases, and still have the power to slug it out and win campaigns decisively; this transformation will correct the condition in today's

[15] General Shinseki described the full-spectrum force as being one that is capable of dominating every point on the spectrum of military operations. He believed that the Army faced strategic deployment problems that inhibited the Army's ability to rapidly transition from peacetime operations in one part of the world to small-scale contingencies or war-fighting in another. He believed that it was necessary for the Army to deploy quickly in order to meet the full-spectrum of possibilities.

Legacy Force where our heavy forces are too heavy and our light forces lack staying power" (Shinseki 2000a).

Shinseki (Shinseki 2001, 1) argued that the United States would be faced with threats of weapons of mass destruction and that cyber attacks would be a part of that threat framework. He argued that the Objective Force must be prepared and equipped to deal with these realities. In this atmosphere of constant change, no military force desiring to remain effective and relevant can remain stagnant (Shinseki 2001, 3). Does this important point mean that transformation is evolutionary and ever changing, and not revolutionary nor seeking an end-state as would be indicated by the achievement of an "Objective Force"? General Shinseki advocated for the Objective Force and provided testimony that the Objective Force would represent the achievement of Army Transformation. This is language that General Schoomaker, his successor as the next chief of staff, would not use.

General Peter J. Schoomaker (August 2003 – April 2007: A Modular Approach to Transformation

Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld convinced General Peter J. Schoomaker to leave retirement and to succeed General Shinseki as Army Chief of Staff in the summer of 2003. General Schoomaker would continue with pursuing his predecessor's vision of transforming the Army, including the continuation of the Future Combat Systems program initiated by General Shinseki. While General Shinseki did talk about the advantages of modularity, General Schoomaker appears to have turned modularity into his focus of what Army transformation would involve. General Schoomaker modularity in the context of Brigade Combat Teams (BCT's) that are "designed as modules, or self-sufficient and standardized, that can be more

readily deployed and combined with other Army and joint forces to meet the precise needs of the Combatant Commanders" (Schoomaker 2005, 10). Where General Shinseki gave the impression that Army transformation was an end-state, or the attainment of some objective force, General Schoomaker would make it clear that transformation is an on-going process and not an end-state. James Carafano (2004) corroborates this point by arguing that General Schoomaker almost immediately began revising Army Transformation plans for how it would accomplish its goals (Carafano 2004, 1).

General Schoomaker wasted little time, after becoming the Army Chief of Staff in August 2003 in expressing his vision of Army transformation. General Schoomaker stated that although he intended to continue much of the transformation that was initiated by General Shinseki, he would not be using terms like "legacy," "interim" and "objective' to describe the force (Schoomaker 2003). James Carafano corroborates the chief of staff's new vision by stating that in August 2003 General Schoomaker re-designated General Shinseki's "objective force" as the "future force" which would indicate that Army Transformation was more process-oriented and open-ended with emphasis on fielding future capabilities with less emphasis on what an "objective force" would look like (Carafano 2004: 6). The Congressional Budget Office (2009) also stated that General Schoomaker's legacy is known as the Modularity Initiative; General Schoomaker argued that breaking the Army into a greater number of smaller units would allow commanders to create forces suited to their needs by combining the appropriate mix of standardized units, rather than having to take a whole division, which might not include the right mix of capabilities (CBO 2009, 1). If Army officers had it in their mind that transformation would occur upon the fielding of the Future Combat Systems (FCS) that would represent Shinseki's Objective Force, then the new Chief of Staff's on-going process viewpoint may have

created some uncertainty about what the term really means. Although FCS would remain as the primary transformation program throughout General Schoomaker's tenure as chief of staff, the perception of what that program now meant to field grade officers may have become less clear.

General Schoomaker provided the 2003 *Army Transformation Roadmap,* a 160-page directive on how the Army was going to proceed toward transformation, in response to the National Security Strategy (NSS 2002), the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR 2002) and the Transformation Planning Guidance (TPG 2003). In the *Roadmap,* General Schoomaker explicitly described transformation as an ongoing process and not an end-state (Schoomaker 2003, XIX). General Schoomaker stated that the Army framed the constant change of transformation through the interaction of the continuously evolving capabilities of the Current to Future Force (1-5). He continued by clarifying that the Current Force is today's operational Army and that the Future Force is the operational force the Army continuously seeks to become (Schoomaker 2003, 1-5). General Schoomaker provided a revised *Army Transformation Roadmap* in 2004 that said that "the Army is changing now and the changes ahead for the Army are significant – the most comprehensive transformation of the U.S. Army since World War II" (Schoomaker 2004, 19). General Schoomaker (2004) went on to say that "the Army is using its increased resources and unusually high operational tempo (intense activity) to facilitate transformation to a modular, brigade-based, campaign-quality army with joint and expeditionary capabilities" (Schoomaker 2004, 17). Although General Schoomaker expressed a vision of transforming to a modular force, his vision appears to be more process-oriented, as opposed to achieving some end-state definite in the future, a vision more closely associated with that of his predecessor.

While General Schoomaker would invariably inherit much of what General Shinseki put into place with regard to transformation initiatives, Schoomaker appeared to have somewhat

different views in how to achieve transformation goals. General Shinseki initiated his Army transformation goals during a time of relative peace. General Schoomaker would inherit the initiatives started by his predecessor during a time of war. Transforming a large bureaucratic organization like the Army during peacetime is one thing, but trying to achieve such significant change in time of war may be something quite different.

General Schoomaker offers some insight into how he views the ability for the Army to transform itself. He suggests that the Army may be in a better position to transform during a time of war as opposed to during peace time where there is significant competition for resources. Les Brownlee, the Acting Secretary of the Army, and General Schoomaker stated that "the Army always has changed and always will. But an army at war must change the way it changes. In peacetime, armies change slowly and deliberately. Modern warfare is immensely complex. The vast array of capabilities, skills, techniques, and organizations of war are a recipe for chaos without thoughtful planning to assure interoperability, synchronization, and synergy. Brownlee and Schoomaker go on to say that "peacetime also tends to subordinate effectiveness to economy, and joint collaboration to the inevitable competition for budgets and programs. Institutional energies tend to focus on preserving force structure and budgetary programs of record. Resource risk is spread across budget years and programs, including forces in the field" (Brownlee and Schoomaker 2004, 8). It is not clear if General Schoomaker is suggesting that transformation is easier to accomplish during times of war, where there is less competition for resources, as opposed to peacetime where transformation efforts may be less urgent and reduced to line items in the overall budget. Nevertheless, it is important to know how General Schoomaker views transformation.

General Schoomaker is credited more for focusing on modularity initiatives and less on achieving some end-state capability. Brownlee and Schoomaker (2004) state that the "foundations of Army Transformation must be diversity and adaptability. The Army must retain a wide range of capabilities while significantly improving its agility and versatility. Building a joint and expeditionary Army with campaign qualities will require versatile forces that can mount smaller, shorter duration operations routinely—without penalty to the Army's capability for larger, more protracted campaigns. A key prerequisite to achieving that capability is developing more modular tactical organizations (13). While these views of where the Army needs to be are important, it is also relevant to explore why General Schoomaker perceived the current Army as being inadequate for future purposes.

Secretary Brownlee and General Schoomaker state that "the Army's force design was based primarily in the context of a large conventional war in which all echelons from platoon to the highest level of Army command (divisions, corps, and Army) were deployed. This presumption of infrequent large-scale deployment encouraged the Army to centralize certain functions at higher echelons of command, and implicitly assumed that deployment would largely be complete before significant employment began. Moreover, presuming peace to be the default condition, the Army garrisoned the bulk of its tactical units to optimize economic efficiency and management convenience rather than combined-arms training and rapid deployability (13).

Since the end of World War II, the Army had been organized by divisions for purposes of deployment and for engaging in tactical and combat operations. A division was typically comprised of three combat brigades (a combination of infantry and armor brigades each having approximately five battalions) along with division artillery, aviation and engineer units and

logistical support. The Army was now transitioning from division-based organizations to brigade combat teams, for purposes of deployment and tactical operations. General Schoomaker provided testimony before the U.S. Senate regarding his views of transformation where he stated that "…we are restructuring from a division-based to a brigade-based force. These brigades are designed as modules, or self-sufficient and standardized Brigade Combat Teams, that can be more readily deployed and combined with other Army and joint forces to meet the precise needs of the Combatant Commanders.[16] The result of this transformational initiative will be an operational Army that is larger and more powerful, flexible and rapidly deployable" (Schoomaker 2005, 10 - 11). During the Cold War, the Army was largely a garrison-based military force organized under a division structure. General Schoomaker considered the garrison and division-based Army to be inadequate in an environment where smaller units, such as brigades, could be deployed more rapidly and with the ability to sustain themselves for a relatively long period of time. However, he also did not want to sacrifice the ability to fight a large conventional war if it became necessary. The modularity of the Brigade Combat Teams (BCTs) may have been his idea of satisfying both scenarios.

General Schoomaker makes a case that moving from the division organization model to that of a brigade model is not necessarily a new concept. Brownlee and Schoomaker (2004) state that

> "although divisions have long been the nominal measure of the Army's fighting strength, the Army also has a long history of deployment and employment of multifunctional brigade combat teams. In addition, the Army has a broad array of reinforcing capabilities—both units and headquarters—but we can significantly improve their modularity. In the future, by

[16] Combatant Commanders are the war-fighting four-star level commanding officers of joint forces (Army, Air Force, Navy, Marines, and Special Forces) that report primarily to the Secretary of Defense and the President of the United States. These commanders may be from any one of the military branches and do not report to their respective chiefs of staff. Instead the chief of staff, in this case the Army, is responsible for supporting their war-fighting needs.

> shifting to such brigade combat teams as our basic units of action, enabling them routinely with adequate combat, combat support, and sustainment capabilities, and assuring them connectivity to headquarters and joint assets, we can significantly improve the tailorability, scalability, and 'fightability' of the Army's contribution to the overall joint fight. At the same time, the inherent robustness and self-sufficiency of brigade combat teams will enhance their ability to deploy rapidly and fight on arrival" (14).

If the Army has some tradition or experience in deploying as brigades, then does General Schoomaker really advocate for change that can be considered transformative? He may be suggesting that the new brigade is going to look different than previous ones, in that they will more autonomous and will be less reliant of division and corps command and control oversight. The brigades may be able to achieve that autonomy as a result of new or evolving technology.

As stated earlier, General Schoomaker did inherit many of the initiatives of his predecessor. While he chose to change the terminology of transformation from "Legacy Force", "Interim Force" and "Objective Force" to that of "modularity" and the "Future Force" he nevertheless proceeded with programs that reflected the former terms. Brownlee and Schoomaker (2004) stated that "the Future Combat System (FCS) remains the materiel centerpiece of the Army's commitment to become more expeditionary,
and will go far to reconciling deployability with sustainable combat power. A year later in testimony before Congress General Schoomaker confirmed that "the FCS is the Army's largest and most promising science and technology investment" (12). He stated that "when finished the FCS will add crucial capabilities to the Army's future modular force that is designed to achieve Department of Defense transformation goals" (Schoomaker 2005, 12). However, Brownlee and Schoomaker clearly express that "we will remain a hybrid force for the foreseeable future, and

we will seek ways to improve the deployability of the platforms we already own" (Brownlee and Schoomaker 2004, 21).

The platforms that the Army owned during his tenure as chief of staff were both legacy and interim systems. The FCS has not been fielded and made available. Brownlee and Schoomaker (2004) concluded by stating that:

> "the changes ahead are significant. But they are neither reckless nor revolutionary. On the contrary, they reflect years of Army study, experimentation, and experience. We have delayed this transformation repeatedly, fearing that we could not afford such change in a time of turbulence and reduced resources. Now we realize that what we cannot afford is more delay. The best way to anticipate the future is to create it. The Army is moving out, and this is merely the beginning. Our incentive is not change for change's sake… the changes are a mere down payment on changes that will follow. But our challenge is to measure ourselves not against others, but against our own potential. It is not enough that we are changing. The real question is, are we changing enough?" (23).

Army transformation appears not to be revolutionary according to Brownlee and Schoomaker, but is instead a result of a long drawn out methodical plan that the Army had developed over the years and is now in a position, based on circumstances that called for other than a large conventional response, where the plan needs to be put into place.

After almost eight years since the announcement of the Army's vision for transformation, the Army Chief of Staff was forced to acknowledge that funding levels were not adequate to both fund the Army in the field and to go forward with transformation plans. In testimony before the U.S. Senate in February 2007, General Schoomaker indicated that "the fundamental challenge impacting Army readiness and strategic depth is the need to establish a proper balance between strategy and resources (Schoomaker 2007, 5). The general went on to add "that had the U.S. Army received funding at the requested levels in recent years, and endorsed policies to assure access to all of our capability, we would be in a better strategic posture" (Schoomaker 2007, 5).

General Schoomaker was clearly indicating that the cost of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan were impacting the Army's funding of the FCS program and the Army's ability to meet its transformation goals. General Schoomaker expressed that

> "to meet the Combatant Commanders' immediate wartime needs, we (the Army) pooled equipment from across the force to equip Soldiers. This practice, which we are continuing today, increases risk for our next-to-deploy units, and limits our ability to respond to emerging strategic contingencies" (Schoomaker 2007, 3).

The limited ability to which General Schoomaker refers may include the inability of the Army to pursue and achieve transformation goals. General Schoomaker adds that "investments accounts were under funded by approximately $100 billion during the previous decade, resulting in nearly $56 billion in equipment shortages across the Army" (Schoomaker 2007, 3). As resources may have been diverted away from Army transformation efforts, such as FCS, to focus more on the immediate resource needs of the Army involved in war, it is possible that an understanding of what the Army was trying to accomplish in the area of transformation became less clear.

General Schoomaker appears to have advocated for a modular force throughout his term as Army chief of staff. Army Field Manual (FM) 3-0, Operations, specifically describes the Army's move toward modular organizations. In 2003, the transition year between General Shinseki and General Schoomaker as Army Chiefs of Staff, the Army implemented a brigade-based force. This was intended as a part of an ongoing transformation process. This move was designed to allow the Army to be more responsive to a variety of world events by being able to deploy smaller and more versatile combat organizations quicker. Instead of deploying an entire corps or division-sized organization, the Army could now deploy smaller brigade size units that were more appropriate and capable (FM 3-0 2008).[17] This description of transforming to a

[17] FM 3-0, Operations states that a corps provides a headquarters that specializes in operations as a land component command headquarters (2-4). There may be multiple divisions under the command of a corps. The Army has reorganized around smaller, more versatile formations able

modular force may have provided General Schoomaker's sole view of what Army Transformation meant to him as the Army Chief of Staff; FM 3-0 makes no other clear reference to Army Transformation. The next Army Chief of Staff, General George Casey would continue with the idea that FCS was the major component of Army transformation. It appears that General Schoomaker's plea to Congress that the Army has been and is underfunded (Schoomaker 2005) resulted in some benefit for his successor, in that the Army did receive funding that allowed for units coming back from combat to be re-fit (reconstituted to pre-deployment levels) and allowed for some transformation initiatives to proceed.

.General George W. Casey, Jr. (April 2007 – April 2011:

Transformation is a Process

"There's no catalyst for change like a war." General Casey[18]

This statement may have been derived by General Casey more as a result of new experiences in twenty-first century conflict rather than any experiences that he may have had in the conventional warfare of the twentieth century. As in the case of General Schoomaker, General Casey began his tenure as chief of staff with the Army involved in two wars, Iraq and Afghanistan, and with budget constraints that were taking their toll on maintaining an Army in the field while at the same time attempting to achieve some level of transformation. He would continue the modularity initiatives begun by his predecessor; and even if he wanted to pursue another path for transforming, he did not necessarily believe he had that ability. General Casey

---

to deploy more promptly. Divisions are the Army's primary tactical war-fighting headquarters. Their principal task is directing subordinate brigade operations. A division can control up to six Brigade Combat Teams in major combat operations (2-5).Brigade combat teams for the basic building block of the Army's tactical formations. They are the principal means of executing engagements (2-8).

[18] Cited in Garamone (2011).

stated that upon becoming chief of staff and that "with everything we had going on, if I had made hard turns, it would have derailed the progress…I came in and said let's finish it, and we kept going" (Garamone 2011).

General Casey had the idea as a division commander (a two-star command assignment) that if a unit could do conventional war, it could do anything. However, after serving for 32 months in Iraq "I don't believe that anymore. What we realized was its not going to be either conventional or counterinsurgency. The wars in the 21st Century are going to be different than the wars I grew up trying to fight. We're not going to be fighting corps-on-corps operations (multiple divisions fighting one another), except maybe in Korea" (Garamone 2011). But Casey says that we are not there yet. Casey adds that "while we have talked about this and thought about it, until we start putting brigades out there on the ground and have then do it, we're not going to crack it. The kicker is that the wheels are falling off the budget and the Army will remain its current size through at least 2015" (Garamone 2010). This provides an overview of how this chief of staff came to the realization, even as a two-star general as late as 2000 and 2001, that the Army was ill-prepared to confront a threat that was other than a conventional one.

The funding that General Schoomaker advocated for previously may have benefited the Army, and General Casey, in fiscal year 2007. General Casey, in a statement before the U.S. Senate, testified that in fiscal year 2007, the Congress provided over $200 billion to the Army which allowed the Army to fully fund its Reset Program, which allows combat units to re-build the readiness consumed in combat and prepare for future deployments and contingencies (Casey 2007b, 1). General Casey continued by testifying that "the Army must transform to meet the demands of the 21st Century. Transformation is a holistic effort to adapt how we fight, train, modernize, develop leaders, station, and support our Soldiers, Families and Civilian.

Transformation is journey – not a destination. Transformation is also a multi-faceted process (Casey 2007b, 5).

General Casey expressed the need to

> "grow the Army to provide and sustain sufficient forces for the full range and duration of current operations and future contingencies; we must continuously modernize our forces to put our Cold War formation and systems behind us and to provide our Soldiers a decisive advantage over our enemies – we will continue to rapidly field the best new equipment to our fighting forces, upgrade and modernize existing systems, incorporate new technologies derived from the Future Combat Systems research and development, and soon to begin to field the Future Combat Systems themselves (platforms that are lighter, less logistically dependent, and less manpower intensive); we are over half-way through the largest organizational change since World War II – we must continue to convert our combat and enabling formation to modular units that are more deployable, tailorable (capable of being customized for specific purposes), and versatile; we must continue institutional change in processes, policies, and procedures to support an expeditionary Army – our transformation cannot be cemented until the institutional systems (personnel, education, training, healthcare, and procurement are adapted to meet the realities of our current and future environments; we must continue to adapt our Reserve Components to an operational reserve; and, we must continue to develop agile and adaptive leaders" (Casey 2007b, 5 – 6).

General Casey may have been optimistic in late 2007 when funding levels were increased for the Army. In a speech at the Annual meeting of the Association of the United States Army, General Casey stated that the Army "intends to transform the current force into a campaign quality, executionary Army[19], that is capable of supporting across the spectrum of conflict in the 21st Century…oh by the way, we are about half way there in completing our modular transformation, and the rebalancing of our Force. The current Army is out of balance…the current demand on our Forces exceeds the sustainable supply. We are consumed with meeting the demands of the current fight, and unable to provide ready forces as rapidly as we would like, for other contingencies" (Casey 2007a).

General Casey described transformation as "a holistic effort to adapt how we fight, how we train, modernize, develop leaders, base our Forces, and support our Soldiers, Families and

[19] It is not entirely clear what Casey means here.

Civilians" (Casey 2007a). Casey goes on to describe four specific aspects of transformation. They are: 1. Growth. An increase in the total number of soldiers in order to cover the full range of operational requirements now and in the future. 2. Modernization. A continuous process that primarily includes the integration of FCS. General Casey places great emphasis on FCS as being both the technology as well as the systems that will result in the Army achieving the BCT-FCS. Arguably what is intended as the Army's primary operational force for the future. 3. Adapting the Reserve Component. The active Army relies on support from the Army Reserves and Army National Guard in meeting operational requirements. In order to be effective in their support of the active component, these reserve components must be resourced similarly. 4. Agile and Adaptive Leaders. The Army must have leaders that are effective in the full spectrum of operations (pre-conflict, conflict, and post-conflict operations). Because the Army expects to face different threats (terrorists, extremists, sub-state actors, and rogue states) as compared to the threats of the 20th Century (the Soviet Union), leadership agility and adaptation are likely more complex and require a better understanding of joint operations and a more comprehensive understanding of the overall operational environment (Casey 2007a).

