INGREDIENTS OF LEADERSHIP: How to Become an Outstanding Individual

Participant Guide

A Seminar Sponsored by the

Public Relations Society of America (PRSA) Buffalo Niagara Chapter

Thursday, November 29, 2012
10:30 – 11:30 a.m. EST

Templeton Landing
2 Templeton Terrace
Buffalo, NY 14202

Contents

- PowerPoint Presentations
- Handout
- Discussion Outline
- James E. Lukaszewski Biography
The Ingredients of Leadership:  
How to Become an Outstanding Individual

Thursday, November 29, 2012
10:30 – 11:30 am EST

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Ingredients of Leadership, PowerPoint presentation slides ........................................................ 3
Personal Leadership Template .................................................................................................... 29
The Bad News Eradicator ........................................................................................................... 31
The Ingredients of Leadership .................................................................................................... 36
Will Leaders and Companies Ever Learn from Their Mistakes? ............................................... 46
Winning When Everyone is Mad at You .................................................................................... 50
How to Successfully Fire the CEO ............................................................................................. 53
Strengthening Corporate Trust in Times of Crisis (Part I) ......................................................... 57
Strengthening Corporate Trust in Times of Crisis (Part II) ........................................................ 62
So, You Want to Be the Conscience of Your Organization? ...................................................... 66
Rediscovering the Key Ingredient in Ethics: Integrity ............................................................... 69
Discussion Outline ...................................................................................................................... 72
Books by James E. Lukaszewski ............................................................................................... 73
James E. Lukaszewski biography ............................................................................................... 75
The Ingredients of Leadership:
How to Become an Outstanding Individual

By James E. Lukaszewski,
ABC, APR, Fellow PRSA

James E. Lukaszewski, ABC, APR, Fellow PRSA, is one of North America’s most prominent management advisors and crisis management strategists. He has more than 25 years experience in dealing with the most troubling, tough, touchy, sensitive issues facing corporate organizations locally and globally. His name recently appeared in PR Week as one of 22 “crunch-time counselors who should be on the speed dial in a crisis” and in Corporate Legal Times as one of “28 Experts to Call When All Hell Breaks Loose.”

Where This Presentation Came From...
- New Leaders
- Old Leaders seeking something fresh
- Leaders in trouble
- Search for simple, sensible, positive and constructive approaches
- Tying Organizations together during crisis, controversy and contention
90 Mins. of a 4-6 hour program

- Leadership rejuvenation session for leaders and managers
- Reducing contention, confrontation,
- Pulling management back from the brink
- Leveling out some bumps
- Recovering from serious mistakes
- Managing Victims
- Refocusing on the future

Definition # 1

Leadership causes the Accomplishment of Great Goals by Many Willing Participants.

Definition # 2

Leadership is...

- About the future
- Positive energy
- Transformational
- Lonely
**Definition # 3**

Managing Inside the Box

- Leadership vs. Managing

**Explanation # 1**

Leaders...

- Go beyond the plan/over the horizon!
- Go beyond the measurement.
- Harness emotion and energy.
- Stretch the limits imposed by others.
- Transform their Organizations to achieve new initiatives

**Transformation ??**

- Among the most frequent questions: “How do I transform?”
- A driving concept
- Gut level change imperative:
  - thinking
  - attitudes
  - aspirations
  - focus on Achieving big goals
The Transformation Imperative

For transformation to take place, leaders must first transform themselves then prepare others for their own transformation.

That’s why we are here together today.

The downsides of leadership

All At The Same Time

- Happy Faces
- Endless energy
- Endless questions
- Who cares as much as you?
- The expectation of success
- What’s next
- Someone is always watching, counting and reporting (SAI NNTS)

The Ingredients of Defeat

Defeat and failure are easy

- Timidity
- Hesitation
- Confusion
- Fuzzy Thinking
- No clear destination . . . Or any?
- Where are you going?
- Does anyone know this besides you?
- Looking for a way off the negative path?
How Leadership in Changing

1. Job comes earlier, shorter tenure
2. Fun stuff diminishing
3. Non-Ops focus growing (40-50% of leadership time)
   - Angry Employees
   - Angry Customers
   - Angry Neighbors
   - Doing the Government's Work
   - Activism
   - Government intervention
   - Powerful Outside Individual Voices
   - Negative/Emotional/Victimizing behaviors ...

Why Leaders Fail

- Over-optimism
- Missed goals
- Persistent bad news
- Unhappy employees / key constituents
- AWOL
- Stuck in the mud
- Failure to engage

The Ingredients of Leadership
1. Be Positive

- Eliminate negative words and phrases.
- Behave in positive ways.
- Teach others to have fun and celebrate some success every day.
- Use positive declarative language.
- End emotional language.

Negative Language

- Non-Communication
- Destructive
- Makes you defensive
- Drives communication out of context
- Causes intellectual deafness
- Always leaves wounds open
- Never achieves victory
- Weighs more than positive language
- Always a lie

Positive Language is the Language of Leadership.

The Bad News Eradicator

The Bad News Eradicator was designed to help eliminate negative words and negative behavior. The four primary areas to focus on are:

1. Eliminate negative words.
2. Behave positively.
3. Teach others to have fun.
4. Use positive declarative language.

The Bad News Eradicator is a tool to help you create a positive environment and to ensure that your communications are not negative.

Positive Language is the Language of Leadership.
Famous Double Negatives

- Please don't hesitate to call
- You can't believe we didn't care
- Don't be silly
- I don't disagree
- We had no idea it wouldn't work
- I don't doubt that
- Certainly not
- We didn't disregard his mistake! (Triple!)

More negatives

- Change doesn't come without a Price
- I can't say for sure
- I can't speak for them
- I don't believe you
- I don't know
- I wouldn't say that
- I am not a crook
- I did not have sex with that woman

Mary's Story

- Positive language can change your life
- Start today
- Help others do the same

Does it work?
It will change your life.
2. Be Constructive

- Eliminate criticism as a management technique.
- Insist on constructive behavior.
- Seek to make and solicit positive, constructive suggestions.
- Constructively critique the performance and achievements of others.
- “Pastor Tom”

Collateral Negative Damage

- The destructive power of negative language
- The stickiness of criticism
- Non-communication
- Always erroneous

3. Be Outcome Focused

- Commit to generating and maintaining forward momentum.
- Focus on today and tomorrow.
- Plan with the end in mind.
- Recognize that the past holds very few important lessons.
- Select achievable, understandable, time-sensitive, worthwhile goals; then go for them.
- Work in the future tense.
4. Be Preemptive

- Answer it now.
- Ask it now.
- Challenge it now.
- Do it now.
- Fix it now.

4a. Preemption, Engagement:

- Controls the critics
- Detoxifies the debate
- Defeats the unprepared abuser

- Silence in the face of controversy will be toxic to you
- Bad news always ripens badly
- Bad news always gets worse before it gets better
- Speed beats smart every time
- Failure to manage your own destiny - you leave it to someone else eagerly waiting to do it for you.

5. Become a Verbal Visionary

- The greatest power you have is verbal power.
- The world moves at verbal speed
- Understand your influence:
  - Top/5%; upper/7%; middle/10%
  - FLS/30%; TGNTM/28%; IMIU/20%
- Storytellers
- Counselors
- Pragmatists
- Dutch Uncles (Aunts)
6. Relentlessly Seek Positive, Incremental, Personal Improvement Every Day

• Be an incrementalist.
• Break problems into solvable parts.
• Resolve incremental problems promptly.
• Incrementalism builds luck.

(Continued)

• Prepare to be lucky, but remember that luck is limited.
• Evaluate your progress every day;
  - Most interesting thing you learned?
  - Most important thing you learned?
  - Most helpful thing you learned?
  - New questions that have arisen?
  - Concerns needing your response?

Questions?
Lukaszewski Areas of Practice

- Activist Counteraction
- Coaching
- Community Relations
- Corporate Governance
- Crisis Management
- Employee Loyalty
- Ethics
- Exposure Management
- Litigation
- Management Strategy
- Media Relations
- Strategy
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Nuances of Leadership

- Orchestrator
- Analytic realist
- Level Five
- Interrupter
- Mood setter
- Passion builder
- Tone setter
- Hand grenade

Copyright © 2012, James E. Lukaszewski. All rights reserved.
Reproduction without written permission of the copyright owner is strictly prohibited.
One-time permission to reprint granted to the Public Relations Society of America on November 29, 2012.
Mood, Tone, Emotion

Leadership Is the Accomplishment of Goals Through the Direction of Human Assistants

W.C.H. Prentice
Harvard Business Review, 1961

Leadership Flaws

• Timidity
• Hesitation
• Confusion
• Fuzzy thinking
Pitfalls of Leadership

• Self-deception
• Self-derogation
• Self-talk
• Mistake denial

Leadership Strategies

• Capricious
• Checks and balances
• Coalitions
• Coercion
• Combat
• Competition

• Conditioning
• Conflict
• Confrontation
• Consensus
• Contretemps
• Cruelty

Phony Indicators

• Nice person syndrome
• Corporate democracy
• Micro-inequities
Self-awareness, Self-counsel, Empathy, Humility

Leadership is

Leaders create shared meaning and have a distinctive voice, have a capacity to adapt, and have integrity.

Warren Bennis

The Ingredients of Leadership
1. Be Positive

- Eliminate negative words and phrases.
- Behave in positive ways.
- Teach others to have fun and celebrate some success every day.
- Use positive declarative language.
- Reduce emotional language.

2. Be a Verbal Visionary

- Counselors
- Pragmatists
- Coaches
- Dutch Uncles (Aunts)
- Storytellers
- Motivators
- Inspiring
- Good questioners

Powerful Verbal Techniques

- Communications objectives
- Packing and bundling
- Stories
- Verbal cuing
- Bridging
- Power words
- Memorability
3. Be Constructive

- Insist on constructive behavior.
- Seek to make and solicit positive, constructive suggestions.
- Seek out useful and challenging questions to answer.
- Critique the performance and achievements of others constructively.
- Help others benefit more than you do each time you interact with them.

4. Be Outcome Focused

- Commit to generating and maintaining forward momentum.
- Focus on today and tomorrow.
- Plan with the end in mind.
- Recognize that the past holds very few important lessons.
- Select an achievable, understandable, time-sensitive, worthwhile goal; then go for it.
- Work in the future tense.

5. Be Reflective

- Seek only useful positive lessons from the past, if you go there at all.
- What could you have done more or less often in the past? What could you have done to make something better?
- Could you have conducted yourself differently, more consistently, more positively?
6. Be Prompt

- Answer it now.
- Ask it now.
- Challenge it now.
- Do it now.
- Fix it now.

7. Be Pragmatic

- Search for the truths everyone can recognize and benefit by.
- Make your forecasts achievable.
- Help others achieve their goals and forecasts.
- Prepare everyone for underwhelming results.

7. Be Pragmatic (Continued)

- Do the doable.
- Know the knowable.
- Achieve the achievable.
- Get the gettable.
8. Be a Finisher

• Start what you can finish.
• Stop what you can't get done.
• Avoid endless and mindless projects.
• Focus on completion.
• Break down the barriers to completion.
• Forecast, and then overcome the institutional resistance to completion.

9. Focus on the Crucial 5%

• 80-20 Rule
• 95-5 Rule

10. Be a Yes Person
11. Relentlessly Seek Positive, Incremental, Personal Improvement Every Day

- Celebrate every positive increment.
- Break problems into solvable parts.
- Resolve each increment of the problem promptly.
- Watch for the big break. Capitalize on big things when they happen.

(Continued)

- Prepare to be lucky, but remember that luck is limited.
- The lucky ones are those who are relentlessly incremental in their personal progress every day.
- Crises occur explosively but are resolved incrementally.

James E. Lukaszewski, ABC, APR, Fellow PRSA

Questions & Answers
Upcoming PRSA Seminars With Jim Lukaszewski

Thursday & Friday
December 6 - 7, 2012
Advanced Crisis Communication Strategy:
How to Think and Advise Management Strategically During Tough Situations and Crises

* To register, go to www.prsa.org.

Lukaszewski Areas of Practice

• Activist Counteraction
• Coaching
• Community Relations
• Corporate Governance
• Crisis Management
• Employee Loyalty
• Ethics
• Exposure Management
• Litigation
• Management Strategy
• Media Relations
• Strategy

Check out Jim’s new Crisis Guru Blog
www.e911.com
Your first stop when crises occur.

Sign up for the free E-Newsletter
Thank you for attending the PRSA Master Practitioner™ Series Seminar
Thursday, November 29, 2012

The Ingredients of Leadership: How to Help Others Become Outstanding Individuals

By James E. Lukaszewski, ABC, APR, Fellow PRSA
INGREDIENTS OF LEADERSHIP: How to Become an Outstanding Individual

Handout

A Seminar Sponsored by the Public Relations Society of America (PRSA) Buffalo Niagara Chapter

Thursday, November 29, 2012
10:30 – 11:30 a.m. EST

Contents

• Personal Leadership Template
• The Bad News Eradicator
• The Ingredients of Leadership
• Will Leaders and Companies Ever Learn?
• Winning When Everyone is Mad at You
• How to Successfully Fire the CEO
• Strengthening Corporate Trust (Parts I & II)
• So, You Want to Be the Conscience of Your Organization?
• Rediscovering the Key Ingredient in Ethics: Integrity
• Discussion Outline
PERSONAL LEADERSHIP TEMPLATE

By James E. Lukaszewski, ABC, APR, Fellow PRSA
Copyright © 2012, James E. Lukaszewski. All rights reserved.

