SECTION 1

HISTORY OF LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

With the strong current focus on growth, performance, innovation, and new markets, the demand for leaders who can meet the challenges of the new global environment has never been stronger. This is why talent has become such a pressing concern for both CEOs and boards of directors. As professionals in leadership development, we will need to recognize and address the concerns of CEOs who believe that leadership development is critical to filling their pipelines, but are deeply skeptical over the ability of current practices to deliver results, think it is not worth the investment, or don't want to dedicate the time and effort required. In the only chapter in this section, we want to pose some tough questions, review the current state of affairs, and revisit our rich legacy of the last century to decide what we can learn as we go forward.

Where We've Been: Leadership Development in the 20th Century, by Jim Noel and David Dotlich

CHAPTER 1

WHERE WE'VE BEEN: LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN THE 20TH CENTURY

Jim Noel and David Dotlich

In order to understand where we are going, it is important to understand where we are and how we arrived at the present situation. How has executive development evolved over the past four decades? What is our legacy? What successes can we build on, and more importantly, what distinguishes breakthrough innovation from incremental improvements? While it's tempting to skip this historical perspective, having a sense of our collective past can inform our future choices and investments.

Post-War Leadership Development: Uniformity and Structure

In the immediate post-World War II era, U.S. businesses, largely enjoying a global market without competition, looked to business schools, long-term executive development programs, and MBA programs to develop leaders from an educational rather than applied perspective. In response, business schools designed programs that mirrored the organizational structures they studied, defining functional leadership and general management as the sum of the functions consistent with the work of Alfred P. Sloan. Because there was so little competition, there was plenty

of time and money to invest in broad-based learning, and the challenge was defined primarily as one of business skills development. When we look at the business skills developed in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s at top business schools such as Harvard, Wharton, Stanford, and Northwestern, the emphasis for executives was on developing the hard skills of business—strategy, financial drivers, and operations, among others. These skills were considered not only essential, but also sufficient.

Many of the basic concepts of organizational structure were first developed during the late 19th Century, but the basic principles of organizational management were refined in the United States during the 1950s. Fields such as strategy and business planning, marketing, corporate finance, production, and human resources took shape from both contemporary business practices and the thinking of academics.

The core MBA curriculum was developed in the 1950s to prepare people for general management positions, but MBA programs did not become seen as a path to advancement, and thus enormously popular, until the late 1970s. Concurrent with formal degree programs, business schools were shaping business practices by offering "executive" programs to mid-level and senior executives. Participants in executive programs were often "high potentials" selected for the purpose of building business and general management skills.

Change on the Horizon: The Debate Between Hard and Soft Skills

Insights about how managers actually develop and what they require in order to perform were also developed during this period. The work environment typically reflects trends shaping society, and beginning in the 1950s and accelerating during the 1960s, there was a growing emphasis on the individual as compared to the organization—"The Man in the Grey Flannel Suit." Today, because we are so focused on the concept of "leadership," it is hard to imagine a time when a major area of academic research interest was "motivation." Researchers focused on key questions such as, "What is motivation?" "How does it differ across individuals?" "How does it appear in groups?" "How can a knowledge of motivation help a manager to maximize performance?" This was a period of great intellectual activity, and researchers like David McClelland, Abraham Maslow, and David McGregor provided strong insights into what motivates individuals and drives human behavior.

So the pendulum began to swing from solely "hard" business issues, and thus began the debate of whether to focus on tasks or people in driving performance. Two researchers popularized this debate during the 1970s, and their ideas were included in most management training programs. McGregor described two types of managers, a "Theory X" manager who focused primarily on tasks, processes, and outcomes,

and a "Theory Y" manager who was focused on people, teams, and relationships. The work of Robert Blake and Jane Mouton also described the convergence of a focusing on task and focusing on people in The Managerial Grid—a set of boxes in which the ultimate manager was described as "9, 9" because he or she focused on both task and people with equal importance.

Other ideas emerged during this period that impacted the work of development professionals. Peter Drucker described The Effective Executive as a combination of the "hard" and "soft" in terms every manager could relate to. Hersey and Blanchard's seminal work on *Situational Leadership* did not prescribe a consistent approach to leadership but argued that situations required different approaches or the application of unique skills. What served the leader in one set of circumstances may fail under a different set of circumstances.