General Casey may have been especially optimistic when he stated that the FCS program was the full spectrum force that was needed for the 21st Century. Again, he may have had little choice in continuing with the program that he had inherited, but it is difficult to imagine that the problems that ultimately resulted in the termination of the program were not evident by late 2007.

As stated previously, General Casey continued with many of the modularity initiatives that were started during General Schoomaker's tenure. Like Schoomaker before him, General Casey inherited the FCS program that was initiated during General Shinseki's tenure. General

Casey mentioned that when he entered as the chief of staff he did not make any "hard turns" or significant changes, lest he de-rail the progress that was being made in programs such as FCS. Although he appeared to be more aligned with General Schoomaker's modularity initiatives, he still appeared to remain a champion for FCS. On October 10, 2008, General Casey mentioned in a speech that the Army transformation efforts remain holistic: "The Army will increase by 1.1 million the numbers of soldiers by 2010 and 85% of our units have converted to modular formations. We are 60% through the rebalancing to skills required for the Twenty-first Century. We will begin fielding the FCS in 2015. Transformation is a journey and transformation is on a very good track" (Casey 2008, 4). General Casey may be more inclined to look at transformation as a process that really never ends by indicating that it is more like a journey, a metaphor that may be consistent with General Schoomaker's view and less like General Shinseki's "Objective Force" and other such end-state focused terms.

General Casey believed that the Brigade Combat Team that was built on the concept of modularity would be the unit that would best represent a transformed army. The qualities of a land force that General Casey describes are directly applicable to a brigade organization that can be customized to meet specific operational needs and have the wherewithal to sustain itself over an extended period of time. General Casey identified six qualities that land forces must be able to demonstrate. They (1) must be versatile by being able to respond to a broad range of tasks; (2) must be expeditionary by rapidly responding to unanticipated conflicts and fighting immediately upon arrival; (3) need to be agile by adapting quickly in order to exploit opportunities in complex environments; (4) need to be lethal in order to defeat enemies; (5) must be sustainable because neither the duration nor the character of military campaigns is predictable; and, (6) must be interoperable with not only joint forces, but with other agencies and allies (Casey, 2008). These

are the qualities that have been consistently emphasized by the three Army Chiefs of Staff since 1999. However, according to some experts cited in chapter 3 of this dissertation, the goal of Army transformation may still not be well understood.

As may be the case in virtually all large organization, the opinions of senior staff may in fact reflect the viewpoints of the leader of the organization. If those viewpoints are different, then one could reasonably expect some level of conflict up to and including the dismissal of s senior staff person. General Casey's views on transformation may have been expressed through senior Army officers that reported directly to him.

Eric A. Hollister (2010) points out that General Casey's Deputy Chief of Staff, in March 2008, stated that the FCS was "non-negotiable" as the program that would be the centerpiece for transformation (6). On October 23, 2008, while addressing officers at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, as a part of the Futures Day Panel, Hollister adds that the Army Capabilities Integration Center's (ARCIC'S) FCS Capabilities Manager (a senior military official that would arguably have represented the views of both the Chief of Staff, General Casey, and the Deputy Chief of Staff) supported the position of the Army Deputy Chief of Staff by saying:

> "I'd ask you to look down on your uniform and see if you've got the U.S. Army there, and if you do, to realize that FCS, per the leadership of the Army, is the principal modernization program for the Army. It is our program. It's ours. It's the Army program. So you may not agree with it, and you may not think that it's going to deliver all that it will – in fact, it probably won't deliver all that it advertises. But it's our program. We spent a ton of money on it already, and a ton of energy and time. And we are now, every year now, fighting budget fights for FCS. So it's important to understand that this is our program. It's not the Chief of Staff's program…it's the Army's program. So if you are in the Army, you ought to understand what it is, you ought to be constructively criticizing it. So if you have issues with it, we'd be happy to take those. But we would ask that you

> remember, this is the Army's program and you're in the Army" (Hollister 2010, 6).

If these positions espoused by both the Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army and the FCS Capabilities Manager represent the viewpoint of the Chief of Staff of Army on matters pertaining to Army Transformation, then the reason may be that field grade officers either do not understand what is intended by transformation, or they reject FCS as representing the centerpiece of what transformation means. This viewpoint from senior Army leadership may indicate that a gap may exist in the meaning of Army Transformation. A few months after the FCS Capabilities Manager admonished the officers at the Command and General Staff College to get behind the program, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, argues Hollister, cancelled the vehicle portion of the program, which in effect ended the acquisition component of the FCS program (Hollister 2010, 6). In the absence of FCS the Army appeared to still be on the path to some form of transformation. General Casey stated 2010 that "the Army will continue to rebalance the force to handle the range of conflicts the nation faces today.

The fiscal year 2011 budget contained the resources to finish Army transformation from a Cold War-era formation to one that is relevant in the twenty-first century (Garamone 2010). The fiscal year 2011 budget that was submitted to Congress by the current administration has not been passed at this point. Since funding is only available under a Continuing Resolution Amendment based on fiscal 2010 funding levels, it is not clear if Army transformational goals are being met at this point. As he stated before, war may serve as a catalyst for change, but the U.S. Army may not have changed to the degree to which some prefer.

Army Transformation: An Analysis

The three Army chiefs of staff that have served from 1999 until April 2011 may have at least one thing in common, none of them may know the results of Army transformation. They all agree that transformation is a process that will allow the Army to adapt to new and emerging threats . However, according to Andrew Krepinevich, General Shinseki viewed the Future Combat System program as the key to transforming the Army and that the transformation would need to be accomplished by 2010 or the Army would lose its relevancy (Krepinevich 2008, 39). General Schoomaker states, in the *2004 Army Transformation Roadmap,* "the Army is changing and the changes ahead for the Army are significant – the most comprehensive transformation of the U.S. Army since World War II. A continuous cycle of innovation, experimentation, experience and change will lead to a campaign-quality Army with joint and expeditionary capabilities" (Schoomaker 2004, 19).

This section will compare what each of the three chiefs of staff has stated in relationship to five transformation imperatives. These five imperatives are listed in Table 5.1 below and are similar to comments that field grade officers were asked to respond to in the survey provided in the Appendix. These imperatives are important in determining if the chiefs of staff view them as being important and if they view them consistently. The language the chiefs of staff use here in describing their individual take on these imperatives will be further used in Chapter 6 when the survey results are analyzed.

The first and second imperatives suggest that transformation may be either revolutionary or evolutionary in nature, and may be either a process or an end-state. While General Shinseki suggests that the Army's transformation strategy is evolutionary, he may also suggest that transformation is also revolutionary. He states that "we will begin immediately to turn the entire

Army into a full spectrum force that is strategically responsive and dominant at every point on the spectrum of operations (Shinseki 1999). This language used by General Shinseki appears to be more revolutionary in that he intends to "immediately" change the Army, which infers achieving some end-state, as opposed to a more evolutionary change of the Army over time. On the other hand, General Schoomaker takes a more evolutionary approach in describing Army transformation when he states that the Army's plan "is continuously improving our ability to operate as part of the Joint Team, while ensuring our ability to dominate in any environment against current, emerging and unforeseen threats (Harvey and Schoomaker 2006). His Vice Chief of Staff and successor, General Casey, would continue in describing transformation in more evolutionary terms. General Casey says that "transformation is a holistic effort…transformation is a journey…not a destination…transformation is also a multi-faceted process" (Casey 2007b). The three chiefs of staff have addressed the two first transformation imperatives. Although General Shinseki states that the Army is evolving his narrative indicates a more revolutionary approach that must meet some end-state. Conversely, General Schoomaker and General Casey consider transformation to be evolutionary and a process that will result some day in an ideal army.

The next imperative in Table 5.1 has to do with what the force will look like in a transformed army. The three chiefs of staff all agreed that the Army had to transform from division as the basis of combat deployments to a smaller force that is lighter, lethal, sustainable and more mobile. General Shinseki believed that there would be a need for interim brigades to meet these criteria in the short-term, but other than referring to a "combat capable brigade" he may not have known for sure what his vision of the Objective Force would look like since his vision relied on technology that was still evolving. General Shinseki stated that "candidly, we

don't have all the answers today; but we are asking the right technological questions, and we will go where the answers are" (Shinseki 2000). Conversely, General Schoomaker and General Cases almost exclusively refer to the Brigade Combat Team (BCT), or modularity in the context of a brigade deployment package, when discussing a transformed army. In 2002, General Shinseki stated that "the Army will begin fielding an Objective Force – this decade (Shinseki 2002). While he also expressed that "true transformation takes advantage of new approaches to operational concepts and capabilities and blends of old and new technologies and innovative organizations that efficiently anticipate new and emerging opportunities" (Shinseki 2000) he confines any reference to a Brigade Combat Team (BCT) to the Interim Force and is less clear on what the Objective Force would look like.

General Schoomaker states "We are transforming to create a future force with a broad set of capabilities to enable our soldiers to address strategic problems the nation will face (Harvey and Schoomaker 2006). General Schoomaker moves away from more idealistic narrative to the more specific when he adds that "we are building a modular force centered on BCTs…our modular conversion across the active and reserve components is designed to meet the demands of the current war, sustain other global commitments, establish the organizational structure needed to accelerate modernization, and support a new global basing posture that will rely more heavily on rotational presence [i.e. an expeditionary force]" (Harvey and Schoomaker 2006). Again, while General Schoomaker refers to achieving an ideal army, he was more specific in that he described an army that was brigade-centric once transformed.

In the spirit of being more process-oriented and evolutionary in thought, General Casey states that "we will continue to rapidly field the best new equipment to our fighting forces, upgrade and modernize existing systems, and incorporate new technologies derived from the

Future Combat Systems research and development…and soon begin fielding FCS themselves" (Casey 2007). Since 2007 General Casey had to amend his comments by stating that "we've moved away from the FCS program to what we believe is an achievable, affordable modernization program for our BCTs (Casey 2010). Assuming that field grade officers even knew the details of FCS, this significant change away from FCS being the "centerpiece for transformation" may cause some confusion about what is now meant by transformation.

The next transformation imperative discussed in Table 5.1 centers on Army culture and whether it needs to change before transformation can be successfully achieved or pursued. General Shinseki stated in 1999 that the commitment to change will require a comprehensive transformation of the Army (Shinseki 1999). General Shinseki may have been talking to both external and internal groups when he indicated that transformation includes the entire Army. He further states that "this is the most significant effort to change the Army in 100 years…our aim is not a single platform swap-out, but a systematic change and full integration of multidimensional capabilities—space, air, sea, land" (Shinseki 2000).

This clearly indicates, for an army that has not experienced such significant change in "100 years", that Shinseki believes the culture of the Army will need to change before transformation can be achieved. General Schoomaker makes reference to the Army of the Cold War, a period that is included in Shinseki's claim that "the Army has not significantly changed in 100 years".

By stating that "at the end of the Cold War, the United States had no peer competitor…our Army was much larger and was built around heavy, mechanized and armored formations…today the future is uncertain and presents many challenges…the emerging challenges manifest themselves as new adaptive threats, employing a mix of new and old

technologies that necessitate changes to the ways in which the elements of our national power are applied" (Schoomaker 2004). The implication made by Schoomaker may be as simple as thinking light as opposed to thinking heavy when it comes to weapon systems, and the fact that the battlefield today (or battle-space) is far different than that of the Cold War threat, and the culture will need to change first in order to acknowledge this new reality.

General Casey moves away from Cold War language and addresses threats in the context of what the U.S. faces now. He states that "we live in a world where global terrorism and extremist ideologies are real threats…national security experts are virtually unanimous in predicting that the next several decades will be ones of persistent conflict – protracted confrontation among state, non-state, and individual actors that use violence to achieve their political and ideological ends (Casey 2007). This statement suggests that Casey believes that the Army needs to do away with Cold War rhetoric and focus on the new realities of persistent threats that come from a variety of sources, a re-focus that may first require a cultural change within the Army.

The last imperative discussed in Table 5-1 addresses the significance of FCS in the context of achieving transformation. All three chiefs of staff have indicated that FCS was either the critical path to or the center piece of transformation. General Shinseki gave life to FCS when he stated that "the Army will create a new family of ground systems called the Future Combat Systems…a key to fielding the Objective Force…see the FCS first unit equipped and operational by 2010…the Army will begin fielding an Objective Force – this decade" (Shinseki 2002). This language indicates that Shinseki placed considerable significance on FCS in achieving the Objective Force and the transformed army.

As stated previously, General Schoomaker upon becoming chief of staff in 2003 would no longer refer to Shinseki's Objective Force but would instead adopt the term Future Force, a force that the U.S. Army would continuously be in pursuit of achieving. However, Schoomaker would still remain in pursuit of FCS began during Shinseki's tenure. General Schoomaker states that "our largest and most promising science and technology investment remains the pursuit of Future Combat Systems technologies by "spinning out" FCS capabilities into the Current Army Modular Force…when completed, FCS will add crucial capabilities to the Future Army Modular Force…FCS-equipped units…will be more deployable and survivable than our current units and will enhance joint capabilities" (Schoomaker 2005). General Schoomaker may have adopted the new Future Force term because he may not have been as optimistic in achieving the Shinseki's Objective Force by 2010. He may have also adopted a more process and evolutionary oriented language, as opposed to Shinseki's more revolutionary and end-state language, because it may have been difficult to forecast FCS fielding dates.

General Casey's comments regarding FCS were provided earlier, in the discussion pertaining to the force composition imperative. However, as late as 2007 General Casey was talking less about fielding FCS combat vehicles and more about integrating the technology derived from the FCS program into existing weapon systems. General Casey stated that "the Army will accelerate delivery of advanced technologies to infantry BCTs fighting in combat today through "spin outs" from our FCS program" without any mention of the FCS combat vehicles at all (Geren and Casey 2009). It appears that FCS technology survives for purposes of upgrading or modernizing current weapon systems. If this represents what transformation now means, it may be counter to what General Shinseki intended when he argued that this change was not simply an upgrade or modernization effort.

TABLE 5.1

The Chiefs of Staff views on Transformation Imperatives

Transformation Imperatives	General Shinseki	General Schoomaker	General Casey
Revolutionary or Evolutionary	"A transformation campaign plan will enable the Army to complete its evolution…"	"Our Future Force is the operational force the Army continuously seeks to become…"	"we are in a period of continuous and fundamental change, and that we must continually adapt with evolving threats."
Process or an end-state	"…will result in an Objective Force."	"When completed, FCS will add crucial capabilities to the Future Army Modular Force to achieve DoD transformation goals."	"…it is a journey…we must continuously modernize our forces to put our Cold War formations and systems behind us."
Force Composition	"Organized into Interim Brigade Combat Teams…to serve as a link to the Objective Force."	"Our goal is to provide a continuous supply of 20-21 BCTs to meet global commitments."	"We must continue to convert our combat and enabling formations to modular units…more deployable, tailorable and versatile."
Army Culture must change	"Transformation will result in a different Army, not just a modernized version of the current Army."	"Our Army is taking action across a broad front to make jointness an integral part of our culture…"	"Our transformation cannot be cemented until institutional systems are adapted to meet the realities of current and future environments."

FCS is key	"…the FCS…a key to fielding the Objective Force."	"The FCS provides a system of systems capabilities that was not previously available to soldiers and commanders in joint operations."	"We've transitioned from the FCS program to what we believe is an achievable, affordable modernization program for our BCT's."

Sources: Brownlee and Schoomaker (2004); Casey (2010, 2007a, 2007b); Geren and Casey (2009); Schoomaker (2007, 2005, 2004, 2003b); Shinseki (2002, 2001, 2000b, 1999a, 1999b).

The three chiefs of staff are consistent in their views of what FCS means to achieving transformation. FCS and its technology are keys to achieving Brigade Combat Teams that meet the operational requirements of the Combatant Commanders. It is clear that where General Shinseki has more of a revolutionary, end-state view of transformation, General Schoomaker and General Casey both appear to have more of an evolutionary and process view of transformation. General Shinseki indicated that transformation would be more than just modernizing existing weapon systems; his two successors appear to focus on modernizing current weapon systems with FCS technology spin-offs.

General Shinseki's vision for a revolutionary end-state for significant change may have been viewed as transformative. However, in comparison, his successors may have moved away from what may have been considered to be transformative, although the term that describes the Army's pursuit of change did not go away, to an evolutionary and process oriented approach that will result in modernization to existing equipment but may not be considered to be transformation at all by some.

Conclusion

In April 2009, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates effectively eliminated the procurement of the FCS manned vehicles and increased the rate at which the components of FCS could be

integrated into existing types of modular units (CBO 2009, 11). According to the Congressional Research Service (2009) Secretary Gates was concerned that there were significant unanswered questions in the FCS vehicle design strategy and, despite some adjustments they still did not adequately reflect the lessons learned of counterinsurgency and close quarters combat in Iraq and Afghanistan (CRS 2009, 3).

The Congressional Budget Office (2009) has estimated that the Army has received at least $57 billion in appropriated funds for 2005 through 2008 for equipment that could be used to equip modular units; that amount is more than twice the $24 billion than the Army estimated for that equipment for the same period (CBO 2009, 34).

Since the FCS family of vehicles no longer exists, the Army is left with the heavy weapon systems that were developed in the 1960s and 1970s for its Modularity Initiative (CBO 2009, ix). The Congressional Budget Office (2009) argues that the Army's transformational programs have achieved some of their initial goals, but generally at a higher cost or over a longer period that was originally projected. Many of those goals have been altered or abandoned altogether (CBO 2009, 36). Before effectively being cancelled by the Secretary of Defense, the FCS program had fallen short of its original goals and would have only been able to equip fewer than 20 percent of the Army's combat units with the original cost estimates being exceeded by at least fifty-percent (CBO 2009, 36 - 37).

The three Army Chiefs of Staff that have been presented here have expressed a strong desire to change the Army from its Cold War configuration. It is not clear if existing weapon systems will be a part of any future force, but according to some, we should not be too quick to discard a known capability in the expectation that something else is better. As Boot (2006) argues, transformation does not necessarily mean that old weapon systems and old ways have to

be swept aside. It is more important to think about how to make a transition and not about how to eliminate current weapon systems (Boot 2006, 467). The Army's bureaucracy appears to have a preference for a technological solution in achieving transformation. However, the Army appears now to be looking past FCS and focusing on how the technology that was developed over the last several years might be incorporated into existing systems.

According to the Government Accountability Office (2010), the Army is taking more of an incremental approach in fielding an information network capability, which is expected to incorporate some of the technology that was developed for FCS (GAO 2010, 7). Although the vehicle portion of FCS has been cancelled, there has been a great deal of technology developed within the FCS program that will benefit current weapon systems, mostly in the area of information technology. This benefit may have come at an extremely high price. The weapon systems that were to be developed in the future were to be lighter in order to be able to move them quicker; the current systems, many argue, are too heavy to meet this important transformation criterion.

James Carafano corroborates General Casey's position by providing that unless we build institutions, doctrine, organizations, traditions and practices throughout the federal government, we will re-learn the lesson again next time (Carafano 2007, 4). The author goes on to mention that every time we have participated in a war, going as far back as the Revolutionary War, we have done so in an "ad-hoc" fashion. This is the United States rhythm of habits; we re-learn every time (Carafano 2007, 1). Based on Carafano's viewpoint of U.S. military history, why should the Army transformation efforts of the last two decades be any different? One of the most significant criticisms of transformation efforts is that the Army may be moving too rapidly

and many are concerned that there is a risk of failure on a large scale. The cancellation of the FCS program in 2009 may be a good example of such concern.

Thomas K. Adams (2008, 250) argues that the success of transformation depends on cooperative enemies that play to the strengths of high-tech forces. If Afghanistan, Iraq and the war on terrorism are examples, the author adds, old fashioned conventional units may not be disposable at all. Adams argues that the digitization of current armored and mechanized systems will remain in business for some time to come; and newer systems may not be able to answer the call any time soon. Army transformation may include both current systems and future weapon systems and organizational structure, it may be difficult to really know at this point. In the meantime, Kagan (2006) argues Army Transformation may simply mean what the Army Chief of Staff says it means. To what extent field grade officers understand what they mean is the topic of the next chapter.

References

Adams, Thomas K. 2008. *The Army after Next: The First Postindustrial Army.* Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Boot, Max. 2006. *War Made New: Technology, Warfare, and the Course of History 1500 to Today*. New York: Gotham Books.

Brownlee, Les and Schoomaker, Peter J. General. 2004. *Serving a Nation at War: A Campaign Quality Army with Joint and Expeditionary Capabilities*. Parameters 34. Carlisle: U.S. Army War College Quarterly. Summer http://www.carlisle.army.mil/usawc/parameters/

Carafano, James J. 2007. "*Thinking Differently About Winning the Peace*." Heritage Lectures No. 987. Washington, D.C.: The Heritage Foundation.

