

ONE

Be Yourself— More—with Skill

WHEN WE ASK PEOPLE in organizations—executives, first-line supervisors, head teachers, hospital nurses—which set of competences they would most like to develop, all provide the same answer: help us to become more effective leaders. They have seen that leadership makes a big difference to their lives and the performance of their organizations.

Equally, when we ask CEOs what is the biggest problem they face, they unerringly reply: our organizations need more leaders at every level.

So, given the hunger for leadership, why are leaders in such short supply? We think there are two fundamental reasons:

First, organizations desire leaders but structure themselves in ways that kill leadership. Far too many of our organizations—in

10 WHY SHOULD ANYONE BE LED BY YOU?

business, in the public sector, and in the not-for-profit sector—are machines for the destruction of leadership. They encourage either conformists or role players with an impoverished sense of who they are and what they stand for. Neither makes for effective leaders. And of course, this gives rise to legions of disenchanting followers, producing the deepest organizational malaise of modern times: cynicism.

Second, our understanding of leadership is blinkered. Having reviewed much of the existing leadership literature, both new and old, we find it surprising how little we know.¹ This observation is not a criticism of our academic colleagues who, no doubt, like us, have pondered long and hard on the mysteries of leadership. Rather, it is an observation about the methods we have used and the fundamental assumptions upon which much of the research has rested.

The main body of leadership literature focuses on the *characteristics* of leaders. This gives it a strong psychological bias. It sees leadership qualities as inherent to the individual. The underlying assumption is that leadership is something we do *to* other people. But in our view, leadership should be seen as something we do *with* other people. Leadership must always be viewed as a relationship between the leader and the led.

Books on leadership persistently try to find a recipe for leadership. Beleaguered executives are invited to compare themselves with lists of leadership competences and characteristics—against which they always find themselves wanting. Attempts to imitate others, even the most successful leaders, are doomed to failure. As Bill Burns, CEO of the \$16 billion global pharmaceutical division of F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd. (Roche) told us, “The idea of us all becoming Jack Welch is nonsense.”²

In our view, there are no universal leadership characteristics. What works for one leader will not work for another. We think that those aspiring to leadership need to discover what it is about themselves that they can mobilize in a leadership context. They need to identify and deploy their own personal leadership assets.³

Our position is different from much contemporary thinking. This insists that effective leadership rests upon full self-knowledge. This sometimes leads to excessive concern with the inner drives of the leader and finds expression in some formulations of emotional intelligence (EI) and more broadly in the psychoanalytic literature on leadership.⁴ No doubt EI is a highly useful life skill, but our observations of leaders suggest that few develop full self-knowledge. Rather, our experience suggests that effective leaders have an overarching sense of purpose together with *sufficient* self-knowledge of their potential leadership assets. They don't know it all, but they know *enough*.

Against this backdrop of increasing demand for leadership, an organizational predisposition to kill leadership, and an inadequate understanding of what leadership entails and requires, the key question is:

How Can We Become More Effective As Leaders and As Developers of Leaders?

The answer, we believe, lies in an explicit recognition of three fundamental axioms about leadership.

Situational

First, leadership is *situational*. What is required of the leader will always be influenced by the situation. This is commonsensical, but true.⁵

12 WHY SHOULD ANYONE BE LED BY YOU?

History is full of examples of leaders who found their time and place, but whose qualities lost their appeal when things moved on. Winston Churchill, for example, was an inspirational wartime leader, but his bulldog style was ill suited to the reconstruction agenda of postwar Britain. Similarly, George Bush (senior) had a colossal opinion-poll lead in the immediate aftermath of the first Iraq war, and yet in the following year he lost to Bill Clinton. By contrast, Nelson Mandela's ability to offer leadership across widely differing contexts exemplifies situational adjustment from a prison cell on Robben Island to the graceful lawns of Union House in Pretoria.

There are parallels in organizational life. For example, some hard-edged, cost-cutting turnaround managers are unable to offer leadership when there is a need to build. But their more adaptable colleagues adjust to shifting agendas—and carry their teams with them.

As we will see, the ability to observe and understand existing situations, something we call *situation sensing*, is key to leadership. This involves a mixture of sensory and cognitive abilities. Effective leaders pick up important situational signals. They are able to tune in to the organizational frequency to understand what is going on beneath the surface. This is both a micro and a macro skill, visible in daily routine encounters (meetings, walking the corridors, elevator conversations) as well as in big, strategic decisions (Does this acquisition smell right? Are these good people to partner with?). Skillful leaders are then able to adjust appropriately, self-consciously deploying their personal capabilities, or leadership assets.

