This paper creates a platform for discussion and learning. The views and opinions presented by the author are not necessarily shared by Bertelsmann Stiftung.
Authors:

Grady McGonagill
With Peter W. Pruyn
McGonagill Associates
Brookline, MA, U.S.A.
grady@mcgonagill-associates.com

For more information about the initiative:

Tina Doerffer
Bertelsmann Stiftung
Gütersloh, Germany
Tina.Doerffer@bertelsmann-stiftung.de
# Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TABLE OF CONTENTS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. THE NATURE OF THE STUDY</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Study Purpose and Scope</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Methodological Assumptions and Limits</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TRENDS AFFECTING LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Societal Trends</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Trends in Understanding How Adults Learn and Develop</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Trends in Understanding/Definition of Leadership</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. BEST PRACTICE: PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Programs Supporting Individual Leader Development</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Programs Supporting Collective Leadership Development</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Noteworthy Theories, Tools, and Practices</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 The Potential of the World Wide Web for Leadership Development</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Sector-Specific Patterns in Leadership Development</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY FOR FOUNDATIONS CONSIDERING SPONSORSHIP OF LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 The Value of Investing in Leadership Development</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Strategies for Investing in Leadership Development</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 The Value of Building a Leadership Development Model</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEX OF ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>END NOTES</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

This study aims to identify best practices in leadership development in the U.S. as part of a larger initiative to enhance the quality of leadership in the public sector and civil society in Germany. For the most part it reflects analysis of patterns in existing cases and other studies rather than compilation of new information. At the same time, by looking systematically at leadership development practices in all sectors, it offers what the authors believe to be a unique contribution.

Background trends

Leadership development has undergone tremendous evolution in recent decades. It is now at a stage of acute fermentation, stimulated by the intersection of a number of trends:

- In society, where:
  - Increasingly complex, global challenges require new levels of capacity and consciousness from leaders
  - Technology provides new resources for learning
  - Networks and multi-stakeholder partnerships offer new resources for change

- In our understanding of adult development, where we now:
  - Draw upon new learning from neuroscience and psychology
  - Realize the potential for adults to continue to evolve in consciousness
  - Appreciate the challenge and support required for continued learning and development

- In the evolution of leadership theory, which increasingly:
  - Places new emphasis on leading change
  - Appreciates the contribution of collective wisdom and leadership
  - Offers potent new “meta-theories” and related practices

Principles and Patterns of Best Practice

The study strives to identify “best practices” while acknowledging the inherent limits of such an effort. Leadership development is an “adaptive” challenge to which there are no clearly defined solutions; evidence of impact for most programs is scant. Nonetheless, the best programs appear to be designed and implemented in accordance with nine general principles:

1. Reinforce/build a supportive culture
2. Ensure high-level sponsorship
3. Tailor the goals and approach of the program to the context
4. Target programs toward specific audiences
5. Integrate all features of the program
6. Use a variety of learning methods
7. Offer extended learning periods with sustained support
8. Encourage commitment to self-development
9. Commit to continuous improvement

Effective programs appear to have more to do with the quality of overall design, integration and implementation than with the choice of particular elements. However, the most effective programs draw on a small number of common practices that have been well documented. The study synthesizes existing research and analysis to offer profiles of seven of the most common practices for individual leader development:

1. Job definition/assignment
2. Action learning
3. Assessment/feedback
4. Formal instruction
5. Coaching
6. Mentoring
7. Networking

We also identify effective approaches to collective leadership development:

- Within organizations
- Across organizations
- In particular communities
- Aiming for systemic change

In addition, we briefly summarize a number of noteworthy theories, tools, and modules that are particularly powerful or promising. The theories include three “meta-theories”:

- Organizational learning
- Integral leadership
- Theory U

We also recommend a number of tools and modules at four levels:

- Intrapersonal
  - Constructive developmental theory and assessment tools
  - Mental models
  - Immunity to change
– Personal mastery
– Presencing
– Mindful awareness practices
– Authentic leadership
– Embodied consciousness
– Personality style assessment
– Solo retreats in nature

• Interpersonal/Team
  – Interpersonal skills
  – Facilitation skills
  – Dialogue
  – Shared vision

• Organizational
  – Systems thinking
  – Storytelling
  – Adaptive leadership
  – Rapid-cycle prototyping

• Transorganizational/Systemic
  – Convening
  – Learning journeys
  – Communities of practice
  – Communities of place
  – Multi-stakeholder partnerships
  – Social networking technology

As part of our review of tools, we take a special look at the powerful implications of web-based technologies for leadership development, reviewing:

• The features of Web 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0
• The implications of these tools for organizations in the three primary sectors
• Their implications for leadership and leadership development

We discovered common features across all sectors regarding both the challenges of leadership development and the responses that constitute “best practice.” However, we found striking differences as well, reflecting differing patterns by sector of challenge and constraint:

• The private sector—driven by competition and supported by clear performance metrics—invests the most resources and has generated the most documentation. This sector most
fully illustrates the value of leadership development and the variety of approaches possible, although programs are typically limited to the development of individual leaders.

- The public sector—which faces more ambiguous challenges and operates with greater constraints—invests less in leadership development and has generated fewer visible examples of best practice. However, the U.S. military offers some of the best examples of best practice in any sector.

- The non-profit sector—where foundations have learned the importance of leadership development as a means to organizational effectiveness—has begun to invest heavily in leadership development and is sponsoring a wide range of creative approaches, along with thoughtful documentation and research. This sector illustrates a clear trend toward network- rather than organization-centric leadership and toward collective leadership development.

- Multi-sector/multi-stakeholder programs—which deliberately recruit individuals from all parts and levels of the system—have recently evolved to address the increasingly complex “adaptive” societal challenges that transcend any single sector and that require broad participation to be fully understood and effectively engaged.

**Implications for Foundations**

In conclusion we affirm the value of investing in leadership development, which has been demonstrated in all sectors. For example, it can:

- Attract, retain, and develop the best talent
- Build a culture supportive of the organization’s mission
- Create an institutional competitive advantage
- Foster networks across organizations to address complex, multi-sectoral problems
- Develop the mindsets, skills, and communities of practice to bring about systemic change

We review the strategies that foundations could use to this end in their internal practices. And we identify the most common funding strategies that have been employed by foundations, providing a number of specific illustrations:

- Support leadership development
  - Within organizations
  - In communities
  - In specific sectors or fields of practice
  - As a means of addressing specific problems
- Build system-wide capacity for leadership
• Support applications of evolving web-based technologies to enhance the effectiveness of organization- and network-centric programs

As this list illustrates, there is enormous variety in the ways in which a foundation can approach leadership development. How can a foundation staff go about choosing among them? We recommend that any foundation considering investing in this area develop a “Leadership Development Model” to guide its design of an initiative. As a tool for model building we offer a “Leadership Strategy Option Matrix” that we adapted from the most outstanding studies of best practice. The 5x5 matrix provides a systematic way of choosing from among a broad range of strategies, including systemic initiatives that foundations are uniquely well positioned to undertake. Such a model can continue to evolve through participation in a “community of practice” on leadership development.

In conclusion, we offer the judgment that foundations can exercise the highest leverage by fostering the development of and participating in “eco-systems” to support leadership development. They are uniquely positioned to do so and can, in our view, make an enormous social contribution.
1. The Nature of the Study

1.1 Study Purpose and Scope

The Charge

This study is one component of a larger project by the Bertelsmann Stiftung on “Leadership Education.” Our original charge was to identify “best practices” in leadership development, with the aim of contributing to the design of curricula for a potentially wide range of audiences in the public and non-profit sectors in Germany. The project has input from several other studies: on the theory of leadership in Germany and the U.S., on leadership development programs in Germany and selected European programs, and on program evaluation. The curricula will be developed with the help of a consulting team.

The Scope

Although the ultimate purpose is to support leadership development in the public and non-profit sectors, the study aims to draw upon best practice not only in these domains but in the corporate world as well. We were asked to focus principally on the U.S. as a source of innovation from a long-established field of practice.

1.2 Methodological Assumptions and Limits

1.2.1 Resource Constraints

The study has been undertaken under significant constraints on resources and time. We originally set out to identify several examples in each of these sectors, some initiated by organizations in those sectors, some offered by other entities (e.g., executive education programs). However, it became evident that a better use of limited resources would instead be to look for patterns in available research on best practices in leadership development. Therefore the study draws for the most part upon existing literature and the judgments of others rather than original research for examples to illustrate themes and trends.

Our principal research methods have been:

- Identifying relevant literature and web-based information on leadership and leadership development
- Inviting input from and selectively interviewing colleagues and experts in the field
- Interviewing practitioners associated with programs that came to our attention from the above sources
1.2.2 The Challenge of Identifying “Best Practice”

In writing this paper, limited resources were not the only constraint on what we could reasonably expect to accomplish. It soon became clear that there were profound methodological difficulties as well. In a soon-to-be-published book review of best-practice tools, Kelly Hannum, director of Global Research for the Center for Creative Leadership, writes: “‘Best’ in the context of training has become a fairly meaningless word that is used in an attempt to imbue something with value, without qualification. ‘Best’ can mean cheap, easy to do, what everyone else is doing, or any number of things that may, or may not, matter.” She proposes instead to replace “best” with “most effective.” We would agree. But how do you know what is most effective?

Here again we find reason to be cautious. A recent survey of 270 European consumers of executive education found that the vast majority of organizations only evaluate at the level of participant reactions. While “86% regularly evaluate at this level, only 11% do so at the organizational level, and only 3% regularly assess the financial ROI [return on investment] of executive education.” (Charlton & Kuhn, 2005, pp. 242-252). In the studies we reviewed, we found few instances in which a compelling case had been documented for the value attributed to the program. One study profiled evaluation methods and outcomes for 10 companies, but such data are a dramatic exception to a general rule (Bolt, Dulworth, & McGrath, 2005, pp. 117-133). And even such data are suspect. We spoke to a number of experienced practitioners who expressed extreme skepticism about the validity of ROI calculations. One defended the lack of rigorous evaluations: “There is no meaningful criterion for success that can be directly and unambiguously assessed. The reason most organizations don't spend money assessing the organizational impact and financial ROI of leadership development programs is that it's extremely difficult to do well and very expensive. I think for most organizations with a limited budget, it's probably best to spend as much as possible on really good instructors/facilitators, and forget about trying to calculate ROI.”

Others pointed to the flaws that have been identified in even the most highly regarded studies of the “best” organizations, including often-cited works such as In Search of Excellence and Good to Great (Rosenzweig, 2007). Still others cast doubt on the very notion of a best practice that can be exported from one environment to another. Such skeptics argue that the nature of leadership challenges is such that clearly defined, replicable best practices are not feasible because the leadership challenges of organizations (and society) tend to be “adaptive” (ill-defined, with no clear, universal, replicable solutions) rather than “technical” (clearly defined, with clearly prescribed solutions) (Heifetz, 1994).

Still more fundamental is the question of what one means by “leadership.” Without a clear definition, it is hard to be certain how best to develop it. Yet one of the more useful studies reported that “Gary Yukl’s observation from 10 years ago is just as true today: ‘The field of
leadership is presently in a state of ferment and confusion. Most of the leadership theories are beset with conceptual weaknesses and lack strong empirical support” (Yukl, 1994, as cited in Hubbard, 2005, p. 5). The report goes on to recall Warren Bennis’s observation in 1959 that “probably more has been written and less known about leadership than about any other topic in the behavioral sciences” (2005, p. 4).

These concerns lead us to aim to follow in the footsteps of what we regard as the most sophisticated studies, which tend to be “careful not to characterize the strategies presented here as ‘best practice.’” (Hubbard, 2005, p. 4). One study used the more modest term “promising practices” (Meehan & Reinelt, 2007). We offer our observations as something closer to “patterns in leadership development practices based on programs that 1) have been singled out by scholars and respected professionals, 2) have been designed and implemented in an imaginative and rigorous way, and 3) seem promising and offer at least some evidence of impact.”

1.2.3 Domains of Best Practice

This study reflects some choices about where to look for best practices. We were asked to consider practices in the three sectors—private, public, and non-profit—and to consider executive education programs serving those sectors. Our own experience led us to add an additional area of leadership development activity: programs explicitly serving multi-stakeholder audiences. After some initial exploration we realized we faced the option of reporting on best practice in the following areas:

1. Programs focused on individual leader development offered on an open enrollment based, either geared toward specific sectors or open to members of any sector (e.g., executive education offerings, workshops by consulting firms)

2. Programs focused on individual leader development in specific organizations in each of the three primary sectors—private, public, and non-profit

3. Programs focused on individual leader development explicitly serving representatives from multiple sectors

4. Programs focused on collective leadership development serving representatives from organizations in multiple sectors

We decided to focus on points two, three and four, giving only passing attention to point one. The primary reason for this was simply that there are limited data on the effectiveness of external programs (particularly executive education and programs offered by consulting firms), so any comparative judgments are highly susceptible to bias and error.³ We also imagine that lessons from the selected areas will be more useful to readers of this report. However, we did
come across some very illuminating case profiles of programs of type 1 and make reference to them.

Late in the study we became aware of an “organization-centric” bias, noting that leadership development programs in the non-profit sector are increasingly “network-centric.” We have attempted to correct that bias in our summary of patterns and practices in the non-profit world and in a separate section on collective leadership.

1.2.4 Definitions of Leadership and Leadership Development

It is important at the outset to make clear any assumptions guiding the study regarding leadership and developing it. Later in this report we summarize trends with respect to the evolution of common understandings of “leadership” and “leadership development.” However, we want to make explicit here the assumptions we were aware of making as we approached this inquiry:

- We define leadership inclusively, not trying to resolve the multitude of definitions in use.
- While we emphasize leadership over management, we see the boundary as blurred and have not tried to draw a strict line between them.
- We are interested not only in programs and practices that develop the skills of individual leaders but also those that develop the capacity for leadership within organizations and systems. Similarly, we are interested in collective as well as individual leadership.
- We assume that there are many means to developing leadership, some more explicit than others. We have therefore sought out not only programs that have significant elements of formal instruction but also those that enable learning through a variety of other methods, such as on-the-job learning, action learning, feedback, mentoring and coaching, etc.
# 2. Trends Affecting Leadership

## 2.1 Societal Trends

A number of societal trends have led to an overall increase in interest and investment in leadership development in recent decades (Hubbard, 2005, p. 8). Some of these trends also have implications for leadership development. (This is of course a highly selective list and may not reflect deeper background trends of interest to an inquiry with broader scope.)

### Societal Trends and Their Implications for Leadership and Leadership Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Implication for Leadership</th>
<th>Implication for Leadership Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accelerating pace of change</td>
<td>• Coping with change is increasingly required</td>
<td>• Need to build capacity for change leadership requiring flexibility, tolerance for uncertainty and ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased complexity</td>
<td>• Increased need to collaborate across sectors to solve multi-faceted problems</td>
<td>• Need to cultivate capacity for leadership and collaboration across organizations and sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leaders “in over their heads” in their ability to effectively lead adaptive responses to organizational and social problems</td>
<td>• Need to support leaders not just in developing more skill but also higher consciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgeoning ecological crises</td>
<td>• Emerging role of leaders as environmental stewards</td>
<td>• Learning that sustainability is an integral part of organizational purpose and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased role as macro system thinkers</td>
<td>• Skill in articulation of sustainability as a strategic principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization and internationalism</td>
<td>• Increased competitive pressures that increase stress and limit time available for development</td>
<td>• Need to support development of skills in cross-cultural communication and conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Need for cross-cultural, inter-religious/ethnic knowledge and comfort-level</td>
<td>• Pressure to develop more efficient ways of supporting leadership development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolving internet</td>
<td>• New ways of communicating, collaborating</td>
<td>• New options for enabling/reinforcing learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Emerging need for virtual leadership</td>
<td>• Need to build skills in virtual leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition for talent</td>
<td>• Challenge to recruit, engage and hold the best</td>
<td>• Appreciating role of leader in developing people and engendering loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic upheaval, downsizing,</td>
<td>• New pressures for hard decisions</td>
<td>• Need for skills in inspiring hope while being candid and firm in dealing with harsh realities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unemployment</td>
<td>• Need to cope with increased workload, insecurity and guilt among “survivors”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Trends in Understanding How Adults Learn and Develop

Some trends are more specific to the effort to bring about lasting change in people within and beyond organizational settings. The most prominent are:

- Better understanding of the nature of adult learning
  - Recognition that people learn by doing and that learning is best when it has an experiential, task-related component (leading to more experienced-based methods in organizational leadership development programs, such as action learning, job rotation, project assignments, coaching and mentoring)
  - Learning needs to be reinforced on multiple dimensions (leading to programs that pay attention to different aspects of human development: cognitive, emotional, physical, spiritual)
  - Appreciation that leadership development, like human development in general, requires a subtle balance of challenge and support
  - Recognition that development requires loss as well as gain, requiring attention to letting go of old patterns in thought and action as well as learning new ones
  - Appreciation of different levels of learning, depending on the degree to which the learning is “transformative” (e.g., single-, double-, and triple-loop learning)

- Emergence of brain science
  - Recognition that behavior change is more possible than previously thought (neuroplasticity)
  - Understanding that behavior change is difficult because old patterns are supported by well-worn neural pathways and require sustained energy and attention

- Increased attention to developing capacity for higher quality consciousness
  - Accumulating evidence that meditation can reduce stress and increase “mindfulness”
  - Increased interest in spirituality and in bringing that perspective into organizations
  - Recognition that effectiveness in organizational settings is closely linked to personal qualities: professional development and personal development significantly overlap

2.3 Trends in Understanding/Definition of Leadership

Conceptions of leadership evolve with the times, with implications for leadership development. Here are a few trends that stand out for us:

- Many definitions. The meaning of “leadership” has evolved in response to these trends. However, one thing has remained constant over the years: the term “leadership” means
many things to different people. Bennis and Nanus (1985) drive this point home in claiming to have found over 350 definitions of leadership. Similarly, the scholar Northouse reports, “In the past 50 years, there have been as many as 65 different classification systems developed to define the dimensions of leadership” (Northouse, 2007, p. 2).

- Leadership vs. management. One distinction that has become more clear during this period is that between leadership and management. One scholar, who claimed to have read everything written on leadership up until 1990, articulated the definition he believed was tacit in most of those theories: “Great men and women with certain preferred traits influencing followers to do what the leaders wish in order to achieve group/organizational goals that reflect excellence.” (Rost, 1991, p. 180). He then observes that this is really a definition of management, because it does not include what is most distinctive about leadership: change. Surprisingly, most definitions in current use are still quite consistent with the more management-oriented definition. For example, Northouse defines leadership as “a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (2007, p.3). Similarly, Jay Conger, one of the principal students of leadership development, concludes that “Leaders are individuals who establish direction for a working group of individuals, who gain commitment from these group members to this direction, and who then motivate these members to achieve the direction’s outcomes” (1992, p.18).

- Importance of change as a component of leadership. Rost offers what he believes is a more robust definition of leadership than those that preceded him: “An influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes.” This not only embraces the notion of change, but also acknowledges the reality that influence can be two-way. Joseph Jaworski captures this notion concisely: “Leadership is about creating new realities.” (Senge, Scharmer, Jaworski, & Flowers, 2004). And change is implicit in Ronald Heifetz’s definition (1994): “Mobilizing people to tackle tough problems.”

- Leadership as an activity (vs. a role). Heifetz is among the writers who have encouraged a separation between leadership as a role and a behavior. From this perspective leaders are leaders not by virtue of their role but what they do, from any role. Leaders are persons at any level within or outside organizations who are “actively involved in the process of producing direction, alignment, and commitment” (McCauley & Van Velsor, 2004, p. 2).

- Leadership as a collective process. A related trend is to shift the emphasis from individual “leaders” to the interaction among leaders and followers and the spontaneous emergence of leadership from the collective (Hubbard, 2005). “Leadership is...about creating a ‘system’ or ‘culture’ in which members instinctively do the ‘right thing’ even when the official leaders are absent” (Drath & Palus, 1994).
• Emphasis on development of leadership capacity in systems as well as leadership skills in individuals. 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. Developing the capacity of the system for leadership is at least as important. The Center for Creative Leadership defines leader development as “the expansion of a person’s capacity to be effective in leadership roles and processes.” Whereas leadership development is “the expansion of the organization’s capacity to enact the basic leadership tasks needed for collective work: setting direction, creating alignment, maintaining commitment” (Hubbard, 2005, p. 13).

• Evolution from exclusive attention to organization-centric leadership toward network-centric leadership. The need to address complex problems that defy the capacity of any single organization or sector has led to recognition of the importance of building networks to forge relationships. Such relationships serve as a source of leadership across organizational or sectoral boundaries (Fine, 2006, pp. 50-51). The U.S. military has discovered that even within traditional organizational structures, networks are the best way to respond nimbly to a rapidly changing environment because they allow information, technology and combat assets to be used as efficiently as possible (U.S. Department of Defense, 2002).

• Recognition that leadership can be self organizing. Similarly, leadership is seen as potentially arising informally from anywhere in an organization or larger system, not just from directives from above.

• Leadership is grounded in the personal qualities of individual leaders. There has been a remarkable resurgence of emphasis on the personal qualities of leaders. This is where leadership theory began: underlying the “Great Man” theory of leadership was the notion that leadership is about “who you are.” It later evolved through an emphasis on “what you do,” and then to a more particular emphasis on “what you do in a particular situation.” But beginning with the writing on “charismatic” leadership (Burns, 1978), attention has been shifting back toward a recognition that leading is personal. This encourages and legitimizes incorporating personal development as an element of leadership development. One difference between the Great Man theory and the emerging perspective is that most people now assume that while some leaders may be “born” (i.e., possess traits that were either inherited or acquired at an early age) most are “made” (i.e., learn much of their ability to lead from experience and formal learning).

• Increased emphasis on developing leadership capacity in others. The belief that leaders are born not made not only expands the notion of who can be leaders, it also expands the responsibilities of a leader. An important dimension of leading becomes the ability to cultivate the propensity for leadership in subordinates who have it naturally as well as supporting the development of those with little inborn talent for leading.
• Rise of constructive-developmental theory. In the past several decades a particular set of theories of human development has had an increasing influence on leadership theory. Constructive-developmental psychology posits that human development does not stop when we reach adulthood but continues (or has the potential to continue) throughout a lifetime (Kegan, 1982; Torbert & Cook-Greuter, 2004). In this view people evolve through stages; leaders who have attained higher stages of development are able to draw on greater complexity in the way they see the world and the options they can imagine and implement (Joiner & Josephs, 2007).

• Incorporation of perspectives from Eastern and indigenous traditions. Western scientific and pragmatic ideas are increasingly supplemented by principles of leadership and leadership development that draw on thousands of years of accumulated wisdom in Eastern spiritual traditions and indigenous cultures. These perspectives place greater emphasis on the importance of consciousness and its potential to emerge from community (Scharmer, 2007).

• Acknowledgement of the ethical dimensions of leadership. Was Hitler a “good” leader? According to almost all of the current definitions of leadership, the answer is “yes.” But challenges to that view are taking root. A strong implicit challenge came in Robert Greenleaf’s Servant Leadership (Greenleaf, 1977), which called for leaders to adopt an attitude of service. This was reinforced by Collins’ highlighting of the humility of “Level 5 leadership” (Collins, 2001) More recently Kellerman, in a book provocatively titled Bad Leadership (Kellerman, 2004), points to the cost of not defining leadership to include ethics as well as effectiveness. And Peter Senge’s latest work (The Necessary Revolution, (Senge, Smith, Kruschwitz, Laur, & Schley, 2008), documents the life-threatening consequences of leadership in all of our institutions that does not take into account social responsibility.

• Emergence of “meta-theories.” “Theories of everything” seem to be popping up in a number of fields, most notably physics, where string theory has emerged as a leading contender. We see that trend in leadership theory as well, in the form of theories that explicitly embrace multiple perspectives in an attempt to be fully comprehensive. These theories come closer to explicitly incorporating an ethical dimension noted above. Examples of this trend, in roughly chronological order are:
  - Organizational learning (Senge, 1990)
  - Integral theory (Joiner & Josephs, 2007; Wilber, 2000b)
  - Theory U (Scharmer, 2007; Senge, et al., 2004)
3. Best Practice: Principles and Practices

As stated at the outset, we focused our search for best practices on programs within organizations in each of the three primary sectors and on programs that explicitly served members of multiple sectors. In drawing lessons, we first aimed to identify general principles and practices across all these domains. We report those findings in the first two sections. However, we realized that our findings are really most appropriate to programs that focus on the development of individual leaders. We have titled those sections accordingly and added a separate section on collective leadership. In addition, we thought it would be useful to ask whether there were lessons associated with particular domains. So we conclude this chapter with a review of patterns and lessons within the sectors.

3.1 Programs Supporting Individual Leader Development

3.1.1 Nine General Design Principles

In study after study of organization-based individual leadership development programs we find the conclusion that the key to “best practice” is in the overall design and implementation of a program, not the adoption of any particular theory or practice (Day, 2001, p. 49). Particular features of the approach appear to matter less than how well those features match the context and purpose of leadership development and how well they are integrated with one another. Following are the more specific overarching principles most commonly cited across multiple studies and sectors as being associated with program effectiveness.

1. Reinforce/Build a Supportive Culture. Culture—an organization’s pattern of shared assumptions—is a very powerful determinant of behavior. The best single means of fostering leadership is through a culture that encourages and rewards leadership. Unfortunately, creating such a culture—or shifting toward one from a culture that is not supportive—is extraordinarily challenging and can take years. Most people setting out to design a leadership development program will not be able to rely on this form of support in the short run. However, there is a consolation. Leadership development has proved to be one of the best ways to build a culture. This creates the possibility that the leadership framework and associated values and competencies defined for a program can become the seeds of a culture that will reinforce and foster leadership development going forward. Before such a culture is firmly in place, there is a large danger to be managed: lessons learned in a formal program risk being erased if participants return to an environment that is either not supportive or, worse, and more typically, tolerates behavior and tacitly espouses values that are contrary to investing in people. To begin building a supportive culture it is also important to align support systems to reinforce learning in all ways possible: procedures for selection, for performance management, recognition, promotion, dismissal, and for
leadership succession. Aligning such systems is singled out by some studies as a best practice in its own right (Conger & Benjamin, 1999, pp. 54-55). The best programs approach leadership development with this broader cultural context in mind, aspiring to reinforce and build on those elements of existing culture that are supportive. In so doing it is critical to have the visible support and role modeling of senior leaders, which brings us to the second principle.

2. **Ensure High-level Sponsorship and Involvement.** Many of the most effective organization-based programs are championed right from the top. CEOs such as Jack Welch at GE, Bob Galvin at Motorola, and Roger Enrico at PepsiCo have all been visible advocates of leadership development (Day & Halpin, 2001, p. 38). Successful programs also actively involve top leaders through engaging them as instructors, facilitators, and guest speakers. For example, FedEx uses high-potential managers as “preceptors” (instructors) (Day & Halpin, 2001, p. 45). In organizations committed to leadership development, leaders set an example. At IBM Lou Gerstner reports having spent 80% of his time on leadership development (Gerstner, 2002). And a study of companies known for leadership development found that their executives often spend 50 to 60% of their time mentoring and developing leaders (Hesselbein & Shinseki, 2004, p. 57). PepsiCo’s central philosophy is simple: “The most important responsibility of a leader is to personally develop other leaders” (Day & Halpin, 2001, p. 38).

3. **Tailor the Goals and Approach of the Program to the Context.** The most effective leadership development programs are designed to respond to the mission-related challenges faced by the organization or the particular needs of the community/society being served. In the case of organization-based programs, the kinds of leadership competencies needed to face the organization’s challenges are often explicitly articulated in a formal model. Fully two-thirds of programs feature such models (Day & Halpin, 2001, p. 11). In analyzing GE’s remarkable success with and reputation for leadership development, Day and Halpin observe that “Much of what GE does with regard to leadership development they acknowledge is not new. But aligning the initiatives with their core values and overall strategy pushes people to implement change with a passion” (2001, p. 35). Similarly, the authors attribute the success of Motorola University to the fact that “much of the University’s development efforts are directed at helping managers become catalysts for change and continuous improvement in support of the corporation’s business objectives.” For example, Motorola’s Vice President Institute is closely tied to the business imperative of sustaining growth. Such aspirations may include organizational change, including culture change, for which leadership has shown itself to be an effective tool. Similarly, it can serve to socialize managers into organizational values. For example, Johnson & Johnson uses it to instill their famous “Credo,” credited with enabling the company to handle the Tylenol recall with widely acclaimed integrity (Day & Halpin, 2001, p. 48). In multi-sector programs serving diverse audiences, studies point to the importance of selecting culturally appropriate methods/tools and facilitators/coaches (Link, Gauthier, & Corral, 2008b, p. 4).
We heard a message across all sectors reinforcing the principle that different situations call for different methods—one size does not fit all. A report from the Wallace Foundation states: “The evidence challenges the wisdom of leadership development initiatives that attempt to be all things to all leaders or refuse to acknowledge differences in leadership practices required by differences in organizational context” (Enright, 2006, p. 25). As one person we interviewed put it, “‘Cherry picking’ features from the ‘best’ programs won’t work. The best you can do is to develop an iterative, trial and error approach that is focused on very clear goals and that is designed and customized for the particular needs and contexts of specific customers.” It follows that customization of programs, with input and feedback from participants, is critical.

4. **Target Programs Toward Specific Audiences.** An important extension of the foregoing tailoring principle is adapting the approach to a particular audience. For example, program content will necessarily vary within a larger initiative, depending on the level of management served. Conger and Benjamin found that “many of the best organizations we observed emphasized different facets of leadership for individuals at different levels of development or in different functions or domains” (1999, p. 34). They cited examples as various as Federal Express and the U.S. Army. In the non-profit world as well, targeting of programs is a common design feature, whether narrowly on the role of executive director or more broadly to include collective leadership within or across an organization (Enright, 2006). Another implication of customizing programs is the importance of selecting participants carefully in alignment with program objectives. While a seemingly obvious criterion, Conger and Benjamin found that “in many cases criteria are either undefined or poorly enforced” (1999, p. 35). Timing of participation is another critical variable. What the Center for Creative Leadership found in their “feedback intensive programs” seems to be true more generally: participation in a program is “particularly useful for people who have recently taken on management responsibility, have had a significant change in the scope of their responsibilities, or are facing significantly different job or personal demands because of other organizational (or life) changes” (McCauley & Van Velsor, 2004, p. 54). FedEx’s LEAP program exemplifies a particularly rigorous approach to participant selection (Day & Halpin, 2001, p. 43).

5. **Integrate All Features of the Program.** “Best practice organizations recognize that sending people through a series of unrelated programs is not nearly as effective as designing an integrated leadership system in which the various experiences (e.g., formal programs, 360° feedback, coaching, mentoring, networking, action learning, outdoor challenges) are linked by means of an over-arching developmental strategy” (Day & Halpin, 2001, pp. 51-52). One of the reasons for this is the recognition that behavior change is challenging and takes both time and reinforcement. Another reason is the value of helping leaders translate their learning into concrete actions by providing multiple formal sessions and/or follow-up to the classroom experience. Good programs also tend to have carefully designed pre-program
activities (McCauley & Van Velsor, 2004, pp. 28-34). For example, at PepsiCo participants spend a month developing an idea for a growth project with their division president and the CEO before attending the program (Day & Halpin, 2001, p. 80). Exercises and materials in advance can heighten anticipation and deepen readiness. The Army makes heavy use of pre-course preparation so that participants can hit the ground running (Conger & Benjamin, 1999, p. 38).

6. **Use a Variety of Learning Methods.** Related to the above principle is the notion that effective programs are characterized by pedagogical variety. One reason for this is that individuals differ in their learning styles: some learn best from lectures, some from structured exercises, others from experience. Another reason is that behavior change requires learning at multiple levels: conceptual understanding, self-awareness of preferences and needs, and behavioral skill acquired through practice. We did find effective programs that do not explicitly incorporate multiple learning methods (e.g., programs that principally feature peer learning and networking), but they typically bring participants together in a way that enables them to learn in their own way. The more diverse the group, the more important this criterion becomes.

7. **Offer Extended Learning Periods with Sustained Support.** The era of leadership development as a one-shot exposure to a free-standing workshop is rapidly waning. Evidence from a variety of sources converges to support the importance of creating programs that extend over time. Conger concluded that the free-standing executive education programs he reviewed in the early 1990s, while powerful within the constraints of the time available, were “too short to have a more lasting impact, especially in terms of developing more lasting skills” (1992, p. 53). His later study with Benjamin, which focused on programs in organizational settings, confirmed the importance of the principle of extended learning periods with multiple sessions (1999, pp. 52-53). Integrated programs invariably extend the leadership development program beyond a single classroom experience to include time to apply the learning and incorporate other forms of learning and support. For most purposes it is optimal to have multiple formal sessions. Such extended programs increase the likelihood that participants can take the difficult step of moving from awareness to actual change in behavior. Explicit structures for tracking and supporting application can be helpful, for which new internet-based tools are available.  

