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survived the Holocaust as a young girl. She told Buffett that you should consider yourself successful in life based on those who will hide you. He joked that most of the rich people he knew would not even include their kids on the list of people who would hide them.

The high bar for success in life may be how many people love you enough to hide you.

This life success criterion hit particularly close to home for Bruce. Though his last name is Avolio, his mother’s maiden name is Greenspan, and her mother and father were the only family members to leave Germany in time to survive the Holocaust. After hearing Warren Buffett, Bruce was on a long drive with his wife Beth, during which they discussed who would hide them—including their children. When Bruce now defines an enduring relationship, he can’t help but think about whether the person whom he considers his very special friend or family member would, in the moment that mattered, not just defend and protect him, but hide him at personal sacrifice and danger.

In a presentation given to the National Academy of Management in Washington, D.C., Bruce mentioned this “hiding criterion” of one’s life success to an audience of approximately 150 scholars and practitioners. About a month later he received an e-mail from a student who had attended the meeting and indicated that, like Bruce, he was the grandchild of people who had survived the Holocaust. Bruce’s remarks had led him to think deeply about his relationships as well. Isn’t it amazing how one moment can multiply in effect across time, people, and situations?

We wonder how many of the leaders who received “frequently, if not always” on the questions in our Gallup Poll regarding the willingness to sacrifice for the good of their people have a good, solid list of people who would hide them. We think those who could count on this are certainly more authentic than the leaders who could not come up with such a list.

FOR YOU TO DO ON YOUR ALD JOURNEY

1. Go to the Web site www.e-leading.com and sign in to take the survey poll on authentic leadership.
2. You will be asked to identify up to five individuals who know you well enough to complete the survey you just completed.
3. Insert their e-mails into the list, and once you exit the site, they will receive an e-mail indicating they have been chosen by you to complete this survey.
4. The people you choose to rate you will not be identified in the feedback report you’ll receive, and they will be assured of that in the e-mail they receive. Only aggregate feedback will be provided, plus your own ratings.
5. Once you receive the feedback, you will be able to compare your ratings and theirs to the national poll data. Keep in mind that leadership is an interpretation based in part on what we called your implicit theory of leadership and their implicit theory.
6. We like to say that everyone’s perception of your leadership is accurate and real. It is their perception, after all, and therefore how they are viewed and interpreted by their raters in terms of their leadership actions and their implicit theory of leadership. The same, of course, is true of your ratings.
7. At the Web site, you will be provided with some additional information on how to interpret the report, and what to do with it in terms of creating a “moment that mattered.”

LEADERSHIP NOTES

- It appears to be more difficult to lead authentically in larger versus smaller organizations. To make sure people in your organization perceive you as an authentic, high impact leader, you must be aware of how to use the positive moments that
matters in your interactions with them. Assume every moment matters in enhancing trust.

- *The base rate for trusting business leaders is much lower than other professions, such as the military.* The advantage of being a business leader is that you can elevate people’s expectations of you as a business leader by being transparent, making choices for the good of your followers whenever possible, and showing some self-sacrifice.

A note of caution: You need to consider what constitutes genuine leadership in different cultures, since there are different behaviors and styles that will generate more or less trust in different places. It is important to know these differences. One way to find out is by asking the most admired managers/leaders who work in that culture.

---

100 YEARS LATER, WHAT DO WE REALLY KNOW ABOUT LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT?

**Less than two years ago a new doctoral program with a specific focus on leadership was initiated at the University of Nebraska. Bruce is the founding director of the program and the Gallup Leadership Institute, or GLI. We both serve in the institute, whose mission is to advance the science and practice of authentic leadership development.**

Our aspiration is to become the “Bell Labs” for leadership development research. Every research project and doctoral dissertation would be directly or indirectly concerned with advancing the science of what we defined at the outset of the book as authentic leadership development, or ALD.

With our initial dozen doctoral students assembled, we charged them with the following specific research question: Do leadership interventions matter? And, as part and parcel to this question: What do we know based on the last 100 years of work on leadership development?