This is a tool to help you assess your own leadership attributes and to review those you might like to acquire. To develop your “score,” use the following self-administered code: N = Have now; M = Maybe have now; W = Want to acquire.

Keep in mind that there is no ideal minimum or maximum score. In my experience most leaders have at least some attributes in each of the nine categories.

My main purpose in developing this instrument is to assist those interested in improving themselves identify the types of behaviors, ideas, and personal goals that will help them know more about themselves and what they might like to achieve.

The sources of these lists are observations, discussions, and executive evaluations I’ve conducted over the last 25 years. I hope you find the exercise personally meaningful and professionally helpful, or at least interesting.

**Actions**
- Act like a leader every day.
- Be prompt: do it now, ask it now, answer it now, fix it now.
- Be socially responsible.
- Communicate in real time.
- Maintain constant accessibility.
- Moderate the tension leadership causes.
- Schedule progress in positive increments.
- Write personal notes.

**Aspirations**
- Do the doable.
- Know the knowable.
- Prepare for the break through.
- Recruit and lead great people.
- Stake leadership on vision.
  - Achievable.
  - Brief.
  - Energizing.
  - People-oriented.
  - Plain language.
  - Positive.
  - Time sensitive.

**Assumptions**
- Accept and learn from mistakes.
- Everything important is a work in progress.
- Trust is earned and validated daily.
- You can achieve anything incrementally.
- You can find or create models that work.
- You can grow through adaptation, innovation, or acquisition.
- You can navigate the change you create.

**Attitudes**
- Ambitious.
- Passionate about goals.
- Positive: little negative language, much positive language.
- Disbelieves personal hype and adulation.
- Brings hope, strategy, vision, excitement.
- Generates satisfaction by driving positive change.
- Leads without bitching.
- Motivates.
- Smiles.
- Transparent.
Attributes
- Acts on the part of the picture that will bring success.
- Bias toward continuous reinvention.
- Charisma.
- Chutzpah.
- Credibility, the cement of progress.
- Finds out what people want to know.
- Intense focus.
- Listens strategically and constantly.
- Persuasiveness.
- Sees the larger picture.

Habits
- Act like an organizational adhesive.
- Be constructive: make and solicit positive, useful suggestions every day.
- Be likeable.
- Choose to succeed; select successful people.
- Communicate a continuous leadership message.
- Know the value of good manners and empathy.
- Look for patterns – inside and outside.
- Plan everything; leave nothing to chance.
- Say less but make sure it’s important.
- Test and challenge all assumptions.

Humanism
- Be involved.
- Do good.
- Help the helpless.
- Play a sport (vigorously).
- Sail around the world.
- Speak out.
- Stand for something.
- Start a company.
- Take a sabbatical.
- Teach.
- Write.

Personal Strategic Questions
- Are you engaged enough? With whom?
- About what?
- Are you prepared for to be lucky?
- Can you be smarter?
- Can you do it differently?
- Can you work harder?
- Do you look at yourself, thoroughly?
- Have you actively planned and rehearsed for the worst?
- How many times do you make the same mistake twice?
- If you could be a new age company, what would you look like in 90 days?
- What are your worst case scenarios?
- What positive lessons can you learn from our past?

Philosophy
- Achieve mission-critical components first.
- Do the really necessary.
- Focus on future.
- Leave the revolution to the next guy; do what’s smart and useful, now.
- Outcome focused.
- Positive goals and milestones control progress.
- Relentlessly seek positive incremental improvement every day.
- The simplest, most direct way is usually the best way.
- Wars cause needless, unpredictable permanent casualties.

The Paradox of Leadership
- Leadership is a tough, grindy, personal matter.
- No one is counting (unless you screw up).
- How good you are is up to you.
- The better leader you become, the lonelier you are.
- You have to be up and on no matter how down and out things get.
- Negative words, actions, and responses cause reactions out of proportion form your perspective.
- No matter how good you are, the unconvinables remain, the victims still can’t hear, the dysfunctional still seem out to lunch, and the self-appointed still try to predict your every mood.
The Bad News Eradicator was designed to help eliminate defensive words and negative phrases from your speech and writing. Keep the document next your telephone. Take it with you when you travel. Collect your own set of habitual negative phrases and words. List them on the sheet, then create their positive equivalent and get a whole new life. The goal is to create a positive phrase that has the same or fewer words than the negative phrase.

The nature of this discipline, because that’s what it is, is to constantly and relentlessly translate and transform the energy of negative language into the power of positive speech or writing. Whenever you have a moment, simply work through the list and develop equivalent positive phrases for each negative phrase. There are many ways to accomplish this; sometimes a negative phrase has a half dozen or more positive equivalent options. The goal is to eradicate the negativity and gain a whole new power over your life.

1. “Are not limited to . . . ” “Include, among others . . . ”
2. “Are not associated with . . . ” “Are separate from . . . ”
3. “Are not necessarily indicative.”
4. “Do not include . . . ” “Only include . . . ”
5. “Does not require . . . ”
6. “Does not sufficiently substitute . . . ”
7. “Does not exceed . . . ”
8. “Does not occur . . . ”
10. “Doesn’t hurt to ask.”
11. “Don’t worry, he won’t care.”
12. “Employees who no longer have an ownership . . . ”
13. “Entitled, but not obligated, to . . . ”
14. “Generally does not vary.” “Generally is consistent.”
15. “Have not been registered . . . ”
16. “Have not yet made . . . ”
17. “He is not happy about this.” “He’d rather see . . . ”
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>“He’s not deranged . . . anymore.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>“I can’t comment on the past . . . I wasn’t there.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>“I can’t comment on what hasn’t happened.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>“I can’t say for sure.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>“I can’t speak for them.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>“I couldn’t help it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>“I don’t believe you.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>“I don’t disagree.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>“I don’t know.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>“I don’t like that idea.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>“I don’t mean to apologize.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>“I don’t see the connection.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>“I wouldn’t say that.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>“I wouldn’t say you couldn’t do that.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>“It is disappointing and misleading.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>“If adequate funds are not available.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>“If either of these events had not occurred . . .”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>“If you can’t refrain from . . .”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>“If you do not refrain from . . .”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>“If you do not wish . . .”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>“Investors are strongly cautioned not to place any reliance . . .”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>“It can’t be done.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>“It didn’t happen that way.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>“It is unable to . . .”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>“It never happened.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>“It was unceremoniously rejected.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>“It wasn’t a good idea then, and it isn’t any better now.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>“It wasn’t our intent to not be involved.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>“It won’t be any trouble at all.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>“It won’t be that way.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>“It won’t work.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>“It's not against company policy.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>“It's never been done before.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>“It's not inappropriate.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>“It's not my responsibility.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>“It’s not the same.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>“It’s not unreasonable.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>“It's not too expensive.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>“It’s not too much trouble.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>“It’s unlikely that he won’t disagree.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>“It’s not unlikely that people will come up with something we won’t do.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>“Let’s not be negative.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>“May not make changes.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>“May not be covered.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>“Misrecollection is not impossible.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>“Most likely to not achieve.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>“Must not be an ineligible corporation.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>“My answer is not no.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>“No.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>“No acquisitions are currently proposed.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>“No amendment may be made.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>“No, clearly we’re not doing it now.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>“No comment.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>“No conflict of interest.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>“No increase or decrease is planned.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>“No, it’s not wrong.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>“No problem.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>“No revenue was generated.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>“Not affiliated with . . . ” “Affiliations are these . . . ”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>“Not my job, unfortunately.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>“Not permitted to be . . . ”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>“Not that again.” “Let’s move on.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>“Nothing is impossible.” “Everything is possible.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>“Nothing was done.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>“Notwithstanding the general limitations . . . ”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>“Options are not exercisable.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>“Our boss would never buy it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>“Our customers wouldn't like it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>“Our participation was never greater than theirs.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>“Our people would never do that.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>“Shouldn’t you have objected?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>“Some of which will not materialize.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>“That isn't our problem.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>“That wouldn’t work.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>“That's impossible.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>“That's not a bad approach.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>“That's not a good question.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>“That’s not been proven.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>“That's not our fault.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>“That’s not to say we can’t do it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>“That's not true.” “Here’s what’s true . . . ”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>“That’s not our perspective.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.</td>
<td>“That’s partly untrue.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td>“That’s the wrong attitude.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.</td>
<td>“That’s unhelpful and unnecessary.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.</td>
<td>“The allegations are false, misleading, libelous, and absurd.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.</td>
<td>“The company does not expect, nor can it guarantee . . . ”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.</td>
<td>“The company does not plan to . . . ” “The company plans to . . . ”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.</td>
<td>“The company has the right, but not the obligation.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.</td>
<td>“The company makes no representation or warranty . . . ” “The company warrants to . . . ”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.</td>
<td>“The company shall not take any of the following actions.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td>“The company will be under no duty to give notification.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td>“The company would not be able to . . .”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td>“The forecasts should not be regarded as a representation.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>“The increasing inability . . .”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td>“The information is not exhaustive.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.</td>
<td>“The option may not be exercised . . .”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td>“The statements were not prepared with a view toward compliance.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td>“There can be no assurance.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.</td>
<td>“These committees do not set the final policy . . .”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.</td>
<td>“They will have no further rights.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.</td>
<td>“This is not about contract negotiation; we’re not talking about that.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td>“This was not a regular occurrence.” “A more likely occurrence is . . .”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td>“Unable to attain.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.</td>
<td>“Unable to complete.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.</td>
<td>“Undue reliance should not be placed on . . .”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td>“Unvested options may not vest…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.</td>
<td>“We aren't a bad company.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td>“We can't change that fast.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.</td>
<td>“We can’t say that.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.</td>
<td>“We can't talk about it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131.</td>
<td>“We categorically deny that.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132.</td>
<td>“We couldn't have known.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133.</td>
<td>“We decided not to do it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134.</td>
<td>“We did all right without it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135.</td>
<td>“We didn’t circumvent the rules.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.</td>
<td>“We didn’t engage in that practice.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.</td>
<td>“We didn't know.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.</td>
<td>“We didn’t need to do that.” “What we should have done was . . .”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.</td>
<td>“We don't agree it’s unnecessary or unwarranted.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.</td>
<td>“We don't care.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141.</td>
<td>“We don't have enough studies.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.</td>
<td>“We don't have the resources.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.</td>
<td>“We don't have the time.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144.</td>
<td>“We don’t see it that way.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.</td>
<td>“We meant nothing of the kind.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146.</td>
<td>“We never did that.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147.</td>
<td>“We shouldn’t get involved.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148.</td>
<td>“We won't have the money.” “Money will be limited.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149.</td>
<td>“We're just too busy; we can't.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.</td>
<td>“We’re not capable of that.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151.</td>
<td>“We're not ready for that.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152.</td>
<td>“Were not approved or disapproved.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.</td>
<td>“Why won’t you use everything I say?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154.</td>
<td>“Will not be allowed to . . .”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.</td>
<td>“Will not be revoked.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156.</td>
<td>“Will not become exercisable.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157.</td>
<td>“You can’t believe that.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158.</td>
<td>“You can’t make a mistake.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159.</td>
<td>“You have nothing to fear.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160.</td>
<td>“You may not take such information out.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

Each year I have the privilege of working with many, many senior and chief executives across the full spectrum of business activity: the corporate sector, government, military, non-profit organizations, and more. One powerful driving concept comes through in each of these settings – the gut-level desire to transform the organization, or to transform how the organization thinks; or to transform the attitudes of a group of individuals or customer base. Personal, top executive leadership is the transformational force that energizes people and organizations to achieve big goals.

Leadership is a lonely obligation. Every leader, no matter how many followers, is an individual actor, sharing ideas and concepts, mostly verbally, in the hope of producing a result that benefits the operation and the people whose lives those operations affect, and that the goals set are achieved.

The question every leader asks repeatedly is, “How can I effectively move the organization forward in some way everyday?” When loyalty is at a premium and markets and workplaces seem so unstable, what is the force that brings focus and forward momentum?

There are crucial behaviors important people, successful executives, and true leaders use to move processes and people forward. These behaviors are the key ingredients of leadership. The more of these ingredients leaders take to heart, teach, and expect of others, the more power they will have to achieve their objective.

These 11 behaviors or ingredients, if applied with sincerity, are quite simple, sensible, quite positive, and very doable. You could call them the Be-attitudes of Leadership because, you see, they start with “be,” and they are attitude-driven behaviors:

1. **BE POSITIVE**
   - Behave in positive ways.
   - Teach others to have fun and celebrate some success every day.
   - Use positive declarative language.
   - Reduce emotional language.
   - Eliminate negative words and phrases.