8. **Encourage Ownership of Self-Development.** Any approach that does not strongly encourage participants to be pro-active learners committed to their own development will be limited in impact. A study team at the National Academy of Public Administration singled out self-development as one of three critical elements after reviewing a number of benchmark companies in the private and public sector. In support of this conclusion, the study quotes leadership development expert Morgan McCall: “Development is not something you can do to, or for, someone. Development is something people do for themselves” (p. 29). Effective self-development often includes building and learning from a diverse network of colleagues.
and peers inside and outside the organization. And it includes seeking out mentors. As one experienced human resources manager observed, “a critical but too-often neglected leadership skill is getting other people to care about your development.”

Self-developers also invest in lifelong learning. Perhaps most importantly, a critical leadership quality—self-awareness—can be very painful and only come through a commitment to self-development.

9. **Commit to Continuous Improvement.** A leadership development program, like most complex endeavors, is hard to get right the first time. An HR manager in a government agency whom we interviewed said: “The programs that have worked in government have come about through trial and error in their particular context.” The best programs build on evaluation from the outset, viewing their initial efforts as pilot programs. They carry forward a spirit of continuous improvement in response to participant experience and faculty reflection. And they commit resources necessary to translate that spirit into tangible reality.

In designing a curriculum-based approach, the rigor that is characteristic of effective leadership development initiatives is typically reflected in a sequence of steps like the following (adapted from Bolt, et al., 2005, pp. 18-24):

1. **Conduct a needs assessment.** Determine key business challenges and executive development needs by:
   a. Reviewing relevant documents to develop an overall picture of the organization
   b. Surveying and interviewing executives and key stakeholders
   c. Interviewing outside experts

2. **Design the program.** Synthesize the learning from phase 1 to:
   a. Clarify program goals
   b. Align the program with the organizations’ vision, values, strategic objectives
   c. Determine learning objectives
   d. Choose learning methods, assuring a balance of learning modes
   e. Design participant applications and follow-through
   f. Design program evaluation

3. **Develop materials and choose faculty**
   Consider the pros and cons of internal vs. external faculty
   a. Orient faculty to create a close-knit team
   b. Develop materials linking modules to overarching objectives

4. **Conduct a pilot program**
   a. Arrange a pilot test of the program
   b. Evaluate the pilot
   c. Revise the program as needed
5. Follow through and continuously improve
   a. Conduct follow-up evaluations at three- and six-month intervals
   b. Re-administer a 360° feedback instrument if used
   c. Track and support applications

3.1.2 Seven Common Elements of Effective Programs

The most impactful and effective programs tend to involve a range of learning modalities, including, but going well beyond, formal instruction. A number of studies have identified the ingredients that are the most common to programs regarded as effective. At the same time, these studies show that not all effective programs employ all these ingredients. The lists overlap significantly—many items show up on most lists, although in slightly different weightings. Again, no single approach or combination of approaches is a guarantee of “best practice.” Effectiveness depends on how well the choices made are integrated with one another and how well they are linked to the priorities of the sponsoring organization and the readiness of the participants. The best programs seem to embody a trend: they “are evolving toward a systems perspective—a recognition that training or education alone cannot develop leaders, nor can assignments without adequate coaching and career plans, nor can experiences that are unrelated to corporate strategic objectives...Corporations are recognizing the power of executive education and leadership development initiatives as part of a system that can help align managers, workers, and organizational process in pursuit of strategic objectives” (Vicere & Fulmer, 1998).

As mentioned in the introductory section, in looking for patterns across programs we have focused more on organization-based programs, as opposed to “external” programs (for example, university-based executive education programs). External programs attract participants from multiple organizations (and to some extent multiple sectors, though most attendees in most programs are corporate, unless deliberately targeted otherwise). Conger reported in 1992 that after early experiments with short life-spans, “corporations have come to rely almost entirely on outside vendors for leadership training programs” (1992, p. 44), and accordingly focused his profiles on examples of that type. But in 1996 a comprehensive study found that “over 75% of all executive education dollars now go to customized programs” (Vicere & Fulmer, 1998, p. 265). Strikingly, a comprehensive review of leadership development best practice in 2001 made no mention of executive education programs whatsoever and instead focused completely on programs within corporations (Day & Halpin, 2001). We observe that executive education programs still play an important role. In addition, they have been recently supplemented by a number of programs that explicitly serve multi-stakeholder audiences. But the momentum has shifted toward internal programs, to which we have chosen to pay the most attention.
Each approach has intrinsic strengths and limits. Participants in executive education programs may find that the curriculum is not adequately tailored to their needs and that their new learning and vocabulary is not shared or supported when they return to their workplace. However, learning alongside people from other organizations can be a broadening experience and can reduce the inhibition participants may feel at being self-revealing. Organization-specific training programs often have an undiscussable “elephant” in the room: company culture. And participants are less inclined to open up in front of their peers. Of course, it is not an either/or choice. Organization-specific leadership development programs can include the option of pursuing specialized training outside. To reiterate, in this report, we have emphasized organization-specific programs for two reasons: there is more literature on that subject, and we imagine that lessons from such applications will be more useful to readers of this report. However, we have tried to broaden the conclusions to be appropriate to programs offered by third parties as well.

Although many studies identify the ingredients of best practice, the most conscientious reviews acknowledge that such elements are better described as “common” practice rather than necessarily “best” (as discussed in the introduction). The authors of those studies present the rankings as a reflection of popularity rather than demonstrated effectiveness. Some also acknowledge that corporate management is “notorious for its fads.” (In one organization people spoke with cynicism of “seatback initiatives”—ideas that came to executives while reading a magazine from the back of the seat in front of them on an airplane!) (Carter, Ulrich, & Goldsmith, 2005, p. 196). And they note that “the same program can be designed and delivered in a variety of ways,” therefore “implementation is the key to success” (Day & Halpin, 2001, p. 3). Despite these caveats, the most commonly cited practices merit some description to illustrate both core features and variety, for they appear to be the principal ingredients not just in the most popular programs but also the most effective.

Below are the seven most common elements that stand out from our review. They are not mutually exclusive and may be used in a variety of combinations. Each merits a brief description with examples illustrating the range of application possibilities.

1. Job definition/assignment
2. Action learning
3. Assessment/feedback
4. Formal instruction
5. Coaching
6. Mentoring
7. Networking
1. Job Definition/Assignment

In designing leadership development it is tempting but limiting to focus on activities outside of normal work designed to supplement learning, such as workshops. These are, in fact, often an important component of the best overall approaches. But the most significant development takes place—or has the potential to take place—in one’s job (Blunt, 2004; McCall, Lombardo, & Morrison, 1988; McCauley & Brutus, 1998). The organizations most committed to leadership development tend to structure job definition and assignment to maximize their developmental potential.

There are a variety of ways in which to do this. The most radical and fundamental begins with the definition of the job itself and expectations of the role. This approach is at the heart of the U.S. military’s reputation for being a premiere institution for developing leaders. The approach common to the armed services illustrates the power of both the first and second general design principles: “reinforce/build a supportive culture” and “ensure high-level sponsorship.” For example, “One of the Army’s highest values is leadership…the Army works hard to help everyone serving in it to become effective leaders” (Hesselbein & Shinseki, 2004, p. 3). The consequence, according to a consultant who has worked extensively with the Army, is that “you learn to be a leader from the day you take command of your first unit. There is deep accountability for achieving the ‘what’ of a mission, but you are not told ‘how.’” And the Army is deeply committed to After Action Reviews, a form of structured reflection as a way of systematically learning from experience on the job (described in the next section). The U.S. Marines take a similar approach. They “don’t distinguish between followers and potential leaders; they believe every member of the Corps must be able to lead” (Katzenbach & Santamaría, 1999, p. 6). This philosophy contributes to a culture of collective pride and mutual trust (an “MVP” culture—based on Mission, Values and Pride) (1999, p. 6). One practical consequence is that every Marine learns to run a basic four-person team.

A more common approach to job-based leadership development is through assignment to a new job. Many companies use job rotation systematically for leadership development. For example, Gillette International regularly makes 12- to 36-month assignments of U.S. managers overseas (Day & Halpin, 2001, p. 598). The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation in the U.S. Department of Labor uses short- and long-term assignments incorporated into a two-year leadership succession planning initiative (Blunt, 2004, p. 53). The U.S. State Department under Colin Powell established a Career Development Program that requires Foreign Service Officers to gain broad experience before being eligible for promotion to the Senior Foreign Service. Public sector organizations that cannot recruit leaders from outside and must grow leaders internally, such as the military and the U.S. Forest Service, create systems of conscious career rotation (Kaufman, 2006). Research indicates that such rotations can contribute to the development of leadership skills along with a broader perspective on the business and adaptability and flexibility (Day, 2001, p. 600). The U.S. military also makes systematic use of this strategy as well.
Companies known for commitment to leadership development have integrated job assignment into their overall strategy. For example, Coca Cola transferred more than 300 professional and managerial staff to new countries in one year for developmental purposes (Day & Halpin, 2001, pp. 598-599). A critical variable in the success of such efforts is “intentionality,” i.e., thoughtful linkage between the particular assignment and what the assigned person needs to develop. Some jobs are more developmental than others and different kinds of learning can result from different assignments. The most developmental tend to be jobs that stretch a manager by putting her in a new situation with both high responsibility and high latitude to manage it as she sees fit.

Such companies take seriously the research indicating that challenging job assignments are associated with greater learning. Citibank puts high-potential managers in job assignments for which they are no more than 60 to 70% prepared. And GE’s Jack Welch was known to be willing to put a manager in a certain position because it was the right professional growth experience for that person, independent of business needs (Day, 2001, p. 60). At a premier consulting firm, internal studies identified as a best practice the tendency of some engagement leaders to assign team members based in part on developmental need rather than simply existing competence. Some comprehensive approaches to supporting leadership development also encourage managers to pursue such challenges outside the workplace through volunteer activity.

But even prior to the question of rotation there are many ways of maximizing the potential learning from an existing job. A recent good book on the subject identifies 10 key challenges that can enhance “development in place” (McCauley, 2006, p. 4). On-the-job challenges can be built into a person’s job by creating the following conditions (pp. 7-8):

- Unfamiliar responsibilities
- New directions
- Inherited problems
- Problems with employees
- High stakes
- Scope and scale
- External pressure
- Influence without authority
- Work across cultures
- Work group diversity

In a similar spirit, the National Academy of Public Administration identified five options suited to the government, which (with the exception of the military) has constraints on its ability to use job rotation (1997, pp. 57-58):
• Leadership or membership on a special project team
• Opportunity for special presentations or high-level briefings
• Assignment as an executive assistant to a senior leader
• Decentralizing and delegating decision authority
• Short-term rotations or exchanges

One particular kind of assignment, through "action learning," is a common feature of leadership development programs and is worthy of treatment in its own right in the section that follows.

_Cautions._ Job assignments intended to stretch a leader are all-too-often high on "challenge" but weak on "support." More generally, many programs seem to lack the intentional use of job rotations that would lead to maximum impact. An early student of this practice observed: “It’s a long way from rotating people or doing succession planning or sending executives overseas, to using experience thoughtfully for developmental purposes. Common practice can benefit enormously from consideration of why a person is given a particular assignment, what one hopes a person will learn from it, and what consequences are attached to learning or failing to learn” (cited in McCall, et al., 1988; National Academy of Public Administration, 1997, p. 26). Although negative experiences can promote learning and increase resiliency, they do not always lead to growth. And many senior executives across all sectors and cultures are not forgiving of failure, failing to see its developmental potential.

2. Action Learning

In 1999 Conger and Benjamin proclaimed action learning as “the new paradigm for leadership development” (p. 211). It extends the support for learning beyond an initial assessment and exposure to concepts. At the same time, it provides the challenge needed to foster development pointed to by assessment. It also enriches formal instruction in a number of ways: it adds an experiential component known to be important for adult learning; it extends and reinforces learning over a longer period of time; and by virtue of being project-based, it provides a means of linking leadership development with the solution of business problems.

Action learning “is a process of learning and reflection that happens with the support of a group...of colleagues working with real problems with the intention of getting things done” (McGill & Beaty, 2001, p. 1). It was conceived over six decades ago in the U.K. (Revans, 1983), but became visible in the U.S. through GE's “Work Out” Program. This well-known program approached the overriding objective of eliminating unnecessary work with the following features (Vicere & Fulmer, 1998, pp. 289-290):

• Pre-identification of a problem and a manager who sponsors it
• A professionally facilitated three-day problem-solving session in which participants in small groups present a solution to the sponsor
• Follow-up on the recommended solution by the sponsor
Action-learning projects typically involve teams of five to seven people working in real time on a significant organizational problem, learning from their experience and taking action to implement solutions.\textsuperscript{13} Many companies besides GE have used action learning to serve leadership development while confronting a major business aspiration, dilemma, or operational challenge. For example, Citibank selected issues that affected total bank performance across various businesses (Day & Halpin, 2001, p. 23). A key objective was developing leaders who could take a broad, systemic perspective. Participants were selected on a global basis. In this case a three-day session served as a kick-off (team building and issue orientation), followed by a several week data-collection and problem-solving period, often involving travel. Solutions were then presented to the CEO and business heads. During a follow-up day participants drew lessons from a facilitated reflection. Senior management was then obliged to follow up in with one to two weeks to make decisions regarding implementation (Dotlich & Noel, 1998).

Some action-learning programs focus explicitly on leadership development:

- Johnson & Johnson used it to broaden the skills and vision of their top managers
- Arthur Andersen used it to transform their senior partners to trusted business advisers (Dotlich & Noel, 1998, pp. 6-7)

But other programs serve additional organizational objectives (Day, 2001, p. 602):

- Switching from an external strategy of growth through acquisition to an internal strategy of innovation and new product development (NationsBank)
- Competitiveness in the face of deregulation (Ameritech)
- Preparing for upheaval in the computer industry (Honeywell)
- Growing revenue or cutting costs (Shell)

\textit{Action Learning as a Component of a Leadership Development Initiative.} A well-documented case of action learning in a bank illustrates how a thoughtful design can be integrated into a larger program (Bolt, et al., 2005, pp. 70-90):

A bank of under 1500 received two wake-up calls regarding the need to invest in leadership development. An internal survey pointed to a lack of leadership development opportunities available in the organization; and the bank discovered a lack of readiness of people in their talent pool for the most senior executive positions. The response was to identify ten high potentials and provide them with an action-learning project as the first four months of a year-long program. During that initial period participants spent eleven days in classroom sessions and about 25\% of their work time on action-learning project teams. The participants were charged with recommending the objectives and design of a new Leadership Institute that would provide missing opportunities in the bank. The first day of an initial five-day workshop focused on team building for the project, supplemented by 360\degree feedback and coaching, which introduced an individual
development plan and a web-based follow through tool (Fort Hill’s Friday5s). The week included benchmarking journeys to a best-practice company. At the end of the week participants developed project plans, presented them to sponsors and company leaders, and got feedback.

Between the first session and a mid-point review, participants followed through on their project plan, which included internal interviews and benchmarking visits to other companies. At the mid-point review they revised their project plan, presented progress review for sponsors, and prepared for the two-month period until the culmination of the project. During those two months they worked intensively on the project, consolidating research results preparing preliminary recommendations, and consulting with stakeholders for validation. They also continued working on their personal development plans. At the concluding session, they reviewed progress on team and individual development goals and prepared and presented a report to sponsors. The report consisted of a detailed plan for the creation of a Leadership Institute drawing on benchmarks but tailored to the unique needs of the bank. They wrapped up the project with an after action review.

Participants then had a three-month break, during which they had another coaching session and completed assignments related to the remainder of the program (a case study on leadership and preparation for personal leadership storytelling). In a second (2½-day) classroom session they learned a framework for dealing with leadership challenges based on the work of Morgan McCall, shared personal leadership stories, and took stock of their individual plans. An additional coaching session took place before a final two-day workshop addressing the power of purpose and other aspects of personal leadership. A variety of indicators—including participant evaluation, the implementation and continuation of the recommended Leadership Institute, continuation of the program, and promotion of seven of the ten participants—suggest that the program was successful.

**Non-Profit Applications.** Action learning is by no means confined to the corporate world. The Annie E. Casey Foundation’s Leadership in Action Program brings together government, non-profit and community leaders for an 11-month program. The program builds skills and capacity to lead large-scale human services reform and community capacity-building initiatives. Each year the program targets a particular focus, such as increasing readiness for school entry in Maryland in 2001-2002. In that case participants engaged in ten months of intensive research, learning and dialogue to understand the problem, meeting every six to eight weeks in meetings led by coach/facilitators. The group issued a report at the end of the program, which was endorsed by the state legislature. As of fall 2005, the proportion of Maryland children entering school “ready to learn” had increased from less than 50% to 59% (Enright, 2006, p. 36).
The Fieldstone Foundation has provided a very different model through their Executive Learning Groups. These consist of a series of monthly one-day seminars over a six-month period that focus on cases brought by participants. While not charged with coming up with a solution, as is typical in most action learning programs, these learning groups are problem- rather than content- or skill-focused. For many adults, learning from peers is a better match for their learning styles than receiving classroom instruction (Enright, 2006, pp. 28-30).

The Jessie Ball DuPont Fund’s Nonprofit Executive Institute, which brings teams of three from organizations to a four-and-a-half-day residential program, demonstrates yet another interesting variation on the core ideas of action learning. It brings together up to ten teams of three—including the CEO, a board member and a staff member—from participating organizations for four-and-a-half days. These teams work on a specific project during the week, while attending faculty sessions on management and leadership topics. Each team leaves with an action plan, and has the support of a faculty coach for a year as it refines and implements the plan (Enright, 2006, p. 22).

After Action Reviews. The most impactful example of action learning may well be the U.S. Army’s use of the After Action Review (AAR) (Day, 2001, p. 603). The Army defines this practice as “a professional discussion of an event, focused on performance standards, that allows participants to discover for themselves what happened, why it happened, and how to sustain strengths and improve on weaknesses” (Hesselbein & Shinseki, 2004, p. 139). This tradition evolved from intense institutional self-reflection in the wake of the Vietnam War and has become a part of the core fabric of the Army’s organizational practice. AARs are a problem-solving process in which all relevant levels of authority come together to reflect on an event immediately afterward. The discussion, led by an “observer-controller,” focuses on four questions:

- What were the intended results?
- What were our actual results?
- What caused our results?
- What will we sustain or improve? (Darling, Parry, & Moore, 2005, p. 4)

In the Army, the AAR has become the backbone of an infrastructure for learning. This routine practice serves to clarify the leadership role of all team members, cultivating distributed leadership among the team members, “rotating as necessary so that the best-qualified leader makes the right things happen at the crucial moment, when his or her skill as a leader is most needed” (Sullivan & Harper, 1997, p. 203).

Corporate efforts to emulate this practice have generally fallen far short (Darling, et al., 2005). One factor is the typical absence of a critical contextual factor: a culture of learning (Sullivan & Harper, 1997, p. 197). It was the absence of such a culture that contributed to NASA’s inability to sufficiently incorporate lessons from the Challenger catastrophe to prevent the Columbia disaster (Langewiesche, 2003; Vaughan, 1996). However, the problem may be more basic,
according to Marilyn Darling, an expert in the method who has facilitated After Action Reviews with the Army: “A core problem is that the corporate mental model about improvement rests on the manufacturing metaphor that a problem can be identified and fixed based on an external post-mortem assessment and expert recommendation. Thus AARs are seen as post-mortem evaluations that should be done at the end of a project. The Army’s model starts before work ever begins to set the stage. ‘We’re going to AAR this at the end, so we may as well try to figure it out now so we can report on a success.’ Through consistent application, the learning culture gets built one step at a time.”

We have seen analogs to the After Action Review gain traction in non-military organizations that do have a learning culture. For example, a premier consulting firm has instituted world-wide “team learning” procedures that include a “post-engagement review.” The elements reviewed include the original objectives for the engagement, including personal learning objectives. However, the quality of implementation of the process varies widely in accordance with the learning culture of particular offices.

**Learning Culture.** As the Army’s use of action learning demonstrates, action learning can foster a learning culture. An academic advocate of action learning, Robert Kramer of American University, writes eloquently about the learning potential of the approach (2007). He has documented the kinds of and quality of learning that can result from even a free-standing use of the method:

The project took place in the Department of Agriculture, in the Plant Protection and Quarantine office of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. A senior operations officer in that office was asked by senior officials to produce a national emergency management plan. He chose action learning as the approach and invited seven regional and national managers to join a team. The project kicked off with a full-day workshop to introduce team members to one another and to action learning. Following the principles originally laid out by Revans (1983) and amended by Marquardt (2004), the team held half a dozen meetings over a period of six months, exploring the various formulations of the problem and alternative solutions. Each session was facilitated by a team member playing the role of learning coach, a role that rotated. Learning coaches are only allowed to play an inquiring role, helping the team reflect through questions and active listening. The team delivered a concrete solution to the challenge in the form of three sets of emergency management procedures, distributed to all fifty states and the territories. Several members of the team created records of their learning. Kramer reports that through a norm of reflection the “process provided the team with a set of skills that opened their minds and hearts to three levels of learning: (1) about their own beliefs and assumptions, (2) about how the group was functioning in the here and now, and (3) about the larger organizational culture.” In Kramer’s view, the most significant outcome of the project was enabling the participants to learn how to learn. He concludes: “Public administrators who become skilled at practicing action learning will develop more confidence in their capacity
to build groups, teams, and organizations that continuously learn new ways of thinking and behaving—and continuously unlearn old ways.”

**Features of Successful Programs.** In reviewing the more traditional forms of action learning, Conger found five features of successful programs (Conger & Benjamin, 1999, pp. 218-229):

1. Careful selection of learning projects (combining importance to the organization, ideally reflected in an organizational sponsor, with developmental value for the individual)
2. Objectives and outcomes that are clearly defined (avoiding hidden or multiple conflicting objectives)
3. Multiple opportunities for reflective learning (avoiding the danger that the task-orientation of action learning overwhelms learning, ideally by incorporating feedback from coaches or other participants)
4. Active involvement of senior management (here it is again!—in this case it signals the importance of the initiative to participants and the larger organization and rewards participants for their efforts by exposure to top leaders)
5. Expert facilitation and coaching (to help participants make sense of potentially overwhelming information)

**Cautions.** Conger and Benjamin also point to three problems and pitfalls:

1. Weak sponsorship (the operating groups providing the problems to be addressed are not fully on board)
2. Dysfunctional team dynamics (lacking norms of candor and diversity of perspectives)
3. Lack of follow-up learning (failure to ensure transfer of learning back to the workplace)

### 3. Assessment/Feedback

The Center for Creative Leadership (CCL), a leading institution in the theory and practice of assessment, offers a simple but compelling model of what is required for behavior change: assessment, challenge, and support (McCauley & Van Velsor, 2004). The starting point is assessment, a characteristic of most leadership development programs. It provides the information that enables leaders to make judgments about where they need to grow. Using 360° feedback to assess skills and behavior is a very popular and potentially powerful form of assessment. Its prevalence merits a special description, which follows below. But it is only one form of assessment, and a program can draw upon a broader range of choices, including:

- Self-assessment (and in some cases assessment by others) regarding
  - Personality preferences
  - Leadership style
  - Negotiation style
  - Learning style
Psychological needs

- Assessment from peers in the form of peer observation (in workshops) and peer coaching (in workshops and in the organization)
- Video feedback (on group participation, interpersonal skills)
- Self-assessment through reflection and journaling

The menu of options is rapidly expanding. New leadership paradigms bring with them new assessment tools. For example, applications of adult developmental theory to leadership has led to the creation of several new tools for assessing stage of development (see the description of “Constructive-Developmental Theory and Assessment Tools,” in section 3.3.2 below).

CCL is a premier provider of assessment- and feedback-intensive leadership development programs and has done extensive research on the appropriateness of its use and impact. As a guideline they suggest targeting leaders for participation in such programs when they are effectively working at the level to which they are currently assigned and therefore ready to move to another level of responsibility or performance (McCauley & Van Velsor, 2004, p. 54). And they note the increased impact that comes from matching such experiences with people who have just taken on new or broader responsibilities or are going through a significant change. It can also be a helpful component of a program to support people who are at risk of “derailment.” Some organizations have created their own assessment centers in order to develop depth in this practice.

Personal style assessment can also go beyond simply generating feedback and be an important area of learning about how to understand and communicate others with different preferences. We comment on this in section 3.8.

360° Feedback. Feedback from all external viewpoints—i.e., from all 360 degrees of a surrounding circle—has become the most popular form of assessment and has been called “one of the most notable management innovations of the 1990s” (McCauley & Van Velsor, 2004, p. 58). Conger and Benjamin single it out as one of seven best practices for leadership development and report that it is an “increasingly standard component of many leadership training programs” (1999). It is a method of systematically collecting opinions about a manager’s performance from a wide range of coworkers (such as direct reports, bosses, peers), other stakeholders (such as customers) or even friends and family members. Nearly all Fortune 500 companies either currently use or have plans to use some form of 360° feedback (McCauley & Van Velsor, 2004, p. 58). The key features are selection of raters by the person being assessed, completion of a survey of relevant skills and behaviors by the rater and participants, and feedback and review of the results under guidance of a facilitator or coach. Typically the feedback is used to create a development plan. It can also serve other purposes, such as performance evaluation, but this tends to detract from its developmental potential.
A number of strengths account for the popularity of this form of assessment: it gathers a panorama of perceptions; it helps compensate for what may otherwise be a lack of feedback in an organization, which increases as managers rise; it provides a structured process for compiling information on others’ perspectives as compared to one’s own; and it does these things in a way that protects anonymity, which makes it particularly useful for senior managers whose power may inhibit others from being candid. The growing popularity of 360° programs may also reflect the increasing recognition of the importance of self-awareness to effective leadership (Day, 2001, p/589).

It can be hard to isolate the impact of 360° feedback because it is often accompanied by other methods of development. However, in addition to being popular, there is considerable evidence testifying to its effectiveness (McCauley & Van Velsor, 2004, p. 67). Some evidence suggests that it is more effective when participants follow up by meeting with direct reports to discuss the results. Ongoing coaching and feedback are also associated with increased impact.

While we can endorse all those strengths from personal experience, in our view the high reputation of 360° feedback exaggerates somewhat its actual value. We agree with Schwarz: “Most feedback systems are designed to unilaterally protect the people who give the feedback, by not having them identify themselves to you. This makes it difficult for you to validate the data and thoroughly understand it” (Schwarz, March 2009, p. 1). At least this is the case when the data are gathered using anonymous surveys, which is the norm. However, this deficiency can be significantly corrected by doing interviews that probe for detail and in which the interviewer can encourage the interviewee—often successfully, in our experience—to give the feedback directly. Surveys and interviews each have strengths and limits. Surveys are useful in pointing to patterns and are cheaper. Interviews are far more expensive by virtue of being labor intensive but likely to generate more intelligible feedback, with concrete examples. An ideal program would encompass both.

What do 360° assessments focus on? Many companies develop their own 360° surveys so that they can link the questions to the competencies that the organization has identified as the objectives of leadership development. An example is Motorola, which created a customized instrument tied to its culture and norms (Day & Halpin, 2001, p. 14). However, there are also advantages to using instruments purchased from established vendors. Such tools are typically subjected to more rigorous validation. And some have generated databases that enable them to provide feedback that compares a participant’s scores with norms from thousands of other managers. Instruments are also emerging that have been designed with constructive-developmental theory in mind so that the feedback can be used to provide a map of the person’s journey along a developmental path.19

A review by the CCL (McCauley & Van Velsor, 2004) identifies the following steps to a 360° process:
1. Identify the purpose
2. Identify the audience
3. Choose an instrument (CCL offers guidelines on how to choose an effective instrument ((Van Velsor, Leslie, Fleenor, & Morrison, 1997))
4. Communicate with raters
5. Collect data (select raters in ways that assure anonymity and confidentiality)
6. Feed back the data
7. Interpret the data
8. Create a development plan

_Cautions_. Assessment tools generate feedback, but this is no guarantee of behavior change. One barrier is lack of openness to the feedback: even the most open of people tend to have well-developed defense mechanisms against threatening feedback (Day, 2001). Another is that acceptance of the feedback may not lead to change, which usually requires both challenge and support.

CCL has found that failure of 360° programs have a number of common causes (McCauley & Van Velsor, 2004):

- Lack of a boss’s support
- Starting a process with the wrong people (it is best to start with highest levels and avoid those with greatest resistance or people with remedial needs)
- Ignoring individual readiness (timing with transition, openness to change)
- Ignoring organizational readiness (timing with other initiatives, work load)
- Shoddy administration
- Confidentiality/anonymity problems

Conger and Benjamin add a few more concerns (1999, p. 41):

- A tendency among raters to evaluate leniently
- Time constraints on bosses (who might have to fill out many forms for subordinates)
- The risk of poor linkage of survey content to organizational realities and priorities (for standardized surveys)
- Lack of follow-up coaching

An experienced consultant adds to this list: “Many of the 360° instruments that I have been asked to work with are tied into the ‘leadership framework’ of the company but do not get down to the level of observable behaviors. So the feedback is vague and difficult for the recipients to act on. Feedback is only useful when it includes context, observed behavior, and impact on feedback giver.” This observation supports the case for using interviews as part of a 360° process.
4. Formal Instruction

The Continued Value of Formal Instruction. The central role of formal (i.e., classroom) instruction in leadership development programs has waned considerably in recent decades. Nonetheless, it remains one of the most common features of organization-based programs. And of course it remains the principal feature of many executive education programs. A study by the American Society of Trainers and Developers found that 85% of companies use formal instruction in leadership development programs (as cited in Day & Halpin, 2001, p. 86). Many organizations in all three sectors send managers to open-enrollment programs offered by third parties, such as university-based executive education programs and consulting firms. However, even in this case the trend is toward customized programs, as noted above. In some cases these are developed in partnership with a lead external vendor. Or they may be “home grown,” and draw selectively on external faculty.

While leadership development has surely been enriched by the addition of a range of non-classroom tools, the power of formal instruction should not be underestimated. The U.S. military relies heavily on immersion in formal programs at many junctures in a leader’s development, using a variety of pedagogical methods—including lectures, war games, case studies, and war stories. However, best practice is by no means confined to this domain. The example of a premier consulting firm—which guards its leadership development approach zealously as a competitive advantage—is again useful here. Soon after joining the firm junior consultants are immersed in an intensive two-week program that provides an orientation to the firm’s values and training in the mindsets and skills of personal mastery, interpersonal skills and teamwork. Two years later those who are promoted to engagement managers take a training lasting several days in team leadership and coaching. The one in six who becomes a partner will have spent another week in a workshop on client leadership. And on becoming a partner, many will spend a week learning the skills associated with that new role. Along the way they will have taken part in an annual “firm day” to celebrate the firm’s values. In this example as elsewhere, formal instruction is a powerful but only partial component of leadership development. In this case it is reinforced by a rigorous “up or out” policy as well as many other means of performance management. This includes a process for partner screening that after a 10-year evolution now makes it all but impossible to be selected without at least minimal people leadership skills, regardless of technical competence.

Variety of Content. Not surprisingly, the content of the instruction in leadership development programs varies enormously. In the early 1990s Conger identified four categories of content in the programs offered by independent training organizations (1992):

- Personal growth
- Conceptual understanding
• Feedback
• Skill-building

A study of best practices a dozen years later reported the following top 10 topics emphasized by companies in their training programs, in order of descending importance (Carter, et al., 2005):

1. Teamwork
2. Customer service
3. Ethics and integrity
4. Giving and receiving feedback
5. Results-based decision making
6. Coaching
7. Business acumen
8. Emotional intelligence
9. Innovation
10. Systems thinking

And a more recent study, aiming to identify innovative programs that serve to develop multi-sector change leaders, found additional content areas that we also see in more cutting-edge programs (Link, et al., 2008b):

• Developmental theory and the importance of higher levels of consciousness
• Importance of congruence between behavior and intentions
• Practice of “deep dialogue”

Combining “Inside Out” With “Outside In” Approaches. In looking for patterns in the above and other examples, we note that most of the best programs include an emphasis on both the “interior” domains (intention, values, worldview, vision) and “exterior” (behaviors, structures, processes, culture). They also stress the interdependence of these domains. While there are examples of good programs that focus more narrowly in service of a particular organizational objective, greater impact is more likely from programs that are integral in this sense. Conger’s early study expressed a concern about the lack of such integration in the four executive education programs he studied. “The ideal program would begin with a conceptual overview, then provide feedback on where participants stand relative to the skills associated with the conceptual model of leadership. This would be followed by skills building, for skills that are teachable. The skills that are more complex…would be the focus of awareness building, with the idea that participants could find long-term opportunities to develop these skills back at the office” (1992, p. 53).

Combining “inside out” and “outside in” approaches would be especially important in programs that have the objective of change leadership. A study of multi-sector “generative change leaders” selected programs based on the assumption that effective programs would embody “a
substantial degree of integration among the personal, interpersonal, and systemic components of the program” (Link, et al., 2008b). Conger and Benjamin concluded that a critical design feature is building a program around a single well-delineated leadership model (1999, p. 33). By contrast, Gauthier et al. found that “many programs blend and integrate several conceptual frameworks” (2008a, p. 9). We conclude that the underlying principle is one of integration, not the means by which it is achieved.