Carafano, James J. 2004. "*The Army Goes Rolling Along: New Service Transformation Agenda Suggests Promise and Problems*." Backgrounder No. 1729. Washington, D.C.: The Heritage Foundation.

Casey, Jr., George W. General. 2008. "Chief of Staff Speaks at the Eisenhower Luncheon, Association of the United States Army." http://www.army.mil/speeches/2008/10/10/13213-chief-of-staff-speaks-at-eisenhower-luncheon (2/28/2009)

Casey, Jr., George W. General. 2010. U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Armed Services. Chief of Staff of the Army Testimony. 111th Cong. 2d sess. February 23.

Casey, Jr., George W. General. 2007a. "Chief of Staff Speaks at the Eisenhower Luncheon, Association of the United States Army." http://wwws.ausa.org/webpub/DeptHome.nsf/byid/WEBP-77ZUXW (2/28/2009)

Casey, Jr., George W. General. 2007b. U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Armed Services. , *Chief of Staff of the Army Statement*. 110th Cong. 1st Sess. November 15.

Congressional Budget Office. 2009. *An Analysis of the Army's Transformation Programs and Possible Alternatives.* June.

Feickert, Andrew. 2009. *The Army's Future Combat System (FCS): Background and Issues for Congress*. Congressional Research Service. RL32888. Washington, D.C. August 3.

Garamone, Jim. 2011. There's No Catalyst for Change Like A War. News Room Magazine. Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense. March 24. http://newsroom-magazine.com/2011/milirary/army-military/general-casey (Accessed 5/24/2011)

Garamone, Jim. 2010. *Army Continues Transformation, Casey Says*. Armed Forces Press Service. May 6. http://www.army.mil/-news/2-2-/05/06/38657-army-continues-transformation-casey-says (Accessed 12/11/2010)

Geren, Pete and George W. Casey, Jr. General. 2009. *2009 U.S. Army Posture Statement*. http://www.army.mil/aps/09/ (Last accessed March 17, 2011)

Government Accountability Office. 2010. *Defense Acquisitions: Opportunities and Challenges for Army Ground Force Modernization Efforts*. GAO-10-603T. Washington, D.C.: The Congress of the United States. pp. 1-16.

Harvey, Francis J. and General Peter J. Schoomaker. 2006. U.S. Congress. *A Statement on the Posture of the United States Army 2006*. U.S. Senate and U.S. House of Representatives Committees and Subcommittees. 109th Cong. 2nd sess. February 10.

Hollister, Eric A. 2010. A Shot in the Dark: The Futility of Long-Range Modernization Planning. No. 79: October. Arlington, Virginia: The Institute of Land Warfare.

Kagan, Frederick W. 2006. *Finding the Target: The Transformation of American Military Policy*. New York: Encounter Books.

Krepinevich, Andrew F. 2008. *An Army at the Crossroads: Strategy For The Long Haul*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments.

National Defense Panel Report. 1997. Transforming Defense: National Security in the 21st Century. National Defense Panel. Arlington, VA. December.

NSS. 2002. *National Security Strategy*. Office of the President of the United States. September. http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/nsc/nss/2002/

QDR. 2001. *Quadrennial Defense Review.* Office of the U.S. Secretary of Defense. September 30

Schoomaker, Peter J. General. 2007. U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Armed Services. *Chief of Staff of the Army Statement*. 110th Cong. 1st sess. February 15.

Schoomaker, Peter J. General. 2005. U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Armed Services. *Chief of Staff of the Army Opening Statement*. 109th Cong. 1st sess. June 30.

Schoomaker, Peter J. General. 2004. United States Army Transformation Roadmap. Department of the Army.

Schoomaker, Peter J. General 2003a. United States Army Transformation Roadmap. Department of the Army.

Schoomaker, Peter J. General. 2003b. Address during the Eisenhower Luncheon of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association of the United States Army. Washington, D.C. October 7.

Shinseki, Eric K. General. 2002. Statement before the U.S. Senate. Committee on Armed Services. 107th Cong. 2nd sess. March 7.

Shinseki, Eric K. General. 2001. U.S. Army *White Paper: Concept for Objective Force*. Washington: Department of the Army.

Shinseki, Eric K. General. 2000a. *CSA Sends – The Army Black Beret*. November 11 http://www.army.mil/features/beret/beret.htm (April 1, 2011)

Shinseki, Eric K. General. 2000b. Testimony before the U.S. Senate Airland Subcommittee on Armed Services. 106th Cong. 2nd sess. March 8. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Shinseki, Eric K. General 1999b. Testimony before the U.S. Senate. Committee on Armed Services. 106th Cong., 1st sess., October 26. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Shinseki, Eric K. General. 1999a. Address during the Eisenhower Luncheon of the 45th Annual Meeting of the Association of the United States Army. Washington, D.C. October 12.

TPG. 2003. *Transformation Planning Guidance*. Office of the U.S. Secretary of Defense. Washington, D.C. April.

United States Army Field Manual 3-0. 2008. The Army Operations and Doctrine Smartbook: Guide to FM 3-0 Operations & the Six Warfighting Functions, 4th ed. Lakeland, FL: Lightening Press.

CHAPTER 6

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

This chapter presents the results of the survey that was conducted in February 2010 at the Command and General Staff College (CGSC) at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. Additionally, a summary of the open-ended interviews that were conducted in January 2010 at the Command and General Staff College will be presented in this chapter. The primary purpose of the open-ended interviews is to corroborate the survey findings. The processes used in conducting both the survey and the open-ended interviews were described in Chapter 4. These two processes were employed in order to gain the perspectives of field grade officers' views on Army Transformation. The views of the Army chiefs of staff were obtained via the case study conducted in Chapter 5 of this dissertation. The survey, the views of the chiefs of staff relative to specific areas of the survey and the open-ended interviews are used to triangulate information that is necessary to test the five hypotheses discussed in Chapter 4 and answer the research question. The research question is:

> Do U.S. Army lieutenant colonels and majors understand Army transformation in the same way as the three Army chiefs of staff who have served since 1999?

The views field grade officers hold regarding Army transformation is important to understand, especially since many of those officers will be the senior Army leaders of the future. Field grade officers throughout the military are competitively selected to attend Military Education Level 4 (MEL 4) training; the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth is but one institution within the military that fulfills that requirement. Although there is no guarantee that an officer who attends MEL 4 training will attain the rank of general officer, those who do not attend will in all probability not achieve that rank during their career.

Therefore, those who do become general officers in the future will most likely be in charge of implementing programs and decisions that are being made by current senior leaders. Gaining the perspectives of current field grade officers, some of whom may be flag officers in a few short years, may be helpful in describing any gap that may exist in how transformation is currently defined. Both the survey and the open-ended interviews allow for some basic demographic information to be collected on the officers who participated in one of these two data collection processes.

A Description of the Survey Participants

There were 1,051 students who attended CGSC during the survey period. Of that number, 837 were active Army, Army Reserve or Army National Guard. The survey was issued to the 837 officers that were directly affiliated with the Army in one of these three ways. Although the survey was issued to these specific students, there were 15 participants who identified themselves as other than active duty Army, Army Reserves or Army National Guard, as shown in Table 6.1[20]. Additionally there were four officers who identified themselves as "other," without specifying other military affiliations.

The total number of individuals who responded to the survey was 216, which provides a response rate of 25.8%. If the 19 officers who identified themselves as "other than Army" were removed from the total the response rate would then fall to 24%. As discussed in Chapter 4,

[20] In addition to the Active Army, Army Reserve and Army National Guard, the other U.S. military services as well as DoD civilians and U.S. allies from around the world also attend the U.S. Army CGSC.

Methodology, while this response rate may appear to be low it does represent an average rate for survey participation at CGSC[21].

The number of participants that responded to the demographical information was inconsistent in that as few as 169 responded to the prior enlisted service question and as many as 197 responded to education level, the Army component affiliated with, and the source of commission. The 197 respondents to these three demographic areas represent the total number of eligible respondents. Most officers who responded were at least 35 years of age, all officers had at least 10 years of military service with over half having more than 13 years in the military.

Army officers must have received a college degree before being commissioned or in some exceptional cases within a very short period of time after being commissioned. A little less than half of the participants had at least obtained a bachelor's degree, with over half having received a master's degree or higher. Five participants had received a doctorate and two had received a law degree. A third category included a participant that reported as a master degree candidate.[22]. The active Army component represented most of the participants, followed by the Army Reserves and the Army National Guard. Most officers, over 96%, were majors followed by 2% who identified themselves as lieutenant colonels or other. The "other" category may have included the two Army warrant officers and an Army captain. A majority of participants indicated that they had received their commissions through the Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC), while the remaining officers were commissioned either through the U.S. Military Academy, presumably at West Point and not at one of the sister service academies, through

[21] Dr. David Bitters, statistician at CGSC, indicated that a survey response rate of between 20-25% is about average for the time of year in which this survey was conducted.

[22] Female officers may be underrepresented in the survey. Only 7.6% of respondents identified themselves as much. A response has not been received from the Quality Assurance Office at CGSC to an e-mail request for demographic information pertaining to this population. It is conceivable that female officers may represent a significantly lower percentage of the population at CGSC.

Officer Candidate School (OCS), by a direct commission, or through a state sponsored military OCS program.

The demographic information that was collected from these participants indicated that the average field grade officer is a major (0-4), over the age of 35, is well educated with many having a master's degree, a doctorate or a law degree, that has been in the military for well over 10 years and appears to be on track for a career in the Army. Most officers identified themselves as being active duty (as opposed to being reservist or national guardsmen), being commissioned through ROTC, and had indicated that they had at least some prior enlisted experience.

Since most officers who attend CGSC are majors, it was expected that lieutenant colonels would be represented at a lower percentage. In most cases, graduating from a MEL 4 military institution such as CGSC is a prerequisite to attaining the rank of lieutenant colonel. However, some officers may attain that rank while a student at this year-long course. To have gained a higher representation of lieutenant colonels, it would have been necessary to have conducted a survey at the U.S. Army War College. There is no evidence that would suggest that by conducting an additional survey at the Army War College simply to capture a greater population of lieutenant colonels, that the survey results would have been any different. However, officers who attend the U.S. Army War College are more likely to attain the rank of general officer. Not all officers who attend CGSC will attend the War College.

The Quality Assurance Office (QAO) at CGSC advised against asking for demographic data relating to ethnicity. It is the opinion of some that requesting such information may be offensive. Additionally, requesting officers to provide their branch affiliation (infantry, armor, artillery, etc.) may not have served a very useful purpose. Unlike the linear battlefields of the Twentieth Century where officers and soldiers were stationed based on their branch (infantry and

armor up front and all others in support), the battlefields in Iraq and Afghanistan have not been linear and everyone is on the battlefield in almost the same way. The fact that ethnicity and branch affiliation were not requested should not affect the outcome of the survey results.

Table 6.1

Demographic Information on Army Transformation Survey Participants

	Percent	Total
Age (N=196)		
30-34	19.9	39
35-39	45.4	89
40-44	28.6	56
45+	6.1	12
Total Years Active Duty (N=184)		
10-12	35.3	65
13-15	32.1	59
16-18	21.2	39
19+	11.4	21
Highest Education Level (N=197)		
Bachelor's Degree	45.7	90
Master's Degree	50.3	99
Doctorate Degree	2.5	5
Other	1.5	3
Gender (N=196)		
Male	92.4	181
Female	7.6	15
Army Component (N=197)		
Active Army	87.3	172
Army Reserves	8.1	16
Army National Guard	4.6	9
Current Rank (N=191)		
0-4	96.3	184
0-5	2.1	4

Other	1.6	3
Source of Commission (N=197)		
Military Academy	12.7	25
OCS	14.7	29
ROTC	65.5	129
Direct	4.6	9
Other	2.5	5
Prior Enlisted Service? (N=169)		
Yes	58.6	99
No	41.4	70

The above demographic information provides an overview of the population of student officers that responded to the survey. The opinions that these officers hold regarding transformation is the most important aspect to the findings of this research.

The information collected from the survey instrument (see Appendix A) will be presented in five individual tables that represent specific themes associated with transformation in the Army. The data that were collected for each of the items represented in the tables will provide the primary basis for testing the five corresponding hypotheses.

It is important to determine the participants' views on transformation and to see if those views vary among field grade officers. Additionally, the view of the participants regarding senior Army leadership is relevant in determining if field grade officers view transformation differently than the chiefs of staff. While the first two items focus on an understanding of what transformation might mean, the third area of interest has to do with determining the basis of how transformation occurs. If field grade officers do not understand the basis for transformative change, then they may prefer the status quo until a more definitive and understandable description of transformation becomes available. The fourth area of interest gives the participants

an opportunity to provide their perceptions of transformation. The literature review in Chapter 3, as well as the Case Study in Chapter 5, may indicate that field grade officers may perceive transformation as being driven primarily by technological innovation and less by other areas that make up the Army as an institution. The last area asks for the respondents to put themselves in the place of fellow field grade officers throughout the Army and to opine as to how they might view Army transformation.

By asking the participants to represent the views of all field grade officers, and that population collectively represents a large segment of Army culture, it is possible, especially if there is a gap in how transformation is defined between field grade officers and between field grade officers and senior Army leadership, that the culture within the Army may need to change first before transformation is possible. Testing each of the five hypothesis statements will allow for the potential confirmation that a gap does exist in how field grade officers define transformation as compared to the views of senior Army leadership.

Participants' Views of Army Transformation

The research question centers on the idea that there is a difference in how senior Army leaders define transformation as opposed to how field grade officers interpret it. Both the literature review and the case study indicate that the three chiefs of staff view the transformative change the Army is experiencing as significant. In pursuit of answering the research question it is necessary to determine if field grade officers also view Army transformation as being significant. This leads to the first hypothesis statement which is:

> H_1: U.S. Army field grade officers will view the Army's transformation as being significant.

There are two items in Table 6.2 that the participants responded to regarding their views on the significance of Army transformation. The first item asks for the participants to acknowledge whether transformation has occurred at all since 1999, or when General Shinseki first announced that the Army would begin the process of transformation. Over 94% of the officers either agreed or strongly agreed that significant organizational change had occurred since 1999. However, over 58% of officers either agree or strongly agree that the term "significant change" and "transformation" are the same in relationship to current Army goals, while more than 41% either have a neutral view, disagree or have no opinion at all.

Table 6.2

Views of Army Transformation

N=197

	Strongly agree %	**Agree %**	**Neutral %**	**Disagree %**	**Strongly Disagree %**	**Don't know %**
The U.S. Army has experienced significant organizational change since 1999.	54.3	40.6	4.1	1.0	0.0	0.0
Significant change and transformation are synonymous relative to current U.S. Army goals.	10.2	48.5	22.5	15.3	2.6	1.0

There appears to be a rather significant gap when comparing the first variable with the second in Table 6.2. Field grade officers may acknowledge that change has occurred and that change has been significant, but the Army goals in achieving significant change may not necessarily be firmly linked in the minds these officers. In responding to the first hypothesis

statement, the distribution of responses indicate that officers do believe that Army transformation has been significant over the last decade, although a significant majority also believe it is difficult to associate this significant change with current Army goals. The respondents also provided comments to this section of the survey that may provide greater insight to the tabular results presented above.

These comments include:

> "It [transformation] is good, but we keep taking three steps back for every step forward. It also seems that we get new direction with every CSA [chief of staff] and programs are constantly cancelled or redefined. Nothing is constant except change itself."

> "Transformation is different than significant change. Significant change is [a] possible outcome of a specific organization's transformational process. For instance, lifting code restrictions in gays entering the military is a significant change, yet part of the transformation process."

> "Transformation is good. However clearly defining those goals and articulating then to the lowest level must be improved. Senior leaders understand that the Army must change and may stay out front."

> "We have made some very good changes in response to the current operational environment, but most of them are incremental/evolutionary not revolutionary as advertised. For example, BG [Brigadier General] Was de Czege described 'modular BCTs' in 1986, and 7 of 10 division had de facto BCTs since the mid-90's. Execution of some of these changes has been poor-modular BCT's again, would have been better served to have created 2 large BCTs per division, instead of 4 small BCTs that not really sustainable. ARFORGEN [Army Force Generation] necessary to sustain the current war without substantially growing the force has raped our readiness, and is recognized as a farce by most of the field grade officers that have to participate in re-setting a BCT to go down range [to ready a brigade combat team to train or to return to combat operations]."

The survey data confirms that over 94% of the respondents believe that significant transformative change has occurred since 1999; therefore the first hypothesis statement appears to be true. Although survey results indicate that respondents acknowledge the Army has

experienced significant change, there is less agreement as to whether transformation is consistent with achieving stated Army goals. If there is a lack of clarity regarding what is intended by transformation or significant change, then it may be inferred there will be differences in how field grade officers define one or both of those terms. Additionally, if the technological based FCS program was viewed by many as the centerpiece of Army transformation, and promoted as such by the three chiefs of staff associated with this research, and the program is in effect terminated, then it may be difficult to find a consensus among field grade officers of what now constitutes Army transformation. It is therefore important to review what senior Army leadership has provided regarding Army transformation.

Although Table 6.2 provides insight on how the respondents view transformation, it may also be useful to see what the three chiefs of staff have said that may have played a role in shaping the respondents' views of transformation. A majority of the respondents agree that there has been significant organizational change in the Army since 1999. However, significantly fewer officers are not convinced that such significant change is synonymous with current Army goals. An understanding of what the three chiefs of staff have said, or information and messages that they have sent, regarding transformation is useful. Significant change may have taken place, however many officers may not associate such change with the Army goals outlined by the three chiefs of staff.

Of the three Army chiefs of staff that have served since 1999, General Eric Shinseki is the one that specifically coined the term "transformation." In testimony before the U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee, General Shinseki stated that "on 12 October 1999, the Army articulated its vision that defined how the Army would meet the Nation's requirements now and

into the 21st Century…the vision is comprised of People, Readiness and Transformation" (Shinseki 2002, 6). Shinseki further states that

> "…transformation is first and foremost about changing the way we fight in order to win our Nation's wars decisively…the 21st Century strategic environment and the implications of emerging technologies necessitate Army transformation…the Army is taking a holistic approach to transformation, implementing change across its doctrine, training, leader development, organization, materiel, and soldier systems, as well as across all of its components…transformation will result in a different Army, not just a modernized version of the current Army" (Shinseki 2002, 14-15).

General Shinseki describes transformation as maintaining the Legacy Force, establishing an Interim Force, and finally achieving the Objective Force as the means in achieving Army transformation. He stated in 2001 that "transformation of the Army's operational force proceeds on three vectors – the Objective Force, the Interim Force and the Legacy Force…all are equally necessary to our Nation's continued world leadership" (Shinseki 2001, 10). In the 2002, General Shinseki stated that "we intend to achieve the Objective Force this decade" (Shinseki 2002, 17).

General Shinseki appeared to highlight up front the importance of emerging technology in achieving transformation. General Shinseki further stated that "the Army will create a new family of ground systems called the Future Combat Systems (FCS)…this networked system-of-systems is a key to fielding the Objective Force-will allow leaders and soldiers to harness the power of digitized information systems" (Shinseki 2002, 17). He also stated that "the results of transformation will result in a different Army than the one we have now" (15). He specifically stated that "the end result of transformation is a new, more effective, and more efficient Army with a new fighting structure, the Objective Force" (Shinseki 2002, 16).

Again, most survey respondents agree that significant change has occurred, starting in the Shinseki era, but fewer respondents are not quite as sure when it comes to understanding those goals expressed by senior leadership, or the use of the terms significant change or

transformation. Later in this chapter we will see that many respondents (as well as some interview participants) either did not address the significance of FCS relative to transformation, or did not know what FCS included. General Peter Schoomaker would continue the task of defining transformation in order for field grade officers, and others to form a view of what that means to the Army.

General Schoomaker began his tenure as chief of staff by immediately moving away from General Shinseki's use of the term Objective Force that described an end-state of what would be a transformed army, by coining the new term of the Future Force. In testimony before Congress, General Schoomaker stated that "we are prioritizing wartime requirements, incorporating next-generation capabilities into current systems where appropriate, and preserving essential investments in the Future Force (Schoomaker 2004, 5). Where General Shinseki had insisted that in order to transform the Army needed to proceed along three different paths simultaneously (the Legacy, Interim and Objective Force), General Schoomaker simply referred to transformation in the context of the Army's Current or Future Force.

