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ABSTRACT

AN EVALUATION OF THE GLOBAL INSTITUTE FOR LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT – GILD 2008
AS A PROVIDER OF CUSTOM EXECUTIVE EDUCATION

By
Don A. DiGirolamo

August 2009

Dissertation supervised by Dr. V. Robert Agostino

The purpose of this study was to determine how participants perceived the effectiveness of their experience in the 2008 Global Institute for Leadership Development – GILD as a provider of custom executive education. GILD is an intensive one-week institute sponsored by Linkage, Inc. GILD has been presented as an accelerated growth experience designed to differentiate superior leaders from average leaders. During its twelve-year history, the Global Institute for Leadership Development (GILD) has not yet been comprehensively evaluated.

GILD 2008 was held from October 12 – 17 in Palm Desert, California. Two hundred eighty nine people from around the world participated in GILD 2008. Sixty-one percent, or one hundred seventy-nine people, completed the evaluation. Program participants included executives, general managers, directors and managers
whose responsibilities include sales, marketing, finance, engineering, information technology and project management. Eighteen countries were represented at GILD 2008.

The research was based on the effectiveness of three central parts of GILD including executive coaching, learning teams and faculty presenters. The evaluation included 52 questions and was administered on the final day of the institute. Data was gathered using quantitative methods including Measures of Central Tendency – Means, Measures of Variability – Standard Deviation and Rank-Order Distribution. Data was analyzed using ANOVA and Post Hoc tests. Qualitative techniques were used to collect data through open-ended questions addressing areas for improvement of GILD 2008 as well as key take-always for the participants.

Study findings suggest leadership development based executive education remains a vital resource for professional development within many organizations around the world. The study supports GILD 2008 was a valuable education resource for the participants. Study participants reported GILD 2008 was valued for the depth of content expertise of the presenters and executive coaches. The study reflects the evolvement of executive education to an era of assessment, coaching and development of peer learning relationships. For Linkage, Inc. the provider of GILD, a slightly different business model may be needed to position GILD as an even more effective process. Those efforts may include the need to conduct organizational assessments of corporate strategy, leadership challenges and culture, with efforts resulting in an enhanced program design based upon client needs.
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Chapter One

Introduction

Traditionally, leadership development has focused on developing the leadership abilities and attitudes of individuals. Leadership development refers to any activity that enhances the quality of leadership within an individual or organization. These activities have ranged from MBA style programs offered at university business schools to action learning high-ropes courses and executive retreats. People are not all born with the same potential to lead well any more than people have the same ability to play football like Zinedine Zidane or sing like Luciano Pavarotti. Different personal characteristics can help or hinder a person’s leadership effectiveness (Robbins, Millet, & Waters-Marsh, 2004). Yet, everyone can improve his or her leadership effectiveness. Achieving such development takes focus, practice, and persistence more akin to learning a musical instrument than reading a book.

In tough times, leadership development is the first thing to cut from the budget. Organizations that are attempting to capitalize on the economic upturn use leadership development to strengthen their leadership ranks to position themselves for the future (Vicere, 2002). 3M, Advanced Micro Devices (AMD), Cisco Systems and First Data Corp. each struggled through difficult economic times yet each sees leadership development as a key to its future. These four companies are pursuing leadership breadth
and depth as a core competency of their organizations. “It’s simple systems integration,” says Cisco’s Mary Eckenrod, director of executive development and talent resourcing. “Leaders need to grow their business. To do that, they need to grow their people. To do that, they need to grow themselves. We just need to help them understand and engage in that process” (Vicere, 2002, p. 50).

Classroom style training and associated reading is effective in helping leaders to know more about what is involved in leading well. Yet, knowing what to do and doing what you know are two very different outcomes, as highlighted by management expert Henry Mintzberg. It is estimated that as little as 15% of learning from traditional classroom style training results in sustained behavioral change within the workplace (Cromwell & Kolb, 2004).

The success of classroom style leadership development efforts has been linked to three variables:

1. Individual learner characteristics
2. The quality and nature of the leadership development program
3. Genuine support for behavioral change from the leader’s supervisor

The past two decades have witnessed something of an explosion of interest in leadership development in organizations. Some of the most noteworthy issues and trends in the field of leadership development in the past 20 years fall under these two general headings:

1. The proliferation of leadership development methods;
2. The importance of a leader’s emotional resonance with an impact on others.
One clear trend over the past 20 years has been the increasing use and recognition of the potency of a variety of developmental experiences. Classroom-type leadership training for the primary formal development mode is now complemented or even supplanted by activities as diverse as high ropes courses or reflective journaling.

Classroom training should not be the only part of a leadership development initiative, and may be the least critical. While training may even be a necessary element of leadership development, development experiences are likely to have the greatest impact when they can be linked to or embedded in a person’s ongoing work and when they are an integrated set of experiences. Activities like coaching, mentoring, action learning, and 360-degree feedback are increasingly key elements of leadership development initiatives (Hernez-Broome & Hughes, 2005).

Another kind of leadership development method gaining popularity during the past 20 years has involved teams. The presence and importance of teams in organizations today and the unique challenges of leading teams make it easy to forget teams were not always so pervasive a part of our organizational lives (Hernez-Broome & Hughes, 2005).

Twenty years ago, our understanding of leadership in organizations was dominated by the classic two-factor approach to focusing on task and relationship behavior. The general approach could be characterized as transactional in nature, as distinguished from a qualitatively different approach often described as transformational.

Transactional leadership is characterized by mutually beneficial exchanges between parties to optimize mutual benefit including the accomplishment of organizational tasks. The exchange model nature of transactional leadership tends to produce predictable and somewhat short-lived outcomes. Transformational leadership
touched followers’ deeper values and sense of higher purpose, and led to higher levels of follower commitment and effort and more enduring change. Transformational leaders provide compelling visions of a better future and inspire trust.

Commonly, the effect of transformational leadership on subordinates centers on three leadership outcomes: (a) the ability of the leader to generate extra effort on the part of those being led, (b) subordinates’ perception of the leader effectiveness, and (c) their satisfaction with the leader. In a Hong Kong study, the author (Pounder, 2008) examined the effect on undergraduate business students of university business school instructors’ exhibiting a transformational leadership style in the classroom. Transformation leadership is one of the central concepts in management, and research has indicated a positive association exists between this style of leadership and desirable leadership outcomes. The author examined this relation in a university classroom context, and the results indicated that transformational classroom leadership was significantly, and positively associated with desirable classroom leadership outcomes such as extra effort.

One factor presumably underlying the interest in transformational leaders is the nature of their emotional impact on others. The nature of the leader’s emotional connectedness to others is also apparent in the growing interest over the past decade in topics like the leader’s genuineness, authenticity, credibility, and trustworthiness (Goleman, 2002). Attention given during the last decade to the concept of emotional intelligence also attests to that shifting interest. For example, Goleman presents data that a leader’s ability to resonate emotionally with others is a better predictor of effective executive leadership than is general intelligence.
More recently, organizations have come to understand that strengthening the connection between alignment of the efforts of individual leaders and the systems through which they influence organizational operations can also develop leadership. This has led to a differentiation between leader development and leadership development (Day, 2007). Leader development focuses on the development of the leader, such as the personal attributes desired in a leader, desired ways of behaving, ways of thinking, or feeling. In contrast, leadership development focuses on the development of leadership as a process. This includes the interpersonal relationships’ social influence process, the team dynamics between the leader and his/her team, the contextual factors surrounding the team such as the perception of the organizational climate, and the social network linkages between the team and other groups in the organization.

Leadership development can build on the development of individuals, including followers, to become leaders. In addition, it also needs to focus on the interpersonal linkages between individuals in the team. In the belief that the most important resource that an organization possesses is the people that comprise the organization, some organizations address the development of these resources, including leadership development.

Today, effective leadership is commonly viewed as central to organizational success, and more importance is placed on leadership development than ever before. Developing more and better individual leaders is no longer the sole focus of leadership development, although it remains a critical aspect. Increasingly, leadership is defined not as what the leader does but rather as a process that energizes and is the result of relationship, focused on the interactions of both leaders and collaborators instead of
focusing on only the competencies of the leaders. Leadership development practices based on this paradigm are more difficult to design and implement than those that have been popular for the last several decades in which the objective was to train leaders to be good managers. In light of this, several theories describe the state of leadership development today:

1. Leadership development increasingly occurring within the context of work;
2. Critical reflection about the competencies in leadership development;
3. Revising the issue of work/life balance

Background

The Global Institute for Leadership Development (GILD) is an intensive one-week institute sponsored by Linkage, Inc. GILD challenges the assumption that 10 – 12 weeks of extended leadership development is required to instill behavior change. Some of the most recognized names in the field of leadership development speak at the program. Speakers such as Marshall Goldsmith, Warren Bennis, John Kotter, and many others conduct sessions focused on cutting-edge approaches to leadership development. GILD combines the depth of an immersion learning workshop, the academic rigor of a university executive education program, and the pace and scale of a world-class conference. The program provides accelerated, transformational leadership growth in areas proven to differentiate superior leaders from average leaders.

Some of the key features of the program are as follows:

1. Accelerated, competency-based development – Based on the High-Impact Leadership Model™, developed and modified over the past eight years by
Linkage and Warren Bennis, identifying the factors distinguishing great and average leaders.

2. World-class faculty – A combination of great leaders, great teachers, and great behavioral change experts.


4. Executive coaching – High-end executive coaches meet with participants a minimum of three times (twice at GILD, once after GILD).

5. Learning Teams – Small, highly relevant sessions where key learning is processed, knowledge sharing occurs, and action plans are developed.

6. Leadership Responsibility Sessions – Some of the world’s most respected leaders share strategies and new approaches helping participants excel in critical leadership responsibilities.

7. Leadership Competency Development – Learning sessions led by world-renowned teachers and leaders providing fuel and guidance for accelerated transformation of these competencies.

8. Leadership Skill-Building Workshops – Interactive workshops designed to meet the needs of emerging or senior leaders providing instruction, simulations, practice, and tools (GILD, 2008).

GILD

The first Global Institute for Leadership Development (GILD) was conducted in 1986. GILD’s development framework begins with the foundation of an ongoing, longitudinal study conducted by Warren Bennis, the “father of leadership,” and Phil
Harkins, Linkage’s Founder and CEO. The study isolates the leadership skills, responsibilities, and competencies clearly differentiating superior from average leaders. These differentiators make up the High Impact Leadership Model™ and are the focus of the entire learning experience.
The Institute included the following individuals:

1. Marshall Goldsmith – Coaching & Mentoring
2. Patrick Lencioni – Motivating the Team
3. Tom Peters – Creating the Organization
4. Renee Mauborgne – Building a Culture of Innovation
5. Tim Sanders – Emotional Intelligence Coaching & Mentoring
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to evaluate how participants perceived the effectiveness of the Global Institute for Leadership Development – GILD 2008 as a provider of custom executive education. During its twelve-year history, the Global Institute for Leadership Development had not yet been comprehensively evaluated. The Institute provides presenters and teachers, who have been identified as some of the best in the world. This study will evaluate the effectiveness of the presenters, the effectiveness of the executive coaching and the learning team process. The study also will identify the lessons learned from the Institute by the participants.

Impact on Education

Bernard Bailyn is an American historian, author, and professor specializing in U.S. Colonial and Revolutionary-era history. He won the Pulitzer Prize for History twice in 1968 and 1987. In 1960, he wrote *Education in the Forming of American Society*. Bailyn (1960, p. 14) suggests to restrict the history of education to formal instruction reflects not only the concerns of the professional writers of the time but also certain assumptions about the nature of the history itself:

It becomes apparent when one thinks of education not only as formal pedagogy but as the entire process by which a culture transmits itself across the generations, when one is prepared to see great variations in the role of formal institutions of instruction… when one sees education in its elaborate, intricate involvements with the rest of society, and notes its shifting functions, meanings, and purposes.
Corporate leaders of today are confronted with a myriad of ongoing professional development needs. They seek innovative ways of implementing the best educational practices in order to develop leaders capable of addressing today’s shifting challenges. The development of more leaders and better leaders is viewed as a key element to the success of today’s corporate organization. Effective executive education can create more leaders and better leaders.

The Global Institute for Leadership Development is one of the most recognized executive education institutes in the world. The evaluation survey conducted in this study aims to identify areas of improvement for this world-renowned executive education institute.

Research Questions

The study of the effectiveness of GILD 2008 as an effective executive education program was conducted to research the following questions:

RQ 1: Have the format and structure of The Global Institute for Leadership Development – GILD met the executive education needs of the participants from around the world?

RQ2: To what extent have the leadership presentations given by the GILD faculty impacted the approach to your leadership challenges?

RQ 3: To what degree did the one-on-one executive coaching sessions allow you to develop a better understanding of your leadership skills?

RQ 4: To what degree did the peer learning teams enhance your learning experience and allow you to apply the learning to your specific leadership needs?
Significance of the Study

Leaders of today are confronted with a myriad of diverse and ongoing professional development needs. Executive education initiatives like GILD were designed to address those needs. GILD combines many of the elements of executive education thought to be best in class. Those elements include assessment, coaching, peer learning, and leadership presentations. The findings of this study will assist Linkage, Inc. in tailoring future initiatives to better meet the needs of their global client base. This study will also result in a template that can be used in evaluation of other executive education programs.

Limitations of the Study

This study was a program evaluation, dealt with a single context, and was subject to all the limitations recognized in evaluation research. Evaluation research studies are limited to variables over which program administrators have some degree of control.

As a formative evaluation of a single case, the Global Institute for Leadership Development – GILD 2008, generalizability is limited to the population of the program at this time, and future delivery of the same program. Executive education programs are generally perceived as positive and productive endeavors. A limitation of the study is also associated with the methodology of administering a paper-based evaluation survey.

Definition of Terms

A variety of terms were used in this study. The following definitions are provided for purposes of clarification and consistency.
Executive coaching: Executive coaching is a facilitative one-to-one, mutually designed relationship between a professional coach and a key contributor who has a powerful position in the organization. This relationship occurs in areas of business, government, not-for-profit, and educational organizations where there are multiple stakeholders and organizational sponsorship for the coach or coaching group. The coaching is contracted for the benefit of a client who is accountable for highly complex decisions with a wide scope of impact on the organization and industry as a whole. The coaching is usually focused on organizational performance or development, but may also have a personal component as well. The results produced from this relationship are observable and measurable (International Coaching Federation Conference [ICFC], 2000).

Global Institute for Leadership Development (GILD): GILD is an intensive one-week institute sponsored by Linkage, Inc. Some of the most recognized names in the field of leadership development speak at the program. Speakers such as Marshall Goldsmith, Warren Bennis, John Kotter, and many others conduct sessions focused on cutting-edge approaches to leadership development. GILD combines the depth of an immersion learning workshop, the academic rigor of a university executive education program, and the pace and scale of a world-class conference. The program provides accelerated, transformational leadership growth in areas proven to differentiate superior leaders from average leaders (GILD, 2008).

Learning Teams: GILD participants are provided a safe and open environment to share leadership and work challenges, further synthesizing the learning through honest,
practical feedback and peer input. Learning teams are facilitator-led, peer teams of 15-18 participants that gather each day to foster critical introspection, discovery, and open exchange with fellow leaders who have similar experiences and scope of responsibility (GILD, 2008).

**Linkage, Inc.:** Linkage is a global organizational development company specializing in leadership development. They provide clients around the world with integrated solutions including strategic consulting services, customized leadership development and training experiences, tailored assessment services, executive coaching, and benchmark research. More than 200,000 leaders and managers have attended Linkage programs since 1988. Linkage is headquartered in Burlington, Massachusetts with operations in Atlanta, Minneapolis, New York, San Francisco, and worldwide (Linkage, Inc., n. d.).
Chapter Two

Historical Perspective and Review of Literature

Introduction

In order to discuss leadership development, we must first look at the word leadership. The best and worst place to start this discussion is with the simple question of the relationship between leadership and management. Historically, they seem to have developed at about the same time, leadership appearing first in about 1918, management emerging as a science between 1908 and 1926. But from the beginning there was serious confusion over the meaning of leadership, specifically as it related to management. The confusion, over the years, rather than being resolved, has been exacerbated by both intellectual neglect and popular myth (Cook, 2000).

One school of thought assumes rationalistic management and leadership are pretty much the same. The words are commonly used interchangeably, even within the same discourse. This is the basic disposition of the corporation model’s belief and practice: leadership is expected to exist in direct proportion to management authority. As one goes up the ladder in management rank, his or her leadership is supposed to increase commensurately. The CEO is, ex officio, the leader of the organization, the first tier of managers, the “leadership” (Cook, 2000).
Cook suggests all of the major graduate schools of business in North America carry many courses variously labeled with the word “leadership.” Many of the course descriptions promise to deliver some kind of “leadership development.” In close reading, however, the text quickly reveals every one of the offerings is pure and simple management training.

As Kouzes and Posner wrote in The Leadership Challenge (2002), leadership is an identifiable set of skills and practices available to all of us, not just the charismatic men and women. They believe the theory there are only a few great men and women who can lead us to greatness are just plain wrong. They suggest men and women with whom we work are the everyday heroes in the world. It is because we have so many, not so few, leaders we are able to get extraordinary things done on a regular basis, even in extraordinary times.

When Kouzes and Posner began their research, they wanted to find out what practices characterize exemplary leadership, so they created a question that framed everything else. The question they asked everyone that they studied was, “What do you do when you’re operating at what you consider to be your personal best?” They wanted to know what leaders at all levels and in all contexts did.

After many years, and several thousand quantitative and qualitative analysis later, they found there are Five Practices that define exemplary leadership (Kouzes & Posner, 2003).

When operating at their best, leaders do the following:

1. Model the Way – Find your voice by clarifying your personal values and set the example by aligning personal actions with shared values.
2. Inspire a Shared Vision – *Envision the future* by imagining exciting and ennobling possibilities, and you *enlist others* in the dreams by appealing to shared aspirations.

3. Challenge the Process – *Search for opportunities* by seeking innovative ways to change, grow, and improve, and you *experiment and take risks* by constantly generating small wins and learning from mistakes.

4. Enable Others to Act – *Foster collaboration* by promoting cooperative goals and building trust, and you *strengthen others* by sharing power and discretion.

5. Encourage the Heart – *Recognize contributions* by showing appreciation for individual excellence, and you *celebrate the values and the victories* by creating a spirit of community.

Kouzes and Posner ask us to remember leaders are learners. To grow as a leader, you need to learn from your experiences as well as leadership development initiatives.

Donald L. Kirkpatrick, Ph.D., is the author of seven management books, including the 3rd edition of *Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels* (2006), which has become the basis for evaluation all over the world. Professional trainers and performance consultants are familiar with the “four levels” of evaluation, for measuring the effectiveness of training of Human Performance Technology (HPT) programs. The four levels include Reaction (Level 1), Learning (Level 2), Behavior (Level 3), and Results (Level 4). It is important to understand Kirkpatrick’s process as we conduct a program evaluation of GILD 2008. Kirkpatrick suggests that there are seven keys for implementing the four levels (Pounder, 2008).
First Key: Analyze your resources.

To do this, we must answer the following questions:

Does your job consist of only one function – evaluating training programs or does it include other and perhaps more important duties and responsibilities of planning and curriculum and teaching? How much support and help can you get from line managers if you are training their subordinates in programs such as Leadership Development for Supervisors?

Second Key: Involve your managers.

If you are going to be effective in evaluating programs, you need to have your managers’ encouragement and support. If they have negative attitudes toward you or the program, you will not be able to evaluate effectively.

Third Key: Start at Level 1 (Reaction) and continue through Levels 2, 3, and 4 as resources permit.

Some organizations skip the first four levels and go directly to ROI. Others do not consider Reaction to be important and go directly to one of the other levels. Kirkpatrick suggests that that is a mistake.

Fourth Key: Evaluate reaction.

The guidelines for evaluating Reaction follow:

1. Decide what you want to find out – make a list of items to which you want the reaction of the participants.
2. Design a form that will quantify reaction.
3. Provide the opportunity for written comments.
4. Get 100% immediate response.
5. Be sure you get “honest” answers. Do not ask them to sign the form.

6. Establish an acceptable standard for their combined reaction and tabulate the forms to see if you have achieved or exceeded the standard.

*Fifth Key:* Evaluate learning.

Guidelines for evaluating Learning follow:

1. Measure before and after knowledge, skills, and attitudes.

2. Use a form the participants can complete for evaluating knowledge and attitude change.

3. Use a performance test for evaluating skills.

4. Get 100% response.

5. For knowledge and attitudes, design a test that measures what you want them to know and the attitudes you want them to have at the end of the program.

*Sixth Key:* Evaluate behavior.

Guidelines for evaluating Behavior follow:

1. Measure on a before-and-after basis, if practical.

2. Allow time for behavior change to take place.

3. Use a patterned interview or written survey, asking the same questions to all respondents.

4. Decide who will be polled.

5. Based on the fact that some participants have not changed their behavior but did answer positively the question, “Do you plan to change your behavior in the future?” repeat the research after three months.

*Seventh Key:* Evaluate results.
Guidelines for evaluating Results follow:

1. Measure on a before-and-after basis.
2. Allow time for results to develop—perhaps six months to a year.
3. Repeat at appropriate times.
4. Use a control group if practical. A control group consists of individuals who did not attend the program.

“To what extent are staff development program participants actually using what they are learning in the (fill in the blank) initiative in their daily work?” (Champion, 2006, p 1). The question about actual use in the workplace is key to tracking impact and designing help during change. Whether the staff learning initiative is differentiating instruction, assessing student performance, teaching critical thinking, mapping curricula, integrating technology into instruction, learning a particular learning approach, or some other complex bundle, getting participants to use what they learn is a major milestone.

Gene E. Hall is the former director at the University of Texas at the Austin Center for Research in Teacher Education. He and Shirley M. Hord, another major researcher at the center, have synthesized their work on change and moved the conversation forward in the newest edition of their book, Implementing Change: Patterns, Principles, and Potholes (2006). Finding credible yet efficient techniques to gauge the extent of implementation of leadership development can be frustrating. The “Levels of Use” framework (known as LoU) is a powerful research-based approach for gathering diagnostic data on individuals involved in incorporating a new approach into their daily work. Hall and Hord explain the evolution of the LoU.
Change does not happen automatically or instantly when someone learns a new approach. The rate of change varies widely with individuals, usually in developmental steps. An important view of the Concerns-Based Adoption Model - CBAM work on change is that schools and districts are very busy workplaces; data must be gathered unobtrusively and efficiently. To gauge an individual’s actual use of a new approach, the LoU uses a focused, one-on-one interview process.

There are two caveats to the effectiveness of the LoU interview process.

Caveat 1: The LoU doesn’t purport to determine how or where an individual learned to do what he is currently doing.

Caveat 2: The LoU cannot predict whether students will benefit from the teacher or principal’s use of a particular new approach.

The LoU has potential multiple uses at different points in the life cycle of an initiative. First, knowledge of the LoU research can help take the guesswork out of long-range budgeting. In the midst of implementation, LoU data can guide staff developers and other change facilitators in more accurately designing the right kinds and amount of activities.