The Importance of Character as Content. The available evidence does not support any particular version of “inside out” content as being more effective. Nonetheless, we are biased in favor of programs that include an emphasis on the character of the leader. Leadership theory began here, with the Great Man theory, now regarded as both gender-biased and limited in its assumption that leaders are born, not made. But the emphasis on character has undergone a rebirth and emerged in more robust forms (George & Sims, 2007; Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002; Scharmer, 2007; Senge, et al., 2004). The leadership development approach of the U.S. Army recognizes the importance of a foundation in character with the first element of its “Be, Know, Do” mantra (Hesselbein & Shinseki, 2004, pp. 8-21). From this perspective, “only a person who is comfortable in his or her own skin, who has a strong set of values, who behaves consistently with those values, and who demonstrates self-discipline, can begin to lead others” (Hesselbein & Shinseki, 2004, p. 25). We believe that leadership development programs that take this into account are more likely to produce leaders who can transcend narrow self-interest and self-protection to consistently act on behalf of the well-being of their organization as a whole and the broader society. They are more likely to gain the self-awareness that enables them to tame their inner demons and attain the maturity that good leadership demands (Brooks, 2008). And they are less likely to be vulnerable to the various forms of “bad leadership” that have been all too prevalent at high levels in our institutions (Kellerman, 2004).

Other Determinants of Content. What else might determine curriculum choices? Are there other patterns that distinguish best practice? One consistent thread is that the most effective programs make a clear link between the organization’s challenges and the competencies for which leaders are developed. Since organizations have different missions and face different challenges, they naturally focus on different content. Over two-thirds of Fortune 500 companies have developed explicit leadership competencies for development and success planning that also serve as a foundation for the design of their leadership development programs (Day & Halpin, 2001, p. 11). Different competencies are reflected in the curricular content of those programs.

The link to strategic objectives means that what constitutes “best practice” in leadership development may change over time in the same organization. Honeywell’s merger with AlliedSignal provides an example. In the late 1990s AlliedSignal had a leadership development program structured around an intensive 360° “Multi-Source Feedback” program (Giber, Carter, & Goldsmith, 2000, p. 44). Honeywell CEO Larry Bossidy, who had also been in charge of AlliedSignal, decided in 2000 to use a “six sigma” total quality initiative to transform the
company. It became the basis for a new talent recruitment and leadership development program (Carter, et al., 2005, pp. 195-212). Indeed, approaches that are unresponsive to contextual change may put the company at risk. IBM invested millions in the 1980s on leadership development, “only to discover too late that leaders were being trained to think in outmoded ways” (Day & Halpin, 2001, p. 8).

In addition to goals, company culture also plays a significant role in choice of curriculum and methods. Mattel’s Project Platypus consciously drew on out-of-the-box paradigms—including postmodernism and the idea of organizations as living systems—to design a 12-week program to help reinvent the company’s approach to innovation. The resulting program was based on the metaphor of a theater. Although the program featured structured inputs from experts, including facilitated brainstorming and problem-solving exercises, participants were expected to self-organize and to navigate the predictable experience of chaos as a necessary stage in creative process. Such an approach would have been risky in more structured settings, with participants less oriented toward creativity, but seemed to work well at Mattel (Carter, et al., 2005, pp. 262-281).

A leadership development program can be used to counter and transform—rather than be consistent with—the organization’s culture. This was the case at Lockheed Martin after resistance to change blocked successful implementation of a quality improvement initiative (Carter, et al., 2005, pp. 239-257). A new program, explicitly designed to shift the culture, reached out to formal leaders to require them to become teachers in a cascading downward cycle of teaching and learning. The program also deliberately engaged informal opinion leaders.

Another variable explaining the variety in program content is the choice about whether “individuals, teams or organizational change efforts are seen as the best vehicle for carrying the dual burden of driving learning and facilitating organizational change” (Giber, et al., 2000, p. xviii). Different programs make different tradeoffs among the emphasis on these three areas of focus. The curriculum in Motorola’s three-month Gold program in the late 1990s, for example, was focused on strategic planning and leading organizational transformation. 360° feedback and coaching were delivered in the context of these objectives (Giber et al., 2000, pp. 326-366). Similarly, Colgate-Palmolive focuses heavily on strategic thinking and planning, accountability for results, and partnering to break down organizational silos (pp. 188-224). This led to modules such as “economic and retail environment” and “supply chain management.”

By contrast, The Mathworks emphasizes training for teamwork and team leadership as a means to transform the culture of its operations department (pp. 277-297). And the MITRE Corporation has a combined emphasis on individual development and team effectiveness, with corresponding modules on each followed by a team-learning experience oriented toward action learning (pp. 298-325).
Greater emphasis on individual-focused development is evident in SIAC’s Leadership Development System, which features 360° feedback followed by coaching. SIAC made a conscious choice to limit its initial emphasis in this way, feeling that this would lay a foundation of credibility before tackling customer and strategic issues. And Gundersen Lutheran Hospital focuses on individual assessment and feedback in an initial workshop, which is then reinforced through participation in “learning teams” that meet for two years (pp. 228-244).

Inclusion and integration of all three levels—individuals, teams, organizations—would be highly appropriate in the case of multi-stakeholder change agents. However, few programs appear to do a good job of integrating all three (Link, et al., 2008b, p. 15).

**Multiple Levels.** The most sophisticated approaches are often distinguished by multiple programs tailored for different levels of management, with correspondingly different curricular content. For example, The Bose Corporation separates development of first line, middle management and senior level, with the supporting training focused respectively on team development and managing individual contributors, business development and managing managers, and organizational development and managing business entities (Giber, et al., 2000, p. 150). This was the case at GE as well. (See also the IRS example described in detail in section 3.5.3.)

One university-based head of executive education made the case for such tailoring in this way: “Teaching Sunday school is not the same thing as teaching seminary.”

Of course, programs offered to members of multiple organizations must use a different method to arrive at program content. An example from the non-profit world illustrates the variety of ways in which content can be chosen and delivered. The Kansas Health Foundation sponsors a Kansas Community Leadership Initiative in 40 communities throughout the state. It enrolls executive directors and “lead volunteers” from community leadership programs (mostly run by local chambers of commerce) in a two-year program. The content is skill development in consensus building, collaboration, visioning, and facilitative leadership (Enright, 2006, pp. 11-14).

**Neglect of Quality of Instruction.** Surprisingly, the studies we uncovered paid scant attention to the quality of instruction. At most they directed attention to the type of faculty (managers in the organization vs. external). Our own view is that the quality—and in particular the personal qualities—of the faculty is hugely important. This is particularly true in the “softer” areas, where being a role model is critical. For leaders to develop emotional intelligence they need exposure to credible examples of people who embody those skills even as they advocate them. To allow leaders to become vulnerable in the interest of learning, they need faculty who have the skill to create a learning environment in which people are willing to take the risk of making themselves vulnerable. And for leaders to persist in the challenging and sometimes painful inquiry into areas of their own “shadow,” they need faculty who are comfortable with such explorations themselves and are able to bring humor to the endeavor.
Other Features of Instruction. There are of course many more particular features of content and pedagogy to be considered in the design of a leadership development program. And there is reason to believe the choice of such features can make a substantial difference in program impact. We will identify and briefly describe a number of those in section 3.3, after completing the review of most common program elements.

Cautions. Mere exposure to knowledge is a poor guarantee that it will lead to behavior change or be put to use. And the popularity of many other program design elements attests to the perceived limits of a focus on formal instruction alone. In aspiring to be comprehensive, programs risk using multiple frameworks that are not well integrated. The risk is compounded when multiple faculty show up to deliver only a piece of the program. Some have expressed concern that competency models may reinforce the notion of an “ideal” leader who has all competencies but may be too limited to the time they were created (Conger & Benjamin, 1999, p. 60). Moreover, there may be a tendency to continue to use competency models that emerged from an expensive process even when the organization’s needs have changed.

5. Coaching

Coaching is probably the most powerful form of support for other common elements of comprehensive leadership development programs, such as formal instruction, assessment, and action learning. It is also useful on its own as an enhancement of on-the-job learning. Coaching can come in several forms:

- Executive coaching
- Coaching from a supervisor
- Peer coaching

Executive Coaching. The kind of coaching most often cited as a critical element of leadership development programs is provided by someone outside the reporting relationship who has special training as a coach. One simple definition of such coaching is “a short- to medium-term relationship between a manager or senior leader and a consultant (internal or external) with the purpose of improving work performance” (Douglas, McCauley, & 1999, cited in American Management Association, 2008, p. 8).

Coaches, at least in the private sector, are most typically hired to improve productivity and enhance leadership development (American Management Association, 2008, p. 1). However, such coaching is increasingly used for leadership development rather than problem solving (Sherpa Consulting, 2008, p. 2). A recent global study indicates that in the corporate world coaching is used in 52% of organizations and its popularity is growing (American Management Association, 2008). About half of engagements last seven to twelve months, with a quarter lasting two to six months and a quarter more than a year (Coutu & Kauffman, 2009, p. 10). In
support of leadership development efforts, coaches play a variety of roles. Typical would be the following roles as part of an initiative to accelerate the development of emerging leaders in a bank (Bolt, 1989, p. 85):

- Facilitate the assessment phase by collecting and analyzing assessment data;
- Help to structure participants’ individual development plans and facilitate discussions with participants and their managers;
- Support participants’ application of learning and coach them on specific management issues that arose on the job;
- Help participants measure progress against goals.

Is coaching effective? According to another study with a large sample, coaching is associated with improvements in both organizational and individual effectiveness, with the “biggest positive impact on...developing future leaders and improving leadership behaviors” (McDermott, Levenson, & Newton, 2007, cited in American Management Association, p. 36). And a study this year found that “87% of HR professionals and coaching clients see the value of executive coaching as ‘somewhat high’ or ‘very high,’” though an equally high percentage “had no formal process to measure that value” (Sherpa Consulting, 2009).

Some organizations use internal human resource staff to provide coaching. This has the advantage of ensuring that coaches have a good understanding of the organization’s culture. However, managers are sometimes reluctant to be fully open with internal coaches, fearing that supposedly confidential information will impact their career path. And external coaches are more likely to have attained a higher degree of skill. However, externally-delivered executive coaching can be expensive. Typical fees in the corporate world (in the U.S.) are $500 per hour and can go much higher (Coutu & Kauffman, 2009).

How do companies select executive coaches? Hiring decisions not connected with a formal program are often made by individual managers. However, coaches used in leadership development programs are typically subject to formal selection procedures. For example, one program engaged 24 coaches, 18 external and 6 internal, though a “rigorous vetting process that included extensive interviews” and provided training to orient them to the program. The coaches all operated within a three-way contracting agreement negotiated among the coach, coachee, and manager. The contract included an individual development plan with three goals—two based on development needs and one based on a strength and how it would be leveraged. The contract also included agreement on a schedule for review of the development plans. In this case managers were also expected to provide coaching on a day-to-day basis (Bolt, et al., 2005, pp. 84-86).

In comprehensive leadership development programs coaches are often engaged to give feedback from 360° instruments. As noted in the section on “assessment,” the effectiveness of these feedback sessions is highly dependent on both the quality of the instrument and the skill
and methods of the coach. The Center for Creative Leadership uses professional staff psychologists for this purpose in their well-known Leadership Development Program (Conger, 1992, p. 123).

There is reason to believe that the benefits of coaching can justify the costs. Consistent with the data in the AMA study reported above, a study in the non-profit world found that coaching is increasingly used as a follow-up tool to support application of knowledge and skills from leadership and management programs. It reports that 42% of foundations provided support for coaching in their funding to grantees (Howard, Blair, & Brown, 2006, p. 8) and that those that did believed it has a positive impact (p.17). For example, coaching:

- Provides grantees with an objective and confidential ear
- Offers a time and place to reflect on practice
- Helps in problem-solving and accountability
- Provides an opportunity for assistance with managing work/life balance issues
- Increases job satisfaction

In another study of non-profit uses of coaching, respondents “overwhelmingly perceive coaching as having a positive impact on their grantees” (Howard, Blair, & Kellogg, 2006, p. 2). Coaching also furthered the organization’s mission by identifying resources that could be better leveraged, led to an improved relationship with and involvement of the board, and enhanced application of learning from training. The report recommended the goal of establishing coaching as an “effective and ubiquitous tool within the non-profit sector as part of larger leadership development and organizational effectiveness capacity-building strategies” (p. 3). An interesting variation on traditional uses of executive coaches was reported by the Fieldstone Foundation, which uses non-profit executives as coaches for executive directors after providing them with training (Enright, 2006, p. 34).

Coaches see two factors as being most important regarding the coachee’s “coachability,” both of which have to do with motivation: “readiness for change” and “active engagement.” Critical success factors for the overall relationship from the coach’s perspective include high motivation, good chemistry, and the now familiar “strong commitment from top management to coaching the executive” (Coutu & Kauffman, 2009, pp. 18-19).

Coaching from a Supervisor. Coaching that is a part of boss-subordinate relationships can reinforce on-the-job learning, which is generally recognized as the most powerful lever for leadership development. Companies committed to leadership development capitalize on this by instilling in their managers the view that developing leadership is a critical part of their job. Even when the overall culture is not conducive to development, managers can create a “micro-culture” that supports development in a variety of ways. These include the common (and valuable but often perfunctory) practice of devising a development plan and overseeing its
implication. But there are a number of other ways in which supervisors can coach, which include (Blunt, 2004, pp. 18-20):

- Being a good role model
- Defining jobs in ways that take people out of their comfort zone with appropriate support
- Creating specific opportunities for stretch work through temporary assignments, job rotations, and projects
- Going beyond interactions around formal performance reviews to serve as a sounding board, encourage reflection, and prod employees to strive for their best

Supervisors have a tool that is not available in the same way to executive coaches who may otherwise be more expert. They can tell stories of their own leadership development. Such storytelling is increasingly recognized as a powerful way of teaching leadership lessons (Denning, 2005; Freedman, 2000; Tichy & Cohen, 1997), and is a leadership skill worthy of development in its own right. (See the fuller description of storytelling in section 3.3.)

**Peer Coaching.** Coaching from peers is also a feature of many effective programs. The Hawaii Community Foundation has found this method to be an important lever for leadership development. Its PONO program brings together mid-career non-profit executives for a year-long program of collective, peer-centered learning. Participants design and implement capacity-building projects focused on critical issues in their organizations. In a series of monthly training sessions, the group engages in facilitated discussion of key aspects of leadership. The goal is to “build a strong group of supports who can get to know each other and coach each other and give feedback” (Enright, 2006). Gauthier et al. also report the prevalence of peer learning in the programs for change leaders they identified (Link, et al., 2008b, p. 9).

Action-learning programs often use a form of peer coaching in the form of a “learning coach,” who plays the role of process facilitator by asking questions and actively listening (Kramer, 2007). A consulting firm experienced in facilitating peer coaching reports the following examples, each of which was launched with skill training and initial professional facilitation:

- Unit leaders from a large corporation met monthly to help each other work on business issues. Individuals brought in their work challenges, such as developing new strategies for revenue generation, helping staff through significant changes in work, or improving work structures and systems. Peers not only made significant progress on their challenges, they also strengthened their relationships, resulting in greater coordination across the business.
- Internal consultants met quarterly to improve their effectiveness in working with clients. Because these professionals did similar work, they not only benefited from peer coaching, they also transferred technical knowledge to one another.
- Entrepreneurs from different industries met monthly to help each other reach their business goals.
The American Management Association global survey found that about half of responding organizations use peer coaching. However, only about a third of respondents (32%) considered peer coaching to be very effective or extremely effective (American Management Association, 2008, p. 11). This likely results from high variability in quality, given that people often receive no training in how to be a good peer coach. Without such training, the reflexive tendency is to offer advice based on personal experience, which may not be fully appropriate to the situation at hand.

Cautions. The AMA study found the biggest hindrances to executive coaching to be, in order of declining significance: "mismatches between coach and employee," “questionable expertise of coaches” and “inability of employee to change” (2008, p. 15). This last factor is consistent with a report that coaches have great difficulty in helping people with “deep behavioral problems” when they are unwilling to look inward and when their values diverge significantly from the organization (Coutu & Kauffman, 2009, p. 14). Coachee readiness is a critical factor, so it can be risky to force coaching on a manager. In addition, the people who need it most are often the least open to it.

6. Mentoring

Mentoring and coaching, being two forms of developmental relationships, have much in common. Both are potentially powerful forms of support. Coaching tends to focus on performance issues related to a current assignment while mentoring is somewhat more likely to focus on longer-termed career development, but they can overlap considerably. The American Society for Training and Development defines mentoring as “a relationship in which a senior mentor guides the career of a junior up-and-coming employee, usually from a different part of the organization.”

Mentoring programs may be formal or informal. Relationships last for a specific period of time in a formal program (e.g., nine months to a year), at which point it may continue informally. Mentoring offers indirect benefits to the organization as well as the mentee. It can serve as a vehicle for passing on organizational values. And it helps shape those values, by contributing to the development of an organizational culture that promotes the sharing of knowledge and information. Mentoring also builds cross-functional relationships and facilitates cross-training throughout the organization. The benefits are not just one way: mentors often report learning from the relationship as well.

Typical Features. The trends reported in a study of mentoring in the transportation industry are probably typical of more general patterns in organizations of all kinds (Corporate Leadership Council, 2002b):

1. Companies target a specific population with their mentoring programs.
2. Most mentoring programs are formal, 12-month ventures that place much of the responsibility for scheduling meetings with the mentee.

3. One person at the company is designated to lead the program or is aided by a handful of administrators.

4. Mentors and mentees are nominated and selected to participate in the program. A group of human resources employees pairs mentors and mentees with each other. Companies conduct orientation programs for their mentoring pairs that are several hours to two days in length. Most companies introduce the mentors to their mentees during these orientations. Geographic concerns must be considered when managing a mentoring program, as should the question of pairing mentors and mentees within the same department or functional area.

5. All profiled companies have found that senior-level support and participant time commitment are critical to a mentoring program’s success.

6. Interviewed officials expressed confidence that mentoring programs at their companies are providing an adequate return on investment, but they noted that quantifying those results is difficult.

Applications. All sectors in the U.S. employ mentoring. In the public sector, for example, the Pension Benefits Guaranty Corporation has a strong mentoring program, and uses senior leaders as both coaches and mentors as part of its two-year Leaders Growing Leaders succession program (Blunt, 2004, pp. 53-55). The U.S. Veterans Benefits Administration also stresses mentoring, with mentors and mentees matched through a web-based process. Both groups receive training (Blunt, 2004, pp. 64-65).

The military offers notable examples. The U.S. Coast Guard encourages formal and informal mentoring as a means of supporting leadership development while also promoting a leader-centered culture. It offers an online learning module (“So You Want to Be a Mentor”) with an eight-step independent learning program supported by training (Blunt, 2004, pp. 56-57). And it offers advice on how to select a mentor. The Marine Corps also emphasizes formal and informal mentoring. A detailed account of its approach to leadership development reports that “senior Marines consider mentoring their juniors one of their greatest responsibilities” (Santamaria, et al., 2004, p. 173). This ethos is reinforced in active-duty units by unusual two-way mentoring relationships—“leadership partnerships” between offices and non-commissioned officers. “Each platoon is run by two individuals: the higher-ranking officer, a young lieutenant with one to three years’ experience, is paired with a seasoned staff sergeant or gunnery sergeant with 12-18 years’ experience. The experience and maturity of the sergeant complement the tactical education and fresh ideas of the lieutenant. The two learn from each other and jointly solve tactical challenges and problems about people” (Katzenbach & Santamaria, 1999, pp. 7-8).

Mentoring is common in the non-profit world as well, found in organizations as diverse as those delivering healthcare to university-based libraries (Mason & Wetherbee, 2004, p. 206). One study of non-profit mentoring found that programs are best designed in accordance with organizational size. Large non-profits (50 or more employees) can follow the examples of
government agencies and corporations and design internal programs, while smaller ones are best served by arranging for external mentors (Academy for Educational Development Center for Leadership Development).

Not only small non-profits have found it necessary to reach outside their organization for mentors. This is sometimes necessary to find appropriate role models for women. For example, Medtronic—a medical technology company—has a program of this kind, with the following goals:

- Accelerate development of mid- and senior-level women and prepare them for key leadership roles
- Develop leaders’ mentoring capabilities
- Foster expanded perspectives
- Provide access to experience, wisdom, and expertise of mentors

**Benefits.** Leadership development is only one of many potential benefits of a mentoring program. One summary of the research pointed to the following seven areas (Corporate Leadership Council, 2000a):

- Improve morale
- Increase retention
- Accelerate employees’ development
- Enhance corporate culture
- Help employees experience fewer adjustment problems
- Grow the leadership bench strength of organizations
- Help women and minorities advance their careers

Regarding this last item, mentoring has proved to be especially important to women and minorities in advancing in organizations where members of the same race or gender are not well represented. One study of 829 companies found mentoring to be the best overall tool for increasing management diversity (Dobbin, Kalev, & Kelly, 2007, p. 22). And another study pointed to “the vital role that mentors play in the development of successful minority executives, who...make use of ‘developmental relationships’ much more frequently than those who end up plateauing in middle management.” According to the findings of this study, a ‘portfolio of mentors’ at each step up the career ladder is a necessity for getting to the top, with the benefits going far beyond counseling and feedback” (Gabarro & Thomas, 1999, as reported in Ross, 1999, p.1). Other research findings indicate that African American men in particular find mentoring more critical to their success than their white counterparts (Douglas, 2003, p. 10).

**Case Examples** One study of mentoring in the non-profit sector included case studies of mentoring relationships. Below are two examples that give a taste of what these relationships can look like. The first describes a woman and a minority as mentee in an external mentor
Michael Montaño at the JUNTA for Progressive Action had as one of several mentors Brett Dignam, Professor of Clinical Studies at Yale Law School. Dignam helps Montaño take advantage of the intellectual resources available in New Haven, particularly at Yale Law School. She has encouraged Montaño to develop critical and strategic thinking capability by providing input and feedback in the envisioning of new initiatives. She is a rigorous coach, often pressing Montaño to recognize weaknesses in strategy, consider alternatives, and think carefully about the motivations, processes and outcomes of his work. She also connects him with individuals who can provide the research data or technical expertise needed to bring his ideas to fruition. Finally, removed from JUNTA’s day-to-day operations, Dignam serves as a safe refuge when Montaño needs to work out challenges in professional relationships at work or in the community.

Mara Schlimm, a program officer with the Academy for Educational Development’s Center for International Exchanges, provided mentoring support to Emily McDonald, a program assistant in the AED center on AIDS & Community Health. The two met every two weeks to discuss general professional development strategies, networking opportunities, and long term career goals. Mara offered tips on grant proposal development (a topic of interest to Emily) and shared some of her contacts in the public health community. She also loaned Emily a few books on managing people, as Emily had recently assumed responsibility for training new program assistants and supervising temporary staff employed by her project. Finally, the two discussed the importance of recognizing one’s own accomplishments and expertise and valuing the unique contributions they were making to their respective work units.

Effectiveness. In light of its multiple benefits to the mentor, mentee and organization, it is not surprising that there is evidence supporting the effectiveness of mentoring. A survey of 350 companies involved in leadership development included mentoring as among the successful elements (formal and informal mentoring were eighth and ninth respectively on a list of thirteen, preceded by action learning, cross functional rotations, 360° feedback, exposure to senior executives, external coaching, global rotations, and exposure to strategic agenda) (Giber, et al., 2000, p. xiv). However, as these data indicate, mentoring tends not to appear among the very most important approaches for most audiences. In a related study in which authors of best-practice case studies in their organizations were asked to identify the four key features that most impacted the success of their programs, none cited formal mentoring and only 7% pointed to informal mentoring. By contrast, 73% named action learning, 67% said 360° feedback, and 26% external coaching (Giber et al., p. 444). But this generalization is apparently not true for minorities and women, whose upward mobility appears to be significantly enhanced by mentoring, as noted on the previous page.
Mentoring can be more cost-effective than coaching. A recent innovation is the “learning group,” in which a formal mentor is paired with a group of four to six high-performing managers. They typically meet once a month for several hours with an open agenda around leadership challenges (Conger & Benjamin, 1999, p. 67).

**Cautions.** Mentoring programs are vulnerable to failure, often because “executives fail to lay sufficient groundwork for these mentoring relationships to grow” (White, 2007). A successful relationship requires readiness and reflection on both sides. For instance, mentees must first analyze their own goals, objectives, work styles, personalities, and other traits, which they will need to articulate to mentors in the first meeting. Mentors must undergo a similar self-discovery process, understanding what they have to contribute and what forms of communication will work best to foster the best outcome for the person being mentored and the organization. Orientation programs for both parties can be helpful. Here, as with leadership development generally, signals of support from senior management—or lack thereof—can make a critical difference.

7. Networking

Across all sectors networking is recognized as a valuable complement to leadership development. It is one way to break down silos to foster collaboration within or across organizations while supporting leadership development. In addition to being a source of coaching (discussed above), peer relationships can be a conduit for knowledge transfer and can also foster collective leadership. Research shows that peer relationships are of high value to development in part because of their duration. In contrast to mentor relationships, which even informally tend to last no more than 3 to 6 years, some peer relationships span a career lasting 20 to 30 years (Day, 2001, p. 597).

Corporate examples of networking include (Day, 2001, pp. 596-7):

- ARAMARK’s Executive Leadership Institute’s action-learning project is done in cross-organizational teams as an intentional means of promoting greater awareness of capabilities and opportunities.

- Andersen Consulting’s Organization Executive Program enables partners to strengthen their personal networks as a means of creating entrepreneurial opportunities.

- Motorola’s Vice President Institute features networking as a third goal, enhancing learning about the company’s heritage and culture and helping the VPs explore new ways to invent technologies and businesses.

An example in the non-profit world is the Fieldstone Executive Learning Groups, cited above as an example of action learning. These programs also have the explicit goal of networking: “We want these individuals to build relationships among themselves so they can support each other”
(Enright, 2006, p. 29). Similarly, the Jessie Ball DuPont Fund’s Nonprofit Executive Institute, which brings teams of three from organizations to a four-and-a-half-day residential program, also aims at “building peer relationships, both within and among non-profit organizations.”

This latter program illustrates the rocky and sometimes meandering path to finding a successful leadership development program. Fieldstone began the journey in 1992 by sending three non-profit CEOs to the Wharton School for an extended residential program. Not satisfied, it turned to the Center for Creative Leadership to organize one-day seminars for non-profit executives in different regions of the country. This seemed too superficial and generated no evidence of impact. Fieldstone then used a focus group of non-profit CEOs to explore what they would want from a leadership development program. What resulted was a residential program, led by the CCL at the Aspen Institute. While evaluation found it had succeeded in development of individual leadership capacity, participants wanted more pragmatic training and wished to include other members of their organizations to better foster systemic change. This led them to the current model, many years after the first step, which serves up to ten teams of three—for example, the CEO, a board member and a staff member—from participating organizations.

Some organizations have evolved with the primary purpose of supporting networking and knowledge sharing. For example, the Young Presidents’ Organization has created a world-wide network with membership limited to heads of enterprises in any sector under 40 years old. Its mission is to “develop better leaders through education and idea exchange.” Members meet in geographically convenient, facilitated “forums” of eight to ten people that provide a safe container for sharing personal issues. YPO offers courses as well.

The Leader-to-Leader Institute is a similar institution with a more explicit agenda of social service. It aims to “strengthen the leadership of the social sector.” Its Investment in America Program brings together leaders from each of the three sectors to “share knowledge and experience in developing values-based, ethically-driven leadership.” To promote cross-sector dialog on leadership it jointly hosts with the Conference Board and the U.S. Army an Invest in America Forum. This is a two-day event at West Point that gathers a small, select group of CEOs and presidents from the public, private, and social sectors to examine mutual challenges facing all three sectors and the nation.

Leaders across organizations have also been convened to foster collective leadership on more specific problems. For example, a foundation convened mayors, university presidents, non-profit leaders, and business CEOs from 15 big cities under the name “CEOS for Cities.” The purpose was to spur economic development in cities by influencing national policy, sponsoring resources, and fostering practitioner networks to accelerate innovation and learning on topics such as workforce skills, infrastructure development, and housing. Every year Grantmakers for Effective Organizations brings together leaders of six to ten foundations to support one another in coming up with solutions to problems specific to their organizations.
Internet Support. The internet provides new opportunities for networking. Nortel uses advanced video and data-networking technologies to offer a Virtual Leadership Academy monthly in 47 countries with simultaneous translation from English into Spanish and Portuguese. The technology enables real-time response to questions and concerns (Day & Halpin, 2001, p. 21). In a powerful innovation now spreading to other organizations, the Open Society Institute’s KARL employs Web 2.0 technology (wikis, blogs) to enable employees to discover common interests, resources, and experiences and to connect across organizational and geographic boundaries. This kind of networking significantly expands the potential for collective leadership to emerge.\textsuperscript{31}

Communities of Practice. Several examples of a new and promising form of networking—the “community of practice”—have been initiated by the federal government. (See the fuller description of this tool in section 3.3.) For example, “Reinventing Government” sponsored the recruitment of local family-service coalitions to join a national learning network to enhance their ability to learn and create better ways to support the development of children and families (Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002, pp. 224-228). This community:

- Held face-to-face conferences twice a year in which they shared goals and strategies, built relationships, and decided what issues and projects to jointly explore
- Convened teleconferences featuring expert speakers and open discussion of problems
- Operated a listserv providing updates on issues such as funding and upcoming legislation
- Created a website with news and helpful information about resources
- Enabled informal member exchange to discuss ideas and get assistance
- Stimulated common projects

The resulting interaction not only fostered communication and learning, but led to tangible outcomes: the creation of a brand (Boost4Kids) that has helped members promote their cause and funding for a plan to deliver after-school programs throughout Palm Beach County in Florida to reach under-served areas.

Other federally sponsored communities of practice include the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century Skills Network, which focuses on workforce development strategies, and SafeCities, which focuses on law enforcement and social action strategies to reduce gun violence (Wenger, et al., 2002, p. 228). Another example particularly appropriate to this study is the Public Sector Consortium, which has created a community of practice around leadership development in the public sector.\textsuperscript{32}

A highly impactful example of a community of practice is the U.S. Army’s CompanyCommand, which connects company commanders—past, present and future—for knowledge sharing (Dixon, Allen, Burgess, Kilner, & Schweitzer, 2005). Army leaders are able to get support on how to deal with whatever challenges may emerge, such as how to communicate with family members of soldiers killed in action. CompanyCommand has evolved from a base of an active website to provide cutting edge, world-class resources. It has generated a book, a monthly
newsletter, and face-to-face learning opportunities. One particularly dramatic example of connecting leaders in the experience to leaders with experience occurred when the idea evolved of creating workshops led by returning combat veterans in Iraq with company leaders about to be deployed. Such “just-in-time” learning enabled those about to lead men under life-threatening conditions with the most recent lessons learned by their peers facing similar challenges (pp. 23-31). In so doing it serves the purpose of mentoring. Other supports include book discussion forums, which participants attest have the benefits of creating a shared experience, helping retain knowledge, building a sense of professional identity, and amplifying the impact of learning (pp. 43-45). A study of the community concludes: “connecting leaders in conversation about their work transforms the individuals who participate as well as the whole profession” (p. 178).

Advocates of communities of practice see enormous potential in this new form of organization: “civic practitioner networks may help renew a long-standing vision for how democracy—at any level of government—can achieve socioeconomic ends by enabling civic groups and coalitions to take charge of their own destiny” (Wenger, et al., 2002, p. 228). In effect, they help foster the emergence of collective leadership. A variety of organizations have evolved to support the emergence of leadership through communities of practice. For example, the wish to create a community of practice on non-profit leadership development led to the formation of the Leadership Learning Community in 2001. It “connects a diverse group of leadership development practitioners, grant-makers, and thought leaders who identify successful practices, conduct research, evaluate current leadership efforts, and exchange information and tools.” LLC sponsors regional- and affinity-circles focusing on specific leadership themes to advance learning and develop action projects (Enright, 2006, p. 33).

Peer Learning. Peer learning and coaching are natural partners with networking and are increasingly common in the non-profit world. The Hawaii Community Foundation’s PONO program, cited above as an example of peer coaching, also reports network building as an important program outcome. All participants reported increases in the size of their networks, and peer networking was rated by participants as the most valuable element of the program overall (Enright, 2006, p. 6). The James P. Shannon Leadership Institute sponsors two related programs: a set of monthly two-day sessions with an opening and closing retreat; and a program with four quarterly three-and-a-half day retreats. Both help experienced leaders address challenges and opportunities they face in their work. Rather than focus on skill building, the programs aim to help leaders draw out wisdom from their experience (p. 34). The Aspen Institute has created a Global Leadership Network of 850 fellows, designed to encourage corporate leaders to incorporate the values of social entrepreneurs.