We do not mean to be excessively deterministic in our claim that leadership is situational. The situation, or context, the leader inherits is simply the starting point. Clearly, leaders' actions themselves help to shape the context, altering the initial situation they found. In so doing, they are able to impact—and therefore re-

shape—the situations within which they lead. Through their interactions, effective leaders construct *alternative contexts* to those which they initially inherited. They use their personal leadership assets to reframe situations—to the benefit of those they lead. This last point is important. It is not sufficient for leaders to reframe a situation to their own advantage; true leadership requires reframing for the benefit of the followers. That is the basis on which the relationship is founded.

Nonhierarchical

This leads to our second observation: leadership is *nonhierarchical*. Much of the leadership literature is overly concerned with those who reach the top of organizations. In fact, we would go so far as to say that the persistent misconception that people who occupy senior organizational positions are leaders has probably damaged our capacity to understand leadership more than anything else. It has blinded us to the true nature of leadership.

While we recognize that there is a relationship between hierarchy and leadership (they may fulfill a similar function, for example, by investing authority), we view the relationship as contingent. Being given a particular organizational title—team leader, section head, and vice president—may confer some hierarchical authority, but it certainly does not make you a leader. Hierarchy alone is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for the exercise of leadership.

Indeed, it could be argued that the qualities that take you to the top of large-scale and often highly political organizations are not obviously the ones associated with leadership. People who make it to the top do so for a whole variety of reasons—including political acumen, personal ambition, time-serving, even nepotism—rather than real leadership quality.

14 WHY SHOULD ANYONE BE LED BY YOU?

Our interviews and experience inside organizations confirms that leadership is not the sole preserve of the chosen few. Great organizations have leaders at all levels. Some of the first work we did on leadership involved examining military organizations. Our assumption was that their hierarchical nature would make leadership development difficult. Nothing could be further from the truth. The best military organizations understand that when they move into action, they simply cannot rely on hierarchy; it may be obliterated when the first mortar lands. It is imperative that they develop leadership capability throughout. They do.

It is not just the military that has reached this realization. Consider Sonae, Portugal's largest company, an organization we will examine in more detail later. Sonae's business stretches from wood veneers to telecommunications, taking in a huge retail operation. It focuses relentlessly on high performance—mediocrity is not tolerated. The company's mission statement starkly states, "At Sonae you are either a leader or a candidate to be a leader." The implication is clear; if you are neither, Sonae is not the place for you.

Successful organizations—be they hospitals, charities, or commercial enterprises—seek to build leadership capability widely and to give people the opportunity to exercise it.

Relational

The third foundation of our view of leadership is that leadership is *relational*. Put simply, you cannot be a leader without followers. Much of early trait theory seemed to ignore this. By trying to distill the characteristics of leaders, it neglected the fact that leadership is a relationship built actively by both parties. In reality, leadership is always a social construct that is re-created by the relationships between leaders and those they aspire to lead. Effective leaders are not simply amalgams of desirable traits; they are

actively and reciprocally engaged in a complex series of relationships that require cultivation and nurture. Like all social creations, this web of relationships is fragile and requires constant re-creation.⁶ You can confirm this every time you talk to a successful CEO, a sports coach, or a team leader. All will tell you that much of their leadership effort is devoted to the maintenance of particular kinds of relationships with their followers.

This insistence on the relational nature of leadership does not mean that these relationships are necessarily harmonious—they may well be edgy—but they are about leaders knowing how to excite followers to become great performers.

Does this mean generalizations are impossible? We don't think so. Some fundamental principles of leadership do apply across the board. Followers want feelings of excitement and personal significance from their leaders—something confirmed by research.⁷ In addition, they wish to feel part of something bigger—a community, if you will. But above all, they look for leaders who are authentic. Indeed, authenticity is integral to the relationship. Without it, there can be no significant investment of trust on either side.

How leaders demonstrate authenticity—and how followers sense it—is a complex theme to which we return at many points in this book. For now, it is sufficient to note that, although this will involve different behaviors in different contexts, effective leaders are still able to communicate a consistent sense of self that is invested—skillfully—in each of the roles that they play.

