


WHITE PAPER

Future Trends in Leadership Development

By: Nick Petrie





Contents

About the Author	3
Experts Consulted During This Study	3
About This Project	5
Executive Summary	5
Section 1–The Challenge of Our Current Situation	7
Section 2–Future Trends for Leadership Development	10
Types of Development	11
Why Vertical Development Matters for Leadership	12
What the Stages of Development Look Like	13
Example of a Vertical Development Process: The Immunity to Change	15
Growth Fuels Growth	19
Final Thoughts	27
Bibliography	28
References	29
Appendix	31

About the Author

Nick Petrie is a Senior Faculty member with the Center for Creative Leadership's, Colorado Springs, Colorado campus. He is a member of the faculty for the Leadership Development Program (LDP)[®] and the legal sector. Nick is from New Zealand and has significant international experience having spent ten years living and working in Japan, Spain, Scotland, Ireland, Norway, and Dubai. Before joining CCL, he ran his own consulting company and spent the last several years developing and implementing customized leadership programs for senior leaders around the world. Nick holds a master's degree from Harvard University and undergraduate degrees in business administration and physical education from Otago University in New Zealand. Before beginning his business career, he was a professional rugby player and coach for seven years.

Experts Consulted During This Study

I wish to thank the following experts who contributed their time and thinking to this report in order to make it stronger. I also relieve them of any liability for its weaknesses, for which I am fully responsible. Thanks all.

Bill Torbert, Professor Emeritus of Leadership at the Carroll School of Management at Boston College

Chelsea Pollen, Recruiting Specialist, Google

Chuck Palus, Manager of the Connected Leadership Project, Center for Creative Leadership

Craig Van Dugteren, Senior Project Manager, Learning & Development, Victoria Police, Australia

David Altman, Executive Vice President, Research, Innovation & Product Development, Center for Creative Leadership

David Carder, Vice President and Executive Consultant, Forum Corporation

Jeff Barnes, Head of Global Leadership, General Electric

Jeffrey Yip, PhD Candidate, Boston University School of Management; Visiting Researcher, Center for Creative Leadership

John Connell, Harvard School of Public Health

John McGuire, Senior Faculty Member, Center for Creative Leadership

Josh Alwitt, Vice President at Sapient Corporation

Lisa Lahey, Co-founder and Principal of MINDS AT WORK[™]; Associate Director of the Change Leadership Group at the Harvard University Graduate School of Education

Lucy Dinwiddie, Global Learning & Executive Development Leader, General Electric

Lyndon Rego, Director, Leadership Beyond Boundaries, Center for Creative Leadership

Maggie Walsh, Vice President of the Leadership Practice, Forum Corporation

Marc Efron, President, The Talent Strategy Group; Author, *One Page Talent Management*

Michael Kenney, Assistant Professor of Public Policy at the School of Public Affairs, Pennsylvania State University

Robert Burnside, Partner, Chief Learning Officer, Ketchum

Roland Smith, Senior Faculty Member and Lead Researcher at the Center for Creative Leadership

Simon Fowler, Methodology Associate Consultant, Forum Corporation

Stan Gryskiewicz, Senior Fellow at the Center for Creative Leadership; President & Founder of Association for Managers of Innovation

Steve Barry, Senior Manager, Strategic Marketing, Forum Corporation

Steve Kerr, Former Chief Learning Officer and Managing Director and now Senior Advisor to Goldman Sachs; former Vice President of Corporate Leadership Development and Chief Learning Officer at General Electric

Harvard University Faculty

Thanks to the following professors and mentors whose ideas, questions, and refusals to answer my questions directly . . . kept me searching.

Ashish Nanda, Robert Braucher Professor of Practice at Harvard Law School, Faculty Director of Executive Education at Harvard Law School

Daniel Wilson, Principal Investigator at Project Zero and Learning Innovation Laboratory (LILA), Harvard Graduate School of Education

Dean Williams, Lecturer in Public Policy, teacher and researcher on Adaptive Leadership and Change; Faculty Chair of the Executive Education Program: Leadership for the 21st Century: Global Change Agents, Harvard Kennedy School of Government

J. Richard Hackman, Edgar Pierce Professor of Social and Organizational Psychology, Department of Psychology, Harvard University

Monica Higgins, Professor at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, focused on the areas of leadership development and organizational change

Robert Kegan, William and Miriam Meehan Professor in Adult Learning and Professional Development, Harvard Graduate School of Education

About This Project

The origin of this report stems largely from my own doubts about the methods my colleagues and I had used in the past to develop leaders in organizations. Though the feedback from managers was that they were happy with the programs, my sense was that somehow, what we were delivering was not what they really needed.

It seemed that the nature of the challenges that managers were facing was rapidly changing; however, the methods that we were using to develop them were staying the same. The incremental improvements that we were making in programs were what Chris Argyris would call “single loop” learning (adjustments to the existing techniques), rather than “double loop” learning (changes to the assumptions and thinking upon which the programs were built).

These continual, nagging doubts led me to take a one-year sabbatical at Harvard University with the goal of answering one question—**what will the future of leadership development look like?** With the aim of getting as many different perspectives as possible, I studied across the schools of the university (Education, Business, Law, Government, Psychology) to learn their approaches to developing leaders and conducted a literature review of the field of leadership development. In addition, I interviewed 30 experts in the field to gather diverse perspectives and asked each of them the following questions:

1. What are the current approaches being used that you think are the most effective?
2. What do you think we should be doing more of in terms of developing leaders?
3. What should we be doing less of/stop doing/phase out?
4. Where do you see the future of leadership development headed?

The following report is divided into two sections. The first (shorter) section focuses on the current environment and the challenge of developing leaders in an increasingly complex and uncertain world. The second looks in depth at four leadership development trends identified by interviewees and the emerging practices that could form the basis of future leadership development programs.

Executive Summary

“In the agricultural era, schools mirrored a garden. In the industrial era, classes mirrored the factory, with an assembly line of learners. In the digital-information era, how will learning look?”

Lucy Dinwiddie
Global Learning & Executive
Development Leader, General Electric

The Current Situation

- The environment has changed—it is more complex, volatile, and unpredictable.
- The skills needed for leadership have also changed—more complex and adaptive thinking abilities are needed.
- The methods being used to develop leaders have not changed (much).
- The majority of managers are developed from on-the-job experiences, training, and coaching/mentoring; while these are all still important, leaders are no longer developing fast enough or in the right ways to match the new environment.

The Challenge Ahead

- This is no longer just a leadership challenge (what good leadership looks like); it is a development challenge (the process of how to grow “bigger” minds).
- Managers have become experts on the “what” of leadership, but novices in the “how” of their own development.

Four Trends for the Future of Leadership Development

1. More focus on vertical development

There are two different types of development—horizontal and vertical. A great deal of time has been spent on “horizontal” development (competencies), but very little time on “vertical” development (developmental stages). The methods for horizontal and vertical development are very different. Horizontal development can be “transmitted” (from an expert), but vertical development must be earned (for oneself).

2. Transfer of greater developmental ownership to the individual

People develop fastest when they feel responsible for their own progress. The current model encourages people to believe that someone else is responsible for their development—human resources, their manager, or trainers. We will need to help people out of the passenger seat and into the driver’s seat of their own development.

3. Greater focus on collective rather than individual leadership

Leadership development has come to a point of being too individually focused and elitist. There is a transition occurring from the old paradigm in which leadership resided in a person or role, to a new one in which leadership is a collective process that is spread throughout networks of people. The question will change from, “Who are the leaders?” to “What conditions do we need for leadership to flourish in the network?” How do we spread leadership capacity throughout the organization and democratize leadership?