A final example illustrates the creative variety of leadership development efforts that feature networking in the non-profit sector. Since 2005 the Barr Foundation in Boston has sponsored a three-year Barr Fellows program. It includes a sabbatical (lasting three months), international travel (a two-week trip to the “Global South” followed by individual travel), a series of retreats,
and peer learning (which includes international peers met while traveling). Fellows are drawn mainly from non-profit organizations, but also from housing and social service agencies as well as schools, in recognition of the interdisciplinary problems the program wants to address. Stipends are given to the organizations from which fellows come to compensate for their absence during the sabbatical. The Barr program uses networking as an antidote to the problem that non-profit leaders tend to be isolated within their organizations, their fields and their geographies. “By bringing a cohort of diverse Fellows together from different fields and connecting them with developing nation leaders, the Barr Fellows program is building both local and international networks.”

Cautions. For networks to realize their full potential, they typically require someone to play an active support role. Without ongoing monitoring and some prodding, they can easily atrophy. To take advantage of networking opportunities, managers need interpersonal competence as well as clear objectives. In a well-orchestrated leadership development program, other elements can help ensure these skills.

3.2 Programs Supporting Collective Leadership Development

An Emerging Trend. As noted in the introduction, definitions of leadership are beginning to emerge that stress a collective orientation (Drath, 2001; Raelin, 2003). Practitioners are keeping pace with this trend as well. Many find that the individually oriented, “heroic” model of the leader is limited in its capacity to cope with the challenging conditions that are becoming typical within and across sectors (Hubbard, 2005). Peter Vaill calls these conditions “whitewater” (quoted in Kramer, 2007). The Army has developed an acronym for them: VUCA (Volatile, Uncertain, Complex, and Ambiguous) (Hesselbein & Shinseki, 2004, pp. 116-117). Under such conditions individuals lack not only the ability but often the credibility to develop unilateral solutions to problems, which often intersect with multiple sectors (Chrislip, 2002, p. 16). Peter Russell quotes the Vietnamese monk Thich Nhat Hanh on this point: “The next Buddha will be a sangha [community].” Russell goes on to explain: “The next awakening will come through communal breakthrough, rather than the insight of a single being...We’re going to need that sort of collective thinking to solve some of the problems we’re up against” (Shapiro, 2009, p. 33).

Another contributor to this trend is the increasing appreciation for the wisdom that resides in groups. Under a number of conditions, groups have been shown to make better decisions than individuals (Suroviecki, 2004). And there is mounting support for the idea that an intelligence can emerge in groups that transcends the intelligence of the individual members (Fetzer Institute, 2001; Hamilton, 2004). An increasing number of workshops and websites are devoted to this idea.37
**The Significance of This Trend.** The increasing emphasis on collective leadership appears to us to be one of the most significant trends in leadership development. In light of this conclusion we are surprised at how slow we have been to fully appreciate it. We thought to add a section explicitly addressing this trend only after several initial drafts of the study. Our awareness emerged gradually, provoked by a nagging unease that we had not yet gotten something quite right. We sense value in documenting the evolution of that awareness in case others need help, as we did, in recognizing and moving beyond tacitly limited mental models of leadership.

- As we examined examples of what others regarded as best practice, we realized that we had been seduced into focusing on leadership within organizations. This is after all where most corporate leadership development programs take place and those programs are the best documented. However, in the non-profit world in particular some of the most interesting tools and practices have to do with managing the challenges across organizations (Enright, 2006; Hubbard, 2005).

- We then became aware of a parallel tacit bias in favor of the development of individual leaders. Again, this is the predominant orientation of corporate programs, but in the non-profit sector and in multi-sectoral initiatives the focus of emerging best practice seemed to be much more on development of teams and networks, extending beyond organizational and sectoral boundaries (Enright, 2006; Hubbard, 2005; Scharmer, 2007).

- Together these concurrent realizations led us to add a section on transorganizational/systemic tools and practices to supplement those within organizations.

- We then began to be bothered by the paradox that some of the companies we were singling out for effective leadership development were among those that have been recently implicated in the collapse of the financial system. For example, we had pointed to Citibank as an example of effective action learning. And one of the authors of this study personally participated in the design and delivery of what he thought were high-quality leadership development programs at Fannie Mae and Lehman Brothers. This realization provided a sobering reminder of the importance of the ethical dimensions of leadership and the importance of understanding the systemic consequences of one’s actions. Similar reflection has recently led some of the elite business schools, at which many of the leaders of those organizations were educated, to begin raising questions about their own role. They are asking themselves: “Is there something essential to good leadership that we are not teaching?”

- A final step came when we read Senge et al.’s *The Necessary Revolution: How Individuals and Organizations Are Working together to Create a Sustainable World* (2008). This book is one of many that makes a powerful case that the way of living that had evolved in the first world—which, ironically, the developing world is hustling to emulate—is not sustainable. But the book is distinctive in bringing a systems perspective to bear on how this has come about and pointing toward solutions in the form of cross-organizational and cross-sectoral collaboration. The book also underscores the importance of an underlying “stewardship ethic” in shifting the orientation of leaders to a “win/win” approach.
from one that appears to be “win/lose” but ultimately turns out to be “lose/lose.” This led us to appreciate the role of leadership in creating a sustainable world and the importance of developing leaders with perspectives—and skills—that transcend the narrow self-interest of individuals, organizations, communities, and even nations.

- In asking ourselves where the needed leadership might come from, we began to more fully appreciate the need that others have seen for cross-sectoral “ecosystems” to support the emergence of the self-organizing systems that may be required to solve increasingly complex and interdependent problems (Scharmer, 2007, pp. 323-326).

So it was that, bit by bit, we have experienced a dawning awareness of the importance of cultivating collective leadership that is capable of detecting and addressing the most fundamental tensions and contradictions in our social institutions, our values, and the very mental models that determine how we see and shape the world in which we live. How does one develop such leadership?

**Four Levels of Collective Leadership Development.** The evolution of emphasis on collective leadership—and the various forms that is taking—is most evident in the history of efforts by non-profit foundations to solve social problems. For example, a recent study of best practices in the non-profit community reports that the W.K. Kellogg Foundation has in recent years “moved from investing in [...] leadership as primarily an individual capacity to leadership as a process in community with others” (Hubbard, 2005, p. 26). The importance of collective leadership is also evident in the aspirations and design of multi-sector/multi-stakeholder programs. Collective leadership initiatives in these two domains (supplemented by occasional examples in the public sector) have resulted in programs of roughly four kinds. They variously:

- Focus on a single organization as a locus for collective capacity building
- Aspire to strengthen the leadership capacity of a network or teams of individuals from different organizations with similar or complementary missions
- Aim to develop “grassroots leadership” across multiple sectors
- Foster systemic capacity leadership

Each of these program types merits attention.

**Organization-Specific Programs.** The rationale for focusing on leadership teams within organizations is that:

- Leaders singled out for training frequently do not return to their original organizations.
- Bringing about organizational change often requires more than what a single leader can achieve.
- Team-based approaches help avoid burnout of executive directors by building support (Enright, 2006, p. i).
• Teams of leaders can support one another in dealing with a culture not supportive of what they have learned when they return to their organization.

The Jessie Ball DuPont Fund illustrated this trend in moving from an individual-focused to a team-focused leadership development program after experimenting with a variety of approaches to its Non-Profit Executive Institute (described above as an example of action learning). This initiative evolved from a focus on CEOs to a program that requires organizations to send teams of three (Enright, 2006, pp. 20-23).

The practice of supporting leadership development in teams rather than individuals is of course not unique to the non-profit world. Some programs serving the public sector, for example, explicitly encourage teams of people from the same organization to attend. And some corporate executive education programs encourage this as well. However, the purpose of such shared participation is usually to provide mutual support for the learners and lessen the challenge of re-entering a culture devoid of support for the learning. By contrast, what is distinctive about many foundation-sponsored programs is that they focus explicitly on a team of top leaders to develop their collective leadership capacity rather than simply providing mutual support.

Cross-Organizational Programs. More than their corporate counterparts, non-profits focus on solving problems that are not within their own sphere of influence, so they need the cooperation of other organizations within and beyond the non-profit sector. Many non-profit programs bring together leaders from more than one organization, with the explicit aim of networking and building peer support across organizations. Programs of this kind often have the explicit goal—and in any case the indirect benefit—of nurturing cross-organizational peer networks. For example, Hawaii Community Foundation’s PONO program, cited earlier, brings together mid-career non-profit executives for a year-long program of collective learning. Participants design and implement capacity building projects focused on critical issues in their organizations. The program uses peer-centered learning. In a series of monthly training sessions, the group engages in facilitated discussion of key aspects of leadership. The goal is to “build a strong group of supports who can get to know each other and coach each other and give feedback” (Enright, 2006, p. 6).

Some initiatives cast a broader net in building collective capacity. For example, the Annie E. Casey’s Leadership in Action Program aims to develop the collective leadership capacity of government, non-profit, and community leaders to work on behalf of children, families, and communities (Enright, 2006, p. 35)

Grassroots Leadership Programs. Just as the emphasis on working with teams of leaders rather than individuals grew out of the effort to develop organizational capacity, an analogous emphasis on grassroots leadership grew out of an effort to build community capacity (W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 1999, 2006, 2007). The Kellogg Foundation has been a pioneer in this
area. It launched the Leadership for Community Change program in 2002 to “promote and nurture collective and culturally appropriate leadership in communities across the country” (W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 2006, p. 2). The pilot initiative supported 25 fellows from each of 6 sites around a theme of “strengthening public will and action towards quality teaching and learning.” The fellows worked “to nurture collective leadership within their communities and then use collective action to create systems change” (2006, p. 3). This program reflects a community-based collective approach to leadership, which Kellogg defines as “the result of a process that brings together a diverse community of people to create change…by entwining leaders, partnerships and networks of individuals and organizations around the focal institutes that need development or change.”

Study of such programs has led one observer to outline a “civic leadership development program,” with steps representing a variation on the ones identified at the end of the previous section for individual leadership development programs (Chrislip, 2002, pp. 123-129):

1. Identify current and future [community] challenges
2. Understand lessons of experience
3. Understand leadership as a field of knowledge
4. Define leadership capacities
5. Design the curriculum
6. Implement the program

This study profiled half a dozen examples of civic leadership initiatives. They illustrate a wide variety in how collective leadership emerges and is supported:

- **Joint Venture Silicon Valley**, an effort to address the economic downturn in the San Francisco Bay Area in the early 1990s, emerged from an invitation by the head of the San Jose Chamber of Commerce to leaders of key professional and business associations to work in partnership. Their momentum eventually attracted public sector participation.

- **Transforming Civic Culture.** An effort to transform a historically divided civic culture in Sitka Alaska resulted from the initiative of the Island Institute, a local non-profit organization, which sponsored catalyzing workshops on leadership.

- **The Neighborhood Action Initiative** in Washington, D.C., was created by a mayor who invited the support of AmericaSpeaks, a non-profit specializing in methods of engaging large groups of citizens.

- **The Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal** resulted from a relationship between the state’s governor and an expert in education, which led to the formation of a formal partnership among seven school districts and two universities.
• **Catalysts for Civic Change**, which used scenario planning as a tool for defining a regional agenda, was initiated by a regional civic organization.

• **The Institute for Civic Leadership** grew out of the effort of a corporate leader in Portland, Maine, to address a leadership vacuum in the community.

• **Leadership Challenge 2001**—a leadership development program designed to train leaders of Colorado’s gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender community—came about through the initiative of a community activist, who attracted foundation support for a series of meetings to explore the concept of such a program.

**Systemic Initiatives.** A noteworthy class of leadership development programs reflects the explicit and primary intention to build capacity for systemic change. We believe these initiatives merit special attention because of their potential to address emerging societal and global challenges of an increasingly complex character. These initiatives may also be of particular interest to foundations, which are uniquely well-positioned to sponsor them. Some of the initiatives described earlier in this section have contributed to systemic capacity-building, among other objectives. This is true, for example, of the Kellogg Foundation’s Leadership for Community Change. However, in this section we point to programs that have systemic capacity building as an explicit and primary objective. Such programs employ a variety of strategies. For example:

• A number of programs approach fostering systemic leadership capacity by building the skills of individuals in learning communities that recruit members from multiple sectors and use action-learning on cross-sectoral challenges. Gauthier et al. provide a significant contribution by identifying and profiling 25 such programs of this general type, all of which aspire to “generative change agent development” (2008a & 2008b). We describe some of those programs and discuss them more systematically in section 3.4.4.

• Another strategy is “multi-stakeholder partnerships,” a tool discussed in section 3.3.2. For example, Generon Consulting used its “Change Lab” methodology to initiate the Sustainable Food Lab, which aspires to make the mainstream global food system sustainable. The Food Lab is now in its sixth year, with increasing participation and projects. Together with the Generon, the Synergos Institute (which later joined Generon in support of the Food Lab) created the Bhavishya Alliance, which attempted to reduce child malnutrition in India. Evaluations of these initiatives document the formidable challenges associated with taking on such diffuse and complex problems. However, they also point to achievements that validate the potential of partnerships of this kind to open up communication across traditional silos and develop collaborative solutions with representatives of the entire “system in the room.”

• Still other strategies are implicit in some of the most useful resources that we have discovered. For example, some foundations have taken a knowledge-building approach,
sponsoring studies that aim to identify patterns of best practice and draw lessons that others in the non-profit world can learn from.41 Other foundations have created new institutions to foster collective leadership development with the potential to bring about systemic change.42

- Finally, some non-profits offer and cultivate the skills that enable leadership to emerge from the periphery of the system, in communities and from organizations that are outside the mainstream.43 This is not surprising: the needed leadership will not necessarily come from the top. Indeed, it may be less likely to come from within established order, for those who have attained positions of power in well-established institutions may be the most blind to limiting assumptions that have become so familiar as to be second nature. The current largely unforeseen implosion of the financial system in the U.S. and in the world as a whole offers a compelling example.

3.3 Noteworthy Theories, Tools, and Practices

Although the most distinctive feature of best-practice programs is the overall integration of methods and linkage to purpose and participants, some contributions to learning are distinctively powerful and worthy of note. It is beyond the scope of this inquiry to provide an exhaustive or fully systematic inventory. Nonetheless, we feel that it is useful to identify and briefly describe a small handful of theories, tools, and practices that stand out as being particularly useful. We approach the construction of this list with full awareness that it will be not only partial but also highly subjective. We candidly acknowledge that selection is more influenced by our prior experience and conviction that by research. No doubt other authors would include items that we neglect and leave out items that we include. However, rather than avoid the risk of being arbitrary by making no judgments of this kind, we prefer to offer our judgments and use them as a stimulus for dialogue and reflection.

3.3.1 Three Meta-Theories

In the section on leadership trends we noted the emergence of meta-theories. By this we mean theories that intentionally include and embrace a range of other theories, striving for a higher synthesis. Some scholars have applauded the rise of “integrative” theories as a natural stage in the evolution of leadership theory (Van Wart, 2005). Meta-theories are attractive to us for more practical reasons. They strike us as a natural and healthy response to a world of increasing complexity. Leaders must increasingly deal with problems that are complex in three different ways (Scharmer, 2007, pp. 59-62):

- Dynamic complexity (cause and effect are distant in space and time)
- Social complexity (stakeholders have diverse interests and worldviews)
• Emerging complexity (characterized by disruptive change, in which the solution is unknown, the problem statement itself is still unfolding, and it is not clear who the key stakeholders are)

William Perry has written that “to understand anything you need at least three good theories.”

To solve problems of simultaneous dynamic, social, and emerging complexity, leaders need tools based on theories that are comparably complex. Meta-theories meet this criterion by explicitly subsuming and extending the reach of other theories.

Although we sense that these theories have greater than ordinary potential, we have not found evidence that use of these—or any—theories distinguish “best” practice from that which is more ordinary. As we have observed elsewhere, quality of execution seems more important than the selection of any particular practice or grounding in any particular theory. However, we are convinced that such theories can serve very useful purposes. First they offer a comprehensive and systematic way of thinking about both the leadership challenge and what is required to develop leadership. Thus they can fruitfully serve as a frame of reference in the design of leadership development programs, providing a checklist for the range of perspectives that might be integrated. In addition they are a good source of potential content for such programs, as will become clear from the descriptions that follow.

We see three theories of this kind, each of which offers not only a systemic picture of leadership, but also distinctive tools:

- Organizational learning
- Integral theory
- Theory U

Organizational Learning

The first such meta-theory to emerge, to our knowledge, was articulated in Peter Senge’s ground-breaking book, The Fifth Discipline (1990) Senge consciously strove to offer an integrated perspective in which he adds a fifth element to four previously existing ones. Together they constitute a new and more powerful whole. The five elements are:

- **Personal Mastery.** This discipline of aspiration involves formulating a coherent picture of the results people most desire to gain as individuals (their personal vision), alongside a realistic assessment of the current state of their lives today (their current reality). Learning to benefit from the tension between vision and reality can expand a leader’s capacity to make better choices and to achieve more of the results he strives for.
• **Mental Models.** This discipline of reflection and inquiry skills is focused around developing awareness of the attitudes and perceptions that influence thought and behavior. By continually reflecting upon, talking about, and reconsidering these internal pictures of the world, people can gain more capability in governing their actions and decisions. They become aware of the “ladder of inference” whereby they leap instantly to counterproductive conclusions and assumptions.\(^{46}\)

• **Shared Vision.** This collective discipline establishes a focus on mutual purpose. People learn to nourish a sense of commitment in a group or organization by developing shared images of the future they seek to create and the principles and practices by which they hope to get there.

• **Team Learning.** This is a discipline of group interaction. Through techniques like dialogue and skillful discussion teams transform their collective thinking, learning to mobilize their energies and abilities to be greater than the sum of individual members’ talents.

• **Systems Thinking.** In this discipline, people learn to better understand interdependency and change within systems and thereby to deal more effectively with the forces that shape our actions and their consequences. Systems thinking is based upon a growing body of theory about the behavior of feedback and complexity—the innate tendencies of a system that lead to growth or stability over time. Tools and techniques such as systems archetypes and various types of learning labs and simulations help people see how to change systems more effectively and act in a way that is more in tune with the larger processes of the natural and economic world.
Integral Theory

Ken Wilber offers an “integral” way of thinking about change in individuals and systems at all levels (Wilber, 2000a). Wilber assumes that all schools of thought in all domains have some merit. All approaches offer some truth but it is a partial truth. The challenge is simply to find out their limits—i.e., the conditions under which their “truth” pertains. Thus he aims to construct a meta-theory that identifies the distinctive contribution of as many other theories as possible. This leads him to construct a 2x2 matrix, creating four quadrants into which the subject matter of all major theories fit.47

Wilber’s “All Quadrants All Levels” Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Collective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal perceptions, sense-making</td>
<td>Cultural mindsets, norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observable individual behavior</td>
<td>Organizational structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual physiology</td>
<td>Political, economic systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Interior | Exterior |

The resulting perspective brings an “integral” way of thinking to any given topic. This theory has inspired an “all quadrants all levels” approach to leadership and leadership development. (“Levels” refers to stage of development, one of the theories embraced by this framework—see the section on constructive-developmental theory below.) Practically, this encourages designers of leadership development to ensure that any initiative fully supports change from every angle, drawing on the potential for assessment, challenge and support in all four domains.
Theory U

What Theory U (sometimes known as the U-Theory) describes is not new. The “U” is a way of representing a practice that many creative people—business and social entrepreneurs, artists, scientists, inventors—have tacitly used for millennia when they create breakthrough solutions to complex problems (Scharmer, 2007). What is new is knowledge of the ingredients of this practice and how to broaden its impact. By studying the work of extraordinary people and integrating a broad base of supporting theory and evidence, it takes what has been an intuitive, individual and largely non-replicable practice and outlines an explicit process. This process lends itself to being used consciously and collectively for transformation in even the most challenging contexts.

The change process based on Theory U comprises three primary phases: sensing—uncovering current reality by expanding and deepening awareness; presencing—retreating and reflecting to enable individual “inner knowing” as a foundation for collective commitment; and realizing—generating a new reality through rapid-cycle prototyping, piloting and implementation of breakthrough ideas. Paralleling these phase are seven capacities.

Theory U was explicitly created to address the realization that most of society’s toughest problems are not owned by any one person or institution; they are problems that involve a “system of systems.” As a result, the most effective way to address such issues is by convening a microcosm of the larger system together. The Change Lab (described below as an example of
a “multi-stakeholder partnership”) is a method to address such multi-stakeholder challenges. A second premise underlying this theory is that a pre-requisite for organizational transformation is personal transformation. Theory U attempts to connect each participant with their “highest potential future self.” By so doing, each individual is positioned to make her best contribution to the whole.

A third premise is that, as creatures of habit, most human action occurs through “downloading” old habits, rather than creativity. One antidote to such reactive thinking is taking “an intentional detour” to explore options beyond one’s initial impulses. Theory U can be thought of as a method for systematizing such an intentional detour, which can be taken by individuals or collectives. A distinctive contribution of the theory is to call attention to the bottom of the U and the importance of “presence” or “presencing.” This concept will be explored below.

Theory U contains a very useful framework for thinking about approaches to learning in a leadership development program (p. 448). We reproduce a modified version below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Intelligence</th>
<th>Type of Knowledge</th>
<th>Non-Reflective</th>
<th>Self-Reflective (reflection-on-action)</th>
<th>Self-Transcending (reflection-in-action)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IQ (Cognitive Intelligence)</td>
<td>Knowledge about organizations, leadership approaches</td>
<td>Practice with feedback, reflection</td>
<td>Improvisational theater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ (Emotional Intelligence)</td>
<td>Experiential action projects</td>
<td>Reflection on hot buttons reflection on 360° feedback</td>
<td>Embodied consciousness exercises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ (Spiritual Intelligence)</td>
<td>Existential storytelling, total immersion learning journeys</td>
<td>Generative dialogue, guided journaling</td>
<td>Contemplative practices, deep presence practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.2 A Sampling of Powerful Tools and Practices

In this section we cite particular tools and practices worthy of special consideration. Inevitably the list is subjective and partial. No doubt it is weighted toward selections that favor our biases or that we happen to be familiar with. However, we have attempted to select items that meet as any as possible of the following criteria:

- They enable deep learning in one or more of four levels of learning about leadership:
  - Intrapersonal
  - Interpersonal/team
  - Organizational
  - Transorganizational/systemic
- They are used in some of the most powerful best-practice programs
- They are either not yet widely known or are so reliably and consistently useful as to merit being singled out again
- They are accessible (no huge barriers to teaching, learning, licensing, etc.)

The World Wide Web offers a special class of evolving tools and practices with enormous potential. We explore that potential and its implications for leadership development in the section that follows (3.4).

Intrapersonal Level

*Constructive Developmental Theory and Assessment Tools* (Kegan, 1982; Torbert & Cook-Greuter, 2004; Wilber, 2000a). One important set of theories encompassed by Wilber’s integral approach is a cluster of theories about adult development. An increasingly large body of work describes the “constructive developmental” paradigm, which is built upon the following propositions:

- We actively construct our understanding of the world.
- We naturally evolve through increasingly complex stages of consciousness that significantly shape how we make sense.
- Development takes place through a process of unfolding awareness of that which we are immersed in and cannot see.
- Each stage of development includes but transcends those which precede it.
- People at higher stages of development bring greater complexity of awareness and thought to their interactions.
- Development is painful and easily arrested; it requires challenge to stimulate it and support to sustain it.
The increasingly complex challenges in the world call out for more leadership from people operating at higher levels of consciousness, as we tend to be “in over our heads” in facing them (Kegan, 1994). Evidence supporting the link between higher stages of personal development and leadership effectiveness is emerging (Torbert & Rooke, 1998). And a recent book makes fully explicit for the first time the implications of this perspective for leadership (Joiner & Josephs, 2007). A variety of innovative assessment tools are emerging that reflect this model of adult development, some of which can point to evidence to support their validity and reliability (McEwen & Schmidt, 2007, p. 3). The tools include:

- The Leadership Development Framework
- The Kegan/Lahey Subject-Object Interview
- The Leadership Agility 360™ survey
- The Leadership Circle Profile

**Mental Models.** This “discipline” also merits mention and elaboration as a tool for intra-individual development. It is based on the notion (articulated in constructive-developmental theory) that we actively construct the reality that we experience, yet are often unaware that we do so, as this process is for the most part automatic and reflexive. The mindsets that filter our construction of the world significantly shape our actions. Lack of awareness of these filters can seriously limit our ability to envision choices that go beyond our comfort zone and to accept responsibility for our actions. Identification of mindsets that drive our behavior at the individual and organizational level—coupled with insight into how to change those mindsets—is a powerful point of leverage for change. This viewpoint is often taught by modules structured around exercises that promote individual reflection featuring the “Ladder of Inference” (Senge, 1990, pp. 242-252). Such reflection allows participants to identify mindsets they hold that compete with their leadership priorities.

**Immunity to Change.** One exercise for generating insight into the mental models that can block leadership commitments is worthy of special mention: the “immunity to change” or “4-column” exercise (Kegan & Lahey, 2009; Kegan & Lahey, 2001). It provides a compelling explanation for why our New Year’s resolutions so often fail. It is not that we lack good intentions or even will power. Rather we hold “competing” commitments to self-protection that require staying in our comfort zone. These commitments, which operate outside our awareness, lead us to behave in ways that undermine our espoused aspirations. Such tacit commitments serve us by helping us avoid the catastrophes predicted by untested assumptions from earlier experience. However, they often undermine our higher aspirations. By identifying these assumptions, and subjecting them to reality testing, leaders open up powerful means of bringing about the personal change necessary to fully deliver on their passions. Through a series of questions that probe the assumptions that guide their actions, participants individually map their own immune system. The exercise has the collateral benefit of encouraging compassion and patience, by giving leaders insight into why changing other people is so difficult. In their recent book (2009) Kegan and Lahey show how the tool can also be a powerful means of team building.
**Personal Mastery.** A useful way of teaching this Organizational Learning “discipline” is through the notion of reactive/creative patterns, as illuminated by the concept of Emotional Intelligence. It is not just our mental processes that limit leadership effectiveness; patterns that have an emotional component do so as well. Daniel Goleman draws on emerging research on the brain to identify five components of emotional intelligence: self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skill (Goleman, 1995). He uses this framework to describe the common phenomenon of the “Amygdala Hijack,” in which something triggers an overreaction to a stimulus and leads us to behave in ways that we regret. This pattern is a particular threat to leaders, who are vulnerable to being seen as not aligning their “walk” with their “talk.” Simple awareness of this framework is powerful. However, to some extent we can also learn to manage the emotional dynamics of our brain. This learning must address the limbic part of the brain, which governs feelings, impulses and drives, rather than the neo-cortex, which governs analytical and technical ability. The limbic system learns best through motivation, extended practice, and feedback.

**Presencing.** Innovative programs are more likely to look beneath the traditional emphasis on skills to address the underlying consciousness of an individual. Beginning with the emergence of “transformational” and “charismatic” conceptions of leadership, attention has been directed to this hidden dimension and previous “blindspot.” In recent years, stimulated by the influence of the philosophy and practice of Eastern wisdom, the notion of ‘presencing’ has emerged as one way of conceptualizing the capacity to bring full awareness into the moment (Scharmer, 2007; Senge, et al., 2004). The emergence of constructive-developmental theory, described above, has contributed to this trend because of its emphasis on the evolution of the quality of consciousness as well. The underlying idea is that in order to generate solutions to the problems currently facing the world, we need leaders who have not simply developed an effective leadership “style” but who can “presence.” To “presence” is to attend to one’s experience in ways that transcend one’s preconceptions and historical ways of making sense. It involves letting go of old identities and certainties, along with the need to control, and letting come fresh perceptions and insights. Leaders who can “presence” have the capacity to mobilize attention to problems from the advantageous leverage point of a level of consciousness that is likely to be higher than that which created the problems in the first place.

We include this concept because we agree with Scharmer that lack of attention to consciousness—including the possibility of being present in an extraordinarily powerful way—has constituted a blindspot in leadership theory and practice and has the potential to make a powerful contribution (2007). At the same time we feel obliged to report that in our experience it is challenging to communicate clearly to leaders what is meant by “presencing” and how it differs from more mainstream conceptions of “presence” (Halpern & Lubar, 2003). It is also difficult to both teach and learn.56
Mindful Awareness Practices. A variety of practices can cultivate the capacity to be present through increasing mindful awareness (Siegel, 2007, pp. 267-271). Meditation is one such practice. Across many spiritual traditions through the ages, from Christianity to Buddhism, meditation has been recognized as a core contemplative practice for the attainment of wisdom. Recently, Western science has begun to generate compelling evidence in support of other benefits. These include alleviation of stress and an enhanced ability to heal, along with heightened calmness, equanimity, creativity, and even happiness. Most important for the personal transformation of leaders, there is evidence that meditation decreases reflexive reactions to threats and upsetting events, enabling more mindful and strategic responses. While meditation is associated with spiritual practice, it may be compellingly presented and fruitfully pursued as a secular practice, simply viewed as a scientifically validated form of mind training (Goleman, 2003; Kabat-Zinn, 2005). Other such awareness practices include yoga, Tai Chi, and Qi Gong, which enhance the flow of body energy (Chuen, 1991).

Authentic Leadership. Managers often struggle with the question of what leadership “style” to practice. This perspective encourages each person to discover a style that is uniquely his own, grounded in the authenticity that can come from a commitment to self-awareness and the integrity of being true to one’s highest self (George, 2003; George, McLean, & Craig, 2008; George & Sims, 2007). “The foundation of leadership is not thinking, behavior, competencies, techniques, or position. The foundation of leadership is who we are—our identity or foundational state” (Quinn, 2004). The notion of authentic leadership provides a frame for engaging leaders in a number of powerful exercises, such as clarifying their values and purpose and learning from their stories of success and failure. As Noel Tichy, who developed GE’s Crotonville Leadership Center, put it: “Leadership…is autobiographical. Who we are as leaders comes from the ups and downs of our life experience, not the books we have read or the courses we have taken.” (Tichy & Devanna, 1986). Discovering who we are thus becomes the challenge of leadership development. More than one good workshop based on this concept is available.

Embodied Consciousness. Learning theory increasingly points to the human body as a source of knowing and learning and as an important element of integration and application of learning. A growing number of practitioners offer leadership development experiences based on concepts such as “embodied leadership,” “conscious embodiment” and “embodied consciousness.” These practices reflect the knowledge that has been a part of Eastern traditions for many centuries but are just now being validated by science: that consciousness can be developed through a variety of practices. Through disciplined use of these practices one can cultivate states of consciousness that enable a person to go beyond learning from the past, to respond creatively in the present, and learn what the future requires. There are practical benefits as well. Such practices can cultivate the capacity for improved decision making. Being another example of mindful awareness practices, they can also enhance a leader’s ability to be present in a way that heightens perception and that others feel and appreciate.
Personality Style Assessment. For many years leadership development programs have included instruments such as the Myers Briggs Type Indicator. Given that such tools have become so widely used, it may seem surprising that we call attention to them here. But this wide appeal makes them no less powerful; their value should not be taken for granted. On the contrary, one simply needs to be careful to use them in ways that are mindful of the possibility that participants may have had prior exposure. They are sometimes used in conjunction with 360° feedback as one dimension of an overall assessment. However, this perspective is often used effectively as a component of the formal part of the curriculum itself, as a tool for understanding and managing differences in personal preference and style. This enables participants to validate the instrument with their own experience. The introduction of such tools in a group setting can illustrate the power of seeing things through the eyes of others. Many such tools can be used for both individual self awareness and awareness of others. The MBTI—which posits 16 “types”—is the most popular (Fitzgerald & Kirby, 1997, pp. 33-60). Less well known but having the strengths and weaknesses of identifying only four types is “Temperament” (Berens, 2006). The Enneagram (which features nine types) is known for its ability to illuminate “shadow” tendencies (Riso & Hudson, 2003). DISC is also used in a number of programs. Many other such tools exist.

Solo Retreats in Nature. Solo immersions in nature enable many individuals to access deeper levels of awareness and knowing. It is difficult to fully engage with questions of identity, meaning and purpose in our day-to-day lives because we live in mediated environments in which stimuli from many sources—from architecture to television—overwhelm our inner landscape and dilute our innate knowing. Being alone in nature frees our attention from these distractions, enabling us to focus on subtle perceptions at the periphery of our awareness and access the intuitive powers that are the source of the greatest creativity. Concurrent solo retreats for a group are a powerful means of enabling the “Co-Presencing” phase of the Theory U, building a field of connection among members that can deepen their alignment for learning or creative visioning and problem solving (Hassan & Bojer, 2005, pp. 54-71; Scharmer, 2007). Moreover, immersion in wilderness has unique power to heal and transform (Moore & Russell, 2002).

Interpersonal and Team Level

The preceding theories, tools, and practices all contribute to leadership at the interpersonal and team level as well, by shaping the habits of thought and behavior that enable and encourage curiosity about others’ perspectives. But there are additional resources that make more direct contributions to this important dimension of leadership.

Interpersonal Skills. High-performing teamwork depends on high-quality communication. But habitual modes of talking—be they polite or blunt—often obscure rather than enhance communication. Being able to understand the reality that others experience, as well as enable them to understand your own, requires the two core skills of reflective conversation: advocacy
and inquiry (Argyris & Schön, 1974). Video-taped roleplays are the most powerful tool for learning these skills.

