

Imposing the Human Dimension Factors in Evaluating the Command Climate in Military Environment

S. Ananthan*, S. Inderjit, FW Kwong

Nasional Defence University of Malaysia.
Kem Sungai Besi, Kuala Lumpur
*ananthan@upnm.edu.my

Abstract: *Military units are principally concerned with training and preparing for operations when they are not deployed on missions. During these periods when they are predominantly stationed in barracks, they are also occupied with a host of administrative and domestic tasks assigned by their higher formation. Despite the varied nature of day-to-day activities, commanders have the challenge of ensuring a suitable organisational climate (referred to as command climate) as this would inevitably contribute towards operational effectiveness. Unlike organisational climate, command climate is impacted by variables peculiar to military units. Existing literature indicates various psychological dimensions of operational effectiveness that includes morale, group cohesion, confidence in leadership and job satisfaction. These variables have to be determined through a systematic process i.e. scouring existing literature and conducting in-depth interviews with experienced military commanders. Underlying theories impacting the various constructs will be identified to provide the necessary grounding. Subsequently, these intangible factors will be empirically measured. This research has its main objective of developing and validating a reliable and easy to use measurement tool, which would eventually enable military unit commanders to evaluate command climate as and when required. Higher formations will also be able to determine the ability of units to perform in the event they are deployed to undertake missions under stressful conditions.*

Keywords: *organisational climate, command climate, morale, cohesion, job satisfaction.*

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the major tasks during peacetime for defence organisations is to prepare for military operations. These operations may be in the form of routine assistance to civilian authority within the country or the more demanding task of defending the nation's territorial integrity during times of crisis and war. More frequently than ever, military forces are also required to operate abroad with coalition partners in peacekeeping and humanitarian relief operations. Military commanders thus have the task of ensuring that the organisations they command can perform effectively when called to undertake a wide range of missions.

To enhance organisational effectiveness, modern military forces are embracing greater levels of technology to improve their fighting and operational capability. However, commanders cannot depend on technology alone to produce a capable fighting force. Recent research in militaries across the globe concur with evidence continually gleaned from business and industry that success is highly dependent on the quality of human workforce and their motivation (Murphy and Fogarty, 2010). Thus, a military organisation's effectiveness in accomplishing military operations is very much dependent on how its personnel (men and women) are trained, gelled together and motivated. This in turn is reliant on a positive organisational culture and climate. More than ever before, organizational (command) climate has become an increasingly significant prerequisite for unit effectiveness and combat readiness (Jones, 2003). Despite these competing demands and the sacrifices they are often times required to make, soldiers remain committed to serving the Army and our nation. What factors propagate this attitude or behavior and this exemplification of devotion, dedication, and selfless service? In particular, what drives soldiers' sense of duty, loyalty, and commitment, influencing their attitude and behavior and ultimately, duty performance? Within the South African context de Vries (1993) indicates that faith, good morale and leadership, motivation, organizational and command cohesion, group norms and culture are important for success in battle. Research shows that capability, especially in military

organisations does not only relate to infrastructure capability but also includes intangible elements such as morale and motivation of soldiers in performing a military mission (Bester and Stanz, 2007; Gal, 1986; Schuman et al, 1996; Sergio, 2004, Norazman, 2000).

This paper has its main objective to discuss the concept of command climate in military organisations. It will be limited to army units and not discuss the challenges for climates in other defence and security agencies, but will use other developed military combat climate models from other militaries as references in this research. This paper endeavours to determine two aspects; 1) The dimensions of military command climate, and 2) The development of a measurement instrument. This research will initially be carried out within the Malaysian Army infantry units only. Command climates within these units are unique. The major thrust of the research will be to design a measurement tool to evaluate command climate during peacetime and barrack duties. The instrument developed through this research will only be able to measure command climate in full-deployment or combat missions with further modification.