History of Leadership Development

Anyone who has seen or read about the pyramids of Egypt cannot help but be impressed by these monuments to ancient man. In addition to the insights they provide into the culture and intelligence of the Egyptians, they also are a reflection of the administrative and leadership skills existing at that time (3000-2000 B.C.). Some Egyptian writings reveal evidence of administrative concern about the nature of leadership and the value of effective communication. Much of the ancient writings were
concerned with improvements in the administration of government units and public works. As time passed, the interest of writers with regard to leadership became even more pronounced (Duncan, 1989).

Forty-five hundred years later, as we view the astonishing accomplishments of the great pyramid builders, the pyramids themselves conceal a mysterious code illuminating the force of superior leadership. Leaders discovered skill alone was not enough to be successful in building the pyramids. With skill, people were working as individuals. As individuals, they were primarily driven by personal motives, the payment they would receive, how much time they needed to work, how many days off they would get, and what was going on at home while they were working. The leaders decided that they wanted to change the way workers approached their jobs. The leaders looked at the situation and came up with the answer – food. Pharaoh deemed massive amounts of clover-fed cattle to be cultivated for the purpose of feeding the workers the tastiest, finest beef to be found on the continent. Workers were fed like royalty. This served the following two purposes:

1. It gave the workers a sense of importance and significance. They ate only the best and felt appreciated in the process.

2. It provided a superior source of protein to make the workers stronger, which in turn provided better performance.

In the context of today’s organizations, this is not the equivalent of giving more money or increasing salary. Back then it was physical strength that created a “better man.” Today mental strength is most precious. The opportunity for individuals to develop their talents and intellectual ability is most important. What was superior beef in Ancient
Egypt is now superior training or personal development in today’s business environment (Shaw, 2003).

Around 1750, England entered a period referred to as the Industrial Revolution. The promise of the machine and the challenge of economic growth accentuated the lack of management talent capable of leadership and responding to the new demands. Three men, all born within a span of 20 years, responded to three distinct challenges of the time.

Robert Owen (1771-1858) became concerned for the evils and inhumanity he saw in industrialization. He therefore advocated developing more attention to the human being, or the “living machine” (Duncan, 1989, p. 32). He attempted, through political action, to activate reforms concerning minimum working ages for children and reduction in daily working hours.

Charles Babbage (1792-1871) tried to advance technology. He was a mathematical genius and a Cambridge professor who is best remembered as the inventor of the “analytical engine” and forerunner of the modern computer. He stressed the importance of the division of physical and mental labor, suggested the concept of profit sharing, and began observing and timing work.

Charles Dupin (1784-1873), a French engineer, was more interested in management and leadership education than technology. By 1826, his materials on management and leadership had been presented in one hundred French cities to more than 5,000 workers and supervisors. He published the famous Discours, which further extended his influence (Duncan, 1989).

The coordination of human and material resources has been a concern of Man almost from the beginning of time. Nevertheless, management and leadership as a
systemic field of study can claim only a relatively short history. It was not until the 1910s, for example, when a few colleges began to offer management and leadership courses. The first recognized assembly of management teachers was held in 1924 in New York City. Today, almost every college and university offers a course in management and leadership.

Two things should be evident from this discussion: the tremendous lag time between the time men and women first decided to voluntarily associate with each other to accomplish a common goal, and recognizing that management and leadership was the key to accomplishing the goal. Once the interest in management developed, the interest in developing management and leadership skills began to grow at an increasing rate (Duncan, 1989).

In the middle of the modern era, computers did not exist. Within a few decades, they multiplied faster than the human race. The use of computers became so important that spending on knowledge management, information technology, and leadership development are the largest items on many capital-sending budgets (Goldsmith, 2002).

Goldsmith suggests we tend to focus understandably on the profound impact these and other workplace changes are having on the lives of individuals. But, too often leaders overlook the equally profound impact these changes are having on their organizations. The fact is, the new work contract – employees taking responsibility for their own careers and corporations providing them with career-enhancing but impermanent opportunities – can be as difficult for organizations to manage as for individuals. Many global leaders still understand little of the mechanics of developing
and retaining people in turbulent times, but are under great pressure to create opportunities to retain talents.

The future success of organizations is about providing a source of in-house replacements for current leaders in order to drive cultural change and retain key talent (Barron, 2004). Effective leaders are invaluable in an era where corporations must change course frequently to navigate obstacles and opportunities, a fact helping boost leadership development to new levels in many firms. Schwan’s Corporation, a frozen food manufacturer and retailer, embodies much of the new thinking about fostering leadership skills. The company conducts a daylong assessment putting the future high potential leaders of Schwan’s through the corporate equivalent of astronaut training. They tackle all manner of business problems. A total of 15 leadership competencies are analyzed in a process that yields the skeleton of an individual development plan used as the basis for subsequent individualized training:

Both changes in the business - the growing competitive intensity, and the increasing complexity of firms are important by themselves. Each is independently having a formidable impact today. The first has been increasing the need for leadership challenge in more and more jobs. The second has been making leadership challenge in those jobs more difficult to handle as well. But, it is the cumulative effect of the two changes that is so powerful. Put these together, and the consequences of both adequate and inadequate leadership are lacking on a whole new dimension today (Kotter, 1998, p. 14).

Review of the Literature
Corporations are more anxious today than ever before to identify and develop executive talent needed to get through the turbulent years ahead. It was in the early 1980s that organizations were in the beginning stages of what was variously predicted to be “permanent white water” and the “white knuckle decade,” and the search was on for heroes. Corporations wanted more leaders, better leaders, and they wanted them as soon possible (McCall, 1998). McCall writes that “the message of the book *High Flyers* is that leadership ability can be learned, that creating a context that supports the development of talent can become a source of competitive advantage, and that the development of leaders is itself a leadership responsibility” (p. xii).

McCall found “the corporate version of the right stuff is built on the assumptions that there is a finite list of virtues that defines effective leadership, and that these virtues distinguish exceptional from average executives” (p. 14). He identified these core attributes as critical to executive leadership: team player, customer-focused, biased toward action, analytic thinker, integrity, global vision, and is good with people. Organizations understand the importance of developing leadership ability will ultimately have a competitive advantage.

Stephen Covey believes that the world has changed dramatically in recent years. Life is more complex, more stressful, more demanding. We have transitioned from the Industrial Age into the Information/Knowledge Worker Age, with all of its profound consequences (Covey, 2004). He suggests that sweeping changes in society and rumbling shifts in the digitized global marketplace continue to support the principles he supported in *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People*. He believes that today, as well as 20 years ago, leadership can be broken down into three basic functions or activities:
1. **path finding**, or a leader’s ability to establish a strategic pathway.

2. **aligning**, or ensuring that all aspects of the organization contribute to achieving your mission.

3. **empowering**, or the ability to help others unleash their talent, ingenuity and intelligence.

Rapid change is making confusion a defining feature of management in the 21st century. Authors Jentz and Murphy (2005) offer five steps to consider for managers who are confused and uncertain of what to do. By learning to embrace confusion, managers are able to set in motion a constructive process for addressing baffling organizational issues. The genesis for Jerome Murphy’s beliefs occurred more than 20 years ago when he became the new – and often confused – associate dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education. Blindsided by unexpected problems and baffled by daunting institutional challenges, Murphy often lost his sense of direction and simply didn’t know what to do. To make matters worse, he felt like a phony. “For God’s sake,” he said to himself, “Isn’t a Harvard dean supposed to have the answers?”

Barry Jentz, an organizational consultant, helped Murphy learn that confusion is not a weakness to be ashamed of but a regular and inevitable condition of leadership. By learning to embrace their confusion, managers are able to set in motion a constructive process for addressing baffling organizational issues. In fact, confusion turns out to be a fruitful environment in which the best managers thrive by using the instability around them to open up better lines of communication, test their old assumptions and values against changing realities, and develop more creative approaches to problem solving.
Jentz and Murphy identified a method by which managers can transform their confusion from a liability into a resource, and describe how this resonance can be used to promote learning, new ideas, and the ability to take effective action. They call this method Reflective Inquiry and Action (RIA), a five-step process through which managers can assert their need to make sense and enlist individuals and teams without sacrificing their goals, values, and judgment.

*Step 1. Embrace your confusion.*

When confronted with disorienting problems, you need to do the one thing you least want to do – acknowledge to yourself that you are confused and that you see this condition as a weakness.

*Step 2. Assert your need to make sense.*

Having prepared yourself mentally, you now need to engage in dialogue. This face-to-face interaction will normally take the form of a meeting in which you describe your confusion so that others will know the point from which you are starting.

*Step 3. Structure the interaction.*

Publicly acknowledging that you are confused is important, but it is only a beginning. Without skipping a beat, you must next provide a structure for the search for new bearings that both asserts your authority and creates the conditions for others to join.

*Step 4. Listen reflectively and learn.*

You now need to listen reflectively as others respond to you. In the context of the RIA model, *reflective* carries both of its common meanings.

*Step 5. Openly process your effort to make sense.*
Once you have taken in what others are saying – some of which will probably be puzzling and may be upsetting – you need to process your responses out loud.

In the 21st century, as rapid change makes confusion a defining characteristic of management, the competence of managers will be measured not only by what they know but increasingly by how they behave when they lose their sense of direction and become confused. Organizational cultures that cling to the ideal of an all-knowing, omni-competent executive will pay high cost in time, resources, and progress, and will be sending the message to managers that it is better to hide their confusion than to address it openly and constructively (Jentz & Murphy, 2005).

Being confused, however, does not mean being incapacitated. Indeed, one of the most liberating truths of leadership is that confusion is the stuff with which managers’ work. Managers can be confused yet still be able to exercise competent leadership by structuring a process of reflective inquiry and action. Effective executive education can help develop competent leadership.

The Council for Excellence in Management and Leadership (CEML), chaired by Sir Anthony Cleaver, was established in April 2000. The aim of the organization is to develop a strategy ensuring that the U.K. has the managers and leaders of the future to match the best in the world. The Council set up a number of working groups, one of which has focused on developing a best practice guide for leadership development in the public and private sectors. Dr. Kim James prepared a paper for the CEML entitled “Leadership and Management Excellence; Corporate Development Strategies.” The paper focuses on examples of how internationally recognized organizations go about the creation of leadership and management talent (James, 2000).
According to James, senior executives in organizations undertake leadership and management activities. Effective leadership can transform an organization. Such activities include creating a vision for the future, investing in the vision, clarifying the past and present status of the organization, and creating an idea about future trajectory.

The following conclusions can be derived from the study by Dr. Kim James:

1. Leadership development is closely aligned with and used to support corporate strategy. Organizations go to great lengths to align leadership development with the overall strategic focus and help to implement strategy to meet new business drivers.

2. Best practice organizations build leadership development teams carefully, emphasizing HR development and business experience.

3. Competencies matter and are developed internally and applied throughout the organization.

4. Action learning is key, on real time business issues.

5. Leadership development must link to succession planning which involves linking assessment, development, feedback, coaching and succession planning into one integrated system aligned with the strategy.

There is a continuing debate about the nature of leadership and management, a lack of definitive conclusion, and the view certain business sectors have unique characteristics. It may therefore be an important part of any organization’s leadership development philosophy to clarify these issues in relation to what it is trying to achieve in its leadership and development program. There is no single “one size fits all” solution possible when the requirements of the organization may be diverse.
Although the field is moving away from viewing leadership development solely in terms of leader attributes, skills, and traits, leadership competencies remain a core dimension of leadership development activities in most organizations. A benchmarking study found that leading edge companies define leadership by a set of competencies that guide leadership development at all levels (Barrett & Benson, 2002). A majority of organizations have identified leadership competencies, or at least tried to define the characteristics and qualities of successful leaders. How then are leadership competencies most effectively used in leadership development?

Leadership competencies need to correspond to the organization’s particular strategy and business model (Intagliata, 2000). Leadership development programs implemented in isolation of the business environment rarely bring about profound or long-lasting changes; therefore, organizations must develop leaders and leadership competencies that correspond with and are specific to their distinct business challenges and goals. While common leadership qualities or competencies characterize effective leaders, developing core leader qualities may not be enough. The leadership competencies of a best-practice organization uniquely fit the organization, its particular strategy, and its business model.

Not only may organizations differ in their identification of critical leadership competencies, some would argue it is unlikely all leaders within an organization must possess the same set of competencies to be successful, or make the organization successful. According to this perspective, leaders should not be accountable for demonstrating a particular set of behaviors but rather should be held accountable for desired outcomes. This perspective looks beyond competencies, which have a tendency
to focus on “what needs fixing,” and instead focuses attention on the whole person and on strengths and natural talents (Buckingham & Vosburgh, 2003). Development is increasingly seen as a process of developing and leveraging strengths and of understanding and minimizing the impact of weaknesses.

How does an organization go about identifying best practices in leadership development? David Day of Pennsylvania State University and Stanley Halpin of the U.S. Army Research Institute conducted a review of leadership development best practices in for-profit organizations (Day & Halpin, 2001). They reviewed formal development programs, 360-degree feedback, executive coaching, job assignments, mentoring, networks, reflection, action learning, and outdoor challenges. Five organizations are popularly recognized for their leadership development practices are highlighted in this report. They are General Electric, Motorola, PepsiCo, Federal Express, and Johnson & Johnson.

Several general principles of effective leadership development emerged from this research. It appears the most important principle in successful leadership development efforts is the presence of an influential champion. Additionally, leadership development must become a systemic process, not an event. Effective leadership development practices are tied to specific business imperatives. They found perhaps the most meaningful principle, however, is successful leadership development depends more on consistent implementation than on the use of innovative practices. The study also suggests that leadership development is an investment in the future and it is more important to recognize that it may take years before dividends are realized.
A distinctive feature of Motorola’s approach to leadership development is the Motorola University. Originally called the Motorola Training and Education Center (MTEC), it was founded in 1980 with an original investment of $40 million. This investment was made despite financial hardships created by a deep recession that year. Also in 1990, Motorola partnered with ABD, Digital Equipment, Eastman Kodak, and IBM, to accelerate the development of Six Sigma Quality and to transfer the knowledge in the most effective manner. Although it is billed primarily as a quality initiative, Six Sigma was determined to be inherently about leadership development.

At the senior executive level, Motorola offers the Vice President Institute (VPI) to foster leadership development in new vice presidents. VPI was developed to help the vice presidents explore ways to invent new technologies and new businesses, with a focus on innovation, globalization, and communications. As such, leadership development was tied directly to a key business imperative. At Motorola, the imperative was one of sustaining growth.

The study found, in terms of fostering a positive culture for leadership, there was no denying General Electric was in a class of its own. Jack Welch changed the structure of GE drastically. He was a proponent of boundaryless behavior, defined as business behavior trampling or demolishing all barriers of rank, functional geography, and bureaucracy, through a combination of culture change, leadership development, and action learning projects.

Using speed as a competitive advantage became a core management value at GE. Jack Welch made it mandatory that every president of a business, officer of the company, and senior executive – roughly 1,000 people – would receive seven days of change-
related training over ten weeks. Thus began the Change Acceleration Process (CAP) at GE. The overarching goal of making people open to change, hungry to learn, and anxious to move quickly on a good idea, became the objective of their leadership development initiatives.

The study found the key take-away principle from the GE approach to leadership development can be stated succinctly as implementation. There was a broad range of best practices to choose from, including those adopted by GE such as 360-degree feedback, coaching, and action learning. However, it is mostly about performing the best practice consistently and with excellence every time. GE acknowledges much of what they do with regard to leadership development is not new. But aligning the initiatives with their core values and overall strategy pushed people to implement change with a passion.

Fulmer (1999) undertook sponsored research into American productivity for the American Society for Training and Development. The best practice selection involved the initial analysis of potential organizations by the research team from journals and sponsors’ suggestions. They then followed an evaluation of potential best practice partners through a screening survey of more than 30 organizations, to select ten finalists and the selection of six best practice partners. This study yielded Arthur Andersen, General Electric, Hewlett Packard, Johnson & Johnson, Shell International, and World Bank.

Several aspects of General Electric’s business intensify its need to ensure strength and continuity in corporate leadership. In recent years, GE has diversified and expanded its operating markets, continuing global growth and venturing into “new economy” businesses. Traditional approaches to leader identification, including succession-planning
practices such as position-person replacement charts, have become inadequate, as GE’s leadership needs have changed rapidly. The company faces a common challenge: to build a process to identify talent from every source and explicitly develops required competencies to generate flexible “pools” of leadership candidates (Corporate Leadership Council [CLC], 2001).

The U. S. Navy is one of the world’s largest global organizations with responsibility for nearly one million people and many billions of dollars of resources. The top 600 leaders at the Navy are admirals (and the civilian equivalent) (Bersin, 2003, p. 44). How does the Navy train and support these senior individuals so they can effectively learn to lead? What can we learn from such a global and complex organization?

The U. S. Navy identified, through their FLAG University, five core competencies for Navy executives. These core competencies include leadership, change management, human capital, information management, and financial literacy. The Navy learned five key lessons about executive or leadership development. Executive education is long lasting, is collaborative, gives responsibility to the learner, requires coaching, and uses technology as an enabler. For Navy admirals and their civilian counterparts, the lessons learned translate into a learning support environment to ensure Navy leaders have the skills necessary to successfully navigate the increasingly dangerous waters of an ever more complex world.

While the U. S. Navy has identified a clear direction to take in developing leaders, the current state of leadership development in the civilian world is not quite as clear. Getting two advocates to agree on a definition of leadership seems impossible (Aldrich, 2003). Covey, Blanchard, PDI, DDI, Kotter, and Achieve Global (just to name a few)
compete tooth-and-nail. Many consultants have tried to turn leadership into a cookbook-style skill, handing out recipes for anyone to follow. It now seems everything good is due to leadership, and everything bad is due to the lack of leadership.

Officer training academies such as the U. S. Military Academy at West Point go to great lengths to only accept candidates who show the highest potential to lead well (Robbins, Miller, & Waters-Marsh, 2004). Personal characteristics associated with successful leadership development include a leader’s motivation to learn, a high achievement drive, and personality traits such as openness to experience, an internal locus of control, and self-monitoring.

At the U. S. Military Academy, development goes well beyond the classroom. Development is also more likely to occur when the design of the development program first integrates a range of developmental experiences over a set period of time (6–12 months). These experiences may include 360 feedback, experiential classroom style programs, business school style coursework, executive coaching, reflective journaling, mentoring, and more. Second steps involve goal setting, following an assessment of key developmental needs, and then evaluating the achievement of goals after a given time period (Cromwell & Kolb, 2004).

Management professor, author of *Stand Your Ground*, and West Point graduate Evan Offstein approached leaders at the U. S. Military Academy and the Department of the Army with two primary questions:

1. How does West Point develop its leaders?

2. Can other individuals and organizations apply these methods effectively?
West Point is the ideal laboratory for studying the dynamics of character, honor, and leadership. First, it operates a comprehensive honor education and enforcement program that has been subjected to rigorous Congressional scrutiny. Secondly, it builds all of its academic, athletic, and military programs on this bedrock of honor. As a result, West Point invests heavily in mentoring, training, and evaluation to ensure the leadership and character development of its 4,000 cadets. From Civil War General Robert E. Lee to astronaut Edwin E. “Buzz” Aldrin to basketball coach Mike Krzyzewski, West Point has groomed leaders whose contributions far exceed the successful management of their immediate charges (Offstein, 2006).

Offstein found many honorable leaders, particularly the young men and women at West Point, were acutely aware of an approaching, dangerous intersection, or what he calls “the moment.” The moment is the point in time at which you enter a decisional intersection. Here, your honor is either knowingly or unknowingly tested. The key is to know that you are approaching this moment. While some people speed right through decisional intersections without much care or thought, this is hardly, if ever, the case with honorable leaders. Like careful drivers, many West Point young men and women demonstrated a sixth sense recognizing what drivers would do as they approached a busy intersection; honorable leaders tend to be on guard and look for the yellow caution light. If there isn’t one, they tend to string up their own. From there, they proceed with caution, awareness, and a heightened sensitivity (Offstein, 2006).

In preparation for the research and writing of the book *Stand Your Ground*, Offstein canvassed over 140 leadership books published for both academic and trade audiences over the last 20 years. With very few exceptions, leadership practice and
theory has largely ignored this topic of awareness. But “awareness” is where all leadership seems to begin at places like West Point and other honorable organizations. He found that higher-elevation leaders and organizations never assume awareness. Instead, they actively cultivate it.

A study entitled “Comparing Leadership Characteristics of Corporate Executive Leaders with United States Air Force General Officers: A Case Study” was conducted by Tatiana M. Stead in 2003. There are four primary findings related to both military and business leaders. For both groups, ethics, values, integrity, and trust were expressed as the most important components of good leadership, while personal disclosure remained a challenge. The study sought to compare leadership characteristics between two distinct groups of extraordinary men sharing a reputation of being distinguished leaders:

1. U. S. Air Force General Officers  
2. Executive suite leaders (Chief Executive Officers, Chief Operating Officers, Chief Financial Officers, Chief Information Officers, and Executive Vice Presidents) working at Capital One Financial Corporation, a Fortune 500 financial services company.

Capital One senior executives represent financial executives in general, and U. S. Air Force General Officers represent senior executives in the U. S. Air Force in general. The study explored similarities and differences in leadership characteristics between two groups of men-acknowledged as leaders through the respective positions they hold within their organizations, and sought to provide insight for those searching to increase their own leadership competencies or develop training within their organization.
There were some striking differences in the two organizations. Capital One quickly rose to the top of the credit card industry in the U. S. with a global customer base of more than 48.6 million, managing loans totaling more than $53.2 billion. Through its pioneering information technology efforts, Capital One is an acknowledged leader in the financial services industry. The path to leadership at Capital One is based on performance with little thought given to time with the company or chronological age. Both co-founders of the company had no practical experience within the financial services industry when they started their journey and were both in their early forties when they became Chief Executive Officer and President.

The U. S. Air Force culture is traditionally viewed as hierarchical and concentrated on military rank based on time and tenure for leadership. However, as the youngest military service (55 years old) when compared to the Navy, Army, and Marines, the U.S. Air Force had to fight for its independence as a separate service. As a result, it has a reputation as a maverick with an entrepreneurial spirit and is noted for attracting individuals similarly described (Stead, 2003).

The study concluded for corporate executives, business acumen is noted as a skilled characteristic, whereas managing diversity is a challenge. For the military, diversity is a non-issue, whereas work-life balance is a challenge. The study further concluded training and development programs in both groups compared here could be enhanced through the further exploration of characteristics of great leadership as well as best practices across organizations.

Rachel Patrice Brophy wrote a thesis in 2004 entitled *Developing Quality Leadership: A Comparison of Leadership Styles in Academic and Corporate*
Environments. The study defines leadership as it pertains to organizational effectiveness and identifies how such effectiveness impacts organizational culture, as well as the behaviors and relationships of the leaders and subordinates within these cultures. Leadership is one of the most popular topics of the 21st century. Leadership research continues to produce groundbreaking attempts to redefine this complex subject. The academic environment was defined as a workplace setting found at a university-level educational institution. The corporate environment was defined as a setting within a corporation or other business-type organization.

Leadership is commonly considered a process involving influence and goal attainment within a group setting. To emphasize significant characteristics of leadership, the case study performed by Rachel Brophy focuses on two bedrock conceptions of leadership styles: 1) relational (people-oriented) leadership and 2) task-oriented leadership. Relational leadership represents an innovative direction in the current modernized workforce, where increased workloads and responsibilities as well as an environment with diverse culture and gender exist. Task-oriented principles, focused on the projects or goals at hand, are also very important. Task-oriented principles are equally significant, as they are essential components that assist in determining organizational success or failure.