Thousands of hours later and numerous revisions to the first, second, and then third round of coding, the GLI associates were able to identify 201 studies—out of approximately 3,000—that had
systematically evaluated whether leadership interventions matter. In fact, even these 201 used minimally acceptable scientific criteria to test whether leadership interventions mattered.

We used a meta-analytic technique as introduced in the first chapter. Meta-analysis facilitates the compiling of data reported in individual studies into one study, providing a quantitative summary of the overall results. As we indicated, essentially, this meta-analysis is like a literature review, except you accumulate data points, as well as the review, to come up with an aggregate of what we know about leadership development.

In other words, rather than relying on opinion or anecdotal evidence, as almost all leadership books do—even those that depend on a favorable study here or there to support the author’s position—our meta-analysis was a quantitative summary of all the published leadership intervention studies ever conducted, and a number of unpublished ones as well, that met the minimal scientific inclusion criteria. The results indicate the average relationship between x and y across all leadership intervention studies, or the average difference between treatment A versus treatment B.

As we stated in our introduction, our reason for going back 100 years with this project was to bring the past into the present so we could eventually bring the future back to the present. How? First, we wanted to learn what others had tried. Specifically, we were curious as to what worked or didn’t work, and with whom they tried it, including leaders and followers.

We felt it made a lot more sense to build from this most comprehensive research base than to “discover” insights haphazardly or serendipitously along the way. We were confident the insights from this systematic review would lay the foundation for future inquiries we would pursue as an institute and for the methods that would eventually be tested. At this point, we feel that we know the past from the results of the meta-analysis and that our vision for the future can now be brought to the present, which will comprise the rest of this chapter.

**HIGHLIGHTS FROM THE META-ANALYSIS**

We present first some of the pertinent highlights of this meta-analytic study. However, for readers more interested in the specific details, a full report of the study can be found at the Web site www.gli.unl.edu. This is the “virtual home” of the Gallup Leadership Institute at the University of Nebraska. Here are some of the major findings:

- There are an accelerating number of studies that engage in interventions. These involve research on what we might call the higher end or new genre theories of leadership. They include those that are charismatic, visionary, and transformational. Indeed, there have been 113 intervention studies done since 1990, while the remaining 88 occurred over the preceding 90-year period. We should learn more about the “higher end/higher impact” aspects of leadership regarding what works faster if this trend continues into the future.

- Across all studies, the accumulated evidence indicates that trying to change leadership through an intervention and its impact does have an effect, albeit small. If the effects were random, the positive impact of a leadership intervention would be a probability of 50 percent, or a toss of the coin. But the meta-analysis found the probability of a positive impact was 63 percent across all studies. This effect is not large, but certainly better than chance alone, and therefore meaningful. This impact of the intervention holds across all studies, types of settings, theories, and measures. However,
certain theories or methods do have a larger impact than others and are higher than the average.

- We were amazed to discover that the longest intervention study we were able to uncover was only seven days in length.
- Comparing U.S.-based studies to those conducted outside the United States—a little over two-thirds were U.S.-based—we found little difference in terms of the impact of the leadership intervention.
- Thus far, some of the greatest effects were seen in a line of research that has tested what is called the “Pygmalion,” or Self-Fulfilling Prophecy, Effect. Essentially, half of the leader subjects in these studies were told they would be working with a group of people who were better—usually meaning smarter—more motivated, and so forth. In fact, the groups in these studies were randomly assigned to each leader and did not differ at all. Yet these leaders in the experiments apparently came to believe their followers were indeed different, and guess what—the followers actually performed differently. The so-called smarter or more motivated groups do better if the leader believes they are smarter or more motivated! Ironically, by creating a ruse (which, of course, is inauthentic), the largest leadership intervention effects were obtained, compared to all other methods.
- Generally, we found the effects were greater in more controlled interventions, such as in a lab, versus conducting the work in the field or the real world. One of the laments of many leadership trainers and participants is that “this sounds good in theory” but when I get back to my job it probably won’t work. This, of course, refers to the old transfer-of-training bugaboo. We now have some evidence to support this assertion. Our findings suggest we better pay attention and focus on developing the context in which we want to embed new leadership stories, theories, interventions, or whatever you want to call them.
- We found that although some of the more traditional leadership theories that focused on enhancing old participative or even more directive type leadership had a positive impact, it was generally not as great as those guided by the higher-end leadership models focusing on transformational, charismatic, or visionary leadership.