Ken Blanchard extended his earlier work on Situational Leadership by identifying the essence of what good managers do in the shortest period in *The One-Minute Manager*. This book popularized the impact of engaging individual employees and the power of the "soft" approach. A best seller that has been amazingly resilient, the "one-minute manager" spends time with people and tries to find people "doing something right" so he or she can acknowledge them.

IBM

Probably the paragon of leadership development in this post-world war era was IBM. In the IBM of the 1950s and 1960s, the issues were clear: Grow with the market, deliver a reasonable return, invest in the community, and provide lifelong employment for satisfied employees. IBM created a leadership development model that leaned heavily on prescribed training. The idea was to spend a minimum of forty hours per year in leadership training that would produce exactly the type of leader previously produced by the same training. IBM was in the business of making high-tech machines that people bought; the customer had little real power to choose, and the organization worked well as a top-down, disciplined, and hierarchical company. In the 1970s, we both taught leadership seminars at IBM with at least sixty people. With only one exception, every person in the room wore a dark blue suit, white shirt, and tie. Women obviously didn't wear this because there were none in the program. IBM, along with much of the corporate world at the time, had a corporate uniform; leaders attended the corporate university and learned to adhere to the corporate line.

In 1960, at the end of his tenure as CEO, Tom Watson, Jr., gave a series of lectures on leadership at Columbia University that were later published. To read these lectures today is to be taken back in history to a much different time. It was a period when manufacturers could rely on their unique technologies to create

demand wherein a sense demand exceeded supply. International meant selling your products around the world by having a sales force in major business centers. Watson spends the better part of one chapter describing the power of "corporate culture" and training to shape a company and its leadership.

General Electric

Another positive example of effective leadership development during this period is GE. In 1956, GE created the first corporate "university" in America at Crotonville, New York, to meet the company's growing demand for general managers. Early attendees were a reflection of that time period. All were men and many were veterans. The knowledge required to lead a GE business was found in seventeen "Blue Books" (so-called because of the color of their hardbound covers). The format for instruction was borrowed directly from Harvard and other business schools. Based largely on lecture and case study methods, it taught the GE approach to a multitude of problems. Perhaps nothing exemplifies the culture of post-war organizations so much as the length of the Crotonville program—three months, during which time participants were expected to visit their homes and families on only one weekend. This was a disciplined group!

A Changing Reality: The Emergence of the "New" Leadership Model

The period of the 1970s and early 1980s was altered by a new business reality. It was a time of "oil shocks" and a rising tide of competition for American manufacturers from Europe, and especially Japan. Some of the first industries to feel the new global competition were textiles, consumer electronics, and automobiles. This challenge led to a questioning of leadership practices. New ideas coming out of Japan, such as quality circles, lean manufacturing, "just-in-time" inventories, "Theory Z" and consensus-driven management, cross-functional integration, and Six Sigma began to impact how we developed leaders. The insight that corporations also create a culture that influences and shapes leadership behavior, rather than vice versa, was first described by Terrance Deal and Alan Kennedy in their book *Corporate Cultures*. Strong leaders, with an understanding of an organization's culture, could take leadership action to change the culture, but it was not easy. Many American companies had evolved stagnant cultures that inhibited change and adaptation to new competition.

Thus was born the idea of a "heroic leader"—one that could create transformational change in an organization. As iconic U.S. companies suddenly went

adrift, a new generation of business leaders emerged who were celebrated in the media and focused attention on the role of the leader as a visionary and transformational change agent. Among these visionary leaders were Lee Iacocca, Jack Welch, Roger Enrico, and Lou Gerstner.

Perhaps Welch best defined this generation of visionary leadership. At first scorned by business schools and the popular business press as "Neutron Jack," he became their darling and the source of numerous articles, case studies, and books (including two of his own). At one point, it was unusual to sit through a discussion on leadership without someone pointing to what "Jack" would do in this situation. But the reality is that this was a rich period in executive and leadership development. GE experimented with large scale strategic and cultural change, the "boundary-less" organization, "work-out" as a form of employee empowerment, thoughtful career planning through the "Session C" process, action learning, and linking performance and values to individual assessments.

The GE of the 1990s under Jack Welch was revolutionary in developing leaders; the leadership school focused on strategy, change, developing people, 360-degree feedback, action learning, lateral relationships, networking—major contributions that continue to have an impact today. In many ways, the leadership development models of this "softer revolution" have so impacted the current field of executive development—and much of what we considered state-of-the-art from GE, PepsiCo, and other pioneers in the field—that we are now missing the next revolution that may be happening around us.