In this study comparing the academic and corporate environment, the following aspects of leadership were reviewed:

1. Organizational culture
2. Leader behavior
3. Subordinate behavior
4. Leader-subordinate relations

5. Relational and task-oriented leadership styles

6. Situational leadership

The study included aspects of leadership common in both working environments. The study concluded there are more similarities than differences in these environments, with regard to working relationships, task accomplishment, and desire of leaders to succeed. Essentially, the study posits creating better leaders will result from proper development and training, eventually leading to successful and collaborative work environments.

According to Goleman, a leader’s singular job is to get results. But even with all the leadership training programs and “expert” advice available, effective leadership still eludes many people and organizations. One reason, says Goleman, is that such experts offer advice based on inference, experience, and instinct, not on quantitative data. Drawing on research of more than 3,000 executives, Goleman explored which precise leadership behaviors yield positive results. The research indicated that leaders who get the best results don’t rely on just one leadership style; they use most of the styles in any given week (Goleman, 2000).

Each generation entering and working within organizations differs from the previous one in terms of education, values, aspirations, work attitudes, and view of the world. The generation born between 1946 and 1964, the so-called “Baby Boomers,” or “new values workers,” present a radically different worker profile in corporations to the so-called “pre-boomers” born between 1909 and 1945. In terms of numbers, the Boomers dominate the nation’s workforce (Mitchell, 1998).
In order to investigate possible age differences in organizational leadership behavior, a diverse sample of younger (25 to 35 years old) and older (45 to 55 years old) mid-level North American department and unit managers (n=1,280) matched for industry, job function, and gender were compared on 22 leadership behaviors and 3 effectiveness measures. A second study compared younger (25 to 35 years old) and older (45 to 55 years old) North American division heads and vice presidents (n=254) using identical procedures. In each study, numerous age differences in both leadership behaviors and measures of effectiveness were obtained.

In this study conducted by Robert I. Kabacoff and Ronald W. Stoffey, 22 leadership practices were measured across various functional organizations and age groups. In comparing younger and older leaders, numerous differences in both leadership behaviors and ratings of effectiveness were obtained. These differences were also fairly consistent across organizational levels. The results suggest, compared with younger leaders, older leaders are more likely to study problems in light of past practices in order to ensure predictability, and minimize risk. To a lesser degree, younger leaders feel more comfortable in fast changing environments and are more willing to take risks and consider new approaches. Older leaders are rated higher than younger leaders on maintaining an in-depth knowledge of their field and emphasizing this knowledge to study problems and issues. Bosses saw older department managers as lower on strategic thinking and long-range planning than their younger counterparts.

Some of the most striking differences are in the area of achieving results. Younger leaders were described as more likely to seek out positions of authority, taking charge, and leading the efforts of others. They were described as more likely to push vigorously
to achieve results in an assertive and competitive manner than their older counterparts. They were also described as more likely to adopt a strong orientation toward achievement, holding high expectations for themselves and others (Kabacoff & Stoffey, 2001).

The study of leadership and age is important for several reasons. Organizations are not necessarily changing the guard, but missing it. As the result of dwindling numbers of new entrants within the workforce and older workers remaining employed longer, multigenerational cohorts will be working side by side in various work and leadership roles (Cufaude & Riemersma, 1999). The mixing of cross-generations is also due to the increase of flattened organizational structures, in which boundaries once separating “senior” staff from “junior” staff are now more fluid. Further, due to the complexity of leading in today’s dynamic and fast paced global economy, leadership is unlikely to be the exclusive domain of a single individual. Top leadership teams comprised of multigenerational members will be the norm (Ernst, 2000).

The demand for quality leadership talent far surpasses the supply. The ideal leader will need a broader range of job experiences than were required in the past because the world of work is moving at a faster pace and is more challenging than before, particularly as the world develops into a global economy. The past decades of organizational downsizing reduced the possibilities of having an abundance of talent for leadership roles in an organization. As organizations downsized, they became flatter and expended fewer resources on the development of current and future leaders. In many organizations, succession-planning systems were abandoned. Now there are fewer managers willing to make the sacrifices needed at the higher levels of management, and the Generation Xers
have less organizational commitment and interest in leadership roles than the Baby Boomers (Byham, Smith, & Pease, 2001).

The challenge facing organizations is to find ways of using and valuing the unique contributions of both younger and older leaders. Organizations need change agents, but also individuals who can help to maintain the corporation’s past learning. They need high achieving individuals who will drive production. At the same time, they need to develop their talent pool through a process of mentoring. During times of crisis, both innovative risk taking and a calm approach valuing past wisdom is needed. There is room for both.

Talentkeepers Corporation studied more than 40,000 workers and 350 organizations, and verified that what employees want in a leader is someone whom they can trust, who treats them fairly and as individuals, and who shows care and concern for them. (Taylor, 2004). Talentkeepers’ extensive survey found critical leadership competencies that help retain high potential talented employees. The competencies are identified as follows: trust builder, esteem builder, communicator, climate builder, flexibility expert, talent developer and coach, high-performance builder, retention expert, retention monitor, and talent finder.

The Talentkeepers survey asked individuals to think of the best boss he or she has had:

Most workers, particularly those on the front line where it really matters, feel as though leaders have ultimate power in the workplace—power over pay, promotions, favorable assignments, job security, and more. People satisfaction,
productivity, and engagement hinge most on someone who treats them fairly and whom they can trust. (Taylor, 2004, p. 44)

John Kotter, in *The Heart of Change* (2002), described a helpful model for understanding the role of the leader in managing change. Each stage acknowledges a key principle identified by Kotter relating to people’s response and approach to change, in which people see, feel, and then change. Kotter’s eight-step change model can be summarized as follows:

1. *Increase urgency* – inspire people to move, make objectives real and relevant.
2. *Build the guiding team* – get the right people in place with the right emotional commitment, and the right mix of skills and levels.
3. *Get the vision right* – get the team to establish a simple vision and strategy, focus on emotional and creative aspects necessary to drive service and efficiency.
4. *Communicate for buy-in* – Involve as many people as possible, communicate the essentials, simply, and to appeal and respond to people’s needs. De-clutter communications – make technology work for you rather than against.
5. *Empower action* – Remove obstacles, enable constructive feedback and lots of support from leaders – reward and recognize progress and achievements.

8. *Make Change stick* – Reinforce the value of successful change via recruitment, promotion, and new change leaders. Weave change into culture.

High potential employees, people identified as being able and willing to ascend the corporate ladder, have often been managed and developed through fast-track programs. Professor Paul Iles of the Liverpool Business School at Liverpool John Moores University, U.K., wrote a paper entitled “Sustainable High-potential Career Development: A Resource-based View” (1997). Rather than exchanging security and upward mobility for loyalty and adequate performance, organizations may increasingly demand growth, development, and updated skills from high potential employees in return for flexibility and continued commitment.

The concept of sustainable leadership development recognizes all programs for high potential employees need to be re-thought in an era of constant organizational change. Those that focus on subordinate development, empowerment, coaching, and mentoring must replace programs that encourage individualism and short-term career focus.

In a recent study sponsored by Accenture, in-depth interviews with 202 specially chosen, high potential leaders from around the world were completed. The participants were all seen as being at the very top when compared to colleagues at their level in their organizations. These future leaders were asked to describe how the ideal leader of the future would differ from the leader of the past. The results were clear. The ideal leader of
the future was seen as a person skilled at building partnerships inside and outside the organization. While those skills were seen as being somewhat important in the past, they were seen as being critically important for the future (Goldsmith, 2002).

In this study, Marshall Goldsmith focused on the importance of leaders building partnerships inside and outside of their organizations. The study found almost all of the high-potential leaders interviewed saw themselves as “free agents,” not “employees” in the traditional sense. They saw the leader of the future as a person equipped to build “win-win” relationships and be sensitive to their needs for personal growth and development.

As Peter Drucker noted, one of the great challenges for the leader of the future is the management of knowledge workers. Knowledge workers know more about what they are doing than their manager does (Drucker, 2001). The high-potential people they interviewed painted a very clear picture. The leaders of the future will have to be good partners. If they are not great partners, they won’t have great people.

Other than the CEO of an organization, every leader in the organization has a manager. The changing role of leadership will mean that the relationship between managers and direct reports will need to change. Many leaders of the future will be operating more like the managing director of an office in a consulting firm than the operator of an independent small business.

Goldsmith (2002, p. 75) concludes,

[A]s companies become larger and more global, there has been a shift from buying stand-alone products to buying integrated solutions.” One reason for this shift is economy of scale. Huge retail corporations like Home Depot or Wal-Mart
do not want to deal with thousands of vendors. They would prefer to work with fewer vendors capable of delivering not only products, but are customized services to meet their needs. A second reason is the convergence of technology. Many customers now want “network solutions,” not just hardware and software. The study found, as the supplier’s relationship with their customers continues to change, leaders from supply organizations would need to become more like partners and less like salespeople. The high-potential participants in this study noticed a shift toward building long-term customer relationships, not just achieving short-term sales. This change means suppliers need to develop a much deeper understanding of the customers’ total business. In short, they will need to act like partners.

*Linkage, Inc. Study*

In 1998, Linkage, Inc., and Warren Bennis collaborated in completing a study of more than 350 companies involved with leadership development and found that nearly all respondents recognized the need to develop stronger leaders, yet less than 44% had a formal process for developing high-potential employees.

Successful companies build their high-potential employees using structured leadership development systems. Some programs make a difference including all of three critical components: formal training, 360-degree feedback, and most importantly, exposure to senior executives including mentoring programs.

Linkage defined a six-phase approach to leadership development (Giber, Carter, & Goldsmith, 2000).

1. *Business diagnosis*: Business drivers and rationale for creating leadership system are identified
2. **Assessment:** Delivered to both individuals and teams

3. **Program design:** Example- using a learning journal to help participants apply learning

4. **Implementation:** Creating action-learning teams to tackle significant business problems

5. **On-the-job support:** Transferring learning to the job

6. **Evaluation:** The point at which the organization can gain insight into how to revise and strengthen a program

Abbott Laboratories and Bose Corporation were two of the companies participating in the study. The following represents some of the key findings from the Linkage study.

**Abbott Laboratories.**

Abbott Laboratories, founded in 1888, is one of the most diversified healthcare manufacturers in the world. Three of Abbott’s four core businesses – diagnostics, hospital products, nutritional, and pharmaceuticals – are number one or two competitors in their fields. Abbott’s success is the result of its strategy, execution, and culture. Among these sources of competitiveness are cultural elements that heavily influence leadership development thinking and efforts.

Abbott identified target audiences for leadership development and aligned leadership competencies to support the audience. They developed the Management Challenge for senior functional managers capable of benefiting from broader general management perspective. Next, they developed the Leadership Development Program for
senior leaders preparing for executive positions. The competencies identified for each program are as follows.

1. Management Challenge - Understanding and implementation strategy,
   Building the team, My leadership

2. Leadership Development Program (LDP) – Developing vision and strategy,
   Building the organization, Leadership or the Leader’s role

The purpose of redesigning Abbott’s leadership development program was to improve its ability to prepare its leaders for a rapidly changing environment. In the eyes of the participants, their managers, and the organization at large, much progress has been made, yet much more progress still needs to occur (Giber, Carter, & Goldsmith, 2000).

_The Bose Corporation_

Founded in 1964 by Dr. Amar G. Bose, professor of electrical engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Bose Corporation creates products combining high technology with simplicity and small size to create the best possible sound systems.

Development of leaders at Bose became a strategic imperative. Bose developed the Center for Organization Development and Education (CODE) and was given the responsibility for engineering the leadership imperative. Since its entrepreneurial beginnings 35 years ago, Bose Corporation has demonstrated product and market leadership best exemplified in its strong brand image. Bose had entered into a new threshold of growth and opportunity that holds many new challenges. They recognized they must continue to build on its past by reaffirming its founding values, renewing its core competencies, and developing new skills and practices to take advantage of emerging business opportunities.
Bose recognized when it comes to program design, one approach does not fit all. CODE developed the Strategic Leadership Development System geared toward providing a leadership pipeline.

**Strategic Leadership Development System**

1. **First Line Development**: Leadership for Action (LFA) program is aimed at managers who have received little or no formal training in leadership. The participants can be new to management or have been in the role for several years. The overall goal is to search for leadership talent and promote it through ongoing developmental opportunities.

2. **Middle Manager Development**: Leadership Excellence is designed at reinforcing better business practices.

3. **Senior-Level Development**: Leadership Institute represents the higher end of the leadership pipeline. Institute members are proposed by their department head and approved by the chairman of the company. The Institute invites selected individuals to broaden their perspectives and develop new ways of thinking.

Bose found designing and implementing a leadership development system places visible long-term demands upon the organization and many, if not most, of its major contributors. The course could not be chartered unless it mapped directly to the company’s strategic business issues. The experience at Bose centered on the vision, ideas and definition of talented people throughout the organization allowing participants to constantly check the course of their leadership efforts (Giber, Carter, & Goldsmith, 2000).
GILD 2008 is based upon the three-pronged learning approach from the Linkage, Inc. High Impact Leadership Model™ including executive coaching, leadership presentations and facilitated peer learning groups. This paper will focus on the effectiveness of those three elements as well as the overall effectiveness of GILD 2008 as an executive education initiative.

Executive Coaching

The history of executive coaching is difficult to track because it has only recently received attention in the literature. In reviewing the literature, it is unclear when exactly executive coaching first began. Only brief statements or speculations regarding the possible origins of executive coaching have been provided (Kampa-Kolesch & Anderson 2001).

Tobias (1996) suggested the term executive coaching came into the business world in the late 1980s and was used because coaching sounded less threatening than other types of interventions. He argued coaching by psychologists is a mere repackaging of practices once done under the umbrella of consultation and counseling. The “developmental counseling” conducted by RHR International since the 1940s would seem to support this observation contended that, for the past decade, consultation geared toward managers and senior leaders in business organizations has increasingly been referred to as executive coaching. He believed consultants began practicing executive coaching when they gained access to the leaders of organizations.

Judge and Cowell (1997) stated the widespread adoption of executive coaching by consulting firms began around 1990, though they acknowledged there was a sprinkling of offerings prior to 1990. As an intervention, they believe executive coaching is currently
moving from the introductory to the growth phase. One industrial organizational psychologist practicing in the field of executive coaching and interviewed by Harris (1999) briefly mentioned three phases in the history of executive coaching.

According to this psychologist, the first phase occurred between the years of 1950 and 1979, when a few professionals used a blend of organizational development and psychological techniques in working with executives. During the middle period (1980-1994), an increase in professionalism occurred as well as the beginning of standardized services, though a full standardization has not yet occurred. In the current period (1995-present), there has been an increase in publications and the establishment of a professional organization for coaching: the Professional and Personal Coaches Association, more recently known as the International Coach Federation (ICF). It is also in the current period that the demand for executive coaching has reached an all-time high.

Even though executive coaching has been dated by some as far back as the 1940s, many agree that it has only more recently come to fruition (Kilburg 1996a, 1996b; Olesen, 1996). Even though earlier periods existed, little is known about what was then practiced. It has only been during the most recent period when the practice of executive coaching began to be addressed in the literature. Within the most recent period, there has also been a push for a more complete standardization of services and research on the effectiveness of executive coaching.

Kilburg (2000, p. 67) proposed the following definition of executive coaching:

[A] helping relationship formed between a client who has managerial authority and responsibility in an organization and a consultant who uses a wide variety of behavioral techniques and methods to help the client achieve a mutually identified
set of goals to improve his or her professional performance and personal satisfaction and, consequently, to improve the effectiveness of the client's organization within a formally defined coaching agreement.

On the basis of our current review of the literature, this definition appears to represent a fairly comprehensive view of what has been discussed and how executive coaching has been defined.

The ICF's definition of executive coaching is as follows (2000, p. 2-3):

Executive coaching is a facilitative one-to-one, mutually designed relationship between a professional coach and a key contributor who has a powerful position in the organization. This relationship occurs in areas of business, government, not-for-profit, and educational organizations where there are multiple stakeholders and organizational sponsorship for the coach or coaching group. The coaching is contracted for the benefit of a client who is accountable for highly complex decisions with [a] wide scope of impact on the organization and industry as a whole. The direction of the coaching is usually focused on organizational performance or development, but may also have a personal component as well. The results produced from this relationship are observable and measurable.

Executive coaching as a consultation intervention received increased attention in literature in the past decade. Executive coaching has been proposed as an intervention aimed toward helping executives improve their performance and consequently the performances of the overall organization. Whether or not it does what it proposes, however, remains largely unknown because of the lack of empirical studies. Some also
question whether executive coaching is just another fad in the long list of fads that have occurred in consultation and business.

Sheila Kampa-Kolesch and Mary Z. Anderson (2001) provide an insight into the history of executive coaching. They completed a comprehensive review of literature with regard to the origin of executive coaching. There are a number of reasons provided in the practice literature for the increased use of executive coaching. Other high-performance individuals - athletes, performers, and public speakers - have used coaching as a means of improving their performance. Other reasons for the increased use of coaching include the rapidly changing global economy necessitating continued development, the lack of opportunities provided executives for growth, the realization by business when poor executive leadership can lead to financial ruin, and the recognition of interpersonal skills key to effectively managing oneself and those in a company.

Although a myriad of approaches to executive coaching have been proposed, there is considerable overlap among them. For example, there appears to be agreement regarding the stages of executive coaching: relationship building, assessment, intervention, follow-up, and evaluation. These stages are typically consistent with most consultation interventions. There is also agreement regarding the desirable assessment techniques and instrumentation, including 360-degree feedback questionnaires, qualitative interviews, and psychological instruments, such as personality and leadership style inventories (Brotman, Liberi, & Wasylyshyn, 1998).

Koonce (1994) believed the consumers of executive coaching are executives identified as solid performers but whose current behaviors are interfering and putting the
company at risk. A survey of leading companies conducted by *Fortune* presents a somewhat different view. According to this survey, the main consumers of executive coaching range from middle managers to CEOs or CEO contenders (Witherspoon & White, 1997). Witherspoon and White further stated coaching clients are usually valued by the company because of certain skills they possess and because they are highly motivated individuals. These clients are typically looking for ways to refine and enhance their skills in order to continue in their current positions or move up into more advanced positions.

Regarding what has been written and what is known about executive coaching, the literature seems to provide some basis for understanding the definition, purpose, process, methodologies, clients, and service providers of executive coaching. The literature also provides some limited evidence that executive coaching is effective for increasing performance, is viewed favorably by executives and has the potential to facilitate developmental change. The type of outcomes executive coaching has in the field needs further investigation.

*Executive Coaching - GILD*

Marshall Goldsmith is a consultant to over 70 CEOs of major corporations and their management teams, conducting workshops for executives, high-potential leaders, and HR professionals. Goldsmith is also the author or co-author of 22 books on leadership and coaching, including his newest best-seller, *What Got You Here Won’t Get You There*.

In his coaching, and in his presentation at GILD, Goldsmith emphasizes the importance for successful leaders to first have a realistic view of their own successes
before attempting change in them or in others. In an interview, Goldsmith bluntly states, 
“One reason that it is hard for successful people to change is that successful people, are 
(in a positive way) delusional.” Successful people, Goldsmith has found, often ascribe 
their success directly to themselves and their behaviors. Successful people, sometimes to 
their peril, believe, “I am successful. I behave this way. Therefore, I must be successful 
because I behave this way!” In reality, asserts Goldsmith, successful people may have 
achieved success in spite of their behavior! (Goldsmith, 2007, p. 21)

Once leaders have a realistic perspective on their behavior – behaviors accounting 
for their success and behaviors impeding the leader from “getting there” – these leaders 
are poised to help themselves and help others break through their performance ceilings.

Dr. Goldsmith suggests executives must be coaches to develop leadership talent in 
their organizations. First, however, executives must examine their own behaviors and 
solicit input from others to gain a realistic and objective perspective – one untainted by 
the admiration and deference bestowed upon people of position and power – of their 
strengths and areas for development.

He suggests leadership development is one of the most important activities that 
executives can do to increase the long-term viability and growth of their organization. 
The deeper the leadership bench, the more stable the company and the more potential the 
company has for change and growth. Additionally, by consciously focusing on the 
development of high potential leaders, the executive – and the company – is more likely 
to retain this talent.

He offers the higher individuals advance in the organization, it becomes 
increasingly less likely someone will tell them their behaviors are inhibiting their
continued success. Due to our inaccurate self-perceptions, we may be leaving damaged relationships in our wake without even knowing it.

In an interview, Dr. Goldsmith (GILD, 2008) summarized the challenge facing successful people as it relates to coaching:

The whole area of coaching is about improving. Coaching used to be perceived as something you did to “fix” poor performers. I think coaching should also be used to help top performers get even better! Executives being coached should not just say, “I guess I should get better at that.” They have to answer the question, “If I get better at this key behavior, is it going to make a real difference in the company?”

Dr. Goldsmith suggests the secret to a successful change – and the secret to a successful coaching – is to pick the one behavior to make the biggest positive difference in your life. Talk to the most important people in your life and involve them in helping you change that behavior. Ask them to give you ideas for the future. Listen to their ideas. Then follow up with them on a regular basis. If you do this, no matter how successful you currently are, you can get better!

In addition to helping the already successful leader achieve breakthrough performance personally, Marshall Goldsmith’s eight-step approach for behavioral coaching enhances the leader’s ability to coach and interact with their employees. His approach allows leaders to determine the desired behavior of someone in their position, to interact with their stakeholders to get opinions and feedback on their performance and expectations, and to repeat the process to achieve specific goals and for continued
growth. In doing so, Goldsmith tackles the “delusion” and creates an environment safe for constructive criticism – Goldsmith calls it feedforward – and development.

Feedforward

Goldsmith believes there is a fundamental problem with all types of feedback, it focuses on the past, on what has already occurred – not on the infinite variety of opportunities happening in the future. As such, feedback can be limited and static, as opposed to expansive and dynamic.

Feedforward Guidelines and Activity

1. Pick one behavior you would like to change. Change in this behavior should make a significant, positive difference in your life.

2. Describe this behavior to randomly selected fellow participants. This is done in one-on-one dialogues. It can be done quite simply, such as, “I want to be a better listener.”

3. Ask for feedforward – for suggestions for the future to help you achieve a positive change in you selected behavior. If participants have worked together in the past, they are not allowed to give any feedback about the past. They are only allowed to give ideas for the future.

4. Listen attentively to the suggestions and take notes. Do not comment on the suggestions in any way; don’t even make positive judgmental statements, such as, “That’s a good idea.”

5. Thank the other participants for their suggestions.

6. Ask the other person what they would like to change.
7. Provide feedforward – as many suggestions as you can provide in one minute aimed at helping the other person change.

8. Say, “You are welcome,” when thanked for your suggestions.

9. The entire process of both giving and receiving feedforward usually takes about two minutes.

10. Find another participant and keep repeating the process until the exercise is stopped – which will be after you’ve talked to five partners.

The Eight Steps of Behavioral Coaching

The following steps outline Goldsmith’s behavioral coaching process. Every coach in his network has to agree to implement the following steps. If the coach follows these basic steps, individuals almost always get better!