4. Much greater focus on innovation in leadership development methods

There are no simple, existing models or programs that will be sufficient to develop the levels of collective leadership required to meet an increasingly complex future. Instead, an era of rapid innovation will be needed in which organizations experiment with new approaches that combine diverse ideas in new ways and share these with others. Technology and the web will both provide the infrastructure and drive the change. Organizations that embrace the changes will do better than those who resist it.

Four Transitions for Leadership Development

Current Focus	Future Focus
The “what” of leadership	The “what” and “how” of development
Horizontal development	Horizontal and vertical development
HR/training companies, own development	Each person owns development
Leadership resides in individual managers	Collective leadership is spread throughout the network

Section 1—The Challenge of Our Current Situation

The Environment Has Changed—It Is Becoming More Complex and Challenging

If there were two consistent themes that emerged from interviewees as the greatest challenges for current and future leaders, it was the pace of change and the complexity of the challenges faced.

The last decade has seen many industries enter a period of increasingly rapid change. The most recent global recession, which began in December 2007, has contributed to an environment that many interviewees believe is fundamentally different from that of 10 years ago.

Roland Smith, senior faculty at the Center for Creative Leadership (CCL®) described the new environment as one of perpetual white water. His notion of increased turbulence is backed up by an IBM study of over 1,500 CEOs.¹ These CEOs identified their number one concern as the growing complexity of their environments, with the majority of those CEOs saying that their organizations are not equipped to cope with this complexity.

This theme was consistent among many of the interviewees in this study, some of whom used the army phrase VUCA to describe the new environment in which leaders must work:

Volatile: Change happens rapidly and on a large scale.

Uncertain: The future cannot be predicted with any precision.

Complex: Challenges are complicated by many factors and there are few single causes or solutions.

Ambiguous: There is little clarity on what events mean and what effect they may have.

“There are no boundaries anymore.”

Jeff Barnes
Head of Global Leadership, General Electric

Researchers have identified several criteria that make complex environments especially difficult to manage.²

- They contain a large number of interacting elements.
- Information in the system is highly ambiguous, incomplete, or indecipherable. Interactions among system elements are nonlinear and tightly coupled such that small changes can produce disproportionately large effects.
- Solutions emerge from the dynamics within the system and cannot be imposed from outside with predictable results.
- Hindsight does not lead to foresight since the elements and conditions of the system can be in continual flux.

In addition to the above, the most common factors cited by interviewees as challenges for future leaders were:

- information overload
- the interconnectedness of systems and business communities
- the dissolving of traditional organizational boundaries
- new technologies that disrupt old work practices
- the different values and expectations of new generations entering the workplace
- increased globalization leading to the need to lead across cultures

In summary, the new environment is typified by an increased level of complexity and interconnectedness. One example, given by an interviewee, was the difficulty her managers were facing when leading teams spread across the globe. Because the global economy has become interconnected, her managers felt they could no longer afford to focus solely on events in their local economies; instead they were constantly forced to adjust their strategies and tactics to events that were happening in different parts of the world. This challenge was compounded by the fact that these managers were leading team members of different nationalities, with different cultural values, who all operated in vastly different time zones—all of this before addressing the complexity of the task itself.



Section 1–The Challenge of Our Current Situation

(continued)

The Skills Sets Required Have Changed –More Complex Thinkers Are Needed

Reflecting the changes in the environment, the competencies that will be most valuable to the future leader appear to be changing. The most common skills, abilities, and attributes cited by interviewees were:

- adaptability
- self-awareness
- boundary spanning
- collaboration
- network thinking

A literature review on the skills needed for future leaders also revealed the following attributes:

- The CEOs in IBM’s 2009 study named the most important skill for the future leader as creativity.
- The 2009/2010 Trends in Executive Development study found many CEOs were concerned that their organizations’ up-and-comers were lacking in areas such as the ability to think strategically and manage change effectively.³
- Jeffrey Immelt, General Electric CEO and chairman, states that 21st century leaders will need to be systems thinkers who are comfortable with ambiguity.⁴

It appears that the new VUCA environment is seeing the demand move away from isolated behavioral competencies toward complex “thinking” abilities. These manifest as adaptive competencies such as learning agility, self-awareness, comfort with ambiguity, and strategic thinking. With such changes in the mental demands on future leaders, the question will be: how will we produce these capacities of thinking?

The Methods We Are Using to Develop Leaders Have *Not* Changed (Much)

Organizations are increasingly reliant on HR departments to build a leadership pipeline of managers capable of leading “creatively” through turbulent times. However, there appears to be a growing belief among managers and senior executives that the leadership programs that they are attending are often insufficient to help them develop their capacities to face the demands of their current role.

Based on the interviews, the most common current reported development methods were:

- training
- job assignments
- action learning
- executive coaching
- mentoring
- 360-degree feedback

While the above methods will remain important, many interviewees questioned whether the application of these methods in their current formats will be sufficient to develop leaders to the levels needed to meet the challenges of the coming decades. The challenge becomes, if not the methods above, then what?

“The overriding theme of what I’ve been hearing from clients recently is that they’re a bit stunned–shocked, actually–at how the leadership-development programs they’d had in place were not able to meet the needs of their business as we’ve gone through these tremendously disruptive economic changes over the past few years.”⁵

Bill Pelster
Principal, Deloitte Consulting

Section 2—Future Trends for Leadership Development

This Is No Longer Just a Leadership Challenge—It Is a Development Challenge

A large number of interview respondents felt that many methods—such as content-heavy training—that are being used to develop leaders for the 21st century have become dated and redundant. While these were relatively effective for the needs and challenges of the last century, they are becoming increasingly mismatched against the challenges leaders currently face.

Marshall Goldsmith has commented, “Many of our leadership programs are based on the faulty assumption that if we show people what to do, they can automatically do it.”⁶ However, there is a difference between knowing what “good” leadership looks like and being able to do it. We may be arriving at a point where we face diminishing returns from teaching managers more about leadership, when they still have little understanding about what is required for real development to occur.

“Some people want to put Christ back into Christmas; I want to put development back into leadership development.”

Robert Kegan
Professor of Adult Learning
and Professional Development,
Harvard Graduate School of Education

Trend 1: Increased Focus on Vertical Development (Developmental Stages)

Research interview question: *What do you think needs to be stopped or phased out from the way leadership development is currently done?*

- “Competencies: they become either overwhelming in number or incredibly generic. If you have nothing in place they are okay, but their use nearly always comes to a bad end.”
- “Competencies—they don’t add value.”
- “Competency models as the *sole* method for developing people. It is only one aspect and their application has been done to death.”
- “Competencies, especially for developing senior leaders. They are probably still okay for newer managers.”
- “Static individual competencies. We are better to think about meta-competencies such as learning agility and self-awareness.”

For a long time we have thought about leadership development as working out what competencies a leader should possess and then helping individual managers to develop them—much as a bodybuilder tries to develop different muscle groups. Research over the last 20 years on how adults develop clarifies one reason why many interviewees have grown weary of the competency model as the *sole* means for developing leaders. We have failed to distinguish between two very different types of development—vertical and horizontal.

Types of Development

Horizontal development is the development of new skills, abilities, and behaviors. It is technical learning. Horizontal development is most useful when a problem is clearly defined and there are known techniques for solving it. Surgery training is an example of horizontal development. Students learn to become surgeons through a process known as “pimping,” in which experienced surgeons continually question students until the point when the student cannot answer and is forced to go back to the books to learn more information.⁷ While the process of learning is not easy, there are clear answers that can be codified and transmitted from expert sources, allowing the students to broaden and deepen their surgical competency.