   **Example:** In normal conversation, when someone says something with which we disagree, we invariably respond by saying something like, “You’re wrong,” or “That’s incorrect,” or “You don’t know what you’re talking about,” or “It’s simply not done that way,” or some
similar negative approach. You may then explain what is correct or how you really do things, but your listener is still dealing with the insult of your negative language. This makes it almost impossible for him/her to hear your constructive language. Negative comments almost always put us on the defensive even though we have important, positive, constructive things to say.

“The Bad News Eradicator,” is a little exercise I do with clients in which I present a list of common negative phrases and then ask the clients to turn them into positives. Let’s take the negative phrases below and turn them into positive ones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“We don’t do it that way.”</td>
<td>“Here’s the way we do it . . . ”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“That’s not our style.”</td>
<td>“Here are important elements of our style . . . ”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The boss won’t buy it.”</td>
<td>“Here’s what the boss has bought in the past; here’s what they may buy in the future . . . ”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“That’s a lie.”</td>
<td>“If you check your facts and assumptions you may come to a different conclusion.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Or, “Using the same analysis we came up with a different, more positive result.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lesson is this: Your use of negative language controls your relationship with other people. Eradicate or eliminate negative and emotional words and you become far more powerful and in control of almost any situation. Your positive approach blocks or defeats those who are negative.

2. **BE A VERBAL VISIONARY**

The manager’s role in any organization is to meet or exceed expectations, meet or exceed established goals or objectives, and help others to do so within the scope of a plan or operational activity.

Leadership, on the other hand, is predominantly a verbal skill. The function of a leader is to look over the horizon, see what’s there, and figure out where the organization has to go, then to return to tell, show, or verbally illustrate the various elements and destinations of the journey and the priorities for moving the organization forward.

This is the work of a verbal visionary.

3. **BE CONSTRUCTIVE**

- Insist on constructive behavior.
- Seek to make and solicit positive, constructive suggestions.
- Seek out useful and challenging questions to answer.
- Critique the performance and achievements of others constructively.
- Help others benefit more than you do each time you interact with them.

Example: Recently a friend called. She was in charge of evaluating the performance of the new minister in their church after a year’s service. She put together a brief letter to members of the congregation asking that they provide some criticism – I believe she used the words “constructive criticism” – of the minister’s performance. She mailed 700. She received more
than 500 responses, each of which contained an average of three comments. Some contained even more.

They were devastating. If you added up all of the criticisms there was no way this minister could possibly continue in the job and survive emotionally. Most of the criticisms were negatives; many reflected individual misunderstandings; and virtually none reflected knowledge of the scope of the congregation’s mission or the daily activities required of the minister as the congregation’s leader. The criticisms boiled down to negative personal commentary.

My friend’s problem was, of course, that she had to share this information to the minister. If she didn’t have something else worked out, she was sure he would undoubtedly resign. While the congregation really liked this man and wanted him to stay, not even a minister could withstand this level of personal criticism.

I told her about a lesson I learned early in my career from Chester Burger. As a communications consultant he faced similar situations inside corporations. His strategy, which I’ve followed for years, was to go back to the same people and, rather than asking for criticism, ask them to make one positive constructive suggestion about what the individual might do to achieve the goals of the organization. The application of this technique is incredibly powerful.

Ask anyone to criticize and critique your appearance, preparation, proposal, presentation, personality, anything, and you’re guaranteed to get dozens of minor negative comments, most of which you couldn’t change even if you wanted to. In fact, most critiques are designed to elicit negative, unhelpful information and are too little, too late.

My friend did go back and use this technique. Out of the 700-member congregation, she received 12 suggestions. Each was implementable and achievable within the next a 30-to-90 day period. My friend went back to the minister, in all honesty, and showed the first assessment from the congregation, but then showed the follow-up work. The minister not only stayed, but also implemented every suggestion in the first 90 days.

The lesson is this: We have the power to structure and control productive discussions and debate. If you want constructive results seek and insist on constructive suggestions. There will be very few, but they will be more useful. If you are constructive and seek positive, constructive suggestions, you automatically control and, therefore, powerfully manage how decisions are made.

Constructive criticism is an oxymoron.

4. **BE PROMPT**

- Answer it now.
- Ask it now.
- Challenge it now.
- Do it now.
- Fix it now.

**Example:** Over the years I’ve learned that whether it’s an activist group, angry employees, upset neighbors, or jealous competitors who appear to be outsmarting us, the way to win, the way to move things forward, the way to stay in charge is to act now, do it now – every time.
This often means making smaller decisions and acting on them more quickly.

- Answer it now. If there are questions, get the answers and get them now.
- Ask it now. Rather than waiting for someone else to ask the serious question, ask it first to get the answer.
- Challenge it now.
- If you know it’s going to be a problem, act now to eliminate the cause.
- Fix it now. If it’s broken, move to repair it; if it’s breaking down, move to shore it up.

The lesson is this: Those who act promptly – who do it now – are ahead of the competition, can foil the opposition’s most carefully laid plans, defeat almost any critic, and control the situation.

The linear thinkers may criticize you for this, “Move that fast and you’ll make mistakes.” Since mistakes will be made, however, deferring them to some other time only delays success. Make the inevitable mistakes early. Fix them now and move on.

5. BE OUTCOME FOCUSED (This means always focus on the goal.)

- Commit to generating and maintaining forward momentum.
- Focus on today and tomorrow.
- Plan with the end in mind.
- Recognize that the past holds very few important lessons.
- Select an achievable, understandable, time-sensitive, worthwhile goal; then go for it.
- Work in the future tense.

Example: In 1995, I was deeply involved in negotiations between some powerful anti-corporate forces: groups of labor unions, church groups, and non-governmental organizations. The issues were extraordinarily compelling, in the news, divisive, and to some extent in the streets. The challenge was to find a way to sit down face-to-face, put these matters in some perspective, and develop a plan of action. Fortunately, someone suggested that we meet with a minister in Brooklyn Heights, New York, just across the East River from Manhattan. He was reputed to have the personal presence required to manage such a politically charged confrontation.

We met in his living room in December. This huge, jovial man greeted us warmly, asked us sit down together in front of a roaring fire, listen to some music, and be quiet for a few minutes.

He then laid down just one ground rule for the day’s work: the discussion was to be entirely outcome-focused. This meant that whatever happened between us prior to entering his living room no longer existed or mattered (disagreements, arguments, behaviors, truth, fiction, and lies). The past was completely irrelevant to our current discussions. If we couldn’t abide by this fundamental ground rule, he promised to end the discussions and bid us a pleasant day.

It’s hard to convey just how powerful this concept is. Fundamentally, it recognizes that everyone owns yesterday, everyone owns this morning. There is nothing anyone can do to change that ownership. But no one owns the future – the next 15 minutes, the next day, the next week, the next month, the next year. Therefore, when we choose to be outcome-focused, we choose how we will enter and live through the future, something we can do together.
Now back to Brooklyn Heights. Each time anyone began a discussion supported by something from the past, our host would halt the discussion and refocus it on tomorrow. By 4:30 that afternoon we had negotiated and signed a one-page agreement. That agreement was reached on December 15, 1995. Those who signed it, still live by it today.

The lesson is this: Focus on tomorrow and only take from yesterday positive, useful, constructive elements and ideas that can move the process forward, promptly. Whatever you did with others on various projects, problems, and situations before you read this article no longer matters. Focusing on the future allows you to build tomorrow without all the problems and misunderstandings of the past.

Bonus lesson: Applying this single concept will cut in half the time you spend in any meeting you attend, sponsor, or lead. A good portion of most meetings is spent explaining to those who weren’t at the last meeting what went on and what has yet to be done. Then it’s necessary to re-explain again because some of those who attended the last meeting have a different perception of what went on than you do. What little time remains is finally used to get something done and move ahead.

Outcome focus saves precious time, reduces mistakes and misunderstandings, and acts as a positive force for moving ahead.

Progress is achieved by looking, acting, and forging ahead. Being outcome focused is one of the most powerful concepts I’ve ever come across to help move things forward. You see, if you stay in the past, argue the past, try to re-write the past . . . You’ll die there; so will your career and your hopes.

You get to the future by starting there.

6. **BE REFLECTIVE**

- Seek only useful positive lessons from the past, if you go there at all.
- What could you have done more or less often in the past? What could you have done to make something better?
- Could you have conducted yourself differently, more consistently, more positively?

Example: In the course of our Brooklyn Heights discussions, there were a few references to the past. The principle of reflective thinking was applied. In other words you can get to go to the past, but only to seek constructive lessons. What useful bit of information could be extracted that would help implement moving forward to achieve a specific goal? Negative lessons were not permitted; emotional conclusions and negative incidents were eliminated.

The lesson is this: The past is of only limited value. It never repeats itself. No scenario from the past is precisely reproducible in the future. There are mistakes we can correct if we take a cold, hard look. There are a few – very, very few – positive lessons that can be mined from past experience and applied successfully to today’s circumstances.

If you must look backwards, look in the most constructive, positive way possible.

7. **BE PRAGMATIC**

Use what works as a platform for what will be or can be accomplished:
• Search for the truths everyone can recognize and benefit by.
• Make your forecasts achievable.
• Help others achieve their goals and forecasts.
• Prepare everyone for underwhelming results.
• Do the doable.
• Know the knowable.
• Achieve the achievable.
• Get the gettable.

Example: Your credibility rests more on what you are actually able to accomplish than on any series of goals or concepts you may choose to announce but only partially, or never achieve.

One of the more interesting stories about pragmatism appears in Jack Welch’s book, *Straight From the Gut*. He had just finished listening to nuclear engineers decide how they were going to begin selling three nuclear reactors per year in the United States, and how this would save this General Electric division.

After listening for an hour, Welch thoughtfully responded that no matter how good the intentions were, nuclear reactors were not going to be sold again in the United States in their lifetime, and that they needed to focus on something else – perhaps servicing existing nuclear facilities would be a more pragmatic approach. GE is now top in its category of servicing nuclear facilities. Mr. Welch was being a pragmatist.

The lesson is this: A pragmatist matches rhetoric with reality. Put yourself in the other person’s shoes. See the world from their perspective. Help them achieve your goals by achieving a portion of their goals in ways they recognize, and from their own perspective. Dale Carnegie was right, “Help the other guy get what he wants, from his perspective; and he’ll help you get what you want, from your perspective.”

Pragmatism is saying and doing things that “make sense.”

**8. BE A YES PERSON**

Select what can be done and focus on that.

Example: One often-heard management phrase is, “Learn how to say no.” Hopefully, we’ve already learned that the power of the negative is defensiveness, confusion, even more questions, all of which fundamentally hurt people. The role of the leader is to let people know what they can do, what they’re expected to do; their latitude in achieving objectives, and to help set and prioritize useful, positive goals.

What happens when an executive says, “You’ve got to learn how to say no.”? What does “no” mean? Which things should not be done? Is this approach a helpful management style? Why is this executive being so negative when all you have done is work 24/7 to see to it that he/she can be successful? What are the criteria for eliminating functions, practices, or processes? Is leadership about not doing things? What is really meant by learning how to say no? Isn’t it far better to teach people how to say “yes”?

The lesson is this: It is far better for managers to lay out precisely what is expected of employees and how they will be measured: “These are the limits of your authority and function, and here are the three things you should do to meet or exceed my expectations; and
other things beyond these three (or four or five) central expectations are less important.” This is helpful; this is being a leader, this is how we move the organization forward, this is how we help individual employees understand what it is the leader is looking for or expects.

9. **BE FOCUSED ON THE CRUCIAL FIVE PERCENT**

We’ve all heard of the equation, better known as the 80-20 rule. Twenty percent of our activities generate 80 percent of our revenue; 20 percent of our customers consume 80 percent of our customer service time. Twenty percent of our time is meaningfully spent, while 80 percent is wasted or otherwise ill used. Twenty percent of our brain is used while 80 percent remains yet to be explored and put into service, . . . you get the idea.

Leaders need to distill even further how to they allocate and consume time. What leaders have to do is to focus on the crucial five percent of what is truly essential to move the organization forward. That leaves 95 percent of the brains, smarts, strategic planning, and execution to the rest of the organization.

Years ago when I was just beginning my career in public relations, I did a marketing study for a Minnesota-based Fortune 500 company that specialized in high technology switching equipment. The marketing study was extensive, expensive, and one of the most interesting projects I’d worked on at that time in my career. When I made my presentation to the assembled executives and their staffs, the response was clearly enthusiastic. When I asked the CEO about moving forward, he said that the majority of the things I talked about were things the organization needed to do and would be enormously helpful.

When I asked him how many of my of my recommendations we could begin implementing his response astounded me. “Oh” he said, “I think we can manage about four percent of what you recommended.” I was stunned. Virtually everything in my report seemed to be useful, successful, and implementable. Everyone was enthusiastic. So in my naive but brazen way, I asked directly if I had made a mistake and misunderstood what happened just an hour earlier?

