



Research

Military leadership – fundamental considerations from research¹



MICHAEL HOLENWEGER,
Military Academy at ETH Zurich

Abstract

Military leadership is influenced by unique circumstances and causes. On the one hand, military leadership is shaped by the professional image of the military. However, the environment also plays a major role. Taking into account these factors, the common features of existing military operational concepts

will be examined. The reference to leadership in extreme situations and in combat is described in more detail using a five-part taxonomy and its implications for leaders are specified. In the following, the scientifically representative effects of the military context on the individual and on the collective are discussed.

Keywords Leadership; Military; Extreme Situations; Combat; Ethics



MICHAEL HOLENWEGER, PhD, Research Project Manager, Leadership and Communication Studies, Military Academy at ETH Zurich. Main research interests: Leadership in extreme situations, strategic communication, security policy, human resource management. Militia officer.
E-Mail: michael.holenweger@vtg.admin.ch

Introduction

The term military leadership is imprecisely formulated in today's literature and there are numerous definitions. The term is also often used by authors when referring to the implementation of military tactics or strategies by commanders, which requires the synchronization of complex systems on the battlefield to generate combat power. However, these tasks of military leadership are more akin to strategic management than leadership.

Leadership in the military context, on the other hand, is primarily about the human component, about managing social interactions between soldiers who fight wars to emerge victorious. Thus, it is not about the management of tactics or strategy or about great leadership or the use of weapons (Jans, 2002; Stouffer et al., 1965).

So when can leadership be described as military leadership? In the military context, is there a particular leadership style or model that is particularly effective and should be taught in military leadership training? If so, what factors determine effective leadership?

Hannah et al. (2009) have accordingly argued in their remarks that military and other extreme contexts are too complex and multi-layered for a limited number of leadership behaviours to lead to success in each case. In the Swiss Armed Forces, military doctrine likewise does not prescribe specific leadership styles² for leaders to apply. Moreover, the definitions and characteristics of military leadership, such as those used in Regulation 50.040 on Command and Staff Organization 17 (FSO 17), are quite general and reflect the generic definition of leadership that is also usually found in the general leadership literature. It states: "The purpose of leadership is to lead individuals to devote their full strength to the common accomplishment of the mission, if necessary, at the risk of their lives" and further "Military leadership processes are geared to the management of crises, conflicts and disasters. Military leadership requires the application of uniformly trained and applied processes as well as uniformly understood and employed concepts" (Schweizer Armee, 2021, 6).

"Leadership in a military context, on the other hand, is primarily about the human element, about directing social interactions between soldiers who fight wars in order to emerge victorious."

Therefore, the fundamental question arises as to what constitutes good and effective military leadership.

Leadership in armed forces is characterized by the military context, which is sub-

ject to unique conditions, constraints and causes that influence leaders and their leadership processes. Osborn et al. state that leadership is embedded in a context that is "socially constructed" and that therefore leadership and its effectiveness is largely dependent on the context. If one changes the context, the leadership changes accordingly (Osborn, 2002, 797f).

Below, in accordance with this approach, I will explain in more detail two levels of the military context that affect the leadership process. The first level is the institutional context³, where the unique culture, social system, social processes, and other factors operating within the military impact leadership. The second level of context that affects military leadership is the environment in which the armed forces operate, which is characterized by the complexity, moral intensity and the lethality of the armed forces (Hannah et al. 2010).

In the social sciences, there have been major theoretical efforts to analyze the phenomenon of leadership over the past two decades (Avolio et al. 2007a; Barbuto et al. 2006; Bass, 2008; Brown et al. 2005; Bryman et al. 2001; Northouse, 2007; Yukl, 2010). The findings thus obtained have subsequently spread to the military sciences. However, it was found that too little attention was paid to the impact of organisational context on leadership (Avolio, 2007b; Porter et al., 2006; Tosi, 1991).

The military profession

After describing the two levels of context, in the following section I analyze the institutional context and how it influences military leadership processes. Organizations develop professions that are characterized by unique expert knowledge and the work that results. Professional expertise requires years of study and learning from experience before one is able to function effectively. For example: a doctor removing a tumor from a patient, or a lawyer representing a client in criminal court, or a mili-

tary leader guiding soldiers while deploying and synchronizing complex weapons systems. Society relies on all three professions for its health, justice and safety. Thus, these experts also have a deep moral obligation to use their unique skills, which they have acquired through their education and practice, only in the best interests of that society (Chadwick, 1998).

The professional ethos of the military is based on a foundation of trust with the society to which it is committed. This trust, which society grants to the military, allows the military professions a great deal of autonomy with which they can create their own expert knowledge and within which the application of this knowledge is regulated by the individual experts (Abbott, 2002; Snider et al. 2002).

In the private sector, companies attempt to motivate their employees mainly through extrinsic factors such as a high salary, good benefits, the prospect of promotions, the offer of further education, whereas to date military professions have relied on inspirational, largely intrinsic factors, such as the lifelong pursuit of expertise, the privilege and honour of service, the satisfaction of protecting life and thus enabling the development of society. Hence, the social status of career military personnel and the associated motivation to engage in the profession was shaped by intrinsic aspects of service rather than extrinsic benefits (Huntington, 1957).