2. HUMAN DIMENSION AND EXISTING COMMAND CLIMATE SURVEYS

The human dimension encompasses the moral, physical, and cognitive components of Soldier, leader, and organizational development and performance essential to raise, prepare, and employ the Army in full spectrum operations. Army concepts acknowledge the Soldier as the center piece of the Army, but none, individually or collectively, adequately addresses the human dimension of future operations. This concept provides an integrating and forcing function that draws on other joint and Army concepts to describe those aspects of a highly nuanced human dimension interacting at all levels. Gal (1986) conducted a factor analysis on the Combat Readiness Morale Questionnaire (CRMQ) results of over 1200 troops about to engage in a 'contingent operation' in Lebanon in 1981. He found two items in particular were highly associated with personal and perceived company morale, 1) perceived unit togetherness and 2) relationships with commanders. In addition, a factor analysis of the 30 items in the questionnaire revealed eight factors that accounted for 52% of the variance for his sample, including 1) confidence in senior commanders, 2) confidence in one's self, team and weapons, 3) unit cohesion and morale, 4) familiarity with the mission and frontage, 5) confidence in immediate commanders, 6) enemy evaluation, 7) the legitimacy of the war, and 8) worries and concerns. As a result of this work Gal (2006) first coined the term 'unit climate' to describe a higher-order factor that appeared to be a better predictor of combat readiness than morale alone.

Command climate surveys have become a routine and important activity for many modern defence forces. Though they may take different forms, their fundamental objective is the same i.e. to measure the possible readiness and eventual effectiveness of combat units, in particular, to undertake military operations. The US Army requires commanders to carry out a Command Climate Survey to evaluate their unit's work environment upon assuming command. This survey is to be repeated from time to time as required by policy (US Army Headquarters, 2008). It is a 24-item instrument which measures responses in various scales. There is also a separate section that requests for qualitative data. The UK Ministry of Defence uses the Armed Forces Continuous Attitude Survey (AFCAS) designed to collect information on attitudes and opinions of serving military personnel. However each service of the armed forces is given a slightly separate format which is able to tap individual responses based on varied roles and experience. It is essential done online with 100 items measured in various scales.

The importance of organisational issues is reflected in the US Army Command Climate Survey (CCS) (ARI, 2006). The CCS comprises 24 straight-forward, actuarial items that focus on practical concerns that fall within the CO's power to change (e.g., morale, leadership and equity issues). The CCS is designed to be administered, analysed and interpreted by the CO without recourse to any outside agency. It is also a mandatory requirement for newly appointed COs both at the beginning of their command and 12 months after taking up their post. There is no normative data for the CCS, but given that the results of the first administration of the survey largely provide a baseline for an incoming CO, the true measure of the COs leadership and impact on the unit is gauged at the 12 month point. The CCS is an example of an attitude survey and the main advantages of this type of instrument are that they are short, easy to administer, and COs can quickly gain a measure of the views of their troops without requiring any particular interpretation.

Imposing the Human Dimension Factors in Evaluating the Command Climate in Military Environment

More detailed information is available of a unit climate survey used by the Australia Defence Forces since 2004. Known as the Profile of Unit Leadership, Satisfaction and Effectiveness (PULSE) survey, it provides a snapshot on the status of morale of unit and sub-units. It is intended to inform commanders on the motivational levels of their personnel and factors that influence this outcome (Goyne, 2010). The PULSE delineates response at the tri-level of individual, group and unit. The core constructs measured are job stress, work motivation, job satisfaction, satisfaction with communication, confidence in leadership, teamwork/cohesion, organisational support and organisational commitment. Thus far the PULSE survey is well received by commanding officers in the Australian Defence Force and unit members are happy to respond to subsequent surveys when they realize their feedback through this survey is acted upon. This instrument retained the underlying tri-level structure of individual, group and unit, but introduced a new dimensional structure comprising six core constructs:

- Job Stress: Derived from the Occupational Environment Scale – Form2 (Osipow, & Spokane, 1983);
- Job satisfaction: Derived from the Job Satisfaction Survey (Specter, 1985);
- Work Motivation: The Work Motivation Scale (Pelletier, Fortier, Vallerand & Briere, 2003);
- Communication: Derived from the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (Downs & Hazen, 1998);
- Confidence in Leadership: From the Unit Climate Profile, Human Dimensions of Operations Questionnaire; and
- Teamwork/Cohesion: Derived from the Group Environment Questionnaire (Widmeyer, Brawley & Carron, 1985)

According to Johnston (2004b) the purpose of this new model was to observe the linkages between each core construct, to provide an overall view of the climactic interrelationships operating within the unit (see Table 1).