1. Involve the leaders being coached in determining the desired behavior in their leadership roles. Leaders cannot be expected to change behavior if they don’t have a clear understanding of what desired behavior looks like. The people we coach (in agreement with their managers) work with to determine desired leadership behavior. Example: What are you looking to be coached on?

2. Involve the leaders being coached in determining key stakeholders. There are two major reasons why people deny the validity of feedback: wrong items or wrong raters. By having our clients and their managers agree on the desired behaviors and key stakeholders in advance, we help ensure their buy-in to the process. Example: Who is the most impacted if you make a change? How will you gain their support?
3. Collect feedback. Dr. Goldsmith personally interviews all key stakeholders. However, traditional 360-degree feedback can work very well. In either case, feedback is critical. It is impossible to get evaluated on changed behavior if there is not agreement on what behavior to change! Example: What do they say about you in this area?

4. Reach agreement on key behaviors for change. As I have become experienced, my approach has become more experienced, my approach has become simpler and more focused. Dr. Goldsmith generally recommends picking only one to two key areas for behavioral change with each individual. This helps ensure maximum attention to the most important behavior. My clients and their managers agree on the desired behavior for change. This ensures the coach will not spend a year working with an individual on the wrong thing! Example: What specific thing will you focus on? Why is that important? What is the cost/benefit of changing in that area?

5. Have the individual to be coached respond to key stakeholders. The individual being reviewed should talk with each key stakeholder and collect additional feedforward suggestions on how to improve the key areas targeted for improvement. In responding, the person being coached should keep the conversation positive, simple, and focused. When mistakes have been made in the past, it is generally a good idea to apologize and ask for help in changing the future. I suggest that my clients listen to stakeholder suggestions and not judge the suggestions. Example: What suggestions do you have for improvement?
6. Review what has been learned with clients and help them develop action plans. As was stated earlier, those coached have to agree to the basic steps in the process. On the other hand, outside of the basic steps, all of the other ideas that Dr. Goldsmith shares with those he coaches are suggestions. He asks them to come back with plans of what they want to do. Example: What specific steps will you take?

7. Develop an ongoing follow-up process. Ongoing follow-up should be very efficient and focused. Questions such as, “Based on my behavior last month, what ideas do you have for me next month?” can keep a focus on the future. Within six months, conduct a two- to six-item mini survey with key stakeholders. They should be asked whether the individual has become more or less effective in the area targeted for improvement. Example: How will we follow up and help you keep focused? What is likely to get in the way? When will we meet again?

8. Review results and start again. If the person being coached has taken the process seriously, stakeholders almost invariably report improvement. Build on that success by repeating the process for the next 12 to 18 months. This type of follow-up will assure continued progress on initial goals and uncover additional areas for improvement. Stakeholders will appreciate the follow-up. No one minds filling out a focused, two- to six-item questionnaire, if they see positive results. The person being coached will benefit from ongoing, targeted steps to improve performance. Example: Congratulations! What’s next?
In the ancient French language, a coach was “a vehicle to transport people.” Today’s leader is a coach-partner helping to transport people to higher levels of personal and professional fulfillment. Leaders partner with employees and teammates to help them develop career capabilities, the skills and knowledge necessary to succeed in the world of business. In addition, truly successful leader-partner-coaches help others develop life skills, such as learning and working productively with the broadcast diversity of peoples and cultures (Segil, Goldsmith, & Belasco, 2003).

James Belasco writes in Partnering – The New Face of Leadership that there are five techniques to be a successful partner-leader-coach and co-conspirator in the growth and development of people (2003).

1. *Focus on progress, not perfection.* No one’s perfect. Just get over it and get on with it! Many successful partner-coaches use the Weight Watchers approach. Weight Watchers is not about making people feel bad about being overweight. It’s about helping people feel good about losing weight. Like Weight Watchers, partner-coaches “weigh in” the people they work with and praise the heck out of those who have achieved their goal. They then help those who didn’t realize their expectation figure out what they can do to be more successful next time.

2. *Create opportunities for people in practice.* Partner-coaches do much more than ask questions or make suggestions. Partnering-coaching is an active, engaging role. They are in the people growing business. It takes practice, lots and lots of practice, to develop new skills, capabilities and attitudes.
3. **Continue to raise the bar.** First-time skiers don’t fly down the slope. It takes a great deal of practice to ski. A good partner-coach knows you can’t promise immediate rides down the big hill after the first lesson. Incremental steps after successful experiences are the only way to achieve mastery of any skill. Successful coaching partners acknowledge current achievements, while raising the bar for future performance.

4. **Encourage visits to excellence in action and help apply the lessons.** It’s hard to imagine what excellent performance really looks like, particularly when you have never seen or experienced it. It’s like describing lobsters to someone who’s never seen or experienced them. Seasoned partner-coached encourage people to experience lobster and excellence in other areas of their lives.

5. **Be the emotional bridge to the future.** It’s very difficult to make the trip to tomorrow when it requires giving up the comforts of today. People generally know what’s expected today. Today may not be everything they really want, but it’s easier to complain about today than to take steps toward the future. After all, the future is totally uncertain.

In the past, the ability of an executive leader to think, understand, and work within the global environment was not nearly as important as it is today. This need for a relatively new set of characteristics has been brought to the forefront by the dramatic increases in global trade and integrated global technology, such as e-commerce. This is not confined to leaders working within the global environment. Domestic “networked” leaders running organizations with multiregional locations across same nation states, will
be impacted by the same issues as a “global” leader, yet on a scale that emphasizes state regulations and intrastate laws.

Leadership Presentations

Leadership presentations at executive education programs are designed to address the learning needs of the participants as their needs shift from functional knowledge to strategic leadership and organizational change (Conger & Xin, 2000). As companies focus on finding new sources of competitive advantage and accelerating an organization’s adoption of them, there is a far greater emphasis on strategy, leadership, and organizational change as course content.

The leadership presentations represent a key piece of the Linkage, Inc. High Impact Leadership Model™. They are ingrained mental, social, and emotional capabilities and behaviors, formed and reformed over the span of a lifetime. During the GILD experience, participants were exposed to learning sessions led by world-renowned teachers and leaders, providing insight and guidance for improving core competencies, strategic leadership, and organizational change (GILD, 2008).

Creating the Organization

Tom Peters spoke at GILD 2008. He has degrees in civil engineering from Cornell University (B.C.E., M.C.E.) and in business from Stanford University (M.B.A., Ph.D.) He served in the U. S. Navy from 1966 to 1970, he made two deployments in Vietnam (as a Navy Seabee), and he survived a tour in the Pentagon. He also served as a senior White House drug abuse advisor from 1973 to 1974. Mr. Peters is a Fellow of the International Academy of Management, the World Productivity Association, the

Tom Peters and Robert Waterman wrote *In Search of Excellence* in 1982. The book was hailed as one of the most useful business books written in decades. In 2003, the authors looked back on the two decades since they had published the book. To their delight, many people embraced the book, believing the authors got it right. The authors continue to believe that the best-run organizations continue to use these eight basic principles to stay ahead of the competition:

1. A bias for action: A preference for doing something – anything – rather than sending a question through cycles and cycles of analyses and committee reports.
2. Staying close to the customer: Learning his preferences and catering to them.
3. Autonomy and entrepreneurship: Breaking the corporation into small companies and encouraging them to think independently and competitively.
4. Productivity through people: Creating in all employees the awareness their best efforts are essential and they will share in the rewards of the company’s success.
5. Hands-on, value driven, insisting that executives keep in touch with the firm’s essential business.
6. Stick to the knitting: Remain with the business the company knows best.
7. Simple form, lean staff: Few administrative layers, few people at the upper levels.
8. Simultaneous loose-tight priorities: Fostering a climate dedicated to the central values of the company combined with tolerance for all employees who accept those values.

Peters believes the skill with which excellent companies develop their people recalls a conflict he mentioned in his presentation at GILD: our basic need for security versus the need to stick out. Excellent companies offer meaning as well as money. They give their employees a mission as well as a sense of purpose. Every man becomes a pioneer, an experimenter, a leader. The institution provides guiding belief and creates a sense of excitement, a sense of being a part of the best, a sense of producing something of quality that is valued. In this way the institution draws out the best from each employee.

*Building a Culture of Innovation*

Companies have long engaged in head-to-head competition in search of sustained, profitable growth. They have fought for competitive advantage, battled over market share, and struggled for differentiation. Yet in today’s overcrowded industries, competing head-on results in nothing but a bloody “red ocean” of rivals fighting over a shrinking profit pool. W. Chan Kim and Renee Mauborgne contend that, while most companies compete within such red oceans, this strategy is increasingly unlikely to create profitable growth in the future.

Renee Mauborgne presented at GILD 2008. She is the INSEAD Distinguished Fellow and is professor of strategy and management at INSEAD in Fontainebleau, France, and Fellow of the World Economic Forum. She has published numerous articles on strategy and managing the multinational, found in *Academy of Management Journal, Management Science, Organization Science, Strategic Management Journal, Harvard
Business Review, Sloan Management Review, and others. Her Harvard Business Review articles are worldwide best sellers. Her research has been featured in The Economist, The Conference Board, and many other publications. She is also founder of the Value Innovation Network (VIN), a global community of practice on the Value Innovation family of concepts, and a board member of the Value Innovation Action Tank (VIAT) in Singapore (Kim & Maubargne, 2005).

In the book Blue Ocean Strategy (Kim & Mauborgne, 2005), the authors review the great success of Cirque du Soleil. The authors suggest, to understand what Cirque du Soleil has achieved, imagine a market universe composed of two sorts of oceans: red oceans and blue oceans. Red oceans represent all the industries in existence today. This is the known market space. Blue oceans denote all the industries not in existence today. This is the unknown market space.

In the red oceans, industry boundaries are defined and accepted, and the competitive rules of the game are known. Here companies try to outperform their rivals to grab a greater share of existing demand. As the market space gets crowded, prospects for profits and growth are reduced. Products become commodities, and cutthroat competition turns the red ocean bloody.

Blue oceans in contrast are defined by untapped market space, demand creation, and the opportunity for highly profitable growth. Although some blue oceans are created well beyond existing industry boundaries, most are created from within red oceans by expanding existing industry boundaries, as the rules of the game are waiting to be set.
Table 1

*Red and Blue Ocean Strategies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Red Ocean Strategy</th>
<th>Blue Ocean Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compete in existing market space</td>
<td>Create uncontested market space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beat the competition</td>
<td>Make the competition irrelevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploit existing demand</td>
<td>Create and capture new demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make the value-cost trade-off</td>
<td>Break the value-cost trade-off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align the whole-system of a form’s</td>
<td>Align the whole system of a form’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities with its strategic choice</td>
<td>activities in pursuit of differentiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of differentiation of low cost</td>
<td>and low cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discipline of the Results – Oriented Leader

Mauborgne suggests that great companies and great leaders distinguish themselves by consistently executing against their plans, whether those plans are for priority initiatives, critical projects and deliverables, or fixes to recurring problems. In such organizations, managers take a disciplined approach to ensuring that the work gets done.

Discipline 1: Have a Clear Picture

Results-oriented leaders process an accurate, fact-based understanding of the business, the results they are accountable for, and the resources available to them.

Results-oriented leaders: stay up-to-date on their business and its context, know clearly what they are expected to contribute to the business, possess a clear-eyed knowledge of their own guiding principles, strengths, and weaknesses in obtaining results, have an accurate assessment of each team member’s capabilities, and base their
implementation plans on a clear understanding of limits on available resources (i.e., time, budget, equipment).

**Discipline 2: Focus on Priorities**

Results-oriented leaders devote themselves and their team to a manageable number of priority goals of high strategic value. They work to keep the connection clear between work results and customer requirements, reviewing and realigning priorities as needed.

Results-oriented leaders: devote at least 80% of their time to the top 20% of their priorities, focus their team’s energy on key targets, focus themselves and their team on outputs/results, not tasks, ensure their team sees the connection between their work and customer needs, and are rigorous in deploying the right people in the right place doing the right work.

**Discipline 3: Secure Commitment**

Result-oriented leaders take a disciplined approach to enlisting others in carrying out priorities. They secure work agreements through a process of involvement, clear communication of deliverables, delegation, and follow-up.

Results-oriented leaders: ensure agreements are informed, explicit, and concrete, assess the level of personal commitment and strive to leverage it, monitor progress and guarantee follow-through throughout the life of important projects, hold others accountable for their results, and provide clear, meaningful consequences for meeting and not meeting commitments.
Discipline 4: Accelerate the Pace

Results-oriented leaders use a variety of means to regulate the work environment in order to generate overall activity and productive output. Through practices, policies, and personal example, they seek to increase the level of energy and the pace of the work, creating a dynamic workplace that is energetic, not frenetic.

Results-oriented leaders: create competition by identifying enemies and challengers, drive decision making and accountability down to the lowest possible level, develop contingency plans for potential breakdowns and barriers to major deliverables, strive for an optimal balance between perfection and speed, and maintain a conscious balance between pushing for results and relieving the pressure so that they and their team have energy for the long-term

Discipline 5: Create an Achievement Ethic

Results-oriented leaders consciously shape an environment characterized by an ambitious drive for high achievement and a passion for winning together. They adopt and adapt structures, systems, and practices that enable innate initiative, energy, learning, and creativity to be directed toward productive, strategic ends.

Results oriented leaders: insist on ownership and accountability, set goals with enough stretch to generate a productive sense of challenge and creativity, cultivate a stimulating and constructive work climate that fosters superior performance, ensure their team captures and shares lessons learned to improve future execution, and keep a compelling and inspired sense of core purpose present and alive

Mauborgne contends that creating blue oceans is not a static achievement but a dynamic process. Once a company creates a blue ocean and its powerful performance
consequences are known, sooner or later imitators appear on the horizon. The question is, how soon or late will they come? Put differently, how easy or difficult is blue ocean strategy to imitate? As the company and its imitators succeed and expand the blue ocean, more companies eventually jump in. This raises a related question: When should a company reach out to create another blue ocean? (Kim & Mauborgne, 2005). Because blue and red oceans have always coexisted, however, practical reality demands that companies succeed in both oceans and maintain the leadership capable to master the strategies for both.

*Emotional Intelligence*

Tim Sanders is the former chief solutions officer at Yahoo and the best-selling author of *Love is the Killer App*. Sanders spoke at GILD 2008 about emotional intelligence, the capability of understanding and mastering your own emotions and those of others, in a way that instills confidence – a balance between perception and emotional maturity.

According to Sanders, technology has revolutionized our landscape. Before the information revolution, business changed gradually and business models became antiquated even more slowly. The value progression evolved over decades and double decades. You could go to college, get an M.B.A., and work for 40 years, and your pure on-the-job knowledge stayed relevant. Relationships were for the most part geo-bound, and only a handful of people comprised your entire business network.

Yesterday is history. Forget about today, because tomorrow is upon us, and to succeed in tomorrow’s workplace, you need a killer application. (What’s a killer app?
There’s no standard definition, but basically it’s an excellent new category in its field. It soon becomes so popular that it devastates the original business model.

What is the application? Simply put: *Love is the killer app.* Love is a point of differentiation in business and will separate us from our competitors just as world-class distance runners separate themselves from the rest of the pack trailing behind them (Sanders, 2002).

Sander’s believes that this isn’t just a feel-good message he senses audiences want to hear. He believes the most important new trend in business is the downfall of the barracudas, sharks, and piranhas, and the ascendancy of nice, smart people because they are what he calls lovecats. He believes that the best general definition is in the noted philosopher and writer Milton Mayeroff’s 1972 book *On Caring*: “Love is the selfless promotion of the growth of the other” (Sanders 2002 p. 12). When you are able to help others grow to become the best people they can be, you are being loving and you, too, grow.

Love in the business world is not some sacrificial process where we must all love in the new economy. Every member of a team depends on every other member to contribute. Sanders suggest we can’t afford to take on people who will sink our value boat. So the definition of love must be modified to guarantee what it means not only to you, but to all the people who populating our business world. He defines *love business* as the act of intelligently and sensibly sharing your intangibles with your business partners. He defines *intangibles* as our knowledge, our network, and our compassion.
By *knowledge*, he means everything you have learned and everything you continue to learn. Knowledge represents all you have picked up while doing your job, and all that you have taught yourself by reading every moment that you can find the time.

By *network*, he means your entire web of relationships. In the 21st century, our success will be based on the people we know. Everyone in our address book is a potential partner for every person we meet. Everyone can fit somewhere in our ever-expanding business universe.

By *compassion*, he means that personal quality machines can never possess – the human ability to reach out with warmth, whether through eye contact, physical touch, or words. The ability to show compassion is paramount to human happiness in any situation, whether at work or at home. You can’t love a computer or a software program or even a book as you can love another person. Sanders believes that sometimes we just need a human.

*Emotional intelligence* has been identified as a powerful combination of self-management skills and the ability to work with others. Emotional intelligence may be the factor distinguishing the outstanding leader from the merely adequate (Goleman, 1998). Daniel Goleman identified five components of emotional intelligence in his article in the *Harvard Business Review*. They are self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skill.

Most large companies today have employed trained psychologists to develop what are known as *competency models* to aid them in identifying, training, and promoting likely stars in their organization. Goleman analyzed competency models from 188 companies; most were large and global, like Lucent Technologies and British Airways.
To create some of the competency models, psychologists asked senior managers at the companies to identify the capabilities exhibited by the organization’s most outstanding leaders. The senior managers were extensively interviewed and tested, and their capabilities were compared. When Goleman analyzed all of the data, he found dramatic results. Cognitive skills such as big-picture thinking and long-term vision were particularly important. When he calculated the ratio of technical skills, IQ, and emotional intelligence as ingredients of excellent performance, emotional intelligence proved to be twice as important as the others for jobs at all levels. Moreover, his analysis showed emotional intelligence played an increasingly important role at the highest levels of the company, where differences in technical skills are of negligible importance (Goleman, 1996).

The study revealed a strong relationship between superior performing leaders and emotional competence, suggesting the social, emotional, and relational competency commonly referred to as emotional intelligence is a distinguishing factor in leadership performance. Six competencies were found to distinguish leaders: self-confidence, achievement orientation, initiative, leadership, influence, and change catalyst.

Dr. Annie McKee coauthored two groundbreaking books on leadership, *Primal Leadership* with Daniel Goleman and Richard Boyatzis (2002), and *Resonant Leadership* (2005). In *Resonant Leadership*, Dr. McKee offers that most people understand what a leader is supposed to do. They know what the job entails: how to scan the environment, build strategy, organize, execute, and manage resources to get the job done. Far fewer people understand how to lead: how to mobilize energy in people, teams, and other
groups; how to increase productivity while also releasing people’s talent, creativity, and resilience; how to build a resonant culture that call for everyone’s best.

Dr. Mckee believes significant and sustainable change occurs only when people engage in a process of intentional change. The process is really a series of discoveries about oneself: one’s hopes, dreams, current situation, plans and supportive relationships to help along the way. She identified the following steps to realizing Intentional Change: (McKee, Boyatzis, & Johnston, 2008):

1. When we really want to change and develop, we need to first realize or reconnect with what is most important to us and who we are. This gives us the energy and the motivation to look closely at what is currently working for us and what is getting in the way.

2. To spark the desire and energy for change, we need to imagine and articulate an Ideal Self: who could I be if I were at my very best, living and working effectively, fully, and happily?

3. After we have discovered our Ideal Self and Personal Vision, we need to have a clear sense of our Real Self: who we are today, our strengths and weaknesses, and how to influence others.

4. The next discovery is the creation of a plan to address gaps between the real and the ideal and to build on our current strengths. Often we need to learn new skills or expose ourselves to different situations in order to achieve our dreams. Getting from the real to the ideal requires a plan.
5. We need to experiment and practice. Long-lasting behavioral change happens only when people have opportunities to try new behaviors and develop new habits in relatively safe and nonjudgmental environments.

Leaders have the opportunity to make big gains and big mistakes. They impact many people in teams, institutions, and communities. Leaders can make a difference when they chose to reach for their personal best, to inspire people, to call them to action, and to reach for a brighter future.

Dr. McKee believes none of this happens by accident. Change - real and sustained change - happens when we have the courage to reach for our dreams and recognize we might not achieve those dreams unless we change how we are going about leadership and life. She suggests we begin the journey.

A study was conducted with 358 managers across the Johnson & Johnson Consumer & Personal Care Group globally, to assess if there are specific leadership competencies distinguishing high performers from average performers. Kathleen Cavallo, Psy.D., conducted the study entitled, “Emotional Competence and Leadership Excellence at Johnson & Johnson: The Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Study” (Cavallo, 2000).

Johnson & Johnson leadership has long been committed to leadership education and development. The leadership decided to fund a study to assess the importance of emotional intelligence in leadership success across the Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies. Specifically, the project involved more than 1,400 employees in 37 countries, set out to determine if the emotional, social and relational competencies
identified by Goleman and other emotional intelligence theorists did in fact distinguish high performing leaders at Johnson & Johnson.

The study design was centered around a 183-question multi-rater survey and was a blend of the Johnson & Johnson leadership competency model, the Standards of Leadership (SOL), and the Emotional Competency Inventory (ECI) based on the work of Daniel Goleman. The Standards of Leadership contained a traditional set of managerial and leadership competencies, built around the Johnson & Johnson credo, embodying the company’s orienting business philosophy towards responsibility, integrity, and ethical behavior. The SOL core competencies include the following: drives business results, promotes innovation, manages complexity, customer focus, develops others, builds partnerships, fosters change, and lives the credo values.

Three hundred and fifty eight managers were randomly selected. Participants were 55% male, 45% female, and regionally distributed as follows: North America, 40%; Europe, 25%; Asia, Africa, and Middle East, 20%; and Latin America, 15%. Participants were required to have a minimum of two years in a management position with Johnson & Johnson, and fluency in English.

The study at Johnson & Johnson supports the position that emotional competence differentiates successful leaders. High performing managers were seen to possess significantly higher levels of self-awareness, self-management and capability, social skills, and organizational savvy; all considered part of emotional competency. The results of the study suggest the importance of incorporating emotional intelligence content in executive education programs.
Peer Learning – GILD

At GILD 2008 participants were provided a safe and open environment to share leadership and work challenges, further synthesizing the learning through honest, practical feedback and peer input. The learning teams were facilitator-led, peer teams of 15–18 participants gathering each day to foster various organizations throughout the world. Through these learning teams, GILD participants expand their network with executive level peers from various organizations throughout the world.

This paper reviews the concepts of peer learning in education and business. The concepts are blended as one at GILD 2008, as participants join together to share with each other in a cooperative executive education-learning environment.

Peer Learning Teams – In Education

Professor Matthew C. E. Gwee from the Department of Pharmacology and Medical Education Unit, Faculty of Medicine, University of Singapore wrote an article titled “Peer Learning: Enhancing Student Learning Outcomes” in 2003. Professor Gwee suggests the use of instructional strategies require students to be more actively involved in the learning process is now strongly advocated for primary, secondary, and tertiary education. Peer learning provides a positive learning strategy (Gwee, 2003).