The CEO’s response was, “No Jim, you didn’t make a mistake. But the fact is, this is a 5,000-employee organization. I am only the CEO. The reality is, those who show up to work every day run this company. Some days we do really well. Some days key people don’t show, or are here but don’t get much done. I’m 57 years old, which means I’ll be the CEO of this organization for probably the next six-to-eight years maximum. If I can shift this organization’s focus or center of direction four-to-five percent each year I’ll be doing extraordinarily well, and that’s considering our competitive environment and how our business changes from month-to-month. This means that in the entire term of my tenure as chairman, if I can turn this organization 35-to-40 percent, I’ll be doing extremely well, absent a catastrophe like a hostile takeover, which could turn this ship 90 degrees or 125 degrees in an afternoon.”

The lessons for me were these: first, the absolute need to focus on what is truly, truly important, that five percent; and second, the limitations of leadership. Even the most dynamic, exciting, and amazing individual is unlikely to make radical changes in organizations over night. Organizational change is incremental.

Here’s a place where the inspiration from Jack Welch is useful to factor in. GE was already America’s most admired corporation when he took over, and he was Chairman for 20 years. By his own count, he only came up with five major initiatives in the 20-year period of his chairmanship. Those ideas did transform the company from a bureaucratically dominated, old-fashioned American conglomerate to a reasonably agile, well-financed, and market-sensitive
leading company in virtually all of its product categories. It took him 20 years, five powerful concepts, and a leadership approach that enabled his own team of managers to move forward.

10. **BE A FINISHER**

- Start what you can finish.
- Stop what you can’t get done.
- Avoid endless and mindless projects.
- Focus on completion.
- Break down the barriers to completion.
- Forecast, and then overcome the institutional resistance to completion.

Studies of management failure and management success show that the ability to finish a few small but core projects can be the difference between success and failure; supremacy and mediocrity; vision and confusion; and reputation gain or catastrophe. *Fortune* magazine cites the failure to complete their own projects and programs as the single most frequent reason CEOs are fired.

Large organizations tend to generate lots of projects, lots of ideas, and lots of “things to do.”

Most CEOs will tell you that when they analyze organizational to-do lists, for every 100 projects there are only three-to-five deserving or needing completion. For every 20 development concepts, only two are worth the effort, energy, and expenditure, and half of those will fail.

Start things you can and will finish. Terminate those things that can never be finished. Off load those processes that suck away time, resources, and key attention of your most valuable people. Beware the sucking sounds: time sucks, resource sucks, brainpower sucks, attitude sucks, and enthusiasm sucks.

The lesson is this: Look at every project, every concept, and every idea that needs to move forward as a marathon. The test of a marathon runner is finishing at the earliest possible time, no matter how long it takes or what level of personal commitment required. Focus, energy, enthusiasm, stamina, sheer guts, and the fortitude to finish are the forces that genuinely move organizations to the head of the line, or to whole new levels of accomplishment and achievement.

If there is no finish line, avoid the starting line.

11. **BE RELENTLESS IN SEEKING POSITIVE, INCREMENTAL, PERSONAL IMPROVEMENT EVERY DAY**

- Break problems into solvable parts.
- Resolve each increment of the problem promptly.
- Watch for the big break. Capitalize on big things when they happen.
- Prepare to be lucky, but remember that luck is limited.
- The lucky ones are those who are relentlessly incremental in their personal progress every day.
- Crises occur explosively but are resolved incrementally.
Example: Everything we do, know, or create came into being incrementally... recognizable increments occur usually in the correct order.

The most credible leaders and managers are those who relentlessly and intentionally:

- Grow and learn every day.
- Help those they serve to achieve some positive incremental progress every single day.
- Identify and talk about those positive increments that they work with, supervise, or lead achieve everyday.
- Assess what they’ve learned, then teach it to others.

This is among the most profound lessons I can share with you. It is the one I think you’ll probably remember most, true success comes to those who relentlessly seek positive, incremental, personal improvement every day.

Well there you are, eleven powerful transformational leadership generating attitudes and behaviors:

1. Be positive.
2. Be a verbal visionary.
3. Be constructive.
4. Be prompt.
5. Be outcome-focused.
6. Be reflective.
7. Be pragmatic.
8. Be a yes person.
9. Be focused on the crucial five percent.
10. Be a finisher.
11. Be relentless in seeking positive, incremental, personal improvement every day.

How will you know when you have achieved success? Here are some indicators: You’ll be invited to share your opinions at higher levels within your organization. As a matter of daily routine you’ll be able to articulate what is truly important, useful, and helpful to others. You’ll notice that, from your perspective, you are doing more important things. This may mean moving to more important work than that which you’re currently doing. It may mean evaluating your current environment and determining whether or not you can become a leadership force within the situation in which you currently find yourself.

Leaders automatically ask themselves several questions at the end of each day. This is a discipline that will ensure that even your most frustrating day is rewarding and important:

- What did I learn today?
- How can I apply that learning to something I’m currently working on or something I want to work on?
- What did others learn from me today?
- How many times today did someone tell me they heard me quoted in a meeting they attended and people were inspired to move ahead?
- How or what have I improved in some way for someone else today?

Leadership is the strategic force that drives individuals, organizations, cultures, and societies forward every day. Leadership is the discipline of being intentionally constructive with a relentlessly positive approach to helping everyone. With these 11 Be-attitudes of Leadership you can live an important, happy, and successful life.
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Among the most frequent questions I get when speaking to groups or talking to clients, and especially to victims and survivors, are:

— “Why do companies and their leadership continue to make the very same mistakes time and time again?”
— “Don’t they read the papers?”
— “Don’t they watch the news?”
— “Don’t they talk about how to avoid the problems they see their colleagues, peers and friends having?”

It’s a question of ethical leadership.

The simple and direct answer is, very rarely. Businesses don’t learn because the typical response to a crisis is focused more on forgetting than learning. The first inclination is to punish the innocent, next, to cover up the misdeeds of the powerful; and then purge the organization of anyone remotely associated with the problems, including the chief executive, sometimes the CFO and even the general counsel.

These summary cultural executions effectively deny the organization the opportunity to learn how to detect, prevent and deter such circumstances from occurring again because the only people who can teach these things are the perpetrators who were responsible in the first place. But they are gone, or muzzled by their attorneys.

The Penn State circumstance is the most complete recent example of this flawed but continually accepted strategy.
**Phase One:** Denial, disbelief and Institutional Deafness: Ignoring the circumstances and allegations, questioning credibility and motives, and discrediting those making the allegations.

**At Penn State:** Internally the early reports were clearly delayed, ignored, discouraged, and discredited for eleven years.

**Phase Two:** Victim confusion. The institution and the perpetrators claim that they are just as much the victim as those who they have been alleged to have assaulted, intimidated and otherwise harmed. The voice of doom speaks, “If this continues, the institution could be harmed.”

**At Penn State:** As the scandal became more real, institutional defensiveness kicked in all the way to DEFCON 5, the official feeling of being under attack and forced to respond.

**Phase Three:** The phony internal investigation strategy stage which prolongs the denials before finally determining either that the allegations are bogus or that, “It was an isolated incident”. In the process, the victims are further discredited; the challenging authorities are demeaned.

**At Penn State:** Victims, media, and any naysayers were actually set upon by students, faculty and community members. All the while, the chief known perpetrator, Mr. Sandusky, and others in the administration were at liberty to try to cover their criminal activities and abusive behaviors, including Mr. Paterno. Ultimately, Mr. Freeh was retained and produced a devastating outside, independent analysis and recommendations.

**Phase Four:** The head-fake shifting blame to everyone else but the folks in charge.

**At Penn State:** The perpetrators, even the police and the co-conspirators, protected each other until the forces of public pressure absolutely required that they be exposed and removed. All this happened, despite a clear pathway of culpability from within the organization in athletics and moving up to the very top.

**Phase Five:** Failing to truly punish the guilty or subject them to corrective behaviors. Two extraordinary consequences occur:

— First: the loss of knowledge of how these problems came about from those who have a better understanding of the entire organization than anyone, the perpetrators.

— Second: an entire avenue of learning for the institution and subsequent cultural modification is removed.

**At Penn State:** Early on there was an extraordinary movement to begin forgetting the incident as quickly as possible. Even now, the University is on the public relations defensive to
continue the process of eradicating these incidents from their memory through extensive PR efforts.

**Phase Six:** Punishing the innocent. Along comes the first of a series of sanctions aimed at the institution, but hits the students instead, missing the perpetrators, the collaborators, and the facilitators.

**At Penn State:** They welcomed the sanctions largely because they themselves couldn’t figure out what to do that would be publicly and internally acceptable.

**Phase Seven:** Bury or hide all the remembrances to ensure forgetfulness. This approach, involving forced forgetfulness, denies the victim’s validation for their suffering and demeans and diminishes the beneficial impact of those who are able to stand up and bring comfort and justice to the afflicted.

**At Penn State:** They removed one statue of Mr. Paterno, but left another in place.

**Phase Eight:** Persecution of the innocent is piled on by outsiders.

**At Penn State:** The NCAA sanctions the school by taking away years of victories, punishing thousands of students no longer attending the University, including those who attended honorably while in school. The NCAA has, like so many intervening outsiders, provided a distraction rather than a solution. The University of Minnesota has announced that it will not recruit athletic students from Penn State.

What is learnable from this tragedy?

1. Culture change requires that the University preserve, expose, disclose and continuously discuss these criminal behaviors rather than simply eradicating them from the life, even the history of the organization.

2. The perpetrators and those found guilty should be required to make periodic appearances to subject themselves to public and survivor questioning to help others understand the sources, nature, and scope of damage to deter future, similar criminal behavior.

3. Traditional, puffy public relations is the exact opposite of what’s needed and will encourage the cover up of previous, and perhaps current, negative administration activities. Public Relations signals an end to additional ongoing disclosures, and diminishes and demeans the important culture changing activities going on.

4. The new compliance structure should continue investigating, be vigilant, and impose compliance. The facts, information and data should be disclosed continuously as discovered. This monitor must focus on present senior administrators of the institution.
Their predecessor’s lack of leadership, complicit behavior that still goes largely undiscovered and unpunished. And, given half a chance, history demonstrates that the new interim administrators are weak and likely to follow or be pushed into similar repulsive behaviors.

5. Culture change occurs through a continuous senior leadership based effort to remind, remember, rehearse, and revisit the circumstances that permitted the victimization of these children. The cultural change goals are to ensure that such events and circumstances are deterred, reported, investigated, prosecuted and prevented.

How long does culture change take? Well, let’s see. When will the victims stop being victims?

The student body insults and punishments will continue, but now by former friends.

This is the old psychology idea that spreading the pain and suffering out among a much larger base of individuals, helps all affected heal or help in the healing. The real effect is that the guilty feel innocent and the innocent feel even guiltier. Believe it or not, there are many who would call this good, therapeutic practice. Ask a victim or their surviving relatives if that’s how they feel.

We find this same delusional notion in other fields… In Public Relations your gaff is covered up and reduced in intensity if you can gather a cluster of third parties around to you to protect you and distract others. In industry the old axiom was, “Dilution is the solution to pollution.”

There has to be a better way. These patterns of willful ignorance, organized forgetfulness, organizational deafness, and the love of yesterday are what give management and leadership the opportunity to say nothing, learn nothing and do nothing.

This article was first published at CommPro.Biz on September 5, 2012. It can also be found on the Crisis Guru blog and the Risdall Public Relations blog.
WINNING WHEN EVERYONE IS MAD AT YOU
How Waging Peace and Reducing Contention Can Bring Success
- Seven Strategies -

By James E. Lukaszewski, ABC, APR, Fellow PRSA

Wherever there is conflict, confrontation and crisis, there is contention. In today’s Twitter, Blogger and bloviater dominated world, working to resolve important issues, questions and decisions often begins very contentiously and ends only after one side is beaten and leaves the field; there is a mutual withdrawal, or mostly commonly, one side wins and the other side stays angry.

Winning, it turns out is rarely about getting 51 percent of individuals or groups to concur or comply; it’s getting 51 percent of those who matter. This thinking leads to an Axiom and a Law.

**Lukaszewski’s first axiom of winning in contentious situations:** Almost every decision of any consequence is made despite serious, often powerful collateral contentiousness. The media can be mad, or support someone else, some of your neighbors can be irritated, even your employees can be against you, but stay the course, be constructive in your approach and you can win.

**Lukaszewski’s law of success and survival:** Neither the media, your severest critic, angry neighbors, irritated legislators, nor regulators can truly stop what you have set out to accomplish. The most significant damage is almost always caused by the intervention, timidity, or hesitation of an overoptimistic boss or Board, well-meaning friends, “supporters,” or relatives, and failure to address the issues raised by those who feel victimized by the process.

These seven principles are the components of a strategic approach for winning:

1. **Wage peace every day:** Reduce the production of critics, enemies and victims at every opportunity. Talk tough, act tough, or threaten and you will have war for sure. War
produces casualties, victims, and new critics, all of whom will live long enough to destroy, delay, or stop your best efforts.