Table1. An Overall View of The PULSE Model Climactic Interrelationships Operating Within The Unit on Indicators, Predictors And Level Of Effect (Source: Johnston 2004b)

| The PULSE Model Predictors | Indicators | Outcomes | Level Of Effect |
|--|---|---|-------------------|
| Policies & practices Unit climate Op Tempo Perceived organisation support | Esprit de corps Organisational commitment Organisational satisfaction | Unit performance Intent to leave unit/Australian Defence Force (ADF) | UNIT |
| Leadership styles Communication | Group cohesion Job satisfaction Confidence in leadership | Group performance Intent to leave working group | GROUP |
| Role stressors Competencies | Health Motivation Job satisfaction | Individual performance | INDIVIDUAL |

It can be concluded from the overall analysis of existing surveys that each military force employs instruments that are best suited to their respective needs. Further to that, not much information can be gleaned from the essential constructs that need to be measured and corresponding data analysis method. Due to this, it would be best to refer to other forms of literature to design an initial framework for the purpose of developing a purpose-designed scales.

3. KEY CONCEPTS OF COMMAND CLIMATE

In this section, definitions of the various concepts and constructs will be framed and subsequently preliminary thoughts on their interrelationships will be outlined. Concepts related to organisational climate should provide a useful reference for the measure of command climate, as they are both the same constructs but operationalised in different environments.

3.1. Climate

Climate is a complex construct. Many studies tend to describe organisational climate and culture as one concept or culture being a sub-set of climate (Rosseau, 2011). However, Schneider (1985) suggests that climate denotes activities and processes whilst culture relates to the shared norms and values. Similarly, Watkin and Hubbard (2003) propose that organisational climate is “a measure of employees’ perception of those aspects of their environment that directly impact how well they can do their jobs”. Another, more elaborate, definition of organisational climate is offered by Bowen and Ostroff (2004). They define organizational climate as shared perceptions among employees of what the organization is like in terms of practices, policies, procedures, routines, and rewards. In the military the commander of a unit, by virtue of authority given to him, is solely responsible for the climate of his organisation (Doty and Gelineau, 2008). A positive command climate is essential to building a disciplined, efficient, well-run unit capable of accomplishing assigned tasks. This must be done in concert with establishing a disciplined process by which effective communication throughout the chain of command can occur (Edson, 2011). In the context of this research, army infantry units are known to possess the same basic organisational culture. Despite this fundamental similarity, the productivity and eventual effectiveness of each unit can differ vastly. Academic literature attributes this to individual and collective motivation influenced fundamentally by command (organisational) climate created largely by the commanders and senior members of the unit.

4. MORALE AND MOTIVATION

Bartone and Kirkland (1991) report that trends toward increased violence and isolation on the battlefield have led military planners around the world to place increased emphasis on the psychological and human dimensions of force readiness. Significant research on morale has been conducted by the Israeli Defence Force. The first study was done by Guttman (cited in Gal, 1986) in 1949. He assessed soldiers’ satisfaction with “arrangements” in their bases and their “mood”. According to Gal (1986) Guttman’s term “mood” is most probably a substitute term for morale. Gal (1986) analysed data from a morale survey administered during 1981 in the Golan Heights. Morale and motivation are two peculiar concepts. Both morale and motivation can be a measure of command climate as well as an outcome of positive climate. **Morale** is an intangible, dynamic characteristic that strengthens confidence in oneself, one’s equipment, the unit, and the unit’s leadership. Morale generally consists of common purpose, identity with, and a personal commitment to a unit; and confidence, enthusiasm, and persistence within a military framework. High morale is a characteristic of effective units.

Britt and Dickinson (2005) state that morale in the military is indicative of a service member’s level of motivation and enthusiasm for accomplishing a mission. Similarly, shared perceptions of undesirable organisational state of affairs, can contribute to low morale and hence low motivation to work. However, when the overall climate creates a conducive and vibrant working environment, morale and motivation can be high. **Manning (1991)**, argues that morale has sharply different meanings depending on the context. The US Army manual on Leadership (2006) provides a clearer illustration of military morale:

“Morale is the human dimension’s most important intangible element. It is a measure of how people feel about themselves, their team, and their leaders. High morale comes from good leadership, shared effort, and mutual respect”.

These definitions suggest that morale is not only an individual feeling but reflective of the entire team or group feel about themselves that eventually creates the motivation and enthusiasm to perform their tasks. When group members feel respected and perceive their commanders to be doing a good job, morale and motivation can be expected to be high.

5. GROUP COHESION

Esprit de corps and cohesion, while less tangible than weapons systems, can prove the old axiom of the whole being greater than the sum of its parts. In a military context, cohesion is the bonding of Soldiers within their organizations, their morale, will to fight and commitment to each other, the unit, and mission accomplishment. Like morale, esprit de corps is a dynamic relationship whose strength is dependent on many factors.