The spectrum of military missions today is very diverse. It ranges from disaster relief to support for civilian authorities – as with the Corona assistance service provided during the pandemic – to rebuilding civilian infrastructure. However, these missions are not why the military profession exists, nor are they its core competencies. The main purpose of the military is the use of force under the political leadership of its nation-state to defend its society, territory, rights and interests (Abbott, 2022; Federal Constitution of the Swiss Confederation, 2021; Snider et al. 2002).⁴

On the one hand, this main purpose influences who is interested in and selected for military service in Switzerland and, on the other hand, it also has an impact on the culture of the armed forces. In view of the very wide range of missions undertaken by the military as well as the mortal danger that is ultimately associated with the exercise of the profession, there is a need for an exemplary ethic for the military profession. The armed forces need to establish and enforce ethics that will govern the culture and actions of military person-

nel in order to promote exemplary performance and thus protect the integrity and legitimacy of the profession (Chadwick, 1998).

Therefore, in training, the armed forces seek to ensure that their military personnel apply the appropriate standards and possess the competencies, expertise, moral qualities and attributes of character necessary for the ethical use of lethal force.

Another distinctive feature of the professional military is that they are predominantly “closed systems”, i.e. there is no lateral entry into the profession. With few exceptions, every soldier begins as a recruit and every officer begins service as a lieutenant. This is necessary because professional competence must be acquired through ongoing training over many years. Career military officers typically stay in the service for twenty or more years, which is in stark contrast to the private sector, where job changes are much more common. This means that it is of great importance for armed forces to invest in the development of their leaders and soldiers throughout their careers and to further a culture in the organization in which the permanent development of employees is cultivated and encouraged.

The military environment

The following section deals with the conditions under which military personnel operate. Leadership research to date has primarily examined the situational demands placed on leadership in conventional environments, but has neglected the demands placed on leadership in highly dangerous and extreme environments. One reason for this is that research in these environments is extremely difficult to conduct. Nonetheless, such research is essential to understanding how (military) leadership functions in those contexts where leadership is most important.

Professional armed forces are characterized by the fact that they produce their own expertise on the basis of a doctrine and implement a professional ethic that regulates the behaviour of their members. They do this by equipping and training their troops accordingly so that they can operate successfully in their areas of operation in accordance with political and legal guidelines. The individual armed forces of a nation (land, air, sea, cyber and information forces) thus prepare for different missions in their areas of responsibility. The armed forces plan operations against various potential adversaries in different locations around the

world – in contrast to the Swiss Armed Forces, which are deployed to defend their national territory and protect its population. The great diversity of objectives and tasks makes the development of a general theory of military command and control problematic as each nation has its own expertise and organisational structures and develops different factors in order to successfully assert itself in its environment. The commonality in all military operational concepts is that they involve extreme contexts, which are explained in more detail below. Yet there is very little work in the field of leadership that addresses leadership in extreme contexts (Campbell et al., 2010; Holenweger et al., 2017).

“The great diversity of goals and tasks makes the development of a general theory of military command problematic since each nation has its own expertise and organizational structures and develops different factors to successfully compete in its environment. The one feature common to all military operational concepts is that they are concerned with extreme contexts (...).”

Extreme contexts

In their review article in *Leadership Quarterly*, Hannah et al. (2009a) present a general taxonomy for extreme contexts and argue that danger can come in many forms, degrees of extremity, probabilities of occurrence, and other dimensions.

The *first* dimension noted by Hannah et al (2009a) is temporal staggering. The authors note a clear difference between extreme contexts and extreme events. For example, a soldier who is in the relative safety of an assembly area and then leaves it to conduct combat operations before returning again may alternate temporally between contexts and events. Leadership in the military environment can vary between the phases of preparation, deployment, and recovery after hazardous events. Accordingly, the effectiveness of leadership varies by phase (Bruning, 1964; Leonard et al., 2007; Holenweger 2022).

These phases of varying intensity are interconnected in such a way that what a leader does in one phase affects the other phases. The way a leader handles the physical and psychological recovery of his or her troops correspondingly influences the unit’s prepa-

ration for the next extreme event. Therefore, it is important that leadership theories address how leadership can influence these transitions between phases of tension and relaxation. It stands to reason that a particular leadership approach, such as an influencing technique, that is effective in one phase may be ineffective in another. Another example is composure during combat, which protects against rash actions, whereas this impedes psychological healing during the recovery phase, when it is better for affected soldiers to talk openly about their traumatic experiences and make sense of them.

The *second* and *third* dimensions of extreme contexts proposed by Hannah et al. (2009a) concern the potential magnitude of the possible consequences and the likelihood that these consequences will actually occur. More intense threats can lead to, among other things, reactions such as an increased sense of mortality, the evocation of fear, high levels of stress, and other debilitating emotional responses (Arndt et al., 1997; Foa & Kozak, 1986; Lazarus & Alfert, 1964; Lazarus et al., 1962).

The likelihood that a threat may actually occur also influences the readiness of the force. When the immediate threat is low, organizations are likely to be more complacent, whereas people are intrinsically motivated to prepare for danger when the probability of a threat occurring is very high (Pauchant & Mitroff, 1992; Pearson & Mitroff, 1993).