Overall, we made some discoveries from this extensive meta-analysis that should help guide us in not only the research work we pursue, but also in how we create moments that matter in accelerating ALD. For example, if given the option, there is no doubt that we would take the seven days available in the longest intervention found in our review, but spread those seven days out over the year.

We are also now convinced that probably one of the best places to start leadership development is readying the playing field or home turf (i.e., the context that academics talk about). The new theory has to be brought back into the context so that leadership development can stick.

To sum up, we discovered it is not just being “self-aware” that matters to ALD, or just the intention and understanding of how to change. Such self-awareness and the motivation and knowledge to change are obviously necessary, but, based on our findings, may not be sufficient for effective ALD. The research told us what seems to count is where (i.e., the context) one brings that awareness, motivation, and knowledge. Whether one will be successful in bringing the future leadership development aspiration goal back to the present depends on developing the process in the appropriate context.

The largest development impact was raising the positive beliefs of followers, instilling in them the conviction that they were better at a performance task than they thought.
OTHER SUPPORTING RESEARCH STUDIES

Recently, several well-conceived studies have shown that leadership interventions can have a positive impact on both the ratings of leadership and the group's performance. For example, in a Canadian study, the researchers focused on developing transformational leadership in a short awareness workshop with supervisors, with follow-up leadership development planning. The researchers found that the leaders who were trained to be more transformational were seen by their followers over time as indeed more transformational.

This type of research shows that if we can help leaders become more aware of their leadership, they can apparently alter the way they interact with followers, and in turn influence followers to evaluate them differently as leaders.

In what is called a "true field experiment," where the participants were randomly assigned to alternative training conditions, another especially relevant research study found that Israeli platoon commanders trained to be more transformational were evaluated as such by their soldiers over time. Behaving in a more transformational manner positively impacted the motivational levels of soldiers in the trained leader's platoons. Most important, after a six-month period, the performance of these platoons improved.

Although there are many other examples of leadership research using interventions, we chose these two to convey some important lessons regarding the type of future work we are doing and hope to see evolve for ALD.

We are convinced that even short leadership interventions can positively impact styles of leadership, especially if "boosted" over time with additional follow-up training, facilitation, or coaching. Where we need to distinguish future leadership development work is in areas that many feel are not trainable, or at least that are difficult to train. These areas especially relevant to ALD would include leaders' and followers' values/
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development. We are suggesting that you “don’t spare measuring the ROD” and spoil the opportunity to advance the science and practice of leadership development.

- As stated in Chapter 1, a starting point for ALD is to know your terminal learning objective, or TLO, and its intended performance impact points up front. Also, you must have a way of evaluating whether you’ve been able to achieve TLO over time with your intervention. Here are 10 easily measured impact points for ALD:
  1. Did the leader change how he viewed himself?
  2. Did the leader change the way she viewed the potential of her followers?
  3. Did the leader change his behavior toward followers?
  4. Did followers change the way they thought about the leader?
  5. Did followers change the way they thought about themselves?
  6. Did followers change their behavior?
  7. How did the leader and followers approach their tasks differently?
  8. How did the changes in both the leader and followers impact early indicators of success—variables that predict changes in short- to long-term performance?
  9. How did performance change as a consequence of the intervention?
 10. To what extent was the change in performance stabilized across two time periods?