Making Sense of Authenticity

The concept of authenticity has been extensively discussed from a psychological and psychoanalytic perspective. Much of this literature focuses on the complex, maybe endless, process of self-

16 WHY SHOULD ANYONE BE LED BY YOU?

discovery.⁸ From that rich seam of research we take three critical elements.

First, authentic leaders display a *consistency between words and deeds*. Leaders who do what they say—who practice what they preach—are more likely seen as “genuine” and therefore authentic. Nothing betrays the aspiring leader quite so much as the attempt to persuade others to do things that they would never do themselves. But an ability to do what you say is not enough on its own.

The second element of authentic leadership is the capacity to display *coherence in role performances*. In other words, despite the unavoidable need to play different roles at different times for different audiences, authentic leaders *communicate a consistent underlying thread*. They display a “real self” that holds these separate performances together.

Closely linked to this is the third and final element. Authentic leadership involves a kind of *comfort with self*, which is perhaps the hardest aspect of all to attain. This is the internal source from which consistency of role performance is drawn. The *Concise Oxford Dictionary* defines that which is authentic as having “undisputed origins.”⁹ And in a leadership context, this is what followers are looking for: a set of performances that have a common origin.

The first two of these three elements have received considerable attention. The distinction between espoused and enacted values was first drawn many years ago by Harvard Business School’s Chris Argyris.¹⁰ It has been most recently revisited with a new twist in Jeffrey Pfeffer’s discussion of the “knowing-doing” gap.¹¹ Coherence in role performances through the “invention of self” is a recurring theme subtly explored in the extensive work of Warren Bennis.¹²

Comfort with self, the third theme, relates to the interplay between personal origins and destinations. It is less widely discussed in the leadership literature but connects with a rich tradition in sociology.¹³

Yet, despite the intense work of many scholars, these insights have remained largely unexplored in understanding the significance of authenticity as it defines the relationship between leaders and followers. In the last five years, there has been a real interest in authenticity as a property of the leader.¹⁴ However, there has been little discussion of authenticity as enacted in social relationships.

So what does all this mean for those who aspire to leadership?

The simple answer (deceptively simple) is that to be a more effective leader, you must *be yourself—more—with skill*.

Me Myself

First, to be a leader, you must *be yourself*. This is our theme in the opening chapters of the book. Followers want to be led by a person, not a role holder or a position filler or a bureaucrat. Inevitably, then, the central question—explicitly or implicitly—in the mind of others who might follow us is, “What is different about you that equips you to lead?” Or, to put it another way, “What is special about you that means I should follow you?”

But this does not take us back to trait theory, which largely failed in its attempts to find *patterned* differences. What correlations there are in trait-based research are weak. For example, effective leaders are often shown to have slightly above-average levels of confidence. The point to note is *slightly* above average—and that the causal relationship remains indeterminate. In other words, it is at least plausible that their self-confidence arises from gradual exposure to successful leadership experiences. Despite

18 WHY SHOULD ANYONE BE LED BY YOU?

great endeavors, trait theory has never conclusively established cause and effect.

Our own view is almost the polar opposite of trait theory. We argue that effective leaders know those individual differences that might help them in a leadership role—*whatever they might be*—and use them to their advantage. They must identify differences that have meaning for followers. Think, for example, of the way in which Sir Richard Branson, the Virgin boss, is able to use his physical appearance—casual dress, long hair, and a beard—to convey the informality and nonconformity that has become a central part of his leadership and, indeed, the Virgin brand.

This is an example of an individual skillfully deploying his differences in ways that attract followers. In this case, the differences are significant, real, and perceived. By this we mean that Branson's differences *signify* a message; they are *authentic*, not falsely manufactured; and they are *seen* by others. We are talking, then, not of *any* personal difference but of an artful and authentic display—often fine-tuned over many years—of genuine differences that have the potential to excite others.

Or consider this example. We met and observed a cleaning supervisor in a large New York office building. Marcia is a Puerto Rican American woman who leads a team of office cleaners. She is a larger-than-life character—in every sense. She is intensely proud of her origins and yet a subtle reader of the many cultures represented by her team. She can be brash—this *is* New York—but it's done in a knowing kind of way. Her language and clothes are exotic. She uses humor to devastating effect: woe betide the slovenly cleaner! Her passion is for the office workers to notice and comment favorably on the cleanliness of the offices. With all this, members of her team know that she cares about them and about getting

the job done right. In unpromising circumstances, she has forged a high-performance team.