**Facilitation Skills.** The value of this foundational skill is often overlooked in leadership development programs. The effectiveness of any style of leadership will be enhanced by solid skills in designing, participating in, and leading productive meetings. Foundational tools are well established (Doyle & Straus, 1976) and are being continuously expanded and enriched.\(^{62}\)

**Dialogue.** The ability to create new realities is radically enhanced by capacity for a more challenging practice: *generative* conversations, or deep dialogue, a practice encouraged by Theory U. In such a conversation, the individuals submerge their individual sense of self and allow a group intelligence to arise. Such a dialogue is “a conversation with a center, not sides” (Bohm & Nichol, 2004; Isaacs, 1999). In the “field” created by such a dialogue new ideas can be brought forth. To enable this field it is necessary to create a safe setting for the participants, a “container” that can be created by practicing four key behaviors: genuine listening, respecting one another, suspending judgment, and speaking with one’s own voice. When such a container is created, insights can emerge from the generative space that no one party could have imagined on their own (Scharmer, 2007, pp. 277-279, 296-297).

**Shared Vision.** This ‘discipline’ from the Organizational Learning meta-theory is a useful vehicle for teaching two leadership dimensions that are valued across all cultures: “team orientation” and “participative leadership” (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004, p. 39). It encourages leaders to facilitate the emergence of a collective shared vision, focusing on mutual purposes. People learn to nourish a sense of commitment in a group or organization by developing shared images of the future they seek to create and the principles and guiding practices by which they hope to get there.

**Four-Player Model.** Former family therapist David Kantor drew on a family systems background to create this framework. It can help leaders understand their preferred tendencies for interaction in groups as well as anticipate and manage the tendencies of team members. The model identifies four core acts that are the essential building blocks of both healthy and dysfunctional team behavior: Move, Follow, Oppose, and Bystand. What determines the health of the team is whether or not these four core acts are performed appropriately and in the proper sequence.\(^{63}\)

**Organizational Level**

Again, the preceding listings for intrapersonal and interpersonal/team development are relevant here. They provide a foundation of familiarity with patterns of thought and behavior that contribute to leadership at the systems level as well. However, additional resources exist that make more direct contributions to systemic effectiveness. Here are a few.
Systems Thinking. This is the “fifth” discipline that Peter Senge brought to the first of the meta-theories, which we described briefly above. It can be introduced conceptually by calling attention to some of the powerful archetypes that explain everyday patterns: the notion of unintended consequences, for example, or the “tragedy of the commons.” But it is more powerful to teach this perspective experientially. Faculty at M.I.T., the birthplace of systems thinking, have long used The Beer Game for this purpose. In our experience Barry Oshry has developed more powerful exercises (Oshry, 1999, 2007). He has created a highly potent set of simulations and underlying frameworks based on a simple but powerful model that distinguishes the worlds of Tops, Bottoms, Middles, and Customers. These simulations help participants see how their own reflexive reactions to the stresses of their place in a system lead them to think and act in ways that contribute to the counter-productive dynamics they experience but tend to blame others for. The classic version of the simulation is the Organization Workshop, which consistently generates powerful insights into systems and one’s personal experience of them. Substantial evidence supports its long-term impact. Other simulations highlight the middle role, on which Oshry has done seminal thinking. In a remarkably intense and extended societal simulation—the Power Lab—participants actually “live” in their roles for several days.

Storytelling. Storytelling is a tool that is useful for leadership and leadership development in a number of ways (Denning, 2005). “In ‘best practice’ organizations, senior leaders use stories to shape and to convey strategic plans (3M), to communicate their culture and core character values (Herman Miller) and to grow leaders as senior leaders to teach the next generation (PepsiCo)” (Blunt, 2001, p. 3). One organization that makes extensive use of stories is the Marine Corps, where “at the Basic School more than three hundred hours over the six months are set aside for captain-instructors to break off with small groups of second lieutenants specifically for the purpose of sharing [sea]stories.” Such stories are seen as the best way to get across as many leadership scenarios as possible. Why? So that “the brain learns to recognize patterns it can apply as analogies to entirely new situations” (Freedman, 2000, p. 75). Through stories leaders can pass on the learning they have gleaned from their own (and others’) experience, while also providing a frame through which others can make sense of the experience they are having. Stories can also mobilize action by bridging the personal story of the leader to the story of the group at a particular moment in time (Ganz, 2007). Stories about change typically cover three elements: the case for change; where we are going; how we will get there (Tichy & Cohen, 1997, p. 221) (In light of its multiple uses, we could locate this tool at the intrapersonal, interpersonal/team, or organizational level, so its placement here—midway—is somewhat arbitrary.)

Adaptive Leadership. A powerful leadership concept comes from the theory of “adaptive leadership” (Heifetz, 1994). It makes a highly useful distinction between “technical” problems, which can usually be solved with known methods, and “adaptive” ones, which are more complex and defy solution with simple remedies. The theory can be taught by a unique and very powerful
method, known as the “case-in-point” (Parks, 2005). This involves using any group—workshop discussion, coaching session, task force meeting—as an opportunity to observe dynamics, connect them to the challenges, and practice Adaptive Leadership behaviors in real time. Participants are often able to gain insight into how their own assumptions and projections relating to leadership unwittingly contribute to dynamics that they do not like but do not feel responsible for. Thus, like Oshry’s simulations, the method raises awareness of the link between individual patterns in mental models and system dynamics.

Rapid-Cycle Prototyping. Changing systems requires tools for translating ideas into action. The traditional approach to strategic planning is to invest in the creation of a master plan with large initiatives and many action steps. A radical alternative, which underlies the success of pioneering innovative companies such as IDEO, is the notion of “rapid-cycle prototyping,” in which one quickly identifies actions to try out and learn from. As the authors of Presence write, “prototyping is not about abstract ideas or plans but about entering a flow of improvisation and dialogue in which the particulars inspire the evolution of the whole and vice versa” (Senge, et al., 2004, p. 151). The motto is “fail early, fail often” in the interest of finding the best solutions before investing major resources. This practice is facilitated by tools for building physical models that draw out the wisdom of the body, such as Lego Serious Play. Scharmer provides a further rationale and a detailed example (2007, pp. 416-421).

Transorganizational/Systemic Level

A final set of tools and practices is useful in the less structured world beyond organizational boundaries. These methods are often applicable within organizations but realize their full potential in multi-stakeholder settings addressing systemic issues.

Convening. The analog to “facilitation skills” at the system level is the skill of convening—bringing together a “strategic microcosm” of those with a stake in an issue. “Extraordinary change requires building extraordinary relationships, and...this requires gathering together diverse people representing diverse views so that they can speak and listen to one another in new ways” (Senge, et al., 2008, p. 231). “Getting the system in the room” in even this partial way is a way of mobilizing a crucial mass of people willing and able to lead. This requires a repertoire of tools better suited to a network-centric, self-organizing world. Convening—or “the art of hosting”—expands and transforms facilitation to create spaces in which generative conversations are possible and in which collective wisdom emerges. Practices that facilitate this kind of interaction include World Café (Brown & Isaacs, 2005), Open Space technology (Owen, 2008), and Generative Dialogue (described above). Effective convening also requires careful groundwork. It is likely to emerge only after “purposeful networking.” And it will be served by coming to understand the interests of the various stakeholders through “dialogue interviews” (Hassan & Bojer, 2005, pp. 19-22; Scharmer, 2007, pp. 241-243).
Learning Journeys. One of the practices that have evolved to enable deeper learning about complex problems by diverse stakeholder groups is “deep dive journeys” that “connect people to the contexts and ideas that are relevant to creating the possible future” (Scharmer, 2007, p. 389). It is a practice that serves “co-sensing,” enabling participants to “see” the system of which they are a part by experiencing it as fully as possible, engaging with stakeholders, and developing an intuitive and holistic picture (Hassan & Bojer, 2005, p. 32). Learning journeys “not only take people physically to places they have not been, but open awareness beyond the intellect” (Senge, et al., 2008). More than benchmarking trips, they are designed to “access a deeper level of emerging reality by observing hands-on practices through total immersion” (Scharmer, 2007, p. 389). Most typically these journeys involve physical travel to new locations, including very different parts of the world. For example, a team from Shell Oil undertook journeys to Stockholm, Milan, and San Francisco (New Business Development Learning Journey, 2002). But it could involve shadowing someone in a different part of one’s organization.

Communities of Practice. We briefly introduced this approach in the section on Networking (3.1.2). “Communities of practice” are “groups of people who share a concern, a set of problems, or a passion about a topic, and who deepen their knowledge and expertise in this area by interacting on an ongoing basis” (Wenger, et al., 2002). Such communities have existed for thousands of years. What is new is the recognition of their potential for managing knowledge in more intentional ways, not only within organizations but among them and across sectors. They differ from networks in their level of intentionality and often in an orientation toward service. One way of understanding such communities is that they are a methodology for leveraging the learning potential of a network, taking it to the next level (Meehan & Reinelt, 2007). Awareness of the potential of such groups for learning and mobilizing support is an important addition to a leader’s knowledge base. And fostering such communities is one way of exercising leadership at a community, field, or system level.

Communities of Place. These communities are a way of addressing problems of a scope too large for any single actor or organization to address effectively. In so doing they can facilitate leadership development by “engaging people where they live rather than taking them out of their contexts” (Meehan & Reinelt, 2007, p. 9). The Kellogg Leadership for Community Change program has developed a framework for leadership in such communities (W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 2007). The discussion of “grassroots leadership” in the section on “collective leadership” contains many examples of leadership development in communities of place. In some cases those communities were initiated by individual leaders at the grassroots level.

Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships. As discussed in section 3.2, specific technologies of great promise have evolved to address complex systemic problems that require multi-stakeholder participation. Generon Consulting and The Synergos Institute, working together and independently, have pioneered the use of the “Change Lab” for this purpose (Hassan & Bojer, 2005; Hassan & Kahane, 2005). Change labs are based on Theory U (discussed above as one of three meta-theories). They typically convene senior leaders from all sectors for a period of six
months to several years, engaging them in a deep immersion in the problem, reflection on themselves as leaders, and exploration of solutions from their collective intelligence. Early applications of this practice have both confirmed its promise and demonstrated the challenge of realizing its full potential. (See section 3.2 on systemic collective leadership initiatives for more information on these examples).

3.4 The Potential of the World Wide Web for Leadership Development

Since the emergence of the World Wide Web in the early 1990s, an array of technologies and tools has evolved at an exponentially increasing pace. These tools have radically expanded the possibilities for communication and interaction at all levels of society. They promise extraordinary change. “When new technology appears, previously impossible things start occurring. If enough of those impossible things are important and happen in a bundle, quickly, the change becomes a revolution” (Shirky, 2008, p. 107). In this regard Web has been compared to the invention of the printing press (Shirky, p. 67). “We are living in the middle of a remarkable increase in our ability to share, to cooperate with one another, and to take collective action, all outside the framework of traditional institutions and organizations” (Kasper & Scearce, 2008; Shirky, 2008, pp. 20-21). In this section we explore the implications for leadership development of these revolutionary new technologies.

3.4.1 The Features of Web-Based Technologies

Although the tools that have emerged via the internet are fostering momentous change in society and organizations, they are just the latest phase of an old pattern: technological change precedes and drives social change. As a foundation for the exploration of the implications of web-based technology for leadership development, it will be helpful to review the evolution of this technology and identify the specific tools enabled at various stages.

Pre-Internet Tools

For decades we have relied on technology to enhance learning. The most common of these are tools so familiar they need no definition:

- Telephone (and telephone conference calls)
- Radio
- Television
- Audiotapes
- Videotapes
• Videodisks
• Computer-assisted instruction
• Computer-assisted simulation games
• LCD projectors

These tools had powerful implications for learning, enhancing learning at a distance, permitting individualization and flexibility of delivery. The relatively limited impact of these tools only became apparent with the paradigm-shifting appearance of the Web.

Web-Based Tools

Observers of the Web seem to agree that it is useful to divide its evolution into phases. However, they disagree about whether to do so simply on the basis of chronology or distinctive features. We see virtues to both approaches and will therefore draw on each.

One active blogger on the topic offers a timeline suggesting 10-year units of demarcation (Spivack, 2007):
Many of the tools featured in this timeline will be unfamiliar to anyone not deeply immersed in these technologies and not all these tools are cited in the report. However, the timeline reflects the conviction of the author, Nova Spivack, that the complexity of web activity makes it difficult to define phases by how they differ from one another. Thus, it is better to simply use a timeline in which Web 1.0 and Web 2.0 each last a decade. We agree that the two phases that have emerged so far correspond to roughly a decade each, but we also see value in describing how those phases differ from one another, and in anticipating what is to come.

Web 1.0. In its first decade, the Web significantly broadened the ease and range of communications. Web 1.0 is characterized by a tendency toward one-way broadcast of information, though some more participatory media emerged. Some of these tools—such as email and instant messaging—are also now so familiar as to require no definition. Other tools, familiar to many but probably not all, include the following:

- **Chat Rooms** refer to any type of synchronous (or occasionally even asynchronous) conversations conducted on the internet.

- **E-learning** is a type of learning involving technologies to reach learners that are mainly internet- or computer-based. In some instances no face-to-face interaction takes place. It is typically implemented through a Learning Management System that employs software for delivering, tracking, and managing training.

- **Listservs** are electronic mailing-list management tools. The name is based on the first such tool, LISTSERV.

- **Podcasts** are any software and hardware combination that permits downloading of audio files (most commonly in MP3 format) for listening at the user’s convenience. The term was inspired by Apple’s iPod. Professional broadcasters and syndicated radio shows are starting to make their content available as podcasts.

- **Search Functions** refers to various means of conducting searches via the internet, such as the key word searches employed by Google.

- **Simulation Games** are reenactments of various activities of "real life" in the form of a game for various purposes: training, analysis, or prediction. Well-known examples are war games, business games, and role-play simulations. They may be enhanced by computers.

- **A Text Message** is a short (160 characters or fewer) message sent from a mobile phone using the Short Message Service (SMS). It is available on most digital mobile phones and some personal digital assistants.
• **Video Conferencing** is a set of telecommunication technologies which allow two or more locations to interact simultaneously via two-way video and audio transmissions.

• **Virtual Education** refers to instruction where teacher and student are separated by time or space, or both, and the teacher provides course content through course management applications, multimedia resources, the internet, videoconferencing, etc. Students receive the content and communicate with the teacher via the same technologies.

• **Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP)** is the technology that enables phone calls over the internet. The advantages include saving money on long distance calls and voice mail that can be received as e-mail messages. Skype is one example.

• **Web Forums**, which evolved from pre-Web electronic bulletin boards, are the web equivalent of a place where people can leave public messages to do such things as announce events, provide information, or advertise things to buy or sell.

• **Webcast**. A webcast is the broadcasting of audio or video content over the internet. An example is a media file distributed over the internet using streaming media technology. A webcast may either be distributed live or on demand.

**Web 2.0.** Borrowing from a tradition in naming phases of software development, the term “Web 2.0” emerged in the wake of the 2001 collapse of the dot.com bubble to refer to a second generation of web development. Web 2.0 does not refer to an update to any technical specifications of the Web, but rather to changes in the ways software developers and end-users utilize the Web. The term is more metaphorical than literal, since many of the technological components of Web 2.0 have existed since the early days of the Web (Brotherton & Scheiderer, 2008, p. 41), and the boundaries are fluid. Although the distinction is not clear and is often disputed, this second generation is roughly distinguished by using tools in a more interactive way, facilitating two-way communication and collaboration, in contrast to the more static, one-way communication characteristic of Web 1.0.

Wikipedia defines Web 2.0 as “a perceived second generation of web development and design, that facilitates communication, secure information sharing, interoperability, and collaboration on the World Wide Web. Web 2.0 concepts have led to the development and evolution of web-based communities, hosted services, and applications such as social-networking sites, video-sharing sites, wikis, blogs, and folksonomies [taxonomies organically defined by people].” These features enable forms of participation and interaction that were not previously possible. Below we define these and other technologies associated with Web 2.0, even though some of them pre-date this new phase:

• **A Blog** (short for “Web log”) is an online journal or diary hosted on a website. It may be maintained by an individual or a group providing regular entries, displayed in reverse-
chronological order. A microblog is a blog post that has a restricted number of characters, such as Twitter (see below).

- **Blended Learning** is a term that has evolved to describe the effort to systematically integrate different forms of learning, combining and complementing face-to-face instruction with the many other modes that are now possible.

- **Collective Intelligence** refers to any system that attempts to tap the expertise of a group rather than an individual to provide a service, produce a product, or make decisions. Examples include collaborative publishing and common databases for sharing knowledge.

- **Crowdsourcing** describes the act of taking a task traditionally performed by an employee or contractor and outsourcing it to an undefined, generally large group of people or community in the form of an open call. For example, the public may be invited to develop a new technology, carry out a design task or help capture, systematize, or analyze large amounts of data.

- **Internet Forums** are a web application for holding discussions and posting user-generated content. (They are also commonly referred to in many other ways, including web forums, newsgroups, message boards, discussion boards, electronic discussion groups, discussion forums, bulletin boards, fora [Latin for the plural], or simply forums.) Messages within these forums are displayed either in chronological order or as threaded discussions.

- **Mash-ups** are aggregations of content from different online sources used to create a new service. An example would be a program that pulls apartment listings from one site and displays them on a map provided by another service to show where apartments are located (such as MyApartmentMap).

- **mLearning** or “mobile learning” is a term describing learning via mobile phones or other portable technologies. It often consists of short modules enabling “just-in-time” learning or review, access to file systems, to internet searches, and instant messaging.

- **Ning** is an example of an online community service that enables users to create their own social networks and join other social networks. Creators of networks can determine to some degree the site’s appearance and functionality, as well as which parts are public and private. Most networks include features such as photos or videos, lists of network members and events, groups within the network, and communication tools such as forums or blogs.

- **Peer-to-Peer Networking** (sometimes called P2P) is a technique for efficiently sharing files (music, video, or text) either over the internet or within a closed set of users. Unlike the traditional method of storing a file on one machine—which can become a bottleneck if
many people try to access it at once—P2P distributes files across many machines, often those of the users themselves.

- **RSS** (Really Simple Syndication) is a family of “web feed” formats used to publish frequently updated works such as blog entries, news headlines, audio, and video in a standardized format. It allows people to get timely updates of information from favored websites or to aggregate information from many sites into one place.

- **Social Bookmarking** is a method for users to share bookmarks of web pages. These bookmarks are usually public but can be private, shared only with specific people or groups, only inside certain networks, or a combination of public and private domains. Services that support bookmarking for this use are Del.icio.us and Stumbleupon.

- **Social Media** (sometimes known as “interactive sharing sites”) allow users to post their own media content, post comments about particular content, and vote to assess content (GEO, 2008). YouTube, Digg, and Flickr are examples. Some people feel that this term is evolving to describe a new dimension of participation and is subsuming the concept of Web 2.0.75

- **Social Networking** refers to systems that allow members of a specific site to learn about other members’ skills, talents, knowledge, or preferences and communicate with them. Commercial examples include Facebook, MySpace, and the aforementioned Ning. These tools are increasingly used by employers as a tool to communicate with their workforce.76 A social networking application that is growing rapidly is Twitter, which has features resembling a blog and a cell/phone IM tool. (One blogger reports that it combines at least 17 familiar features into one function77). It allows users 140 characters for each posting (“tweet”) to say whatever a user would like to say. Tweets appear on a public timeline, displayed like a series of “micro-blogs.” Registered users can subscribe to “follow” other users, receiving their tweets. And others may “follow” them.

- **A Virtual World** is a computer-based simulated environment intended for its users to inhabit and in which they interact via “avatars” (two- or three-dimensional graphical representations). The user can manipulate elements of the modeled world and thus experience a “virtual world,” with rules based on the real world or some hybrid fantasy world. Second Life is an example of an online service enabling virtual worlds.

- **Webinars** are a specific type of “web conference,” a term that originally described asynchronous group discussions and message boards but which now refers to “live” meetings. They are typically one-way, from the speaker to the audience with limited audience interaction, as in a webcast. However, a webinar can be collaborative and include polling and question & answer sessions. In most cases access may be supplemented by telephone as well as an internet connection.
• **Web Services** are layers of software technology that can be integrated with existing systems to make it easier for them to communicate with other systems in order to automatically pass on information or conduct transactions. For example, a retailer and supplier might use web services to communicate over the internet and automatically update each other's inventory systems.

• A **Wiki** is a page or collection of web pages designed to enable anyone who accesses it to contribute or modify content, using a simplified markup language. It is an example of a collective intelligence application. Wikis are often used to create collaborative websites and to support community websites. The collaborative encyclopedia Wikipedia is one of the best-known applications. Wikis are used in business to provide intranets and knowledge management systems.

**Web 3.0 and Beyond.** According to Spivack’s timeline, Web 3.0 is about to begin. A Google search for the term turns up hundreds of hits, many of them offering predictions of what is to come. Despite the lack of consensus about the best way to describe this future and its phases, some elements of what is coming next are clear. Whatever the future entails, it will address the limitations of familiar search tools, among other things. Google relies on key word search, a tool that will not be able to keep pace with the explosion of information—an explosion made possible by the increased capacity for information creation that has been enabled by the Web. And it delivers the same information to everyone, failing to distinguish among users with different needs. More sophisticated approaches are already emerging. One example is project Wolfram Alpha, launched on May 18, 2009.⁷⁸

As one of the next steps, the person credited with inventing the Web, Tim Berners-Lee, calls for more “linked data,” in which raw data are available on the Web and connections made easy.⁷⁹ He and others talk of the “semantic web,” in which data are made more meaningful, either by putting them in the form of “meta-data” using tools that include tagging (a Web 2.0 tool), or by creating smarter software, which can describe relationships among different kinds of data, or both (MacManus, 2009). These innovations will enable more personalized responses to searches. And they will enable the Internet to have the “intelligence” to identify tacit knowledge in users and make it explicit. Such an “implicit web” will enable a web-based agent to track a person’s pattern of usage of the Web and then to make inferences about the person’s interests and provide suggestions without the person having to make an explicit request for that information (van Allen, 2009).⁸⁰ Early examples of this are evident on Amazon.com and Netflix.

It will be a while before the tantalizing possibilities of Web 3.0 will be realized. And it will be still longer before their implications for leadership development are fully evident. Meanwhile, most organizations have yet to fully capitalize on the tools associated with Web 2.0. However, a few are paving the way. This is where we next focus.
3.4.2. The Implications of Web-Based Technologies for Organizations

In order to understand the implications of these technologies for leadership development, it is important to first understand the enormous changes in organizations that are evolving from such technologies. One pair of observers has written:

Just as the new Web is revolutionizing media, culture, and economics, it is reshaping organizations and workplaces in a profound way. Peer production and co-creation are not just happening in online communities and networks like MySpace, Linux, and Wikipedia. Increasingly employees are using blogs, wikis, and other new tools to collaborate and form ad hoc communications across department and organizational boundaries. The result is a number of deep, long-term transformations in the culture, structure, process, and economics of work. We are shifting from closed and hierarchical workplaces with rigid employment relationships to increasingly self-organized, distributed, and collaborative human capital networks that draw knowledge and resources from inside and outside the firm (Tapscott & Williams, 2006, p. 241).

These shifts will not come easily. Web-based technology is the portal though which organizations are being infiltrated by a culture that in many ways runs counter to traditional organizational norms. The culture of the internet is the “geek” culture of free and open software, which places high value on freedom and the open sharing of information (Kelty, 2008). Some commentators see a “new socialism” evolving from this culture, which will clash with norms that evolved from capitalism (Kelly, 2009). Web-based tools that enable easy sharing of information across traditional boundaries will inherently encourage more feedback from stakeholders of all kinds: employees, customers, even the public at large. As scholars of the internet have observed, this trend will likely create discomfort for anyone in a leadership role who is used to maintaining control over information and limiting the feedback they receive (McAffee, 2006). It will test whether they are able to avoid the gap that often emerges between an organization’s “espoused theory” and its “theory-in-use” (Argyris & Schön, 1978).

The “tectonic shift” from web-based technology is not limited to any one sector. All will be impacted. To be sure, organizations will retain some of their traditional forms; corporations, governments, and foundations will not go away. But the relative advantage of such forms of organization has disappeared. “The new possibilities for self-organizing group communicating, sharing, and action will transform the world everywhere groups of people come together to accomplish something, which is to say everywhere” (Shirky, 2008, p. 24).

Following are some examples that illustrate how internet-based technology is impacting basic organizational practice in each of the three primary sectors.
3.4.2.1 Private Sector

Not surprisingly, the most extensive applications of internet-based technology so far are in the private sector, driven by the competitive advantages that can accrue to early adopters. These applications have even led to a new descriptor—“Enterprise 2.0,” which Wikipedia defines as “a term describing social software used in ‘enterprise’ (business) contexts. It includes social and networked modifications to company intranets and other classic software platforms used by large companies to organize their communication.” According to a recent survey, “For 56% of North American and European enterprises, Web 2.0 will be a priority in 2008.” Adoption of social networking solutions in businesses is accelerating, with investments expected to reach $4.6 billion by 2013 (Books24x7, 2008). Following are a number of examples of Web 2.0/Enterprise 2.0 in the private sector, organized according to some of the patterns of application.

Sharing of best practices among workers

- BT (formerly British Telecom) created BTpedia, a company-wide wiki tool designed to democratize the publication process and elicit informal knowledge. It also features internal YouTube-style podcasting in which employees can upload short video or audio “learning nuggets” (Schooley, 2009, pp. 21, 30).

- Best Buy’s Geek Squad used an employee-initiated informal group playing the online multiplayer game Battlefield 2 as a vehicle for sharing technical best practices (Tapscott & Williams, 2006, pp. 241-242)

Communication between management and the workforce

- Alcoa makes creative use of an internal website to disseminate information, answer employees questions, and support employee sharing of best practices (Schooley, 2009, p. 21).

- Research on the “inevitable” move toward Web 2.0 documents the popularity of social networking websites in companies to interact with employees and the widespread use of instant message or sites like Facebook by employees who are geographically separated from co-workers to keep in touch.

Providing just-in-time learning

- Nike uses 3 to 5 minute web-based training modules on rapidly changing product information, delivered via portable devices through an “underground subway” of options for individualized “mobile learning” or “mLearning” (Schooley, 2009, pp. 26-29).
Opening up the organization to participation from the outside

- “The mining firm Goldcorp made its proprietary data about a mining site in Ontario public, then challenged outsiders to tell them where to dig next, offering prize money. The participants in the contest suggested more than a hundred sites to explore, many of which had not been minded by Goldcorp and many of which yielded new gold. Harnessing the participation of many outsiders was a better way...than relying on internal experts” (Shirky, pp. 247-248, citing Tapscott & Williams, 2006).83

- Netflix conducted an open competition with a reward of $1,000,000 for the best collaborative filtering algorithm to predict user ratings for films, based on previous ratings.84

Seeking and responding to customer feedback

- The evolution of Flickr—one of the new Web 2.0 services—is a fascinating example of how the new tools can shape not just the effectiveness of an organization, but its very purpose. “Flickr’s founders, operating under the name Ludicorp, had begun their enterprise as a site for gaming. Users actually told Flickr’s founders to shift their business focus from gaming to online photo-sharing, and the company listened” (Shuen, 2008, p. 7).

- Comcast is using Twitter as customer service tool. A “director of digital care” oversees at Twitter account (@comcastcares), which solicits feedback and concerns.85

Reducing the cost of failure

- Shirky argues that “open source” projects—of which the computer software system Linux is a famous example—lower the cost of failure. By relying on peer production, work on projects made accessible through open source code can be highly experimental yet at considerably less cost than a firm could otherwise afford. Failure becomes cheaper than the cost of deciding whether to try something. Shirky concludes from this and similar examples that “services that tolerate failure as a normal case create a kind of value that is simply unreachable by institutions that try to ensure the success of most of their efforts.” An example is Meetup, an online service for offering meetings, which has been consistently able to find [new offerings] without needing to predict their existence in advance and without having to bear the cost of experimentation” (Shirky, 2008, pp. 243-253).86
Creating organizations not previously feasible

- Aggregation of citizen photos of a community event, such as a parade, is now possible (free) through the website Flickr (Shirky, 2008, pp. 31-32). The users themselves do something via social media service that would have been virtually impossible for an organization to provide. What was only latent potential before has now become reality (p. 47).

Substituting amateurs for experts

- New Assignment was launched to demonstrate that “open collaboration over the Internet among reporters, editors and large groups of users can produce high-quality work that serves the public interest, holds up under scrutiny, and builds trust.” It resulted in the publication of seven original essays and 80 interviews as well as a series of stories about collaborative journalism for Wired magazine (Noveck, 2008, p. 2)

Responding creatively to the recession

- The drive to lower costs has spurred organizations to rely on Web tools such as blogs and social networks (and the site Gumtree) for recruiting in lieu of headhunting services (Bodie, 2009).

The pervasive way in which these possibilities come together in a single organization is illustrated by Oracle, which reports over a dozen applications in areas as diverse as Human Resources, Finance, Marketing, and Research and Development (Oracle, 2008).

3.4.2.2. Public Sector

As we have seen in leadership development more generally, the public sector lags far behind the private in responding to the potential of Web 2.0. This came as a rude shock to a tech-savvy member of the Obama transition team who was charged with prepping the new administration for inauguration day. He tried to “bring Web 2.0” to Washington, but encountered a number of formidable blocks. A short list of these barriers includes: restriction on services carrying ads, which many services do; a prohibition against unlimited liability clauses, which most web services have; the requirement of equal access of laws for the handicapped, which require that videos on sites such as YouTube be transcribed; the Presidential Records Act, which requires that all documentary materials related to the presidential office must be saved for posterity, in theory requiring everything accessed on the Web to be printed out.87

More disturbingly, the intelligence agencies have lagged far behind in capitalizing on Web 2.0. Some observers have speculated that use of these technologies within the intelligence
communities might have prevented the 9/11 attack by helping “connect the dots” (Thompson, 2006). More generally, adherence to classic bureaucratic forms of organization in these agencies contrasts sharply with the flexible strategies employed by terrorist groups such as Al Qaeda (Thompson, 2006).

But the signs of change abound. Early indicators include:

- Intellipedia, an online system for collaborative data sharing among the 16 agencies of the intelligence community, which was launched in 2005 (Wikipedia; Evans, 2009; Jackson, 2009).

- NASA’s Clickworkers, which invited public volunteers to identify craters from orbiter data online (Monitor Institute & Packard Foundation, 2007, p. 9).

The Obama administration has added strong momentum to the adoption of new technologies in the federal government. In May of this year the Office of the Management of the Budget (OMB) released a directive that details how federal agencies will adopt innovative tools such as Twitter and other social media sites to enhance inter-agency collaboration, increase transparency, and foster citizen participation in agency decision making. The OMB directive was mandated by President Obama in a January 21 memo titled “Transparency and Open Government.” And the new administration has announced a website—www.recovery.gov—to enable the public to monitor implementation of the economic stimulus package. Recently the administration also issued an invitation to submit ideas for making the website a “more effective portal for transparency.” And as of this writing the General Services Administration has just reached an agreement with Facebook and MySpace to resolve legal concerns that had been a barrier to government organizations using the sites (Tartakoff, 2009).

Recent indicators that the winds of change are blowing throughout the capital include:

- The Food and Drug Administration used Twitter to notify consumers about recalls of peanut and pistachio products.

- NASA announced that astronaut Mike Massimino would use Twitter to provide a personal behind-the-scenes peek at his last few weeks of training before embarking on a space shuttle mission. (In the first 48 hours he attracted more than 14,000 followers.) NASA is also providing content to social media sites (Facebook, MySpace, YouTube, Flickr, and Ustream) and will reduce the number of press releases and publications. Bob Jacobs, acting assistant administrator of NASA’s Office of Public Affairs, said, “It’s a shift in the cultural mindset...it used to be that when we needed to say something, we issued a news release. We’re having to change that legacy media structure. Now we’re saying maybe we’ll publish a short web feature, put it on Twitter and run video on YouTube and see if that has impact.”
• The U.S. General Services Administration has four Twitter accounts for communicating and used Twitter to cover the inaugural. And in March 2009 GSA allowed agencies to share content on four popular websites: YouTube, Flickr, Vimeo, and blip.tv. So the restrictions that the Obama aide encountered are now dissolving.

Even state governments are getting into the act:

• South Dakota’s Department of Public Safety began sending out text messages in March 2009 to alert motorists of upcoming sobriety checkpoints as a way of deterring drunken driving (Martin, 2009).

• Law enforcement agencies in a number of cities are using Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube to inform and update citizens (Martin, 2009).

Yet these applications have only begun to tap the potential of Web 2.0. Another commentator writes: “Most [government] experiments with enterprise 2.0 have been limited to the creation of additional communication channels to broadcast organizational messages to a defined customer set, albeit with good value in speed and targeting of delivery. Call it marketing 2.0.”

To be sure, there are isolated examples of more extended application. In section 3.1.2 (“Networking”) we cited several examples of communities of practice in the government, including the Army’s Company Command. Other examples going beyond broadcast of information include:

• GovLoop, a website that has attracted 8,000 members, consisting of government employees, academics, students, and interested non-profits. It features newsfeeds, forums, job and event boards, blogs, and profile pages.