2. Reduce contention: Contention is the absence of agreement. Work for agreement, incrementally, every day. Stop causing contention.

3. Seek permission rather than entitlement: Getting permission depends upon gaining public agreement and consent. Avoid and resist anything, anyone, or any decision, that delays, denies, disables, or damages the permission process. Act like you’re entitled to a public decision and you’ll really be stopped cold.

4. Control testosterosis: Anger, irritation, frustration, and confrontation cloud judgment, damage relationships, cause misunderstandings, create critics, naysayers and rarely accomplish anything good. Stop taking contrary views and negative messages personally. The only one who is suffering from this is you. No one else cares. Remain calm and carry on.

5. Be Democratic: Recognize and leverage from the patterns of democracy, avoid political games and game players, all those people have their own agendas. They will dump you in a minute.

6. Work as directly as you can: Like most everything that matters in life, agreement is generally achieved, when the principals commit to sit down face-to-face and directly work out their differences. Engagement builds stakeholder support, and reduces the production of critics.

7. Communicate Intentionally: Success depends on simple, sensible, positive, declarative and constructive communication, common sense, direct, prompt action, empathy, transparency, and engagement. Explain to everyone as well as remind them of your communication and behavior intentions so they will know what to expect and how to behave in return.

Over the 30 years I’ve been helping clients get public permission, communities, critics, individuals and organized opposition have consistently grown more powerful in their ability to stop or significantly alter the plans of even the most worthy projects and powerful companies. With “social media” the power of individual opposers will continue to grow.

I’ve also learned that you can often achieve your objectives with people being upset, the media angry, your employees split, and in communities that may be more divided than unified.

Winning depends on altitude (keeping calm) and attitude:

1. Candor: Public trust depends on receiving information well ahead of their actual need for it. The most toxic strategy is to fail to answer every question, provide key information after it is truly needed, or work to disparage, demean, or discredit those
who oppose or have concerns about the project, and go to the trouble of making them public.

2. **Patience**: Accomplishing your goals is going to take longer than ever imagined, even to achieve interim milestones.

3. **Resources**: Success will defy financial management. More money will be spent for things one never imagined would happen, or be requested or required.

4. **Stomach Power**: Set your stomach for all the lies, misunderstandings, deceptions, bad behaviors and misrepresentations created by angry, frightened, and unqualified people with real power, combined with a willing media, and the outrageous motives they will ascribe to you, with all of your explanations, good work and intentions just bouncing off.

5. **Staying Power**: Community decision making is slow, sometimes silly, even stupid, sloppy, expensive, confusing, and emotionally driven. Settle back and go with the flow. Kick up, kick out, and you’ll go nowhere pretty quickly.

6. **Pragmatism**: Winning means constantly waging peace and re-acquiring community consent daily. It means relentlessly doing the doable, knowing the knowable, getting the getable, and achieving the achievable.

   If democracy is one thing, it is a process. Those who propose, if they can stay the course, can expect to achieve less than they had hoped, sometimes far less, but usually wind up with more than they need to successfully achieve their objectives, which are likely to change as the community has its say. If you believe that you are entitled to get what you are asking for, you are entitled only to disappointment.

   Your goal is to help work preemptively, constructively, and productively to shorten the timelines and lower the barriers that are inevitable byproducts of public decision making. Wage peace and win earlier, if winning is possible at all.

---

*James E. Lukaszewski, ABC, APR, Fellow PRSA is a crisis communications expert with Risdall Public Relations based in St. Paul, Minnesota.*
How to Successfully Fire the CEO
The When, The Why, and The Where

By James E. Lukaszewski, ABC, APR, Fellow PRSA

How do you know when it's time for the CEO to go? What are the indicators, the mistakes, and the evidence that signal the need for departure? Who makes the decision, what’s the sequence of events, just how tough, and embarrassing, is it going to be?

A number of sources each year, usually the business magazines, take a poll, do some kind of survey, look up at the sky, and come up with the top 10 reasons CEOs have to go. One conclusion we can quickly draw is that the risks to CEO survival are steadily increasing.

Here's Lukaszewski’s CEO Departure Index (LCDI) -- a compilation of recent departure reason lists and what I see every day as a leadership consultant and observer.

1. **Failure to get the job done.** The number one reason is the inability of the CEO to actually carry out or execute what he or she was hired to achieve.

2. **Over optimism.** Constantly casting every decision, action, and decision in the most positive light possible whatever the actual circumstances. Sooner or later somebody notices, a key shareholder, a whistleblower, industry watchers, CEO watchers, the SEC, the Justice Department – you get the picture. Someone is always watching and counting what CEOs do.

3. **People trouble.** Big dreams, big aspirations, overcoming major obstacles often requires the acquisition of new people with new talents. Hiring the right people at the right altitude is one of the greatest challenges of top leadership. The failure rate for such new hires is high, probably 50% or better. When these people fail, the boss fails too.

4. **Stuck in the mud.** No matter what the fanfare, accolades from the board, even industry recognition, outsider or insider, huge problems, a demoralized workforce, persistent bad news can combine to defeat even the most highly credentialed CEO.

5. **AWOL.** This is the CEO who loves the television camera, the public platform, who is the high-profile do-gooder. When public visibility supersedes meeting fundamental management responsibilities, trouble lies ahead.
6. **Too long in the tooth.** A compilation of ten-year forecasts by executive search and outplacement firms puts the average tenure of a new American and European CEO at about 41 months. Every month beyond this threshold puts the incumbent deeper into this “long in the tooth” zone and closer to the door.

7. **What business schools failed to teach.** In the good old days of being a CEO, now long past, being a Chief was a career capstone. The job was fundamentally operational, inspirational, institutionally focused, and a pretty good gig. Today, by some estimates, the CEOs job has become about 40% operational and up to 60% nonoperational. Before, an angry shareholder would be mollified by the IR folks. Today this individual blasts right through to the CEO’s desk. The same is true for public policy problems, neighbor problems, product problems, angry dissatisfied customers, and victims. Failure to manage these highly emotional nonoperational circumstances is among the most important and growing causes of CEO departures. Silence is definitely toxic to the CEO’s career. Doing something can also be career defining.

Emotional behaviors and demands tend to fall on management’s deaf ears. What these people learned in business school was that only what you can measure or count matters. Guess again.

8. **Failure to manage persistent bad news.** One of the most interesting contrasts illustrating the vulnerability of CEOs is the difference between the Exxon Valdez incident in 1989, and the British Petroleum disaster of 2011. Exxon CEO Larry Rawls blasted the press, chided and insulted activists, government officials, just about everybody who argued that the spill in Alaska was a big deal. He and his pals at the petroleum club enjoyed extraordinary press coverage of their anger, vitriol, and whining. Fast forward to 2011, Tony Hayward says a few stupid things: “I would like my life back….” and “The Gulf of Mexico is a really big ocean,” and he's out the door.

9. **Being the leader when bad things happen.** Today, virtually the first person tossed overboard will be the CEO. Boards and shareholders have learned that the best way to stop the lightning is to get rid of the lightning rod, the CEO. Want to moderate negative media coverage, fire the CEO. Want to move inquiries away from the company or organization, fire the CEO. Want to distract the detractors, even temporarily, fire the CEO. Want to temporarily redirect the work of public officials and congressional committees, fire the CEO.

There is a ritual for showing these people the door which is, in and of itself, a bit ludicrous and maddening. This ritual has ten basic components:

1. **Establishing the grounds for removal:** Once the decision has been agreed to, this is often the most difficult and challenging assignment. The decision to remove is way easier than figuring out why and how.
2. Determining what information might be necessary to achieve the removal objective: Sometimes the appointing authority is so gun shy, the step becomes a major source of delay and debate.

3. Preparing the exit compensation strategy: Another major point of contention between those who want to punish, and those who want to move on. There'll be a big check in either scenario. Count on it.

4. Constructing the nondisclosure i.e. protecting the guilty, the incompetent, the conspirators, and the complacent): Why this is so important remains a mystery to most, but nevertheless takes up significant discussion time.

5. Testing the waters: Someone has to start the, “you need to exit” conversation. It’s usually a couple, sometimes three people, for what will be an 8 minutes or less conversation.

6. Redoing your plans following first contact: Despite some shock and awe, this is when the real uncertainty, sometimes paralysis, sets in. This is classic strategic planning. The reality is that after the first shot is fired, a whole new strategy will likely be needed to respond to the CEO’s reactions.

7a. Keeping those in the know from premature public disclosure: Like most urgent or crisis like situations, it's never the media, the government, your toughest competitor, or even an angry employee that messes up your plans and spills the beans. Premature disclosure is all too frequently done by a board member who has a different perspective, an overconfident CEO, a well-meaning friend, or a relative.

7b. Destiny Management: Managing the story from the inside out: If ever there was a time to enforce the systematic and rigorous cascading communication strategy based on engagement, this is the time. Start at the top with leadership, and then migrate further south to the next level of leadership, then further south to the first line supervisors with probably a total of four messages, each message being between 75-100 words. These mini-scripts then make up whatever you say outside, regarding of the questions the organization is being asked. Adverse news accounts, web accounts, and social media accounts are collected, corrected, clarified or commented on, with great promptness on your organization’s web site. It’s your destiny. If you fail to manage it, someone else is waiting in the wings to do it for you.

8. Preparing for leaks, hiccups, unintended consequences, and stupid mistakes: These stumbles, fumbles, bumbles and mumbles are caused, to be charitable, by the need to be perfectly ready. The problem is, once this process is underway there is no stopping it, and there's only one way to avoid the stumbles, get it done fast, even faster than fast.
Hiring people is always a dicey business. Firing people, upon reflection, is always done with a dull meat ax. Avoid prolong the process. Do it quickly - now - and fix far fewer mistakes later.

9. **Waging peace, finally, rather than war:** If the target of the disposal effort pushes back, typical business school strategy says taking things off the table, punish them, teach them a lesson, "Don't be a sissy when you're doing this." After a while, somebody really smart recognizes that the most powerful word to achieving your dismissal objective is," yes," rather than no.
This usually takes place after sufficient public or internal embarrassment.

10. **Writing the check and zipping their lips.** Frankly, I've never understood the reason for nondisclosure agreements. The usual legal rationale is the prevention of copyrights, release of proprietary or competitive information. However, since most organizations have only one CEO at the time, the likelihood of copycats seems small. The more likely reason is the prevention of somebody’s personal embarrassment among business buddies and yet another bad headline. I always remind my clients that the check they write today will likely be the smallest check they will ever write in this matter, So let's get to it. It turns out that, as in most crisis scenarios, speed beats smart every time.

James E. Lukaszewski is the President of The Lukaszewski Group Division of Risdall Marketing, based in the Twin Cities. His practice includes crisis preemption and management, leadership and organizational recovery.
Strengthening Corporate Trust
In Times of Crisis (Part 1)

By James E. Lukaszewski

All too often when large companies and organizations fix mistakes and cope with disaster, embarrassment, and difficulty, a familiar pattern of initial behaviors occurs that actually generates more adverse results and more serious ethical lapses.

This article, appearing in two parts, suggests a rather extensive template for use in forecasting and pre-empting those opportunities for unethical, or at the very least, questionable behavior by management and others in times of crisis.

Part II contains specific templates for regaining public trust and confidence, and repairing whatever ethical damage has occurred.

Early on in crisis there are far too few acts of corporate courage, especially at the highest levels. Relatively quickly an all-too-familiar pattern resurfaces: confusion, contradiction, and avoidance that is marked by denial, victim confusion, arrogance, search for the guilty, fear of the media, and management by whining, rather than prompt, positive, ethical action.

All organizations have vulnerabilities that create ethical dilemmas—bad loans; faulty financial strategies; rogue employees and bosses; fraud; foolishness; the landfill to be sited or closed; the labor agreement that’s getting tougher to negotiate; the sudden appearance of a new tax provision in an otherwise benign piece of legislation; a product recall; a kickback scandal; saying too much; buying too much; selling too much; blowing something up; burning something down; allowing something to leak, seep, smoke, or stink—and critics who grow stronger with every newly revealed, often self-inflicted mistake.

The bigger the enterprise, the greater is the potential for large-scale problems or collections of scattered adverse events being gathered into a pattern of negative, often unethical behavior.

Leaning in the wrong direction

There are seven early spontaneous management reactions that crisis and ethics management strategists must plan against. If these behaviors occur and go unaddressed, management will quickly multitask itself into long-term difficulty driven by the questionable ethics of these actions. These behaviors will be mirrored in others who are simply reflecting the unethical or questionable behaviors and attitudes of their bosses.

1. Denial — Refusal to accept that something bad has happened; that there may be victims or other direct effects that require prompt public acknowledgement. There is denial that it is really serious; denial that the media or public have any real stake or interest in whatever the problem happens to be; denial that it should take anyone’s time in the organization except those in top management specifically tasked to deal with it;
The bigger the enterprise, the greater is the potential for large-scale problems or collections of scattered adverse events being gathered into a pattern of negative, often unethical behavior.

denial that the problem is of any particular consequence to the organization provided no one talks about it except those directly involved.