Marcia and Richard Branson have a lot in common. So how do they do it? As we noted, this does not rest upon complete or even deep self-knowledge. Rather, it is developed and honed pragmatically as leaders engage with their tasks and their followers. This is the difference, perhaps, between self-awareness and self-knowledge. Over time, these leaders figure out what works for them. The point is that they don't necessarily need to know why or how it works, as long as they can reproduce the effect. In fact, in our experience, this level of self-knowledge is more often absent.

In chapter 2, we explore how individuals come to know and deploy their differences, and we illustrate the impact this has on their followers. This journey of self-discovery has its roots in our origins—shaped as they are by such powerful forces as family, gender, locale, and social class. Effective leaders are able to extract from these experiences a sense of self that they are comfortable with despite, in many cases, a significant shift in their social milieu. They understand and are at ease with where they are in relation to where they started.

Showing yourself as a leader inevitably involves taking personal risks—and revealing weaknesses—and we deal with these themes in chapter 3. What is it that drives individuals to take personal risks? In our experience, it is an unbending sense of purpose. Great leaders *really* care—about an idea, values, a dream, or vision. It is this commitment that can carry them through adversity and personal risk. Think, for example, of the leaders of the civil rights movement who took enormous personal risks in pursuit of their dream.

Inevitably, as leaders expose themselves, they will always show us weaknesses as well as strengths. But does this make them less

20 WHY SHOULD ANYONE BE LED BY YOU?

attractive as leaders? We think not. Clearly, demonstrating strengths lends leaders legitimacy—but not if weaknesses are denied. The desire to be led by a real person demands that we know something of a leader's human foibles and shortcomings. The claim of perfection will rarely convince us of another's humanity. And paradoxically, denying weakness is most likely to increase rather than reduce the leader's vulnerability.

The Context's the Thing

But although the link between self-knowledge and self-disclosure is a central—and increasingly fashionable—starting point for understanding effective leadership, it is not everything. The world is not that simple. Leadership does not take place in a vacuum: you must be yourself *in context*. Great leaders are able to read the context and respond accordingly. They tap into what exists and bring *more* to the party. In management jargon, they add value. This involves a subtle blend of authenticity and adaptation, of individuality and conformity. We discuss these capabilities in the middle chapters of the book.

In chapter 4, we discuss situation sensing. Using a complex mix of cognitive and observational skills, leaders pick up signals that help them explain what's happening without having others spell it out for them. These skills enable them to read and interpret the situation. They tune in so that they know when team morale is shaky or when complacency needs challenging. Often they appear to collect this information through osmosis. But although some individuals seem to have a natural instinct for sensing, we believe this skill can be learned and leaders can improve their sensing capabilities. In our work we have observed three powerful ways in which leaders have been able to hone their sensing abilities.

The first is early exposure to a range of different experiences. Sometimes this comes with a family background that involves mobility in childhood. This creates opportunities—and, perhaps, a need—for individuals to experience and make sense of different cultures and lifestyles.¹⁵ On other occasions it arises from early career experiences that provide similar cultural contrasts across different occupational groups or business contexts. We have been struck, for example, by the number of leaders who, early in their careers, took on jobs at the edge of their organizations—typically selling—that brought them into contact with a range of different potential customers and incentivized them to get to know them better (to make the sale).

Take Franz Humer, the chief executive and chairman of the Roche pharmaceutical empire. Accomplished at detecting subtle shifts in ambience, he can read nuanced cues and sense unspoken opinions that elude less perceptive people. Humer told us that he developed his skill when he worked as a tour guide in his mid-twenties and was responsible for groups of one hundred or more. “There was no salary, only tips,” he told us. “Pretty soon, I knew how to home in on particular groups. Eventually, I could predict within 10 percent how much I could earn from any particular group.”

The second successful approach seems to be structured, experience-based learning where individuals are exposed to a range of direct experiences and helped to learn from them by skilled facilitators. Witness the remarkable growth of business school interpersonal skills programs, and 360-degree survey feedback. Both share the objective of encouraging individuals to sense better the situations they are in and the manner in which their behavior can impact them.

In one case, we interviewed a relatively lowly office manager in a large firm in Cincinnati. For him, a brief exposure to 360-degree

22 WHY SHOULD ANYONE BE LED BY YOU?

feedback, delivered in a constructive and sympathetic manner, had proved a turning point in his leadership experiences.

The third approach—again increasingly popular among executives—is the use of a personal coach. Although coaching styles and methods vary, there is typically a shared ambition to create opportunities for individuals to practice skills in familiar and new situations and to receive feedback on their impact.