Peer learning essentially refers to students learning with and from each other as fellow learners without any implied authority to any individual, based on the tenet “Students learn a great deal by explaining their ideas to others and by participating in activities in which they can learn from their peers” (Boud, 2001, p. 1-17).
Reliance on the traditional lecture as the main mode of student learning has been criticized as: molding students into passive recipients of information transmitted by the teacher and making them highly dependent on teachers for much of their learning needs; promoting rote learning involving mainly memorization, recall, and regurgitation of facts; and acquiring abundant inert knowledge often difficult to apply in the work environment, whereas “What matters…is not just what students know but what they can do with what they know. *What’s at stake is the capacity to perform, to put what one knows into practice*” (Gwee 2003, p. 1).

Today, information technology such as computer programs, databases, and the Internet has provided students with opportunities to learn without requiring a teacher to relay information, thereby necessitating a shift in paradigm from the highly teacher-centered to learner-centered education (i.e., peer learning) in which students are expected to take greater initiative and responsibility to manage more of their own learning and educational/personal development (Gwee, 2003).

In peer learning, students construct their own meaning and understanding of what they need to learn. Essentially, students are involved in searching for, collecting, analyzing, evaluating, integrating, and applying information to complete an assignment or solve a problem. Thus, students engage themselves intellectually, emotionally, and socially in “constructive conversation” and learn by talking and questioning each other’s views and reaching consensus or dissent (Boud, 1999).

Peer learning is optimized when incorporated as an integral component of a curriculum, paying special attention to the following:
Creating a conducive learning environment: Students must build mutual respect for and trust and confidence in one another. Peer learning can be further enhanced if the “environment of mutual help…continues over time and beyond the classroom” (Boud, 2001, p. 1-17). Thus, students are individually and collectively accountable for optimizing their own learning and achievements.

Learning in small collaborative groups: Many of the key elements for effective peer learning are often incorporated in the design of small collaborative learning groups, and “research shows students who engage in collaborative learning and group study perform better academically, persist longer, feel better about the educational experience, and have enhanced self-esteem” (Landis, 2000, p. 23).

In addition to content knowledge acquisition, peer learning, especially in small collaborative groups, nurtures and fosters the development of: self-directed learning skills, and thus lays the foundation for life-long continuing self-education; critical thinking and problem-solving skills; communication, interpersonal and teamwork skills; and learning through self, peer assessment and critical reflection.

Peer learning also strongly motivates learning often attributed to the fun and joy of learning in small groups. The outcomes of peer learning ultimately depend on the design strategy, outcome objectives of the course, facilitating skills of the teacher, and the commitment of students and teachers.

In conclusion, peer learning is learner-centered education transcending content knowledge acquisition. Peer learning optimizes student learning outcomes and provides a more holistic, value-added, and quality-enhancing education better preparing students for the needs of the workforce in this millennium.
Professor Alice Christudason from the Department of Real Estate, School of Design and Environment, University of Singapore, indicates many institutions of learning now promote instructional methods involving “active” learning present opportunities to discuss issues, explain their viewpoints, and engage in cooperative learning by working in teams on problems and projects. Peer learning is a form of cooperative learning and enhances the value of student-student interaction resulting in various advantageous learning outcomes (Christudason, 2003).

To realize the benefits of peer learning, teachers must provide what is referred to as intellectual scaffolding. Thus, teachers prime students by selecting discussion topics all students are likely to have some relevant knowledge of; they also raise questions/issues prompting students towards more sophisticated levels of thinking. In addition, collaborative processes are devised to get all group members to participate meaningfully.

To facilitate successful peer learning, teachers may choose from an array of strategies:

*Buzz Groups:* A large group of students is subdivided into smaller groups of 4–5 students to consider the issues surrounding a problem. After about 20 minutes of discussion, one member of each sub-group presents the findings of the sub-group to the whole group.

*Affinity Groups:* Groups of four to five students are each assigned particular tasks to work on outside of formal contact time. At the next formal meeting with the teacher, the sub-group, or a group representative, presents the sub-group’s findings to the whole tutorial group.
**Solution and Critic Groups:** One sub-group is assigned a discussion topic for a tutorial and the other groups constitute “critics” who observe, offer comments, and evaluate the sub-group’s presentation.

**Teach-Write-Discuss:** At the end of a unit of instruction, students have to answer short questions and justify their answers. After working on the questions individually, students compare their answers with each other’s. A whole-class discussion subsequently examines the array of answers that still seem justifiable and the reasons for their validity.

Critique sessions, role-play, debates, case studies, and integrated projects are other exciting and effective teaching strategies stirring students’ enthusiasm and encouraging peer learning. Students thus have diverse opportunities to experience in a reasonably safe and unconstrained context (while perhaps being evaluated by another group and/or the teacher), reactions to complex and real problems they may face later in their careers as an individual and in the group.

For peer learning to be effective, the teacher must ensure the entire group experiences positive interdependence, face-to-face interaction, group processing, and individual and group accountability. *Positive interdependence* emphasizes the importance and uniqueness of each group member’s efforts while important cognitive activities and interpersonal dynamics are quietly at work. As students communicate with one another, they inevitably assume leadership roles, acquire conflict-managing skills, discuss and clarify concepts, and unravel the complexities of human relationships within a given context; this process enhances their learning outcomes. Thus, students’ learning extends far beyond the written word and even the given task.
However, peer learning may encourage the presence of “freeloaders,” team members who fail to fulfill their team responsibilities but are awarded for assignments or presentations the same (high) grade as their more responsible teammates. Freeloading may be minimized by using peer ratings to assess individual performance of team members, or conducting a post-test. There will then be two levels of accountability: the individual and the group.

Research indicates peer-learning activities typically result in team-building spirit and more supportive relationships; greater psychological well-being, social competence, communication skills and self-esteem; and higher achievement and greater productivity in terms of enhanced learning outcomes. Although peer-learning strategies are valuable tools for educators to utilize, simply placing students in groups and telling them to “work together” is not going to automatically yield results. The teacher must consciously orchestrate the learning exercise and choose the appropriate vehicle for it. Only then will students in fact engage in peer learning and reap the benefits discussed above (Christudason, 2003).

Peer Learning Teams – In Business

David Boud is Professor of Adult Education, Faculty of Education at the University of Technology, Sydney (UTS), Australia, and Heather Middleton is a research associate working with Professor Boud, on a major research project, “Uncovering Learning at Work” (Boud & Middleton, 2003).

Boud and Middleton wrote a paper to address the question of who is involved in learning in workplaces and the way in which members of workgroups learn as part of their normal work. They found learning at work constitutes a large part of the learning
undertaken by adults during their lives. Therefore formal systematic learning may be of lesser importance than informal learning. For example, Boud’s consideration of the academic profession suggests informal interactions with peers are predominate ways of learning and the impact of formal training on practice can be quite marginal. It has been argued the person who is nominally expected by organizations to foster learning in the workplace – the working supervisor – may be unable to do so effectively because of the structural constraints of their role. Hughes (2002) suggested staff could have difficulties in trusting supervisors to facilitate their learning because of supervisors’ formal role in surveillance of staff and the need for individuals to portray themselves as competent workers.

This paper addressed the question of who is involved in learning in workplaces and the ways in which members of workgroups team as part of their normal work. It draws on qualitative data from a study of multiple worksites with differentiated work within a large organization. It examines the value of the notion of communities of practice in conceptualizing workplace learning.

The focus on learning from others informed the methodological approach. The research was qualitative – employing long interviews and social network analysis as the primary instruments to draw out subjective experiences of work and learning.

The portrayal of the work groups emphasized the contextual differences between the work sites and its effect on the kind of informal learning engaged in. The experience of learning is strongly influenced by the nature of the work and the workflow of units. Nevertheless, the findings from the different groups also illustrate some commonalities in formal learning.
Three significant areas of learning are evident in the analysis of the interviews:

1. Mastery of organizational processes. These include keeping pace with revised administrative requirements and becoming competent in the use of computer-based systems or other packages necessary to undertake work-related tasks.

2. Negotiating the political. This category includes both negotiating relationships within the everyday workplace, as well as strategic positioning to ensure a successful future career path.

3. Dealing with the atypical. No set procedure or process exists. Strategies have to be created for solving problems either as individuals or as a group.

Boud and Middleton identified a range of informal learning occurring in workplaces and illustrated the complexities of such learning. There is a diverse range of people we learn from at work, very few of whom are recognized by the employing organization as people with a role in promoting learning. In a large organization, the range and diversity of communities of practice one may legitimately participate increases with seniority, and therefore the range of opportunities for informal learning increases as do the types of learning. Some learning networks manifest features of communities of practice, but others do not strongly build identity and meaning. While they have suggested some directions to be pursued in the analysis of workplace learning, the development of further conceptualizations help illuminate the processes of learning at work is needed.

**Motivating the Team**

Patrick Lencioni spoke at GILD 2008. He is the founder and president of The Table Group, Inc., a specialized management-consulting firm focused on executive team
development and organizational health. He is the author of five business books, including *The Five Dysfunctions of a Team.*

In this day and age of informational ubiquity and nanosecond change, teamwork remains the one sustainable competitive advantage that has largely been untapped.

(Lencioni, 2007, p. 1)

Much time is spent on teaching leaders to lead. Yet often followers don’t know how to follow; or, more to the point, they don’t know how to – or don’t want to – work together. If Lencioni is correct and teamwork is a competitive advantage, then it’s equally apparent companies don’t devote enough time and attention to this critical area.

It’s easy to think teamwork is natural, that people instinctively have the interpersonal skills to work together. Perhaps it was more true 150 years ago when team success, in the form of families or villages working together to raise a barn or bring in the crop, might have been rewarded. However, since the dawning of the industrial age, performance of the individual has been paramount. One gets hired on his or her individual merit. Companies hire individuals to fill specific needs and those getting hired stand alone – or walk – on their individual skills. Once hired, individuals are measured, rated against other individuals, and promoted or recognized. Successful teams may get a nominal award and a t-shirt.

Lencioni suggests even the culture is stacked against teams succeeding. In many cultures, it is the individual called out, praised, and recognized. In the United States, agrarian “team-ish” settlers stayed in the east while the rugged, brave individuals ventured westward. Legends and heroes – individuals – are idolized and worshipped. Few
stories are written about *The Committee to Expand the Tillable Soil in the Greensborough.*

Just as biologists use the short-lived fruit fly to examine heredity changes from generation to generation, it seems sociologists use software development project teams to study team performance. Perhaps it is because software development is a big deal: billions and billions of dollars are spent every year developing, enhancing, and maintaining software; or perhaps it’s because team failure is so pervasive in the software development environment.

“You look at any major report that’s ever been done in this area, it says that major projects fail, generally, because of people,” says Ira Hobbs, the Treasury Department’s CIO. “Not because of the lack of dollars or the lack of clarity in the vision. But in terms of people managing what they’re doing” (McCormick, 2005).

Many leaders have been schooled in the ways of strategy and vision, yet few recognize when the engine of the company – teams of individuals – aren’t performing effectively or efficiently. While strategy and vision are key to company and team success, teams fail for a variety of other reasons: people don’t trust each other, they are afraid of conflict within the team, they aren’t committed, and they aren’t held accountable for individual and team results. In short, the engine burns up for lack of effective lubrication. The engine seizes and production halts, or the engine loses power and limps along, unable to carry even its own weight.

Teamwork has become increasingly important, and complicated, over the past few years. As organizational hierarchy has flattened, more work is being done by increasingly fewer people – and more teams of people. As technology allows us to connect to more
and more distant team members, the technology can mask team dysfunction and even give the illusion of team effectiveness.

In his book, *The Five Dysfunctions of a Team*, Patrick Lencioni states ineffective teams demonstrate one or more of these dysfunctions:

1. *Absence of trust.* The fear of being vulnerable with team members prevents the building of trust within the team.

2. *Fear of conflict.* The desire to preserve artificial harmony stifles the occurrence of productive, ideological conflict.

3. *Lack of commitment.* The lack of clarity and/or the fear of being wrong prevent team members from making decisions in a timely and definitive way.

4. *Avoidance of accountability.* The need to avoid interpersonal discomfort prevents team members from holding one another accountable for their behaviors.

5. *Inattention to results.* The desire for individual credit erodes the focus on collective success.

Effective teams, he believes, know how to prevent or overcome these dysfunctions. Moreover, effective teams recognize the significant and continuous effort required to overcome cultural and organizational pressures working against their team effectiveness.

Lencioni suggests, like it or not, all teams are potentially dysfunctional. This is inevitable because they are made up of fallible, imperfect human beings. From the basketball court to the executive suite, politics and confusion are more the rule than the exception. However, facing dysfunction and focusing on teamwork is particularly critical
at the top of an organization because the executive team sets the tone for how all employees work with one another.

A former client, the founder of a billion dollar company, best expressed the power of teamwork when he told Lencioni, “If you could get all the people in the organization rowing in the same direction, you could dominate any industry, in any market, against any competition, at any time” (Lencioni, 2002, p. vii). Lencioni suggests, counter to conventional wisdom, the causes of dysfunction are both identifiable and curable. However, they don’t die easily. Making a team functional and cohesive requires levels of courage and discipline many groups cannot seem to muster.

To begin improving your team and to better understand the level of dysfunction you are facing, Lencioni believes you should ask yourself these simple questions:

1. Do team members openly and readily disclose their opinions?
2. Are team meetings compelling and productive?
3. Does the team come to decisions quickly and avoid getting bogged down by consensus?
4. Do team members confront one another about their shortcomings?
5. Do team members sacrifice their own interests for the good of the team?

Although no team is perfect and even the best teams sometimes struggle with one or more of these issues, the finest organizations constantly work to ensure that their answers are “Yes.” If you answered “No” to many of these questions, your team may need some work.
According to Lencioni, the first step toward reducing politics and confusion within your team is to understand there are five dysfunctions to contend with and address each, one by one.

Chapter Summary

In the history of Man it has been only recently, the 1800s, that management and leadership development has been studied. Once the interest in management developed, the interest in developing management and leadership skills began to grow. Rapidly changing business and competitive intensity has created an increasing need for leadership at all levels of an organization. Corporations today are more anxious than ever to develop leaders to get them through the turbulent times ahead.

The demand for leaders far surpasses the supply. The ideal leader will need a broader range of job experiences than the leader of the past. As organizations downsize, they have reduced the resources spent on current and future leaders. There are now fewer managers willing to make the sacrifices needed at the higher levels of management. The study of leadership and age is important. The mixing of generations will be the norm. Generation Xers and Yers will need to take on leadership responsibilities side-by-side with Baby Boomers.

GILD 2008 was based upon the three-pronged learning approach from the Linkage, Inc. High Impact Leadership Model™, including executive coaching, leadership presentations and facilitated peer learning groups. The literature seems to indicate that executive coaching is effective for increasing performance and is viewed favorably by executives. Leadership presentations address the learning needs of the participants as their needs shift from functional knowledge to strategic leadership. At GILD 2008, peer-
learning teams provided a safe and open environment to share leadership and work challenges with executive level peers from organizations throughout the world. These three approaches to learning have been identified as key pieces of an effective executive education initiative.

Executive education will continue to play a prominent role in leadership development initiatives. Leadership competencies remain a core dimension of leadership development in most organizations. Leadership competencies need to correspond to the organization’s strategy and business model. Effective leadership development ties directly to an organization’s key business imperatives. Much of what successful organizations do with regard to leadership development is not new. However, it is mostly about doing the best practice consistently and with excellence every time.
Chapter Three

Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to examine the effectiveness of the Global Institute for Leadership Development – GILD 2008. Linkage, Inc. developed an evaluation inventory, GEI, to measure the effectiveness of the GILD program. Chapter 3 presents the methodology used to select the participants, development of the evaluation inventory, data collection procedures, confidentiality, study reliability and validity, and data analysis. Using the secondary dataset provided by Linkage, analysis of current literature, and GILD’s content, four areas were selected for investigation. The following research questions were posed for the study.

RQ1: Have the format and structure of The Global Institute for Leadership Development – GILD met the executive education needs of the participants from around the world?

RQ2: To what extent have the leadership presentations given by the GILD faculty impacted the approach to your leadership challenges?

RQ 3: To what degree did the one-on-one executive coaching sessions allow you to develop a better understanding of your leadership skills?

RQ 4: To what degree did the peer learning teams enhance your learning experience and allow you to apply the learning to your specific leadership needs?
Research Design

A mixed methodology was selected for the study and included both quantitative and qualitative questions. Mixed methods studies pose potential design issues and concerns. The choice of sampling procedure may frame the evaluation and imply the importance of one method over another. Most researchers have argued that synthesizing the results of different methods is problematic because they serve different purposes. Qualitative research was used to explore and quantitative research was used to confirm. In this study a mixed methodology was selected recognizing some questions were more appropriately addressed by quantitative methods and others were more suited for qualitative strategies.

Mixed methods strategies are less well known than either the quantitative or qualitative approaches. The concept of mixing different methods originated in 1959 when Campbell and Fiske used multi-methods to study validity of psychological traits. They encouraged others to employ their multi-method matrix to examine multiple approaches to data collection. This prompted others to mix methods, and observations and interviews (qualitative data) were combined with traditional surveys (quantitative data) (Creswell, 2008).

Mixed methods research is an approach to inquiry combining or associating both qualitative and quantitative forms. It involves philosophical assumptions, the use of qualitative and quantitative approaches, and the mixing of both approaches in a study. Thus, it was more than simply collecting and analyzing both kinds of data. It also involves the use of both approaches in tandem so the overall strength of a study is greater than either qualitative or quantitative research (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007).
Study Participants

Linkage, Inc. marketed GILD 2008 in a number of ways: direct marketing (brochure paper campaigns and e-marketing), using both an in-house list of potential participants and outside contacts. Other methods of marketing the GILD conference included telemarketing, word of mouth by GILD alumni, the GILD website, webinar conducted with GILD faculty, and marketing at other Linkage programs and workshops. (L. Qiu, personal communication, March 24, 2009). Corporate executives such as Chief Executive Officers, Chief Operating Officers, Chief Financial Officers, Vice Presidents, General Managers, Directors, Managers, and Supervisors of for-profit and not-for-profit organizations were targeted as possible attendees for the 2008 conference. Participants from 18 countries attended GILD 2008.

Study participants volunteered to complete the evaluation. Studies indicate volunteers differ from non-volunteers in important ways. In 1991, Rosenthal and Rusnow concluded volunteers in general tend to be better educated, a higher social class, more intelligent, more sociable, more unconventional, less authoritarian, less conforming, more altruistic, and more extroverted than non-volunteers. These characteristics could affect the results to lead to conclusions different than if a probability sample was used (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). Data was collected to reflect the preferences of all of the designated participants of GILD 2008 who responded to the evaluation.

Evaluation Instrument

Linkage, Inc. created the evaluation inventory (see Appendix A) through a collaborative effort of advisors and expert researchers. A four point forced choice Likert scale was used as the response scale. Responses were – “Strongly Agree” (4), “Agree“
(3), “Disagree” (2), “Strongly Disagree” (1). Constructs addressed by the GILD survey included executive coaching, learning teams, and faculty presenters. The Likert scale was applied to general questions, with regard to executive coaching, learning teams and faculty presentations, and other specific parts of GILD 2008. Open-ended questions addressed the participant’s perception of what they learned and what could be improved in future GILD sessions. Demographic information was requested to enable grouping and comparisons, including gender, age, country of origin and highest level of education, current leadership position, and work discipline.

The GEI was designed based upon a review of literature as well as other program evaluations. The foundation of GILD is the High Impact Leadership Model™, an established leadership competency model co-developed by Linkage and Warren Bennis (GILD Brochure, 2008). The result of an in-depth longitudinal study, the model identifies key competencies, skills, and responsibility areas perceived to differentiate superior leaders from average leaders. The entire GILD curriculum is focused on the accelerated development of these leadership differentiators. GILD utilized a three-pronged learning approach emphasizing executive coaching; peer learning teams and faculty presenters. The GEI consists of a three-page instrument with a total of 52 questions focused on the following key areas.

Executive Coaching

Executive coaching is a facilitative one-to-one, mutually designed relationship between a professional coach and a key contributor with a powerful position in the organization. This relationship occurs in areas of business, government, not-for-profit, and educational organizations where there are multiple stakeholders and organizational
sponsorship for the coach or coaching group. The coaching is contracted for the benefit of a client who is accountable for highly complex decisions with a wide scope of impact on the organization and industry as a whole. There were nine items in the executive coaching subscale utilizing the four point Likert response scale. Sample items included: executive coaching helped me develop goals for my leadership responsibilities and executive coaching helped me define my leadership challenges.

Learning Teams

Learning teams are led by a facilitator-and peer teams gather each day to foster critical introspection, discovery, and open exchange with fellow leaders with similar experiences and scope of responsibility. Through these learning teams, participants expand their network with executive level peers from organizations throughout the world. The seven items in the learning team scale used a four point Likert response scale and included items such as learning teams helped me address my specific leadership needs and learning teams peers provided valuable input.

Faculty Presenters

Faculty presenters items asked about the effectiveness of leader/faculty presenters at GILD. Leadership competencies are ingrained mental, social and emotional capabilities and behaviors formed and reformed over the span of a lifetime. During the GILD experience, participants were exposed to learning sessions led by world-renowned teachers and leaders providing insight and guidance for improving core competencies. There were seven items in the faculty presenter scale using the four point Likert response scale and included items such as faculty presenters inspired new ways of personal thinking and faculty presenters presented usable ideas for leadership.
The GEI also included several open-ended items. These items were used to collect more personal observations and perceptions of GILD attendees. GILD participants were asked what one thing they learned at GILD would put to use in their leadership position immediately, what changes they would make in their leadership behaviors over the next six months as a result of attending GILD, and what was their objective in attending GILD. Open-ended questions also asked participants what they thought would make GILD more useful in the future. They were asked what they would change, retain, or add to the GILD program. Open-ended questions were a key part of the evaluation and asked the participants what they would retain, change and add to future GILD sessions.

The evaluation instrument included questions to identify demographic information. The questions asked participants to identify their gender, actual current age, country of origin, education level, level of responsibility within their organization, and work discipline.

Pilot Survey

A pilot survey was conducted by Linkage, Inc. with members of a bank, each of whom had participated in a prior GILD conference (Appendix B). The pilot survey was administered in September 2008. Pilot participants were asked to review the evaluation inventory and write comments on the document. The six pilot survey participants were asked to review the survey based on several points: clarity, ease of understanding, face validity, and relevance of the items to GILD content. Comments and suggestions were considered before the final version of the evaluation inventory was completed. Minor changes to the instruction for administration of the GILD 2008 survey were made as a result of the pilot survey responses. Comments indicated the GEI captured the facets of
the GILD program and appropriate comments were incorporated into the final version of the survey.

Data Collection Procedures

Linkage, Inc. developed the evaluation inventory, GEI, and made the initial collection of the results. The data used for this study was a secondary dataset. A secondary analysis is defined as the analysis and reanalysis of an existing database. The evaluation data was provided by Linkage and is considered a secondary data set.

The GEI was administered by Linkage on the final day of GILD 2008. The GILD program director met with the peer learning team leaders on the morning of the last day of the conference to review the process for administering the GEI. Packets had been prepared for each team leader containing the GILD program evaluation letter (Appendix C), the consent form (Appendix D), GEI (Appendix A), instructions for administering the GILD 2008 survey (Appendix E), and tickets for a prize drawing. GILD attendees completed the evaluation inventory during their final peer learning team meeting. The peer learning team leaders collected the signed consent forms, and completed surveys were placed in manila envelopes and returned to the program administrator. The envelopes were then mailed to an independent researcher working with Linkage.