What We Can Learn From the Past

When confronting the complexities and challenges of today, the revolution of the 1980s is considered old news. In past eras, when companies sent leaders to school, either external university-based or internal, they sent the individual. Such training may have helped the individual, but it wasn't necessarily focused on the company's systemic issues, business drivers, execution challenges, leadership tradeoffs, or even growth challenges. In some cases, executive development became so focused on programs, events, and the softer side of business that it produced leaders with great people skills and very little business acumen. In one company, an annual senior leadership program became regarded as a mark of a certain level of achievement— something that a senior leader was entitled to attend at a certain point. Attendees saw it as a great opportunity to network—something that can be very positive, certainly, but an activity that may not provide a lot of impact to the business. One CEO of a Fortune 50 company, catching this trend and wanting to keep up, sought us out to design and deliver a senior executive program he termed "Wart Removal."

His goal was to produce more nice people who could get along with each other in the increasingly contentious atmosphere his industry was facing.

The truth is that much of leadership development today does tend to remove warts and in the process stamp out the character and uniqueness that made leaders stand out and produce results in the past. Winston Churchill or Harry Truman probably wouldn't make it today at Wells Fargo, General Motors, or IBM. Such entities have a tendency to expect their leaders to be codified—uniform. Global monoliths like Toyota, IBM, and Wal-Mart now struggle with a core paradox: How to gain adherence to the culture while constantly challenging it. Conformity enables speed, discipline, and alignment—and may ensure that the unchallenged business model dies.

In our experience, most large companies still err on the side of conformity. Walk into any global company's senior executive leadership program and look around: People dress alike, talk alike, and even think alike. Thirty years ago, such an approach enabled a company to grow and thrive; today, it can be dangerous. Leaders who don't want to be codified will leave. They'll drop out of a huge corporation (especially women) and do their own thing, start up a new company, or find a company with a more attractive culture. Challenges to the business that allow a company to jump on the next growth curve will go unspoken.

The New Revolution

This is the new revolution we are facing in leadership development today: Business models and technology are changing so fast, customers have so much more power, and people have so many choices, that our old approaches to defining competencies, putting people in classrooms, uncovering their flaws, and fixing them seem increasingly disconnected to what is happening in business. Our challenge is to discover how we as executive development professionals take our rich intellectual, theoretical, and practical approaches and mold them into revolutionary changes in leadership, innovation, and execution that respond adequately to the various needs and drivers of today's business.

Most boards and CEOs today recognize that everything is for sale: Technology, market share, brand, scale—and virtually all companies have access to the same capital. The one thing that can't be bought is a cadre of committed, capable leaders who uphold a company's values. That must be built. What differentiates the winners is a strong leadership pool with the ability to attract, develop, and retain talent. We're invited to help shape the next revolution in business and leadership—provided we can become contemporary, real, and driven by results, growth, and returns.

What is the shape of this third revolution we're facing? How can we be part of the action and not living in a parallel universe? How can we develop the business instincts that create effectiveness while maintaining a focus on leadership success? How can we acknowledge the strengths and weaknesses of our field without becoming defensive and pretending we have more answers than we do? Some of these issues are contained in the articles in this book—real dilemmas and paradoxes that are at the heart of our profession. Can real leaders be "made," or not? How can we be effective going forward, so we're contemporary, real, and contributing in valuable ways?

We are the recipients of a large reservoir of practice and experience. One of the criticisms often leveled at development professionals is that we constantly jump from trend to trend—"the flavor of the day." So let's look back and investigate what our legacy is—what practices and experiences we can use as we go forward into this new global economy. While there can be a lot of debate as which tools or perspectives should be highlighted, we offer six for your consideration.

The Work Done by the Center for Creative Leadership

Anyone working in the field of talent and executive development today is shaped by the research conducted by the Center for Creative Leadership in the early 1980s. How do people develop and learn the skills they need to be successful? They learn by doing. How do you develop people? You develop people by giving them challenging work that stretches them. Work is developmental, but some work, like "start-ups," "fix-its," and moves to new geographies working with new people and new cultures, are powerful developers of people. The conclusions drawn from this study were the need to plan and manage careers through "talent review" and succession planning and influenced the creation of many succession planning processes in large companies.