In 2003 General Schoomaker described these two terms by stating that "the Army frames the constant change of transformation through the interaction of the continuously evolving capabilities of the Current to Future Force. The Current Force is today's operational Army. The Future Force is the operational force the Army continuously seeks to become. Informed by national security requirements and DoD guidance, the Future Force in the strategically responsive, joint interdependent, precision maneuver force, dominant across the full range of military operations envisioned in the future global security environment" (Schoomaker 2003, 1-5). When General Schoomaker made this statement he may not have known himself what the transformed Army would look like when he used terms such as "operational force the Army

continuously seeks to become". That language does not appear to speak of a definitive end-state of what transformation will be, rather it may best refer to transformation as a journey to some ideal state. If this is the case then the respondents to the survey, and the field grade officers in general, may have a difficult time developing consistent views of what transformation might mean. General Schoomaker's successor as chief of staff, General George Casey, Jr., would continue with the General Schoomaker's objectives in maintaining the Current Force while endeavoring to achieve the Future Force.

General George Casey, in a statement before Congress in 2007, stated that

> "…we must continue to transform our Army to meet the demands of the 21st Century. Transformation is a holistic effort to adapt how we fight, train, modernize, develop leaders, station, and support our soldiers. Families and civilians…transformation is a journey…not a destination. Transformation is a multi-faceted process…we must continuously modernize our forces to put our Cold War formations and systems behind us…we will continue to rapidly field the best new equipment to our fighting forces, upgrade and modernize existing systems, incorporate new technologies derived from the Future Combat Systems and begin to field the Future Combat Systems themselves…we are ultimately working toward an agile, globally responsive Army that is enhanced by modern networks, surveillance sensors, precision weapons, and platforms that are lighter, less logistical dependent, and less man-power intensive" (Casey 2007, 5).

As in the case of his predecessor, General Schoomaker, General Casey appears to be creating the view that transformation is a journey that will be continuous.

Since transformation is a journey, as defined by Generals Schoomaker and Casey, then it is likely that field grade officers may have different views about what is really meant by transformation. Senior Army leadership, since 1999, has defined transformation differently in that General Shinseki described the Objective Force as the end-state for achieving a transformed army, while his two immediate successors have defined transformation as a continuous journey. If transformation is a journey then it may be difficult to arrive at a consensus as to what transformation means to a group of field grade officers, much less arriving at a consensus among

field grade officers in general. To better understand how the survey participants may view senior Army leadership transformation initiatives it is important to ask them about how senior Army leaders may view transformation.

Participants' Perceptions of the Basis of Transformation

Transformation may not only have a different meaning among field grade officers, but the meaning may also be different between senior level leaders and field grade officers. In Table 6.3, the survey participants were able to provide their thoughts of what Army transformation means to them. The responses that the participants provide indicate that not only do their thoughts differ among themselves relative to transformation, but the participants also think of transformation differently than do the chiefs of staff. This provides the basis for the second and third hypotheses statements:

H_2: Field grade officers will define transformation differently from one another.

H_3: Field grade officers will define transformation differently than the chiefs of staff.

The first item in Table 6.3 refers to the perception of whether respondents consider the integration of technology as the basis of transformation. Over 40% of the respondents indicate that Army transformation is based largely on technology, while over 59% either have no opinion or a negative opinion regarding technology's role in transformation. The first item addresses specifically whether field grade officers believe technology drives transformation. If technology is a major transformation driver in the minds of the chiefs of staff, and the Army is in a position of having to wait for technology to evolve, then field grade officers may be inclined to believe that another variable, such as force structure, is more important.

The second survey item in Table 6.3 asks the respondents to address whether transformation is based on force structure. Almost 80% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree that force structure is very much a basis of transformation. The remaining 20% either have no opinion or have a somewhat negative view of this variable as a transformation driver. Almost 80% of the respondents believe that transformation has more to do with changes in force structure (how many soldiers are available and how the organizations within the Army are designed) while approximately 20% of the respondents had no opinion, either disagree or strongly disagree, or do not know.

The third survey item in Table 6.3 addresses whether transformation is a process or an end-state. Over 80% of the respondents indicated that transformation is a process while the remaining 20% either disagree or have no opinion at all. The respondents were asked if transformation includes all that the Army does before, during and after combat operations; in other words, does transformation include the complete "battlespace"? Over 48% of the respondents believe that transformation does include the complete battlespace, while over 50% of the respondents either have a different opinion or no opinion at all. Finally, the fifth survey item asked the respondents if transformation refers to the complete Army mission. Over 41% of the respondents believe that it does, while a majority either has another opinion or no opinion at all.

Table 6.3

Basis of Army Transformation

N=197

	Strongly agree %	Agree %	Neutral %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Don't know %
U.S. Army transformation is based largely on the integration of technology into weapon systems.	7.6	32.5	27.9	29.4	1.5	1.0
U.S. Army transformation is based largely on changes in force structure.	17.8	61.9	12.2	7.1	.5	.5
U.S. Army transformation is a process and not an end-state.	19.4	61.7	11.2	5.6	.5	1.5
U.S. Army transformation addresses the complete "battle-space" (all aspects of the battlefield before, during and after combat operations).	6.1	42.4	26.0	17.4	5.6	2.6
U.S. Army transformation addresses all aspects of the U.S. Army mission	6.1	35.2	31.1	19.4	6.1	2.0

The data in Table 6.3 clearly indicates that the respondents view transformation differently from one another. Additionally, where a majority of respondents tend to agree that force structure is most important relative to transformation the following will suggest that the chiefs of staff focus a great deal on technology as a means in transforming the Army. The respondents, in large part, have a different view of transformation as compared to the chiefs of staff. General Shinseki was more specific about achieving some end-state; his two successors

were not so specific in that they viewed transformation as a journey. It also appears that the modularity initiatives under Generals Schoomaker and Casey were intended more toward the Current Force and the BCTs, but what is intended for the Future Force. Field grade officers may view the insertion of modular technology into the current BCTs as being transformative, when in actuality the Future Force is where transformation may actually occur; but it may be that senior Army leadership does not know what the Future Force will look like. The respondents also provided the following narrative comments to this segment of the survey:

> "Transformation must encompass full spectrum warfare [deployment, combat operations, peace-keeping, etc.] the Army must be able to be competent in all phases."
>
> "[Transformation] Covers the spectrum-from well defined path to not sure where we are at or where we are going and need to go."
>
> "I think that most field grade officers believe transformation was about reorganizing into BCT's and integrating the FCS system and Net-centric warfare. This is, unfortunately, a wrong mind set."
>
> "I do not believe the Army should focus so heavily on technology. This is still a people business and one that must close with and destroy the enemy…We are the good idea cut off point…It would be nice for the Army to spell out what it is that we are trying to achieve with transformation."
>
> "Transformation is of course more than organization. It includes the culture of the personnel, equipment, doctrine, plus the mentality of the force. Embracing the reality that the U.S. will conduct stability and support operations and security force assistance is appropriate. Army leaders must value initiative and adaptability and week to develop these traits. A broad based, liberal education for the office corps and as many personnel as possible would also be encouraged."
>
> "I think the Army leadership looks at transformation as a means of supporting the combatant commanders [CINCs] requirements. I think that new equipment and technology are considered important parts, and perhaps they are too important. Transformation should be more about the process that about equipment."

According to the survey results, an argument can be made that there appears to be a lack of consensus among field grade officers regarding the basis of Army transformation. The

responses and comments that the respondents provided also indicate that not only do field grade officers view the basis of transformation differently, but collectively they may view the basis of transformation differently than the chiefs of staff. Overall, the five items indicate a rather broad distribution of responses between the "strongly agree" to "disagree". This collective distribution of "neutral" and "disagree" responses, except for perhaps the second and third items where those responses are relatively low, would indicate that a relatively high percentage of the respondents may not agree with the basis of transformation as provided in Table 6.3. If there is disagreement here, or a relatively high degree of uncertainty, then there is a gap in how respondents view the basis of transformation as compared to that of the chiefs of staff.

In addressing the second hypothesis statement it is helpful to refer to the three chiefs of staff, and what they have said, that in order to determine how they may have contributed to the fact that field grade officers may not agree on what transformation includes, In describing the Objective Force, General Shinseki clearly intended that any transformation would include the entire Army. Additionally, any initiative that he took as chief of staff would need to be continued under future leadership. The question is would future chiefs of staff proceed with the transformation initiatives initiated by General Shinseki, or would they deviate from his vision thereby causing field grade officers to view transformation differently than originally intended under Shinseki? General Shinseki (2000) stated:

> "...that transformation to the 'Objective Force' would encompass the entire Army. The Legacy Force will transform directly to the Objective Force, and the Interim Force will follow. Over the course of 10 to 15 years the Army will transform itself into the Objective Force. The budget request provides sufficient funds to support continuation of the Army's transformation in fiscal year (FY) 2001. We have restructured the FY 2001 budget to fund the transformation. Fielding the Objective Force while sustaining decisive capabilities will require significant resources throughout this transformation" (Shinseki 2000, 9).

In order to achieve General Shinseki's vision, transformational goals would have to be adjusted by future chiefs of staff. Shinseki had a vision that transformation will result in a different Army, not just a modernized version of the current Army (Shinseki 2002, 2). He further states that "the Objective Force is our main transformational effort. It seeks to leverage advances in technology and in organizational innovation to transform land-power capabilities. Better than 90 percent of our science and technology investment are focused on this future Objective Force (Shinseki 2002, 3).

General Shinseki publicly announced his intention to transform the Army on October 12, 1999. In his speech he stated that "our commitment to meeting these challenges (increased responsiveness, rapid deployment, more agility, more versatility, greater lethality, increased survivability, and becoming more sustainable) compels comprehensive transformation of the Army…we will begin immediately to transition the entire Army into a force that is strategically responsive and dominant at every point in the spectrum of operations (Shinseki 1999). General Shinseki made it clear that the Army was entering a period of significant change.

Shinseki also expresses that change is difficult and that an environment of innovation needs to exist. General Shinseki spoke of the Objective Force as a concept and not as something that was describable in tangible terms. If the Objective Force is what General Shinseki had intended by transformation, and it was only a concept, then transformation in the context of achieving some Objective Force may not have been well understood by field grade officers.

General Schoomaker continued with his take on what the basis of transformation should be. In testimony before Congress, he stated that "there are no front lines in today's battle space…we must remain committed to investing in technologies and equipment that enable our most important asset, the Soldier to remain ahead of our adversaries who quickly adapting their

methods, tactics, and tools of warfare. Investing sufficiently in our future readiness is a strategic necessity-which must be viewed as a matter of priority not just affordability" (Schoomaker 2007, 3).

General Schoomaker was speaking on the need to provide more resources for soldiers who were currently at war, but his point was that the U.S. needed to make sure that battle space was different than before, that technology needed to be exploited. To that end, he continued by stating that "the Future Force is the operational force the Army continuously seeks to become…the Future Force is the strategically responsive, joint interdependent, precision maneuver force, dominant across the full range of military operations envisioned in the future global security environment" (Schoomaker 2004, 1-5).

General Schoomaker appeared to have a dual role with regard to his interpretation of the basis of transformation. He needed to make changes to support soldiers on the battlefield now, and then he envisioned that the Future Force would be that ideal force that would be continually sought after. General Schoomaker does address the basis of transformation, including that transformation is a process (continually trying to achieve) and not an end-state.

General Casey described the four aspects of transformation as growth, modernization, adapting our Reserve Components and agile and adaptive leaders. The second point, modernization, is important to discuss with regard to the transition between General Schoomaker and General Casey as chiefs of staff. General Casey (2007) states:

> "that we must continually modernize our equipment to put our Cold War systems behind us and to provide our soldiers a decisive advantage over any enemy they face in the future. We'll continue to rapidly field the best possible equipment to our soldiers. They're fighting every day. We'll upgrade and modernize the existing combat and support systems. We'll incorporate new technologies that are spun out of the future combat systems research and development. And we'll finally begin to field the future combat system [FCS], brigade combat teams [BCTs] themselves…the future combat

system is the full spectrum combat force that we need for the 21st century" (Casey 2007, 5).

Upgrading legacy systems, or the heavy systems that may have been developed during the Cold War era, was something that General Casey thought was necessary in order to support soldiers currently involved in current war-fighting efforts. At the same time General Casey remained optimistic about the final development and future fielding of the FCS-BCT. The fielding of FCS-BCTs may have been his vision of achieving a transformed Army. FCS was not the idea of General Schoomaker or General Casey as chief of staff; according to Eric Hollister (2010) FCS was the Army's modernization plan beginning in 2000. It was originally intended that all 65 brigade combats teams were to be FCS-equipped by 2032, but the program would be revised multiple times until only 15 BCTs, less than a fourth of the total, would become FCS BCTs (Hollister 2010, 5-6). In the fall of 2008, the Army Deputy Chief of Staff[23] stated that FCS is "non-negotiable and that it is not the Chief of Staff's (General Casey) program, it is the Army's program" (Hollister 2020, 6). The Deputy Chief of Staff may have been representing the views of the Chief of Staff when he made such a statement to a group of field grade officers at Fort Leavenworth in the fall of 2008.

Despite Casey's support for the program, the acquisition portion of the program was terminated by Secretary of Defense Robert Gates the following spring, effectively ending the combat vehicle portion of the program. The views of the three chiefs of staff appear to indicate that the Army has been involved in transformative or significant change, but it is not all that clear if field grade officers understood what was intended by transformative change in the same way.

[23] Eric A. Hollister does not refer to the Army Deputy Chief of Staff/G-8 by name in this 2010 document; however, MG David D. Halverson was the G-8 Deputy Chief of Staff at the time this statement was made.

If a gap does exist within the field grade officer ranks regarding what is meant by transformation then that may indicate that a conflict exists between those who perceive transformation as an end-state or as a process. Although a majority of participants indicated that transformation is a process, General Shinseki tended to talk in terms of transformation as being some end-state that must be achieved, i.e. the Objective Force. Many field grade officers entered the Army just prior to or in the very early stages of the current transformation era, and they may by now have had their fill of constantly transforming, and may be more inclined to prefer equipment and force structure that they currently know and understand. Many field grades officers (>80%) believe that transformation is a process as opposed to an end-state, and believe that since it is a process that transformative change occurs incrementally, which in effect may not be transformative at all. If transformation, therefore, is revolutionary or is other than a process, then there appears to be the likelihood of more resistance to such change and the status quo may be preferred. In short, the reason that a majority of officers consider transformation to be a process as opposed to an end-state is that change is all they have ever known. So when change is indeed transformative, most may still regard that transformative change as a process as opposed to changing the Army from what it was before. The following discussion, which will address the third hypothesis statement, will center on how the survey participants view transformation differently than the Army chiefs of staff.

All three of the chiefs of staff adopted the term transformation in describing what the Army must do in order to confront new threats. Some of the respondents believe that the term transformation may be an antiquated term, although the term appears to be still in use by senior Army leadership. Some respondents believe that while senior Army leadership may know what is intended by transformation, that same viewpoint appears not to be making it down through the

ranks to field grade officers. The following represents some of the comments that were provided in this section of the survey:

> "Transformation is necessary in order to maintain a relevant, capable fighting force."
>
> "I think that Army leadership sees it as a thing of the past. We often hear about the time when transformation was taking place, or when we were trying to fight a war in the middle of the transformation."
>
> "It appears that Army leadership is just looking to the Army instead of the entire joint force. [The] Goldwater-Nichols [Act] was signed over twenty years ago, and we are still struggling to become joint."
>
> "Conceptually, certain leaders may know what transformation means and understands the vision, but the information is not readily available to some of the junior field grade officers."
>
> "General Shinseki was the last Army leader to take on this project [transformation]. I wish the previous Chiefs of Staff put as much effort behind it as he did."
>
> "Aside from the Chief of Staff, I have seen many senior officers resist the changes, especially at the colonel and lieutenant colonel level."
> "The Army leadership understands transformation. However, members of its force do not."

The above respondents provide some insightful comments on transformation. Again, some view the term as being antiquated, while others view transformation attempts as being "cosmetic", a process that has not been achieved since the Goldwater-Nichols Act of 1986 and has not been seriously pursued since General Shinseki was chief of staff. There are those that believe that senior ranking officers within the Army, other than the chief of staff, may resistant to such significant or transformative change. And finally, the operations tempo that the Army is faced with in being involved in both Afghanistan and Iraq may allow for the chief of staff to provide only ready units, in support of the CINCs, that are still using legacy systems from the Cold War era. If field grade officers do not understand what senior leaders mean by

transformation, it is useful to review some of the statements that have been made by the chiefs of staff that may have contributed to some level of confusion between these two groups.

General Eric Shinseki had described the Objective Force as arguably the end-state in achieving Army transformation. In describing the Objective Force, General Shinseki stated that "the greatest potential for revolutionary (as opposed to evolutionary) advances in capability derives from technology, the Army recognizes that only through the synergy of parallel advances in doctrine, training, leader development, organizations, material and soldiers (DTLOMS) will the Objective Force achieve its full potential (Shinseki 2001, 15).

Shinseki continues by adding that "the Objective Force will be more responsive, more deployable, more agile, more versatile, more lethal, more survivable and more sustainable than today's forces, ready to provide precise and dominant capabilities for land campaigning" (Shinseki 2001, 21). Some of the respondents gave General Shinseki credit for being specific on what he intended for transformation. Since he spoke in terms of an Objective Force and in achieving some end-state, that language may have been easier to understand for field grade officers. Shinseki's successors preferred not to use such "end-state" language.

General Schoomaker continued with the transformation initiated by his predecessor, but instead of endeavoring to achieve the Objective Force, his plans would have centered on pursuing (a continuous effort) the Future Force. General Schoomaker did away with the term "Objective Force" upon becoming Chief of Staff in August 2003. In the 2003 Army Transformation Roadmap, General Schoomaker stated that "the Future Force is the operational force the Army continuously seeks to become" (Schoomaker 2003, 1-5). Even with the change of terms General Schoomaker continued to pursue the FCS program that was initiated under General Shinseki. General Schoomaker stated that:

> "…the Future Combat Systems-equipped force represents a capability crucial the Army's Future Force and the accomplishment of Department of Defense transformation goals…FCS remains at the heart of the Army's strategy to adjudicate risk using the Current to Future construct. Under this construct, the Future Force informs development of the Current Force…the Army has used the FCS-equipped unit of action operational and organizational plan as the starting point to create a modular, brigade-based Army…through its modularity efforts, the Army is rapidly moving its Current Force toward characteristics envisioned for the FCS-equipped Units of Action…and this will enable the Army to transition into FCS-equipped units and FCS-enabled methods of operations" (Schoomaker 2004, 13).

General Schoomaker placed a great deal of emphasis on modularity and the technological advantages of FCS. It appears that technology may be a very big driver in achieving transformation. While General Schoomaker addresses modularity as enabling the Army to be more responsive to Combatant Commanders, he does not acknowledge modularity being the attainment of the Future Force. He states that "modular units are interchangeable, scalable, and tailorable formations (customized for operational purposes), which provide the Joint Force Commander with a strategically responsive force that greatly increases his ability to defeat any adversary. Modularity enables us to tailor our capabilities to the requirements of the situation…modularity permits the Combatant Commander to optimize his war-fighting tool set" (Brownlee and Schoomaker 2004,15). If field grade officers are experiencing modularity in brigades, then that may be their view of how the Army is transforming. However, General Schoomaker appears to only indicate that such modularity pertains to the Current Force. It is not clear what he means by transformation in terms of the Future Force. The pursuit of modularity would continue with the next chief of staff.

General Casey, who would continue many of his predecessor's modularity initiatives, believes that "transformation is a journey, and we will continue to evolve as we continue to look and see how the future security environment will cause us to continue to adapt" (Casey 2008). He continued by stating that "versatile, expeditionary, agile, lethal, sustainable and interoperable

forces will be essential to providing the prompt, sustained, and dominant responses across the spectrum of conflict that will be necessary for our security in this environment…while we already possess many of the qualities that we need for the future, we must continue to transform to realize the full potential of our experiences, and to stay ahead of our enemies" (Casey 2008). General Casey, as General Schoomaker did before him, addressed each of the bases for transformation that were listed in the survey. General Casey went one step further by saying that transformation will never stop because the U.S. needs to stay ahead of its enemies. By referring to transformation in this way it may over time, if it has not already, make the term rather meaningless in the minds of field grade officers.