Vertical development, in contrast, refers to the “stages” that people progress through in regard to how they “make sense” of their world. We find it easy to notice children progressing through stages of development as they grow, but conventional wisdom assumes that adults stop developing at around 20 years old—hence the term “grown up” (you have finished growing). However, developmental researchers have shown that adults do in fact continue to progress (at varying rates) through predictable stages of mental development. At each higher level of development, adults “make sense” of the world in more complex and inclusive ways—their minds grow “bigger.”

In metaphorical terms, horizontal development is like pouring water into an empty glass.⁸ The vessel fills up with new content (you learn more leadership techniques). In contrast, vertical development aims to expand the glass itself. Not only does the glass have increased capacity to take in more content, the structure of the vessel itself has been transformed (the manager’s mind grows bigger). From a technology perspective, it is the difference between adding new software (horizontal development) or upgrading to a new computer (vertical development). Most people are aware that continuing to add new software to an out-dated operating system starts to have diminishing returns.

While horizontal development (and competency models)

will remain important as one method for helping leaders develop, in the future it cannot be relied on as the only means. As one interviewee suggested, it is time to “transcend and include” the leadership competency mentality so that in the future we are able to grow our leaders simultaneously in both horizontal AND vertical directions.

“Organizations have grown skilled at developing individual leader competencies, but have mostly ignored the challenge of transforming their leader’s mind-set from one level to the next. Today’s horizontal development within a mind-set must give way to the vertical development of bigger minds.”

John McGuire and Gary Rhodes
Transforming Your Leadership Culture,
Center for Creative Leadership

Why Vertical Development Matters for Leadership

The next question may be: “Why should someone’s level of cognitive development matter for leadership and organizations?” One answer is that from a leadership perspective, researchers have shown that people at higher levels of development perform better in more complex environments. A study by Keith Eigel looked at 21 CEOs and 21 promising middle managers from various companies, each with annual revenues of over \$5 billion.⁹ The study showed that across a range of leadership measures, there was a clear correlation between higher levels of vertical development and higher levels of effectiveness. This finding has since been replicated in a number of fine-grained studies on leaders assessing particular competencies.¹⁰

The reason that managers at higher levels of cognitive development are able to perform more effectively is that they can *think* in more complex ways.

According to McGuire and Rhodes (2009) of the Center for Creative Leadership: “Each successive level (or stair) holds greater ability for learning, complex problem-solving, and the ability to set new direction and lead change. People who gain another step can learn more, adapt faster, and generate more complex solutions than they could before. Those at higher levels can learn and react faster because they have bigger minds; people at later stages are better at seeing and connecting more dots in more scenarios (which means they are better at strategy). That’s all. But that’s a lot.”

There is nothing inherently “better” about being at a higher level of development, just as an adolescent is not “better” than a toddler. However, the fact remains that an adolescent is able to do more, because he or she can think in more sophisticated ways than a toddler. Any level of development is okay; the question is whether that level of development is a good fit for the task at hand. In terms of leadership, if you believe that the future will present leaders with an environment that is more complex, volatile, and unpredictable, you might also believe that those organizations who have more leaders at higher levels of development will have an important advantage over those that don’t.

“A new leadership paradigm seems to be emerging with an inexorable shift away from one-way, hierarchical, organization-centric communication toward two-way, network-centric, participatory, and collaborative leadership styles. Most of all a new mind-set seems necessary, apart from new skills and knowledge. All the tools in the world will not change anything if the mind-set does not allow and support change.”

Grady McGonagill and Tina Doerffer
The Leadership Implications of the Evolving Web,
Bertelsmann Stiftung Leadership Series

What the Stages of Development Look Like

There are various frameworks which researchers use to measure and describe levels of cognitive development. Below is a short description of Robert Kegan’s levels of development and how they map against other researchers in the field.

Kegan’s Adult Levels of Development

- **3–Socialized mind:** At this level we are shaped by the expectations of those around us. What we think and say is strongly influenced by what we think others want to hear.
- **4–Self-authoring mind:** We have developed our own ideology or internal compass to guide us. Our sense of self is aligned with our own belief system, personal code, and values. We can take stands, set limits on behalf of our own internal “voice.”
- **5–Self-transforming mind:** We have our own ideology, but can now step back from that ideology and see it as limited or partial. We can hold more contradiction and oppositeness in our thinking and no longer feel the need to gravitate towards polarized thinking.

Adult Levels of Development

Level	Kegan Levels	CCL Action Logics	Torbert & Rookes Action Logics ¹¹
5	Self-transforming	Interdependent-Collaborator	Ironist (>1%)* Alchemist (2%) Strategist (5%)
4	Self-authoring	Independent-Achiever	Individualist (11%) Achiever (30%) Expert (37%)
3	Socialized	Dependent-Conformer	Diplomat (11%) Opportunist (4%)

* Study of 4,510 managers. The percentages denote the number of managers measured at each stage of development using the sentence completion test.

According to interviewees, the coming decades will increasingly see managers take on challenges that require them to engage in: strategic thinking, collaboration, systems thinking, leading change, and having “comfort with ambiguity.” These are all abilities, which become more pronounced at level 5. Yet according to studies by

Torbert and Fisher¹² less than 8% have reached that level of thinking. This may in part explain why so many people are currently feeling stressed, confused, and overwhelmed in their jobs. A large number of the workforce are performing jobs that cause them to feel they are “in over their heads” (Kegan, 2009).

What Causes Vertical Development

The methods for horizontal development are very different from those for vertical development. Horizontal development can be learned (from an expert), but vertical development must be earned (for yourself). We can take what researchers have learned in the last 75 years about what causes vertical development and summarize it by the following four conditions (Kegan, 2009):

- People feel consistently frustrated by situations, dilemmas, or challenges in their lives.
- It causes them to feel the limits of their current way of thinking.
- It is in an area of their life that they care about deeply.
- There is sufficient support that enables them to persist in the face of the anxiety and conflict.

Developmental movement from one stage to the next is usually driven by limitations in the current stage. When you are confronted with increased complexity and challenge that can't be reconciled with what you know and can do at your current level, you are pulled to take the next step (McGuire & Rhodes, 2009). In addition, development accelerates when people are able to identify the assumptions that are holding them at their current level of development and test their validity.

McGuire and Rhodes describe vertical development as a three-stage process:

1. **Awaken:** The person becomes aware that there is a different way of making sense of the world and that doing things in a new way is possible.
2. **Unlearn and discern:** The old assumptions are analyzed and challenged. New assumptions are tested out and experimented with as being new possibilities for one's day-to-day work and life.
3. **Advance:** Occurs after some practice and effort, when new ideas get stronger and start to dominate the previous ones. The new level of development (leadership logic) starts to make more sense than the old one.

Torbert and others have found that cognitive development can be measured and elevated not only on the individual level, but also on the team and organizational level. McGuire and Rhodes (2009) have pointed out that if organizations want to create lasting change, they must develop the leadership *culture* at the same time they are developing individual leaders. Their method uses a six-phase process, which begins by elevating the senior leadership culture before targeting those managers at the middle of the organization.¹³ While personal vertical development impacts individuals, vertical cultural development impacts organizations.

The challenge for organizations that wish to accelerate the vertical development of their leaders and cultures will be the creation of processes and experiences that embed these developmental principles into the workplace.

“A major part of our job is helping people develop how they think. How they get to an answer matters more than ever.”

Jeff Barnes
Head of Global Leadership,
General Electric

Example of a Vertical Development Process: The Immunity to Change¹⁴

The “Immunity to Change” process was developed over a 20-year period by Harvard professors and researchers Robert Kegan and Lisa Lahey. It uses behavior change, and the discovery of what stops people from making the changes they want, to help people develop themselves.