The extent and likelihood of extreme contexts will elicit different human responses, which in turn will influence leadership processes.

The *fourth* dimension, which Hannah et al. (2009a) suggest, is that extreme contexts vary with respect to proximity. Proximity can be defined in terms of physical nearness, e. g. if one is directly on the front line or more in a rear unit. However, proximity can also be defined in terms of psychological or social proximity, e. g. how close one feels to exposure to danger and socially close to those affected. Differences in the extent of closeness between leadership levels can become problematic and thus negatively affect leadership processes (Little, 1964; Mack & Konetzni, 1982; Yagil, 1998).

A leader in a rear command post may experience difficulty in empathizing with the actions at the front and understanding what situation his troops are in. At the same time, those troops at the front may feel that the leader is out of touch with them and does not

share their difficulties and risks. Those closer to the extreme situation will naturally experience the consequences to a greater extent and with a greater likelihood, and thus experience a more intense emotional reaction than those further away from the action.

The *fifth* and final dimension is the form or nature of the threat. Hannah et al. (2009a, 908) note that the consequences of extreme events can be classified as physical (e.g., death, injury, exhaustion), psychological (e.g., post-traumatic stress, war neurosis), or material (e.g., loss of property following environmental disasters). In the military context, threats can be multidimensional. A soldier may face death or injury, on the one hand, and potentially psychological threats such as post-traumatic stress disorder, on the other, while simultaneously having to balance the personal use of force, the need to accomplish the mission and the protection of self and comrades. However, each form of threat can have different effects.

What all armed forces have in common is that they all train and prepare to operate in extreme situations. The five dimensions of extreme contexts can be used as a starting point to assess what distinguishes military from non-military leadership. In any military context there are likely to be some constructs such as emotional stability (Goldberg, 1993) or courage (Goud, 2005) which are effective. But because of the multidimensional nature of these contexts, it is not scientifically useful to posit a generalized or normative theory of military leadership. Military leadership takes place in the arena of armed struggle, where leaders' decisions can have direct and immediate as well as long-term effects on human lives and the fate of nation-states. In order to understand leadership in combat, a systemic approach – where military leaders interact with their social environment – is critical since the complex, extreme, and volatile environment of the military makes it difficult, if not impossible, for any leader to be able to control the tensions, instability and unpredictability of the context itself (Marion & Uhl-Bien, 2001).

“What all armed forces have in common is that they all train and prepare to operate in extreme situations. The five dimensions of extreme contexts can serve as a starting point for assessing what distinguishes military from non-military leadership.”

Military leadership is characterized by a high degree of responsibility and authority. In combat, leaders' decisions can have monumental consequences. Casualties are to be expected in war and these are therefore part of the commander's calculus in selecting actions and balancing mission accomplishment with the safety of subordinates. Therefore, due to the high level of responsibility, armed forces seek to accelerate the development of their leaders in order to maintain effectiveness (Hannah & Avolio, 2010).

Military ethos

Military leadership research has given special attention to one factor, the concept of ethos, which is explained in the following section. Already Aristotle, in the *Nicomachean Ethics*⁵, explained that ethos arises from practical skills, wisdom, virtue, goodness, and benevolence toward others. Wright and Quick (2011) demonstrate that different occupations attract and socialize people with different character profiles, from which occupation-specific character strengths can then be defined. They suggest that a unique character profile could apply to organisations operating in extreme contexts, including character strengths such as bravery.

Hannah and Avolio (2010) state in their research that certain professions such as firefighters, police officers and military personnel require an extremely high level of character, whereby merely ethical behavior in extreme contexts is not sufficient. They define ethos as the extreme degree of character strength

required to produce and sustain extra-ethical virtuous behavior under conditions of high moral intensity where personal risk or sacrifice in the service of others is required. Hannah et al. (2010, 180) also posit that ethos prescribes the inner strength that compels an individual to willingly endure the cognitive, emo-

tional and physical hardships typically associated with dangerous and extreme contexts, and when ultimately necessary, to risk physical injury or death, all with little extrinsic reward.

Effects of extreme contexts on the individual

In addition to the military ethos, the effects of the unique military context that military personnel face in the field will be considered below, independent of the psychological and physical stresses. Therefore, I attempt to discuss some scientifically representative effects of the military context in terms of emotions, physiological responses, the search for meaning, judgment, and motivation.

Sorokin (1943) demonstrated that people can become so overly agitated and emotional in extreme situations that they distort their information processing and decision making. Being exposed to extreme and dangerous events can threaten one's sense of personal safety (Taylor, 1983) or lead to battle fatigue, war fatigue or traumatic stress (Belenky et al., 1985). These traumatic events can also overwhelm group members and thus block them from acting when they experience fear, terror or other emotional reactions (Arndt et al, 1997; Bowlby, 1969; Foa & Kozak, 1986; Lazarus & Alfert, 1964; Lazarus et al, 1962; Parks, 1971). When individuals are repeatedly exposed to extreme contexts, they may withdraw over time or reach a state of learned helplessness (McKean, 1994; Seligman, 1975).