- Consider that in the meta-analysis reported at the beginning of the chapter nearly two-thirds of the studies used college students as subjects. Therefore, most of what we know about leadership development is based on young, or sometimes called “emerging,” adults, generally without full-time work experience. What we do know here is that it’s likely easier to shape how young people view their leadership versus those who are further along in their life course. This is simply because young people’s “installed base or platform” is not as well-established. Specifically, when someone comes to a workshop in their mid-40s, they have had 40 years to learn through “life’s leadership development program.” What makes us think that in one to seven days we will change that sufficiently enough to get our desired ROD? We’re not suggesting that we cannot effect change, even significant change. This change was indicated in the 100-year review of the leadership intervention literature. What we are suggesting is that we must become much smarter in how we use the training and development days we have. We would argue once again that the smartest starting point is to know the future impact point you want to bring to the present.

When starting a leadership development intervention, know your impact point.

THE BORN VS. MADE ISSUE
It is almost impossible to leave any discussion of leadership development without making some reference to the “born versus made” question. No facilitator in leadership development has ever gotten through more than several workshops or sessions, if not just a couple of hours, without being asked, “Aren’t leaders born to lead?”

It strikes us as being a curious question coming from participants already enrolled in leadership development workshops. Are they there to simply watch those “born” leaders get better? Do they view themselves as a born leader, and, this as simply a brush-up session? Or are they there because they were told to be there. They are reaffirming in their mind that the person who gave the order to attend is simply wasting their time.
In any event, this born versus made question is legitimate, and has no doubt become part of what we called earlier one’s “implicit model” of leadership. Our experience over the years has been that no less than a third, and up to two-thirds, of large groups will raise their hand when asked the question, “How many believe leaders are born rather than made?” It’s interesting, however, that no one can accurately answer this question based on solid scientific work.

There has never been a study comparing, say, identical twins trained and untrained in leadership, to see whether they evolve differently from birth. However, we are now beginning to see links made between predispositions toward leadership (e.g., high energy), as well as other personality attributes. Thus, to the extent that more energetic people emerge and excel at taking the lead in groups, we can say that leadership is at least partially born into leaders.

Some more direct research on this issue of born versus made has been recently conducted by two different groups examining identical and fraternal twin pairs. By using twins, the researcher can estimate how much of the commonality in genes for identical twins, which are the same, and fraternal twins, which are approximately 50 percent similar, accounts for differences observed in their leadership.

In a study conducted with a Canadian sample of twins, the researchers reported that self-rated transformational leadership had more of a genetic component than transactional leadership. Nearly 40 percent of the leader’s transformational self-ratings could be accounted for by genetics, meaning that there was more commonality with identical versus fraternal twins in their self-perceptions of transformational leadership.

A more recent study, conducted with a sample of twins from the well-known University of Minnesota database, examined the degree to which the emergence of twins in leadership roles was a function of commonalities in genetics. In this study, the researchers examined the degree to which genetics accounted for the emergence of leaders in the community and at work.

In summarizing their findings, the researchers in this study estimated that almost a third (30 percent) of the emergence in leadership roles could be accounted for by genetics with men, with a similar percentage associated with women. In other words, like the previous study using the Canadian twins, if one identical twin emerges as a leader, so will the other to some degree, at least better than chance alone, but obviously not one-to-one or 100 percent of the time.

What this still preliminary research shows is that genetics does play some role in explaining who emerges as a leader in organizations, schools, communities, and government. Yet, how people’s genetic endowment interacts with and engages their environment could be considered a “holy grail” explanation of what constitutes ALD success.

In other genetics work, we already know that how a person’s genetic makeup engages and is affected by its environment is not stable. Instead, the genetic-environment interaction is elastic (i.e., changes) over time. Specifically, as the “genetic program” unfolds, it is greatly affected by the context in which it unfolds.

The environmental context matters as to how the genetic program plays out. We know that certain genes are triggered into action depending on the characteristics of the context in which the individual lives. For example, someone prone to heart disease will have it triggered by a pattern of living (i.e., context) that promotes such disease. While another individual with essentially the same genetic disposition toward heart problems may either delay or never experience its full effects because of the better environment in which he embeds himself over time.