How it works: Leaders choose behaviors they are highly motivated to change. They then use a mapping process to identify the anxieties and assumptions they have about what would happen if they were to actually make those changes. This uncovers his or her’s hidden “immunity to change,” i.e., what has held his or her back from making the change already. The participant then designs and runs a series of small experiments in the workplace to test out the validity of the assumptions. As people realize that the assumptions they have been operating under are false or at least partial, the resistance to change diminishes and the desired behavior change happens more naturally.

Why it accelerates development: The method accelerates people’s growth because it focuses directly on the four conditions of vertical development (an area of frustration, limits of current thinking, an area of importance, and support available). Many leadership programs operate on the assumption that if you show people how to lead, they can then do that. However, the most difficult challenges that people face in their work lives are often associated with the limitations of the way they “make meaning” at their current level of development. When a person surfaces the assumptions they have about the way the world works, they get the chance to question those assumptions and allow themselves the opportunity to start to make meaning from a more advanced level. For example, a manager may have difficulty making decisions without his boss’s direction, not because he lacks decision-making techniques, but because of the anxiety that taking a stand produces from his current level of meaning-making (the Socialized Mind).

How this is being used: The method is currently being used in the leadership development programs of a number of leading banks, financial services firms, and strategy consulting firms. It is best suited for leaders who already have the technical skills they need to succeed, but need to grow the capacity of their thinking in order to lead more effectively.

Trend 2: Transfer of Greater Developmental Ownership to the Individual

Interview question: *What should be stopped or phased out in leadership development?*

Response: *“Stop sending people to courses they don’t want to go to.”*

According to social psychologists, people’s motivation to grow is highest when they feel a sense of autonomy over their own development.¹⁵ However, some interviewees believe that the training model common within organizations for much of the last 50 years has bred dependency, inadvertently convincing people that they are passengers in their own development journey. The language of being “sent” to a training program, or having a 360-degree assessment “done on me,” denotes the fact that many managers still see their development as being owned by someone else, namely HR, training companies, or their own manager.

Even as methods have evolved, such as performance feedback, action learning, and mentoring, the sense for many still remains that it is someone else’s job to “*tell me what I need to get better at and how to do it.*” Many workers unknowingly outsourced their own development to well-intentioned strangers who didn’t know them, didn’t understand their specific needs, and didn’t care as much about their development as they themselves should. This model has resulted in many people feeling like passengers. The challenge will be to help people back into the driver’s seat for their own development.

Several interviewees point out that the above issue has been compounded in the last 10 years by the demand placed on managers to take on the role of coaches and talent developers. Many staff, however, express skepticism at being developmentally coached by managers, whom they believe are not working on any development areas themselves. To paraphrase Rob Goffee’s 2006 book, “Why should anyone be developed by him?”¹⁶ In an organization where everyone is trying to develop someone else, but no one is developing themselves, we might wonder whether we are really approaching development from the right starting point.

Despite staff’s doubts about the current top-down development methods, we can see clues to the future of development in the growing demand for executive coaching.

What principles can be learned from this demand for coaching that can be expanded to all development practices?

Some modifying factors for coaching:

- The manager chooses what to focus on, not the coach.
- The process is customized for each person.
- The coach owns her development; the coach guides the process (through questions).
- The coach is a thinking partner, not an authority/expert.
- There is no “content” to cover.
- It is a developmental process over time, not an event.

Despite this demand for coaching, the barrier has always been that it is difficult to “scale” the process, because of the cost and time needed for the coach. However, if greater ownership of development is transferred back to the individual, with HR, external experts, and managers seen as resources and support, there is no reason that these same principles could not be applied on a larger scale throughout an organization.

Leadership Development for the Masses

While many organizations say that they need leaders at all levels of the business, a number of interviewees pointed out that this statement appears inconsistent with their practices, as long as they continue to train and develop only their “elite” managers. Leadership development can become democratized, if workers get a better understanding of what development is, why it matters for them, and how they can take ownership of their own development.

In his study on how Colombian drug traffickers were able to grow their operations despite a multidecade campaign against them costing billions of dollars, Michael Kenney found that a key factor was the traffickers’ ability to outlearn and outadapt their U.S. government adversaries.¹⁷ Kenney discovered that traffickers, despite lack of education, were driven to learn and develop by the “high risk/high return” for learning. The rewards for those who learned the most were money and status; the risks for those who failed to learn were prison and sometimes death. Colombian drug cartels do not have HR departments or training companies to manage their training programs, yet these young, often uneducated traffickers still find sufficient motivation in the risk/return for learning to drive their own development. If organizations believe that their people would not be motivated to take more ownership of their own development, they might stop and ask, “How clear and visible is the ‘risk/reward’ for learning in our organization?”

What Development Might Look Like

Robert Kegan and Lisa Lahey (2009) suggest that you would know that an organization had people taking ownership of their ongoing development when you could walk into an organization and any person could tell you:

1. **What** is the one thing they are working on that will require that they grow to accomplish it
2. **How** they are working on it
3. **Who** else knows and cares about it
4. **Why** this matters to them



“The industry needs to ask itself how leadership development became so elitist. The world’s challenges are big enough now that we need to think about how we can democratize leadership development, take it back to the masses—to the base and middle of the socioeconomic pyramid, not only the peak.”

David Altman
Executive Vice President–Research,
Innovation, & Product Development
Center for Creative Leadership

“It makes little sense to begin executive development processes at very senior levels, as many companies do. Instead the process must start early.”

Morgan McCall, Jr.
“Executive Ask”
Academy of Management Executive¹⁸

In addition to these points, interviewees suggested that some of the following factors would also be present in an organization where people were taking greater ownership of their development:

- Recognition from senior leaders that in complex environments, business strategies cannot be executed without highly developed leaders (and that traditional horizontal development won’t be enough)
- Buy-in from the senior leaders that new methods for development need to be used and that they will go first and lead by example
- Staff to be educated on the research of how development occurs and what the benefits are for them
- For all staff to understand why development works better when they own it
- A realignment of reward systems to emphasize both development as well as performance
- Utilization of new technologies such as Ryppl¹⁹, which allows people to take control of their own feedback and gather ongoing suggestions for improvement
- Creation of a culture in which it is safe to take the type of risks required to stretch your mind into the discomfort zone

We are already seeing examples of this happening at innovative organizations such as W. L. Gore and IDEO, as well as at younger companies like Google, where managers may have up to 20 direct reports each. Because top-down feedback and coaching is impractical with so many direct reports, staff members are expected to drive their own development by using peers to gather their own feedback on areas to improve and to coach each other on how they can develop.

Growth Fuels Growth

While many HR staff may be delighted at the possibility that, in the future, people would take more ownership for their own development, some may question whether people are inherently motivated to grow. Yet, the majority of people can reflect on what is common knowledge in most workplaces: the people who grow the most are also the ones hungriest to grow even more. Clayton Alderfer's Existence, Relations, Growth (ERG) model of human needs identified that the need for growth differs from the needs for physical well-being and relationships.²⁰ Alderfer found that the need for physical well-being and relationship concerns are satiated when met (the more we get, the less we want), whereas the need for growth is not (the more growth we get, the more we want). The implication for development is that if we can help people to get started on the path of genuine vertical development, the drive for still more growth gathers momentum.²¹

In addition, social psychologists have long identified that a sense of autonomy (ownership) is crucial for people to feel intrinsically motivated. If the experience of development is combined with a sense of autonomy over the development process, individuals are likely to gain a significant boost in their motivation to

proceed. Finally, both Kegan and Torbert's research suggests that as more people transition from the levels of the socialized mind to the self-authoring mind, there will naturally be a greater drive for ownership by individuals.