This leads to the discussion of the third hypothesis statement. The three chiefs of staff view technology as a transformation driver. In the first survey item in Table 6.3, a majority of participants have no opinion, disagree or do not know if transformation is based on the integration of technology. This collective view clearly indicates that this group of officers do not share the same views as those of the chiefs of staff, Additionally, a majority of the participants either have no opinion, disagree or do not know if transformation includes all aspects of the battlespace (the operational environment before, during and after combat operations). Finally, a majority of participants have no opinion, disagree or have no opinion of whether transformation includes all aspects of the Army mission (i.e. everything the Army does including battlespace operations). The first, fourth and fifth variables in Table 6.3 clearly demonstrate that the participants view transformation differently than do the chiefs of staff.

The survey participants, along with their comments and those of the chiefs of staff, clearly indicate that field grade officers do not look at transformation in the same way. This difference provides evidence in support of the second hypothesis. Additionally, there is a

significant difference, according to the participants and what the chiefs of staff have stated in how field grade officers view transformation vis-à-vis the Army chiefs of staff. This gap between how field grade officers and the chiefs define transformation may have consequences. Any gap may lead field grade officers to form a negative view of transformation until they are able to understand and accept transformational goals that are established by senior Army leadership. The delivery of technology that increases the capabilities of current weapon systems or the delivery of new systems (such as what was intended with FCS) may provide material proof, to field grade officers, of what is meant by transformation from the view points of the chiefs of staff. The role of technology in transformation and the officers' views toward transformation will be the topics of the next two sections.

Participants' Perceptions of Technology in Army Transformation

This section addresses how field grade officers perceive technology, from a variety of viewpoints, and its role in achieving transformation. Arguably, many of the transformation goals center on the Army being able to deploy on a brigade level basis or as BCTs. Improved technology may be a major aspect in the Army's ability to effectively deploy brigades for a variety of mission requirements. The fourth hypothesis statement seeks to determine if field grade officers view technological innovation as a key factor in achieving transformation. The hypothesis is states as follows:

> H_4: Field grade officers believe that Army transformation is determined primarily by technological innovation.

Table 6.4 displays the results of survey items which asked the participants to respond to four items in order to determine the perceptions of technology's role in achieving such significant change. The first survey item in this area has to do with the development and availability of new weapon systems. It takes a great deal of time, perhaps years, to develop and field a new weapon system. The respondents are asked to provide their views of how new systems may impact the achievement of transformation. The second item addresses specifically whether field grade officers believe technology drives transformation. If technology is a major transformation driver, then senior Army leaders may be in a position of waiting on the integration of technology before they are able to provide clearly stated goals vis-à-vis a less tangible vision of the future. Regarding the third survey item, field grade officers are asked to address the role of Network Centric Warfare (NCW)[24] technology in achieving transformation. Finally, the fourth survey item asks the respondents to provide their views of how Future Combat Systems (FCS) factors into how the Army achieves transformation. The responses to these four areas will confirm that field grade officers consider technology to be imperative in achieving transformation.

Again, the first survey statement in this area addresses new weapons system development and the time-line that is needed for achieving some new capability. Current weapon systems may be viewed as being sufficient in achieving mission success, and the fielding of new weapon systems may not be all that important if Army transformation goals are not achieved. Approximately 43% of the respondents addressing the second category, time-line for new

[24] Network Centric Warfare (NCW) is an information superiority-enabled concept of operations that generates increased combat power by networking sensors, decision-makers (strategic, operational and tactical), and shooters (war-fighters) to achieve shared awareness, increased speed of command, higher tempo of operations, greater lethality, increased survivability, and a degree of self-synchronization. NCW translates information superiority into combat power by effectively linking knowledgeable entities into the battle-space (Cammons et al. 2003, 13)

weapon systems, believe that weapon system development is a key aspect in achieving transformation, while the majority of officers had no opinion, disagreed or strongly disagreed, or did not know if new weapon systems time-lines were key to transformation. A majority of respondents did not believe that the development of new weapon systems served as a key factor in achieving Army transformation.

As stated previously, the second survey item is very direct in asking for the respondents to address technology as a driver for transformation. A majority of the respondents (approximately 53%) believe that technology drives transformation in the Army, while the remaining respondents either have no view, either disagree or strongly disagree, or do not know. While a majority of the respondents believe that technology is a transformation driver, a majority of the respondents also believe that the Army will remain relevant even if transformation goals are not achieved. Somewhat paradoxically, a majority of the respondents believe that the weapon system development time-line is not all that important in determining successful transformation while at the same time a majority of respondents believe that new technology is imperative to transformation.

The third item in Table 6.4 has to do with information technology on the battlefield. Network Centric Warfare (NCW), as both a term and a concept, was described earlier. A majority of the respondents to this survey item either had no opinion (29%), either disagreed or strongly disagreed (17%), or did not know (7%). Over 46% of the respondents agreed that NCW is a significant component of Army transformation. There are perhaps a couple of reasons for why the majority of field grade officers would either have no view or a negative view of NCW as a transformation driver. It is possible that the respondents are not familiar with the concept of NCW, which might explain the 36% that responded either “neutral” or “do not know”. A second

reason might be that field grade officers may be concerned about decision makers, at all levels (strategic, operational and tactical), having complete battle-space situational awareness and therefore be able to override the decision-making authority (i.e. reducing the amount of discretion) of officers in the field.

The final survey item in Table 645 addresses the Future Combat System (FCS). FCS includes much of what is available under NCW. But in addition to information technology, the FCS includes a new family of combat vehicles and other capabilities that are based largely on new technology. This fourth item in Table 6.4 resulted in even fewer respondents than NCW, above, indicating that FCS may have been a significant factor for successfully achieving transformation. Approximately 33% of the respondents believe FCS is important, while a majority (77%) of the respondents were neutral; either disagreed or strongly disagreed, or did not know. There were over 27% that disagree that FCS was significant to the achievement of Army transformation.

Again, there are perhaps a couple of reasons for this rather large negative to neutral response. The first reason may be as a result of the Secretary of Defense, Robert Gates, canceling the procurement portion of FCS in 2009, which in effect ended the combat vehicle portion of the program. The inference is that since the program was in effect canceled, then it must not be significant relative to Army transformation. Secondly, some field grade officers may have not been familiar with FCS since it was late in being fielded. Many field grade officers may have only been familiar with FCS from a conceptual perspective and had little understanding of what capabilities FCS would provide. Again, senior Army leadership appears to be proponents of FCS, but field grade officers on the other hand may have had a slightly more negative view of what FCS means to transformation.

Table 6.4

Perceptions of Technology's Role in Army Transformation

N=197

	Strongly agree %	Agree %	Neutral %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Don't know %
The weapon systems development time-line is a key aspect of determining successful transformation.	11.2	32.5	28.4	20.3	6.1	1.5
The U.S. Army will rely on technology to drive transformation goals.	7.6	45.7	24.9	18.3	2.5	1.0
Field grade officers believe that Network Centric Warfare is a significant component of transformation.	8.1	38.6	28.9	13.2	4.1	7.1
Field grade officers believe that Future Combat Systems is a significant transformation factor.	5.6	27.7	32.8	19.0	8.2	6.8

Again, this section of the survey gave the participants an opportunity to provide input on their perceptions of transformation from two perspectives dealing with transformation. Some of the comments provided by respondents are included here:

> "Stop relying on technology for transformational needs. Just because technology is available does not mean we have to incorporate it. Sometimes the new technology is irrelevant and does not apply to our needs and only serves to overcomplicate the situation."
>
> "Transformation should not solely rely on technology. Technology is definitely part of it, but most importantly are training and doctrine."

> "I think that the Army leadership should clearly focus on changing the Army culture rather on technological developments. Army culture need to change to emphasize a clearly stated professional military ethic, reduce the rampant anti-intellectualism, and support and educate divergent thinkers. Our professional military schools do not emphasize enough the importance of critical thinking and intellectualism. We need smart, educated officers who can respond to an uncertain environment…this more than anything else, especially superficial changes like berets and uniforms, will drive Army transformation – it's a mindset not a piece of equipment."

These perceptive comments made by the survey participants, above, may indicate that technology is only one aspect of transformation. It may be in fact more important to first change other areas of the institutional Army before endeavoring to achieve transformation. The following will present an overview of how the chiefs of staff have provided some insight into this area of the survey.

General Eric Shinseki highlighted the significance of a cultural change within the Army as well as the need for the development of new technology. He must have perceived that any significant change would have to be preceded by a change in Army culture. Shinseki (2001) states that "change in any large organization is not easy. Leaders at all levels have a critical role in the Army's attainment of the Objective Force and must work to overcome the inertia that impedes progress. Leaders must embrace the Army vision and become agents and disciples of change themselves. Leaders must establish an environment of innovation and encourage initiative that will harness the creative energy required in the development of the Objective Force concept" (Shinseki 2001, 20). In effect General Shinseki may have been indicating that the Army's culture would need to change in order to successfully transform to the Objective Force.

Some leaders may use some sort of a symbol as a reminder that the organization needs to change. In the case of pursuing Army transformation, General Shinseki used the black beret as a symbol for Army change. Shinseki (2000) insisted that

> " the Army must change to maintain its relevance for the evolving strategic environment…that as technology allows, we will begin to erase the distinctions between heavy and light forces…we are transforming today's most powerful Army in the world from a Cold War Legacy Force to an Objective Force with early entry capabilities that can operate jointly, without access to fixed forward bases, and still have the power to slug it out and win campaigns decisively…this transformation will correct the condition in today's Legacy Force where our heavy forces are too heavy, and our light forces lack staying power…to symbolize the Army's commitment to transforming itself into the Objective Force, the Army will adopt the black beret for wear Army-wide" (Shinseki 2000).

General Shinseki appeared to have observed that the Army's culture needed to transform, and in order to make sure that happened he required that everyone in the Army wear the black beret. Additionally, General Shinseki also made the comment "that as technology allows" that the Army would change from the heavy systems to systems, based ostensibly on technology yet to be developed, that would allow the Army to become the Objective Force. This was his vision, and to remain focused on that vision the black beret would be worn by everyone in the Army.

It is not clear if General Shinseki's successor embraced the black beret as an emblem of transformation, but he did indicate that there is a human element to transformative change. General Schoomaker states that:

> "…regardless of concepts, capabilities, and technologies, it is important to remember that at the center of every joint system are the men and women who selflessly serve the Nation. Although the tools of warfare change, the dynamics of the human dimensions, instilled through innovative leadership, remain the driving force in all military operations…the human dimension of Army transformation is the crucial link to the realization of Future Force capabilities and the enhanced effectiveness of the Current Force…to realize the full power of transformation, the Army seeks to embed a culture of innovation within its people and organizations to ensure innovative practices, processes and activities emerge to produce required joint capabilities…changing the Army's culture now, however, is not about introducing innovation…it is about changing how and when innovation occurs in the transformation cycle…instead of processes constraining solutions, solutions must drive processes" (Schoomaker 2003, 1-4 – 1-5).

Innovation may mean different things (tactics, leader development, etc.) but it appears that General Schoomaker may mean that innovation is the integration of technology which will

continue as the Army seeks to continuously transform itself; the culture within the Army may need to adapt to that reality if it has not done so already.

Changing the culture within the Army may be more difficult than any other aspect of achieving transformation. General Casey stated in 2007 that:

> "…most of our systems were designed to support the pre-9/11 Army. Our transformation cannot be cemented until the institutional systems, personnel, education, training, healthcare, procurement, and support among them, are adapted to meet the realities of our current and future environments. We will continue Army Business Transformation through management, contracting and acquisition reform; comprehensive redesign of organizations and business processes that support our expeditionary Army at war; and consolidation of bases and activities. While this is largely an internal process, it may well be the most difficult aspect of transformation…and the one that is most essential to giving us the Army we need for the rest of this century" (Casey 2007, 6).

General Casey may indicate here that the expeditionary army, the one that is currently at war, may be have already adapted to the realities of transformation, whereas the institutional army, or everyone else, may still need to change in order for the Army to achieve it transformational goals and objectives. Procurement and acquisition, a part of the institutional army as described be General Casey here, is the segment of the Army that develops and procures both new weapon systems and new technology. If these areas are lagging, as General Casey seems to indicate, then the culture within that part of the institutional Army may need to transform in order to allow the Army to achieve the technological advantages needed for the Future Force. Culture may in fact drive the Army's ability to achieve innovation in not only technology, but also within its educational institutions, training efforts, healthcare practices and general business practices.

The majority of the survey respondents believe that technological innovation primarily drives transformational change in the Army. Along with that belief a majority of respondents either agree or are neutral in viewing weapons system development time-time as being important

in achieving transformation. Regardless of these views on the importance of technological innovation, a majority of officers believe that the Army will remain relevant even transformation goals are not achieved. This viewpoint may reinforce the idea that the respondents may have a negative view of transformation if such change is other than incremental in nature. Responses regarding the importance of technology in achieving transformation, and the emphasis that the chiefs of staff appear to make on technology, lend support for the fourth hypothesis; field grade officers believe that Army transformation is determined primarily by technological innovation. While in this section the respondents, as field grade officers, provide their views on the importance of technology and other factors for the attainment of transformation, it is also important for respondents to offer their estimates on how they believe other field grade officers may influence transformation.

Participants have a Critical Perception of Army Transformation

This section seeks to determine if field grade officers possess a critical view of Army transformation. As expressed in Chapter 4, Methodology, the responses provided by the participants here may be based largely on the collective experiences and associations with other field grade officers over the course of a career, particularly over the last decade. It is possible that some bias will occur as these participants seek to represent the attitudes of all field grade officers serving in the Army. Table 6.5 affords the participants an opportunity to provide responses to eight different variables which will help in determining if field grade officers hold a critical view of Army transformation. If field grade officers view Army transformation efforts critically, then those viewpoints may explain the differences in how senior Army leaders interpret transformation as compared to field grade officers. The fifth hypothesis statement seeks

to determine if field grade officers do indeed possess a critical perception of transformation. The fifth hypothesis is stated as follows:

H_5: Army officers will view Army transformation efforts critically.

The first variable in Table 6.5 indicates that a majority of close to 60% of the participants believe that the term transformation is well understood by field grade officers in terms of current objectives. There is a rather high percentage of participants, approximately 40%, who either disagree or have no opinion. Regarding the second item, a little more than 58% of the officers believe that transformation changes from one chief of staff to the next, while the remaining approximately 42% of participants either have no opinion or disagree. Approximately 44.5% of the participants in terms of the third variable believe that the Combatant Commanders (CINCs) have greater influence in defining Army transformation while the remaining 55% either disagree or have no opinion. The fourth question indicates that a majority of participants, approximately 53%, do not believe that senior Army leaders have been clear in defining transformation goals. This view supports the response where 75% of the participants, in the fifth variable, indicate that goals should be more clearly stated by senior Army leaders. Regarding the formation of transformation in the sixth variable a minority of participants, approximately 28%, believe that field grade officers have the opportunity to provide input regarding transformation. Additionally, in variable seven, a minority of officers, approximately 23%, believe that field grade officers have discretion in implementing transformation goals. Finally, variable eight indicates that 67% of the respondents believe that significant change in Army organizational goals are clearly understood by field grade officers.

Table 6.5

Views of Leadership on Army Transformation

N=197

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Neutral %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Don't know %
The term transformation is well understood by field grade officers in terms of U.S. Army change objectives.	6.6	53.3	21.8	15.2	1.5	1.5
The meaning of Army transformation changes from one chief of staff to the next.	19.8	39.1	27.9	9.1	1.5	2.5
The Combatant Commanders (CINCs) have greater influence in defining transformation than does the Army chief of staff.	18.6	25.9	32.9	21.8	4.1	6.6
I believe senior Army leadership has been clear in defining transformation goals.	5.1	41.8	30.6	16.3	5.6	.5
The U.S. Army transformation goals should be more clearly stated by senior Army leadership.	30.1	44.9	20.4	4.6	0.0	0.0
Field grade officers have an opportunity to provide input in determining what Army transformation means.	3.6	24.4	27.9	31.0	12.7	.5
Field grade officers have flexibility in implementing Army transformation goals.	2.1	21.0	30.3	31.8	12.8	2.1
Significant change in U.S. Army organizational goals are clearly understood by field grade officers.	6.6	60.4	20.3	11.7	.5	.5

Again, this section of the survey gave the participants an opportunity to be critical of transformation. Some of the comments provided by respondents are included here:

> "Most field grade officers have ideas on how transformation should work but their ideas are rarely integrated if they are even received at the echelon making decisions."
>
> "I feel field grade officers have an excellent opportunity to affect transformation yet feel senior level leaders tend to discount their opinions."
>
> "I think that most of my peers feel that transformation is a joke. A series of useless cosmetic changes have been sold as transformation, but the basics of military readiness are not addressed by senior leadership, and, in fact, many initiatives are a distraction from training for war. I don't need resiliency, new uniforms and pie in the sky weapons systems. I need time to train soldiers, and I need to get those soldiers early enough in the ARFORGEN [Army Force Generation] cycle that I can exercise collective training to standard."

The perceptive comments made by the survey participants, above, indicate that field grade officers hold critical views of transformation. Their comments confirm that, in their view, transformation could be more clearly defined by senior level leaders. While a majority of officers (59.9%) believe that transformation is well understood in terms of Army objectives, a similar majority of the participants (58.9%) believe that the meaning of transformation changes from one chief of staff to the next. Additionally, a majority of officers (53%) either have no opinion or hold a negative view regarding senior leadership clearly defining transformation goals. Indeed, a significant majority (75%) of field grade officers believe that the chiefs of staff should more clearly state transformation goals. To the degree that transformation is understood, any changes that a new chief of staff makes may cause field grade officers to form a more critical view of significant change.

Some field grade officers may view the chief of staff as having less influence in determining transformation as compared to other senior level officers. A rather significant percentage of participants, approximately 44.5%, who believe that Combatant Commanders

(CINCs) have more influence in shaping transformation than does the chief of staff may indicate that there is some confusion regarding who provides clearly defined goals. Because a significant percentage of field grade officers believe that the CINCs (i.e. the war-fighting four-star generals) have significant influence in determining what transformation should entail, their view of transformation may be critical if the Army chief of staff's view is different than that of the CINCs.

The participants were also clear in their views that field grade officers have little opportunity to provide input in defining transformation and have little discretion in determining how transformation is implemented. Field grade officers serve in assignments at the battalion level and higher, as well as in senior Army and joint staff assignments. Because of their relative high status within the Army, field grade officers will most likely develop a critical view of transformation if they believe that they have little opportunity for determining such policy or if they have little discretion regarding its implementation. The inability for field grade officers to provide input regarding transformation, and to also exercise some discretion, may have something to do with a budget process that is largely determined from the top down. While somewhat outside the scope of this research, a constrained budget (especially constrained when in time of war) may also make it difficult for senior leadership to send a strong and clear message of change because of limited resources. If senior leaders are espousing transformative change on one hand and a constrained budget makes it difficult to achieve transformation on the other, then field grade officers will most likely form a very critical view of transformation. Again, this question may be better left to further research that determines if the budgeting process within the federal government contributes to critical views of significant change.

If field grade officers are not able to express their views of what transformation means, and they believe they lack the discretion necessary to implement transformation goals, then field grade officers will have a critical view of transformation, if for no other reason that they do not view themselves as partners in the process. According to the survey results in Table 6.5, and the comments provided by the survey participants, there is a rather large percentage of officers that are neutral or do not agree with many of the items in Table 6.5. While there are many who do agree that the chiefs of staff make transformation understandable as a term, that senior Army leadership has been clear in defining transformation goals, and significant change in terms of Army organizational goals are well understood, there is nevertheless a rather large percentage in the "neutral" and "do not agree" categories that may indicate a large percentage of officers who hold very critical views of transformation. By opening up the lines of communication between senior Army leadership and field grade officers, especially in the area of transformational goals, and then allowing field grade officers to exercise more discretionary authority may go a long way toward eliminating the critical view of transformation that a relatively large number of officers currently possess.

There is an obvious inconsistency in Table 6.5 regarding the views of field grade officers. The first variable indicates that almost 60% of the officers believe that Army transformation is well understood, while in item five 75% of the officers believe that senior Army leadership should do a better job of stating transformation goals. Approximately 40% of field grade officers believe that the term transformation could be better understood by field grade officers. Additionally, in the last variable 66% of officers believe that transformation goals are clearly understood by field grade officers, while over 30% believe that significant changes in Army organizational goals are clearly understood. The relatively high percentage of officers

represented in the neutral or disagree categories in the first and last variable indicate that many officers hold a critical view of transformation. Those percentages along with the fifth variable, where a high percentage of officers believe that transformation goals should be more clearly stated, confirms that field grade officers view transformation critically.