A number of signs point to the emergence of an “open government” movement in the federal government. GovLeaders.org, which enables access to leadership resources and features blogs on public-sector leadership, has attracted 5,000 members. And a Government 2.0 Club was recently established to “bring together thought leaders in government, academia, and industry from across the country to explore how social media and Web 2.0 technologies can create a more transparent, participatory, and collaborative government” (Drapeau, 2009). And Data.gov was launched in 2009, enabling anyone to search and download federal data sets.
3.4.2.3. Non-Profit Sector

Web 2.0 has enormous potential for the transformation of organizations—and organizing—in the non-profit sector. Traditionally there has been a choice between getting things done by the state or by businesses, with foundations filling the gap in between. The assumption was that people could not self-assemble. But electronic networks are enabling novel forms of collective action because of a new ease of assembly. Now it is possible to have groups that “operate with a birthday party’s informality and a multi-national’s scope” (Shirky, 2008, p. 48) and that emerge through “ridiculously easy group forming” (Shirky, 2008, p. 54, quoting social scientist Seb Paquet).

Despite this potential, the non-profit sector as a whole initially lagged behind the private sector and is still playing catch-up. But Web 2.0 is gaining momentum in this domain and in some areas is leading the charge. Evidence that it still lags comes from a recent study that concluded that very few non-profit networks are taking full advantage of what networks can do with new technologies. It found “the need for a baseline understanding particularly strong with social media—or Web 2.0—tools” and a “heavy reliance on more traditional communication platforms, such as email listservs, document sharing tools and the telephone” (Monitor & Packard Foundation, 2008, p. 3).

However, this sector is beginning to show an active interest in experimenting with Web 2.0. In addition to the benefits relevant to other sectors, leaders in the non-profit community increasingly see the new technologies as a means of responding to emerging societal trends. For example (“Changing Advocacy,” 2009):

- **Withdrawal.** People are increasingly overwhelmed with information and “tune out” requests for support.

- **Need for privacy.** People are opting to have their names removed from lists used by organizations to solicit support.

- **The prevalence of “non-jinters.”** People are less inclined to join churches, unions, bowling leagues, political parties and civic associations.

Responding to these and other challenges, non-profit organizations are beginning to draw on web-based tools to make fundamental changes in the way they do business. Following are examples, organized by trends that illustrate the potential within and beyond formal institutional structures:
Applications enhancing the effectiveness of existing organizational structures

Improving internal communication and knowledge management

• Through an internal blog, staff members at ZeroDivide document lessons learned as the foundation implements a new grantmaking program to support social enterprises (Luckey, O’Kane, & Nee, 2008, p. 3).

• The Open Society Institute’s KAR uses wikis, blogs, tagging and other Web 2.0 tools to enable communication and collaboration among employees separated by culture, geography, and program boundaries, and between the organization and its grantees and partners.  

Enabling transparency of communication with grantees and ease grantmaking transactions

• At the Skoll Foundation, prospective award applicants can easily determine their eligibility through the online “eligibility quiz” (Luckey, et al., 2008, p. 3).  

• DonorsChoose.org. is an online marketplace for connecting donors with opportunities to support public schools (Monitor Institute & Packard Foundation, 2007, p. 9)

• The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation has a searchable online database. An RSS feed of grants awarded makes grantmaking data available to all (Luckey, 2007, p. 5).

Connecting grantees with peers and experts

• The MacArthur Foundation hosted online discussions between clusters of grantees and issue experts (Luckey, et al., 2008, p. 3).

• The Nonprofit Technology Enterprise Network provided educational forums for its members via webinars led by issue experts in the field of nonprofit technology. By using a website plug-in (Gabbly), NTEN provides attendees the opportunity for “back channel” chats during the seminar. A podcast of the call is posted on the organization’s website (Luckey, 2007, p. 3).

To support this trend, the non-profit technology hub TechSoup created NetSquared (Net2) to help non-profit organizations learn about and utilize social Web tools.

Learning from and involving the wider community in grantmaking

• The Packard Foundation is using a public wiki to gather insights from stakeholders to inform its grantmaking strategy around nitrogen pollution.
• The Omidyar Network, a philanthropy launched by eBay founder Pierre Omidyar, asked the public to participate in awarding its grants. It created an online framework for the interested community to deliberate and winnow the proposals first (Noveck, 2008, p. 2).

• The Global Greengrants Fund makes small grants to grassroots environmental groups working around the world, using a network of regional and global advisory boards to make regionally-based decisions.¹⁰¹

• Ashoka’s Changemakers builds communities that compete to surface solutions to social programs and collaborate on solutions. Expert judges select a set of finalists, but the final winner is chosen through a vote of the online Changemakers community (Monitor Institute & Packard Foundation, 2007, p. 9).

Providing support for customers

• Massachusetts General Hospital’s uses CarePages, an online blogging system, to help patients with critical health issues manage the challenge of communicating the status of their health with family and friends (Li & Bernoff, 2008, pp. 153-157).

Sharing knowledge and interacting with the wider community

• The Skoll Forum on Social Entrepreneurship, a popular annual event that brings together leaders in the field of social entrepreneurship, has become interactive with real-time chat and streaming video (Luckey, et al., 2008, p. 2).

• The Meyer Memorial Trust created Connectipedia.org in 2008 as a collective intelligence wiki space for the non-profit sector.¹⁰²

• The Natural Capital Institute created WiserEarth.org in 2005 to “identify and connect the hundreds of thousands of organizations and individuals throughout the world working in the fields of environmental sustainability and social justice.”¹⁰³

Forging new collaborative partnerships for problem solving

• The Myelin Repair Foundation created a collaborative research effort in which researchers from diverse disciplines work toward the shared goal of developing MS treatments, using an online infrastructure for coordination and collaboration to overcome traditional barriers (Monitor Institute & Packard Foundation, 2007, p. 9).
Organizing distributed labor

- InnoCentive acts as a broker for crowdsourcing solutions to R&D challenges. It creates an innovation marketplace connecting companies and academic institutions seeking breakthroughs with a global network of more than 125,000 scientists, inventors, and entrepreneurs. The Rockefeller Foundation is allowing nonprofits to use the InnoCentive process to post problems related to addressing the needs of poor and vulnerable populations and offering rewards to innovators who solve them.\textsuperscript{104}

Bringing people together in novel ways to solve problems quickly

- The World Health Organization set up a network of scientists from 11 laboratories to identify the causal agent of SARS, pinpointing a virus as the cause within only a month (Monitor Institute & Packard Foundation, 2007, p. 10).

- A U.S. biotech company that was unable to find a solution for a new DNA sequencing test method put the problem on InnoCentive. The company found a high quality solution within four weeks from a Finnish research team in an entirely different field (Monitor Institute & Packard Foundation, 2007, p. 10).

Fundraising

- Tweetsgiving, a campaign launched by Epic Change, raised over $10,000 in 48 hours to build a school in Tanzania.\textsuperscript{105}

- Twestival raised $250,000 in three months for Charity Water by sparking local “Tweet-ups” for giving.\textsuperscript{106}

Applications going beyond traditional organizational structures

Traditionally there have been four kinds of civic engagement (Kearns, 200?, p.2):

- Direct engagement (individuals act alone)
- Grassroots engagement (individuals act as part of a loose coalition)
- Organizational engagement (people work through non-profit and advocacy organizations with a governing board and centralized leadership)
- Network-centric engagement (an individual acts as part of a coordinated network)

Network-centric engagement is a hybrid of the individual determination of the first two and the organizational efficiencies of the third. Its potential is radically increased by Web 2.0. Network-centric advocacy focuses on enabling a network individual and resources to connect on a
temporary, as-needed basis to execute advocacy campaigns. Leadership of campaigns can be
decentralized. And Web 2.0 makes possible the “just-in-time” delivery that has revolutionized
manufacturing and retail in the business sector.

Network-centric organizing is especially visible in advocacy efforts, where organizations have
been a limiting vehicle. Kearns argues that the “progress of the environmental movement has
been stalled and in some cases reversed” by organization-based advocacy, which has been
successfully countered by opposing organizations. Advocacy organizations are also vulnerable
to the “organizational dynamics of self-preservation, governance maturity, brand protection and
specialization.” The challenge is to launch new forms of advocacy, linking the 3,000 non-profit
organizations (in the U.S.) with organizations from other sectors, individuals, and loosely
organized teams through networks. This new form of advocacy is a way to counter the trend
away from “joiners” toward a more casually connected base of support.

Other research (Kasper & Scarse, 2008) points to the benefits of network-centric vs.
organization-centric ways of organizing. And Research at the Harvard Business School
suggests that organizational growth “does not necessarily translate into greater social value
creation” (Lagace, 2005). The author found that “the work of nonprofits is even more conducive
to network forms of organization because the issues these organizations are trying to solve are
large complex problems that can’t be addressed by any single entity” (p. 2).

Following are examples of applications of Web 2.0 that are inspired by a network-centric
approach.

**Extending services through affiliated organizations**

- In 1990 Women’s World Banking served 50,000 women with microfinance services. Ten
  years later it served 10 million by fostering a network of affiliates and associates that were
  themselves independent organizations. The founder, Nancy Barry, suggests that “instead
  of thinking about management challenges at the organizational level, leaders should think
  about how best to mobilize resources both within and outside organizational boundaries to
  achieve their social aims” (Kasper & Scarse, 2008, p. 2)

**Mobilizing people rapidly**

- “Smart mobs”—large groups of people linked by cell phones, text messages, emails, or
  other technologies—can assemble suddenly in a public place to perform some collective
  action in support of a cause. This was demonstrated for the first time in the Philippines in
  2001 to protest government corruption and help oust then-President Joseph Estrada
  (Rheingold, 2003, as reported in Shirky, 2008, pp. 174-175). Such “flash activism” has
  since become a common strategy (Schwartz, 2009). An interesting variation is Carrotmob,
“a network of consumers who buy products in order to reward businesses that are making the most socially responsible decisions.”

**Sounding crisis alerts and providing documentation and support**

- Web-based photo-sharing provided up-to-the-minute documentation of the 2006 military coup in Thailand, despite government restrictions on the media. Wikipedia served as a clearinghouse (Shirky, 2008, pp. 36-37).

- The Katrina PeopleFinder Project evolved to engage volunteer programmers in developing a single site that allowed people to search dozens of separate databases and message forums to find lost relatives after Hurricane Katrina (Tapscott & Williams, 2006, pp. 186-188).

**Providing citizen access to useful information**

- Safe2Pee.org helps people find public toilets.

- Freecycle Network is a global network of local groups composed of volunteers who help link people with unneeded usable items with others who might need them, to reduce waste.

- Couchsurfing.com helps people make connections with places they travel, including meeting people and finding a place to stay.

**Expanding participation**

- Media Volunter.org captured the time of nearly 20,000 volunteers to develop a media contact database for progressive organizations.

- The online news site Muckraker asked its readers to make sense of the 3,000 emails released by the Department of Justice related to the firing of federal prosecutors in 2007. Within hours readers were identifying questionable passages, leading to new story leads.

- The Extraordinaries “delivers micro-volunteer opportunities to mobile phones that can be done on-demand and on-the-spot.” http://www.theextraordinaries.org/

**Building organizations rapidly**

- Voice of the Faithful formed quickly in response to a series of articles in the *Boston Globe* about sexual abuse scandals in the Catholic Church. The organization grew from 25 local
members to a 25,000-member global network in less than a year (Kasper & Scearce, 2008, p. 3).

Initiating action to create or mobilize a network

• A new form of activism—“Micromovements” (“narrow, tiny,” movements) (Godin, 2008, cited in Godin, 2009)—now enable individuals or small groups to create a “movement in a silo” by connecting with people through the web and enabling followers to easily connect with one another.

Providing incentives and support structures for volunteer contributions

• Timebanks.org has created a system that “connects unmet needs with untapped resources.” It does do by using the soft currency of contributed time to reward participants who volunteer their skills by enabling them to trade their accumulated credit for access to skills contributed by others.114

Cautions About Web 2.0 Based on Organizational Applications

The enormous potential of Web 2.0 does not come without challenges and risks. Most wikis and blogs do not succeed. “The normal case for social software is failure,” writes Clay Shirky (2008, cited in Thompson, 2006, p. 11). And success can come at a high price. “Our experience suggests that, as with using any tool for the first time, social media experiments often require a steep learning curve that can be quite time consuming” (Kasper & Scearce, 2008, p. 9).

The chief obstacles are not technical. Some have to do with understanding and expectations. A BusinessWeek article identifies a number of misleading “myths” about social media (e.g., “social media is cheap, if not free,” and “you can make a big splash in a short time”) and debunks them (Ochman, 2009). But the obstacles are more than informational. As a consultant who has worked with the U.S. Marine Corps to adopt Web 2.0 reports, “We can install a Web 2.0 system in an agency probably within a few hours or a few days. But the move to Web 2.0 is about behavior change, organizational change, and changing the mindset of what collaboration is” (Kathuria, 2009).

There are risks as well as costs. Among the most frequently mentioned are:

Information leakage (making public proprietary, confidential, or inappropriate information)

• Information assurance (information of uncertain quality)
• Information overload (too much information to effectively process)
• “Tool fatigue” (too many tools to keep up with)
• Past failures, creating a barrier of cynicism
• Lack of internal understanding and support for what it takes to make a collaborative effort work115
• The potential of Web 2.0 tools to exacerbate as well as overcome hierarchy\textsuperscript{116}

Worthy of particular attention is the danger of not recognizing the limits of collective wisdom. The crowd can be ignorant as well as wise (Carr, 2007; Lanier, 2006). Moreover, a caution more relevant to public and non-profit sectors is that increased ease of access to information and services through the internet is available to many but not all; a “digital divide” remains.

All of these cautions are relevant to the application of Web 2.0 to leadership development.

3.4.3 Implications of Web-Based Technologies for Leadership Development

Before focusing directly on the specific question of the implications of web-based technologies for leadership development, it will be helpful to take stock of how these tools may have influenced what we mean by leadership and what we expect leaders to know and do.

3.4.3.1. Implications for What Leaders Are Expected to Know and Do

The Shifting Meaning of Leadership. Leaders will need to be prepared for a Web 2.0-driven evolution in the leadership styles required to be effective. The shift from one-way, hierarchical, organization-centric communication toward two-way, network-centric, collaborative communication will reinforce a trend already evident away from reliance on “heroic” styles of leadership. Network-centric leadership also tends to have a more collective orientation, as discussed in section 3.2. We can expect networks—and collective leadership—to play an increasingly important role as Web 2.0 extends its reach. In many contexts the primacy of individual intelligence will give way to the primacy of collective intelligence, as leaders learn to take advantage of crowdsourcing and other means of drawing upon others’ perspectives.

The shift toward more collective leadership has implications not just for how to lead but for who leaders are. Although large online collaborative projects have nominal leaders, they play a very different role than do traditional organization-based leaders. In fact, “some of the traits and roles of traditional leadership are now becoming properties of the network itself.”\textsuperscript{117} In the political realm it has always been possible for an individual to emerge as a leader because of some combination of motivation and charisma (e.g., Mario Savio at the University of California Berkeley in the 1960s). However, it is now becoming possible for ordinary people to exercise leadership—or at least contribute to it—on a much more spontaneous and temporary basis. For example, individual bloggers in Thailand who posted personal pictures of tanks in front of the parliament exercised a form of leadership in documenting the 2006 military coup. Some of these “leaders” seem highly improbable candidates for playing such a role—e.g., “a fashion-obsessed college student” (Shirky, 2008, pp. 36-37).
**Web 2.0 Literacy.** As the foregoing examples make clear, the organizations in which leaders function are undergoing radical change. As a consequence, the emerging technologies are increasingly becoming a content area in which leaders need to be informed in order to be organizationally “literate.” Web 2.0 literacy will soon rank along with accounting as an area where at least minimal foundational knowledge of the implications for organizational effectiveness is critical. To optimize their effectiveness, leaders will need to command at least minimal literacy in how to use these tools personally. They will also need to know how to leverage these technologies to grow other leaders.

**Networking and Network Leadership Skills.** As discussed in the previous section, networking is one of most common elements of effective leadership development programs. The power of networking for learning will only be enhanced by Web 2.0. It expands the range of possibilities for networking to such a degree that understanding networking is increasingly inseparable from understanding web-based technologies. For this reason, Web 2.0 will also expand the skill set that leaders would do well to command. Network-leadership skills will become as important as team-building skills. Like teams, networks have predictable stages of development and other characteristics with which leaders need to be familiar (Hurley, 2007, p. 20). Leading networks with the rules of a more traditional approach to leadership risks “turning them into bureaucratic federations. Network leaders provide mediating energy…They set up exchanges between other partners, point out collective advantages in collaboration, and identify dangers and opportunities. Leaders must be able to see and respond to trends, and redirect energies as appropriate. They must be able to identify and bring together network resources to tie the network together and reconnect fractures” (Boje, 2001). A foundation report on “boundary-crossing leadership” identified 10 competencies needed across a range of situations. While they included some traditional leadership skills, some were more particular, including (Leadership Learning Community, 2008, p. 2):¹¹⁸

- An ability to build relationships with allies
- Being able to create and hold neutral space for diverse people to come together for dialogue and action
- Awareness of how culture, sector, and other areas of difference influence perspectives and actions

**Interpersonal Skills.** Web 2.0 has mixed implications for the need for interpersonal skills. In some ways the new tools reduce the need for such skills. It will be increasingly easy to “listen” simply by engaging in skillful use of Web 2.0 tools. Social media, RSS feeds and other tools will likely expose leaders to a broader range of information from perspectives other than their own than has been previously possible. However, mere exposure to other perspectives does not ensure effective engagement. To constructively manage encounters with perspectives based on differing assumptions about the world, leaders will need even more skill in listening to other views and constructively asserting their own. The inability to do this may result in a marked decrease in the volume and quality of information willingly made available to them. And without
a disposition to inquire, leaders could use the new media to seek information that merely confirms their biases.

**Leading “Millennials.”** Organization-based leaders face a challenge in leading employees of the “millennial” generation (born between 1982 and 2001). Gary Hamel observes that “the experience of growing up online will profoundly shape the workplace expectations of ‘Generation F’—the Facebook Generation.” Members of that generation—sometimes called “millennials”—will expect the social environment of the work to reflect the social context of the Web. “Companies hoping to attract the most creative and energetic members of this generation will need to understand these expectations and reinvent management practices accordingly.” He offers a list of 12 “work-relevant characteristics of online life”:

- All ideas are on an equal footing
- Contribution counts more than credentials
- Hierarchies are natural, not prescribed
- Leaders serve rather than preside
- Tasks are chosen, not assigned
- Groups are self-defining and self-organizing
- Resources get attracted, not allocated
- Power comes from sharing information, not hoarding it
- Opinions compound and decisions are peer-reviewed
- Users can veto most policy decisions
- Intrinsic rewards matter most
- Hackers are heroes

**Skills in Participatory, Collaborative Forms of Leadership.** The expectations of millennial generation employees is only one dimension of a larger set of forces that add momentum to the historical shift away from one-way, hierarchical, organization-centric communication toward two-way, network-centric, participatory, and collaborative leadership styles. We can also expect networks—and the collective leadership that they enable—to play an increasingly important role as the power of Web 2.0 makes networks more prevalent and more powerful. In many contexts the primacy of individual intelligence will give way to the primacy of collective intelligence, as leaders learn to take advantage of crowdsourcing.

**3.4.3.2. Implications for How Leaders Learn**

In all sectors, Web 2.0 offers the possibility of expanding leadership development options in a number of specific ways. The possibilities include:

- Enhanced effectiveness of formal instruction
- Increased ease of access to learning
• New forms of delivery of learning
• New forms of learning

Opportunities of this kind indicate a broad overall shift in the patterns of leadership development. One of the ways in which this shift is being framed is “blended learning.” We will also introduce that concept and review the perspective that it offers.

First, a review of the new possibilities for learning about leadership offered by Web 2.0.

Enhanced effectiveness of formal instruction.

Translating learning into development requires support as well as challenge. Classroom-based instruction has been limited in its ability to provide support—even when it consists of multiple exposures—because of participants’ vulnerability to being consumed by job-related pressures when not formally engaged in learning. The new technologies help mitigate this problem by making it easier to spread support over time in ways that are integrated into the lives of participants. Examples include:

• **Laying the groundwork for formal programs.** Organizations that sponsor learning of various kinds have begun using web technology prior to seminars or meetings in order to prepare participants to take greater advantage of face-to-face time (Hannum, Center for Creative Leadership., & Martineau, 2008).

• **Following up formal programs.** Since 2005, CCL’s flagship Leadership Development Program has featured Friday5s (a web technology developed by the Fort Hill Company) to accelerate post-program application of learning and sustain commitment to goals (Whyman, Santana, & Allen, 2005). CCL evaluations show that such reinforcement leads to significant increases in goal achievement (Pollock & Santana, 2007).

• **Facilitating support networks among workshop/program participants.** Many workshops now support participants in signing up for an email list or listserv that enables participants to keep in touch, reinforcing the workshop experience. Such groups tend to peter out after a while, but do tend to reinforce and extend the period of active engagement with the learning.

• **Forming communities around workshops.** Some workshops have gone so far as to create support for online communities that connect participants from any previous workshop. For example, the Shambhala Institute for Authentic Leadership, which sponsors an annual week-long workshop in Halifax, Nova Scotia, has used the new web tool Ning to create such a site.
New forms of learning

- **Internet forums.** Web 2.0 adds power to electronic bulletin boards, enabling more interactive discussions on areas of common interest to leaders. Many of the social media and other Web 2.0 tools enable such interactive communication.\(^{124}\)

- **Virtual learning environments.** Online role-playing games enable players to practice leadership skills in situations that pose challenges typical of the requirements of future leaders: speed, risk taking, and acceptance of leadership roles as temporary (Reeves, Malone, & O’Driscoll, 2008).

- **Web-supported communities of practice.** Web support for learning networks creates new opportunities for information sharing and problem solving. “Just-in-time” learning is now accessible in ways never before possible, as illustrated by CompanyCommand, the U.S. Army community of practice described in section 3.1.2.

Increased ease of access to learning

- **Overcoming barriers of geography and language.** Nortel uses advanced video and data-networking technologies to offer a Virtual Leadership Academy monthly in 47 countries, with simultaneous translation from English into Spanish and Portuguese. The technology enables real-time response to questions and concerns (Day & Halpin, 2001, p. 21).

- **Virtual access to conferences.** Conference presentations are beginning to be available virtually.\(^ {125} \) The Shambhala Institute for Authentic Leadership now offers access to its current leadership workshop to graduates of previous programs.\(^ {126} \) And blogging and texting of conferences has begun to offer enhanced information sharing among attendees as well as enable outside access to a broader audience.

- **More powerful and individualized means of keeping informed.** It is now possible to track areas of interest easily by subscribing to an RSS feed, enrolling in Twine, or using Google Alerts.\(^ {127} \) Web 3.0, which is predicted to make the internet “more intelligent” in anticipating and meeting individual needs and interests, will sharply increase this trend (MacManus, 2009).

- **User-friendly access to personal development opportunities.** People who could never find time to attend time-intensive workshops such as meditation retreats can now learn at home in manageable time chunks, not just through books and CDs, but on web-advertised and supported teleconferences, webinars, blog radio, and the like.\(^ {128} \)
New forms of learning delivery

- **Webinars.** The economic downturn has sparked an explosion of webinars, adding momentum to an already evident trend.¹²⁹

- **Online coaching.** Online coaching is beginning to be offered as a tool for following up workshops in a cost-effective manner.¹³⁰

**Blended Learning.** These specific possibilities are leading to more fundamental changes in how organizations and individuals approach leadership development. In the search for ways of framing this shift, one good candidate is the notion of “blended learning.” This concept is receiving significant attention in the corporate world (e.g., “Blended learning IS the next big thing” (Bersin & Associates, 2003); and “The future of learning will reflect a true blend” (Schooley, 2009), but seems equally applicable to other sectors.

What is blended learning? It describes the effort to systematically integrate different forms of learning, combining and complementing face-to-face instruction with the many other modes that are now possible. There are certain things that can be done better face-to-face in more traditional formats. For example, 360° feedback and other efforts to foster significant changes in self-awareness are likely to require at least some direct personal interaction in a classroom or with a coach or mentor. However, other forms of learning may be more cost-effective. The most important consideration in making judgments about an optimal “blend” of options is to clarify the goals and learning objectives, which will then determine the best choices.

Blended learning offers learners the opportunity to be both together and apart. A community of learners can interact anytime and anywhere via computer-mediated educational tools. Blended learning provides a mix of such technologies and interactions that results in a socially supported learning experience. It recognizes that the learning environment is a continuum from structured to informal learning and encourages the architects of leadership development programs to take strategic advantage of this (Schooley, 2009, p. 16). For simple and specific situations, such as informing managers of a new policy or product, an email reinforced by a conference call and supporting materials might be the strategy of choice. For an ambitious undertaking (such as Cisco’s recertification program, which needed to reach an audience of 900,000 people), a more complex combination—primarily web-based formal instruction, supported by other tools and informal learning—is likely more appropriate (Bersin & Associates, 2003, p. 2). IBM reports that its Basic Blue Program—a program featuring face-to-face learning labs, synchronous online discussion, online interactive learning, and just-in-time online information—delivers five times the content of previous courses at one-third the cost, for an overall ROI of 57 to 1 (Corporate Leadership Council, 2002, p. 4).

In one sense this perspective is by no means new. Indeed, it is implicit in at least four of the nine design principles summarized in section 3.1.1:
- Tailor the Goals and Approach of the Program to the Context (#3)
- Target Programs Toward Specific Audiences (#4)
- Integrate All Features of the Program (#5)
- Use a Variety of Learning Methods (#6)

And for most situations, a fifth is relevant as well:

- Offer Extended Learning Periods With Sustained Support (#7)

However, such an approach encourages even more strategic reflection on the pros and cons of any particular tool. Following is an example of one such effort:\textsuperscript{131}

The example is noteworthy not just because of its systematic assessment of the many dimensions that need to be considered in selecting a particular tool. It also unwittingly illustrates the importance of taking a broad view. The authors of this study were clearly focused on “media,” leading them to overlook several of the most powerful approaches to leadership development identified in this study, such as job definition/assignment, action learning (although “lab-based simulations” may capture some features of this learning), and 360\degree feedback. (For an explanation of tools not defined in this study, see the footnote that introduces the example.)
Another implication of blended learning is encouragement to underscore the importance of design principle #8: “Encourage Ownership of Self-Development.” In the world being shaped by Web 2.0, leadership development will be increasingly self-directed. The possibilities for creating one’s own individualized curriculum are radically expanded. A developing leader can now put together a thoroughly individualized curriculum, consisting not only of traditional seminars but also of the many options identified in the above table, plus other options identified in this report. This trend will be even more evident as Web 3.0 become more available. “Smart” tools will make it increasingly easy for leaders to become informed in topics of personal interest, and to network with others of like mind.

Further Cautions

In addition to the red flags identified with respect to applications of Web 2.0 to organizations more generally, there are some additional concerns that arise when using these tools for learning and specifically for leadership development.

Our chief concern is related to lessons learned about Web 1.0. The web-based training that evolved from earlier technologies made learning more efficient but reduced or eliminated the “social learning” that comes from diversity of perspective and sharing of real world experience. Happily, these social experiences can now be embedded in the delivery of such training through Web 2.0 tools. However, even online social experiences cannot substitute for face-to-face experiences with regard to deeper forms of learning. Online coaching, for example, loses the rich data that come from live interaction and the ability of a skilled coach to use that information in calibrating the right balance of challenge and support. Unless the approaches to learning made possible with Web 2.0 are truly skillfully “blended,” reserving appropriate space for live encounters, leadership development initiatives risk reducing the likelihood of fostering the deeper kinds of learning that are critically needed if we are to develop leaders who can avoid the failures in leadership so evident in the world today.\(^{132}\)

3.4.4 Concluding Reflections

Just as web-based technologies are transforming society, so too are they transforming organizations—and organizing—in all sectors. Inevitably, the nature of leadership is changing as well. And of necessity, leadership development must change to accommodate these shifts. In these ways Web 2.0 is a force to which leadership development must react. But the new technologies also offer powerful opportunities. They have the potential to make organizations both more efficient and more effective. And they have the potential to support forms of organizing that go beyond traditional organizational structures.
The potential for efficiency is being exploited at an accelerated pace in response to the economic downturn, which has forced many organizations to turn to the internet for services traditionally performed in other (more expensive) ways. And its potential for effectiveness is evident from the examples cited. The organizations that take the lead in exploiting this potential will be more distinctive and competitive, serving their customers and stakeholders in novel and powerful ways.

These organizations need leaders who can take them there. The same Web 2.0 tools that demand these changes in leadership can also be utilized to enhance the effectiveness of leadership development. Foundations can support organizations in rising to the challenge of this tectonic societal shift by supporting the application of these emerging web-based technologies for that purpose.
### 3.5 Sector-Specific Patterns in Leadership Development

Keeping in mind the Bertelsmann Stiftung’s ultimate objective of designing leadership development programs in the public and non-profit sectors—as well as potentially for multi-stakeholder audiences—we looked for patterns of similarity and difference across the sectors. As a first pass at this question we reviewed 1) the design principles and 2) the common program elements to compare what we have learned about programs in each sector. The tables that follow are the result.

#### Application of Design Principles to Effective Programs by Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Principle</th>
<th>Sector of Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensure high-level sponsorship</strong></td>
<td>Equally prevalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tailor the goals and approach of the program to the context</strong></td>
<td>Typically done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absence of profit motive complicates Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absence of profit motive complicates challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need to manage multiple motives complicates challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target programs toward specific audiences</strong></td>
<td>Equally prevalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typically done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes come from diverse organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always come from diverse organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrate all features of program</strong></td>
<td>Equally prevalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combine use of “inside out” with “outside in” approaches</strong></td>
<td>Typically done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pays less attention to “inside out”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typically done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typically done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Outside in” approaches vary and include more emphasis on societal systems dynamics and collective leadership for non-private sector programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use a variety of learning methods</strong></td>
<td>Typically done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some programs with limited methods (e.g., peer learning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offer extended learning with sustained support</strong></td>
<td>Equally prevalent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relevance of Design Element by Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Sector of Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant variance, especially at organizational/systems levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action learning</td>
<td>Most prevalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment/feedback</td>
<td>Most prevalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive coaching</td>
<td>Most prevalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>Most prevalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job assignments</td>
<td>Most prevalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>Prevalent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We will refer to the observations reflected in these tables in the sections that follow.

3.4.1 Patterns in the Private Sector

Compared to other sectors, the private sector is distinguished by a consistent history of greater attention to and investment in leadership development. And that interest has gained momentum in recent years. Over 2% of the corporate budget is invested in employee training. This attention is reflected in the relatively greater abundance of case studies and research. And on average, corporate programs draw more fully on the complete menu of program elements available for leadership development. For example, they are more likely to combine 360° assessment, executive coaching and mentoring.

Many university-based executive education programs have evolved to serve a primarily corporate audience (though the offerings are usually available to all comers). The magazine *Leadership Excellence*, which compiles an annual ranking of top leadership development programs and practitioners, listed 20 such programs in 2008. We have not attempted to judge the relative quality of such programs, nor offer profiles, for fear of producing a superficial and subjective ranking. Instead we have focused on initiatives within companies.

However, it is worth acknowledging a vehicle for leadership development that seems almost unique to the corporate world: the corporate “university” or “learning center,” defined as “the overall organizational umbrella for aligning and coordinating all learning for employees in order
to achieve the organization’s goals” (Plompen, 2005, p. 83). A study by the European Foundation for Management Development found that two-thirds of its members are engaged in learning activities that meet this definition (Plompen, 2005). Some of the most well-known examples of corporate best practice are grounded in such institutions, the most famous being GE’s Crotonville, which was founded in the 1970s and was among the very first. Another four were launched in the 1980s, and more than fifteen in the 1990s (Plompen, 2005, p. 84). According to one observer (Moingeon, 2000), in the 1980s these were mainly training centers, often driven by the goal of cost savings. In the 1990s they became “corporate learning centers,” developing truly customized learning programs in support of strategy implementation and change management. The university of the future is likely to be a “web-enabled learning hub.”

At the most successful of these, the CEOs “see their corporate universities as the vehicle for the implementation of their strategies, through the development of a strong corporate culture.” Of the remaining purposes (below), about half serve leadership development:

- Optimizing internal learning
- Maximizing people development processes
- Aligning people processes
- Attracting top people
- Retaining the best managers
- Developing future leaders
- Driving cultural change
- Increasing performance
- Growing operational competencies
- Integrating with knowledge management approaches (Plompen, 2005, p. 85)

The scope of such institutions varies on a continuum from “wide-focused” to “lean” universities. The wide-focused ones tend to cover management as well as technical training and serve everyone from first line managers to senior executives (for example, Lufthansa). Lean universities might focus on a narrower objective such as building bridges between top management teams, as in the case of the Allianz Management Institute (Plompen, 2005, p. 87).