Of course not everything can be organized and carried out by the individuals, and the role of learning and development professionals within organizations will remain crucial. However, it may transform into more of a development partner whose main role is to innovate new structures and processes for development. Marc Effron, president of the Talent Strategy group, predicts that much of the HR function may soon focus only on developing talent, with much of the rest of their duties being outsourced.

This could mean that rather than a traffic cop selecting and directing people into programs, the future L&D professional could become more like a community organizer who facilitates people, processes, systems, and structures that connect networks of people to each other and spreads a culture of development throughout the organization. Several interviewees pointed out that the most effective leadership development programs shift responsibility for developing leaders away from HR and toward the current leaders of the organization. GE, for example, expects both the CEO and the senior managers to spend a significant amount of time at its leadership university (Crotonville) training future leaders. For L&D professionals this would mean partnering with senior leaders to build a true culture of development, a task that would require a great deal of skill and development for those who take up the challenge. The role of the learning professional would become both more critical to the business and more challenging for its practitioners. And despite positive signs that people are ready to take on greater ownership, several interviewees point out that we may yet need to be patient. It took us 50 years of the expert model to arrive at our current mind-set for development; it may take some time to transition to the next.

Example of a development process that increases ownership: Feedforward coaching

What is it: A behavior change process designed for busy, time-poor people who like to see measured results. In the feedforward process an individual engages trusted colleagues in a peer coaching process, asking each colleague to do three things: focus on the *future*, give only *suggestions*, make these something *positive* the person can *do*.

How it works: Participants choose one or two areas they want to improve and five to eight internal people they trust who become feedforward coaches. With the support of an internal or external coach, the leader gathers monthly suggestions from the feedforward coaches as to how she can improve in her chosen areas and progress reports on how much she is changing. At the six- and twelve-month points, a mini-survey measures the level of her behavior change (Appendix 1).

Why it works for development: It is extremely time-efficient, taking only two to three hours per month, involves the people who know the leader best to help him/her change, measures results, holds the coachee accountable over time, and acknowledges that behavior change is a *process*, not an *event*. Feedforward puts responsibility for development into the hands of individuals, then lets them tailor the process as to who will be involved, what they will work on, and how conversations will take place. In addition, the structure of the process ensures continuous support and accountability conversations with a coach, which helps people to keep following through on their actions.



Trend 3: The decline of the heroic leader—the rise of collective leadership

The story of the last 50 years of leadership development has been the story of the individual. It began with discoveries about “what” made a good leader and was followed by the development of practices that helped a generation of individuals move closer to that ideal. The workplace context rewarded individuals who could think through a situation analytically and then direct others to carry out well-thought-through procedures. Leadership was not easy, but the process itself was comparatively clear. However, in the last 15 years this model has become less effective, as the “fit” between the challenges of the environment and the ability of the heroic individuals to solve them has started to diverge. The complexity of the new environment increasingly presents what Ronald Heifetz calls “adaptive challenges” in which it is not possible for any one individual to know the solution or even define the problem (the recent U.S. debt crisis, for example). Instead, adaptive challenges call for collaboration between various stakeholders who each hold a different aspect of the reality and many of whom must themselves adapt and grow if the problem is to be solved. These collectives, who often cross geographies, reporting lines, and organizations, need to collaboratively share information, create plans, influence each other, and make decisions.

A simple inference for those in charge of leadership development could be that we need to start teaching managers a new range of competencies that focus on collaboration and influence skills. However, several interviewees suggest that something more significant may be happening—the end of an era, dominated by individual leaders, and the beginning of another, which embraces *networks* of leadership.

The field of innovation has already begun this process. Andrew Hargadon, who has researched how innovations occur in organizations, says that until recently it was common to think that innovations came from lone geniuses who had “eureka” moments. However, in the last 10 years, contrary to this “great man” theory, researchers have shown that innovation is a result of large numbers of connection points in a network that cause existing ideas to be combined in new ways. Researchers now say that innovation doesn’t emanate from individual people; it “lives” in the social network.

Similarly, the field of leadership has long held up heroic individuals as examples of great leaders who could command and inspire organizations. This idea resonated with the public, as well as business audiences who sought to glean leadership secrets from these leaders’ books and speeches. However, a future made up of complex, chaotic environments is less suited to the problem solving of lone, decisive authority figures than it is to the distributed efforts of smart, flexible leadership networks.

This transition in thinking may not come quickly or easily. This was evident in the media’s efforts to find the “leader” of the movement that toppled Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak. Many people were interviewed by the media without it ever becoming clear who was directing the movement. In contrast, the youths who utilized social networking tools to force regime change after 30 years seemed clear that for them leadership was not aggregated in an individual (they didn’t have “a” leader), leadership was distributed throughout their network. This was not the first generation of youths to be frustrated with Mubarak and want him ousted, but it was the first with the tools and the collective mind-set to make it happen.

The younger generation’s comfort with social networking as the preferred means of connecting and influencing each other suggests that they will have little difficulty in accepting that leadership can be distributed throughout a network. But how quickly will others take on this thinking?

“If leadership is seen as a social process that engages everyone in a community, then it makes less sense to invest exclusively in the skills of individual leaders.”

Grady McGonagill and Tina Doerffer
“The Leadership Implications of the Evolving
Web,” Bertelsmann Stiftung Leadership Series

Redefining Leadership

A starting point for organizations may come from helping their people redefine what is meant by the term *leadership*. There has been a major trend among organizational theorists to shift the focus from leadership as a person or role to leadership as a *process*. For example:

- the process of mobilizing people to face difficult challenges (Heifetz, 1994)
- anyone and everyone who gets in place and helps keep in place the five performance conditions needed for effective group functioning²² (Hackman, 2002)
- “Leaders are any people in the organization actively involved in the process of producing direction, alignment, and commitment.” (McCauley & Van Velsor, 2004)

A key distinction in the definitions at left is that leadership can be enacted by anyone; it is not tied to a position of authority in the hierarchy. Heifetz, in fact, believes it is far easier to exercise leadership from a position outside of authority, without the constraints that authority brings. More importantly, these definitions do not tie the act of leadership to an individual. Leadership becomes free to be distributed throughout networks of people and across boundaries and geographies. *Who* is the leader becomes less important than *what* is needed in the system and how *we* can produce it.

If leadership is thought of as a shared process, rather than an individual skill set, senior executives must consider the best way to help leadership flourish in their organizations. Leadership spread throughout a network of people is more likely to flourish when certain “conditions” support it, including:

- open flows of information
- flexible hierarchies
- distributed resources
- distributed decision-making
- loosening of centralized controls

“Organizations and those who would exercise leadership have no choice about whether to accept a new world that differs fundamentally from the old. Welcomed or not, it is the inevitable future and is becoming the present in many organizations at a breathtaking pace. At the same time, there is a choice about whether to deny and react to these cultural and economic shifts or instead acknowledge and embrace them. And there is a choice as well—for both organizations and individuals—about whether and to what extent to cultivate the culture, mind-sets, skills, and knowledge that make it possible to leverage the enormous potential of the tools of the evolving web to better realize their purposes.”

Grady McGonagill and Tina Doerffer
“The Leadership Implications of the Evolving Web,”
Bertelsmann Stiftung Leadership Series²³

Organizations that choose to embrace these conditions will align themselves with the wave of new technologies that are changing the way we work and organize our workplaces. Grady McGonagill and Tina Doerffer (2011) suggest three stages of technological innovation that have already occurred:

1. **Web 1.0 (1991-2000)** in which tools for faster, cheaper, and more convenient forms of communication (such as email) became available and widely used
2. **Web 2.0 (2001-2010)** in which use of another set of new tools for communication (such as wikis and blogs) began enabling interaction and communication in transformative ways
3. **Web 3.0 (2011-present)** in which powerful new computing platforms (the Cloud), a second generation of search tools, and meta-level methods for managing knowledge (such as tags and folksonomies) are beginning to realize the web’s potential to generate more immediately and personally useful knowledge from archived information

While we are still in the early stages of thinking about leadership development at a collective level, it seems increasingly likely that future generations will see leadership residing within networks as a natural phenomenon. With the Internet and social networking flattening hierarchies and decentralizing control, leadership will be happening throughout the system, so development methods will *have* to follow it there, sooner rather than later.