This discussion reminds us of something Father Flanagan said when he established Boys Town in Omaha, Nebraska, to help kids in trouble. Although genetics researchers have found some evidence linking generations to bad behavior, Father Flanagan (not Spencer Tracy) suggested that we didn’t have bad boys, just the conditions that created such behavior. Psychobiology would say that
The High Impact Leader
to a great extent he was right, although the genetics are still in place
to potentially steer the child in the wrong direction.

Genetics plays an important role in leadership development, but its
role is limited to how an individual engages life's program.

THE ROLE OF TRIGGER MOMENTS
Besides the born versus made or nature versus nurture issue that
has been ongoing in psychology over the years, what does this all
have to do with leadership development? In the model of ALD we
have presented so far, and will do a “deeper dive” into the model in
the chapters that follow, we maintain that “moments matter.”

We will now add to this special moments idea what we call “trig-
ger moments.” What we mean by this term is that certain situations
will trigger reflections, ideas, emotions, and reactions or behaviors
that will contribute to ALD. These trigger moments are essentially
what we mean by leadership interventions in the ALD process.
Trigger moments may last just several seconds or minutes, or they
can be quite long in duration, unfolding gradually over time.

How we trigger ALD (i.e., set up interventions in the process)
is essential to achieving the 10 impact points that we suggested a
bit earlier as being desirable for growth and performance. Going
back to the born versus made issue, if you systematically study well-
known leaders, you will find patterns in their development that
were triggered by certain moments. In some instances, trigger
moments appear to be a brief but consequential interaction. Such
a trigger moment later shapes leaders’ thinking about who they are
and what they want to accomplish.

An often cited example of such trigger moments was Ghandi
going to South Africa and for the first time experiencing up close
and personal the ugly underbelly of racial discrimination. This trip
not only triggered his efforts to liberate his home country of India
from domination by the British, but also triggered him concerning
the value of a nonviolent strategy. And the nonviolent strategy used
by Ghandi also became a full-circle moment for Nelson Mandela
to use in South Africa, and by Dr. Martin Luther King in the U.S.
civil rights movement.

Such trigger moments do not have to be such monumental his-
torical events. Practice leaders for the Center for Creative Leader-
ship recently told of a senior executive—we’ll call her Jane—who
was experiencing increasing difficulties with her CEO. While
attending a top level executive meeting, right in front of her the
CEO blurted, “What are we going to do about our problem with
Jane?” Everyone sat in silence, and Jane was embarrassed and
dumbfounded. However, for her this humiliating experience served
as a trigger moment. In her words, she “reassessed both my career
and myself in a way that I’d never done before.” Voluntarily, she
soon left this firm after landing a CEO position in another com-
pany, and experienced great satisfaction (and probably a bit of
revenge) in leading her new firm to growth and success.

These trigger moments pop up in life’s course and shape the
leaders we eventually observe, and whom we wonder whether they
were born or made. The answer has to be both born and made.

Genetics may predispose the authentic leadership of a Ghandi,
Mandela, King, or Jane Doe, but we maintain that the trigger mo-
ments then shaped what they pursued, how they pursued it, and
with whom they pursued it. These trigger moments help bring the
future to the present, and they can be both positive or negative.

A middle-class student from the United States goes on a mission
trip with her church to El Salvador. What most strikes her is how
much hope they all brought to the township they visited, but how
little they did to achieve such hope. She thinks about the little
things that build hope each and every day as a consequence of her
moment. How will this trigger moment effect her in 20 years?
When Bruce first came to Nebraska, the CEO of Gallup said to him, “A lot of people build great things, but great and different is the winning combination.” Since that moment, Bruce has talked with the people in GLI about being different and the best at what we do.

Finally, just imagine the following true story.