Executive education programs often participate in a more recent variant on the corporate university: the “consortium” (Vicere & Fulmer, 1998, p. 286) or “alliance” (Plompen, 2005). These affiliations, for purpose of offering training, may be between a business school and a corporation or between several schools and one or more corporations. There has been enormous growth in this area but an alarming failure rate: 70% (Plompen, 2005, p. 50).
3.4.2 Patterns in the Non-Profit Sector

Traditionally, organizations in the non-profit world in leadership development have invested less in leadership development than their private-sector counterparts. A study of environmental organizations in the early 1990s found a pattern in those organizations that is typical of the sector: organizational leaders are attracted out of a sense of “‘moral or political imperative and a deep personal commitment,’ but lack training for their job” (Snow, 1992, p. 11). Moreover, the study found that “opportunities for mid-career training and refreshment virtually do not exist for most professional staff leaders among the NGOs” (p. 145). Lack of resources is of course one contributing factor but not always the primary one. Skepticism of “business-school culture,” and a belief that the problems are “out there” rather than internal to non-profit organizations or leaders also contributed significantly. All this, however, is changing.

Realization That Leadership Matters. There is an increased interest in leadership development in this sector that parallels the rise in interest in the corporate world and for many of the same reasons. Additional factors also exist, including the following:

- An intrinsically high degree of challenge (Hubbard, 2005, pp. 7-8):
  - Non-profit organizations often take on “mega-scale” problems
  - Higher stress/failure/turnover rates among leaders result from such challenges
- Recent societal trends:
  - Difficult economic times post 9/11
  - Increased competition for limited funding
  - Increased concern for accountability
  - Predicted labor shortages, reinforcing the difficulty of attracting talent to the non-profit world

Efforts to meet these challenges through leadership development must address distinctive conditions, such as:

- Metrics for success that are less explicit than in the private sector
- Diffuse power structures that make a command/control style of leadership difficult (and may therefore require more collaborative leadership) (Collins, 2005, p. 9)
- A tendency toward cultures of “niceness” in which candor is often suppressed (Collins, 2005, p. 32)

Interest in leadership development in this sector has evolved in ways that invert the history of corporate interest. In the corporate world interest in leadership development for skill building and other purposes evolved later into the realization that leadership development can serve organizational capacity building. By contrast, many players in the non-profit world have arrived at this linkage from the other direction. Sponsors originally interested primarily in the development of organizational capacity began to note the significance of the quality of
leadership in determining organizational effectiveness. In addition, capacity-building interventions often fail without good leadership in place (Enright, 2006, p.1). The president of the Agnes E. Meyer Foundation, which has invested heavily in working with leaders for some time, observed: “Over the years we’ve come to believe more and more in the link between strong executive leadership and effective organizations” (p. 9). The study that reports this found that “time and again, foundations’ executives spoke of a ‘growing understanding,’ ‘dawning realization,’ or an ‘increased appreciation’ of how leadership makes a difference. Equally important, many talked about the importance of connecting leadership development and organizational performance” (p. 10).

*Emphasis on Collective Leadership.* In responding to these conditions, leadership development efforts in the non-profit domain have evolved away from an emphasis on individual leaders and toward an emphasis on collective leadership. We discussed this trend in Section 3.2, citing the history of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation as an illustration. Kathleen Enright, the president and CEO of Grantmakers for Effective Organizations, describes a similar trend in her organization’s thinking: “We started by looking at how to develop nonprofit leadership as a means of building organizational performance. We weren’t focused on individual or collective leadership outside of the context of the organization. But understanding that no single organization alone can make significant progress on society’s toughest challenges, we are now exploring how to build network and community leadership capacity for social change and problem solving. That’s where our work is moving.”

Foundations sponsored many of the collective leadership initiatives reported in section 3.2.

The commitment to collective leadership has led to support for leadership development programs in which networking and peer learning play an especially significant role. They have proven to be useful tools in forming the bridges across organizational boundaries within and across sectors. Such connections enable peer learning as well as the formation of ad hoc teams to address multi-stakeholder challenges.

**3.4.3 Patterns in the Public Sector**

The public sector poses the greatest challenges of all for leadership development. Leaders in this domain not only lack the performance measures available to their private sector colleagues (such as profit margins, stock prices, market share) but lack the more specific performance measures of non-profit organizations as well (attainment of program goals, fundraising benchmarks). They also have inherently more ambiguous measures of performance because they simultaneously pursue multiple, non-economic goals (Van Slyke & Alexander, 2006, p. 364).

Leadership in the public sector is complicated by differing mechanisms of authority as well. The need for transparency, accountability, and due process shapes leaders’ behavior, which is further constrained by bureaucratic rules (p. 367). Leaders must deal with unions, like their
counterparts in some private sector companies. And they “lack the range and flexibility of rewards and the discretion and authority” with which to align subordinates and hold them accountable (p. 367). Quite simply, it is harder to hire and fire. If Jack Welch had been a public-sector manager, he would not have been able to earn the reputation of “neutron Jack” for having swept GE clean of the thousands of employees that did not meet his standards.

Public sector leaders work in an environment subject to political appointments and greater pressure for a representative work force. And they face greatly increased accountability to stakeholders, which include “citizens, interest groups, elected officials, the courts, direct service clients, and media.” The result is that decision making and implementation are more incremental, deliberative, and subject to political intervention (p. 366). If this were not enough, one must add to the mix the many differences that exist across the various levels of government, not to mention type of agency. Putting all these challenges together creates a uniquely challenging set of dilemmas. For example “the complexity of federal agencies, combined with the distrust which can result from political campaigns, make it difficult for newly appointed political leaders and civil service leaders to achieve long term outcomes together.” And the need for short-term results on the part of politically appointed leaders creates an incentive for command and control leadership styles that may not serve the long-term interests of the institution (Bishop, et al., 2003, p. 19).

It should be noted that the public sector offers one advantage. Government exists to create public value. As some have observed, this is “work to be proud of, and many government workers choose it for that reason” (Sugarman, 2000, pp. 6-7). Leaders can potentially leverage this asset to stimulate change in government agencies.

Not surprisingly, facing these challenges may require different skills. One scholar concludes that while many of the skills and competencies transfer across sectors, “the internal and external demands facing leaders of public sector organizations may well consist of more differences than similarities” (p. 367). Does this mean that a different approach to leadership development is required? Not necessarily. The author of another study, himself a veteran of federal government service, concludes that “the principles and practices of how to grow leaders are not significantly different in the public and private sectors (Blunt, 2004, p. 72).

He goes on to observe that what is different is the level of commitment to developing such skills. Unfortunately, in the U.S. there appears to be an inverse relationship between the magnitude of the leadership challenge and the commitment to investing in leadership development. In testimony before the National Commission on Public Service, the former president of the Council for Excellence in Government, after lauding the private sector for its level of spending on employee training, said “Sadly, this is not the case in the public sector. The fact that no one knows how much—or how little—the government invests in training and developing its workforce tells the whole story.” Based on a review of strategic and performance plans in the federal government, a General Accounting Office report (2000) confirmed that leadership
succession “is not yet a priority for immediate action” (cited in Blunt, 2004, p. 47). And a survey by the Office of Personnel Management declared a “wake up call” after having found that only 4 of 20 federal agencies surveyed had formal leadership development initiatives for beginning supervisors (cited in Blunt, 2004, p. 47). Other studies found a “largely serendipitous” system and a “gap of leadership talent in the public service that will almost certainly grow in the next 20 years” (reported in Blunt, 2004, p. 11).

We were also struck by the relatively fewer number of profiles of organizations illustrating best practice in the public sector. To be sure, we did come across examples of descriptions of effective programs at various levels: federal (Blunt, 2004), state (National Academy of Public Administration, 1997), and local (Chrislip, 2002). However, such examples were sparse compared to the rich variety we found in the other two sectors in the U.S. Moreover, scholars have noted the lag in research on public sector leadership internationally (Van Slyke & Alexander, 2006, p. 364). The studies that do exist give cause for concern. One reports: “The dominant form of leadership development in the federal government today is an ad hoc approach that relies upon serendipity for success and on the assumption that leadership development consists of attending leadership courses” (Blunt, 2004, p. 57).

But this pattern may be undergoing a shift. We heard from several people knowledgeable about the federal government that the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) was “doing something interesting.” We were able to speak to two senior officials—Marcia Pelberg, the director of Leadership & Cross Functional Training and Mathew Ferrero, director of Leadership Succession Planning—who provided descriptions of a program that is as sophisticated as any we’ve seen. A brief portrait of the impetus behind the program, as well as the program itself, will provide an illuminating window into the conditions that foster effective leadership development and what it can look like.

They reported a general background trend of increased attention to leadership development in the federal government in the last three to four years, stimulated by factors that included:

- Penetration of the message from the emerging literature on talent management (Michaels, Handfield-Jones, & Axelrod, 2001) and on the impact of leadership on front-line performance (Corporate Executive Board, 2003)

- Impact of the bi-annual report on human capital by the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, which includes a survey of the most attractive places to work in the federal government. (We had learned elsewhere that a partner from Andersen Consulting had become Comptroller of the General Accounting Office in 1998, was “appalled at how poorly federal government thought about human capital,” and had been a force for drawing people’s attention to it.)

Within this overall trend the IRS was “ahead of the game” because of intense Congressional scrutiny in 1998 and the resulting legislation, which reorganized the IRS and created an oversight board. As part of this reorganization the IRS established a Leadership Development
Executive Council in 2001, with participation from top leaders in the IRS across business units. Over the next two years, the IRS built a competency-based and integrated leadership development program. In 2003 this program received one of 23 BEST Awards from the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) for employee learning and development, selected from an international pool of candidates. Additional emphasis on the importance of human capital came in 2008 when a commissioner from the private sector was confirmed. He “took talent management by the horns” and established an influential Workforce of Tomorrow Task Team to drive innovation in attracting, developing, and retaining top talent.

Like many of the most effective leadership development programs, the IRS program is multi-faceted and not easy to fully capture in a brief summary. However, the following elements stand out:

- **Framework.** An overall framework based on leadership competencies (5 core leadership responsibilities and 21 competencies derived from behavioral event interviews) that are aligned with the IRS mission, vision, values, and strategic goals.

- **Assessment.** A variety of assessment procedures, including 360° instruments based on competencies (linked to an OPM framework), personal style assessment (DISC), and feedback from coaches and mentors.

- **Challenge.** Job-related stretch within the job, from higher-level assignments and from team projects.

- **Curriculum.** A comprehensive curriculum with separate components for employees (“leading yourself”), front-line managers (“leading your team”), mid- and senior-level managers (“leading your organization”), and senior executives (“leading the Service”), with complementary emphasis on both management (processes) and leadership (relationships). The curriculum has distinct categories of leadership development within each track (entry level, mastery, readiness programs for advancement, functional training). It is also supplemented by individual learning.

- **Support.** Systematic coaching and mentoring, and release from job assignments for developmental opportunities.

- **Faculty.** Diverse faculty, drawing up internal managers and executives as well as expert vendors.

- **Integration.** Direct linkage between leadership values and competencies and how people are selected, evaluated and recognized (e.g., the IRS was the first federal government agency to directly link leadership competencies to annual performance measurement). Leadership development is also integrated with a well-developed Leadership Succession Planning program.
The IRS is certainly not the only example of best practice within the federal government. For example, the Veterans Benefits Administration’s LEAD program has woven together some familiar elements in a compelling way:

Three weeks of formal training in the course of a nine-month program
- Three weeks of formal training in the course of a nine-month program
- Action learning
- 360° feedback
- Individual development plans

It also added some distinctive features:

- Shadowing assignments, in which participants select a mentor and a division chief to shadow for a week
- Management interviews with two senior management officials to gain insights and a broader professional perspective (Blunt, 2004, p. 65)

In addition to promising but still relatively isolated examples such as the IRS and the Veterans Benefits Administration—and in stark contrast to overall patterns—the organizations that are widely regarded as being the most committed to and effective at leadership development in the U.S. are in the public sector. We have made numerous references to the military. In the Army, for example, leadership development is deeply embedded in organizational policies and norms. As mentioned in section 3.1 on job definition/assignment, personnel are expected from the beginning of their career to exercise significant leadership. And in the course of a 20-year career, an officer would typically have spent 4 years in formal learning. The results of this commitment are remarkable. A consultant to the Army has observed: “Leadership development is much more systematic, much more of a priority in the Army than in the corporate world.”

And an academic observer concludes, “The American organization that has arguably reinvented both its management system and its leadership culture most dramatically is the United States Army, the very organization from which industry learned the original management approach [command and control] it is now trying to change.”

Although there is no strong parallel in this sector to the corporate trend toward building universities, we did find analogs in the military. All have dedicated “universities,” some of which are well known: the Army’s War College; the Air Force’s Academy. Less well known is that the Coast Guard has created a Leadership Development Center, which has enabled the agency to “bring together leaders at all levels, to share a common philosophy...of leadership and public service, and to have ongoing involvement of line managers as teachers and contributors to the curriculum” (Blunt, 2004, p. 57). The Marine Corps illustrates the pervasiveness of formal training through dedicated institutions. A Marine who attains the rank of general will have attended at least four full-time schools after an Officer Candidates School and a “Basic School,” each one lasting an average of a year (Freedman, 2000, p. 77).
While the military has idiosyncratic features that limit the extent to which its leadership practices can be emulated, proponents argue that it “provides a leadership construct that transcends the civilian-military paradigms. Basically it is about people-to-people motivation and adherence to institutional goals and character.” In any case some highly effective companies appear to have been able to model themselves after military-inspired traditions. The Marines in particular have inspired imitation. Their three “pillars” of leadership—“leadership by example, taking care of those in your charge, and leadership development”—have wide applicability (Santamaria, et al., 2004, pp. xii-xiii). Federal Express, under the leadership of CEO Fred Smith, a former Marine, has consciously tried to apply the Marine approach. FedEx's Manager's Guide incorporates many Marine principles. Among many other practices the company has a structured “screen, train, coach” approach to leadership development that is patterned after the “recruit, train, mentor” paradigm used by the Marine Corps (2004, pp. 174-176). For the training component, FedEx has created the ASIRE training program, an equivalent of the Marine’s Officer Candidate School, and a follow-up Leadership Institute equivalent to the Basic School, which has several levels to which participants return. Coaching and mentoring is expected of all managers, following the Marine principle, captured in FedEx’s Management Guide, that “an infallible measure of success for any managerial assignment is its legacy” (p. 176).

Two of the courses at the Officer Candidates School—the Leadership Reaction Course and Combat Course—have also inspired the Wharton Business School at the University of Pennsylvania to co-sponsor with the Marine Corps a Leadership Ventures course, for “learning leadership and decision making under uncertainty and complexity.” Using methods based on those for which the Marine Corps has become renowned, the course “provides intense, hands-on learning experience that emphasizes fast decision-making, team-based problem solving, and effective strategic thinking.”

There are a number of executive education programs targeting government managers. The Federal Executive Institute and related Management Development Centers have the most comprehensive set of offerings, which many hold in high regard. The Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, which has a Center for Public Leadership, also has high stature among the several university-based programs. Some of its programs, like those based on the work of leadership theorist Ronald Heifetz, are at the cutting edge of leadership theory and practice. For years the Kennedy School has regularly attracted public sector leaders from abroad, including Germany, where similar programs are scarce (Houben & Rische, 2008). However, most of these executive education offerings have the limitation of providing concentrated exposures to learning with no follow up. In addition, participants return to settings in which what they have learned is not shared or reinforced. But strong peer support, often leading to alumni networks, helps compensate for this deficiency.

A number of other institutions avoid the limitations of brief programs by offering six- to eighteen-month programs for targeted cadres of managers, who are supported in a program of classroom learning interspersed with on-the-job application of learning. For example, the Partnership for
Public Service sponsors the “Excellence in Government Fellows Program,” an award-winning year-long program for mid-level federal career executives. It consists of five weeks of formal learning spread over a year. Some agencies send cohorts of managers to provide reinforcement for the learning. Over the past 20 years the program has trained more than 2,700 federal employees. The Partnership also sponsors the Annenberg Leadership Institute, a six-month program serving high-potential GS-13 to GS-15 federal employees. The Institute features:

- Coursework (on topics such as leading people and high-performing teams, delivering results on-time and on-budget, and leading innovation and managing change)
- Action learning projects (on issues such as strengthening inter-agency communications during food recalls, recruiting mission critical talent, and improving employee morale to enhance performance and results)
- Coaching

Another pattern we see in this sector is one of less investment in explicit intra-individual, “inside out” learning, in favor of more task- and problem-focused learning. If this is an accurate conclusion, it would be consistent with our experience with such organizations, in which passionate idealists, eager to solve the world’s problems, are disposed to believe that the problems are all “out there” and therefore less inclined to invest in their own individual (or organizational) development.

3.4.4 Patterns in Multi-Sector Programs

As we have noted more than once, one of the most significant societal trends with implications for leadership development is the increasing complexity of problems confronting leaders in every sector (Scharmer, 2007, pp. 81-104). It is becoming commonplace that problems cannot be solved by a single organization or even multiple organizations within a single sector (Waddell, 2005). In response to this trend, a number of innovative programs have evolved in recent years with the explicit aim of developing leadership across all sectors. Often these programs have the objective of fostering societal change by building the individual capacity and collective networks to address complex problems that cannot be effectively addressed within a single sector. Few of these programs have a long enough history to have accumulated much data on impact. But a number of them seem intuitively promising. Studies by the Global Leadership Network have identified and profiled 25 programs that have an emphasis on “generative change agent” development, many of which serve multi-stakeholder audiences (Link, et al., 2008b).

These multi-sector, multi-stakeholder programs tend to place greater emphasis on understanding system dynamics and learning tools for collaborating with people of diverse backgrounds across multiple sectors. They rely less on 360° feedback (perhaps because of its expense) and mentoring (usually they do not come from organizations that sponsor leadership
development programs), and instead feature peer coaching and learning. Participants may receive coaching from faculty in the formal programs but tend not to be the beneficiaries of professional executive coaches between sessions. Again, the probable reason is cost and the lack of institutional sponsorship. It is worth illustrating the range of these programs with a few examples.

An example with a global orientation and good data on growth in participant consciousness is the Generating Transformative Change in Human Systems program, led by the consulting firm Pacific Integral in affiliation with the Leadership Institute of Seattle at Bastyr University in Seattle, Washington (Link, Gauthier, & Corral, 2008a, p. 21). Its purpose is to develop participants’ capacity to influence, design, and generate transformative changes and measurably increase their ability to give and receive value. Its 18-month program targets 15 to 20 participants who are a mix of executive directors of NGOs, hospitals, and government agencies and consultants aged 30 to 50 with some participants from overseas (in their 20s). It aims for people who are simultaneously going through an outer (work) and inner (personal) transformation. The program consists of a mix of five-day intensive residential retreats, field work, on-line classrooms, action learning teams, individual coaching, conference calls with the cohort, and final projects in the form of “transformational travel” together. This program is typical of programs of this type in that it draws on the emerging meta-theories, in this case Ken Wilber’s Integral Theory (with its “All Quadrant All Levels” framework) and Theory U. It also uses Susann Cook-Greuter’s Leadership Development Framework as a pre-post measure of stage of development. This framework is adapted from the Loevinger Sentence Completion Test and geared toward the constructive developmental frameworks of Robert Kegan and Bill Torbert (O’Fallon, Fitch, Carman, & 2008).

Another globally oriented program, co-sponsored by M.I.T.’s Sloan School of Management and the Presencing Institute, is Emerging Leaders Innovate Across Sectors (ELIAS) (Link, et al., 2008a, p. 22). The creator and lead faculty is Otto Scharmer, author of Theory U (2007), one of the meta-theories we have highlighted. ELIAS aims to “contribute to the evolution of sustainable global market systems that build human, social, and natural capital as well as financial and industrial capital by building a cross-sector network of high-potential leaders and their institutions working collectively to generate new ideas, prototypes, and ventures.” Beginning in 2006, it has attracted 25 participants per year from all sectors for a 15-day program over five months. It consists of two modules delivered in Boston and learning journeys and self-organized meetings between sessions. The modules focus on: raising awareness about global issues that impact institutions and the challenges of working across sectors; practicing basic skills of presencing with particular emphasis on “sensing” skills; and the practical application of these skills after the course. Its most distinctive features are use of the presencing methodology, cross-sector peer-shadowing experiences, deep-dive learning journeys, deep listening, dialogue tools, deep reflection practices and hands-on prototyping of innovations.
In the U.S., the Leader to Leader Institute sponsors a different kind of multi-stakeholder leadership development activity. The Institute sees its vision as charting the future path for the social sector to become the equal partner of business and government in developing responsible leaders, caring citizens, and a healthy, diverse and inclusive society. To these ends the Institute identifies and sponsors a variety of programs that bring together representatives from multiple sectors. For example:

- The *Investment in America Program* brings together leaders from each of the three sectors—social, private, and public—to share knowledge and experience in developing values-based, ethically-driven leadership.

- The *Investment in America Forum* gathers a small, select group of leaders (CEOs and Presidents) from the public, private, and social sectors to examine mutual challenges facing all three sectors and the nation.
4. Implications of the Study for Foundations Considering Sponsorship of Leadership Development

Although this study was commissioned by the Bertelsmann Stiftung, we have been encouraged to articulate implications with a broader audience in mind. Thus we direct this concluding section toward foundations more generally, while retaining some references to the context of German society and culture relevant to the Bertelsmann Stiftung.

4.1 The Value of Investing in Leadership Development

The first question—only implicit in our assignment but of fundamental importance—is: “Is there good reason to believe that investments in leadership development will pay off?” The answer, we believe, is an unequivocal “yes.” All the studies we have found come to that conclusion, which is consistent with our own experience. For example, a comprehensive review of leadership development in all sectors found: “Investing in leadership development adds value, giving the organization a competitive advantage. Motorola, GE, Ford and the Army all believe that the money, time and effort expended in developing the leadership talent of supervisors and middle managers pays dividends…toward excellence that competitors cannot match” (National Academy of Public Administration, 1997, p. 38). And a review in the non-profit sector concluded that “there are ample reasons to invest in non-profit leadership development,” citing a “convergence of factors—expectations for performance, senior-level retirement and turnover, competition for talent, increasing service and management demands—that have highlighted the importance of developing leadership within the sector” (Hubbard, 2005, p. 9).

A rationale for investing in leadership development that is more specific to foundations is that doing so can contribute to the effectiveness of programs to which the foundation is already committed. Such was the experience of many foundations in the U.S., which discovered through experience that a powerful route to organizational capacity building is through investments in leadership development (Hubbard, 2005; Enright, 2006). Our research identified an interesting illustration of this correlation in local government. Several case studies highlight the city of Phoenix, Arizona, which in 1993 received The Carl Bertelsmann prize for being one of two best-run cities in the world. One of these studies attributes Phoenix’s success to the quality of leadership in the local government (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2001). Other studies of successful local government point to the role of culture, which is significantly influenced by leadership (Denhardt & Denhardt, 1999).

A final rationale for investing in leadership development specifically in Germany stems from the underdeveloped state of leadership in German society as a whole. Compared to the U.S., interest in leadership in Germany has lagged far behind. This is true not only as regards
scholarly debate, but also in the practice of leadership development. The reasons for this lie in Germany’s history, which has led Führung to be a “historically tainted term” (Houben & Rische, 2008, p. 143). “Based on the semantics of the term—and its use in National Socialism—a sense of unease exists to this day” (p. 134). As a result, use of the English “leadership” has become widespread. But a sense of inhibition goes beyond semantics to apply to the whole notion of leadership, with the consequence that leadership development has been relatively neglected in Germany. In contrast to their U.S. counterparts, German universities and professional schools have not featured teaching on leadership. And leadership development is lacking more broadly, especially in the social sector (p. 147). Moreover, studies of the state of leadership development in Germany have also identified an unmet need for development of German leaders in national administration generally and in particular settings such as international development organizations (Houben & Rische, 2008, pp. 200-216).

4.2 Strategies for Investing in Leadership Development

In our experience foundations considering investing in leadership development often think first of sponsoring some kind of formal instruction, such as a skill-building program targeting individual leaders in particular fields or organizations. Such a strategy may well be worth considering. However, this study has illuminated a wide range of additional options, some of which appear to offer more leverage than instructional programs. We have referred to many such initiatives in the narrative. In this section we systematically summarize a broader range of strategies that have been used by foundations in the U.S., with examples going beyond those that have already been cited. We begin the list with suggestions for practices that start at home, in the internal practices of foundations themselves.

Support leadership development internal to your own foundation:

- Design a comprehensive leadership development program to ensure a pipeline of qualified leaders, following the principles of effective leadership development identified in this study. We suggest paying attention in particular to the first two principles: fostering a culture supportive of leadership development and ensuring support for leadership development from senior leaders.

- If a comprehensive program seems daunting or untimely, draw selectively on the most common elements of effective leadership development programs. For example, develop a mentoring program.

- Encourage emerging leaders in your organization to participate in externally sponsored training opportunities, individually or in teams.
Build leadership development into grant making policies and practices:

- Include funds in program grant budgets for leadership seminars, conference attendance, individual retreats, staff retreats, staff development coaching, and field study trips and for the costs associated with these programs.

- Review grants for their attention to individual and team development and to the overall development of leadership of their institutions, emphasizing the importance of such issues in grant guidelines and in counseling applications.

- Recognize the work of exceptional leaders/leadership in grantee organizations through award ceremonies, newsletters, letters from the foundation president, etc.

- Make technical assistance support for leadership development available to executive directors, staff, and board members of supported organizations.

- Support efforts to convene leaders across funded organizations by introducing grantee leaders to one another, by building into grant budgets opportunities for convening them, and by other forms of support, such as making available foundation meeting space.

- Include a discussion of leadership in your foundation’s annual reports and in program descriptions and publications and on your website.

Support existing leadership development efforts with a proven track record:

- Thirty-six foundations have supported the Rockwood Institute, whose Leading from the Inside Out program has a strong reputation for building the capacity of executive directors and senior managers of non-profit organizations to lead their organizations and networks (Link, et al., 2008a, p. 23).

Support leadership development within organizations:

- The Jessie Ball DuPont Fund’s Non-Profit Executive Institute invites teams of three (e.g., CEO, a board member, and a staff member) from participating organizations (Enright, 2006, pp. 20-23).

Support leadership development in communities:

- The Annie E. Casey’s Leadership in Action Program aims to develop the collective leadership capacity of government, non-profit, and community leaders to work on behalf of children, families, and communities (Enright, 2006, p. 35). (See the discussion of Action Learning in section 3.1 for more information.)
• The Kellogg Foundation launched the Leadership for Community Change program in 2002 to “promote and nurture collective and culturally appropriate leadership in communities across the country” (W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 2006, p. 2). The pilot initiative supported 25 fellows from each of six sites around a theme of “strengthening public will and action towards quality teaching and learning.” The fellows worked “to nurture collective leadership within their communities and then use collective action to create systems change.”

• The Fieldstone Foundation’s Executive Learning Groups consist of a series of monthly one-day seminars over a six-month period that focus on cases brought by participants coming in teams from non-profit organizations. These learning groups are problem- rather than content- or skill-focused (Enright, 2006, pp. 28-30). They also aim to build relationships among participants for mutual support.

Support leadership development in specific sectors or fields of practice:

• Four foundations support leadership development in the public sector by supporting the Partnership for Public Service. The Partnership sponsors the Excellence in Government Fellows Program, a year-long program for mid-level federal career executives. The program consists of five weeks of formal learning spread over a year. The Partnership also sponsors the Annenberg Leadership Institute, a six-month program serving high potential GS-13 to GS-15 federal employees. (See section 3.5.3 for more information on both programs.)

• The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation aspired to reverse the decline of symphony orchestras in the United States through a 10-year $50 million initiative to strengthen a select group of leading symphony and chamber orchestras. Its Orchestra Forum was designed to provide orchestras engaged in the process of artistic and organizational revitalization with opportunities to share their insights into new and effective practices, learn from each other, reinforce each other's experimentation, and further stimulate their own thinking by introducing them to creative leaders from other fields. It provided support to 15 participating institutions for strategic planning and change, while gathering teams of 3 from each institution to offer leadership development several times a year.151

Support leadership development as a means to addressing problems:

• A foundation convened mayors, university presidents, nonprofit leaders, and business CEOs from 15 big cities under the name “CEOS for Cities.” The purpose was to spur economic development in cities by influencing national policy, sponsoring resources, and fostering practitioner networks to accelerate innovation and learning on topics such as workforce skills, infrastructure development, and housing.152
• The Leader-to-Leader Institute’s Investment in America Forum gathers a small, select group of leaders (CEOs and presidents) from the public, private, and social sectors to examine mutual challenges facing all three sectors and the nation.

• Grantmakers for Effective Organizations brings together every year leaders of six to ten foundations to support one another in coming up with solutions to problems specific to their organizations.\textsuperscript{153}

• The Synergos Institute supported the Global Philanthropists Circle in taking a Learning Journey in March 2009 to East Africa that included visits to projects in Kenya and Tanzania. The journey exposed participants to innovative approaches to poverty and inequality in East Africa, highlighting micro-franchise and finance, land conservation, sustainable subsistence, and commercial agricultural farming.\textsuperscript{154}

**Build system-wide capacity for leadership:**

• The Richardson Family Foundation established the Center for Creative Leadership in Greensboro, North Carolina, which has had a huge impact on the field of leadership development (Datar, Garvin, & Knoop, 2008, p. 1).

• The W.K. Kellogg Foundation catalyzed the creation of the Leadership Learning Community, which “connects a diverse group of leadership development practitioners, grant-makers, and thought leaders who identify successful practices, conduct research, evaluate current leadership efforts, and exchange information and tools.”\textsuperscript{155}

• The Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund and the Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation supported Grantmakers for Effective Organizations in writing the invaluable two-volume *Investing in Leadership* series on which this study has heavily relied (Enright, 2006; Hubbard, 2005).

• The Shift Foundation created the Global Leadership Program to raise global consciousness through the development of the world’s future leaders (Link, et al., 2008a, p. 25). It serves business entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs, cultural visionaries, change agents and career professionals from the Asian-Pacific, Middle Eastern, African, European, and North and South American realms in a year-long part-time program.

• The Philanthropic Initiative supported a revitalization of leadership in the City of Portland, Maine in 1993 that helped transform the civic culture of the region through an Institute for Civic Leadership, which provided leadership skills training for 25 to 30 people per year (Chrislip, 2002).

• Additional possibilities suggested by social network observer Allison Fine (2006, p. 171) include:
• Provide support for existing communities of practice. ("Foundations can help to foster the connections needed to keep networks vibrant and growing by recruiting other funders, researchers, and public officials into the network.")

• Fund networking infrastructure to support a particular goal. ("Increasing civic participation in Hispanic neighborhoods requires more than funding voter-registration drives. People with many struggles in their lives need more support than simply registering to vote. People need civic education, voter protection, and access to working voting machines. A foundation does not have to fund each of these groups individually; it can instead fund networking infrastructure, like a website with an online organizer to facilitate conversations and post information relevant to the network in order to reach the overall goal of civic engagement.")

Support applications of evolving web-based technologies\textsuperscript{156} to

• Enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of non-profit organizations
• Foster networking among organizations and their stakeholders
• Enable ways of organizing that do not depend on traditional organizational structures

As this list illustrates, there is enormous variety to the ways in which a foundation can approach leadership development. How can a foundation’s staff go about choosing among them? The next section suggests one approach.

4.3 The Value of Building a Leadership Development Model

In response to these considerations we believe a foundation’s staff can both strengthen its capacity to design powerful initiatives and engage in deliberate reflection on its overall strategy by:

• Building a Leadership Development Model
• Using the model to identify, design, and implement specific leadership development initiatives in areas of interest
• Continuing to refine the model as part of a Community of Practice on Leadership Development

These recommendations reflect our learning across all sectors. Not surprisingly, however, the most direct and potent lessons come from the learning of other foundations, which have most significantly influenced this recommendation. We elaborate on these recommendations, and the rationale for them, below.
4.3.1 Steps Toward Building a Model

The first step builds on a recommendation presented in one of the most useful studies of leadership development in the non-profit world (Hubbard, 2005). That study encourages sponsors of leadership development to make explicit the assumptions underlying their existing or preferred strategies. Doing this rigorously is of course no easy task, for the attempt to develop a robust and comprehensive theoretical base for understanding leadership development has just begun (Day, Harrison, & Halpin, 2008). However, with a modest investment in reflection it is possible to significantly increase awareness of the underlying assumptions that guide an organization’s thinking about leadership development. The study contains a template for doing so (2005, pp. 22-23). This recommendation is supported by other pioneering work in leadership development, which also provides guidance. Kantor and Huselton (2002) suggest three elements to building a model of any professional practice that is applicable here:

1. Theory of the ‘Thing’ (beliefs and assumptions about leadership)
2. Theory of Change (beliefs and assumptions about leadership development)
3. Theory of Practice (preferred tools for fostering leadership development)

The starting point for building a model is to understand the model a foundation staff already has. There surely is one but it is likely somewhat tacit. Probably there are fragments of a model, e.g., statements of mission and purpose, perhaps even of preferred strategy, but it is unlikely that these have been systematically integrated. By making the model explicit a foundation can see where the organization is starting from and the strengths and limits of the existing model will be more transparent. Doing so will require the foundation’s staff to think through the cause-effect links between any specific activities it envisions and the intermediate and longer-termed outcomes it desires.