How Might Leadership Look Different in a Network?

In order for organizations to become more effective at using networks of leadership, interviewees suggested a number of changes that would need to occur. First, at the collective level, the goal for an organization would be to create smart leadership networks, which can coalesce and disband in response to various organizational challenges. These networks might contain people from different geographies, functions, and specializations, both within and external to the organization. Just as brains become “smarter” as the number of neural networks and connections are increased, organizations that connect more parts of their social system to each other and build a culture of shared leadership will have greater adaptability and collective capacity.

Second, organizations would use their leadership development programs to help people understand that leadership is not contained in job roles but in the process that takes place across a network of people to continuously clarify *direction*, establish *alignment*, and garner *commitment* (DAC) of stakeholders. While leadership may sometimes be enacted by an individual, increasingly it will be a process that happens at the group level, with various people’s contributions influencing the DAC of the collective. As these changes happen, the distinction between who is a leader and who is a follower becomes less clear or relevant; everyone will be both at different times.

Both the Center for Creative Leadership (CCL[®]) and the Bertelsmann Foundation (a German research and publishing foundation) are exploring new ways to think about leadership development at the collective level. Both advocate looking at different strata at which leadership could take place. CCL outlines four levels, which they call SOGI (Society, Organization, Group, and Individual). At each of these levels they are innovating different practices specifically designed to enhance this strata’s level of development.²⁴

“Some of the most important innovations of coming decades will not be new technologies, but new ways of working together that are made possible by these new technologies.”

Thomas Malone
Patrick J. McGovern Professor
of Management, MIT Sloan
School of Management

Bertelsmann Stiftung (2010), in their comprehensive study of leadership development best practices, suggested that in the future, organizations could choose to invest their leadership development efforts to improve capacity at one of five different levels:

- individual capacity
- team capacity
- organizational capacity
- network capacity
- systems capacity

Depending on the area in which increased capacity is desired, organizations will target different group sizes and use different development practices (Appendix 4). Not all types of organizations will need to adopt this new paradigm of thinking. Traditional companies, in stable environments requiring little creativity from staff, may well be more effective if they stick to traditional, individualistic command and control management styles. However, organizations that expect to operate in VUCA environments will quickly need to develop the types of networks and cultures in which leadership flows through the system. Complex environments will reward flexible and responsive, collective leadership, and the time is fast approaching for organizations to redress the imbalance that has been created by focusing exclusively on the individual leadership model.

Trend 4: A new era of innovation in leadership development

If at least some of the changes mentioned in the preceding sections do transpire, there are no existing models or programs, which are capable of producing the levels of leadership capacity needed. While it will be easy for organizations to repeat the leadership practices that they have traditionally used, this continuation makes little sense if those methods were created to solve the problems of 10 years ago. Instead, an era of innovation will be required.

The creation of new development methods will be a process of punctuated progress. Transformations are most likely to begin with small pockets of innovators within organizations, who sense that change is either needed or inevitable. These innovators will need to be prepared to experiment and fail in order to gain more feedback from which to build their next iterations. L&D innovators will need to look to find partners within and outside of their organizations who they can join with to create prototypes that push the boundaries of the existing practices.

These types of innovative prototypes are already under way. At CCL, Chuck Palus and John McGuire are partnering with senior leadership teams to build “leadership cultures” rather than individual leader programs. Leadership teams engage in practices to elevate their own levels of development, thus creating “headroom” for the rest of the culture. Meanwhile, David Altman and Lyndon Rego are spreading leadership capacity throughout the system by taking CCL knowledge to the “base of the pyramid” and delivering programs on the sidewalks and in villages in Africa, Asia, and India.

Robert Kegan and Lisa Lahey are sharing their Immunity to Change process with universities, businesses, and school staff around the world. Rather than try to do it all themselves, they are equipping consultants, HR practitioners, and students to take their work out into their communities. Lisa Lahey comments, “We don’t expect to do it all, we are just two people.”

DUSUP, a Middle East oil producer, has changed its leadership programs from “content events” to “development processes” in which managers take ownership of their own development. All senior

managers engaged in a six-month process in which they learned the principles of development, then put those principles into practice on themselves. Only after they have had experience developing themselves with the new tools do they start coaching their team members to also apply them.

“First the industry needs to embrace the challenge of finding a new approach to leadership development and we haven’t done that yet. We are going to need to allow ourselves to come to a whole new paradigm about how to do this. We need to let go of the old mental models and find the people out there on the fringe.”

Lucy Dinwiddie
Global Learning & Executive Development
Leader, General Electric

All of these are early attempts to address the principles suggested in this paper:

- Build more collective, rather than individual, leadership in the network.
- Focus on vertical development, not just horizontal.
- Transfer greater ownership of development back to the people.

These examples are not “answers” to the development challenge but examples of innovations. Even greater innovative breakthroughs in the future may come from networks of people who can bring together and recombine different ideas and concepts from diverse domains. While leadership development communities currently exist with this aim, many limit their capacity for innovation by being excessively homogenous, with most members exclusively HR-related and of a similar generation and cultural background. This limits the effectiveness of these collectives, both in terms of the similarity of the ideas they bring as well the implementation of those ideas, which may fail to take into account the different values and priorities of stakeholders who will have to engage in any new practices.

In the future, innovative leadership development networks will need to increase the number of perspectives that they bring together, by crossing outside of the boundaries of the leadership development community and engaging other stakeholders to help come up with transformative innovations. Conferences that bring leadership development people together may in time give way to virtual networks facilitated by Organizational Development practitioners, which connect diverse groups of people who all have a stake in the process: executives, supervisors, customers, suppliers, as well as leadership development specialists.

This would require a different skill set for many learning and development specialists who must transfer from creating the programs for the executives to becoming the social facilitators of a construction process that involves all of the stakeholders in the system. Given this, the greatest challenge for the L&D community may be the ability to manage the network of social connections, so that the maximum number of perspectives can be brought together and integrated. The great breakthrough for the transformation of leadership development may turn out not to be the practices that are created but the social networking process that is developed to continuously present new practices to be distributed throughout the network.

Final Thoughts

Yesterday, I had lunch with a pair of New Zealand friends who are recent graduates from two prestigious Boston universities. While discussing how to start a new business, my first friend said that at his school, professors now tell them not to bother writing business plans, as you will never foresee all the important things which will happen once you begin. Instead they are taught to adopt the “drunken man stumble,” in which you keep staggering forward in the general direction of your vision, without feeling the need to go anywhere in a straight line. “That’s interesting,” said my second friend. “At our school they call it the ‘heat-seeking missile’ approach. First you launch in the direction of some potential targets, then you flail around until you lock onto a good one and try to hit it.”

At the start of this project I hoped that I would find some clear answers to what the future of leadership would look like, but after dozens of interviews, months of reading, and weeks of consolidation, I am humbled to say that what I now have is an educated “guess.” Will organizations really start to focus more of their efforts on vertical development? Will they actually educate and then transfer greater ownership back to the individuals? Will leadership really come to be seen as more of a collective process than an individual person? I am certain it should, but can I say it will?