Based on the results of the survey, the five hypotheses statements presented in this research have been proven warranted. By proving the accuracy of each of these hypotheses statements, it also indicates that there is indeed a gap that exist between how senior Army leaders define transformation as compared to how field grade officers define that term. If there is a difference in how the chiefs of staff have defined transformation (an end-state or an Objective Force preferred by General Shinseki as compared to the continuous pursuit of some Future Force that was the preferred approach of both General Schoomaker and General Casey) then there is strong possibility that field grade officers may also view transformation differently.

Similarly, field grade officers may view transformation as being defined differently from one chief of staff to the next. If transformation takes on a somewhat different meaning, or perhaps a significantly new meaning, from one chief of staff to the next then field grade officers may perceive senior Army leaders as being clear and consistent on transformation goals and objectives. If field grade officers do not understand what senior leaders mean by transformation, then they may be more inclined with the status quo (weapon systems, tactics, institutions, etc.) of which they are more familiar. If transformational goals are not clear, then the unknown may not be preferred by most field grade officers; in fact field grade officers may have a negative view of transformation.

Each of the three chiefs of staff has highlighted technology, most notably FCS, as the centerpiece for transforming the Army. While the respondents do not necessarily address FCS in

many of their comments, they do acknowledge that technology has benefited the Brigade Combat Teams (BCT) that serve as the Army's primary units of deployment. Finally, field grade officers believe that the culture of the Army needs to change in order for the Army to transform. Many of the respondents believe that field grade officers have limited access to senior Army leadership for purposes of making recommendations and comments concerning transformation. While many field grade officers have known nothing but change since they began their careers in the late 1990s, senior ranking officers who began their careers decades before may have a different perspective of what needs to be accomplished. The difference in how transformation is perceived by the chiefs of staff and field grade officers may have a great deal to do with a clash of sub-cultures within the Army, The cultural change may occur at senior levels within the Army as field grade officers get promoted to general officer. To further support the survey results presented here, open-ended interviews were conducted at CGSC for purposes of receiving first-hand input into how some field grade officers think about transformation from a variety of perspectives.

Interview Results

As discussed in Chapter 4, Methodology, a series of open-interviews were conducted at CGSC in January 2010 with the participants consisting of four students (Army Majors) and three faculty and staff members (an Army Major and two Lieutenant Colonels). These interviews were open-ended in that the prepared questions (see Appendix B) may have caused each interview to take a somewhat different direction based on the willingness of the participants to each provide somewhat different points of view. Indeed, due to time constraints, in some cases all of the questions were not addressed. Some questions caused some informants to go down different

paths in providing their responses, which did take considerable time in some cases. Some of those responses provided a great deal of information that was not specifically relevant to the research. For instance, there was some discussion of what is taking place within the BCT that had little to do with the overall research question or hypotheses. The interviews were useful in triangulating the information that was received during the survey process, as well as the information that was gathered as a part of the literature review.

The informants each signed an informed consent form (Appendix B), were all very cooperative, provided excellent insight into the challenges of transformation, and completed the entire interview process. While the transcription of the interviews resulted in a large amount of information, only a portion of the total interviews are represented here.

The selection of officers who participated in this interview was out of my control. The Deputy Chief of the U.S. Student Division at CGSC selected four student-officers and four faculty and staff members to participate. There were no minority or female officers selected to participate. Of the officers selected, the four student-officers were Active Army majors and the faculty and staff consisted of three Active Army lieutenant colonels and one Active Army major. As stated in Chapter 4, Methodology, a cassette tape containing the interview with a lieutenant colonel, while available, did not allow for information to be accessed. This is the reason for why there are only seven open-ended interviews as opposed to the eight that I had intended to transcribe.

It was important to have the officers acknowledge whether any transformation had occurred, and if it did it was useful to receive their viewpoints as to the nature of that transformative change. The following represents some of the responses relating to the question of whether there has been any organizational change within the Army since 1999:

> "Oh, absolutely."
>
> "Probably a large degree of organizational change not only in terms of structural but on how the Army is trying to change how we think about complex problems…instead of more methodology like you do it like this…thinking more in terms of what are all the factors involved in this problem and how we get to where we need to be after solving the problem based on the factors."
>
> "Yes, I think more so due to the conflicts in wars than transformation itself…when it comes to transformation, we realigned some of our units…and decentralized some of how we fight to a lower level…but I don't it goes as far as reorganizational change…you still wake up in the morning, you put on your uniform, you still follow orders, and a lot of our processes are very much the same…I don't think the using of BCT structure is the centerpiece of the transformation or so significant that I would say it was an organizational change…I wouldn't go so far as to say that our transformation was as great as some of the military transformations or revolutions of the past."

The next question that is represented here asked the participants to provide input on how they view the development of weapon systems as a driver for achieving transformation in the Army.

> "They could probably speed up the process [weapons system development]. I know there's the bureaucracy that you, you know, you have to maneuver through, but they should shorten the lifecycles for programs from conception to production…the transformation piece, I mean it has basically two parallel paths; one is, you know, just a natural evolution of technology and the other is always wanting to have, you know, top shelf stuff."
>
> "…I think it has experienced some organizational change…I mean maybe not as drastic as from what I've seen, but there has been some."

The term transformation or significant may not mean the same thing to different people. Additionally, some individuals may view even transformative change as being incremental and not necessarily change that occurs all at one. The following represents responses to the question that addresses whether transformation is either significant change or incremental change.

> "I think we are wrapped up in the demands of the current operating environment and I'm not sure that at the highest level we start to say here's where we are going to with an Army 10 or 15 years from now [do you think the status quo is sufficient?]…yeah, I think we've proven that as an organization we will continue to move and progress and

evolve…you have to ask yourself are we really getting to where the chief wants us to go if he's not thinking?"

"It's both, certainly significant but it's been incremental and it's been a revolution making adaptation to requirements of the strategic operations environment, I think you could see that in the organization for combat…in the institutions available on the various posts around the world and the support we offer the units."

"I would say both. I would say the incremental changes that we have experienced since 2004 have significant at a logistical standpoint, we've seen a majority of the logistical structures changed to the way we fight now and the maneuver units are supporting them, so I would say both."

"…in terms of organizational structure, I would say that it was a significant transformation in the context of both, you know, brigade centric versus the whole structure of divisions that occurred…I'd say the impact …were almost instantaneously…but when you're talking about a large organization and you're trying to guide in a different direction I would say it's been incremental, the gains have been realized incrementally because in a large organization you can't just flip a light switch and say we're now doing this…it takes some time."

"It would be significant change…so, the transformation is…a big broad stroke of you know a major muscle group type of change…transformation is a big broad stroke whereas with that broad stroke you have all these little different changes that are done with a fine brush that support the big broad stroke."

"I would say that it has been much more incremental for the simple fact that as they transformed units to BCTs they had to do so incrementally."

"…a little bit of both, incrementally in the fact that we have seen the change in uniforms, we've seen changes in equipment, we've seen change in just about everything that could be changed…we're changing."

"…yes I think it does when I think the biggest change that we had all at once was a minor change…that was putting the black berets on all at the same time back in 2000."

Some officers may not view the Army Chief of Staff as the individual that is responsible for creating the vision for transformation. Others may view other actors such as the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army or other public officials external to the Defense Department as being more influential in determining what organizational change needs to occur in the Army. The following responses provide the participants' opinion of who determines change in the Army.

> "I think the senior leaders of the Army to be that voice. I see the chief of staff of the Army probably to be the primary guy that says here's where we are go, certainly every four-star has a role in that, hopefully there's some consensus at that level…I hope that they are informed by the recommendations of organizational leaders from throughout the formation and that information is gathered in a variety of ways, to do a lot of face-to-face for we know what we want to look like 5-10-15 years from now…certainly the chief is that mouthpiece, that guy represents our interests and after that lawmakers and all the budgetary discussions and things that drives change at you."

> "Ultimately, I think the Chief of Staff of the Army…is the person who has to set the tempo and then push it down and get people to follow suit…you know, if it's not coming from the chief of staff it's not going to happen."

> "…the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army and we work through the civilians when we have to get that guidance…I mean we have a lot of smart senior officers…who can see the trends and the way things are going, but I think that we have input, but the national command authority has to say this is the direction you have to go."

> "…the Army is not so much higher autocratic, or whatever you want to call it, it has been modified over the last 10 years, where we have thicker skin than we use to…we kind of screwed that up and we got to fix it is the mindset now."

> "I think all leaders are responsible for the structural change…I would say the Army leadership with guidance from the civilian leadership to ensure we are forming and changing to meet the needs that the civilian leadership directs us to go as far as their strategy, as far as their guidance to us on how we need to be best."

While the participants may agree that change has occurred within the Army, there is some disagreement on who actually determines the change objectives for the Army. If that is true, then there may be some ambiguity about what the vision may be for transformation in this military service. The following comments are in response to whether or not a vision has been expressed for purposes of transformation.

> "I think it has been expressed…it's also been changed over time for a variety of reasons since 1999."

> "There's been a vision and they've put out a lot of what I call propaganda…that may seem like the wrong term to explain the vision in the higher ups of the chain…I think a lot of that gets lost when you get down to the ground levels…I saw a lot of power point charts with a lot of arrows that pointed to a lot of this is what's changing, but when you said to someone what is that…they couldn't articulate it…I think there is ambiguity built into it because we're learning as we go, we're trying to change fast, we don't want to go

too far in the wrong direction so they think if they filter some flexibility into the change, cause they'll know it when they see it."

"… we all have a piece of it, so I can't say one particular person would be responsible for saying 'hey this what it is and this is what we're looking at'…in 2000 is when I started hearing about transformation, they said by 2010, which oh by the way by now transformation should be complete."

"I would say no and I would be interested in seeing something like that and hoping that I get that here (at CGSC) but I have not seen anything like that in what I have been doing lately."

"I think as definitive and expressive as they can be…we just changed out doctrine and we include stability support operations and counter-insurgency as a much greater piece of the overall operations."

"…there's a gap and it's mostly I say between the three and four star level and the commanders. You know you have a bunch of three and four stars and two stars who come up through the old Army with NTC [National Training Center] rotations; they're fine and very intelligent men, but now we've got this kind of different way of looking at business…and we have ones that from 2003 – 2004, those battalion commanders who are now brigade commanders…so it's coming up you've got people who were getting experience in this type of war and that goes all the way down to the lieutenants who don't know anything but patrolling in an urban environment."

"I guess we're lacking vision right now but it has been provided in the past from the civilian leadership then transferred into military leadership out to the units…I think it is important for the members of the organization to understand what leadership, whether it be military or civilian, what their vision is for the unit; where they want things to head for the organization and what direction they want them to travel in."

The next section asks the participants to address the significance of having an expressed vision that is driven from the top down within the Army's organizational structure. The open-ended interview approach allowed for additional insight to be gained regarding the ability subordinates to provide information from the bottom up.

[Does bottom-up feeding of information make its way to senior level leadership and become incorporated in change?]
"Yes, because if you don't, especially in the organization…with the culture of the military, you know people are slow to change."

"…more so now than it use to and I think a lot of it is exacerbated by technology…when I started my own career back in 1992 we were lucky to have a computer in a company

> now we're all connected to the internet, to all this vast amount of data, that didn't exist before, so the information sharing and the existing information is so much greater I think to some of our senior leaders.

The chiefs of staff all emphasized the need for innovation and the need to insert technology into both existing and developing weapon systems (mostly FCS). The participants were asked to provide their views of how technology may drive transformation in the Army.

> "…we try and use technology too much on transforming to meet technology and the situation doesn't allow us to be, that technology is the driver…we're in two different wars right now with two drastically different scenarios but what we try to do is when something works with one scenario or in one area we try to use it over in the other and sometimes maybe…we realize it's not really appropriate and we try and force it to work."

> "…two categories…those things that enhance your efficiency and those technological advances that are so sweeping at different levels of command that they want now and they want more…cannot live without."

> "…it plays a significant role."

> "…technology affects force structure much more…I don't know how much you know about future combat system (FCS)…it wasn't working."

> "I think another reality of this current environment is that technology in not going to carry the day in future accomplishments…when I hear FCS I don't think of light and deployable…I think this environment is showing us that might be a pipe dream and regardless of how high tech we get it's very difficult to truly understand all the aspects and human dimensions of war and to really have information dominance…in end there are other factors that are more important in that equation."

As stated previously, the Army budget affects everyone in the organization. The participants were asked to provide their viewpoints on how the Defense Budget may impact the U.S. Army's ability to achieve organizational change

> "I'd say probably the budget issues are the main reason transformation has become so bureaucratic, it so political…what you need to look like gets clouded by the budget restraints and that's where we become bureaucratic and you get tied into problems…all these political leaders from all camps that helping to cloud the issues."

> "…the budget is very important because…until you get this stuff that symbolizes the change…you get the equipment and you're able to restructure your force."

> "I think it depends on the level of transformation the unit that is transforming, what the unit was before they transformed versus what they are going to be once they complete transformation…if a unit is infantry and they're transforming they're staying infantry and they're just transforming the unit's structure as far as the personnel there, they may be gaining a few more soldiers, or fire teams, the budget will need to increase a little to pay for the training."

The survey results indicated that the Army chiefs of staff have a different view of what transformation means as compared to that of field grade officers. The interview participants were asked express their views on how transformation may be different between these two levels.

> "I would say no. I would say that the more senior you become the broader the scope across the Army becomes, so you tend to see things differently than what a major down in a battalion or maybe at the brigade level would see; the scope is different.
>
> "I would have to say yes more than in the past when Shinseki pretty much started the whole thing, he kind of changed the model for the concept of thinking and that's just kind of how the snow ball affect with the chiefs that succeeded him, because before you can change, like everything else it is painful, nobody likes change because it is different…it forces you to learn something new or do something different than what you're use to…but the Army has gotten used to this idea of change."
>
> "I don't think so, I there's a gap between their strategic plan and the way they want to go and how it's being executed on the ground…I think the gap is wide because it often seems that the input from the grade officers and the guys on the ground doesn't get to higher, or higher already made up their mind before they ask for input…"
>
> "I think a four-star would think about change as more long-term because of the size and scope of the organization that they command whereas field grade officers would view the principles…a four star can change his shirt from red to blue and that means organizational change.
>
> "I think they (senior leaders) are more focused on strategic level…they have a longer view of requirements and I think different perspectives toward change."
> "I think that the chief's answer would be a composite of sound-bites probably driving toward big objectives…I think my answer would be focused more on well transformation equals force structure changes down at the division and brigade, both levels with new technologies in the formations, more soldiers, a change in how we educate the force and train the force."

The open-ended interview provided for a very good forum for discussing what Army transformation means to a field grade officer on a personal level. The following provides some viewpoints on what transformation means to the interview participants.

"…when it was coined General Shinseki was trying to change the Army into a more expeditionary force into a force that was more capable of deploying rapidly, realigning our formation and to be able to plug into to small wars to go fight as brigade units…send in small packages somewhere very quickly…which was going to have to change a lot of mindsets and a lot of our logistics tail…[General Shinseki made the comment that if we don't have FCS by the year 2010 the Army is going to be irrelevant]…but no one can still tell you what FCS is."

"…nothing. It doesn't affect me. I mean my day-to-day activity in the Army kind of continues whether it was Army transformation or not…"

"…I don't think they do. I think that …senior leaders have feelings of stewardship they need to change some things we need, emerging threats, but at the same time it's easy to come out and say this is what we need to do and then it is the majors and lieutenant colonels that have to staff and execute all these, and again just the amount of stuff that we've got going on in our day to day mission, not even talking about deployment training and all that, if you're going to transform a unit you got to just transform a unit."

"…a lot of officers have never known anything but change…they're comfortable with change."

"…it probably means there is a defined end-state."

"…it is basically a timeframe in the Army's history where we went through a major restructuring and reorganization of the way our units are structured and supported and the way we actually look at those units…I see transformation as really 2000 – 2001 timeframe until now where we are, I would say probably coming towards the end as we finish migrating everybody from what we call legacy units, the older structured units to the modular structured units"

"Transformation is nebulous and a term which should be retired. It adds little clarity and serves and has become something of a joke because contractors and program managers now dub everything "transformation" to gain funding. Same thing is now being done with COIN (Counterinsurgency)/IW (Information Warfare."

The interviews provided a unique opportunity to interface with majors and lieutenant colonels and to gain an understanding of how they perceive transformation. This experience would not have been possible through the survey process, but the interviews did serve to support the findings in the survey. There is clearly not a consistent understanding of what transformation means among field grade officers. Even when these officers address transformation as being either an end-state or a continuous process, there is still some disparity in how they perceive the magnitude in what is actually happening in the way of significant change. Many of these officers

have known nothing but change since they entered the Army over a decade ago. The fact that General Casey, for instance, refers to transformation as a "continuous journey" that is ever evolving may be less of an impact on these officers than the generation of officers who preceded them. Additionally, the participants in these interviews have also experienced war for over seven years. The idea of receiving new technology that makes their life easier, if not safer, may be a welcome change. Receiving any new technology for purposes of fighting the current war may not be associated with transformation by these officers, the insertion of technology may only be perceived as upgrading existing equipment which may be viewed as only an evolutionary or incremental change to existing systems.

Conclusion

The term Army transformation means different things to different people. Within the Army, there are different meanings of transformation among field grade officers and field grade officers have a different perception of what transformation means as compared to senior Army leadership, and field grade officers generally view that the meaning of transformation changes from one chief of staff to the next. In this chapter there has been empirical evidence provided that proves that each of the five hypothesis statements is true. Transformation may necessitate that a cultural change needs to take place within the organizational or institutional army; it may mean the need to constantly pursue technological innovation for both current weapon systems and for any weapon systems that are being developed for the future; it may include the need to change the current force structure of the army into something that is more appropriate for present and future needs; it may mean addressing all aspects of what the Army is engaged with before,

during and after combat operations; and, finally, it may include all of the above as well as other considerations that may be outside of the scope of this research.

In short, Army transformation may simply mean what any given chief of staff says it means. To the degree that the term changes from one chief of staff to the next, there is going to be some difference in how the term is perceived or defined by field grade officers. Those field grade officers will view the term critically primarily because of their education, experience and their view of the world around them. If the term Army transformation is not made more definitive, if it means a continuous journey to some ideal state, then the way in which that term is viewed and defined by the many members of an organization will be numerous.

References

Brownlee, Les and Schoomaker, Peter J. General. 2004. *Serving a Nation at War: A Campaign Quality Army with Joint and Expeditionary Capabilities*. Parameters. Summer

Brownlee, Les and Schoomaker, Peter J. General. 2004. U.S. Army Posture Statement. Office of the Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, Special Actions Branch. February 5.

Cammons, Dave, John B. Tisserand III, Duane E. Williams; Alan Seise; and, Doug Lindsay. 2003. Network Centric Warfare Case Study: U.S. V Corps and 3rd Infantry Division (Mech) during operation Iraqi Freedom Combat Operations (March to April 2003). Center for Strategic Leadership. U.S. Army War College. Carlisle, PA.

Casey, Jr., George W. General. 2010. U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Armed Services. Chief of Staff of the Army Testimony. 111th Cong. 2d sess. February 23

Casey, Jr., George W. General. 2008. "Chief of Staff Speaks at the Eisenhower Luncheon, Association of the United States Army." http://www.army.mil/speeches/2008/10/10/13213-chief-of-staff-speaks-at-eisenhower-luncheon (2/28/2009)

Casey, Jr., George W. General. 2007b. U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Armed Services. , *Chief of Staff of the Army Statement*. 110th Cong. 1st Sess. November 15.

Geren, Pete and George W. Casey, Jr. General. 2009. A Statement on the Posture of the United States Army 2009. Submitted to the U.S. Congress, Committees and Subcommittees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. 111th Cong. 1st sess. May 7. http://www.army.mil/aps/09/ (3/17/2011)

Hollister, Eric A. 2010. A Shot in the Dark: The Futility of Long-Range Modernization Planning. *The Land Warfare Papers No. 79*. Arlington: The Institute of Land Warfare

Schoomaker, Peter J. General. 2007. U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Armed Services. *Chief of Staff of the Army Statement*. 110th Cong. 1st sess. February 15.

Schoomaker, Peter J. 2006. U.S. Congress, House Committee on Armed Forces. *Chief of Staff of the Army Statement*. 109th Cong. 2nd sess. June 27.

Schoomaker, Peter J. General. 2004. U.S. Congress. House Committee on Armed Services. *Chief of Staff of the Army Remarks.* 108th Cong. 2nd sess. January 28.

Schoomaker, Peter J. 2004. United States Army Transformation Roadmap. Department of the Army.

Schoomaker, Peter J. 2003. United States Army Transformation Roadmap. Department of the Army.