Typical management responses are: “Let’s not overreact.” “Let’s keep it to ourselves.” “We don’t need to tell the people in public affairs and public relations just yet. They’ll just blab it all over.” “If we don’t talk, no one will know.”

2. Victim Confusion — Irritable reaction to reporters, employees, angry neighbors, and victims’ families when they ask for help, information, explanation, or apology.

“Hey! We’re victims too,” says management.

Symptoms include time-wasting explanations of what a good corporate citizen we have been, how we have contributed to the opera, the community, and the schools. “We don’t deserve to be treated this badly.” “Mistakes can happen, even to the best of companies.” “We’re only human.” “People make mistakes.”

When these behaviors don’t pass the community, media, or victim ‘straight face’ test, or are criticized or laughed at, a stream of defensive threats follows:

- “There is risk in everything humans do.”
- “We’ve only known about this problem for the last two years.”
- “There aren’t even any government standards to cover it. Until there are standards, how can we be expected to comply?”
- “If the government enforces this regulation, it will destroy our competitiveness.”
- “If we have to close this plant, it’s their fault.”
- “It’s the only decision we can make.”
- “If we are forced to address this problem to this level, many more will suffer needlessly.”

3. Testosterosis — Looking for ways to hit back rather than to deal with the problem. It is marked by refusing to give in; refusing to respect those who may have a difference of opinion or a legitimate issue; manifesting disrespect for critics, victims, families, angry employees, and neighbors.

Because there is so much at stake, there is often extraordinary negative energy inside the executive circle. That is what testosterosis really is, an attack of negative adrenaline. Another definitive testosterosis indicator is the use of military terminology—“enemy,” “beach head,” “attack,” “counterattack,” “retreat,” “truce.” This builds a macho atmosphere. This emotional mentality sets the stage for predictable errors, omissions, and mistakes.

4. Arrogance — A reluctance to apologize, express concern or empathy, or to take appropriate responsibility because, as is often said, “If we do that, we’ll be liable,” or, “We’ll look like sissies,” or, “We’ll set bad precedents,” or, “There’ll be copycats,” or, “We’ll legitimize the bad actions of people who don’t like us anyway.”

It is conspicuous by a contempt for adversaries, sometimes even for victims, and almost always for the news media. It is corrosive. It incites more powerful negative responses.

5. Search for the Guilty — Shifting blame away while digging into the organization to look for traitors, turncoats, troublemakers, those who push back or make mistakes.

The news media and employees probably would be shocked to learn how much energy is often diverted to the search for “guilty” individuals and to finding others to blame.

6. Fear of the Media — As it becomes clear that the problem is at least partly real, the media and victims begin asking, “What did you know, and when did you know it?” “What have you done, and when did you do it?” along with other humiliating, embarrassing, and damaging questions such as, “What have you done and why?” “What do you refuse to do and why?” and “How many victims will it take to get action?” There are no good answers because the organization’s leaders have stalled for so long.

Those in public affairs and media relations know this phase has begun when they hear comments like, “There they go again, just attacking business like always,” or when the Communications Department manager or director is asked why his/her “friends” in the media have once again intentionally misunderstood their business. Orders are issued to “stop the story,” “ban reporters,” “keep employees from talking to the press,” “call the publisher,” and to “reconsider the advertising policy” (yes, some executives
still think this way).

7. **Management by whining about** — Shuffling around, head down, whining and complaining about bad luck, the people that wield power undeservedly, being misunderstood by the media, and why we “aren’t getting credit” for what we have already contributed to society.

Self-talk prevails. When the decision is made to finally move ahead, the corporation focuses on its own pain. This makes victims, employees, neighbors, government officials, and the media even angrier. Here are some of my favorite whiny management phrases:

- “Who appointed the media to deal with this?”
- “We can’t be competitive if the media gives away our secrets.”
- “This is our business and no one else’s.”
- “How can reporters do a story without all the facts?”
- “It’s just harassment and personal media attacks.”
- “Aren’t reporters interested in the truth?”
- “The media are a bunch of liberal zealots.”
- “It’s the only way these creeps can raise money for their cause.”

---

**Fear is the most difficult human emotion to dispel.** When there are physical injuries or death, or threat of further serious injuries, it may be impossible to do more than attempt to reduce the fear.

---

**Community vs. Corporate Priorities: A Powerful Paradox**

The key to understanding why corporate reputation is so easily threatened is to comprehend the different priorities communities and individuals set versus the corporation. On a day-to-day basis, companies and organizations tend to operate around what is in their economic and operational best interest. So long as the community and/or individuals are unaffected, there is little difficulty. However, when a crisis situation occurs, it is the community’s value system that predominates.

The corporation or organization that refuses to acknowledge, abide by, accept, and operate in response to the community’s value system is the corporation or organization whose reputation, ability to operate, and, perhaps, even future survival is threatened.

Remember the community’s definition of a value.

**A community value is a personal protective belief. It is something that cannot be changed without the participation and permission of the community or the individuals directly involved.**

Figure 1 simply but dramatically illustrates the community’s priorities versus corporate priorities. When a crisis occurs, the corporation or organization must immediately adopt the community’s priorities until such time as the community gives its permission to the company or organization to resume its normal method of operations.

Companies wishing to maintain good relationships with constituents will recognize the power of these community values and expectations and build corporate operational values and behaviors around these community priorities. — **JEL**

**Figure 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Priorities</th>
<th>Corporate Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Health and Safety</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Natural Environment</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Social Environment</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Cultural Environment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Technical Considerations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Financial Considerations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Economic Considerations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Building/rebuilding trust and credibility

The first casualties in a crisis are often trust and credibility. America’s current fiscal and economic woes are the result of failed moral and ethical leadership. This very public and pervasive situation illustrates how quickly and deeply trust can be damaged.

Credibility is conferred by others based on an individual’s or organization’s past behavior. When bad things happen, past behavior will be used to predict future actions. When past behaviors have been good and helpful, and current and future behaviors don’t match those expectations, there is a loss of credibility.

Trust is the absence of fear. Fear results from unexpected injury caused by circumstances or by someone or something that was previously trusted. Fear is the most difficult human emotion to dispel. When there are physical injuries or death, threatening circumstances, or threat of further serious injuries, it may be impossible to do more than attempt to reduce the fear. Left unaddressed, fear is corrosive, creating frustration, anger, then retribution. There are seven trust-building, fear-reducing, credibility-fixing behaviors:

- Provide advance information.
- Ask for input.
- Listen carefully.
- Bring victims/involuntary participants into the decision-making process.
- Demonstrate that you have heard, i.e., change your plans.
- Stay in touch.
- Speak in plain language.

What follows is a study of one company’s failure to protect and enhance corporate trust in a crisis. Entirely fictitious, the content in this case study was culled from real cases, real problems, and real circumstances where people suffered injury and death, and from the behaviors of the executives involved.

BurgerMax: A fictional case study in crisis response

On a Wednesday afternoon at about 1:30 p.m., the first seven-year-old patient was admitted to St. Mary’s Emergency Room suffering from a very unusual but unmistakable set of symptoms. This child was the victim of a severe form of E. coli, a bacterial contaminant commonly found in meat products and undercooked food. That same afternoon, a number of patients of various ages were admitted to St. Mary’s with symptoms of food poisoning or food-born illness. Other emergency rooms across the city were experiencing similar circumstances. It was determined by early evening that what these patients had in common was they had eaten a meal that day, or the previous evening, at a BurgerMax fast food restaurant.

On an anonymous tip from a hospital emergency room worker to the local ABC affiliate, the story broke on the ten o’clock evening news.

The timeline

Events unrolled as follows:

**Day One:** Customers and the media call to ask about those who were getting sick. BurgerMax denies any responsibility and refuses to talk with the families except through an attorney. Intense media speculation forces the company to make public statements and to issue a news release. Company officials call in the department of health.

**Day Two:** Continued media speculation forces BurgerMax to acknowledge that something that happened in their ovens might be the cause. “If it was our burgers,” more than likely, the company said, “it was the fault of the supplier who provided contaminated meat.” The company cautions the media to be responsible and not to start a panic. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) is already examining the supplier’s facilities. Other countries have made similar announcements.

**Day Three:** The first deaths are reported. Many departments of health suggest shutting down all BurgerMax restaurants for inspection and decontamination. The company agrees to shut down the three restaurants where identifiable victims had eaten. Families of the victims hold news conferences demanding that BurgerMax take responsibility. BurgerMax runs full page ads.

The theme of these advertisements is: “Don’t panic.” “It’s just an isolated incident.” “We follow the law.” “Come on down and enjoy a MammothMax.”
BurgerMax releases a statement condemning meat inspection programs. “This might not have happened had there been more qualified inspectors.” “It’s an industry-wide problem.”

**Day Four:** Two more children die. The department of health reports that cooking temperatures were probably too low to kill the bacteria. BurgerMax says, “We followed all approved procedures,” “Food safety is our number one concern,” “If the meat had not been contaminated by our suppliers, there would not have been problems in our restaurants.”

**Day Five:** Another death. BurgerMax announces it will sponsor an international study of food safety. It contributes $100,000, declaring that meat inspection is a “government problem that needs to be promptly addressed.” Two former employees, speaking anonymously, suggest that they may have, “cut a corner or two,” especially during busy times. “Managers just looked the other way.”

**Day Six:** Two more deaths. The families of the first victims announce litigation against BurgerMax and demand criminal investigations. The company announces a plan to help victim families obtain assistance more easily and suggests that they come to the company rather than to government agencies, the news media, or attorneys.

**Stall and delay**

An analysis of this case shows that through the crisis, BurgerMax displayed the following behaviors. The company:

1. Stalled and delayed in getting information to the victims and to the public.
2. Never had a good grasp on exactly what information would be useful to the victims:
   - What to do if you are experiencing symptoms.
   - How to get more information about E. coli.
   - Exactly what BurgerMax was going to do to make the situation right.
3. Only looked internally for expertise. It didn’t seek help from external resources.
4. Rejected recommendations for an advisory board.
5. Blamed consultants, government, and suppliers for what was ultimately its own responsibility.
6. Listened with a corporate ear. It heard only the financial markets.
7. Responded financially first. “This will cost a lot of money.” Promised to help but then delayed payments.
8. Had little or no follow-up with victims. It concentrated follow-up efforts with the government, but only because the company was required to do so.
9. Rely ever on technical language to support its position that suppliers contaminated the meat and also to explain why it wasn’t adequately prepared to manage this crisis. It seemed to have no understanding of the risks associated with this bacterial strain. It maintained that the problem was not its fault. It appeared to be testing its legal defense strategy through the news media.
10. Never considered the victims as BurgerMax victims, but rather as victims of faulty government inspection systems and non-compliant suppliers. It ignored the fact that its employees felt like victims as well.
11. Probably lied about what it knew and when it had crucial information. At the very least, it hid behind legal definitions rather than be forthcoming early in the scenario.

By comparison, companies in a crisis foster trust and credibility when they:

1. Talk openly.
2. Reveal what the public should know, even if they don’t ask.
3. Explain problems, delays, and changes quickly.
4. Answer all questions, even those that victims would not think to ask.
5. Cooperate with the media.
6. Demonstrate that victims and employees have a higher priority.
7. Respect and seek to work with victims and opponents.

In Part II, we present a further analysis contrasting what BurgerMax actually did versus what was expected by the community, and what is is ethically and morally acceptable.

---

**When past behaviors have been good and helpful, and current and future behaviors don’t match those expectations, there is a loss of credibility.**

---

*Reprinted with permission of Ethikos (www.EthikosJournal.com)*
Strengthening Corporate Trust
In Times of Crisis (Part 2)

By James E. Lukaszewski

This article, appearing in two parts, suggests a template for use in forecasting and pre-empting those opportunities for unethical, or at the very least, questionable behavior by management and others in times of crisis.

In Part I (see the May/June issue of Ethikos), we discussed seven spontaneous early management reactions that crisis and ethics management strategists must plan against. We also presented a (fictitious) case study of one company’s failure to protect and enhance corporate trust in a crisis. When an outbreak of E. coli, a bacterial contaminant commonly found in meat products and undercooked food, was traced to BurgerMax, a fast food restaurant chain, that company’s reaction ranged from denial to ‘stall and delay’ to blaming others, including the victims.

In Part II, we present a further analysis contrasting what BurgerMax actually did versus what was expected by the community, with a particular focus on what is ethically and morally acceptable.

The ethical dimension

There is always a moral and ethical dimension to crisis management. Management’s greatest difficulty in a crisis often is just how to handle these moral and ethical aspects.

- What do we say, and when do we say it?
- Whom do we tell, and how much do we disclose?
- Whom do we have to tell, and can we avoid disclosing some things forever?
- If we do anything, are we admitting there is a problem and that we are responsible?

Business organizations and institutions are expected to have consciences and to act in ways that reinforce this public expectation. That is why someone will be held accountable whenever there are victims.

In such instances, moral and ethical assessments are essential. This assessment process consists of answers to a series of questions, or at least preparation to answer these questions publicly and promptly.