However, there is one thing that I have become certain of and that is that the methods that have been used in the past to develop leaders really, truly, categorically will not be enough for the complexity of challenges which are on their way for organizations (and broader society). Human resource people, O.D. theorists, consultants, and training companies don’t have great influence over too many things that happen within organizations, but one area that they do have a strong influence over is how leadership is understood and how leadership capacity is developed. It seems to me that the art of practicing this area well is going to get much harder, as it, at the same time, becomes much more important.

For any of us who might feel disheartened by the size of our challenges, we can take heart from the fact that, like most future leadership challenges, we don’t have the solutions because there are no solutions (yet). The answers will not be found in a report (even a good one) but discovered along the way on the messy path of innovation. And while I like the thought that we will make our breakthroughs through the exciting metaphor of the heat-seeking missile, I fear that it will be the “drunken man stumble” for us all. And though not elegant, it’s at least comforting to know that the most important skill needed is the will to take another step forward. I offer this report as the first of many steps.

Nick Petrie
Cambridge, Massachusetts, August 2011

“In ice hockey they teach you to skate not to where the puck is, but to where it is going next.”

Ashish Nanda
Robert Braucher Professor of
Practice, Harvard Law School

Bibliography

- EDA Pearson. (2009). Trends in executive development. Retrieved from http://www.executivedevelopment.com/Portals/o/docs/EDA_Trends_09_Survey%20Summary.pdf
- Goffee, R. (2006, March). *Why should anyone be led by you?: What it takes to be an authentic leader*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Goldsmith, M., & Reiter M. (2007). *What got you here won't get you there: How successful people become even more successful*. New York: Hyperion.
- Hackman, J.R. (2002). *Leading teams: Setting the stage for great performances*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- IBM. (2010, May). Capitalizing on complexity: Insights from the Global Chief Executive Officer Study. Retrieved from <http://public.dhe.ibm.com/common/ssi/ecm/en/gbeo3297usen/GBEO3297USEN.PDF>
- Kegan, R., & Lahey, L. (2009). *Immunity to change: How to overcome it and unlock potential in yourself and your organization*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kerr, S. (2004). Executive ask: How can organizations best prepare people to lead and manage others? *Academy of Management Executive*, 18(3).
- Kenney, M. (2007). *From Pablo to Osama: Trafficking and terrorist networks, government bureaucracies, and competitive adaptation*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- McCauley, C., & Van Velsor, E. (2004). *The Center for Creative Leadership handbook of leadership development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- McGonagill, G., & Doerffer, T. (2011, January 10). The leadership implications of the evolving web. Retrieved from http://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/cps/rde/xchg/SID-6822B895FCFC3827/bst_engl/hs.xsl/100672_101629.htm
- McGuire, C., & Rhodes, G. (2009). *Transforming your leadership culture*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- McIlvaine, A. (2010). The leadership factor. Retrieved from <http://www.hreonline.com/HRE/story.jsp?storyId=330860027>
- Uhl-Bien, M., & Russ, M. (2009). Complexity leadership in bureaucratic forms of organizing: A meso model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(4), 631-650.

References

- ¹ See IBM, Capitalizing on Complexity: Insights from the Global Chief Executive Officer Study. Retrieved from <http://public.dhe.ibm.com/common/ssi/ecm/en/gbeo3297usen/GBEO3297USEN.PDF>
- ² Perrow, C. (1986). Snowden & Boone, 2007.
- ³ See EDA Pearson, Trends in Executive Development. Retrieved from http://www.executivedevelopment.com/Portals/o/docs/EDA_Trends_09_Survey%20Summary.pdf
- ⁴ See A. McIlvaine, The Leadership Factor. Retrieved from <http://www.hreonline.com/HRE/story.jsp?storyId=330860027>
- ⁵ Ibid.
- ⁶ See M. Goldsmith and M. Reiter, *What Got You Here Won't Get You There: How Successful People Become Even More Successful*. (Hyperion, 2007).
- ⁷ Interestingly, the strong attachment to the pimping technique by senior surgeons has led to the teaching mantra, "pimp 'em till they bleed."
- ⁸ Kegan, personal communication, January 2010.
- ⁹ R. Kegan and L. Lahey, . (2009). *Immunity to change: How to overcome it and unlock potential in yourself and your organization*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- ¹⁰ Ibid., p. 23.
- ¹¹ For a fuller explanation of Torbert & Harthill Associates' Action Logics, see Appendix 3.
- ¹² See Personal and Organizational Transformations: Through action inquiry with. Dalmar Fisher, David Rooke and Bill Torbert. Edge\Work Press, Boston MA (2000 ISBN 0-9538184-0-3)
- ¹³ McGuire and Rhodes (2009) outline six steps they recommend to develop leadership cultures: The Inside-Out, Role Shifting Experience Phase; The Readiness for Risk and Vulnerability Phase; The Headroom and Widening Engagement Phase; The Innovation Phase; The Structure, Systems, and Business Processes Phase; and The Leadership Transformation Phase.
- ¹⁴ To learn about methodologies for how individuals vertically develop, refer to Kegan and Lahey (2009).
- ¹⁵ Richard Hackman, personal communication, November 2010.

References

- ¹⁶ R. Goffee, *Why Should Anyone Be Led by You?: What it takes to be an authentic leader* (Harvard Business School Press, March 2006).
- ¹⁷ For more on Kenney's fascinating study on how drug cartels and terror groups became learning organizations, see his book *From Pablo to Osama: Trafficking and terrorist networks, government bureaucracies, and competitive adaptation* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007).
- ¹⁸ Executive Ask: How can organizations best prepare people to lead and manage others? (*Academy of Management Executive* 18(3), 2004)
- ¹⁹ To learn more, refer to this article by Chelsea Pollen from Google, who outlines the ways in which online social tools can be used for development: <http://www.elearnmag.org/subpage.cfm?section=reviews&article=19-1>
- ²⁰ Hackman, personal communication, October 2010.
- ²¹ This poses an interesting question of whether we are likely to see greater divergence of development in organizations. We have seen this happening with pay rates over the last 50 years, with those at the top becoming far better paid than those at the middle and bottom. It is interesting to consider if we could see something similar happen with developmental levels and what that would mean.
- ²² Hackman's five conditions are: a real team, compelling direction, enabling structure, supportive context, expert coaching. For more, see J. R. Hackman, *Leading Teams: Setting the stage for great performances*. (Harvard Business Press 2002).
- ²³ G. McGonagill and T. Doerffer, *The Leadership Implications of the Evolving Web*, (January 10, 2011). Retrieved from http://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/cps/rde/xchg/SID-6822B895-FCFC3827/bst_engl/hs.xsl/100672_101629.htm
- ²⁴ See McGuire and Rhodes, *Transforming Your Leadership Culture* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2009).

Appendix 1: Feedforward–Aggregated Feedback Summary for a Group of Seven Managers

Mini-Survey Results

Direct Report Feedback Summary

Has your manager become more (or less) effective in the past few months on the following items?

	Less Effective		No Perceptible Change			More Effective		No Change Needed Not Enough Information	
	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	NCN	NI
Personal Improvement Items:									
Aggregate of Direct Report Feedback (# of respondents).....		1	1	4	4	16	19	2	1
.....%		2.2	2.2	8.9	8.9	35.6	42.2		
Has this manager become a more effective leader in the past few months?.....	1		1	4	1	4	12	1	1
.....%	4.3		4.3	17.4	4.3	17.4	52.2		

Response and Follow-Up

Did this manager talk with you about his/her feedback and action plan after the Leadership Workshop?

YES = 20
80%

NO = 5
20%

How much follow-up has this manager done with you on his/her action item?