Feedback and 360-Degree Feedback

Writing in the *Harvard Business Review* about five years ago, the late Peter Drucker spoke on all of the fads and trends he had seen in his long career. Many were just plain silly, he said, but providing feedback to people, especially 360-degree feedback, could be very helpful. Feedback can cause us to address issues that we may not even be aware of because hierarchical organizations tend to stifle honest upward communication. No one wakes up in the morning with the intention of doing a bad job. We go to work, often with the best of intentions, yet things do not always happen the way we would like. It is feedback that makes us aware of these gaps and allows us to address them.

Coaching

Coaching has become a mini-revolution in delivering learning to the learner "just in time, just for you." In the late 1990s coaches proliferated because they could customize feedback and learning and because they provided a more efficient way to learn than sitting in management training programs. Coaching was also tied to work assignments, because challenging assignments could be made more valuable by providing coaching, and the best coaching opportunities are frequently from the immediate supervisor. Effective coaching provides support for reflection and attention to what is being learned. By listening, asking probing questions, and sharing experiences, a good coach or supervisor helps turn work into a developmental experience.

Action Learning

Action learning is learning by doing. If the best learning happens on the job, you may not be able to give executives all the experiences required through formal job moves. It is possible, however, to structure learning experiences in such a way that people do have a significant experience that will shape them as leaders. Action learning creates learning by setting up a unique environment in which learners must model behaviors and values needed back on the job. Learners are encouraged to reflect on their actions, to develop a point of view on what needs to change in themselves or their companies, and to determine how those changes can be accomplished.

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, GE realized that its future growth depended on markets outside of the United States. At the time only 17 percent of gross sales were outside the U.S. market. The irony is that this transition would be lead primarily by leadership within a U.S.-based company. At that time, nearly all executive development was done outside of the United States by giving participants action learning projects (e.g., How do we enter the lighting market in Western Europe? How do we enter the medical imaging business in India?). Projects were done in teams of people who were held accountable for their recommendations. Today, over 50 percent of GE's sales are outside the United States. Over time, GE systematically developed global leaders and a global mindset. Action learning was a part of this process of developing a "global mindset."

Emotional Intelligence

More recently, leadership development has been significantly impacted by the idea of emotional intelligence. Building on the earlier work of McGregor and Blake and Mouton, Daniel Goleman defined specific attributes that he proved

were equal or more important than innate intelligence in getting things done in organizations and in life. He raised the question: Why do really intelligent people sometimes fail miserably in organizations? His explanation of emotional intelligence is a reminder that leadership begins with a personal understanding of one's self and the impact we have on others.

The Work of Ram Charan

To the ideas cited above we would add the work of Ram Charan. Charan, the co-author of *Execution* and author of *What the CEO Wants You to Know* and most recently *Know How*, reminds us to stay focused on the reality of business leadership—creating a profitable business. In his practical, common sense approach, Charan keeps us focused on the business side of leadership. While acknowledging the importance of people and "social architecture," he continually brings us back to the need to understand the core of business and especially how it makes money. According to Charan, the fundamental question for leaders is: "What is the business engine? At the gut level, how are we going to make money?" He suggests that the leadership pendulum may have traveled too far in the direction of people issues and must now swing back more in the direction of an understanding of the business and its key drivers.

We have only highlighted a few of the research tools, books, and ideas that have shaped the field of executive development today. What belongs on the list can be debated. But what we should not forget is that professionals in the field today have a legacy of practice and experience—a "theory of the case" that rivals that of Finance and engineering. It has been a field with a changing perspective, shaped by the requirements of the day—from a beginning focused on "hard" business tools to the inclusion of softer issues focusing on leading people, managing change, and understanding cultures. The common theme has been finding an advantage that leads to increased performance. The trends and influences that will shape executive development in the future are now altering the work environment and shaping the nature of global competition. It is to these transformational forces that we now need to turn our attention.

Creating Leaders for a Changing World

The turn of the millennium has introduced leadership challenges never before faced by business professionals. The spirit of the day is one of performance, of meeting expectations quarter after quarter. No CEO can feel secure from demanding analysts and shareholders. The focus today is on growth, performance,

innovation, and new markets, and the demand is for leaders who can execute. In fact, one of the most successful books of this new era is *Execution* by Larry Bossidy and Ram Charan.