A convenience sample was used on the basis of accessibility of the attendees. It was convenient to use the attendees as a group of subjects for the study. While this type of sample makes it easier to conduct the research, there was an important limitation: there is no precise way of generalizing from the sample to any type of population. The generalizability of the findings was limited to the characteristics of the subjects. Although
the study was a convenience sample, important information was gathered with regard to GILD 2008 as an effective executive education program.

Statistical Analysis

The study utilized a non-experimental descriptive method of inquiry to characterize the data. The purpose of most descriptive research is limited to characterizing something as it is. For example: What is the perception of GILD participants with regard to the effectiveness of the executive coaching sessions? Did peer learning teams help the GILD participants’ address their specific leadership needs?

Descriptive statistics (frequency, mean, standard deviation) were used as a fundamental tool to summarize data and were useful in interpreting the results of the quantitative research. The quantitative research relied heavily on numbers in reporting results, sampling, and providing estimates of instrument reliability and validity. It was useful to get an idea of the typical or average score or observation in addition to knowing the frequency distribution. This study identified the mean or average response to each evaluation question. The mean scores were listed from highest to lowest to create a rank order distribution. Scale scores were created for executive coaching, learning teams, and faculty presenters by using the items in the appropriate scale and calculating mean score for each person. Survey participants, grouped by age, country of origin, and gender and mean scores on the three scales, were compared using analysis of variance. A probability level of $p=.05$ or less was used as the criteria for determining statistical significance. When there were significant differences and more than two groups as the independent variable, a Bonferroni post hoc test was used to identify how the groups differed from each other.
The qualitative phase of data collection and analysis involved reviewing response to open-ended questions. Data analysis began with the primary researcher processing the ideas and facts while collecting data. In qualitative research, developing the methods for gathering data, analyzing the data, and reporting the data are decidedly different from those for quantitative research.

Limitations

The evaluation was intended to be a comprehensive study of the GILD 2008 program; however, there were limitations to the study. This program evaluation was performed during the final peer learning session and not all GILD program attendees participated in the peer learning groups.

The peer learning team leaders administered the evaluation inventory, and this may have biased the responses of the participants. The GILD program director provided verbal instruction and information packets, including consent documents, to the peer learning team leaders early in the day on the final day of GILD 2008. There is no guarantee that the evaluation inventory documents were administered in a uniform fashion.

The primary investigator attended the GILD 2007 session. The results of the program evaluation are being filtered through the eyes of someone who attended a prior session.

The GEI was used for the first time at GILD 2008. The validity and the reliability of the GEI had not been established.
This study was limited to the perceptions of the participants. The participants were not asked to provide evidence of behavior change or improvement in their leadership capacity resulting from GILD 2008.

Because surveys are used so frequently and are adaptable to a wide range of uses, some develop the mistaken impression that surveys are easy to conduct. However, without careful development of questions, sampling procedures, and overall survey design, it is unlikely survey research methods will provide credible results.

Institutional Review Board Procedures

The initial research proposal was forwarded to and approved by the dissertation committee. This research was submitted to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for its approval. The primary researcher completed the IRB form for proposal submission including the evaluation inventory instrument, research design, data collection method, and data analysis procedures. The IRB procedures require, depending upon the level of risk of the research protocol and the participant population, either full board review, expedited, or exempt review. The IRB approved the study for an exempt review.

Summary

This chapter describes the program evaluation instrument and methodology used to interpret the results of the Global Institute for Leadership Development – GILD 2008. The results will provide Linkage, Inc. information to help them develop an even more effective executive education experience for future GILD participants. In addition, the evaluation instrument used in this study will be used as a template to critique future executive education programs.
The evaluation inventory was designed by Linkage Inc. with input from the pilot survey conducted with members of a bank. Each pilot survey participant attended a prior GILD session. Six individuals responded to the pilot, and each gave broad support to the evaluation inventory. A few comments represent the overall sentiment of the pilot group: “Well composed,” “More user friendly than prior years,” “Good blend of Likert scales and free form text entry.”

The evaluation inventory employed mixed methodology including both a quantitative and qualitative approach to the research. The evaluation inventory included 52 questions. A four point forced choice Likert scale was used as the response scale for quantitative questions. Open-ended qualitative questions were used to determine the participant’s point of view.

The interrelated information provided in chapters 1, 2, and 3 provided logical connections among the topic of the study, the research questions, relevant literature review, and the methodology. Study results are presented in chapter 4.
Chapter Four

Findings

The purpose of the study was to examine the effectiveness of the Global Institute for Leadership Development – GILD 2008 as a provider of customer executive education. This chapter is organized into three sections. The first section presents a profile of the study participants. This section includes information about the number of responses to the GILD Evaluation Inventory GEI. This section also includes the results of the study participant’s demographic information questions. The second section of the chapter provides a summary of the findings from each of the four research questions. Each research question is included in order, with a presentation of the findings from the GEI. Responses to open-ended questions are included when most relevant to support the findings. The final section of the chapter is a summary of the information presented within this chapter.

Evaluation Inventory Participant Profile

Two hundred eighty-nine people from around the world participated in GILD 2008. Sixty-one percent, or 179, completed the GEI origin. One hundred and seventy-six individuals participating in the GEI identified their gender. One hundred and thirty-one (74%) identified themselves as male. Forty-six (26%) identified themselves as female.
Table 2 represents the total number of participants identifying their age. Three age groups were identified for this study.

Table 2

*Age of GEI participants as Reported (N=176)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Reported</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ages 26-39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 40-47</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 48+</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 includes 177 GEI participants identifying their country of origin. One hundred and fourteen (67%) of the participants identified themselves as working in the US. The Other category includes participants from Germany, Brazil, Slovakia, Nigeria, France, Bermuda, Malaysia, Spain, Serbia, Belgium, Greece, Australia, Singapore, and Israel.

Table 3

*Participants by Country of Origin as Reported (N=177)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country as Reported</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey participants were asked to identify their level of education. Table 4 represents the total number of participants by education level.

Table 4

*Participants by Level of Education as Reported (N=167)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education as Reported</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>93.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey participants represented their organizations in many different roles. Each served as key decision makers within their own organization. Executives, general managers, directors, managers, and supervisors attended GILD 2008 and are identified in Table 5.

Table 5

*Participants by Level in the Organization as Reported (N=177)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Organization as Reported</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager/Supervisor</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>59.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor/Team Leader</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>94.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey participants held responsibility for diverse aspects of a business organization. Table 6 represents the total number of participants by work discipline.

Table 6

*Participants by Organization Discipline as Reported (N=171)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Discipline as Reported</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product Manager</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Profit</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measures

The internal consistency reliability for the four questions was determined.

_Evaluation Inventory Findings_

**Research Question 1**

_Have the format and structure of GILD 2008 met the executive education needs of the participants from around the world?_

Table 7 represents the GILD 2008 participant response to question 1. It should be noted that mean scores for this question ranged from 3.65 to 3.87. The mean scores indicate a positive response to this question.

Table 7

*Meeting Executive Education Needs (N = 161)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D D D A A SA SA Mean SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attending GILD was beneficial to me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1 0.50 19 11.80 141 87.60 3.87 0.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend GILD to a colleague or friend</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1 0.60 33 20.50 127 78.90 3.79 0.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILD provided return on investment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1 0.60 52 32.70 106 66.70 3.65 0.515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* SD – Strongly Disagree  
D – Disagree  
A – Agree  
SA – Strongly Agree
Six open-ended questions were included in the GEI. The questions addressed the general executive education needs of the program participants. The first of the open-ended questions is question 32. What one thing have you learned at the GILD program you will put to use in your leadership position immediately? The responses to this question were separated into nine categories or codes. There were no responses from 13 individuals, or approximately 7% of the group. Each code includes a brief definition identified in Table 8.

Table 8

*Codes for Open-ended Response – Use in your Leadership position immediately (N=181)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Incidence</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Learn</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Listen</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Goldsmith</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Teams</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>EI</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Work-life</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Invest</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Meet</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative</td>
<td></td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first three open-ended questions dealt with personal development. The premise of GILD is leaders have a commitment to themselves, their colleagues, and their
organization to maximize their own performance. Attending GILD demonstrates the commitment toward improved leadership capacity. There were one hundred and eighty-one (181) responses to question 32. The three most frequent responses were Learning to lead (45), Listen to employees (34), and Goldsmith techniques (27).

Some of the key responses to Learning to lead follow:

“The ability (my ability) to be a leader on my own right regardless of my background. I am I can, be a leader. Focus and structure around the activities I am involved in. If there is value, I will continue, no value, I will stop.”

“The dynamics of leading a team – much more structure and process needed than I was aware.”

“The work I do building relationships can positively affect a wide array of leadership “behaviors.” ‘Many things I should, could and will put to use, but the most immediate would be to be more empathetic by being empty’”

Listening to employees was the second most common response:

“The importance and value of listening, saying thank you and being respectful.”

“We should value our people as much as our customers.”

“Listening effectively is the key to leadership. I will use many of the concepts identified including communication, team building, vision, etc. But I will focus on listening to become a more effective leader.”

“I will listen more to my employees and really let them know I care.”

Some of the key responses to applying Goldsmith techniques are as follows:

“That leaders serve their employees not the other way around.”

“To say thank you & move on when I disagree.”
“Trust is the foundation of leadership.”

“How to create more meaningful communication encounters.”

“Necessity – a leader to give sense, clarity, and trust. Leaders are responsible for creating the space and providing opportunities and tools for their staff to develop to their excellence.”

Goldsmith techniques include; “feedforward” resulting in behavior change, and the eight steps in the behavioral coaching process detailed in Chapter 3. Goldsmith suggests that executives must be coaches to develop leadership talent in their organization. Goldsmith’s techniques for “feedforward” and coaching include the following: pick one behavior you would like to change, describe the behavior to a randomly selected participant, ask for feedforward, listen to suggestions, thank the other participant for the suggestion, ask the other person what they would like to change, provide feedforward, and say “You are welcome.” These techniques are some of the items detailed in the response to the first open-ended question.

The second open-ended question is question 33. What changes will you make in your leadership behaviors over the next six months as a result of attending GILD? The responses to this question were separated into 13 codes. There were no responses from 19 individuals, or approximately 10.5 % of the group. Each code includes a brief definition identified in Table 9.
### Table 9

*Codes for Open ended Response – Changes you will make over the next six months*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Incidence</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Listen</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Make</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Learn</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Ask</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Delegate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Invest</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Engage</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Deal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Tell</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative</td>
<td></td>
<td>87.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were one hundred and eighty-one (181) responses to question 33. The three most common responses were Improve listening skills (35), Encourage effective teams (28), and Make things happen (19).

*Improving listening skills* was the most common response.

“Change the way I deal with team – better listener.”
“I will try to listen more and talk less. Also I will not spend time on worthless issues.”

“Discuss my shortcomings with direct reports and listen. More active engagement with my student research group. Asking more questions of them.”

“I will listen more intently, focus on personal relationships and trust in my employees more.”

“Be better listener and more humble in giving recognition/praise to employees.”

Encourage effective teams was the second most common response.

“More effective leadership with my team, ensure they feel valued.”

“Refocus on success through enabling the team rather than directing them to do tasks.”

“I will be actively developing closer relationships with my team members.”

“Will take a stronger role to make sure we don’t fall into Lencioni’s 5 dysfunctions.”

“Improve organizational communication & develop leaders within my team.”

“Improved listening, management by walking around, team management skills and enhancing trust in management team.”

Some of the key responses to Make things happen follow.

“Strategize, organize my development plans, and better define my role. Clear expectations. I will meet with my peer team and negotiate new ways to work with one another.”

“More thoughtful, more inclusive, ensure priorities are correct.”
“Better establish measurable objectives. Provide the needed clarity for my team to perform & deliver better results.”

The third open-ended question is question 34. My objective for attending GILD was… The responses to this question were organized into seven codes. There were no responses from 19 individuals, or approximately 10.5 % of the group. Each code includes a brief definition identified in Table 10.

Table 10

*Code for Open ended Response – My objective for attending GILD was…*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Incidence</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Improve</td>
<td>Improve leadership skills</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Grow</td>
<td>Personal growth</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Add</td>
<td>Add value to teams</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Complete</td>
<td>Complete the session</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mentoring</td>
<td>Mentoring/Coaching staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. EI</td>
<td>Improve Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Work</td>
<td>Improve work-life balance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were one hundred and eighty-one (181) responses to question 34. The two most common responses were Improve leadership skills (99), and Personal growth (42). Some of the responses to *Improve leadership skills* were as follows.

“Getting influencing skills and techniques.”
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“Continued development of my leadership skills.”

“To add tools to my tool kit & better define (enhance) my leadership skills and approach.”

“To learn how to increase my leadership skills, senior voice, leading without authority.”

“To become more self aware of areas of opportunity in my own leadership behavior.”

“To spend time in self-assessment & reflection, to become a better person and leader.”

“Empower my leadership skills – to be inspired as a leader. To improve my leadership skills & competencies in order to better respond to leadership needs.”

Personal growth was the second most common response.

“Increase awareness [and] understanding on why I do what I do and other options/approaches.”

“To break the patterns that have kept me in the wrong role.”

“To recharge and to return to work with a renewed sense of purpose.”

“To update myself on latest tools/thoughts on leadership to improve myself as a leader.”

“Broaden my perspective and gain knowledge related to leadership competencies.”

While the first three open-ended questions dealt with personal development, the fourth, fifth, and final open-ended questions asked for the participants to identify specific improvements that could be made in GILD.
The fourth open-ended question is, What would you retain (from GILD 2008)? The responses from this question were separated into seven codes. There were no responses from 44 individuals, or approximately 24.3% of the group. Each code includes a brief definition identified in Table 11.

Table 11

*Codes for Open-ended questions - What would you retain?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Incidence</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Speakers</td>
<td>Retain speakers</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SLC</td>
<td>Retain Speakers/ Learning</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team leaders/Coaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. All</td>
<td>Retain all things</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Except</td>
<td>Retain all except</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Team</td>
<td>Retain learning teams</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lead</td>
<td>Retain leadership themes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Coach</td>
<td>Retain coaches</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Cumulative | 67.9 |

There were one hundred and eighty-one (181) responses to the question regarding what the participant would retain from GILD 2008. The three most common responses were Retain Speakers (42), Retain Speakers/Learning teams/Coaches (36), and Retain all things (29).

Some of the key responses to Retain speakers were as follows.

“Most speakers were exceptional. Keynote speakers that can talk to experience in specific fields. Proven track record gives credibility.”
“The set up was great, and the quality of keynote speakers was outstanding.”

“Quality of speakers is excellent overall, full days, fast paced is good.”

Retain Speakers/Learning teams/Coaches was the second most common response.

“Effective speakers, team-learning groups, executive coaching.”

“The coaching was very good. The vast majority of the speakers were excellent.”

“The personal coaching, team coaching, & the keynote speakers.”

“Most speakers were exceptional. Keynote speakers that can talk to experience in specific fields. Proven track record gives credibility.”

Some of the responses to Retain all things follow.

“All speaker, great food/beverages, outstanding variety.”

“The pace is excellent. Speakers & scope of topics was excellent.”

“You are doing it right!”

“The format is fantastic and allows for time to reflect.”

The fifth open-ended question was, What would you change (from GILD 2008)? The responses to this question were separated into eight codes. There were no responses from 40 individuals, or approximately 22.1% of the group. Each code includes a brief definition identified in Table 12.
Table 12

*Codes for the Open-ended Response – What would you change?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Incidence</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Schedule</td>
<td>Revise schedule</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Speakers</td>
<td>Ineffective Speakers</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Team</td>
<td>Learning teams – ineffective</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nothing</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coach</td>
<td>Executive Coaching – ineffective</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 360</td>
<td>Provide 360 results before GILD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Svc</td>
<td>Service inadequate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sunday</td>
<td>Do not start on Sunday</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were one hundred and eighty-one (181) responses to this question. The three most common responses were Revise schedule (48), Ineffective speakers (34), and Learning teams ineffective (29).

Selected responses to the question dealing with Revise schedule follow.

“On some sessions, offer choice of session. Informally we changed sessions, but make a formal option.”

“Length of days – too long. Need more reflection time. Some speakers not relevant.”
“Compress the schedule a little to allow for a quicker return to what we want to change. I believe this is the only way to do it. Ideally 2 days of intense sessions. 3-4 week break; 2 more days after would tend to avoid information overload.”

“Better pre-conference help, better schedule (end by 5; more specifically in group-groups). Ensure all participants are aware of all sessions so they can make the decisions on what to sit in on.”

Ineffective speakers were the second most common response:

“Drop lectures that are “selling the book” rather than transferring knowledge ineffective speakers, less speakers throughout day, ½ day of reflection or team building vs. speakers.”

“Tom Peters spun out of control and proved to lack diversity in his sphere of influence-typical for his experience; Practice what he preaches.”

“Put speakers that are not as dynamic as others earlier in the morning instead of last.” “High-grade speakers – Thomas Stewart & Yonghu Long – Good but low relative to exceptional speaker roster.”

“Some of the speakers were out of touch – maybe make their sessions workshops for the people who are infatuated with their famous reputations.”

Some of the key responses to Learning teams ineffective are as follows:

“Limit learning teams to 1.5 hr. sessions; allow more time to discuss messages from speakers and application to member’s issues.“

“Learning teams should have more time and a deeper approach (there are lots to share).” “Learning teams were too big and not specific enough to the individual.”
“Provide consistency in the learning team objectives. Some participants had less productive learning teams depending upon the coach.”

“Create more focus with case studies during the team meeting. Learning team was enjoyable but did not contribute to leadership growth.”

The sixth and final open-ended question is, What would you add (to GILD 2008)? The response to this question was separated into nine codes. There were no responses from 78 individuals, or approximately 43.1% of the group. The researcher noted for this question as well as the other open-ended questions, fewer responses were recorded, when compared to the responses to the overall GEI. The researcher suspects it is more challenging for participants to write an answer to an open-ended question as opposed to making a checkmark in a box on a Likert scale. Each code includes a brief definition identified in Table 13.
Table 13

*Code for Open-ended Response – What would you add?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Incidence</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Speaker</td>
<td>More selected speakers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shorter</td>
<td>Shorter days</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coach</td>
<td>More coaching time</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Content</td>
<td>More structured content</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reflection</td>
<td>More reflection time</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Program</td>
<td>Program materials</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Improve</td>
<td>Improve learning teams</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Team</td>
<td>Improve teams</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Nothing</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were one hundred eighty-one (181) responses to this question. The three most common responses were More selected speakers (23), Shorter days (14), and More coaching time (12).

Some of the key responses to More selected speakers follow.

“More business leaders – rather than only consultants.”

“More women and more leaders from creative industries.”

“Add additional business concept presentations to learning teams. But perhaps add new corporate speakers from Asia-China/India/Malaysia (Tun Mahaluir).”
“More focused sessions giving substance to the issues being addressed more presentations, even among emerging leader group? Multiple thanks for more targeted learning.”

Shorter days, was the second most common response.

“Another day – these are very, very full.”

“More workshops – more free time.”

“More breaks, shorten learning team mtgs.”

“Industry/role information to better develop focus network, i.e., finance, technology, etc.”

Some of the key responses to more coaching time follow.

“More individual coaching – coach just started understanding situation toward end of second hour. More 1 on 1 coaching. More time for recreation/reflection at resort. Otherwise, might as well hold at the airport Hilton.”

“More female speakers, more on diversity, more coaching time.”

“One more hour with our executive coach.”

Research Question 2

To what extent have the leadership presentations given by the GILD faculty impacted the approach to your leadership challenges?

Table 14 presents the collective responses from all GEI participants answering questions 25 through 31. A four point forced choice Likert scale was used as the response scale. Responses were “Strongly Agree” (4), “Agree” (3), “Disagree” (2), “Strongly Disagree” (1). The three questions receiving the most positive response were questions 26, 25 and 27. Faculty presenters were recognized as doing a better job on assisting
GILD 2008 participants in addressing their needs identified in these questions than they
did for addressing the leadership needs recognized in questions 29, 28, and 31. It should
be noted that the range of mean scores for all questions was 3.67 – 3.36. All mean scores
ranged between “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” indicating a positive response to the
overall faculty presenter experience.

The GILD 2008 participants from the USA ranked questions 26, 25, and 30 as
most positive, and questions 29, 28, and 31 as least positive with regard faculty
presenters. Participants from Canada rated questions 25, 26, and 27 most positively and
responded least positively to questions 30, 28, and 31. Those from other countries
identified earlier in this chapter, regarded questions 25, 30, and 26 most positively and
questions 29, 28, and 31 least positively. Participants holding a bachelor degree rated
questions 26, 25, and 29 most positively and questions 27, 28, and 31 least positively.
Those holding a masters or doctorate degree rated questions 26, 25, and 27 most
positively and questions 29, 28, and 31 with a least positive response. It should be noted
that the mean scores of all the demographic groups for this set of questions, ranged from
3.67 to 3.36. Like the scores from the overall group, the mean scores indicate a positive
response to the faculty presenters.
Table 14

*Faculty Presenters*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Presented usable ideas for leadership</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Inspired new ways of personal thinking</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Inspired innovative leadership thinking</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Challenged my current mental models of leadership</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Encouraged creative thinking about leadership problems</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Provided new ways of addressing current problems</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Articulated new strategies for business challenges</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 represents the mean scores of the groups, identified by country of origin, answering questions 25 through 31. Table 16 represents the mean scores of the groups identified by education level responding to questions 25 through 31. In both tables, very little difference is seen in the mean response to those questions.
Table 15

*Faculty Presenters - Country of Origin*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Presenters/Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>3.5523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.6682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.4709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>3.5602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16

*Faculty Presenters - Education Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Presenters/Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.5872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters/Doctorate</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.5526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>3.5664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 25 states, Faculty presenters inspired new ways of personal thinking. As noted in Table 14, participants gave this question the second highest mean score 3.65. Using post hoc tests comparison, question 25 resulted in a level of significance of .045 between country groups 1 – USA and 2 – Canada. ANOVA results – [F (2, 170) = 3.069, p= .05]. We are able to reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference between country groups with regard to response to this question.

Question 27 states, Faculty presenters inspired innovative leadership thinking. Participants gave this question the third highest mean score 3.60. Using post hoc tests comparison, question 27 resulted in a level of significance of .042 between male and
female participants. ANOVA results – [F (1, 172) = 4.198, p=.05]. We are able to reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference between male and female participants with regard to the response to this question.

There were two other questions dealing with faculty presenters worthy of attention. Participants gave Question 28, Faculty presenters provided new ways of addressing current problems, a mean score of 3.60. Using post hoc tests, question 28 resulted in a level of significance of .025 between age groups one (age 26 – 39) and three (age 48 +). ANOVA results – [F (2, 169) = 3.787, p=.05]. We are able to reject the null hypothesis, there is no difference between age group one and three with regard to the response to this question. Participants gave Question 30, Faculty presenters challenged my current mental models of leadership, a mean score of 3.59. Using post hoc tests, question 30 resulted in a level of significance of .003 between age groups one (age 26 – 39) and two (age 40 – 47). ANOVA results – [F (2, 169) = 5.865, p=.05]. We are able to reject the null hypothesis; there is no difference between age groups one and two with regard to the responses to this question.