3	12%	Did NOT Respond, No Follow-Up
4	16%	Responded, but Did NOT Follow-Up
2	8%	Responded, but a LITTLE Follow-Up
5	20%	Responded, but Did SOME Follow-Up
5	20%	Responded, but Did FREQUENT Follow-Up
6	24%	Responded, but CONSISTENT/PERIODIC Follow-Up

Some of the specific leadership skills that individuals committed to improve:

I will . . .

- Address issues/conflicts/problems both positively and developmentally
- Develop a (my group) strategy linked to the (company) business strategy
- Develop the best team
- Know what motivates my group to perform different tasks
- Delegate effectively to my new team
- Ensure that my conversations are not perceived as confrontational, and are more problem-solving
- Delegate more effectively
- More skillfully manage unanticipated challenges from internal business partners to improve my communication to my stakeholders
- Do a better job of understanding what motivates people
- Know and communicate what my customers want

Appendix 2: Example of Immunity to Change Map

Behavior Change Map			
1 Behavior Goals (Visible Goals)	2 Doing/Not Doing Instead (Behaviors Which Work Against the Goal)	3 Hidden Competing Goals	4 My Big Assumptions
<p>I need to be more patient with people</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wait until they have finished talking. • Talk slower. • Walk around the office slower. • Not pressure people so much. • Give other people a chance to talk. • Listen to people. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I interrupt people when they are talking. • I make decisions very quickly. • I walk very fast around the office. • I talk very fast and very loud. • I sometimes forget to say hello to people. • I sometimes pay no attention to people who are talking. 	<p>Worries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I will have to spend three to four more hours every day. It will mean long days. • My family will be affected. • My home life will affect my work life. • My attention will be diverted to nonsense things and that will delay important things. <p>I am committed to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not wasting my time on nonsense • not damaging my home life • not seeing my performance drop because of people wasting my time • not having my image and career stalled because my performance drops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I need to be fast and impatient all the time or I will not get results. • If I am not fast and impatient all the time, my results will decrease and my image will be damaged.

Appendix 3: Torbert & Harthill Associates' Action Logics

Action Logic	Characteristics	Leadership Strengths	Weaknesses
Opportunist	Wins any way possible. Self-oriented; manipulative; "might makes right."	Good in emergencies and in sales opportunities.	Forcibly self-interested and manipulative. Rejects feedback and externalizes blame.
Diplomat	Avoids overt conflict. Wants to belong; obeys group norms; rarely rocks the boat.	Good as supportive glue within an office; helps bring people together.	Avoids conflict, rigidly conforms and is status-driven. Sees negative feedback as punishment.
Expert	Rules by logic and expertise. Seeks rational efficiency.	Good as an individual contributor.	Critical and dogmatic. Chooses efficiency over effectiveness. Resists "subjective" feedback.
Achiever	Meets strategic goals. Effectively achieves goals through teams; juggles managerial duties and market demands.	Well suited to managerial roles; action and goal oriented.	Can be over-driven to achieve self-chosen "objective" standards. Blind to complex subjectivity.
Individualist	Interweaves competing personal and company action logics. Creates unique structures to resolve gaps between strategy and performance.	Effective in venture and consulting roles.	Can be a maverick, an outsider or rebel. Their independence can work against collaboration.
Strategist	Generates organizational and personal transformations. Exercises the power of mutual inquiry, vigilance, and vulnerability for both the short and long term.	Effective as a transformational leader within large contexts such as organizations.	Tempted by the dark side of power. May not employ their skills in a given context.
Alchemist	Generates social transformations. Integrates material, spiritual, and societal transformation.	Good at leading society-wide transformations.	Personal suffering may obstruct the use of their skills.

For more, see <http://www.harthill.co.uk/leadership-development-framework/seven-action-logics.html>

Appendix 4: Bertelsmann Stiftung Leadership Development

Leadership Development Investment Matrix

Goal of Development Effort

Level of System Targeted	Individual Capacity	Team Capacity	Organizational Capacity	Network Capacity	Systems Capacity
Individuals	1. Develop capacity of individuals for self-awareness, ongoing learning, and exercising initiative	2. Develop capacity of individuals to work together in groups and lead teams	3. Develop capacity of individuals to understand and lead organizations	4. Develop capacity of individuals to cultivate and leverage peer relationships	5. Develop capacity of individuals to see the big picture, understand root causes, and influence systems
Teams	6. Develop capacity of teams to develop and elicit the full potential of all team members	7. Develop capacity of teams to define and attain purposes	8. Develop capacity of teams to enhance organizational performance	9. Develop capacity of teams to align their goals and activities across boundaries	10. Develop capacity of teams to prototype systems change
Organizations	11. Develop capacity of organizations to support staff, volunteer, and board member development	12. Develop capacity of organizations to support effective teamwork	13. Develop capacity of organizations to foster internal collaboration to effectively adapt to challenges	14. Develop capacity of organizations to collaborate with one another	15. Develop capacity of organizational coalitions to lead systemic change
Communities	16. Develop capacity of communities to support reflective learning and engagement of community members	17. Develop capacity of communities to foster and support inclusive group initiatives	18. Develop capacity of communities to sustain organizations that promote community well-being	19. Develop capacity of communities to learn together and align efforts toward common goals	20. Develop capacity of communities to advocate systems change
Fields of Policy and Practice	21. Develop capacity of fields to cultivate innovative thought leaders and practitioners	22. Develop capacity of fields to organize around shared interests and goals	23. Develop capacity of fields to organize and disseminate knowledge and field best practices	24. Develop capacity of fields to find synergies across institutional silos and disciplinary boundaries	25. Develop capacity of fields to generate policy solutions and transform institutional practices and culture

http://www.ila-net.org/members/directory/downloads/webinars/2010.05-Leadership_Development_in_US_Presentation.pdf



Center for Creative Leadership®

The Center for Creative Leadership (CCL®) is a top-ranked, global provider of leadership development. By leveraging the power of leadership to drive results that matter most to clients, CCL transforms individual leaders, teams, organizations, and society. Our array of cutting-edge solutions is steeped in extensive research and experience gained from working with hundreds of thousands of leaders at all levels. Ranked among the world's Top 10 providers of executive education by *Bloomberg Businessweek* and the *Financial Times*, CCL has offices in Greensboro, NC; Colorado Springs, CO; San Diego, CA; Brussels, Belgium; Moscow, Russia; Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; Johannesburg, South Africa; Singapore; Gurgaon, India; and Shanghai, China

CCL - Americas

www.ccl.org
+1 800 780 1031 (U.S. or Canada)
+1 336 545 2810 (Worldwide)
info@ccl.org

Greensboro, North Carolina

+1 336 545 2810

Colorado Springs, Colorado

+1 719 633 3891

San Diego, California

+1 858 638 8000

CCL - Europe, Middle East, Africa

www.ccl.org/emea

Brussels, Belgium

+32 (0) 2 679 09 10
ccl.emea@ccl.org

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

+251 118 957086
LBB.Africa@ccl.org

Johannesburg, South Africa

+27 (11) 783 4963
southafrica.office@ccl.org

Moscow, Russia

+7 495 662 31 39
ccl.cis@ccl.org

CCL - Asia Pacific

www.ccl.org/apac

Singapore

+65 6854 6000
ccl.apac@ccl.org

Gurgaon, India

+91 124 676 9200
cclindia@ccl.org

Shanghai, China

+86 182 0199 8600
ccl.china@ccl.org

Affiliate Locations: Seattle, Washington • Seoul, Korea • College Park, Maryland • Ottawa, Ontario, Canada
Ft. Belvoir, Virginia • Kettering, Ohio • Huntsville, Alabama • San Diego, California • St. Petersburg, Florida
Peoria, Illinois • Omaha, Nebraska • Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan • Mt. Eliza, Victoria, Australia