Emotions are therefore a key factor for effectiveness in military contexts since activated positive emotions tend to promote performance, whereas negative emotions generally worsen performance (Ashkanasy et al., 2000; Brief & Weiss, 2002; Erez & Isen, 2002).

Gunnar and Quevedo (2007) have shown in their research the physiological responses that result due to the perception of danger and stress. Excessive or prolonged stress has negative effects on cognitive functions and the immune system (Kalat, 2009), thus reducing combat effectiveness (Belenky et al., 1985).

Leaders can shape the reality in which their subordinates work by assigning and clarifying roles and associated expectations, directing tasks, and providing social and emotional support (Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006; Yukl, 2010). Leaders thus have a strong influence on their subordinates' physiological responses to extreme threats.

Current research indicates that leaders play a key role in making sense of dynamic and extreme contexts (Dixon et al., 2016). When individuals are con-

fronted with traumatic events, they often attempt to find some form of justification for, and to rationalize, the experience and what they have witnessed (Bowlby, 1969; Parks, 1971; Staw, 1980). Weick (1988; 1996) further demonstrated that people are in an active mode of sense-making during this time. Leaders can engage in sense-making in such extreme contexts by helping their subordinates analyze and learn from the event as well as understand how what they have learned can help them perform more effectively in the future. Sense-making by the leader during a combat mission is thus crucial since team members need to grasp the sense of their actions to orient themselves and to obtain a fuller and more accurate idea of what is happening and what options are available to them. This helps team members restore a sense of personal security and agency (Janoff-Bulman & Freize, 1983). This collective search for meaning, in a supportive environment, can help individuals better cope with negative psychological effects following trauma (Moxley & Pulley, 2004; Tedeschi & Calhoun, 2004).

Staw et al. (1981) demonstrated in their study that human judgment generally deteriorates under pressure. The intense pressure, dynamic events, and information overload that frequently occur in dangerous and extreme situations limit the ability to plan, coordinate and adequately deploy resources and can quickly overwhelm the cognitive abilities of managers and their subordinates (Shrivastava, et al., 1988; Weick, 1993).

Therefore, it is hugely important to improve the ability of leaders and their subordinates to make sense of complex and novel information (Mumford et al, 2007; Mumford et al, 2000). A quicker understanding of situations and identification of potentially effective responses increases an individual's ability to engage and counter any threat in combat (Martin et al., 2007). However, achieving this adaptability requires not only skills and competencies, but also the development of metacognitive capabilities that enable leaders to develop a comprehensive understanding of complex situations and to recognize and understand the relationship between task demands and individual capabilities (Lord & Hall, 2005).

Traditional leadership research in recent decades has focused on how leaders can motivate their team members to achieve goals. However, in extreme military contexts, individuals' intrinsic motivation may

be based on individual survival instincts and the instinct for self-preservation, as well as group cohesion. In extreme contexts, feelings about one's own mortality, among other factors, affect individual motivation and must be understood collectively within the team (Arndt et al., 1997).

In combat, leaders may need to dampen or control the motivation of their team members so that they do not become overly aroused, become ineffective, or take inappropriate actions due to panic or fear (Belenky et al., 1965; Foa & Kozak, 1986; Sorokin, 1943). This means that in an extreme situation such as combat there may be an optimal level of motivation, the control of which is an important leadership task.

Effects of extreme contexts on the collective

Extreme and dangerous contexts create a high degree of interdependence among members of a military unit because they depend on each other for their lives and safety. A sense of belonging among military members is necessary, specifically within their own unit. Research regarding leader-member exchange (LMX) has shown that factors such as trust, sympathy, loyalty, professional support, contributory behavior, interpersonal attraction, and mutual influence between leaders and their team members promote such a high-quality relationship (Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Grean & Uhl-Bien, 1995).⁶ Research has further shown that trust is a critical factor in fostering effective relationships between leaders and their followers (Belenky et al., 1985; Sweeney et al., 2009). However, in reality, things like trust are non-negotiable in extreme contexts. Because of the personal risk each team member takes, they require high quality leadership (Hamby, 2002).

Leaders and their subordinates who work together under combat conditions at the tactical level are also often in physical proximity, which in turn has a positive effect on subordinates' perceptions of their

superiors (Antonakis & Atwater, 2002; Howell et al., 2005). Leaders who share the risks and difficulties with their subordinates tend to be viewed as more trustworthy and effective and build higher quality relationships (Little, 1964). In the course of combat, leaders also tend to reduce the power distance from their subordinates and to establish less hierarchical relationships with their team members (Stouffer et al., 1965).

Within the military organization diverse social units emerge, which arise on the basis of task specialization. Therefore, it is important to understand that different types of military groups experience different leadership phenomena. Depending on specialization, groups also have different forms and levels of training, equipment, command and control structures, and other resources that are critical to performance in dangerous and extreme contexts (Turner, 1976).

Cohesion is critical in the military because members are highly interdependent and must rely on each other, not only with respect to tasks but also for socio-emotional support in order to face the danger and emerge victorious (Jans, 2002; Little, 1964; Stouffer et al., 1965). Research shows that positive states such as cohesion, identification with the team and organization as well as commitment to the group all reduce stress and anxiety and improve performance in combat. Unit identification may also mitigate individual fear of death (Strachan et al., 2007). Cohesive units that share similar values and identities provide a sense of security to their members (Hinsz, 2008).