When an issue involves integrity and moral or ethical dilemmas, the organization must begin the moral reasoning and questioning process quickly. When the public’s deepest values are offended, fast action is required.

Ethical issues demand the moral courage to ask difficult, tough, direct questions immediately, and a commitment—the strength of heart—powerful enough to take the most appropriate action promptly. Acting on matters of principle will counter the negative impact of a situation that the public, employees, and other audiences find morally troublesome. Moral issues require individuals to illustrate their personal belief systems through their behavior.

The following table presents BurgerMax’s assumptions (2nd column) versus the community’s ethical expectations (3rd column). It can be applied to other cases.

How did BurgerMax’s ethical assumptions match up against the community’s moral expectations?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moral and Ethical Questions</th>
<th>BurgerMax Assumptions</th>
<th>Community Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What did they know and when did they know it?</td>
<td>1. Quality was fine.</td>
<td>1. When did Quality Assurance know about the regulatory change? Why was it not acted upon?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What are the relevant facts of the situation? • What decisions were made? • Who was involved/affected? • What was sacrificed to benefit the victims?</td>
<td>2. Victims were caused by someone else’s negligence. Shareholders became the victims along with company management.</td>
<td>2. The decision to only partially recall product was totally unacceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was there a first-hand attempt to find the truth?</td>
<td>3. We always deal in the truth.</td>
<td>3. Truth was concealed by company for “fear of releasing proprietary information.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What alternative actions are available?</td>
<td>4. We’ll do whatever we’re forced to do to get this situation under control.</td>
<td>4. Take immediate action. Make public acknowledgement and take responsibility. Raise cooking temperatures. Move to the aid of victims. Explain what to do if ill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Who would be affected?</td>
<td>5. Predominantly our shareholders, employees, and customers.</td>
<td>5. The company needs to clear all stores of possible contamination potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What ethical principles or standards of conduct are involved or at issue?</td>
<td>6. Our standards are fine. Our ethics are okay. Leave us alone so that we can fix the problem.</td>
<td>6. The company behaved badly and in doing so, prolonged/expanded the problem. It slandered its suppliers. It offered no protection of the public interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How would these principles be advanced or violated by each alternative action?</td>
<td>7. It’s not necessary that these be considered.</td>
<td>7. We expect the company to do what’s right, promptly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Is it really the company’s problem?</td>
<td>8. It’s a problem only because someone else screwed up.</td>
<td>8. It’s the company’s problem until it proves to us that there is no further reason to worry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What is the duty to update and inform?</td>
<td>9. Answer only the questions that we are asked directly.</td>
<td>9. Tell us as much as you can, when you can, and keep telling us until we tell you we no longer need information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Who should be advised or consulted?</td>
<td>10. Let’s stay focused on those we know are directly affected.</td>
<td>10. First, the victims, then those who feel they may be affected—employees and those of us who may have purchased food at BurgerMax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. What was the fundamental cause—omission, commission, negligence, neglect, accident, arrogance, other?</td>
<td>11. It’s someone else’s problem, which we’re obliged to fix and take the blame for.</td>
<td>11. All of the above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How could this have been avoided?</td>
<td>12. We need better inspectors; select a higher quality supplier.</td>
<td>12. Failed to take immediate dramatic action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Are all the crucial ethical questions being asked and answered?  
13. This really isn’t an ethical situation; it’s a business problem that we’ve resolved by changing suppliers.  
13. Temporary but significant loss of credibility and public trust until it can be re-established by the company.

14. Are the actions open, honest, and truthful?  
14. We’ll tell as much of the truth as our attorneys will allow.  
14. Actions were closed, conditional, and beneficial only to the company.

15. What affirmative action is being taken now to remedy or remediate the situation?  
15. We’ll do whatever we’re told to do.  
15. Do whatever it takes to make us feel comfortable to dine at your stores again.

16. Is there an institutional “code of silence” when morally questionable decisions or actions come to light?  
16. Probably not. We only spend as much time on this as is necessary. Besides, the public only has a limited right to know anyway.  
16. As more and more disgruntled employees speak out about BurgerMax’s food handling practices, clearly the company isn’t telling us everything we need to know.

17. How will future unethical behavior be disclosed? To whom? How fast?  
17. We may tighten some things up, but it’s not really our problem.  
17. We want a process in place that company management doesn’t control.

18. What lessons can the organization learn as this dilemma is resolved?  
18. Mainly operational information and procedural changes.  
18. Ethical behavior is a leadership responsibility. Failing to act ethically is a failure to lead honorably.

19. As an organization, are we prepared to combat the behaviors that lead to ethical compromises?  
19. We could be criminally prosecuted.  
19. Should BurgerMax be criminally prosecuted, which is possible, it will likely be forced to establish very rigid compliance and integrity processes. This will eradicate ethical compromises.

20. How many “typical behaviors” do we know go on that can potentially cause trouble (See below):  
20. These can’t happen here.  
20. If one thing turns out to be wrong, there are most likely a lot of other things that are also wrong and need to be looked into thoroughly.

- Lax control  
- No tough, appropriate, centralized compliance  
- Underreporting of infractions  
- Leadership that allows supervisors to overlook bad behavior  
- Allowing employees to experiment with “unapproved methods”  
- Encouraging a “do whatever it takes” mentality  
- Minimizing oversight and compliance processes  
- Structuring incentives in such a way that they compromise safety, public health, or product integrity  
- Overlooking shortcuts  
- Avoiding confrontation with managers  
- Operating “on the edge”  
- Ignoring signs of rogue behavior  
- Tolerating inappropriate behavior or management by individuals who are “critical to the organization’s mission”  
- Belittling or humiliating those who suggest or seek ethical standards  
- Dismissing employees who report bad or outright wrong behavior  
- Demeaning the internal credibility of internal whistleblowers

The behavior dimension  
Post-crisis analysis involving hundreds of companies, industries, and negative circumstances reveals a pattern of unhelpful behaviors that work against rebuilding or preserving reputation, trust, and credibility. The greater the negative nature of the incident and the greater the number of victims, the more opportunities there are for trust-weakening behaviors to occur. Good crisis plans are structured
to work directly against, anticipate, and eliminate negative behavior patterns.

**Negative behaviors to plan against:**
1. Arrogance, no concern.
2. Minimizing victim needs.
4. Broadening the situation unnecessarily (or for public relations reasons).
5. Inappropriate language.
6. Inconsistency.
7. Inflammatory statements.
8. Little or no preparation.
9. Minimizing the impact.
10. Missing opportunities to communicate with government, the public, and victims.
11. Failure to admit responsibility.
12. Victim confusion.

**BurgerMax behaviors:**
1. Was concerned mostly about the financial impact.
2. Actively made the situation difficult for victims. Failed to acknowledge victims.
3. Aggressively blamed suppliers, government departments of health, and government inspection systems. Maintained an “anybody but us” mentality.
4. Supported industry initiatives instead of the victims. “We are the victims of the government’s lax approach to regulating the meat industry.” Gave $100,000 for “research” rather than to compensate victims. Note: The most common truly damaging PR tactic is to create or drag in third parties.
5. Was self-serving, careless, and inhumane. Was consistently stupid and self-serving.
6. Attacked suppliers, the government, and the media.
7. Had no recall plan in place to deal with the E. coli bacteria despite many stories in the news and in trade publications.
9. Did not communicate until overwhelmed by negative events. Then it used a completely defensive approach: “It’s isolated to just three of our 31 stores.”
10. Waited to communicate until forced to do so. Should have pro-actively communicated with the victims and others directly affected by the problem.
11. Made no admission of responsibility to this day.
12. Senior management was embarrassed and felt it was the real victim.

---

Reprinted with permission of Ethikos (www.EthikosJournal.com)
Frankly, the notion that a PR person could effectively and credibly be an organization’s conscience has been troubling. The vast majority of us have little, if any, impact or contact with top management, where unfortunate, unnecessary, and unethical behaviors are initiated, allowed, ignored, encouraged, or forgiven. For many of us, our knowledge of operations is generally weak, which means that the only “bad behavior” we can spot occurs in familiar areas such as communications, human resources, maybe security, and the other staff functions. Ethical behavior in any organization begins at the top and requires relentless modeling, management engagement, encouragement, and an environment where integrity overrides all other considerations.

In many organizations, some serious ethics-related groundwork needs to be laid down before even an informal corporate conscience process can take shape and be appropriately delegated by management. Corporate ethics programs, to be completely effective, must have three crucial functioning elements: compliance programs, codes of conduct, and integrity development.

Any would-be organizational conscience needs to first identify whether an appropriate array of attitudes, ethical systems, processes, and training are currently available or in development. The truly ethical organization has developed and tries to maintain an environment of integrity where the culture expects everyone to move toward appropriate behaviors and decisions first, and whenever there is a choice.

Codes of conduct are legally driven and are generally the lists of things employees can’t, shouldn’t, mustn’t, or could be penalized for doing: essentially lists of what not to do, with consequences.

Compliance programs consist of standards that set goals or minimum optimal procedures for behaviors, processes, decisions, and actions. These standards are monitored to determine how well an organization adheres to the rules set down in the law or regulation, including internal or industry measures. Compliance approaches are also quite legalistic and, generally, driven more by attorneys than anyone else in the organization.

Integrity is the atmosphere and culture created by the top leadership of an organization that teaches, fosters, coaches, and expects an employee’s intention to do the best, most correct, or “right” thing first. It also promotes the obligation to report to appropriate authorities (in or out of
the organization) when non-compliance, failure to adhere to the code of conduct, or omission, commission, or negligence occurs. Effective integrity development programs make everyone in the organization a corporate conscience. To me, this is a powerful goal for the ethical communication leader. This is the real goal for the “corporate conscience.”

One place for the communicator to start is engagement in the existing compliance, code of conduct, and integrity development processes. These are powerful operational-level responsibilities. Specialized codes of conduct can be created for special circumstances. The great challenge of achieving ethical behavior is providing employees with useful, clear, and memorable examples of the right way to do things, how to acknowledge or identify inappropriate or unethical behaviors, and safe, clear ways to report bad behavior.

Another place to begin is an examination of your organization from a current ethical behavior perspective. There are easily recognizable patterns of behavior that indicate potential ethical problems. It is essential to identify them because there is another powerful pattern to consider – persistent unethical behaviors and decisions are often predicate activities to criminal behavior. Widespread, generally accepted unethical behavior almost always indicates that inappropriate, even criminal, behavior is present somewhere.

Knowing these behaviors is another key ingredient in building and maintaining an environment of integrity. Be alert for these insidious unethical behaviors:

1. Lax control: A manager’s careless enforcement, education about, and monitoring of ethical standards.
2. Lack of tough, appropriate, centralized compliance within each area of the company.
3. No one charged with responsibility of teaching, enforcing, and disciplining in cases where ethical breaches occur.
4. Leadership that allows supervisors to overlook bad behavior.
5. Leadership that allows employees to experiment with methods and tactics outside established guidelines.
6. Emphasis on “doing whatever it takes” to achieve appropriate business and financial goals.
7. Managers and supervisors who minimize the importance of oversight and compliance processes.
8. Structuring incentives in such a way that they can compromise the ethical behavior of people and the quality of the products and services delivered, and allow shortcuts to be taken for a variety of obviously questionable reasons.
9. Avoiding confrontation with managers who chronically misbehave or chronically overlook misbehavior.
10. The tendency to operate “on the edge,” always pushing for more than is appropriate.
11. Management that ignores the signs of and doesn’t question rogue behavior.
12. Management that tolerates the inappropriate behavior of individuals who are “critical to the organization’s mission.” They are the super sales people and high achievers who are allowed to break the rules to maintain their performance.
13. Belittling or humiliating those who suggest or seek ethical standards.
14. Dismissing or destroying the careers of employees who report bad or outright wrong behavior.
15. Demeaning the internal or external credibility of those who blow the whistle and those who report or bring management’s attention to lapses in ethics.

This list of behaviors is an effective tool for quizzing company management when serious problems have occurred or if you suspect that bad decisions and behaviors could be happening. My technique is to gather all senior managers and distribute this list of unethical behaviors. Then I ask these managers to circle those currently occurring in their area of the business or in another area they are aware of, and to jot down some identifying or descriptive information. Quite often, before I even finish my introduction, these senior managers are circling behaviors from the list. Invariably, the company has been doing a number of things as a matter of routine without thinking of them as unethical or as predicate behaviors that could lead to something more serious.

The communicator’s most useful role is in helping create an environment of integrity. Employees seek to be in such an atmosphere. Specifically, such an atmosphere is required in public companies under the Sarbanes-Oxley laws. Truly being management’s conscience is a serious, complicated, and badly needed staff service in which, at the moment, very few PR people happen to be engaged. If you are interested in building integrity in your organization, this work is far more important than being the corporate conscience. When you focus on integrity, your goal becomes making everyone a corporate conscience.

Ethics is now a mainstream management obligation. It’s time to pick your spot, take your position, get in there, and play for keeps. Or, as Josiah Bartlet, the US President from “The West Wing” would say, “Break’s over; game on.”