Imposing the Human Dimension Factors in Evaluating the Command Climate in Military Environment

In evaluating unit climate, the Australian PULSE model taps the perception of both task and group or social cohesion (Goyne, 2009). Task cohesion is defined as “*the shared commitment among members to achieving a goal that requires the collective efforts of the group. A group with high task cohesion is composed of members who share a common goal and who are motivated to coordinate their efforts as a team to achieve that goal.* On the other hand social cohesion is “*the extent to which group members like each other, prefer to spend their social time together, enjoy each other’s company, and feel emotionally close to one another*” (MacCoun and Hix, Undated). It would be best if a group can have both task and social cohesion. An indicator of this is when group members spend a lot of time working, playing, training and participating in leisure activities together.

6. CONFIDENCE IN LEADERSHIP

Climate is a perception of organisational members of the working environment. In the military, the Commanding Officer as the CEO of a unit has the authority and responsibility for establishing the leadership climate and developing disciplined and cohesive units (US Army Headquarters, 2008). Literature is a bound with studies that link leadership and participative management with employee satisfaction. Many studies report of employees pointing tonon-supportive group and leader relations as causes of stressful organisational climates. (Schneider, 1985 and Rosseau, 2011). A study undertaken at the US Naval Academy in 2006 suggests that leadership characteristics that are centered on equality and fairness have significant influence on a unit’s morale and hence job performance.

7. JOB SATISFACTION

Any research that studies employee perception of their work place can be considered as a climate study. Most widely studied are the relationship of climate to employee well-being such as job satisfaction and job stress (Rosseau, 2011). Job satisfaction is the combination of feelings and beliefs that workers hold in relation to their current jobs. Someone with a high level of satisfaction will generally like their job. They feel that they are being fairly treated and believe that the job has many desirable facets. The satisfaction at work has been characterized as a positive or pleasing emotional state that emerges as the result of evaluating one’s work or experiences in the workplace. (Locke, 1976). Job satisfaction is the degree to which people like their jobs. Some people enjoy work and find it to be a central part of life. Others hate to work and do so only because they must. The study of the causes and consequences of these important issues is one of the major domains of organizational psychology. Job satisfaction is directly related to job performance, attitude, motivation and morale. “Job dissatisfaction was predicted by lack of career opportunities, poor organizational climate and morale and lack of autonomy at work, together with some domestic stressors e.g. family health” (Cooper and Sloan, 1985).

8. RESEARCH METHOD

To undertake this research, prior permission will have to be requested from Army Headquarters (Human Resource Branch). Their agreement and support is essential to the cooperation from commanding officers of targeted military units and respondents. As this is an exploratory study, the instrument will have to be designed taking into consideration the peculiarities of the Malaysian Army. Patton’s (2002) suggestion that a triangulation method be used to check and establish validity of findings from multiple perspectives will be adhered. This is in an endeavour to overcome the weaknesses and biases from using a single method, single-observer and single-theory studies.

Towards this end, four distinct steps shall be followed in designing and constructing the survey questionnaire to meet scientific rigour and standards. First, based on the conceptualisation of command climate gleaned from relevant literature, each sub-domain will be operationalised. Care will be taken to ensure each construct can be measured. Where possible existing questionnaires from past related studies will be sourced. Secondly, requirement, a focus group discussion shall be arranged at the Army Headquarters to obtain inputs on the concepts of command climate and its operationalization. The theoretical model will be presented to experts ensure face validity. This will inevitably involve senior officers who have experienced peacetime and operational command. Thirdly, interviews and discussions will be carried out with senior rank and file

personnel currently serving in infantry units. They are the people who experience command climate first hand. Their views on positive and negative contributors of command climate will be solicited. Collectively this information from literature, focused group discussions and interviews will be triangulated in designing the required survey instrument. Finally, to ensure high content validity, an army psychiatrist and expert on test construction will be sought to help verify each item of the instrument. Factors such as respondents military experience (numbers of years of service), language proficiency and understanding of the various terminologies are important criteria in the overall design of the test.

9. RESEARCH ETHICS

To obtain genuine feedback and participation, respondents must be given the assurance that they can provide direct but anonymous feedback to their commander. Thus, it is important to ensure the highest standards of confidentiality in this research especially as it requires respondents to share information about the impact of their superior's performance within the organisation. Responses shall be treated with the strictest of confidence with assurance that no one besides the researchers will see the completed survey. Completed surveys must be safely stored and destroyed appropriately within an agreed time.