Effective military units can create a buffer effect for their members by providing psychological resources. Resilience, for example, is a critical skill for dealing with challenges and setbacks and can operate on both an individual and collective level (Reich, 2006; Manyena, 2006). Units that have a high degree of cohesion are better able to help their members cope with traumatic experiences (Belenky et al., 1985; Tedeschi & Calhoun, 2004). In addition, collective goals are important in guiding behavior in military units. Groups that set common goals and develop a shared understanding of threats are better able to manage crises (Holenweger, 2022; Mintz, 1951; Wright 1946).

Perspectives

Future research should examine how ethos is generated and operates through leadership processes. Thus, of particular interest is how leaders

“Extreme and dangerous contexts create a high degree of interdependence among members of a military unit because they depend on each other for their lives and safety. A sense of belonging among military members is required, specifically within their own unit.”

can use ethos to maximize unit performance and virtuous behavior in extreme contexts.

Moreover, to date, current research has done little to examine how leadership can reduce or channel negative reactions or how these individual reactions influence social interactions. For leaders in the military, it is important that future research identifies how to mitigate negative emotions in their subordinates and how to reinforce positive ones.

“For leaders in the military, it is important that future research find out how to mitigate negative emotions in their subordinates and how to reinforce positive ones.”

Another important area of research involves how hierarchical, bureaucratic and administrative systems in the armed forces can be effectively used in conjunction with more adaptive organizational systems to achieve the flexibility required for effective command and control systems. While adequate control is required in military operations, too much administrative control leads to too tight a coupling which, once the system is confronted with a problem, causes chain reactions that can spiral out of control over time. In terms of a learning organization, it is important to explore new knowledge as well as to use existing knowledge.

Another area where research is needed is the routine of dealing with extreme contexts. Most of the leadership literature on extreme contexts has been produced in the context of crises. Unfortunately, this term is poorly defined and too general. For military leadership and use, these definitions are inadequate, which is why I have used the term extreme context. Unlike crises, extreme events can be known well in advance and appropriate planning can be in place. In this context, extreme situations can have low to high probability and low to high levels of ambiguity. From my perspective, there are few places where leadership is as important as in combat. The importance of research into what constitutes effective military leadership in such contexts can therefore not be overstated and must be intensified in the future.

In summary, I suggest that the foundation for military leadership, and therefore effective combat leadership, must be established prior to actual com-

bat operations. Effective leaders must be able to flexibly employ a spectrum of different leadership styles as needed. Scholarly discussion suggests that there may not be a general model of implicit leadership theory for what constitutes effective military leadership. In general, there are organizational and cultural differences in what is meant by an effective leader, and followers tend to judge leaders based on how well they fit these ideal types and followers’ expectations. However, as military units rotate in and out of dangerous and extreme contexts, the expectations of followers also change, resulting in different implicit theories of leadership. The characteristics, traits and behaviors of a leader who leads his soldiers in attack differ significantly from those of the leader who directs a unit’s physical and psychological recovery after combat ends. ♦

Summary of selected leadership styles and behaviours of managers

Dimensions	Task- and-relationship oriented leadership	Authentic leadership	Charismatic leadership	Servant leadership	Ethical leadership	Laissez-faire management	Transactional leadership	Transformational leadership
	1. Initiating structure 2. Consideration	1. Self-awareness 2. Transparency in relations 3. Balanced processing 4. Internalized moral perspective	1. Idealised exercise of influence (characteristics and behaviour) 2. Articulation of a vision	1. Altruistic vocation 2. Emotional healing 3. Wisdom 4. Convincing assignment 5. Organizational responsibility			1. Management by exception (active, management by exception) 2. Management by exception (passive, management by exception) 3. Conditional rewards	1. Idealised influence (attributes and behaviour) 2. Inspiring motivation 3. Intellectual excitation 4. Individualized view
Theoretical definition	"The initiating structure is the extent to which a leader defines and organizes his or her role and the roles of followers, focuses on achieving goals, and establishes clearly defined communication patterns and channels" (Judge et al., 2004, 36; adapted from Fleishman, 1973). "Consideration is the extent to which a leader shows interest and respect for followers, cares about their welfare, and expresses appreciation and support" (Judge et al., 2004, 36; adapted from Bass, 1990).	"Specifically, we define authentic leadership in organizations as a process that draws on both positive psychological skills and a highly developed organizational context, resulting in both greater self-awareness and self-regulated positive behaviors on the part of leaders and employees, and fostering positive self-development" (Luthans & Avolio, 2003, 243).	A charismatic leader was previously defined as a leader who has "dominance, self-assurance, a need for influence, and a strong conviction in the moral rightness of his or her beliefs" and uses tactics such as "goal setting, role modeling, building a personal image, demonstrating conviction, and having high expectations of followers and motivating behavior" (House, 1977, 28).	Servant leadership "begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, that one wants to serve first. Then a conscious decision leads the leader to strive to lead" (Greenleaf, 1977, 13).	Ethical leaders engage in "normatively appropriate behavior through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, as well as the promotion of such behavior among followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision making" (Brown et al., 2005, 120).	Laissez-faire leadership is "a non-leadership component – leaders avoid taking ownership of their responsibilities, are absent when needed, do not follow up on requests for support and refuse to voice their opinions on important issues" (Bass, 1997, 134).	"The transactional leader pursues a cost-neutral, economic exchange to satisfy the current material and psychological needs of subordinates in return for the 'contracted' services provided by subordinates" (Bass, 1985, 14).	Transformational leadership encompasses transactional leadership but "tends to go further in seeking to awaken and satisfy higher needs and to involve the whole person of those led" (Bass, 1985, 14).
Source/Measurement	• Halpin, (1957) Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) • Stogdill, (1963) Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Form XII (LBDQ-XII) • Fleishman, (1989b) Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire (SBDQ) • Fleishman, (1989a) Leader Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ)	• Avolio, Gardner, & Walumbwa (2007) • Neider & Schriesheim (2011)	• Bass & Avolio (1995) Conger & Kanungo (1987, 1998). • Multi Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)	• Barbuto & Wheeler (2006) • Liden et al. (2008)	• Brown et al. (2005)	• Bass & Avolio (1995) • Multi Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)	• Bass & Avolio (1995) • Multi Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)	• Bass & Avolio (1995) • Multi Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)