When Saddam Hussein’s mother was seven months pregnant with him, she unsuccessfully tried to abort the fetus. Once he was born, he was openly rejected by her for the first three years of his life. Saddam was relegated to an uncle who reputedly abused him. Regardless of genetic makeup, we know that the early moments of maternal bonding and the early years of upbringing are critical to triggering a healthy social development of human beings. During these periods we begin to form our healthy attachment to loved ones and humanity in general.

The role of a loving mother is central to healthy development. One does not have to speculate too far as to what these early trigger events did for Saddam’s view of humanity and his leadership of the people of Iraq. If a mother does not care for a child in the deepest sense, it may be an almost unrecoverable trigger event in a leader’s development, unless a significant alternative is provided to replace the mother. Good luck!

We know of one CEO of a large high technology company who described his parents as always challenging him to the nth degree in everything. However, when he failed, they simply looked at what he had done, explored how to improve his performance, and said try it again. In such challenging and deep support, one may see the beginning of resiliency being developed.

FOR YOU TO DO ON YOUR ALD JOURNEY
1. Think about some traits or characteristics you have observed in your immediate or extended family and how they apply to your behavior and actions. For example, in some families there seems to be a “thrill-seeking” tendency that runs through family members. They may express this through participating in extreme sports activities more than the average family.
2. As you get older, you begin to see “things” that you have taken from your parent or parents. What is the single most important quality that seems to come from your parents? When did you notice that you noticed?
3. Try to uncover times where your parents discussed things about your development, and determine how that discussion shaped the way you look at yourself with respect to the attributes uncovered in the previous point.
4. Do you see any patterns between what they were trying to teach you to be and what you have turned out to be? How much of the teaching, over the genetics they passed on to you, impacted who you are becoming?
5. If you have read a biography recently, go back and take a look at the “early life sections of the book,” then skim forward to see whether the leaders describe themselves in ways that link back to those early characteristics shaped by parents, other family members, friends, teachers, etc. Look for linkages between what happened early and what happened late in this person’s life, as you have done for yourself.
6. What have you learned about the balance of life’s program with the balance of what happens to you in life in terms of shaping your full authentic leadership potential?

LEADERSHIP NOTES
- At the start of any leadership development intervention, begin by identifying your performance impact point. Too often, leadership trainers focus on the process they are trying to create
or the developmental experience for the leader. What we are suggesting is that you know the impact point you are trying to affect with the introduction of a leadership development intervention.

- **View your investment in leadership development like any other business investment and estimate the return on development.** This ROD should be based on the performance impact point you are trying to achieve, the number of leaders you want to have at a certain level of competency, and the challenges and opportunities you are preparing them to address.

- **Leadership is not inherent, even though some attributes that relate to leadership have some genetic input.** What we're finding is that one's genes predispose but do not preordain one to lead. There is a very significant interaction that occurs between genetic predispositions and the environment, and it helps shape human and leadership development over time.

- **Trigger events may represent those incidents that are accelerants for authentic leadership development in organizations.** We find that brief moments in life seem to have a lasting positive impact on a leader's development, if the leader has taken the time to reflect and learn from those moments. Encouraging managers to think about the moments they want to create with followers is part of the authentic leadership development that occurs in organizations every day.

---

ONE OF OUR MAIN goals in writing this book was to provide you a "visual map" for your ALD journey. To frame this journey in the right context, we felt it was important for you to visualize ALD as something very personal. This map incorporates a model or theory of yourself, and in more generalized terms, how you influence just one other person, on up to hundreds or even thousands of followers or peers. The exact number would depend on your constituency.

We need to stretch the idea of ALD from the inside to the outside right into the future. Then, as we have repeatedly said up to this point, you need to bring that future back into the present. Effective authentic leaders are able to bring their dreams, strategic vision, and values back to the present reality.

If we were presenting this as a treasure map, the beginning and ending point would in effect be the same point. This is where X marks the spot. For each cycle in the ALD process, it is fundamentally important that we begin and end with your self-awareness. However, your ending self-awareness will be enhanced by the experience of doing something consistently different. And when you get back to