10. CONCLUSION

Many developed defence forces are already using some form of survey to quantify command climate. Indeed the report generated by this survey will be helpful to unit commanders to determine the different actions to be taken to improve the climate within their units. It will also help higher commanders to ascertain the potential readiness of a given unit under their command. This is an exploratory study and a first of its kind in the Malaysian Army. It is hoped that this can be a pivotal study for further research on command climate in the Malaysian military environment. The empirical evidence collected from the study shall be able to provide a foundation for the development of a robust instrument for evaluating the command climate of infantry units in Malaysian Army.

REFERENCES

- Bowen, D.E. & Ostroff, C. (2004). Understanding HRM-from performance linkages: The role of the strength of the HRM system. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(2), 203-221.
- Cooper, C.L. & Sloan, S. (1985). Occupational and psychosocial stress among commercial aviation pilots. *Journal of Occupational Medicine*, 27, 570-6.
- Doty, J., & Gelineau, J. (2008). Command climate. *Army Magazine*, 58(7).
- Edson, D.W. (2011). Command climate. *Marine Corps Gazette*, 95(7).
- Goyne, A. (2009). PULSE project overview: Pulling the strings of unit climate together. Paper presented at the 10th Industrial and Psychology Conference. Retrieved from http://www.iopconference.com.au/2009/presentations/2_Friday/1200/Goyne-A.pdf
- Goyne, A. (2010). *Maximizing performance: Measuring unit climate in the Australian defence force*. <https://www.psychology.org.au/publications/inpsych/2010/april/goyne/>
- Goyne, A. (Undated). *Measuring unit effectiveness: What do commanders want to know and why?*
- Jones, S.M. (2003). *Improving accountability for effective command climate: A strategic imperative*. The United States Army War College Press. Retrieved from <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubID=248>
- Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In Dunnette, M.D. (Ed), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. 1297-1349. Chicago; Rand McNally.
- MacCoun, R.J., & Hix, W. M. (Undated), *Unit cohesion and military performance*. Retrieved From http://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/csIs/Unit_Cohesion_and_Military_Performance_Ch_5_MacCoun_Hix.pdf
- Miller, C.A. (2006). *The influence of midshipmen leadership on morale at the United States Naval Academy* (Unpublished master's thesis). Naval Postgraduate School, California, United States.
- Murphy, P., & Fogarty, G. (2010). Good to Go. The human dimensions of mission readiness. Retrieved from http://eprints.usq.edu.au/6123/1/Murphy_Fogarty_BookCh_A_PV.pdf.

Imposing the Human Dimension Factors in Evaluating the Command Climate in Military Environment

- Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rosseau, D.M. (2011). *Organisational climate and culture*. Retrieved from <http://www.ilo.org/oshenc/part-v/psychosocial-and-organizational-factors/macro-organizational-factors/item/29-organizational-climate-and-culture>.
- Schneider, B. (1985). Organizational behaviour. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 36, 573-611.
- Watkin, C. Hubbard, B. (2003). Leadership motivation and the drivers of share price: The business case for measuring organizational climate. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 24(7), 380-386.
- US Army Headquarters. (2006). *Army leadership: Field Manual 6–22*, 7-8.
- US Army Headquarters. (2008). *Army command policy: Army regulation 600–20*, 53.
- Osipow, S.H., & Spokane, A.R. (1984). Measuring occupational stress, strain, and coping. In Oskamp, S. (Ed). *Applied Social Psychology Annual*, 5. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, pp. 67-87.
- Pelletier, L.G., Fortier, S.F., Valler and, R.J., & Brière, N.M. (in press). Associations between perceived autonomy support, forms of self-regulation and persistence: A prospective study. *Motivation and Emotions*.
- Specter, P.E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13, 693-713.
- Johnston, B.F. (2004). Effectiveness of the organization: An integrated concept. Unpublished presentation DHRRE.
- De Vries, R. (1993). The military tactical appreciation – sharpening the psychological combat edge. *Armed Forces*, March.
- Kirkland, F.R., Bartone, R.T. & Marlowe, D.H. (1993). Commander's priorities and psychological readiness. *Armed Forces & Society*, 19(4): 579-598.
- Downs, C. W., & Hazen, M. D. (1977). A factor analytic study of communication satisfaction. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 14 (3), 63-73.
- Gal, R. (1986). Unit morale: From a theoretical puzzle to an empirical illustration - An Israeli example. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 16(6): 549-564.
- Widmeyer, W.N., Brawley, W.N. and Carron, A.V. (1990). The effects of group size in sport. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 12, 177-190.
- Command Climate Survey (Version 1.4) Commander's Guide (ARI, 2006)