Endnotes

- 1 This article was originally published in German in *stratos* 1-22 and the present version is a translation of it.
- 2 See also: Swiss Armed Forces (2021). Command and Staff Organisation of the Armed Forces 17; Swiss Armed Forces (2019b). Tactical leadership 17; Swiss Armed Forces (2019a). Operational Leadership 17 and table on selected leadership styles and behaviours of leaders in the annex.
- 3 A special feature of Switzerland is the militia system, which also applies to the army and is enshrined in Article 58 of the Swiss Federal Constitution, unlike other armies, which consist of either professional soldiers or volunteers. The advantage of the Swiss model from my point of view is that the soldiers can profitably bring their knowledge acquired in civilian life into the military and thus generate added value for the military. However, this also means that military expertise is not as great as in professional armies, for example.
- 4 See BV Art. 58 para. 2: The armed forces serve to prevent war and contribute to the preservation of peace; they defend the country and its population. It supports the civilian authorities in countering serious threats to internal security and in dealing with other exceptional situations.
- 5 See on this: Höffe (2019). Aristotle: The Nicomachean Ethics.
- 6 See also the article in this issue of *stratos* (1-22) by Sarah von Felten (2022). The codependency of leaders and followers.

Bibliography

- Abbott, A. (2002). The Army and the theory of professions. In D. M. Snider and L. J. Matthews (Eds.), *The Future of the Army Profession*, 1st Ed. (pp. 523–536). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Antonakis, J., & Atwater, L. (2002). Leader distance: A review and proposed theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 673–704.
- Antonakis, J., Bastardoz, N., Jacquart, P., & Shamir, B. (2016). Charisma: An ill-defined and ill-measured gift. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 3, 293–319.
- Arndt, J., Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., & Simon, L. (1997). Suppression, accessibility of death-related thoughts, and cultural defense: Exploring the psychodynamics of terror management. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 73, 5–18.
- Ashkanasy, N. M., Hartel, C. E. J., & Zerbe, W. (Eds.). (2000). *Managing emotions in the workplace*. Armonk, NY: Sharpe.
- Avolio, B. J. (2002). Examining the full range model of leadership: Looking back to transform forward. In Day, D., & Zaccarro, S. (Eds.), *Leadership development for transforming organizations*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2007). *Authentic leadership questionnaire*. Menlo Park: Mind Garden.
- Avolio, B. J. (2007b). Promoting more integrative strategies for leadership theory building. *American Psychologist*, 62, 25–33.
- Barbuto, J. E. Jr. & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group & Organization Management*, 31, 300–326.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional–transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, 52, 130–139.
- Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bass, B. M. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership. Theory, research, and managerial applications*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *MLQ multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Redwood City, CA: Mindgarden.
- Belenky, G. L., Noy, S., & Solomon, Z. (1985). Battle stress: The Israeli experience. *Military Review*, July, 11–20.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss. Volume 1: Attachment*. London: Hogarth.
- Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 279–307.
- Brown, M. E., Treviñ, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97, 117–134.
- Bruning, J. L. (1964). Leadership in disaster. *Psychology: A Journal of Human Behavior*, 1, 19–23.
- Bryman, A. (2011). *The SAGE handbook of leadership*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Bundesverfassung der Schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft vom 18. April 1999 (2021).
- Campbell, D. J., Hannah, S. T., & Matthews, M. D. (2010). Leadership in military and other dangerous contexts: Introduction to the special issue topic. *Military Psychology*, 22, S. 1–14.
- Chadwick, R. (1998). Professional Ethics. In E. Craig (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (pp. 432–466). London: Routledge.
- Cherulnik, P. D., Donley, K. A., Weiwei, T. S. R., & Miller, S. R. (2001). Charisma is contagious: The effects of leaders' charisma on follower affect. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31, 2149–2159.

- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 637–647.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Sage Publications.
- Dixon, D. P., Weeks, M., & Boland, R. (2016). Making sense when it matters most: An exploratory study of leadership in extremis. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 24, 3, 294–317.
- Erez, A., & Isen, A. M. (2002). The influence of positive affect on the components of expectancy motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 1055–1067.
- Fleishman, E. A. (1973). Twenty years of consideration and structure. In E. A. Fleishman, & J. G. Hunt (Hrsg.). *Current developments in the study of leadership* (1–40). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Fleishman, E. A. (1989a). *Leadership opinion questionnaire (LOQ) examiner's manual*. Park Ridge, IL: Science Research Associates.
- Fleishman, E. A. (1989b). *Supervisory behavior description questionnaire (SBD) examiner's manual*. Park Ridge, IL: Science Research Associates.
- Foa, E. B., & Kozak, M. (1986). Emotional processing of fear: Exposure to corrective information. *Psychological Bulletin* 99, 20–35.
- Foldy, E. g., Goldman, L., & Ospina, S. (2008). Sensegiving and the role of cognitive shifts in the work of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 514–529.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist*, 48, 26–34.
- Goud, N. H. (2005). Courage: Its nature and development. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education, and Development*, 44, 102–116.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership*. Ramsey, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Gunnar, M., & Quevedo, K. (2007). Biological and genetic processes in development. In S. T. Fiske, A. E. Kasdin, and D. L. Schacter (Eds). *Annual Review of Psychology*. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.
- Halpin, A. W. (1957). *Manual for the leader behavior description questionnaire*. Columbus, OH: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University.
- Hamby, J. E. (2002). The mutiny wagon wheel: A leadership model for mutiny in combat. *Armed Forces & Society*, 28, 575–600.
- Hannah, S. T., Campbell, D. J., & Matthews, M. D. (2010). Advancing a research agenda for leadership in dangerous contexts. *Military Psychology*, 22, S. 157–189.
- Hannah, S. T., Sweeney, P. J., & Lester, P. B. (2009). The courageous mindset: A dynamic personality system approach to courage. In C. Pury & S. Lopez (Eds.), *The Psychology of Courage*. American Psychological Association.
- Hannah, S. T., Uhl-Bien, M., Avolio, B. J. & Cavarretta, F. (2009a). A Framework for Examining Leadership in Extreme Contexts. *Leadership Quarterly*.
- Hannah, S. T., Woolfolk, L., & Lord, R. G. (2009). Leader self-structure: A framework for positive leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30, 269–290.
- Höffe, O. (2019). *Aristoteles: Die Nikomachische Ethik*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Hogg, M. A. 2001. A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5, 184–200.
- Holenweger, M., Jager, M., & Kernic, F. (2017). *Leadership in extreme situations*. Cham: Springer.
- Holenweger, M. (2022). *Training for leaders in extreme situations*. Cham: Springer. (in print)
- House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23(3), 409–473.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Howell, J. M., Neufeld, D. J., & Avolio, B. J. (2005). Leadership at a distance: The effects of physical distance, charismatic leadership, and communication style on predicting business unit performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 273–286.
- Humphrey, R. H. (2002). The many Faces of emotional leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 493–504.
- Huntington, S. (1957). *The Soldier and the State*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Belknap Press.
- Hurst, D. K. (1995). *Crisis and renewal*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Janoff-Bulman, R & Frieze, I. H. (1983). A theoretical perspective for understanding reactions to victimization. *Journal of Social Issues*, 39, 1–17.
- Jones, T. M. 1991. Ethical decision-making by individuals in organizations: An issue-contingent model. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 366–395.
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 755–768.
- Kalat, J. W. (2009). *Biological psychology* (10th edition). Belmon, CA: Wadsworth.