CEOs are in a bind when it comes to leadership development. There is no question that they value their leadership pipelines. When all companies have access to basically the same technology and financial resources, leadership is a competitive differentiator and is often the difference between winning and losing. But when it comes to leadership development initiatives and programs, what proof do CEOs have that current programs are effective? For many there seems to be a weak link between company performance and resources expended on leadership development.

CEOs today believe that leadership development is critical to the success of their organizations, but have a deep skepticism about the ability of current leadership development practices to deliver results. Let us illustrate with an example. One of our clients, a $5 billion global company, has seen dramatic changes in recent months. As part of an initiative to upgrade the talent in this organization, the new CEO began a search for a "Global Head of Talent and Organization Development." The CEO hired one of the best search firms in the world, and the firm presented three candidates. Two have Ph.D.s in organizational psychology from good universities and backgrounds in consulting, academics, and training. The third candidate has a BA in business and is a senior HR person with a track record as a proven generalist. Although this third candidate may appear to be the least qualified on paper, this is the candidate who caught the CEO's eye.

Why did this CEO select the third person over more highly qualified professionals in the field of leadership development? This candidate has proven line experience, a demonstrated ability to assess people as members of a business team, and an understanding of business issues from a strategic perspective.

This company's selection has broad implications for executive development as a whole. As a field of professionals, we need to develop a reputation as business partners—people who understand the strategy, the business model ("How do we make money?"), and can make difficult assessments of talent. Business is about results.

In this second edition of the *Pfeiffer Annual: Leadership Development* we want to ask some tough questions of ourselves as practicing professionals: Where are we as a profession today? What are our strengths? What are our weaknesses? What new tools and techniques will help us develop future leaders? What tools do we currently use that are worth holding onto? More than thirty experienced practitioners, academics, and consultants have contributed their insights.

Leadership development occurs in a context; it is a reflection of the business demands of the day. Next we want to explore some of the emerging trends in business and speculate on their implications for development professionals.

Some Observations About the Current State of Leadership Development

In our experience with global companies who want to develop leaders at various levels in the organization, we've noticed a trend: Leadership development initiatives are often—even usually—undertaken by very professional people who do excellent work—but fulfill the wrong agenda.

Leadership development professionals are often people who have degrees in psychology or a related field (for example, organizational psychology or industrial psychology) who have become unusually competent in organizational change theory and individual, professional development practices. However, what these professionals lack is something that is at the center of their client's world: An innate desire to make money, grow a business, and win. Many people are attracted to HR and leadership development because they "like people," not because they like "making money." As a result, leadership development experts often operate in a parallel universe. In their world, learning theory, the latest trends in management thinking, and incremental improvements in behavior and communication are valued. In their client's universe, what matters is an in-depth knowledge and understanding of business as an enterprise and a focus on competitive advantage—what works, now—with little investment of time and money. We have noticed that when this gap prevails, investments in leadership development most often go awry. Without a real anchor in the "business engine," leadership development is tolerated, but not embraced. Commitment is acted out, but not internalized. Leaders learn, but don't really change.

Why does it matter whether leadership development professionals have the business instincts, experience, and drive to match the right degrees and publishing credits? Because in business, it's always been about results, and as global competition intensifies, demand for effective leaders, not "textbook approaches to leadership programs," is trumping everything else. If leadership development and talent initiatives are to gain investment and support, the business as an enterprise, the board of directors, the CEO, and the team all need to see measurable impact on growth, execution, globalization, and financial performance.

As a field with deep roots in social science research, we've emphasized talking to each other about our best practices. We've excelled at going to conferences, reading about each other's success, and focusing on competencies. We become good at helping people understand their personalities, their strengths, and their flaws and at helping them to resolve conflict and interpersonal issues. When we're really confronted with the one question on the mind of business leaders today—"How do you measure your results?"—we demur, even fumble. "Trust us," we say. "We know this works; it just takes time."

What we aren't so great at is helping people understand the basics of business, selecting leaders who have the instinct to win, and helping organizations solve business issues first, rather than social science engineering.

In today's business climate, there is a greater focus on performance than ever before; shareholders and analysts are demanding that leadership teams perform and deliver consistently and in acceptable numbers. Leaders are being held accountable in greater numbers than ever; CEO tenure is shorter than ever, primarily due to impatience at insufficient results. In the recent past, CEOs of Merck, BMS, BP, Ford, Morgan Stanley, Home Depot, HP, and many others have faced the judgment of shareholders and been shown the door. CEOs feel the pressure. In most leadership development programs we run today, one characteristic seems to trump all others: Accountability. Even a large pharmaceutical company in Europe includes in its corporate vision a goal of providing a return to shareholders—right along with its vision to improve, extend, and save the lives of people. In an industry in which there is a focus on helping people, the dynamic importance of performance is still recognized.