The “general design principles” identified in this study merit consideration for inclusion in the model. Most of the “most common elements” are relevant as well. However, the first—Job Definition/Assignment—will be less relevant to a foundation sponsoring leadership development as an external entity (except in applying the model to its own organization), while the last element—Networking—is a particularly powerful option (see section 3.1.2).

What is still missing from the model is an articulation of basic assumptions about the preferred strategies for leadership development. Only when those assumptions are explicit can a foundation make strategic choices among the rich menu of possibilities at their disposal. On the next page we offer a tool for engaging in this kind of reflection. This Leadership Development Strategy Matrix identifies options for supporting leadership development as regards two variables: the specific goal of development and the level of the system targeted. We have adapted and expanded the matrix from a prototype contained in *Investing in Leadership Vol.1*.
This matrix offers a way of sorting through the many possibilities, including those listed in section 4.2.

**Leadership Development Strategy Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of System Targeted</th>
<th>Goal of Development Effort</th>
<th>Individual Capacity</th>
<th>Team Capacity</th>
<th>Organizational Capacity</th>
<th>Network Capacity</th>
<th>System-wide Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individuals</strong></td>
<td>1. Develop capacity of individuals for personal mastery</td>
<td>2. Develop capacity of individuals to work in groups and lead teams</td>
<td>3. Develop capacity of individuals to lead organizations</td>
<td>4. Develop capacity of individuals to collaborate across differences</td>
<td>5. Develop capacity of individuals to collaboratively lead systemic change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teams</strong></td>
<td>6. Develop capacity of teams to support individual development of team members</td>
<td>7. Develop capacity of teams to be effective at meeting their goals</td>
<td>8. Develop capacity of teams to exercise leadership in organizations</td>
<td>9. Develop capacity of teams to coordinate and align their goals and activities</td>
<td>10. Develop capacity of teams to lead systemic change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizations</strong></td>
<td>11. Develop capacity of organizations to support individual development of members</td>
<td>12. Develop capacity of organizations to support effective teamwork</td>
<td>13. Develop capacity of organizations to be effective</td>
<td>14. Develop capacity of organizations to collaborate</td>
<td>15. Develop capacity of organizational coalitions to lead systemic change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communities</strong></td>
<td>16. Develop capacity of communities to support individual development of members</td>
<td>17. Develop capacity of communities to organize using groups and teams</td>
<td>18. Develop capacity of communities to sustain organizations that promote community well-being</td>
<td>19. Develop capacity of communities to align diverse interests towards the common good</td>
<td>20. Develop capacity of communities to organize social movements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fields of Practice</strong></td>
<td>21. Develop capacity of fields of practice to cultivate innovative thought leaders and practitioners</td>
<td>22. Develop capacity of fields of practice to organize around shared interests and goals</td>
<td>23. Develop capacity of fields of practice to generate and disseminate knowledge via professional organizations</td>
<td>24. Develop capacity of fields of practice to connect diverse perspectives across institutional and disciplinary boundaries</td>
<td>25. Develop capacity of fields of practice to influence policy and the allocation of resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A traditional focus on the development of individual leaders would confine choices to the first row of the matrix. However, one lesson of this study is that there is powerful synergy in integrating leadership development with organizational development in support of the organization’s mission, which would encourage attention to the second and third rows. In the
non-profit and public sectors, moreover, there is high value to creating linkage across organizations and among communities to enhance system capacity, which makes the fourth and fifth rows and columns potentially attractive.

These more “systemically” oriented initiatives are something that a foundation is uniquely well positioned to undertake. The resulting communities that could evolve from some of these initiatives have the potential to become what Otto Scharmer calls an “ecosystem of innovation”—a higher-level form or organization that is needed to cope with increasingly complex societal challenges (2007, pp. 323-326).

As a final stage of model development, it makes sense to draw upon this study’s list of sample theories, tools, and practices to flesh out the model in accord with the assumptions and constraints associated with preferred strategies. Not all tools will be applicable in every situation, but it is of high value to think through one’s preferred toolkit.

4.3.2 Using the Model to Identify/Design Specific Initiatives

It is evident from the foregoing analysis that a foundation wishing to support leadership development has a wide range of choice, as regards both the level of the system and the type of development addressed. The model building exercise will presumably have clarified the range of possibilities that a portfolio of initiatives might cover. However, there remains a key choice. How directive does the foundation wish to be? With respect to any initiative, it can ask itself the question: Where do we choose to be on a continuum of prescriptive to emergent? What is most effective may vary. Yet it is worth considering the possibility of being less prescriptive and letting the solution emerge. This would be consistent with the “adaptive” nature of the problems most likely to be worthy of the Foundation’s attention.

For example, a foundation in Germany might use its stature to convene a group of high-level leaders in various sectors in the country, with the broad aim of drawing on the group’s wisdom to create an initiative that would enhance leadership in all spheres. The meeting could be designed as a collective problem-defining or problem-solving exercise around how to foster better leadership within and across sectors, in which solutions emerge from the group. The technology for such interactions is well developed and has been successfully applied to adaptive problems in a number of areas (Waddell, 2005).

4.3.3 Continuing to Refine the Model as Part of a “Community of Practice”

Any model of practice can and should evolve with experience. Making explicit one’s assumptions about and preferred approaches to leadership development establishes a firm grounding for a baseline assessment. Evaluation of initiatives guided by the model can then be
analyzed for their implications for its robustness. The model is thus never fully “built” but continues to grow.

Our experience is that the evolution of such a model is best carried out as part of a “Community of Practice,” as defined and discussed in section 3.1.2 on “Networking.” Creation of such a community can itself make a contribution to strengthening the “field” in support of leadership development, as suggested in the example of the Leadership Learning Community above. There are also signs of emergence of another relevant example in the U.S.: a community of practice around “transformational philanthropy,” which is exploring how to transform relationships among donors and between donors and recipients in pursuit of transformational social outcomes. Participation in such a community of practice could create a more robust basis for the Foundation’s work on leadership development and other areas by shifting the underlying paradigms that guide its approach.\textsuperscript{158}
Index of Organizations and Programs

21st Century Skills Network ........................................................................................................51

3M ................................................................................................................................................71

Academy for Educational Development  
Center for International Exchanges .........................................................................................48

Agnes E. Meyer Foundation .......................................................................................... 107, 120

Alcoa ........................................................................................................................................82

Allianz  
Management Institute .............................................................................................................105

Amazon.com ..............................................................................................................................80

American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) .........................................................110

AmericaSpeaks  
The Neighborhood Action Initiative .........................................................................................57

Ameritech ................................................................................................................................28

Andersen Consulting ............................................................................................................ 109  
Organization Executive Program .......................................................................................... 49

Andrew W. Mellon Foundation  
Orchestra Forum ......................................................................................................................119

Annie E. Casey Foundation  
Leadership in Action .............................................................................................................118

Leadership in Action ...............................................................................................................29, 56

ARAMARK  
Executive Leadership Institute ................................................................................................49

Arthur Andersen .......................................................................................................................28

Ashoka .......................................................................................................................................89

Changemakers ..........................................................................................................................89

Aspen Institute  
Changemakers ........................................................................................................................50

Global Leadership Network .....................................................................................................52

Barr Foundation  
Barr Fellows ..........................................................................................................................52, 53

Best Buy ....................................................................................................................................82

Geek Squad ...............................................................................................................................82
Bhavishya Alliance .......................................................................................... 58
blip.tv ............................................................................................................. 86
Boost4Kids ....................................................................................................... 51
Bose Corporation ............................................................................................. 40
BT ..................................................................................................................... 82
BTpedia ............................................................................................................ 82
CarePages ......................................................................................................... 89
Carrotmob ......................................................................................................... 91
Catalysts for Civic Change ............................................................................... 58
Center for Creative Leadership .......................................................................... 10, 16, 20, 32, 34, 50, 97, 120
Leadership Development Program .................................................................. 43, 97
CEOS for Cities ............................................................................................... 50, 119
Charity Water .................................................................................................. 90
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation .................................................................... 88
Citibank ............................................................................................................ 26, 28
City of Portland, Maine
  Institute for Civic Leadership ......................................................................... 58
  Institute for Civic Leadership ......................................................................... 120
Coca Cola .......................................................................................................... 26
Colgate-Palmolive ............................................................................................. 39
Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal .................................................. 57
Comcast ............................................................................................................. 83
Conference Board
  Invest in America Forum ............................................................................. 50
Couchsurfing.com ............................................................................................. 92
Digg .................................................................................................................... 79
Donors Choos.org ............................................................................................. 88
Epic Change ...................................................................................................... 90
  Tweetsgiving ................................................................................................. 90
Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund .................................................................... 120
Facebook .......................................................... 79, 82, 85, 86, 96
Federal Express .................................................. 19, 20, 112
ASIRE .................................................................. 112
Leadership Institute .............................................. 112
LEAP .................................................................... 20
Fieldstone Foundation ............................................ 30, 43, 119
Executive Learning Groups .................................... 119
Executive Learning Groups ................................. 30, 49
Flickr ................................................................... 79, 83, 85, 86
Ford Motor Company ............................................. 116
Fort Hill Company
  Friday5s .............................................................. 97
General Electric ..................................................... 19, 26, 27, 28, 40, 68, 105, 108, 116
  Crotonville Leadership Center ............................... 68, 105
  Work Out ........................................................... 27
Generon Consulting ............................................... 58, 73
Gillette International ............................................. 25
Global Greengrants Fund ....................................... 89
Global Leadership Network .................................... 113
Goldcorp ................................................................ 83
Google .................................................................. 80
Google Alerts ....................................................... 98
Government 2.0 Club ............................................ 86
GovLeaders.org ................................................... 86
GovLoop ............................................................... 86
Grantmakers for Effective Organizations ................. 50, 120
Gumtree ............................................................... 84
Gundersen Lutheran Hospital ................................. 40
Hawaii Community Foundation
  PONO ................................................................. 44, 52, 56
Herman Miller ....................................................... 71
Honeywell ............................................................ 28, 38
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>19, 39, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Blue Program</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEO</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InnoCentive</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellipedia</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transforming Civic Culture</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James P. Shannon Leadership Institute</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessie Ball DuPont Fund</td>
<td>56, 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Executive Institute</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Executive Institute</td>
<td>30, 50, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson &amp; Johnson</td>
<td>19, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Venture Silicon Valley</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNTA for Progressive Action</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas Health Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas Community Leadership Initiative</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katrina PeopleFinder Project</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellogg Foundation</td>
<td>55, 107, 119, 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership for Community Change</td>
<td>57, 58, 73, 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Public Leadership</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Challenge 2001</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Learning Community</td>
<td>52, 120, 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-to-Leader Institute</td>
<td>50, 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in America Forum</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in America Program</td>
<td>50, 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lego Serious Play</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linux</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockheed Martin</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacArthur Foundation</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts General Hospital</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathworks</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mattel
  Project Platypus...........................................................................................................39

Media Volunteer.org........................................................................................................92

Medtronic..........................................................................................................................47

Meetup..............................................................................................................................83

Meyer Memorial Trust .................................................................................................89

MITRE Corporation........................................................................................................39

Motorola..........................................................................................................................19, 34, 39, 49, 116
  Vice President Institute...............................................................................................19, 49

Muckraker.......................................................................................................................92

MyApartmentMap..........................................................................................................78

Myelin Repair Foundation.............................................................................................89

MySpace!............................................................................................................................81, 85

NASA.................................................................................................................................85
  Clickworkers................................................................................................................85

National Academy of Public Administration.................................................................26

NationsBank.....................................................................................................................28

Natural Capital Institute.................................................................................................89

Netflix...............................................................................................................................80, 83

New Assignment.............................................................................................................84

Nike..................................................................................................................................82

Ning..................................................................................................................................79, 97

Nonprofit Technology Enterprise....................................................................................88

Nortel
  Virtual Leadership Academy.........................................................................................51, 98

Office of the Management of the Budget........................................................................85

Omidyar Network.............................................................................................................89

Open Society Institute
  KARL...........................................................................................................................51, 88

Oracle.................................................................................................................................84
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TechSoup</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NetSquared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Extraordinaries</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timebanks.org</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twestival</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twine</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>79, 85, 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data.gov</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Drug Administration</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Revenue Service</td>
<td>40, 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Air Force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force Academy</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army</td>
<td>20, 21, 25, 30, 31, 38, 50, 51, 53, 98, 111, 116, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CompanyCommand</td>
<td>51, 86, 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Point</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Coast Guard</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Development Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Labor</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders Growing Leaders</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Federal Executive Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Development Centers</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Forest Service</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. General Accounting Office</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. General Services Administration</td>
<td>85, 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Internal Revenue Service</td>
<td>109, 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Development Executive Council</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Succession Planning</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce of Tomorrow Task Team</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Marine Corps</td>
<td>25, 46, 93, 111, 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic School</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Course</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Reaction Course</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeants School</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War College</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Office of Personnel Management</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Office of Public Affairs</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. State Department</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Veterans Benefits Administration</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAD</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vimeo</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the Faithful</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Ventures</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wikipedia</td>
<td>81, 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wired magazine</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WiserEarth.org</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfram Alpha</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's World Banking</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale Law School</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Presidents’ Organization</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youtube</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td>82, 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZeroDivide</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
References


Books24x7 (2008). *The growing adoption of Web 2.0 in the enterprise*.


Corporate Leadership Council (2002). *IBM's "Basic Blue": Blended delivery of management training.*

Corporate Leadership Council (2002b). *Mentoring programs for a dispersed work force.*


Kramer, R. (2007). Leading change through action learning: Agency managers can change organizational culture and build a learning environment, as demonstrated by APHIS. *The Public Manager.*


Schwartz, J. (2009, May 5). Flash activists use social media to drum up support. *USA Today*.


End Notes

1 Personal communication.

2 Personal communication with a high-level staff person working on leadership development in a U.S. federal intelligence agency. This person went on to say: “When I see claims like ‘Program X has an ROI of 172%,’ I just go nuts. Behind the curtain lurks a mountain of assumptions. Never any attempt to calculate measurement error...There's really no general agreement even on how to compare programs. I became aware of this issue during our comparison of two different learning interventions designed to teach decision making to first-line supervisors. We were using companies that specialize in research methodology to help us design this large experiment—the best minds we could find to help us measure impact in the most sophisticated way possible. One group of researchers used only the differences in post-test scores across groups to determine learning outcomes, while another group used the differences between pre- and post-test scores across groups...The two methods of comparison provided different results. These are the kinds of issues that the usual evaluators of leadership development programs overlook. So I would claim that not only are we unable to accurately measure impact at the organizational level, we can't even be sure of the impact at the personal level.”

3 There are several publications that provide annual rankings of either executive education programs (the Financial Times [http://media.ft.com/cms/ca3da848-1b7b-11dd-9e58-0000779fd2ac.pdf] or leadership development programs (Leadership Excellence: [http://www.leaderexcel.com/]). However, they either do not make explicit their criteria for ranking (the Financial Times) or provide enough information on how they apply these criteria (Leadership Excellence) to be a useful guide to designers of leadership development programs.

4 This is an abbreviation of Edgar Schein’s definition of organizational culture: “A pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way you perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems” (Schein, 2004, p. 12).

5 Personal Communication from a senior HR manager in the federal government.

6 An example of a well-regarded internet-based technology that supports follow up application is Fort Hill’s Friday 5s® ([http://www.forthillcompany.com/]).

7 Personal communication from an HR manager in an intelligence agency who requested anonymity.

8 Personal communication from an HR manager in a federal agency who prefers anonymity.

9 Personal communication from Marilyn Darling of Signet Research & Consulting, LLC, who has extensively researched the U.S. Army’s leadership and learning practices.

10 Posting by a State Department employee on Sept. 3, 2005 in response to a blog by Ray Blunt on “Best Principles” at GovLeaders.org.

11 The U.S. Army stresses “operational assignments” as one of its three pillars of development (the other two being institutional training/education and self-development). Those with high potential rotate between officially designated leadership positions and staff positions. Assignments also stretch personnel beyond their core proficiency to include at least one additional capacity. And assignments rotate developing
leaders across functions (e.g., combat, training, supporting) (National Academy of Public Administration, 1997, pp. 33-34).

12 This research was conducted by the senior author of this study at a client that prefers anonymity.


14 The Fort Hill website, which describes this and other products, is http://www.forthillcompany.com/.


16 The authors are obliged to disclose a potential bias in offering this observation. One of them worked with this firm—which guards its confidentiality zealously—to develop this process.

17 Kramer, ibid.

18 PPT presentations from three participants on their experience with the project are accessible at The American University website: http://spa.american.edu/executivempa/action.php.

19 The Leadership Agility survey, based on the book of the same name by Joiner and Josephs, is a new tool explicitly designed to place respondents along a continuum defined by three of the five developmental stages described in the book. (http://www.cambriacconsulting.com/newsroom/press_releases/leadershipagility360released/). The Leadership Circle is a more well-established tool that was designed with developmental theory in mind, and points toward developmental stage, but does not directly measure it (http://www.theleadershipcircle.com/).

20 Personal Communication from David Hudnut, Grok Consulting, S.L.

21 The Marine Corps is known for intensive investment in formal learning programs upfront, which helps instill core values from the outset (Santamaria, Martino, & Clemons, 2004). And leaders continue to experience intensive classroom training throughout their careers. For example, the Army has four sequences of courses for non-commissioned officers, five for warrant officers, and five for officers. It also encourages off-duty civilian education, which is noted in officer evaluations (National Academy of Public Administration, 1997, pp. 33-34). Military training may range from a few days to a year or more in a War College. A veteran of 20 years in the military may spend 20% of that time in some kind of formal learning program. It is worth noting that one result of the Army’s post-Vietnam introspection was creation of a Training and Doctrine Command, which oversees training and is also the architect of the roles, structure and leaders of the Army’s future. It strategically uses education and training centers as agents for change (National Academy of Public Administration, 1997, p. 38).

22 Again, this example draws on the consulting experience of the senior author of the study.

23 The “command climate” of the U.S. Marine Corps—while reinforced by a Corps-wide culture—is itself a powerful contributor to that culture through the ways in which leaders embody Corps values. According to Dr. James Van Zummern, director of the John A. Lejeune Leadership Institute at the Marine Corps University, “Any commander must fully embrace the command and promote positive behavior through his own behavior. You have to embrace it or people see through it. You have to live it 24 hours a day,
whether in training or socially. You lead, motivate, use coaching and mentoring because you respect the people you work with and want to make them better.”

24 These examples are from the practice of Waterline Consulting: http://www.waterlineconsulting.com/assets/files/Peer-Coaching.pdf.

25 Specialized consultants sometimes perform this function as well, using software designed to match mentors and mentees.

26 This program was designed and delivered by Menttium Consulting. The case is described at http://www.menttium.com/OURSERVICES/CaseStudies/Medtronic/tabid/70/Default.aspx.

27 The Young Presidents’ Organization website is http://www.ypowpo.org.

28 This program is described at http://www.leadertoleader.org/ourwork/iap/index.html.


30 Personal communication from Kathleen Enright, Executive Director of Grantmakers for Effective Organizations.

31 Personal Communication from Thomas Moroz, director of Special Projects, the Open Society Institute.

32 The Public Sector Consortium (http://www.public-sector.org/) convened a Community of Practice within the federal government for the purpose of re-inventing the practice of public leadership. It began with monthly meetings among a convened working group of representatives from the National Security Agency, the Environmental Protection Agency, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Veterans Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration, and the Reserve Officers Association of the U.S. and the Graduate school, USDA. The group created a description of “public sector core leadership practices” (http://www.public-sector.org/publications_and_resources2.html).

33 Examples of such organizations are the Berkana Institute, the Center for Reflective Community Practice, SEED-NY, Kellogg Leadership for Community Change, and the Leadership Learning Community (cited in Meehan & Reinelt, 2007).

34 http://www.leadershiplearning.org/.


36 A description of the Barr Foundation Fellows may be found at http://www.barrfoundation.org/fellows/fellows.html.


This is true, for example of the “Excellence in Government Fellows Program,” now sponsored by the Partnership for Public Service.

Learning histories and reports from the Sustainable Food Lab can be found at www.sustainablefoodlab.org. A description of some of its activities, including learning journeys, can be found in Senge et al., 2008, pp. 259-262. For reflections on the Bhavishya Alliance see Hassan and Bojer, 2007.

The Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund and the Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation supported Grantmakers for Effective Organizations in writing the invaluable two-volume Investing in Leadership series on which this study has heavily relied (Enright, 2006; Hubbard, 2005).

The W.K. Kellogg Foundation catalyzed the creation of the Leadership Learning Community, which “connects a diverse group of leadership development practitioners, grant-makers, and thought leaders who identify successful practices, conduct research, evaluate current leadership efforts, and exchange information and tools.”

An example of such an institution is the Berkana Institute, founded by Margaret Wheatley (http://www.berkana.org/).


This summary is taken almost verbatim from the website of the Society for Organization Learning (http://www.solonline.org/organizational_overview/).

Peter Senge popularized this tool, but he credits Chris Argyris as the source. See, for example, Reasoning, Learning and Action (Argyris, 1982).

Adapted from A Theory of Everything (Wilber, 2000b).

Bob Anderson, developer of The Leadership Circle, a 360° tool, has presented additional evidence based on the work of Susanne Cook-Greuter in certification workshops for that tool, but the results are not yet published (http://www.theleadershipcircle.com/). A recent case study of a coaching relationship documents the link between a shift in stage of development of a CEO and an increase in organizational effectiveness (Metcalf, 2009).

Joiner and Joseph’s developmental framework was significantly influenced by the work of Bill Torbert, of whom Joiner was a student.

Susanne Cook-Greuter’s dissertation contains evidence supporting the validity of the Leadership Development Profile. See the note immediately below.

Also known as the Leadership Development Profile, the Leadership Maturity Framework and the SCTi-MAP. McEwen & Schmidt (2007) write: “William R. Torbert first developed contours of the LDF (building upon Jane Loevinger’s work), which was expanded upon, researched, and validated by Susanne Cook-Greuter in her 1999 Harvard doctoral dissertation. Cook-Greuter’s robust research and validation of the LDF has spanned twenty years and includes over 7,000 database profiles.” (Susanne Cook-Greuter, Postautonomous Ego Development: A Study of Its Nature and Measurement. (doctoral dissertation, Harvard University), Dissertation Abstracts International, 60 (06), 3000.).
An intensive interview designed to assess stage of development in Kegan’s model of adult development (Kegan, 1982).

A tool for 360° feedback that assesses a leader’s development with respect to three of the five stages in the synthesis of developmental theories contained in Joiner and Joseph’s Leadership Agility (2007).

A tool for 360° feedback that points toward developmental stage but does not measure it precisely. However it is usefully organized around “creative competencies” and “reactive tendencies” (http://www.theleadershipcircle.com/).

The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook contains the best description of the Ladder of Inference, but as noted above, Chris Argyris is the source of the concept. See, for example, Reasoning, Learning and Action (Argyris, 1982).

One of the authors of this study has found Heifetz’s concept of “reflection in action” useful in teaching presencing (Sharon Daloz Parks, Leadership Can Be Taught, pp. 27, 50).

The Authentic Leadership Institute is one source of such workshops (http://www.authleadership.com/). Another is The Leadership Circle (http://www.theleadershipcircle.com/site/main/work-authentic.htm).

Richard Strozzi Heckler (http://www.strozziinstitute.com/).

Wendy Palmer (http://www.consciousembodiment.com/).

Arawana Hayashi (http://www.arawanahayashi.com/).


This description draws upon “The Four-Player Model: A Framework for Healthy Teams” on the website of the MIT Research Center (http://mitleadership.mit.edu/r-fpmodel.php). It is important to note that that description, while quite useful, misattributes the authorship of the framework and fails to give credit to its creator, David Kantor.

Personal communication with Karen Oshry indicates that such evidence is available and being compiled.

See www.powerandsystems.com/ for further information.

An organization with a distinctive and well-developed tool kit in this area is "The Art of Hosting": www.artofhosting.org.

After reviewing several successful examples of imaginative solutions to deeply divisive problems that resulted from collaborative networks, Senge et al. observe: "network leaders…are always asking, ‘Who else should we be talking with about this?’ In this simply way, existing networks of common interest and concern start to identify themselves—the emerging leaders…just presented themselves" (Senge, et al., 2008, p. 329).

Scharmer (2007) gives examples of Learning Journeys involving both travel to another part of the world and shadowing someone in a different part of the organization (pp. 389-392). Senge et al. also give examples (2008, pp. 260-261). Organizations such as the Berkana Institute have recently begun to offer the service of leading such journeys (http://www.berkana.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=section&id=12&Itemid=66).

Generon Consulting has evolved into two distinct organizations: Generon International (http://www.generoninternational.com/) and Reos Partners (http://reospartners.com/office/generon-reos-llc/).

The Synergos Institute is described at http://www.synergos.org/.

According to Wikipedia, “the World Wide Web (commonly abbreviated as ‘the Web’) is a system of interlinked hypertext documents accessed via the Internet. With a Web browser, one can view Web pages that may contain text, images, videos, and other multimedia and navigate between them using hyperlinks. Using concepts from earlier hypertext systems, the World Wide Web was started in 1989 by the English physicist Sir Tim Berners-Lee, now the Director of the World Wide Web Consortium, and later by Robert Cailliau, a Belgian computer scientist, while both were working at CERN in Geneva, Switzerland. In 1990, they proposed building a ‘web of nodes’ storing ‘hypertext pages’ viewed by ‘browsers’ on a network,[1] and released that web in December. Connected by the existing Internet, other websites were created, around the world, adding international standards for domain names & the HTML language” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_Wide_Web).

These definitions draw heavily on Wikipedia.

These definitions draw heavily upon Brotherton et al., 2008, pp. 41-2; McKinsey & Co., 2007, p. 6.

Personal communication from Jonathan Hooper, Open Society Institute. April 24, 2009.


“17 Things We Used to Do,” April 20, 2009 blog posting by Andrew McAfee (http://www.andrewmcafeeorg/blog/).


One observer notes that Goldcorp had nothing to lose because it owned the site. In addition, he notes, the recognition of the value Goldcorp got has made people warier of doing this for free (personal communication from Michael Chender, founding Chair of the Shambhala Institute for Authentic Leadership).


[http://twitter.com/Comcastcares.](http://twitter.com/Comcastcares.)

One caveat: with open-source software there are still the development costs of integration into an existing system, with attendant lost opportunities (personal communication from Michael Chender, software entrepreneur and CEO of Metal Economics Group).

Blog post on Government ([http://www.theregister.co.uk/2009/04/03/google_on_washington/](http://www.theregister.co.uk/2009/04/03/google_on_washington/)).


Ibid.


Personal Communication with Thomas Moroz, co-director of KARL.


Information may be found on the Mott Foundation website, [http://www.mott.org/about/searchgrants.aspx](http://www.mott.org/about/searchgrants.aspx).


“The typical problem here is lack of a persistent internal communications/marketing campaign to carry usage to a critical mass after the initial enthusiasm” (personal communication from Michael Chender, founding Chair of the Shambhala Institute for Authentic Leadership).

“Approaching conversational and network-centric tools without being prepared to ‘listen’ in that context or without a collaborative ethos that recognizes horizontal and networked leadership (leadership and wisdom of others no matter their position or title), can be damaging. One reason is that it can make the broadcast, top-down nature of an organization even more apparent and explicit, thus further separating others in the organization or movement from their power or desire to be a part of ‘the team’” (personal communication from Elissa Perry, faculty, University of St. Mary’s).


The Synergos Institute offers training in “bridging leadership” skills (http://www.synergos.org/bridgingleadership/seminar.htm).


Andrew Mcfee offers a commentary on each of these 12 in his blog, March 31, 2009 (http://www.andrewmcafeeorg/blog/).

This article is accessible online at http://www.ccl.org/leadership/news/2006/friday5s.aspx?pageId=1500.

The ALIA Institute (Authentic Leadership in Action) http://community.alainstitute.org/.

An example is the ALIA Institute’s Social Network: http://community.alainstitute.org/.


Twine, is a “social web service for information storage, authoring and discovery” (Wikipedia). For more information about Twine see http://www.twine.com/about. Google Alerts are “email updates of the latest relevant Google results (web, news, etc.) based on your choice of query or topic” (http://www.google.com/alerts).

For example, the Buddhist meditation teacher Shinzen Young offers telephone retreats to supplement face-to-face retreats, www.BasicMindfulness.org).

An example is the series of webinars offered by CCL: http://www.ccl.org/leadership/community/webinars.aspx?pageId=208.

CCL uses online coaching as part of its Friday5s follow-up program. Lessons learned are summarized in the internal CCL document “Four Steps to Effective Online Learning: The 4Rs” (Whyman, Santana, & Allen, 2004).

This table, from Bersin & Associates, 2003, p. 4, includes terms that have not been defined in this study. E.g., “WBT” means “web-based training.” A “Job aid,” According to Rossett and Gauier-Downes (1991), is a repository for information, processes, or perspectives…[that is] external to the individual…supports work and activity [and] directs, guides, and enlightens performance.” “EPSS” means “Electronic Performance Support Systems.” In a 1991 book by that title Gloria Gery defined EPSS as: “an integrated electronic environment that is available to and easily accessible by each employee and is structured to provide immediate, individualized on-line access to the full range of information, software, guidance, advice and assistance, data, images, tools, and assessment and monitoring systems to permit job performance with minimal support and intervention by others.”

The most basic learning occurs when one incorporates new information into existing frameworks and structures. This kind of learning results in what some have called “horizontal” development. By contrast, “vertical development” involves learning that results in alteration in a person’s way of knowing (Thomas, 2007). It involves a transformation of the learner. Others have distinguished among three levels of learning from experience. Argyris differentiates “single-loop” learning, in which one learns about the effectiveness of a given action, from “double-loop learning,” in which one learns about the appropriateness of the goals underlying the action (Argyris, Putnam, & Smith, 1985). Torbert among
others has added an additional level, pointing towards “triple-loop” learning, in which the actor uses a holistic, “transconceptual” awareness to gain insight into her process of constructing reality and choosing goals (Starr & Torbert, 2005; Torbert, 1972). Like vertical development, triple-loop learning is transformative. It is this level of learning that is most likely to develop leaders with the capacities to recognize complex systemic patterns and take responsibility for addressing them (McEwen & Schmidt, 2007).


Personal communication from Kathleen Enright, executive director of Grantmakers for Effective Organizations.


Personal communication with Ray Blunt, former employee in the Veterans Administration and associate director and fellow at the Washington Institute for Faith, Vocation and Culture.

Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998.

According to an internal memorandum, the IRS program was cited “for its tiered approach to leadership development, the agency’s leadership framework with an emphasis on guiding principles of quality service, promoting accountability, fostering communication, insisting on integrity and working as a team, and the mix of approaches to build a solid leadership development curriculum.” In addition, the American Productivity and Quality Center selected the IRS as a “Best Practice Partner” in their study of Talent Management.” (Personal communication from Mathew Ferrero.).

Doug Shulman, who came to the IRS from the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (FINRA), the private-sector regulator of all securities firms doing business in the United States.


Personal communication with Dr. James Van Zumnern, director, John A. Lejeune Leadership Institute, Marine Corps University.

The course website is: http://leadership.wharton.upenn.edu/l_change/trips/Corps.shtml.


This program is being transferred to Partnership for Public Service in February 2009 from the Council for Excellence in Government, which is going out of business (http://www.ourpublicservice.org/OPS/pressroom/releases/release_0902209_CouncilforExcellence.shtml).
More information on the Leader to Leader Institute can be found at [http://www.leadertoleader.org/](http://www.leadertoleader.org/).


Information on this and other programs of the Rockwood Institute is available at [http://www.rockwoodleadership.org/](http://www.rockwoodleadership.org/).


Personal communication from Kathleen Enright, Executive Director of Grantmakers for Effective Organizations.


Kathleen Enright offers the following account of the founding of Leadership Learning Community: “In 1998 the W.K. Kellogg Foundation and the James MacGregor Burns Academy of Leadership convened the first gathering of 20 leadership development programs to engage in collective learning explore to opportunities for collaboration. The convening led to the launch of the Leadership Learning Community in 2001…To date more than 70 leadership development programs have joined this community.” (Enright, 2006, p. 33).

See section 3.4 for many examples.

The original matrix is 3x3. Claire Reinelt of Leadership Learning Community ([http://www.leadershiplearning.org](http://www.leadershiplearning.org)) added a fourth (“systems”) dimension, which is especially useful with regard to non-profit and public sector organizations (this can be accessed at [http://docs.google.com/Doc?id=dczr7twb_14c54k9dw&invite=dnbw5r](http://docs.google.com/Doc?id=dczr7twb_14c54k9dw&invite=dnbw5r). She also created a user’s guide for the expanded matrix that contains compelling examples of how foundations have used it to clarify their funding strategies. We have built on that expanded matrix by adding a fifth dimension in order to integrate all three dimensions of the Bertelsmann Stiftung’s *Leitbild*.

The principal author of this study has served as a facilitator for exploratory meetings of such a community, with representation from the Open Society Institute, Tipping Point Foundation, and a number of representatives of family philanthropies.