- Kanfer, R., Chen, G., & Pritchard, R.D. (Eds.) (2008). *Work Motivation: Past, Present, and Future*. New York: Routledge.
- Lazarus, R. S. & Alfert E. (1964). The short-circuiting of threat. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 69, 195–205.
- Lazarus, R. S. & Speisman, J. C., Mordkoff, A. M. & Davison, L. A. (1962). A laboratory study of psychological stress produced by a motion picture. *Psychological Monographs*, 76, 553.
- Leonard, H. B. & Howitt, A. M. (2007). Against desperate peril: High performance in emergency preparation and response. In D. E. Gibbons (Ed.), *Communicable crises: Prevention, response and recovery in the global arena* (pp. 1–25). Charlotte, NC: Info Age.
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). *Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment*. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 161–177.
- Little, R. W. (1964). Buddy relations and combat performance. In M. Janowitz (Ed.), *The new military: Changing patterns of organization*. NY: Sage.
- Lord, R. G., & Hall, R. J. (2005). Identity, deep structure and the development of leadership skills. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 591–615.
- Mack, W. P., & Konetzni, A. H., Jr. (1982). *Command at sea* (4th ed). Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press.
- Marion, R., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2001). Leadership in complex organizations. *Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 389–418.
- Martin, I.M., Bender, H., & Raish, C. (2007). What motivates individuals to protect themselves from risks: The case of wildland fires. *Risk analysis* 27, 887–900.
- McColl-Kennedy, J. R., & Anderson, R. D. (2002). Impact of leadership style and emotions on subordinate performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 545–559.
- Metcalfe, J., & Shimamura, A. P. (1994). *Metacognition: Knowing about knowing*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Milliken, F. J., & Martins, L. L. (1996). Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organizational groups. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 402–433.
- Moxley, R. & Pulley, M. L. (2004). Hardships. In McCauley, C. & Van Velsor, E. (Eds.) *The Center for Creative Leadership handbook of leadership development* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mumford, M. D., Friedrich, T. L., Caughron, J. J., & Byrne, C. L. (2007). Leader cognition in real-world settings: How do leaders think about crises? *Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 515–543.
- Mumford, M. D., Zaccaro, S. J., Harding, F. D., Jacobs, O. T. & Fleishman, E. A. (2000). Leadership skills for a changing world: Solving complex social problems. *Leadership Quarterly*, 11, 11–35.
- Neider, L. L., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2011). The authentic leadership inventory (ALI): Development and empirical tests. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 1146–1164.
- Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- Osborn, R. N. & Hunt, J. G. & Jauch, L. R. (2002). Toward a contextual theory of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly* 13, 797–837.
- Parks, C. M. (1971). Psycho-social transitions: A field study. *Social Science and Medicine*, 5, 101–115.
- Pauchant, T. & Mitroff, I. (1992). *Transforming the crisis-prone organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pearson, C., & Mitroff, I. (1993). From crisis-prone to crisis-prepared. *Academy of Management Executive*, 7, 48–59.
- Piccolo, R. F., & Colquitt, J. A. (2006). Transformational leadership and job behaviors: The mediating role of core job characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 327–340.
- Pinder, C. C. (2008). *Work Motivation in Organizational Behavior*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Porter, L. W., & McLaughlin, G. B. (2006). Leadership and the organizational context: Like the weather. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 559–576.
- Schweizer Armee (2019a). *Operative Führung 17*. Bundesamt für Bauten und Logistik BBL, Bern.
- Schweizer Armee (2019b). *Taktische Führung 17*. Bundesamt für Bauten und Logistik BBL, Bern.
- Schweizer Armee (2021). *Führung und Stabsorganisation der Armee 17*. Bundesamt für Bauten und Logistik BBL, Bern.
- Shrivastava, P.; Mitroff, I., Miller, D., & Miglani, A. (1988). Understanding industrial crisis. *Journal of Management Studies*. 25, 285–303.
- Snider, D. M., & Matthews, L. J. (2002). *The Future of the Army Profession*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Sorokin, P.A. (1943). *Man and society in calamity*. NY: Dutton.
- Staw, B. (1980). Rationality and justification in organization life. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 2. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.
- Staw, B. M., & Sandelands, L. E. & Dutton, J. E. (1981). Threat-rigidity effects in organizational behavior:

- multi-level analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, 501–24.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1963). *Manual for the leader behavior description questionnaire, form XII*. Columbus, OH: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University.
- Stouffer, S. A., Lumsdaine, A. A., Lumsdaine, M. H., Williams, R. M., Smith, M. B., Janis, I. L., Star, M. A., & Cottrell, L.S. (1965). *The American Soldier: Combat and its aftermath* (Vol. 2). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sweeney, P. J., Thompson, V., & Blanton, H. (2009). Trust and influence in combat: An interdependence model. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 39, 235–264.
- Taylor, S. E. (1983). Adjustment to threatening life events: A theory of cognitive adaptation. *American Psychologist*, 1161–1173.
- Tedeschi, R.G., & Calhoun, L. G. (2004). Posttraumatic growth: Conceptual foundations and empirical evidence. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15, 1–18.
- Tosi, H. L. (1991). The organization as a context for leadership theory: A multilevel approach. *Leadership Quarterly*, 2, 205–228.
- Turner, B. A. (1976). The organizational and interorganizational development of disasters. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21, 378–397.
- Von Felten, S. (2022). The codependency of leaders and followers. *Stratos* 1–22.
- Weick, K. E. (1988). Enacted sensemaking in crisis situations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 25, 305–317.
- Weick, K. E. (1993). The collapse of sensemaking in organizations: The Mann Gulch disaster. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38, 628–652.
- Weick, K. E. (1996). Drop your tools: An allegory for organizational studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 301–313.
- Weick, K. E. & Bougon, M. G. (1986). Organizations as cause maps. In Sims, H. P. Jr. and Gioia, D. A. (Eds.), *Social Cognition in Organizations* (pp. 102–35). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wright, T. A., & Quick, J. C. (in press). The role of character in ethical leadership research. *Leadership Quarterly*.
- Yagil, D. (1998). Charismatic leadership and organizational hierarchy: Attribution of charisma to close and distant leaders. *Leadership Quarterly*, 9, 161–176.
- Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in organizations* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River: Pearson.
- Zaccaro, S.J., Ely, K., & Nelson, J. (2008). Leadership processes and work motivation. In R. Kanfer, G. Chen, & R.D. Pritchard (eds.), *Work Motivation: Past, Present, and Future* (pp. 319–360). New York: Routledge.