Shinseki, Eric K. 2002. U.S. Congress. Senate Committee on Armed Services. *Chief of Staff of the Army Statement.* 107th Cong. 2nd sess. May 16.

Shinseki, Eric K. 2001. U.S. Army *White Paper: Concept for Objective Force*. Washington: Department of the Army.

Shinseki, Eric K. General. . 2000. *CSA Sends – The Army Black Beret*. November 11 http://www.army.mil/features/beret/beret.htm (April 1, 2011)

Shinseki, Eric K. General. 2000. Testimony before the U.S. Senate Airland Subcommittee on Armed Services. 106th Cong. 2nd sess. March 8. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Shinseki, Eric K. General. 1999. Address during the Eisenhower Luncheon of the 45th Annual Meeting of the Association of the United States Army. Washington, D.C. October 12.

APPENDIX A

United States Army Command and General Staff College

Army Transformation Survey

Researcher(s): Administrator(s):
David H. Jerome, Graduate Student, Public Policy Ph.D. Program

Researchers:

David H. Jerome, Graduate Student
William D. Schreckhise, Ph.D., Faculty Advisor
University of Arkansas
College of Arts and Sciences
Public Policy Ph.D. Program
428 Old Main
Fayetteville, AR 72701
479-575-3356
djerome@uark.edu

Compliance Contact Person:

Ro Windwalker, Compliance Coordinator
Research & Sponsored Programs
Research Compliance
University of Arkansas
120 Ozark Hall
Fayetteville, AR 72701-1201
479-575-2208
irb@uark.edu

Description: The present study will investigate the meaning of "Army Transformation" as defined by senior U.S. Army leaders and U.S. Army lieutenant colonels and majors. You are asked to voluntarily participate in this survey.

Risks and Benefits: The benefits include contributing to the knowledge base pertaining to the meaning of the term "Army Transformation". By engaging in the survey you should continue to consider the meaning of "Army Transformation", perhaps throughout your career, and its importance to senior level planners and decision-makers. There are no anticipated risks to participating in the survey.

Voluntary Participation: Your participation in the research is completely voluntary.

Confidentiality: All information will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law and University policy. Results from the research will be reported as aggregate data.

Right to Withdraw: You are free to refuse to participate in the research and to withdraw from this study at any time. Your decision to withdraw will bring no negative consequences — no penalty to you.

Purpose of the survey: The following survey is a part of a doctoral research project concerning United States Army transformation efforts that have occurred since 1999. The survey will take roughly 15 minutes to complete. The questions below will be used to understand differences in perception among different groups. There will be no attempts to identify individual responses. The aggregated summary information will be used by the researcher but will otherwise remain confidential. If you do not feel comfortable answering a question, leave it blank. Your participation in this survey is very much appreciated.

Demographic Information

1. Current rank

   A. O4

   B. O5

   C. 06

   D. Other, specify: _____

2. Army Component

   A. Active Army

   B. Army Reserves

   C. Army National Guard

   D. Other, specify: _____

3. Current Duty Position

   A. CGSC Student Officer

   B. CGSC Staff

   C. CGSC Faculty

   D. Other, specify: _____

4. Total number of years of active duty service: _____

5. Gender

   A. Male

   B. Female

6. Age: ____

7. Race: _____

8. Highest level of education achieved:

   A. Bachelor's Degree

   B. Master's Degree

C. Doctorate

D. Other: _____

9. Source of U.S. Army Commission:

A. Military Academy

B. OCS

C. ROTC

D. Direct

E. Other: _____

10. Branch (i.e. Infantry, Artillery, Acquisition Corps):_____

Please respond to all of the remaining survey comments by using the following scale:

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
5	4	3	2	1	

Terminology

The purpose of this section is to gain an understanding of what the term "transformation" means to you

1. The U.S. Army has experienced significant organizational change since 1999.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

2. Significant change in U.S. Army organizational goals by field grade officers.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

3. "Significant change" and "transformation" are synonymous relative to current U.S. Army goals.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

4. The term "transformation" is well understood by field grade officers in terms of U.S. Army change objectives.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

5. I believe senior Army leadership has been clear in defining "transformation" goals

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

6. The meaning of Army transformation changes from one Army Chief of Staff to the next.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

7. Combatant Commanders (CINCs) have greater influence in defining Army Transformation than does the Army Chief of Staff.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

Comments

What "transformation" means to the Army

The purpose of this section is to gain an understanding of what transformation means to the Army.

8. U.S. Army transformation is based largely on the integration of technology into weapon systems.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

9. U.S. Army transformation is based largely on changes in force structure.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

10. U.S. Army transformation is based largely on information technology.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

11. U.S. Army transformation is a process and not an end-state.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

12. U.S. Army transformation addresses the complete "battle-space" (all aspects of the battlefield, before, during and after combat operations).

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

13. Transformation addresses all aspects of the U.S. Army mission.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

14. The U.S. Army will remain relevant even if transformation goals are not achieved.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

15. The weapon systems development time-line is a key aspect in determining successful transformation.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

16. Military training and educational institutions clearly express a senior level description of what "Army Transformation" means.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

Comments

Field Grade Officer views about transformation

The purpose of this section is to get your perceptions of what other field grade officers think about "transformation"

17. Field grade officers have an opportunity to provide input in determining what "Army Transformation" means.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

18. Field grade officers have flexibility in implementing "Army Transformation" goals.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

19. Field grade officers believe transformation is necessary based on 21st century threats v. 20th century threats

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

20. Field grade officers believe that Network Centric Warfare is a significant component of transformation

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

21. Field grade officers believe that the Future Combat System is a significant transformation factor

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

22. Field grade officers believe that the U.S. Army transformation is a "process" as opposed to an "end-state"

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

Comments

What the U.S. Army should consider for Transformation in the future

23. The U.S. Army will rely on technology to drive transformation goals and objectives

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

24. U.S. Army Transformation goals and objectives should be more clearly stated by senior Army leadership.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

25. U.S. Army leadership must change the culture within the Army in order to achieve transformation.

5 4 3 2 1 Don't Know

Comments

APPENDIX B

OPEN-ENDED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Informed Consent

Title: Army Transformation: What does it mean?
Researcher(s): Administrator(s):
David H. Jerome, Graduate Student, Public Policy Ph.D. Program

Researchers:
David H. Jerome, Graduate Student
William D. Schreckhise, Ph.D., Faculty Advisor
University of Arkansas
College of Arts and Sciences
Public Policy Ph.D. Program
428 Old Main
Fayetteville, AR 72701
479-575-3356
djerome@uark.edu

Compliance Contact Person:
Ro Windwalker, Compliance Coordinator
Research & Sponsored Programs
Research Compliance
University of Arkansas
120 Ozark Hall
Fayetteville, AR 72701-1201
479-575-2208
irb@uark.edu

Description: The present study will investigate the meaning of "Army Transformation" as defined by senior U.S. Army leaders and U.S. Army lieutenant colonels and majors. You will be asked to participate in an open-interview.

Risks and Benefits: The benefits include contributing to the knowledge base pertaining to the meaning of the term "Army Transformation". By engaging in the interview you should continue to consider the meaning of "Army Transformation", perhaps throughout your career, and its importance to senior level planners and decision-makers. There are no anticipated risks to participating in the study.

Voluntary Participation: Your participation in the research is completely voluntary.

Confidentiality: You will be assigned a code number that will be used to match the responses to the interview questions. Only the researcher will know your name, but will not divulge it or identify your answers to anyone. All information will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law and University policy. Results from the research will be reported as aggregate data.

Right to Withdraw: You are free to refuse to participate in the research and to withdraw from this study at any time. Your decision to withdraw will bring no negative consequences — no penalty to you.

Informed Consent: I, _____, have read the
(print your name)
description including the purpose of the study, the procedures to be used, the potential risks and side effects, the confidentiality, as well as the option to withdraw from the study at any time. Each of these items has been explained to me by the investigator. The investigator has answered all of my questions regarding the study, and I believe I understand what is involved. My

signature below indicates that I freely agree to participate in this experimental study and that I have received a copy of this agreement from the investigator.

_____

Signature/Date

Open-Ended Interview Questions

U.S. Army Command & General Staff College

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas

Demographic Information

1. What is your rank?

2. How many years have you served in the Army?

3. Are you a student of staff member at CGSC?

4. Male/Female

Core Questions

5. Has the Army experienced any organizational change since 1999?

6. If yes, has that change been significant or incremental since 1999?

7. If no, has there been a need for the Army to make any changes since 1999?

8. In your opinion, who is responsible for expressing what organizational change is needed for the U.S. Army?

9. Has a vision for change in the U.S. Army been expressed?

10. If yes, would you consider that expressed vision for change as incremental or significant?

11. If no, is it important to have an expressed vision for change?

12. What role does technology play in U.S. Army organizational change, if any?

13. What role does force structure play in U.S. Army organizational change, if any?

14. What role does the Defense Budget play in U.S. Army organizational change, if any?

15. Do field grade officers and senior leaders view change in the same way?

16. What does “Army Transformation” mean to you?

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

The chiefs of staff of the Army and field grade officers define transformation differently. This difference may be as a result of many factors that can exist within a large bureaucracy such as in the case of the U.S. Army. The findings in this research indicate that not only do field grade officers view transformation differently than the Army chiefs of staff, they also view transformation differently among themselves as a group. If there is not a clear and consistent understanding of what transformation means either to or among field grade officers, then they will have a critical if not negative view of transformation until they can develop a better understanding of its effects. Because the chiefs of staff appear to emphasize technological innovation, field grade officers are more inclined to view any such innovation as the driver for transformation. The Brigade Combat Teams (BCTs) and the Future Combat System (FCS) program were both referred to by the chiefs of staff as the centerpiece of transformation. The findings in this research may be of use to senior Army leadership as they compare their vision for the future of the Army with the understanding that field grade officers currently have of that vision. Before an attempt is made to apply the findings of this research to areas with broader public policy implications, it is important to first summarize the five hypotheses statements that were validated in the previous chapter.

A Summary of the Five Hypotheses Statements

In Chapter 6 empirical proof was provided that affirmed each of the five hypotheses statements. There is a gap that does exist in how senior Army leaders define transformation and how field grade officers define that same term. To degree that the gap exists there will be some

level of goal failure in achieving whatever transformation initiatives the Army chiefs of staff have in mind. The five hypotheses statements are: H_1: Field grade officers will view the Army's transformation as being significant; H_2: Field grade officers will define transformation differently from one another; H_3: Field grade officers will define transformation differently than the chiefs of staff; H_4: Field grade officers believe that Army transformation is determined primarily by technological innovation; and, H_5: Field grade officers will view Army transformation efforts critically. Each of these five statements will be summarized here.

The Army is a large bureaucratic organization and its members have different opinions about what transformation means to them. While the survey respondents in Chapter 6 largely acknowledged that significant change has occurred within the Army, it is significant largely because the effects are unclear to them, and that any transformation may depart from established standard operating procedures for which they have grown accustomed. The first hypothesis statement addresses this point:

H_1: Field grade officers will view the Army's transformation as being significant.

Many field grade officers have been deployed in combat operations over the last decade, while others have served in other capacities where they may have formed a somewhat different view on how the Army is transforming itself. Independent of programs like FCS, officers still have different views of what is intended by transformation based on their individual experiences and views of the world. Changes in force structure, doctrine, training, the institutional army, and operations were all factors that field grade officers considered, in varying degrees, in determining what transformation means to them. If there is no consensus on what transformation

means among field grade officers, then it is even less likely that field grade officers will define the term in the same way as the Army chief of staff.

Army chiefs of staff come and go, with each four-star general appointed to that position serving approximately four years. During any one chief of staff's term there is a very limited amount of time to both address the day-to-day operational needs of the Army and to pursue any vision that they may have for the future. At the four-star level there may be a different perspective of what significant change means as opposed to how field grade officers may view that same term. This leads to the second and third hypotheses which state:

H_2: Field grade officers will define transformation differently from one another.

H_3: Field grade officers will define transformation differently than the chiefs of staff.

Field grade officers may view transformation as being any change that provides a capability that was not available. Such change may only represent a fragment of what the chiefs of staff are trying to achieve in transforming the Army on a much larger scale. Additionally, Army chiefs of staff may have a different take on what transformation means at their level. Some chiefs of staff may view transformation as being revolutionary with a defined end-state, while others may view transformation as being more of a process that continues. If there is not a clear definition of what any one chief of staff means by transformation, or transformation is re-defined by different chiefs of staff, it is very likely that field grade officers will have a different definition of that term. If there is a different definition between these two levels, then field grade officers will most likely view transformative initiatives critically, if not negatively..

Field grade officers may prefer a more incremental or evolutionary approach to transformation where fewer and less dramatic changes are pursued over time and in a more

understandable manner. Revolutionary or sudden significant change will create a more critical or negative view in that field grade officers will not understand the purpose of such change in the context of current operations. Field grade officers may also not understand the implications of transformative change in terms of what it may mean to them personally. If transforming the operational Army to BCT's reduces promotional opportunities for field grade officers, then there most likely will be a critical view of what transformation is trying to accomplish. If the only perceived evidence of transformation is technological innovation, then field grade officers will most likely view technology as the primary driver in achieving transformation.

In Chapter 6, the survey respondents stated they believe that technology is a transformation driver. The Brigade Combat Team's (BCTs), arguably the operational unit that the Army hopes to transform into, is heavily dependent of technological innovation in order for the Army to become lighter, more mobile, more deployable, more lethal and more sustainable. This perception of the importance of technology is the basis of the fourth hypothesis:

> H_4: Field grade officers believe that Army transformation is determined primarily by technological innovation

While field grade officers tend to agree that technology is a transformation driver, they also believe that transformation should be driven by other factors besides technology. It must be hard for field grade officers to ignore the emphasis the chiefs of staffs have made in areas such as the FCS program, modularity initiatives, and information systems. Field grade officers also believe that training, logistics, doctrine, and the institutional Army need to change as well; not just technology. If technology is preferred by senior level leaders, then the viewpoints that field grade officers may have concerning transformation may not be taken into consideration.

It is not uncommon for field grade officers to spend their careers developing skills based on certain weapon systems, based on training that they receive and based on their understanding of doctrine in an operational or combat environment. When significant changes in these areas are made and field grade officers are not able to visualize how these changes are situated into what they know to be true, then field grade officers will hold a critical perception of transformation. According to the survey respondents, field grade officers believe that they have limited opportunity to shape transformation goals and objectives. This viewpoint is provided for in the fifth and final hypothesis statement:

H_5: Field grade officers will view Army transformation efforts critically.

Not only do field grade officers believe they have little opportunity to provide input into determining transformation, but they also believe that they have little discretionary authority in implementing transformation programs. If field grade officers lack the opportunity to provide input, and little authority to determine how to implement the output, then they may consider themselves as only actors in the transformation process itself whereby they play only minor roles. If there is little communication occurring up and down the chain of command, then there will most likely be different views of what transformation means to all field grade officers. There is a gap in what transformation means to senior Army leadership and field grade officers. In order to respond to an ever-changing world that is different from that of the Cold War era, an era that is most familiar to senior level leaders, then the gap of what transformation means to these two groups needs to be narrower in order for the Army to more efficiently meet future national security requirements.

The Broader Implications of Army Transformation

The Army may have to modify its vision for transformation if other agencies and departments within the federal government assume a greater role in national security planning and execution. For instance, should the State Department increase its diplomatic role then perhaps the Defense Department, including the Army, may need to adjust its current transformation plans. The United States Army is but one element of the U.S. National Security apparatus. If there is a disagreement within the Army on what transformation means, then there may be some concern moving forward regarding the difficulty this branch of military service may face in not only meeting its joint obligations in support of combatant commanders, but in participating in national security efforts that include more actors from throughout the U.S. federal government. Additionally, if changes are not well understood or accepted within the bureaucracy, as the Army seeks to support strategic national security interests and priorities, there may be some limitation in its ability to engage effectively in interagency collaboration and coordination. Army leadership clearly understands the need to support the joint environment in theaters of operation such as Iraq and Afghanistan. However, supporting future joint operations that are not currently known may be difficult if the Army lacks consensus of what is needed for an environment which may be fundamentally different from that which the Army currently seeks to understand.

Relative to U.S. military involvement in both Iraq and Afghanistan, Max Boot (2006) argues that many have asked: "why did the Department of Defense not invest in more linguists, more military police, more civil affairs specialists, and more soldiers in general, rather than in more high-tech weapons" (466)? The answer, Boot continues, is that senior military leaders believe that the future of warfare lays in high tech information systems, not in lowly

infantrymen. If technology appears to be the driver of transformation, this may come at the expense of the basic areas that Boot describes.

Boot makes a case in point by referring to the U.S. Army of the 1950s, where there was an emphasis to rearrange around the demands of the nuclear battlefield which found the Army unprepared for the threat that would be faced in the Vietnam War in the 1960s (466). Boot (2006) argues that trade-offs need to be continually made between basic requirements and technology insertion; should the U.S pay for more traditional infantrymen, or push resources into "transformational" programs like surveillance satellites, wireless broadband networks, and directed energy weapons (467)?

History indicates, according to Boot, that the wisest course of action is to feel one's way along with careful study, radical experimentation and free-wheeling war-games; paradoxically, revolutionary transformation can often be achieved in evolutionary increments (467). The first decade of the new millennia may have caught the U.S. Army focusing more on revolutionary change-centered on technology, and less focused on trying to strike the balance suggested by Max Root, above. This unbalanced focus may have been out of the control of the Army chiefs of staff.

The following is intended to demonstrate that there is disagreement within the defense community on how transformation should occur. It may only serve to cause greater confusion as to what transformation means if there is disagreement at the very top levels in the Defense Department. By the time Donald Rumsfeld's tenure as Secretary of Defense had ended, according to Bacevich (2010), the term transformation had become a symbol of overweening arrogance that had characterized his entire tenure in office (166). Senior officers, including those within the Army, at least those wishing to remain in the defense secretary's good graces,

parroted the language of transformation (175). The very person that coined the term transformation for the Army in 1999, General Eric Shinseki, was one of those senior officers who fell out of favor with Secretary Rumsfeld, as a result of statements that he made about the need for significant troop levels in post-invasion Iraq (Bacevich 2010, 175). It appears that General Shinseki understood the need for more ground troops given the circumstances of Iraq and Afghanistan, which went counter to Secretary Rumsfeld's preference for fewer troops and increases in technology.

According to David Margolick (2007) all[25] applauded when Rumsfeld was named to his post; some even initially favored his plans to streamline – or "transform," as he termed it, the military. But Margolick argues that most had soured on him before the public did, after they believe he had humiliated and marginalized four-star general Eric Shinseki, the well-respected army chief of staff, who had disputed Rumsfeld's lowball estimates of the troops required for any Iraq war (Margolick 2007). Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld preferred a technological approach in confronting Iraq with less emphasis on additional troops as had been proposed by some. To emphasize this point U.S. Army Lieutenant General Robert Wagner, Deputy Commander of the Joint Forces Command, stated that:

> "…we envision the future from an information age perspective where operations are conducted in a battle-space, not a battlefield. We are now able to create decision superiority that is enabled by networked systems, new sensors and command and control capabilities that are producing near real-time situational awareness. Our operations in Afghanistan and Iraq have demonstrated the operational attributes that an adaptive joint force must possess in the modern battle-space" (Wagner 2004).

According to Bacevich (2010) this statement was made by Lieutenant General Wagner within a year after U.S. forces entered Iraq (176). Such a statement, by a U.S. Army lieutenant general, that advocated for technology over troops would have run counter to what the U.S. Army Chief

[25] The author is not clear on what "all" represents.

of Staff was advocating for a year earlier. Not only was there disagreement between the Army chief of staff and Secretary of State, but there was disagreement at very senior levels within the Army regarding its priorities.

General Shinseki left his post as chief of staff before a replacement was available. According to Robert Haddick (2011) Secretary Rumsfeld lured General Peter Schoomaker out of retirement to be the new chief of staff. General Schoomaker was charged with implementing Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld's vision of converting the Army from large divisions to smaller and more deployable brigades. Haddick points out that Rumsfeld preferred that the Pentagon's funding remain focused on research and equipment modernization rather than personnel accounts, where more soldiers could be made available for combat operations (Haddick 2011). Some in the Defense Department may believe that pursuing high technology in deference to supporting basic capabilities is the priority in this particular era of transformation. Again, this may suggest that Max Boot's point regarding the need to maintain basic requirements, such as soldiers, may have been overlooked and may have been more appropriate.