You do not need to be a senior executive in an organization to experience this coaching effect. Even better than coaches are good colleagues. We observed a relatively inexperienced young African American woman who was given the opportunity to lead the floor of a large retail outlet. Initially, she found the leadership aspects of the job rather daunting—most of the staff were older and more experienced than her. But she found and used a skilled mentor in one of the firm's buyers, and with gentle but persistent guidance, she blossomed into an exciting, even inspirational, leader.

But effective leaders do not simply react to context. They also shape it—by illuminating aspects of the situation that they can turn to their advantage. This theme is developed in chapter 4. It is further developed in chapter 5, where we argue that effective leaders conform *enough*.

This involves the skillful ability to communicate individuality, for collective benefit, in leadership roles. But it also involves an awareness of when and where to conform. Without this ability for measured conformity, leaders are unlikely to survive or make the connections they need to build successful relationships with others. Expressed differently, despite a clear sense of purpose and strong values, effective leaders seem to know where and when to make compromises. Think, for example, of the extent to which political leaders such as Nelson Mandela in South Africa, Gerry Adams in Northern Ireland,

and Senator George Mitchell in the Middle East have successfully “conformed enough” but always in pursuit of a clear set of values and political ideas. As a result, they have not lost their followers.

By conforming, they demonstrate common cause with their followers. Another way to think of this is in terms of consciously engaging an organizational gear. To be effective, the leader needs to ensure that his or her behaviors mesh sufficiently with the organizational culture to create traction. Leaders who fail to mesh will simply spin their wheels in isolation from their followers.

The central concept that informs this tension is what we call a sense of social realism.¹⁶ This is an important part of being an authentic leader. In our experience, where individuals with leadership potential fail, it is most often because they are lacking an acute enough sense of social realism.

The Skill Factor

But knowing yourself and the context are not enough. You must also *act* as a leader. And since leadership is inevitably a relationship, we focus in the later chapters of the book on the leader’s skill in managing relationships and communicating inspirationally and with good timing.

In chapter 6, we show how good leaders manage relationships by knowing when to be close—to empathize, to build relations of warmth, loyalty, and affection; and when to be distant—to keep people focused on the goal, to address poor performance, to give relationships an edge. Crucially, leaders are able to create this distance without resorting to formal hierarchy. To some extent, our discussion echoes the work of the early style theorists. But the fundamental concept underlying this tension—originally developed by the sociologist Georg Simmel—is social distance.¹⁷

24 WHY SHOULD ANYONE BE LED BY YOU?

One outcome of the management of social distance is one of several leadership paradoxes: although leaders show who they are, they are *not* easily stereotyped. Because they both show emotions and withhold them, get close and stay apart, are like us but different, their colleagues often see them as possessing enigmatic qualities.¹⁸ They are authentic chameleons, a notion we explore in more detail in chapter 6.

Pulling all of this off demands skillful communication. Effective leaders pay careful attention to how they are seen and heard. They do not take others' perceptions for granted or assume that they are perceived similarly in every context. In chapter 7, we explore the ways in which leaders construct compelling narratives about themselves and their contexts. We also show the ways in which they identify communication channels that work for them.

Some leaders, for example, are best able to display their qualities through the platform speech; others are more effective in more intimate face-to-face settings. Part of being an effective leader is knowing which media work for you—and finding ways to exploit those. And finally, we look at their understanding of the pace and rhythm of their organization—and its implication for leadership communication.

In chapter 8, we examine the other side of the leadership equation: *followership*. If leadership is a relationship, as we believe it is, then followers also have a vital part to play. In the course of our research, we asked many followers what they wanted from their leaders. Their replies included many different things. But we also found recurring patterns. Their responses can be described under four broad headings. The four elements followers want from leaders are authenticity, significance, excitement, and community. Effective leaders understand and deliver on these four key issues.

Finally, in chapter 9, we bring these practical strands together by examining what happens when things go wrong—as they inevitably will at some point—and the ethical demands that are placed on leaders.

Inspirational Tension

You will see that there are tensions underlying each of the parts of our book: between revealing strengths but showing weaknesses, being an individual but conforming, establishing intimacy but keeping your distance. Managing these tensions lies at the heart of successful leadership. Our experience suggests excellence in one or two of these areas is insufficient for truly inspirational leadership. It is the interplay between them, guided by situation sensing, that enables great leaders to find the right style for the right moment.

