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**Q.No.1: Some say leaders are born while other argue leaders are made. What is your opinion about this statement?**

**Answer:** According to R. M. Stogdill’s *Handbook of Leadership*, “There are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept.”[1](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5423074/#B1) While there is no standard definition of leader, there are many different kinds of leadership that exist in today’s environment. When thinking about outstanding leaders, whether present day or historical, one may question how they became such a notable leader. Were they born this way or were they taught to lead? The Great Man Theory, popularized in the 1840s by Thomas Carlyle, suggested that leadership traits are intrinsic, meaning that great leaders are born and will emerge when confronted with the appropriate situation.[2](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5423074/#B2) These individuals possess certain qualities and talents, such as deep honesty, moral vision, compassion and care, that make them well-suited for leadership.[3](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5423074/#B3) On the contrary, organizations invest much time and money to help their employees develop leadership skills based on the assumption that leaders can be trained. In fact, US companies spend approximately $14 billion each year on this training, and higher education offers a multitude of degree courses pertaining to leadership.[4](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5423074/#B4) This suggests that leadership itself is a skill that may be learned (i.e., extrinsically fostered). This article will examine and provide further perspective on the much-debated question: are the foundations of outstanding leadership intrinsic (i.e., leaders are born) or extrinsic (i.e. leaders are made)?

METHODS

The purpose of a debate is to search for the truth, or perhaps the best answer, by comparing or contrasting ideas.[5](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5423074/#B5) The structure of a debate can be simplified into three components: the claim, the warrant, and the impact. The claim provides the position that the debater would like to instill upon the audience. Outstanding leaders are born, or made, is the claim. The warrant justifies the claim, either by evidence, or with external opinion. The impact places the claim into perspective and suggests why the audience should be interested. All three components (claim, warrant, and impact) are necessary for a complete argument. The structure of the debate follows a point/counterpoint format, where one side provides an argument, followed by a rebuttal from the other side. The opportunity for targeted questions and answers between debaters also occurs during a typical debate.

For this debate, two Academic Leadership Fellows Program (ALFP) groups drew a position at random. The position drawn may not have necessarily represented the personal views of the ALFP group members. Research by each group member involved literature review of primary sources, expert opinion, and historical references. Regardless of the position drawn, each group researched both positions, as opposing research prepares a debater for potential counter-arguments. Sources included Google Scholar, PubMed, ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center), and broad-based Internet searching for known leaders.

After extensive research, each ALFP group began preparing and practicing specific remarks for their position. Preparation involved mock debate sessions that were closely timed. Certain group members posed as the opposing group to better mimic a real debate. The entire preparation process, from research to debate, extended over several months and involved several group meetings, both live and virtual. The culmination was a debate presented at the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy (AACP) Interim Meeting in Tampa, Fla., in February 2016.

POINT: LEADERS ARE BORN

The Role of Genetics in Leadership

Over the past three decades, numerous twin studies have been conducted evaluating the heritability of leadership. Twin studies provide a good assessment of born and made leadership in that each twin serves as a control for the other. Identical or monozygotic twins who share 100% of their genetic material can be compared to fraternal or dizygotic twins who share 50% of their genetic material to evaluate both genetic and environmental influences on leadership. Data from twin studies have consistently shown that leadership has a substantial degree of genetic basis. These studies have used a variety of methodologies including questionnaires and mathematical models to evaluate the genetic and shared or unique environmental experiences of twins in leadership roles. A majority of twin studies demonstrate moderate genetic contributions for personality traits of leaders, with an overall relative influence of a genetic relationship for leadership of up to 30%. In fact, in a study by Den eve and colleagues evaluating what traits determine leadership role occupancy, the shared environment of the twins was not significant with only a 10% correlation; whereas, the genetic component was found to be 24%.[7](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5423074/#B7) Overall, twin studies have consistently demonstrated a genetic component to leadership.

In particular, Den eve and colleagues demonstrate that leadership role occupancy may be associated with the rs4950 genetic marker, a single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) that resides on the neuronal acetylcholine receptor gene on chromosome 8.[7](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5423074/#B7) The neuronal acetylcholine receptor gene can be related to personality traits, suggesting a link between leadership role occupancy and personality traits.[7](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5423074/#B7) Indeed, personality traits were considered in the book, *Good to Great*, where a level 5 (highest) leader often possesses traits such as personal humility and professional will.[11](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5423074/#B11) It follows that a favorable genetic background sets outstanding leaders apart from the rest.