**Research Question 3**

*To what degree did the one-on-one executive coaching sessions allow you to develop a better understanding of your leadership skills?*

Table 17 presents the collective responses from all GEI participants answering questions 9 through 17. A four point forced choice Likert scale was used as the response scale. The three questions receiving the most positive response were questions 15, 13, and 17. Executive coaches were recognized as doing a better job on assisting GILD 2008 participants in addressing their needs identified in these questions than they did for
addressing the leadership needs recognized in questions 12, 16, and 14. It should be noted that the range of mean scores for all questions was 3.56 – 3.28. All mean scores ranged between “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” indicating a positive response to the overall executive coaching experience.

There were some differences in response to these questions identified by demographic group. Male and female participants responded somewhat differently than the overall group. Male participants gave the most positive response to questions 15, 17, and 13. The questions receiving the least positive response were 12, 16, and 14. Female participants responded most positively to questions 13, 9, and 10, with the least positive response going to questions 11, 14, and 16. Age group 26-39 responded most positively to questions 15, 10, and 13 and least positively to questions 12, 14, and 16. Age group 40-47 responded in an identical fashion to age group 26-39. Age group 48 and above responded most positively to questions 17, 15, and 13. They also responded least positively to questions 12, 14, and 16. It should be noted that the mean scores of all the demographic groups for this set of questions ranged from 3.63 to 3.17. Like the scores from the overall group, the mean scores ranged between “Strongly Agree” and “Agree”, again indicating a positive response to the overall executive coaching experience.

GEI participants were asked to identify their executive coach by name in the evaluation inventory document. There were 45 executive coaches recognized in this fashion. The executive coaches were ranked based upon the evaluation responses to questions 9 - 17. Not all participants completed every question in this section. Forty-one of the 45 coaches received a rank mean score of 3.00 or better. Four executive coaches
received a 4.00 rating. The mean scores ranged from 4.00 to 2.64. The average mean score was 3.45. See Appendix F.

Participants responded to question 36, How effective were each of these components in reaching that objective? – One on one executive coaching. Participants answered using a four point forced choice Likert scale. One on one coaching was “Very Effective,” “Effective,” “Somewhat Effective,” or “Not Effective at all.” Forty-one of the 45 coaches received a rank mean score of 3.00 or better. Six executive coaches received a 4.00 rating. The mean average score was 3.15. See Appendix G.
### Table 17

**Executive Coaching**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>with my own personal development</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>become more aware of my skills as a leader</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>work effectively with my problems</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>define my leadership challenges</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>develop goals for my leadership responsibilities</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>develop my leadership improvement plan</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>develop effective ways of working with staff</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>understand the components of leadership</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>learn to model behaviors for others</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 represents the mean scores of the male and female participants answering questions 9 through 17. Table 19 represents the mean scores of the three age groups responding to questions 9 through 17. In both tables, very little difference is seen in the mean response to those questions.
Table 18

Executive Coaching - Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exec/Coach/Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3.4432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.4174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>3.4363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19

Executive Coaching – Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exec/Coach/Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 26 – 39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.3209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 40 – 47</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.4652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 40 +</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.4937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>3.4329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 4

To what degree did the peer learning teams enhance your learning experience and allow you to apply the learning to your specific leadership needs?

Table 20 presents the collective responses from all GEI participants answering questions 18 through 24. A four point forced choice Likert scale was used as the response scale. The three questions receiving the most positive response were questions 24, 20, and 19. Learning Teams were recognized as doing a better job on assisting GILD 2008 participants in addressing their needs identified in these questions than they did for
addressing the leadership needs recognized in questions 23, 22, and 18. It should be noted
the range of mean scores for all questions was 3.57 – 3.05. All mean scores ranged
between “Strongly Agree” and “Agree”.

There were few differences noted in response to these questions identified by
demographic age group. Male and female participants responded somewhat differently
than the overall group. Male participants gave the most positive response to questions 24,
20, and 19. The questions receiving the least positive response were 22, 23, and 18.
Female participants responded most positively to questions 24, 19, and 20, with the least
positive response going to questions 21, 22, and 18. Age group 26-39 responded most
positively to questions 24, 19, and 20 and least positively to questions 23, 22, and 18.
Age group 40-47 and age group 48 and above responded in an identical fashion to age
group 26-39. The mean scores of all the demographic groups for this set of questions,
ranged from 3.67 to 3.05.
Table 20

Learning Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>provided a place for open exchange of ideas</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>members worked collaboratively</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>peers provided valuable input</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>enabled reflection on personal challenges</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>applied content to business challenges</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>enabled new insight into leadership</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>helped me address my specific leadership needs</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21 represents the mean scores of the male and female participants answering questions 18 through 24. Table 22 represents the mean scores of the three age groups responding to questions 18 through 24. In both tables very little difference is seen in the mean response to those questions.

Table 21

*Learning Teams - Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Team/Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>3.3070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.5155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>3.3612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22

*Learning Teams – Age Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Team/Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 26 – 39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.2171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 40 – 47</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.3530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 40 +</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.4862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>3.3575</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 18 states, Learning teams: helped me address my specific leadership needs. As noted in Table 20, participants gave this question the lowest mean score 3.05. Using post hoc tests comparison, question 18 resulted in a level of significance of .011 between age group one (age 26 – 39) and three (age 48 +). ANOVA results – [F (2, 172)
We are able to reject the null hypothesis; there is no difference between age groups one and three with regard to the responses to this question.

Question 20 states, ‘Learning teams; members worked collaboratively.’ Participants gave this question a mean score of 3.52. Using post hoc tests comparison, question 20 resulted in a level of significance of .028 between age group one (age 26 – 39) and three (age 48 +). ANOVA results – [F (2, 172) = 3.760, p=.05]. We are able to reject the null hypothesis; there is no difference between age groups one and three with regard to the responses to this question.

Questions 21 and 22 yielded similar results. Question 21 states, ‘Learning teams enabled reflection on personal challenges.’ Participants gave this question a mean score of 3.33. Using post hoc tests comparison, question 21 resulted in a level of significance of .034 between age group one (age 26 – 39) and three (age 48 +). ANOVA results – [F (2, 172) = 4.092, p=.05]. Question 22 states, ‘Learning teams enabled new insight into leadership.’ Participants gave this question a mean score of 3.22. Using post hoc tests comparison, question 22 resulted in a level of significance of .019 between age group one and three. ANOVA results – [F (2, 172) = 3.847, p=.05]. For both questions, we are able to reject the null hypothesis, there is no difference between age group one and three.

Three questions were illustrative of the differences identified by gender. Question 19 states: ‘Learning teams peers provided valuable input.’ Using ANOVA comparison, question 19 resulted in a level of significance of .024 between male and female participants. ANOVA results – [F (2, 172) = 5.191, p=.05]. Questions 22 and 23 yielded similar results. Question 23 states, ‘Learning teams applied content to business challenges.’ Using ANOVA comparison, question 22 resulted in a level of significance of .010, and
question 23 a level of significance of .006. With regard to all three questions, we are able to reject the null hypothesis; there is no difference between gender groups.

Chapter Summary

This chapter is a summary and analysis of the data pertaining to the four research questions. The GEI was administered in October 2008. The findings include a profile of the participants based upon demographic information gathered from the evaluation instrument. Unedited comments from open-ended questions were included to provide an insight into the thoughts of the participants. A summary of the evaluation inventory, conclusions from the findings, and recommendations are presented in chapter 5.
Chapter Five

Study Overview, Conclusions and Recommendations

Chapters 1, 2, 3, and 4 of this paper contained descriptions of the purpose of the study and related research questions, the history and related literature in the field and the mixed methodology, data and findings. The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the study, discuss the findings reported in chapter 4, offer conclusions and implications of the study, present the researcher’s recommendations, and summarize the study. Chapter 5 is arranged into seven sections: an overview of the study, a discussion of the findings, conclusions of the study, implications for further research, recommendations, new knowledge and a summary of the study.

Study Overview

The researcher has worked as a manager for United States Steel Corporation for 33 years, leading various aspects of the human resources organization. For the past seven years, the researcher headed the leadership development organization for the corporation. The researcher sought to develop a better understanding of how the learning process worked and began doctoral studies in the ILEAD program at Duquesne University in 2003. The coursework and dissertation study provided an opportunity to understand more about the process of learning and the application to leadership development.
The researcher has worked with Linkage, Inc., the developer of GILD, since 2002, to address the executive education needs of United States Steel Corporation. The researcher hired Linkage, Inc. to provide executive coaching to the corporate leadership team. Linkage, Inc. conducts leadership presentations with world-renowned speakers and delivers them via satellite. The researcher contracted with Linkage, Inc. to deliver satellite presentations to the company. As a result of the positive response from those presentations, the researcher and the executive leadership team participated in GILD in 2007. The researcher and the company’s executive leadership team met with Phil Harkins, founder and CEO of Linkage, Inc., during GILD 2007 to discuss the Institute’s perceived strengths and areas for potential improvement. Following the meeting, Phil Harkins and the researcher began discussions on methods to improve GILD, leading to this study.

The purpose of this study was to evaluate how participants perceived the effectiveness of the Global Institute for Leadership Development – GILD 2008 as a provider of custom executive education. During its 12-year history, the Global Institute for Leadership Development had not yet been comprehensively evaluated. The Institute provided presenters and teachers, who have been identified as some of the best in the world. This study evaluated the effectiveness of the presenters, the executive coaching, and the learning team process. The study also identified the lessons learned from the Institute by the participants.

Linkage, Inc. created the evaluation inventory through a collaborative effort of advisors and expert researchers. A pilot survey was conducted with members of a bank, each of whom had participated in a prior GILD conference. Comments from the pilot
survey were considered before the final version on the evaluation inventory was completed.

In a competitive marketplace, executive education programs like GILD strive to be distinguished from others by providing world-class content and developing client relationships. Understanding customer needs and interests in a rapidly changing marketplace is essential to the providers of executive education. An analysis of the data from the GEI suggests that the Global Institute for Leadership Development – GILD 2008 was a success and met the executive education needs of the participants. However, the responses make it clear there is room for improvement in GILD. The responses are also illustrative of the importance of connecting participant based needs with executive education program content.

The questions for this research study were the following: (1) Have the format and structure of GILD 2008 met the executive education needs of the participants from around the world? (2) To what extent have the leadership presentations given by the GILD faculty impacted the approach to your leadership challenges? (3) To what degree did the one-on-one executive coaching sessions allow you to develop a better understanding of your leadership skills? (4) To what degree did the peer learning teams enhance your learning experience and allow you to apply the learning to your specific leadership needs? Answers to these questions are important to understanding the current state of executive education in general and the effectiveness of GILD 2008 in particular.

The four research questions provided the framework for organizing the data and interpreting participant experiences. The qualitative responses from the evaluation inventory were collected and analyzed to identify trends in responses and to find
similarities and differences within demographic groups. The analytical process was based upon immersion in the data and sorting and coding. Tables were created from the data sorting responses to individual questions. To allow for comparison, data codes were identified and applied consistently across multiple data sets for similar questions.

Survey participants, grouped by age, country of origin, gender, and mean scores for faculty presenters, executive coaching, and learning teams, were compared using analysis of variance. The level of significance was used to indicate what the chance was we were wrong in rejecting the null hypothesis. A probability level of $p = 0.05$ or less was used as the criteria for determining statistical significance. The probability level is expressed as a decimal identifies how many times out of a hundred we would be wrong in rejecting the null hypothesis.

Discussion of the Research Findings

Discussion of Findings Related to Research Question 1

RQ 1: Have the format and structure of the Global Institute for Leadership Development – GILD met the executive education needs of the participants from around the world?

The literature review recognized corporations are more anxious today than ever before to identify and develop executive talent needed to get them through the turbulent years ahead. The future success of organizations is about providing a source of in-house replacements for current leaders in order to drive cultural change and retain key talent (Barron, 2004; Covey, 2004; Kotter, 1998; McCall, 1998).

Linkage, Inc. developed the GEI. The researcher analyzed the data gathered by Linkage, Inc. to evaluate the effectiveness of GILD 2008 as a provider of custom executive education. GILD’s development framework begins with the foundation of an
ongoing, longitudinal study conducted by Warren Bennis, the “father of leadership,” and
Phil Harkins. The study isolates the leadership skills, responsibilities, and competencies
clearly differentiating superior from average leaders. These differentiators make up the
High Impact Leadership Model™ and are the focus of the entire learning experience.
This study supports the focus on leadership content through presentations, executive
coaching and peer learning teams, or leaders teaching leaders as critical aspects of
effective executive education programs as identified by Day and Halprin (2001) and

This study found leaders, from the many companies investing in GILD,
participate in order to develop their leadership capabilities and build organization culture.
The study recognized a strong positive response to the overall GILD experience and most
strongly agreed their needs were met. The study did uncover a number of items for
improvement to be discussed later in this chapter. There were some significant
differences in the responses associated with Faculty Presenters, Executive Coaches and
Learning Teams.

Discussion of Findings Related to Research Question 2

RQ 2: To what extent have the leadership presentations given by the GILD faculty
impacted the approach to your leadership challenges?

The literature review identified leadership presentations at executive education
programs address the learning needs of the participants as their needs shift from
functional knowledge to strategic leadership and organization change (Conger & Xin,
2000; Mckee, Boyatzis, & Johnston, 2008; Sanders, 2002). The researcher wanted to
identify if this was true for GILD 2008 participants.
The researcher recognized the significant difference is response from male and female participants with regard to Faculty Presenters. Linkage, Inc. distributes pre-conference surveys to GILD participants asking to identify their learning expectations for the upcoming session. The researcher suggests Linkage, Inc. review prior years survey responses by gender to identify any trends in expectations of prior years GILD participants. Trends should be identified, if any exist and shared with Faculty Presenters before their appearance at GILD. The same approach should be taken with regard to survey data accumulated and sorted by age group, and country of origin. Table 23 represents the significant differences in response related to Faculty Presenters by gender, age group and country of origin.
### Table 23

*Faculty Presenters Significant differences in Response to GEI and Action Plan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Faculty Presenters</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>Significant differences identified in responses by Male/Female participants.</td>
<td>Review current and prior years GILD pre-work survey responses by gender to identify any trends in expectations of GILD participants. Identify trends, if any exist, and review with each faculty presenter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Group</strong></td>
<td>Significant differences identified in responses by age group 26 – 39 and age group 48 +. Junior group not as supportive as senior group.</td>
<td>Review current and prior GILD pre-work survey responses from identified age groups to determine if there are different expectations with regard to speaker’s expertise and presentation content. Alert each faculty presenter of any trends identified in the pre-work survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of Origin</strong></td>
<td>Significant differences identified in responses from participants from USA and Canada.</td>
<td>Review current and prior GILD pre-work survey responses by country of origin to determine if there are different expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with regard to speaker’s expertise and presentation content. Alert each faculty presenter of any trends identified in the pre-work survey.

There were no significant differences identified in responses to the GEI by the demographic groups; level of education, level of organization or organization discipline.

Multigenerational differences in perception of individual behavior and organizational events, reflecting a unique world-view, create the potential for conflict and misunderstanding. The literature review revealed for example, baby boomers may view their pre-boomer colleagues as too fiscally and socially conservative, or unwilling to innovate and take risks. Likewise, Gen Xers may view their baby boomer counterparts as workaholic, idealistic, hierarchy-worshiping, and overly influenced by their parents’ depression mentality. Moreover, the continued presence of high level, older leaders can cause frustration and dissension among Gen Xers eager for promotion to senior level status. Conversely, diversity in the organization’s belief structure also has the potential to positively impact creative and comprehensive decision making capabilities and provide the necessary momentum for organizational change and renewal (Kabacoff & Stoffey, 2001).

In today’s organization, older and younger leaders are likely to be working together in team-oriented endeavors. A mutual understanding of the strengths and weaknesses each group brings is crucial to future success. Identifying the specific needs of each age group, and tailoring programs to fit those needs is critical in developing
effective executive education programs.

The responses to open-ended questions relating to Faculty Presenters reflect the interests of the overall GILD 2008 participant group. From the responses, the researcher suggests Linkage, Inc. balance the mix of business related and academic related speakers more heavily in favor of business related speakers. GILD hosts should announce, at the beginning of the week, the availability of books for sale by those presenters who have them. GILD hosts should ask the Faculty Presenters to focus on the content of the presentation and minimize reference to their book. GILD is an intensive one-week session. In order to maintain a high interest level amongst the participants, Faculty Presenters should be scheduled with consideration given to the normal energy level of the speaker. Linkage, Inc. should continue to scan the globe for leading women speakers and speakers bringing an international flavor to the institute. Table 24 represents the response to open-ended questions related to Faculty Presenters.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Open-ended questions</th>
<th>Selected Open-ended responses</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What would you retain?</td>
<td>Retain speakers that can talk to experience in specific fields.</td>
<td>Balance the mix of business related and academic related speakers more heavily in favor of business related speakers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would you change?</td>
<td>Drop speakers who are selling the book. Schedule speakers who are not as dynamic earlier in the day.</td>
<td>GILD hosts should announce at the beginning of the week the availability of books for presenters who have them. Request speakers to focus on the content of their presentations, not book sales. Mix speaker schedules, based not only on content, but on speaker energy level as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would you add?</td>
<td>Add more business leaders – rather than only consultants. Provide more women speakers as well as speakers from other countries.</td>
<td>Provide additional business-concept presentations connected to the objectives, identified in the pre-work of the learning teams. Identify, provide an even more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion of Findings Related to Research Question 3

RQ 3: To what degree did the one-on-one executive coaching sessions allow you to develop a better understanding of your leadership skills?

The literature review indicated there has been an increased use of executive coaching. In the last decade, high performing individuals in athletics, performers and public speakers have used coaching as a means of improving their performance. Other reasons include the rapidly changing global economy, the realization by business when poor executive leadership can lead to financial ruin, and the recognition of interpersonal skills key to effectively managing oneself and those in a company (Kampa-Kolesch & Anderson, 2001). Dr. Goldsmith suggested executives must be coaches to develop leadership talent in their organizations. To be effective, executives must first examine their own behaviors and solicit input from others to gain a realistic perspective (Goldsmith, 2007).

The responses to open-ended questions relating to Executive Coaching reflect the interests of the overall GILD 2008 participant group. From the responses the researcher suggests Linkage, Inc. continue to identify the best available executive coaches with significant business experience. GILD pre-work includes an opportunity for participants to select an executive coach based upon a review of on-line background material. The researcher suggests Linkage, Inc. arrange for a brief telephone interview with the participant and his or her executive coach to enhance the selection process. Linkage, Inc. should revise the GILD schedule to include three (3) one-hour coaching sessions. The
additional one-hour session would be used to link participant’s learning objectives to an enhanced action plan for personal improvement. Table 25 represents the response to open-ended questions related to Executive Coaching.

Table 25

*Executive Coaching Response to GEI selected Open-ended Questions and Action Plan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Open-ended questions</th>
<th>Selected Open-ended responses</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What would you retain?</strong></td>
<td>Retain executive coaches.</td>
<td>Continue to identify the best available executive coaches with significant business experience for future GILD initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The coaching is very good.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What would you change?</strong></td>
<td>Provide mechanism for executive coach and participant to connect before the first session at GILD.</td>
<td>Provide an opportunity for GILD participants to select a coach following on-line screening and a telephone interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What would you add?</strong></td>
<td>Schedule additional time with executive coaches. The coach was just beginning to understand my situation toward the end of the second hour.</td>
<td>Revise GILD schedule to provide three (3) one hour coaching sessions during the Institute. Use additional time to link participants learning objectives to an action plan for personal improvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were no significant differences identified in responses to the GEI with regard to Executive Coaching by any demographic group.

Discussion of Findings Related to Research Question 4

RQ 4: To what degree did the peer learning teams enhance your learning experience and allow you to apply the learning to your specific leadership needs?

The literature review addressed the question of who is involved in learning in workplaces and the way in which members of workgroups learn as part of their normal work (Boud & Middleton, 2003). They found learning at work constitutes a large part of the learning undertaken by adults during their lives. Therefore formal systematic learning may be of lesser importance than informal learning.

The researcher recognized the significant differences in response from male and female participants with regard to Learning Teams. Linkage, Inc. distributes pre-conference surveys to GILD participants asking to identify their learning expectations for the upcoming session. The researcher suggests Linkage, Inc. review current and prior years survey responses by gender to identify any trends in expectations of prior and current years GILD participants. Trends should be identified, if any exist and shared with Learning Team leaders before their appearance at GILD. The same approach should be taken with regard to survey data accumulated and sorted by age group. Table 26 represents the significant differences in response related to Learning Teams by gender, and age group.
Table 26

*Learning Teams Significant differences in Response to GEI and Action Plan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Learning Teams</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Significant differences identified in responses by Male/Female participants.</td>
<td>Review current and prior years GILD pre-work survey responses by gender to identify any trends in expectations of prior GILD participants. Identify trends, if any exist, and review with each learning team leader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Age Group</strong></th>
<th><strong>Learning Teams</strong></th>
<th><strong>Action Plan</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 – 39</td>
<td>Significant differences identified in responses by age group 26 – 39 and age group 48 +. Junior group not as supportive as senior group.</td>
<td>Review current and prior GILD pre-work survey responses from identified age groups to determine if there are different expectations with regard to learning teams outcomes. Alert each learning team leader of any trends identified in the pre-work survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant differences identified in responses to the GEI by the demographic groups; country of origin, level of education, level of organization or organization discipline.
The responses to open-ended questions relating to Learning Teams reflect the interests of the overall GILD 2008 participant group. From the responses the researcher suggests Linkage, Inc. continue to identify the best available Learning Team leaders possessing significant business experience. The researcher suggests Linkage, Inc. review responses to Learning Team questions in the GEI, identifying responses where the Learning Team leader did not address participant’s specific learning objectives. Time should be scheduled during the Learning Team meetings to discuss Faculty Presenter content, in order to connect topics to participant Learning Team objectives. Learning Team leaders should provide case studies to connect business concepts to team objectives. Table 27 represents the response to open-ended questions related to Learning Teams.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Open-ended questions</th>
<th>Selected Open-ended responses</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What would you retain?</td>
<td>Retain most of the learning team leaders.</td>
<td>Review responses to learning team questions identified in the GEI. Identify responses where the learning team leader did not address participant’s specific leadership needs. Review the results with the learning team leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would you change?</td>
<td>Limit learning teams to 1.5 hours to discuss messages from faculty presenters. Create more focus with case studies during the team meetings.</td>
<td>Schedule time during learning team meetings to discuss faculty presenter content and connect to learning team objectives. Add case studies to learning team discussion, reflective of learning objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would you add?</td>
<td>Add more business concept presentations to learning teams.</td>
<td>Provide case studies to connect business concepts to learning team objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the study the researcher believes leadership ability can be learned. Leaders are both born and made. Individuals at all levels of the organization have the capacity to lead. As Kouzes and Posner wrote in *The Leadership Challenge* (2002), the theory there are only a few great men and women who can lead is just plain wrong. GILD 2008 provided an example. Successful leaders from around the world, performing at many different organization levels and disciplines gathered to work on their own leadership challenges. Executive education processes are a vital part of leadership development initiatives. GILD participants revealed relationships with one’s boss, peer group and subordinates were critical to their leadership success.