You may have reached an early conclusion as you contemplate these tensions: leadership is complicated, demanding, and full of personal risk. All of this is true. Clearly, not everyone can be a leader. Many executives do not have what it takes to develop the *skillful* authenticity necessary for effective leadership. They are unable to balance the tensions at the heart of successful leadership. First, to demonstrate the maturity required to understand and deploy weakness as well as strength. Second, to know when to get close and when to remain apart from followers. Third, to appreciate that individual expression must be balanced with the need to conform *enough*.

It is not difficult, in our experience, to think of individuals who seem oblivious to their limitations yet who regularly overestimate their strengths. Senior executives, in particular, are known to systematically exaggerate their credibility with others. Equally, it

26 WHY SHOULD ANYONE BE LED BY YOU?

is easy to think of individuals who seem stuck in the default mode of “closeness” with others and are never able to separate enough to provide objective distance. For them, being “one of the boys” fatally undermines their leadership capacity. For others, it is the reverse: their separation from others—their failure to connect—leaves them forever isolated and without the relationships necessary to sustain effective leadership.

Finally, we have been witness to countless uncomfortable examples of executives who feel that the art of leadership is to give unfettered expression to their “true selves” in bold take-it-or-leave-it fashion. They typically find that others choose to leave it. Leadership is not achieved by riding into town—cowboy fashion—and shooting it up. Skillful leaders, to continue the analogy, need to get a sense of the town, and to conform enough so that they are seen to be acting in the best interests of the townspeople, so they can lead change without being shot early on in the proceedings!

Do You Want It? Leadership and Life

All these qualities, however, are necessary but not sufficient conditions for leadership. Individuals must also *want* to be leaders—and many very talented individuals are not interested in shouldering that responsibility.¹⁹ Others prefer to devote more time to their private lives than to their work. After all, there is more to life than work, and more to work than being the leader.

This sense of other priorities is often missed in popular discussions of leadership—particularly in business. To assume that everyone has the sheer energy, drive, and willpower required to offer inspirational leadership to others is facile. While, as we argue, each individual has unique differences that potentially can be exploited in a leadership role, each of us has to address the harsh

question, Do we want it? And if we do, do we want it enough to put in the work required and make the necessary sacrifices?

It may well be that a variety of factors—unimaginative educational systems, limiting jobs, bureaucratic hierarchies—relentlessly crush the individual spirit that lies at the root of authentic leadership. Remove these barriers, and we, like others, are sure that more leaders may emerge. But it is too big a jump to assume we may all want it.

Nor is it sensible to assume that good leadership always delivers the best business results. We noted earlier that leadership is not just about results. Yet this is a trap that many modern leadership researchers have fallen into. We have become overly concerned with the ends—sometimes at the cost of neglecting the means. Interestingly, the classical understanding of leadership is primarily concerned with providing meaning. The obsession with results is a contemporary conceit and one that is partly responsible for eroding the moral dimension of leadership.

While some well-led businesses do not produce short-term results, some businesses with successful results are not well led. Enron, for example, appeared to be performing exceptionally for some years. If results were always a matter of good leadership, picking leaders would be easy. In every case the best strategy would be to go after people in companies with the best business results. But clearly, as recent painful corporate collapses and governance scandals demonstrate, things are not that easy.

Clearly, the ability to connect with followers—to inspire, excite, and arouse—is a central leadership attribute, and it is at the heart of our concerns in this book. And as we have said, *outstanding performance* is unlikely without it. But the *direction* in which leaders channel energies will vary.

28 WHY SHOULD ANYONE BE LED BY YOU?

The “excitement” generated in a company culture like Enron’s can produce inappropriate actions and disastrous outcomes. Equally, highly motivated, well-led workforces can still fail if the market for their product collapses, or a change in government funding takes the ground from under their feet. Meanwhile, quasi-monopolistic businesses in protected markets may be performing satisfactorily with competent management and little leadership.

Yet despite all these provisos, the truth remains: great leaders can, and must, make a difference—and your capability to act as a leader can be improved. In the process, you might even make the world a better place. As we constantly urge those we work with, “Be yourself—more—with skill.” In what follows we aim to show you the tough challenges involved in following this advice—and how to address them.

The led—the followers—are constantly asking the question at the heart of this book: Why should *anyone* be led by you? Why should *we* be led by you? Effective leaders must answer these questions every day in all they say and do.