Conversely, while there may have been mistakes made in trying to achieve transformation by focusing almost exclusively on technology over the last decade, Max Boot (2006) argues that focusing on technology in the future may not be a mistake if the U.S. finds itself in a clash with China or North Korea (466). Bradley A. Thayer (2005) argues that due to the growth of Chinese power in the 21st century there is no greater foreign policy issue for the American public. Thayer argues that there is a distinct possibility of a new Cold War with China, and so it is essential now for the United States to evaluate how it will respond to the growth of Chinese power (Thayer 2005). If the burden of addressing any foreign policy concerns relating to

China is left to the U.S. military, then the maximum benefit of the U.S. national security apparatus will not have been engaged.

Other agencies within the U.S. federal government have an important role to play in the area of national security. If China becomes a more realistic threat to U.S. national security, then the U.S. Army may have only just begun its efforts to transform its force by integrating technology into current and future weapon systems. The U.S. Army facing, in part, a scenario involving hostile sub-state actors for which it may not have fully anticipated, entered Iraq and Afghanistan in 2003 with a capability better suited for the likely heavy force-on-force scenario of the 20th Century. The weaponry, technology and tactics of the Cold War may not have been appropriate for the demands of Iraq and Afghanistan, but if the United States is ever threatened by China those Cold War capabilities, along with new technology, may be essential in such a scenario where there is a nation-state level engagement. Boot (2006) argues that there is no rule of thumb to suggest how much or how little a military should change in response to technological developments (467). However, as Boot stated earlier, it may be wise to "feel one's way" by engaging in radical experimentation and free-wheeling war-games" and then perhaps incrementally over time a radical transformation will have occurred (Boot 2006). Perhaps transformation is more than just the Army's problem, or for that matter the Department of Defense's problem to deal with; maybe it is a problem because the national security apparatus of the United States needs to be fixed.

There may be too much demand being placed on the Army, along with the other military services within the Defense Department, when it comes to addressing foreign policy issues. New demands that have been placed on the Army by civilian leadership, since the end of the Cold War, for which the Army may be ill-suited in preparing for may contribute to the problem of

defining transformation. Admiral Mike Mullen (2010), former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (2007-2011), argues that

> "…military power should not - and maybe cannot - be the last resort of the state. The tangible effects of military engagement may give policymakers a level of comfort not necessarily or wholly justified; as we have seen, the international environment is more fluid and more complex than ever before. We cannot count on military might alone, we have to invest in our homeland security, we have to improve and better coordinate our intelligence and we will have to use diplomacy. U.S. foreign policy is still too dominated by the military, too dependent on generals and admirals who lead our major overseas commands. It is one thing to be able and willing to serve as emergency responders; quite another to always have to be the fire chief" (Mullen 2010).

Perhaps diplomacy, international relations and national security planning should include more from the U.S. government than just what is available from the Defense Department.

Admiral Mullen continues by pointing out that he agrees with Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Secretary of Defense Robert Gates in that there needs to be more funding and more emphasis on soft power.[26] Mullen argues that "should we choose to exert American influence solely through our troops, we should expect to see that influence diminish in time; in fact, I would argue that in the future struggles of the asymmetric counterinsurgent variety, we ought to make it a precondition of committing our troops, that we will do so only if and when the other instruments of national power are ready to engage as well" (Mullen 2010). By increasing the presence of civilian agencies in national security activities (i.e., removing functions that the Defense Department currently performs then transferring it to a more appropriate department or agency) there is a risk that effective coordination and collaboration will take some time to achieve, especially in the heat of any given moment when engaged in pre-conflict, conflict or post-conflict operations.

[26] According to Joseph S. Nye, Jr. (2004) "soft power" rests on the ability to shape the preferences of others, or getting others to want the outcomes that you want, it co-ops people rather than coerces them. Soft power uses a different type of currency (i.e., without force or money) to engender cooperation-an attraction to shared values and the justness and duty of contributing to the achievement of those values.

Richard K. Betts (2000) argues that civilian strategists may take a nonpartisan approach to integrating service priorities for a combined strategy, but very few know enough about operations and logistics to be as informed about the underpinnings of strategy as military professionals. Betts continues by arguing that when civilians override service objections they risk promoting strategies that proved tactically insupportable. Betts argues that national strategy remains hobbled by organizational parochialism, inflexibility, and incremental change; leaders can disturb organization behavior but can rarely control it (Betts 2000). If others are to join the Defense Department in sharing the burden of national security planning an execution, then it may be wise to start training and planning together now.

Both Secretary of Defense Robert Gates and Admiral Mike Mullen have argued, according to Lubold (2010), that there needs to be a more balanced resourcing of foreign policy and that this argument has caused some policymakers and lawmakers to begin rethinking the status quo. But it could take years before Congress really gets the message. If generals and admirals are the defacto leaders of U.S. foreign policy, then their solutions for addressing foreign policy matters will most likely be centered on a military solution; that is what they know. Transformation may be continuous within the services, namely the Army, in that senior military leaders are continually learning that their role in U.S. foreign policy is both growing and changing. The communicating to Congress of the Army's perceived role will be the focus of the next section.

National Security Documents Need to be Specific

The U.S. Army is first and foremost a military force that has been used to fight wars and to protect U.S. national interests. Generals have advanced through the ranks, to fight and win

wars as a part of achieving overall U.S. foreign policy objectives. These senior Army or military leaders did not rise up through the ranks to be the foreign policy principals on behalf of the United States. If the military has been placed in the leading role in matters of foreign policy, then that designation may be ill-placed. Senior Army leaders are not professional diplomats or international economists; they are leaders of soldiers. If generals are required to focus in areas that are best left to the leadership of more appropriate civilian agencies and departments, then solutions to foreign policy concerns may not be desirable.

For instance, Joseph S. Nye, Jr. argues that "for the all the fashionable predictions of China, India and Brazil surpassing the United States in the next decades, the greater threat may come from modern barbarians and non-state actors" (Nye 2010). The military is but one component of U.S. foreign policy. Perhaps the military needs to focus on what it does best, providing a military force that supports the overall foreign policy objectives.

J. Brian Atwood, M. Peter McPherson and Andrew Natsios (2008) argue that the Defense Department's massive staff has assumed roles that should be performed by the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and the Pentagon's $600 billion budget has eclipsed those of civilian agencies. Hillary Rodham Clinton (2010) argues that diplomacy and developments (arguably foreign affairs areas of expertise that are better accomplished with civilian departments and agencies in the lead) can only be accomplished if the U.S. moves beyond agency "stove-piping" and uses all talent and expertise within the federal government (Clinton 2010). Clinton continues by arguing that the U.S. cannot succeed if agencies are not working together; the internal branches of the U.S. Government need to focus on integration, cohesion and problem solving (Clinton 2010). If transformation is

difficult to achieve within the Army, then it may be even more difficult to change the manner in which the U.S. engages in national security planning across the federal government.

James Carafano (2007) argues that the military's job is to fight and win the nation's wars. He continues by arguing that the U.S. has relearned a lesson in Iraq that we have re-learned a thousand times; winning the peace is a part of fighting and winning the war, but unless the U.S. builds institutions, doctrine, organizations, traditions and practices throughout the federal government, it will re-learn the lesson again the next time (Carafano 2007). By increasing the role of other agencies in areas of foreign policy, and taking the load off of the Defense Department, then perhaps senior Army leaders will be able to focus more on transformation or organizational change within their department. Problems in achieving Army transformation should not rest on the shoulders of one or two actors, such as a Secretary of the Army or an Army chief of staff. Transformation of a large bureaucracy involves many more actors throughout government. Recent national strategy documents suggest that there may still be a focus on the military to drive national security initiatives.

In the 2006 National Security Strategy, President George W. Bush indicated that the major institutions of American national security were designed in a different era to meet different challenges; now they must be transformed. While the president makes reference to transformative initiatives at the Department of Homeland Security and the Intelligence Community, there is clearly a focus that the Defense Department is pursuing a Future Force and that the department is transforming itself to better balance its capabilities across four categories. Those four categories are 1. Traditional: challenges posed by states employing conventional armies, navies, and air forces in well-established forms of military competition. 2. Irregular: Challenges from state and non-state actors employing methods such as terrorism and insurgency

to counter our traditional military advantages. 3. Catastrophic. Challenges involving the acquisition, possession, and use of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) by state and non-state actors; and deadly pandemics and other natural disasters that produce WMD-like effects. 4. Disruptive: Challenges from state and non-state actors who employ technologies and capabilities in new ways to counter military advantages the U.S. currently employs. President Bush stated that there needs to be improved capability to plan for and respond to post-conflict and failed-state situations. He mentions that there is an Office of Reconstruction and Stabilization that will integrate all relevant U.S. government resources and assets in conducting reconstruction and stabilization operations. Finally, President Bush expressed the need to improve the capacity of agencies to plan, prepare, coordinate, integrate, and execute responses covering a full range of crisis contingencies and long-term challenges. Specifically, the president mentioned that the U.S. needs to strengthen the capacity of departments and agencies to do comprehensive, results-oriented planning, and that agencies that have traditionally played only a domestic role increasingly have a role to play in our foreign and security policies.

He concludes that this requires us to better integrate interagency activity both at home and abroad (Bush 2006). The National Security Strategy of 2006 made no provisions for how these initiatives would be achieved, or at what point the Defense Department would cede certain functions that are better suited for another agency or department. A national security planning document could be instrumental by increasing the level of specificity that is needed to better integrate agencies and departments for purposes of national security planning and implementation.

A national security planning document may be useful for purposes of realigning the roles and responsibilities of agencies and departments in meeting national security and foreign policy

objectives. In the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), the Department of Defense recommended that a National Security Planning Guidance be made statutory in order to better direct the development of both military and non-military plans and institutional capabilities. The Defense Department argues that this planning document would set priorities and clarify national security roles and responsibilities that would reduce capability gaps and eliminate redundancies between departments and agencies. The planning document will help federal departments and agencies align their strategy, as well as develop budget and planning functions with national objectives (QDR 2006). Such a planning document would assist in better supporting the president's national security strategy and the nation's policy goals (QDR 2006). Self-admittedly, the Defense Department states that it is still profoundly influenced by the Cold War in the way it is organized and executes its missions (QDR 2006). Evolving threats of the 21st Century may not be suited for a Cold War approach.

In November 2008, the Project on National Security Reform, headed by James R. Locher III, issued its report to the President of the United States entitled *Forging a New Shield*. The project's focus was on improving the national security planning process. As recommended by the QDR in 2006, this project also recommended that a National Security Planning Guidance be issued annually by the president to all national security departments and agencies (Locher et al. 2008). Specifically, the Project on National Security Reform recommended the following:

> 1. We recommend *instituting a National Security Review to be performed at the beginning of each presidential term*, as directed by the new President's Security Council. The review should prioritize objectives, establish risk management criteria, specify roles and responsibilities for priority missions, assess required capabilities, and identify capability gaps.
>
> 2. We recommend *the preparation of the National Security Planning Guidance,* to be issued annually by the president to all national security departments and agencies, in order to provide guidance to departments and agencies based on the results of the

> National Security Review. The president should further direct that departmental and agency planning conforms to this guidance.
>
> 3. We recommend *that an executive secretary* of the President's Security Council be empowered by statute, as detailed in the report, to support overall system management. The executive secretary would report to the director for national security.
>
> 4. We recommend the creation of an official, reporting to the director for national security, to *analyz*e *interagency operations*, including real-time assessments of overall system performance and system component performance.

The recommendation for the president to issue an annual National Security Planning Guidance was not implemented during President George W. Bush's administration and has not been considered thus far in President Barrack Obama's administration. Based on the statements made by both Secretary of Defense Robert Gates and Admiral Mike Mullen, provided earlier, who both argue for a balanced resourcing of foreign policy planning, there appears to be little indication that such a planning guidance will be available any time soon.

The Future and National Security

The Cold War has been technically over for more than two decades. Since then, the United States has been involved in a variety of conflicts, peacekeeping operations, and post-conflict activities since the end of the Cold War in November 1989. The U.S. is still very much engaged in conflict in both Afghanistan and Iraq. According to Aaron L. Friedberg (2005), the future character of the U.S. China relationship is also profoundly uncertain. Friedberg argues that most experts have opinions about this question, but few would claim to be sure about what lies ahead. He points out that the answers to this question are not only unknown, but they are unknowable. Friedberg argues that twenty years ago few people foresaw that the confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union was about to undergo a radical transformation, and few still imagined that the latter would soon cease to exist. Friedberg argues that today's

observers are no better equipped than their counterparts were over 20 years ago (Friedberg 2005). If the Defense Department has the lead in driving national security planning, then what evidence is there that suggests that Army generals, or other Defense Department flag officers (generals and admirals) as far as that goes, are the go-to experts for determining what seemingly no one else knows anything about?

The United States may have an opportunity to prepare for the future now by understanding that the Defense Department cannot bear the burden of national security planning and implementation. Graham T. Allison (1969) argues that at any given time a government consists of existing organizations, each with a fixed set of standard operating procedures and programs. The behavior of these organizations and consequently of the government, Allison argues, relevant to any particular instance is, therefore, determined primarily by routines established in these organizations prior to that instance. Allison (1969) argues that organizations do change; that learning occurs gradually over time; and that dramatic organizational change occurs in response to major crises. Allison concludes that both learning and change are influenced by existing organizational capabilities (Allison 1969). Since budgets change incrementally, according to Allison, then the U.S. may want to consider changes sooner rather than later as it moves funding from defense to another department where a function is perhaps more appropriate. Now may be the time for the United States to clearly change the way in which national security planning takes place and is implemented. Although the Defense Department may have the largest budget as compared to other departments and agencies involved in national security, it clearly is not capable of performing duties that are more appropriate for other organizations.

Army Transformation Continues, But What Is It?

This evidence provided in this dissertation suggests that Army transformation means one thing to senior Army leadership and something else to field grade officers. Each of the three Army chiefs of staff discussed in this research have provided a vision for what transformation means to them, but that vision of what transformation will ultimately look like is not clear to field grade officers. Indeed, there is a lack of consensus among field grade officers as to what transformation means, which may indicate that the meaning was not well expressed in the first place by senior Army leaders. How the term "transformation" is interpreted may have a great deal to do with one's perspective based on social status within the Army. Senior leaders may understand what the term means to them, but lower ranking officers, because of their view of the world, may have a different take on what the term means to them. But like the integration of new technology or attempts to change force structure for purposes of transforming the Army, leadership within the Army changes as well. Transformation appears to take on somewhat new meaning from one chief of staff to the next. If that is true, then there may be an opportunity for new definitions from senior Army leadership over the very short term.

General Martin E. Dempsey succeeded General George Casey, Jr. as Army Chief of Staff on April 11, 2011. In his initial address General Dempsey stated that "today our Army is in transition. This is certainly not a new phenomenon for us. We are always in transition…we'll change. Change is inevitable, but we change, we'll change to contribute to the versatility and relevance of the nation's military instrument of power. We'll maintain a reputation as good stewards of America's resources. We'll remain connected to America. And we'll succeed in all that because we'll connect, engage, empower and hold our leaders accountable" (Dempsey 2011). In his speech General Dempsey does not use the word "transformation" but instead uses

the words “change” and “transition”. It is not clear that General Dempsey is acknowledging any transformation that the Army may have achieved over the last decade when he states that “we’ll change to contribute to the versatility and relevance of the nation’s instrument of power”. On Monday, May 30, 2011, President Obama nominated General Dempsey to replace Admiral Mike Mullen, as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who retired on October 1, 2011(Sandza 2011). General Dempsey’s nomination was confirmed by the U.S. Senate and is now serving as the 18th Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (Department of Defense 2011). Additionally, the President nominated General Ray Odierno to replace General Dempsey as the Army Chief of Staff (Sandza 2011). General Odierno was also confirmed and he became the 38th Chief of Staff of the Army on September 7, 2011 (U.S. Army 2011). By October 1, 2011 the Army had three chiefs of staff (General Casey, General Dempsey and General Odierno) in a period of just six months. Change appears to be continuous in the Army, and that is certainly the case when it comes to the office of the Chief of Staff of the Army.

Summary

The U.S. Army is at war. The U.S. Army is being asked by the national command authority to do more than just fight and win battles; it is being asked to be more involved before and after conflicts in ways that it never planned for during the Cold War. The Army has also come to the realization that counterinsurgency operations and information warfare are facts of life in the 21st Century and that it needs to adapt to that reality. It is possible that field grade officers knew of that reality before senior Army leadership was ready to admit. The reality of the future is that the U.S. does not know the future all that well. Perhaps the best course would be to not call anything transformation, but to change incrementally based on experiences, testing, training, and the involvement of other government agencies and departments being funded to

perform the duties and functions that they can perform best. Perhaps the best definition of transformation could include every government organization performing their national security responsibility without any one department or agency dominating because of the size of their budget, but instead are performing duties for which they are better suited.

In the meantime organizations within the Department of Defense, and senior Army leadership in particular, will define transformation in terms that they can best understand. The U.S. Army can and does win wars, but can it be expected to win the peace as well? The Army may be better suited to stay in its lane for purposes of national security planning. Other functions may be best left up to another agency. If the nontraditional tasks that the Army is being asked to perform are placed in their rightful agency or department, then senior Army leadership may be able to concentrate on what the Army needs to do in support of the overall national strategy, and thereby be in a better position to describe in clearer terms what transformation means.

References

Allison, Graham T. 1969. "Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis." *The American Political Science Review.* 63:3. September. 689-718.

Atwood, F. Brian, M. Peter McPherson and Andrew Natsios. 2008. "Arrested Development: Making Foreign Aid a More Effective Tool." *Foreign Affairs*. November-December. 123-132.

Bacevich, Andrew J. 2010. *Washington Rules: America's Path to Permanent War*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Betts, Richard K. 2000. "Is Strategy and Illusion?" *International Security* 25:2. Autumn. 5-50.

Boot, Max. 2006. *War Made New: Technology. Warfare, and the Course of History 1500 to Today.* New York: Gotham Books.

Bush, George W. 2006. The National Security Strategy of the United States of America. March.

Carafano, James J. 2007. "*Thinking Differently About Winning the Peace*." Heritage Lectures No. 987. Washington, D.C.: The Heritage Foundation

Clinton, Hillary Rodham. 2010. "Leading through Civilian Power." *Foreign Affairs*. 89:6. November-December. 13-24.

Dempsey, Martin E. 2011. April 11, 2011, *Assumption of Responsibility Ceremony Remarks*. June 7. http://www.army.mil/article/54808 (Last accessed July 16, 2011)

Department of Defense. 2011. http://www.defense.gov/home/top-leaders/ (Last accessed October 17, 2011)

Friedberg, Aaron L. 2005. "The Future of U.S.-China Relations: Is Conflict Inevitable?" *International Security*. 30: 2. Fall. 7-45.

Haddick, Robert. 2011. "This Week at War: Rumsfeld's Revenge." *Foreign Policy*. July 8. http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/07/08/this_week_at_war_rumsfelds_revenge?page=full (Last accessed on July 13, 2011)

Locher III, James R. et al. 2008. *Forging a New Shield*. Arlington: Project on National Security Reform. November 26.

Lubold, Gordon. 2010. “Admiral Mullen: foreign policy is too dominated by the military.” *The Christian Science Monitor*. March 3. http://www.scmonitor.com/USA/Military/2010/0303 (Accessed 7/12/2011)

Margolick, David. 2007. “The Night of the Generals.” *Vanity Fair*. April.

Mullen, Mike Admiral. 2010. *Landon Lecture Series Remarks as delivered by Admiral Mike Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff*. March 3.
Joint Chiefs of Staff Official Web Site
mhtml:file://E:\Admiral Mullen’s comments at Landon Conferece.mht
(Last accessed on July 18, 2011)

Nye, Jr., Joseph S. 2010. “The Future of American Power.” *Foreign Affairs*. 89(6): 2-12.

Nye, Joseph P. Jr. 2004. *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York. Public Affairs.

Sandza, Richard, 2011. *Dempsey named new Joint Chiefs chairman.* Army Times. May 30. http://www.armytimes.com/news/2011/05/military

QDR. 2006. The *Quadrennial Defense Review Report*. Office of the U.S. Secretary of Defense. February 6.

Thayer, Bradley A. 2005. ”Confronting China: An Evaluation of Options for the United States.” *Comparative Strategy* 24: 71-98

U.S. Army. 2011.
http://www.army.mil/leaders/
(Last accessed on October 17, 2011)

Wagner, Robert. Lieutenant General. U.S. Congress. House. 2004. Committee on Armed Service. *Statement by Deputy Commander, United States Joint Forces Command.* 108th Cong. 2nd sess. February 26.
http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/congress/2004_hr/040226-wagner.htm.