**Study Conclusions**

The researcher identified these conclusions from this study, based upon the responses to the GEI evaluation inventory, including both quantitative and qualitative questions. One hundred seventy-nine individuals participated in the GEI.

The development and use of effective executive education programs is as important today, with the world-wide economic crisis, as it has ever been. The conclusions from the study include the following.

1. This researcher believes the study results reflect the strong interest in executive education. Companies continue to make investment in executive education to develop leadership skills within their organizations.

2. GEI respondents indicated they had a very positive response to the content, structure and delivery of GILD 2008. They believed attending GILD was beneficial to them, provided return on their investment, and they would recommend GILD to a colleague or friend.
3. Program participants understand the importance of improving their leadership skills.

4. Understanding the leadership needs of a diverse demographic participant group is important to crafting an effective executive education program.

5. GILD participants believed (1) learning to lead, (2) listening to employees and (3) implementing techniques offered by Marshall Goldsmith were the most apparent changes they could make in their leadership style immediately upon returning from the 2008 institute.

6. GILD participants responded (1) improving listening skills, (2) encouraging effective teams and (3) making things happen, were the most apparent changes they could make in their leadership style during the six-month period following GILD.

7. Participants responded they had a number of objectives for participating in GILD 2008. They indicated (1) improving leadership skills; (2) personal growth and (3) adding value to teams were key objectives.

8. The survey asked participants to identify what they would retain, change and add to the GILD. Participants indicated they would like to (1) retain most of the speakers, (2) revise and shorten the schedule, and (3) add selected business leaders to the list of speakers.

9. With regard to faculty presentations, participants believed the presenters (1) provided usable content, (2) inspired new ways of personal thinking and (3) provided innovative thoughts about leading organizations. Significant differences were found in responses between country groups USA and
Canada, between male and female respondents and between age group one (26 – 39) and age group 3 (48+).

10. GILD participants indicated executive coaches helped them (1) with their own development, (2) to become more aware of their skills as a leader and (3) work more effectively with others.

11. With regard to learning teams, participants believed the teams, (1) provided an opportunity for exchange of ideas. (2) Members of the teams worked collaboratively and (3) learning team peers provided valuable input as they discussed leadership challenges. Significant differences were found in responses between male and female respondents and between age group 1 (26 – 39) and age group 3 (48+).

Recommendations for Linkage, Inc.

Based upon the findings and conclusions of the study there are a number of implications specifically for Linkage, Inc., with regard to the Global Institute for Leadership Development - GILD. There was a strong positive response to the overall experience and most strongly agreed their needs were met. The study did uncover a number of items for improvement. We found the following recommendations were important.

1. Revise the schedule in order to provide more time during the week for reflection. The Institute is packed with content. The participants requested more time to absorb the concepts offered by the faculty presenters.

2. Provide an option for participants to select alternate schedules during the week. Participants were provided with a schedule to follow. An optional
schedule would provide participants with an opportunity to reflect on GILD content, conduct business and enjoy the hotel accommodations.

3. Exposure to outstanding faculty presenters is a key part of the GILD experience. Continue to utilize faculty presenters with extensive business experience. Faculty presenters provide invaluable and recognized expertise with regard to current leadership challenges. Participants emphasized the presenters identified with academic backgrounds provided lesser value.

4. Faculty presenters received a positive response from most participants. There was a significant difference in the responses from the most junior and the most senior GILD participants. The results suggest the most junior participants were not as supportive as the senior most group with regard to faculty presenters approach to current problems and innovation. Efforts should be made to ensure the audience views the content of the faculty presentations as current and relevant to all age groups.

5. GILD participants recognized the importance of their executive coaching experience as one of the most important aspects of the Institute. There are three suggestions to improve the process:
   a) Provide an opportunity for the executive coach and GILD participant to communicate before the session to judge compatibility.
   b) Provide more time at GILD for executive coaching, with longer or more frequent sessions.
   c) Retain the highest rated coaches and dismiss the lower rated coaches for future GILD sessions. See Appendix F & G.
6. Peer learning teams received a positive response from most participants.

There was a significant difference in response from the most junior and the most senior GILD participants. The results suggest the most junior participants were not as supportive as the senior most group with regard to learning teams leaders approach to working collaboratively, enabling reflection on personal challenges, and insights providing into leadership.

Efforts should be made to ensure the audience views the content of the peer learning discussions as relevant to their needs.

7. GILD participants recognized the learning team experience as one of the most important aspects of the Institute. There are three suggestions to improve the process:

   a) Reduce the size of the learning team groups to no more than 10 – 12 participants. The size of the learning team groups in GILD 2008 was 15 – 18. Participants indicated they did not have sufficient time to communicate with and learn from other team members.

   b) Provide more time at GILD for learning teams, with longer or more frequent sessions.

   c) Structure the learning team discussions (peer processing) to provide reflection on the faculty presentations for the day.

Recommendations for New Programs

Based on the study findings and the research, there are a number of implications for those considering developing and delivering a new executive education program. We found the following recommendations would be important.
1. Survey participants with regard to their learning objectives before they arrive. GILD does this. Study the data to align the program content and delivery.

2. Provide a 360-degree evaluation as a pre-work assignment. Provide a coach to work with each participant. GILD does this.

3. Include a module offering methods to improve listening skills. GILD participants identified this area most frequently as an area of need for their personal development.

4. Provide a module on improving teamwork within the organization. GILD does this. Use Patrick Lencioni’s *The Five Dysfunctions of a Team* to tell the story.

5. Schedule a module on making things happen within the organization. Provide a template as a reminder on when and how to take effective action.

The researcher has been responsible for the content, schedule and delivery of leadership development programs within his company. Experience has taught there is a fine line balance between the amount, timing and delivery of content and the amount of downtime scheduled in a leadership development program. The researcher suggests each learning group of participants and presenters is unique. Those responsible for developing and delivering leadership programs should carefully consider the best mix for their specific circumstances.

**New Knowledge**

The purpose of this study was to evaluate GILD 2008 as a provider of custom executive education. Program evaluations are not a new concept. In 1975, Donald Kirkpatrick first presented the four-level model of evaluation, quickly becoming a classic in the industry. Training departments with limited budgets often assume new programs
are effective and put dollars into the next program rather than evaluating the current program. However as senior executives demand more accountability from leadership development initiatives, interest increases in measuring and reporting results.

The researcher sought to answer the question, so what? Although the study was vital to the completion of the researcher’s doctoral program, and important to Linkage, Inc. to continue to improve GILD, the researcher wanted to determine if this study produced any new knowledge.

The researcher carefully reviewed the results of the GEI, particularly with regard to the open-ended questions. It became apparent, the consistent use of the concept of sharing ‘my leadership story’ would provide a common strand of learning in executive education programs and would be important to consider as new knowledge. According to Noel Tichy, winning organizations are distinguished from losing ones by their extraordinary success at teaching people to be effective leaders. (Tichy, 2002). It was evident in some aspects of GILD 2008, the participants were encouraged to share their leadership story. It is clear to the researcher, there would be great value in structuring executive education programs so participants, as well as Faculty Presenters, Executive Coaches, and Learning Team Leaders share their successes and failures as leaders. Sharing their leadership story would provide a common strand of learning throughout the GILD process. The structure of GILD requires participants to share their leadership story with their Executive Coach. It would be instructive to structure the executive coaching process to encourage executive coaches to share their story with the participant. In a similar fashion, Faculty Presenters should include a piece on their leadership story during their presentation. The Learning Team meetings were viewed as a key part of GILD
Learning Team leaders brought years of experience to the process and should review their leadership story with participants in their team. Sharing the good days and bad days of their careers and what they learned from those experiences would be instructive for all.

Executive education programs cannot be effective if they are not structured to address the needs of the adult learner. Adults tend to be self-directed in their lives, although responsibilities with jobs, families, and other organizations can remove a degree of their freedom to act. Adulthood brings an increasing sense of the need to take responsibility for our lives and as a result adults strongly resent it when others take away their rights to choose. As a result, balancing an executive education program schedule becomes a critical aspect of the success or failure of the endeavor.

The results of the GEI illustrate the need to schedule GILD in a way to balance the needs of the adult learners. Adults are relevancy-oriented. They must see a reason for learning something. They also need time to reflect on what they have learned and have time to connect to their own knowledge. Although these are not new concepts, the results of the GEI emphasize the need for time for reflection and time for participants to discuss and connect with the program content relevant to their experiences.

Linkage, Inc. surveys participants prior to GILD asking them to identify their learning objectives for the upcoming session. Based upon analysis of the results of the GEI, it may be important to study the data and analyze the results by demographic group: gender, age, country of origin and level of education. The session may be adapted, to the extent possible, to address the learning needs of the diverse demographic groups.
Implications for Further Research

In order to further evaluate the effectiveness of GILD 2008, the primary researcher will work with Linkage, Inc. to conduct a follow-up interview with selected participants in the Institute. The primary researcher will utilize a stratified random sample, using demographic selection variables and proportional sampling to identify the interview participants.

A list of interview questions will be identified based on the following revised GEI questions:

Q. 32. What ONE thing did you learn at the GILD program you put to use in your leadership position immediately?

Q. 33 What changes did you make in your leadership behaviors as a result of attending GILD?

Q. 34 My objective for attending GILD was …

The interviews will be conducted in July 2009, nine months after GILD 2008, and again in April 2010, 18 months after GILD 2008. To evaluate behavior, the primary researcher will use a patterned interview asking the same questions of each learner so the responses can be quantified. Interview participants will be asked how much they have changed since they participated in GILD 2008. If little or no change has occurred, participants will be asked what prevented the behavior change. Interview questions will be asked to determine if what they learned at GILD 2008 applied to their jobs, did their boss support their behavior, or did other factors prevent them from changing.

The primary researcher will work with Linkage, Inc. to analyze the data from the follow-up interview process. The results will be used to craft changes in future GILD
sessions, and will serve as one part of a template for evaluation of future executive education programs.

Study Summary

Covey stated in the 1980s and McCall reiterated in the 1990s, businesses were entering an era of managing in “permanent white water”. McCall offered under those circumstances, effective leadership was key to sustainable business growth. He concluded with the suggestion leadership ability can be learned, creating a context supporting the development of talent as a source of competitive advantage.

Today’s turbulent economic environment places a greater emphasis on the need for effective leadership. In one bleak assessment, economists at the World Bank predicted recently the global economy and the volume of trade would both shrink this year, for the first time since World War II. The World Bank said in a new report on the crisis begun with junk mortgages in the United States was causing havoc for poorer countries having nothing to do with the original problem. Central European countries like Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic are hurting from diminished exports to Western Europe. They are also reeling from a severe credit crisis among major European banks, which have taken huge losses on American mortgages and mortgage-based securities (Andrews, 2009).

The renewed interest in developing executive talent has been stimulated in recent times by various events such as the worldwide economic downturn. Corporate America is aware the leadership styles utilized in the decades following World War II are inadequate in the current era characterized by global competition, deregulation and economic upheaval. Wherever one looks it seems there is a shortage of leaders able to navigate the storms.
Many factors determine the success and failure of corporate struggles, one of which is quality of leadership. It does seem the inability of many companies to adapt was abetted by inadequate leadership. It is plausible to assume a different kind of leader is needed. Another stimulus for renewed interest in developing leaders resulted from corporations searching for answers as they survived changes associated with reengineering, total quality and restructuring. The result had a negative effect on human resources, leaving many organizations without much depth in their management talent. The new organization – flat, customer-focused, team-based, entrepreneurial, were even harder to lead effectively than the bureaucracies it replaced.

Rather than assuming leaders are more often born, not made, we suggest leaders are both born and made. If executive leadership is mostly learned from experience, then the competencies differentiating leaders from followers are the result of accumulated experiences. No one set of characteristics or competencies can be applied to all leaders. What matters is how well prepared people in leadership roles are to meet the challenges and overcome the obstacles posed. In a world of rapid change, the real measure of leadership is the ability to acquire needed new skills as the situation changes. The Global Institute for Leadership Development – GILD is an ongoing endeavor designed to meet the needs of global leaders. This study was an effort to improve GILD as a provider of custom executive education.

The domain of leaders is the future. The leader’s unique legacy is the creation of valued institutions surviving over time. The most significant contribution leaders make is not simply for today’s bottom line; it is to the long-term development of people and institutions so they can adapt, change, prosper, and grow.
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# GILD 2008 Program Evaluation Inventory

Please help us evaluate how we did this year and assist us in planning for next year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Attending GILD was beneficial to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would recommend GILD to a colleague or friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. GILD provided return on investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pre-program communication was effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The participant website was useful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I knew what to expect before arriving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Faculty presenters were inspiring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Location was conducive to networking with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXECUTIVE COACHING HELPED ME:**

(Complete only if you participated in Executive Coaching)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Executive coach's name ____________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Develop goals for my leadership responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Define my leadership challenges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Develop my leadership improvement plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Develop effective ways of working with staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Become more aware of my skills as a leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Learn to model behaviors for others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. With my own personal development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Understand the components of leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Work effectively with my problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEARNING TEAMS:**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Helped me address my specific leadership needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Peers provided valuable input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Members worked collaboratively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Enabled reflection on personal challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Enabled new insight into leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Applied content to business challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Provided a place for open exchange of ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FACULTY PRESENTERS:**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. Inspired new ways of personal thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Presented usable ideas for leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Inspired innovative leadership thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Provided new ways of addressing current problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Encouraged creative thinking about leadership problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Challenged my current mental models of leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Articulated new strategies for business challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32. What one thing have you learned at the GILD program you will put to use in your leadership position immediately?

33. What changes will you make in your leadership behaviors over the next six months as a result of attending GILD?

34. My objective for attending GILD was

How effective were each of these components in reaching that objective?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>35. 360° leadership assessment instrument</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Not at all Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36. One on one executive coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Peer learning – Learning teams and real time applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Leadership responsibility development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Leadership competency development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Leadership skill-building workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. How does GILD compare to the other external leadership development program(s) you have attended?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor Value</th>
<th>Extremely Valuable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. How does GILD compare to the other internal leadership development program(s) you have attended?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor Value</th>
<th>Extremely Valuable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. Please rate the effectiveness of each faculty presenter and then select the five you thought were most influential. Please rank them from 1 to 5 with one being the very best and five being good. Please put your number ranking in the space provided and rate them by checking a box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Not at all Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Abrahoff - Producing Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Allen - Personal Productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Goldsmith - Coaching and Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saj-nicole A. Jou - Strategic Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Lencioni - Motivating the Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Lencioni - Leading Teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yongru Long - Relationship Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mitchell - Trusted Influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mitchell – Decision Making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Mauborgne - Building a Culture of Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Negroponte - Creating the Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Niemenberg - Systems Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Very Effective  Effective  Somewhat Effective  Not at all Effective

_____ Nando Parrao - Focused Drive
_____ Tom Peters - Creating the Organization
_____ Tim Sanders - Personal Productivity
_____ Thomas Stewart - Conceptual Thinking
_____ Nick Washenko - Communication
_____ James White/Janice Dias - Leading Change

Will you please tell us a little about yourself?

44. Gender  □ Male  □ Female

45. Your Age ____________________ Years

46. Your country of residence ____________________

47. What best describes your leadership position?  □ President (CEO)  □ Vice President  □ Chief/Chairman
(choose only one)  □ Manager/Gfd  □ Director  □ Supervisor/Team  □ Other

48. Your highest completed educational level  □ Bachelor  □ Masters  □ Doctorate

49. What best describes your business (choose only one)
□ Product Management  □ Information Services
□ Research and Development  □ Engineering
□ Finance  □ Marketing
□ Project Management  □ Human Resources
□ Sales  □ General Management
□ Other ____________________

50. GILD Attendance  □ This is my first year attending GILD  □ I have attended GILD in previous years

51. How many external leadership programs have you attended in the last five years?  ____________ Trainings

52. How many internal leadership programs have you attended in the last five years?  ____________ Trainings

Please help Linkeage make GILD 2009 more useful and meaningful.

What would you retain? ____________________________________________________________

What would you change? ___________________________________________________________

What would you add? _______________________________________________________________

THANK YOU!
Global Institute for Leadership Development – GILD 2008

Pilot Inventory participants - Please read this background information before evaluating the Inventory document.

The Global Institute for Leadership Development, GILD, is an intensive one-week institute sponsored by Linkage, Inc. Some of the most recognized names in the field of leadership development speak at the program. Speakers such as Marshall Goldsmith, Warren Bennis, John Kotter and many others conduct sessions focused on cutting-edge approaches to leadership development. GILD combines the depth of an immersion learning workshop, the academic rigor of a university executive education program, and the pace and scale of a world-class conference. The program provides accelerated, transformational leadership growth in areas established to differentiate superior leaders from average leaders.

Some of the key features of the program that we will evaluate through the inventory are:

- Executive coaching – high-end executive coaches meet with participants a minimum of three times (twice at GILD, once after GILD) Participants select a coach from a list of business leaders and academics. The coach receives personal improvement objectives from the participant before GILD begins. The coach works with the participant to develop a plan to address objectives.
- Learning Teams – Small, highly relevant sessions where key learning is processed, knowledge sharing occurs and action plans are developed.
- Leadership Competency Development – Learning sessions led by world-renowned teachers and leaders that provide fuel and guidance for accelerated transformation of these competencies.

Purpose of the Evaluation Inventory

The purpose of this inventory is to measure the effectiveness of the Global Institute for Leadership Development. Since 1996 GILD has been a provider of individualized executive leadership education and provides presenters and teachers, identified as some of the best in the world. However, GILD has not been...
comprehensively evaluated for effectiveness. The GILD 2008 evaluation inventory will measure the effectiveness of the presenters, the effectiveness of the executive coaching and the learning teams. The survey will also identify attendees’ personal goals, leadership change behaviors, and how participants may use the information learned at GILD.

You are being asked to participate in a pilot inventory, enabling Linkage, Inc. to assess the survey for clarity, ease of use, and completeness. This will allow us to make any necessary change prior to administering the inventory to GILD 2008 participants in October.

Consent to Participate in Inventory Review – Instructions

The consent form is administered to provide a level of protection for inventory participants as well as to provide an explanation to identify how the survey results will be used.

Please review the consent document and write your comments on the document. You should not sign the document.

We would like you to comment on the following points:

- Clarity of the consent form document
- Ease of understanding and use
- Face validity – judgment that the consent document appears to be relevant

Pilot Inventory Review – Instructions

Please review the inventory and write comments on the inventory document. You should not attempt to answer the inventory questions. We seek only an evaluation of the inventory.

You should not attempt to complete the inventory.

We would like you to think about and comment on the following four points:

- Clarity of the questions/items
- Ease of understanding and use
- Face validity – judgment that the inventory items appear to be relevant
- Do these items measure GILD accurately
GILD Linkage

The Global Institute for Incorporated Leadership Development

October 12 – 17, 2008
Marriott Desert Springs Resort
Palm Desert CA

Program Evaluation

This is the 12th year of the Global Institute for Leadership Development (GILD) presented by Linkage, Inc. We have assembled a world-class faculty to enhance your learning experience.

To assist us in our effort to continue to improve GILD, a survey will be distributed to you during the session. The survey will take approximately 5 – 10 minutes to complete and will help us prepare for GILD 2009. The results will be compiled by an outside source and will be anonymous.

Each individual who completes the survey will participate in a drawing for one of two prizes:

- i Phone TM
- One free registration for GILD 2009 for you or someone else from your organization.

Thank you in advance for helping us continue to improve GILD.
APPENDIX D

CONSENT FORM

Consent To Participate in Survey document

*Global Institute for Leadership Development – GILD 2008*

PURPOSE: You are being asked to participate in a questionnaire seeking to measure the effectiveness of the Global Institute for Leadership Development, GILD as a provider of individualized executive education. To assist in efforts to continue to improve, GILD, a questionnaire is being distributed to you during the last learning team session. The survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete and will help in preparing for GILD 2009. The results will be compiled by an outside source and will remain anonymous.

COMPENSATION: There will be no compensation for your participation. However, everyone completing the survey will be eligible to participate in a drawing for one of two prizes:

- i Phone 3G TM
- One free registration for GILD 2009 for you or someone else from your organization.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Do not put your name on the survey, the questionnaire will be separated from the paper forms and you will not be identified by name at any time. All data will be presented in an aggregated format and all data will be kept in a secure location separate from the consent forms. Each completed questionnaire will be assigned a randomly selected identification number and only the outside analyst will have access to the list matching names and numbers. Consent forms will be destroyed by a cross cut shredder at the completion of the study. All information collected as a part of this study will remain confidential unless you provide your written consent for your written comments to be used by GILD for marketing purposes.

RIGHT TO WITHDRAW: You are under no obligation to participate in this survey. You may choose not to complete all of the survey and there will be no retribution. You are free to withdraw your consent at any time and request that your data not be included in any aggregated reporting of data.

STATEMENT OF CONSENT- SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE: Your signature indicates that you have read and understood the information provided above, have had an
opportunity to ask questions, and agree to participate in this survey. Will you please sign the consent form and participate in the GILD 2008 questionnaire?

Thank you.

☐ Yes, I am willing to participate in the survey questionnaire

____________________________________________   __________________
Signature                                                                          Date

-------------------------------------

STATEMENT OF CONSENT FOR GILD MARKETING PURPOSES COMMENTS:
Yes, I am willing to have GILD use my written comments for marketing purposes.

☐ Yes, I am willing to have my written comments as well as my name used for marketing purposes

______________________________________  ________________
Signature                                                                          Date

Thank you in advance for helping us continue to improve GILD.
APPENDIX E

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING GILD 2008 SURVEY

Thank the group for participating in the Survey

Distribute the GILD 2008 Survey

Purpose of the survey

The purpose of this survey is to measure the effectiveness of the Global Institute for Leadership Development. Since 1996 GILD has been a provider of individualized executive leadership education; however GILD has not been comprehensively evaluated for effectiveness.

GILD provides presenters and teachers, identified as some of the best in the world. The GILD 2008 evaluation survey will measure the effectiveness of the presenters, the effectiveness of the executive coaching and the learning teams. The survey will also identify attendees’ personal goals, leadership change behaviors, and how participants may use the information learned at GILD.

You are being asked to participate in a survey, enabling Linkage, Inc. to assess the survey for clarity, ease of use, and completeness. This will allow us to make any necessary change prior to administering the survey to GILD 2008 participants in October.

Distribute and review the Consent to Participate in Survey document

Read to the group the Consent to Participate in Survey Review – Instructions.

Allow 2 - 3 minutes to read the document

Collect the Consent to Participate in Survey document

Distribute and review the GILD 2008 Survey document

Read to the group the Survey Instructions

Allow 10 minutes to read and complete the GILD 2008 Survey document.

Collect the GILD 2008 Survey document

Distribute a 50/50 ticket for each individual who has completed the survey.
Separate the ticket – give one half to the participant – and place the other half in the envelope marked GILD 2008 Drawing.

Thank the group for participating in the Survey

Put these documents in the envelop with your name (Learning Team Leader)

Response to Consent to Participate in Survey

Response to GILD 2008 Survey

Turn in your envelope to __________ immediately following your session. The 50/50 tickets will be used in the drawing Gala Dinner and Closing Ceremonies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Coach</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.45</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.473</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

EXECUTIVE COACHING
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>151</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.15</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.524</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>