Emerging Business Trends That Influence Our Industry

To understand the parameters of the current revolution in business, we think it is important to look around and see the most important signals coming from the environment. We see six major trends that are revolutionizing business and leadership today:

1. ***Digitalization:*** People worldwide download music, news, and various media from the Internet; trade stocks and manage investments online; and interact through blogs and online communities in ways that leaders of even ten years ago could not imagine. The result is summed up in *Time* magazine's "Person of the Year" for 2006—every person who creates, reads, and contributes to online content around the world. Corporate executives have begun blogging, providing a new method for interaction between levels of an organization and even the customer. In three years, Google has become a verb, a noun, and one of the highest market cap companies in the world. Companies such as American Express are buying real estate on Second Life for avatars to conduct business. Communities of interest are new constituencies for banks, pharmaceutical companies, car drivers, and almost every other type of end-user imaginable.

   Unfortunately, some leaders are unequipped to respond to this kind of worldwide digitalization and global community. Today's workforce expects to be involved, engaged, and empowered to make changes, and leaders who

don't understand that they don't control information or events and embrace this digitalization will fail.

2. ***Globalization:*** As markets, economies, and companies continue to globalize, leadership requirements become more complex, nuanced, and demanding. Now, many senior leaders in large companies have experience working outside their countries of origin. In the United States, recent immigrants constitute large segments of the entrepreneurial, customer, and employee classes. Leaders must be equipped to respond to the great variety of cultures and communities of a worldwide economy. They have to be able and willing to work across cultural differences with confidence. Culture is inextricably linked with business and will be an inescapable component of effective leadership in almost any setting. Without acknowledging it and learning to leverage it, leaders will fail.

3. ***Customer Power:*** The Internet has given the customer real power through the ability to acquire more information and opportunities to compare and choose. In the post-war world, demand exceeded supply and business didn't have to be as responsive. Now, supply exceeds demand; customers have access to research tools and information in greater quantities than ever, resulting in an upended organizational pyramid. At the top now sit shareholders, customers, and clients—all of whom have the final say on any substantial course of action. The power of the customer is changing the old command/control structure, creating a workforce that does not want to be part of an old bureaucratic organization and a customer base that is truly calling the shots. Organizations that don't respond by empowering their employees to genuinely take care of customers have no future.

4. ***Emphasis on Performance:*** In a throwback to an earlier era, we see a renewed emphasis on performance, results, and accountability in companies, but not in a command-and-control environment. Shareholders and analysts want to see results; they scrutinize expenditures, including executive compensation, with new information and vigor and challenge leadership development investments that aren't linked to business strategy and don't demonstrate results.

5. ***More Lateral, Complex, Adaptive Organizational Contexts:*** With the rapidity of information today, much of what is done in the business world is lateral—across organizational, cultural, and even time boundaries. The old metaphor for an organization was a machine: Organized, rational, planful, and disciplined. The new metaphor is an organism: Growing, adapting, problem solving, even shape-shifting. Hierarchy isn't disappearing, but it is becoming less important, and more lateral structures where people come together regardless of rank or status to solve problems and do the job are emerging. Increasingly, it's the information that's important—not the title of the person who has it.

6. ***Involving More Women and People of Color in the Upper Levels of Business:*** While women are being more effectively used in management today than in the past, we're still not seeing them climb to the levels we should expect to see. As in decades past, we still see that we're cutting ourselves off from a very valuable supply of talent by not effectively using the unique strengths and talents of half the world's labor supply—women and people who don't look, act, and think like the dominant culture. This trend requires some analysis: What isn't happening that needs to happen? We posit that many women may feel unable to find outlets for integrating their whole life experiences into the corporate world, and many simply start their own businesses to find careers that provide the rewards they are looking for.

All of these trends have contributed to creating a world that moves very fast in which leaders have to make decisions in an instant and workers are expected to do what needs to be done without waiting for instruction or delegation. Increasingly, we need leaders at all levels of the organization—people who can act intelligently, understand strategy, take tactical steps that help the organization win, serve customers in rapid way, and are at home anywhere in world.