James E. Lukaszewski, ABC, APR, Fellow PRSA, is a specialist in managing tough, touchy, sensitive situations for large businesses and organizations worldwide. For more information, check out his Web site at www.e911.com.
The public relations profession continuously suffers from schizophrenia. On one hand, we want to be at the table making decisions and guiding strategy with the boss in good times and bad. On the other hand, many of us want to serve as the guiding conscience of our organizations. So far the record for the profession in either arena is mixed. There have been some successes, some strikeouts, some absolute no hitters, and some MIAs.

As we enter the third year of relentless pulses of corporate scandal, primarily in the United States but also in other parts of the world, we see a business and organizational leadership environment increasingly dominated by media persecution, government prosecution, and aggressive and growing compliance and conduct regulation – all because business and other leaders have lost or ignored, for a variety of reasons, their responsibility to build and rebuild integrity as a workplace principle, a workplace guiding force.

State legislators, Congress, and many legislators outside of the United States continue to pass laws imposing extensive compliance requirements and an ever-increasing stack of regulations, restrictions, oversight requirements, in addition to internal and self-imposed monitoring. Virtually none of this can restore public, investor, employee, customer, or individual trust. Restoration of trust begins by focusing and rebuilding the most essential element of ethics: integrity.

The public relations profession, if it chooses to, can play a vital role in restoring trust. Lawyers aggressively oversee the areas of compliance and codes of conduct. That’s where the monitoring is, that’s where the police are, and that’s where the detection, deterrence, and disclosure of infractions occur.

A compliant organization is one where codes of conduct are observed and respected, where inspiration and motivation from leadership and management drive a desire to work with integrity in an ethical organization.
Restoring trust and maintaining an environment of integrity occurs in an organization along two powerful tracks: the principles that guide daily processes and uncompromising vigilance.

Here are some examples of organizational principles:

- Our goal is integrity.
- We have constructive aspirations.
- We live a philosophy of integrity.
- We have a commitment to compliance and good conduct.
- We recognize those who achieve the best work in the best way.
- Our vigilance is driven by our principles, priorities, and our conscience.
- Everyone is committed to integrity.

Uncompromising vigilance means to clearly define, dramatically emphasize, and relentlessly enforce organizational values and beliefs. It is the unconditional commitment to prevent, detect, deter, or ultimately expose and learn from those activities that run counter to the ethics of the organization. A compliant organization, one with integrity, insists on and expects uncompromising vigilance from everyone.

Integrity is about setting guidelines in three areas: work, behavior, and relationships.

These are concepts public relations practitioners can understand and dig into, and where they can provide extraordinary language and message leadership to their organizations. Integrity is barely taught in business schools. While they’re learning more about compliance and codes of conduct, especially since Sarbanes-Oxley, Sarbanes-Oxley and the sentencing guidelines of 1991 are not integrity. Integrity is something the boss doesn’t really know much about. This is a perfect place for the public relations practitioner to provide extraordinary help. Integrity is a key ingredient in constructive leadership. And if there’s one thing public relations does in an organization, it’s to counsel leaders.

The problem is, and will continue to be for a while, that many bosses think integrity is “sissy stuff.” They have a hard time seeing themselves down at the country club having their buddies in the locker room kid them about how they caved into the “panty-waists” at work who would rather sell out than sell up. Years ago, after one of my clients pled guilty to quite a number of felonies, the client, their lawyers, and I were meeting to explain the implementation of the Plea Agreement they agreed to. After I finished explaining elements of the compliance and integrity programs that were required, the CEO looked at me and said, “Lukaszewski, whenever you’re around it feels like Sunday School.” I looked him in the eye and said, “Tom, when somebody has pled guilty to as many felonies as your company has, it seems to me a little Sunday School might be useful.” He didn’t laugh. He was gone in less then a year. Being for integrity means standing up. Being for integrity means that an organization needs to unlearn inappropriate behaviors. It means learning how to handle ethical dilemmas and difficult issues. Integrity also teaches how to bring out the best in an organization – the best people, the best products, the best relationships, the best work, and the best practices.

If there ever was a growth area for public relations – one in which most of us absolutely, positively fit – it is this third crucial aspect of ethical development: integrity – behaving with honor and expecting everyone else to do the same. If there’s one lesson these past three years is teaching us, it is that without integrity, nothing else matters.
If you’d like get into this topic in more depth, and explore how you might expand your knowledge in this arena, here are some useful places to visit:

- **The Ethics Officers Association**, [www.eoa.org](http://www.eoa.org)
- **Ethics Resource Center**, [www.ethics.org](http://www.ethics.org)
- **The Institute for Global Ethics**, [www.globalethics.org](http://www.globalethics.org)
- **Josephson Institute of Ethics**, [www.josephsoninstitute.org/jilinks.htm](http://www.josephsoninstitute.org/jilinks.htm)
- **Pointer Center for the Study of Ethics and American Institutions**, [www.pointer.indiana.edu](http://www.pointer.indiana.edu)
- **[www.ethicsweb.ca/codes](http://www.ethicsweb.ca/codes)** (This Web site has a collection of ethics speeches on creating codes of ethics as well as an interesting current book list.)
- **[www.prsa.org](http://www.prsa.org)** (To find the Public Relations Society of America’s Code of Ethics, Click on, “About PRSA,” and scroll to, “Code of Ethics.”)
- **[www.iabc.com](http://www.iabc.com)** (To find the International Association of Business Communicators’ Code of Ethics, Click on, “Knowledge Centre,” and then, “Ethics Centre.”)
- **[www.globalpr.org](http://www.globalpr.org)** (To find the Global Alliance for Public Relations and Communication Management’s Ethics Protocol, Click on, “Information,” and then, “Code of Ethics.”)
- Compliance training and certification, [www.integrity-interactive.com](http://www.integrity-interactive.com)
- Stier Anderson, L.L.C. (Corporate Integrity Law), [www.stier.com](http://www.stier.com)
- Compliance Systems Legal Group, [www.cslg.com](http://www.cslg.com)
- Compliance training and certification, [www.eyeonintegrity.com](http://www.eyeonintegrity.com)

# # #

James E. Lukaszewski, *ABC, APR, Fellow PRSA*, is president of The Lukaszewski Group Division of Risdall Public Relations, a consultancy specializing in crisis communication management. For more information on crisis management, business resumption, and disaster recovery, visit The Lukaszewski Group’s content-rich Web site at [www.e911.com](http://www.e911.com) or contact Jim at jel@e911.com or 651-286-6788.
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The Ingredients of Leadership:
Finding the Personal Power For Moving People and Organizations
Into the Future

PRSA Seminar
Thursday, November 29, 2012

If those who listened to this program with you would like to have a follow-up discussion, here are some questions to begin the conversation:

1. What do you know now that you didn’t know when the program began?
2. What’s the most important concept or idea you learned from this program?
3. What question has the presentation raised for which you need to find answers?
4. What key skills, ideas, or knowledges did this program confirm for you?
5. Based on what you learned and heard today, what is the first thing you’re going to do when you return to your office?
6. What’s the second thing you’re going to do?
7. What areas could be included in such a presentation or program to help answer questions, make the presentation more complete, or resolve issues and questions that remain on your mind?
A Book for Everyone Who Wants to Tell the Boss What to Do

- Do people hold up meetings waiting for you?
- Do people remember what you say and quote you to others?
- Do others seek out your opinion and ideas?
- Do they try to influence you to influence your boss?

“Far more than it first appears. This book is a real look at the soul of what good business can be. Everything could be like this, health care, politics, etc. Jim Lukaszewski sketches the boss, inner circle, advisor, and staff. He then explains each player and how they fit together, where they are coming from, and how you contribute. The big picture is there when you finish. He has some good visuals and many lists:

- 7 disciplines
- 5 imperatives
- 4 things to do
- 5 flawed strategies
- 9 things a leader expects
- 11 things you need to know to work with a boss
- 3 lists of questions to consider, nice learning device

Too many books could be a pamphlet, not this one. ‘Managers test before they trust,’ a nice thought. ‘I liked the section on trust. On half the pages I wrote a comment. An enjoyable read of deep material. His thoughts reveal a life that works. This body of work is a protein meal. I Love this book.”
— Dr. Don Malnati, Five Star Reviewer on Amazon.com, January 2, 2009

“Leaders must have trusted advisors. This book shows you how to be one and stay one.”
— Harvey B. Mackay, author of the New York Times #1 bestseller Swim with the Sharks without Being Eaten Alive

“Jim Lukaszewski has personally helped resolve more corporate crises than anyone I know of. His experience ‘in the trenches’ equals the high quality of his judgment.”
— Chester Burger, APR, Fellow PRSA, American Public Relations Leader Emeritus and PRSA Gold Anvil Winner

James E. Lukaszewski (loo-ka-SHEV-skee) is an expert in managing and reducing contention, counteracting tough, touchy, sensitive corporate communications issues. He is a prolific author (six books, hundreds of articles), lecturer (corporate, college and university), trainer, counselor, and internationally recognized speaker.

Visit Jim’s Web Site: www.e911.com
Register for Jim’s Free eNewsletter: www.e911.com
Visit Jim’s Blog: http://crisisgurublog.e911.com
E-mail Jim: jel@e911.com

Available wherever books are sold.
Lukaszewski on CRISIS COMMUNICATION
WHAT YOUR CEO NEEDS TO KNOW ABOUT REPUTATION RISK AND CRISIS MANAGEMENT
Coming Soon
Pre-Order Today at amazon.com®
JAMES E. LUKASZEWSKI, ABC, APR, Fellow PRSA

James E. Lukaszewski (loo-ka-SHEV-skee) advises, coaches, and counsels the men and women who run very large corporations and organizations through extraordinary problems and critical high-profile circumstances. The bulk of his practice is in the Western Hemisphere, although he has clients from many parts of the world.

He is an expert in managing and reducing contention, counteracting tough, touchy, sensitive corporate communications issues. He counsels companies facing serious internal and external problems involving: activist counteraction; community conflict and grassroots campaigns; corporate relations failures; reputational threats; employee relationship building; ethics/integrity/compliance; litigation visibility; Web-based attacks; and threats to corporate survival. His broad-based experience ranges from media-initiated investigations to product recalls and plant closings, from criminal litigation to takeovers. He is frequently retained by senior management to directly intervene and manage the resolution of corporate problems and bad news. The situations he helps resolve often involve conflict, controversy, community action, or activist opposition. Almost half of his practice involves civil and criminal litigation.

He is a teacher, thinker, coach, and trusted advisor with the unique ability to help executives look at problems from a variety of sensible, constructive, principled perspectives. He teaches clients how to take highly focused, ethically appropriate action. He has personally counseled, coached, and guided thousands of executives in organizations large and small from many cultures representing government; the military and defense industry; the agriculture, banking, computer, financial, food processing, health care, insurance, paper, real estate development, and telecommunications industries; cooperatives; trade and professional associations; and non-profit agencies. He is a coach to many CEOs.

Jim helps prepare spokespersons for crucial public appearances, local and network news interviews including 20-20, 60 Minutes, Dateline NBC, and Nightline, and for financial analyst meetings, and legislative and congressional testimony. He also provides personal coaching for executives in trouble, or facing career-defining problems and succession issues.

He is a prolific author (six books, hundreds of articles and monographs), lecturer (corporate, college and university), trainer, counselor, and public speaker. He is an editorial board member of most of Public Relation’s important Journals and serial Publications. His most recent book, Why Should the Boss Listen to You?, was published by Jossey-Bass in 2008.


An accredited member of the International Association of Business Communicators (ABC) and the Public Relations Society of America (APR), Mr. Lukaszewski is also a member of the PRSA’s College of Fellows (Fellow PRSA); Board of Ethics & Professional Standards; a member of ASIS International, where he serves on the Crisis Management and Business Continuity Council. He has lectured annually at the U.S. Marine Corp’s East Coast Commander’s Media Training Symposium since 1987.

Lukaszewski received his BA in 1974 from Metropolitan State University in Minnesota. He is a former deputy commissioner of the Minnesota Department of Economic Development and assistant press secretary to former Minnesota Governor Wendell Anderson. He founded Minnesota-based Media Information Systems Corporation in 1978. Prior to founding The New York based Lukaszewski Group Inc. in 1989 he was senior vice president and director of Executive Communication Programs for Georgeson & Company and a partner with Chester Burger Company, both in New York City. In 2011 He joined St. Paul Minnesota based Risdall Public Relations as president of its Lukaszewski Group Division. Risdall is ranked as the third largest PR firm in Minnesota and 182 out of the top 250 U.S. local firms ranked by the Holmes report.

His biography is listed in 26 editions of various Marquis Who’s Who in America (including the 2013, 67th edition), The World (including 2012, 30th edition), Finance and Government. The story of his career appears in, “Living Legends of American Public Relations,” (2008) Grand Valley State University. His name was listed in Corporate Legal Times as one of “28 Experts to Call When All Hell Breaks Loose,” and in PR Week as one of 22 “crunch-time counselors who should be on the speed dial in a crisis.” Googling James E. Lukaszewski yields over 32,000 entries.
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