In practice, we can reference historical examples of twins who have demonstrated notable leadership. Identical twins Mark and Scott Kelly, NASA astronauts as well as retired US Navy captains, have both led great discoveries in space.[12](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5423074/#B12) Julian and Joaquin Castro are identical twins from Texas. Julian served as the US Secretary of Housing and Urban Development from 2014 to 2017 and Joaquin is currently a US congressman. Examining twins aids in the understanding of how genes lay the groundwork for leadership. The twins are born with potential and the ability to emerge as leaders if the genetic leadership traits are fostered in the right environment.

The evidence consistently shows a genetic component to leadership. As a result, leaders are born, not made.

Leaders and Followers

We can look to nature to argue that one can be taught to follow, but not to lead. The concept of leadership exists throughout the animal kingdom, and animal models are commonly used to study leadership behavior. The three-spined stickleback fish, for example, serves as a model species for research on personality and social behavior. Individual fish show large differences in the extent in which they emerge from covered areas to explore their environment. Some fish are bold and act as leaders, while others are shy and prefer to follow those that lead. To determine how individuals may cope with a forced change in their leadership/follower role, Nakayama and colleagues formed pairs of stickleback fish, each consisting of a member that had shown natural leadership behavior and a member that had naturally taken on a follower role. The followers were rewarded with a small amount of food each time they showed initiative, while the bolder fish received the same reward only when they followed the shyer member of the pair. The resulting behavioral patterns were compared with those resulting from fish being rewarded for showing their natural tendency to lead or follow. While the positive reinforcement helped both leaders and followers to show significantly more follower behavior, the increase in leader behavior was less significant. Moreover, when the fish were forced to swap roles, the overall performance of the pairs, as measured by the amount of food they were able to collect together, was reduced. Altogether, the investigators concluded that fish can learn to follow but struggle to take on a leadership role. If we extend this into human leadership behavior, it may indicate that leadership is mostly born.

COUNTERPOINT: LEADERS ARE MADE

Arguments for the claim that leaders are born should not be supported because (1) there are statistical flaws in the twin studies evaluating leadership; (2) numerous examples exist of historical figures devoid of a family history of leaders; (3) individuals can learn the skills to be an outstanding leader through life experiences and leadership development programs. There has yet to be research to identify one single trait or mix of traits that is found in all leaders. Warren Bennis, author of the book *On Becoming a Leader*, identifies several characteristics that leaders share: a guiding vision, passion that provides hope and inspires others, integrity (which encompasses candor, maturity and self-knowledge), curiosity, and the willingness to take risks. These are not traits that individuals are born with and cannot change, but rather traits that are developed as a result of life experiences. According to Bennis, “Developing character and vision is the way leaders invent themselves.” Leaders embrace opportunities, engage in skill development, and respond to a set of external circumstances.

The Role of Genetics in Leadership

There is a lack of experimentation in humans on this issue, so researchers have relied heavily on statistical analysis of variance between pairs of twins to estimate the extent to which differences between the pairs correlate with genetic or environmental factors. The accumulated results of twin studies have consistently estimated the genetic component of leadership role occupancy at only 30% while estimating environmental influence at 70%. Even more recent studies in molecular genetics have estimated the heritability of leadership at only 24% by demonstrating an association between leadership role occupancy and the rs4950 genotype.[7](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5423074/#B7) Simply having occupancy in a leadership role does not assume that the person is an outstanding leader.

Twin studies also make significant assumptions that limit their validity, such as the equal environment assumption (EEA), which assumes identical and fraternal twin pairs grow up experiencing roughly equal environments. Every person has slightly different perceptions of the world, and they see, hear, and internalize their environment to a different extent. Furthermore, results from twin studies cannot be directly generalized because they do not represent a random sample of the general population. While twin studies and molecular genetics have provided some indirect evidence in the form of statistical correlations or associations with self-reported leadership occupancy, these same studies also conclude that leadership is complex and that it is formed much more significantly by a person’s environment. That is, leadership is not something we are simply born with like blue eyes or red hair. Leaders, especially outstanding leaders, are developed over time through hard work and lived experiences.

Historical Examples

Genetics logic would suggest that outstanding leaders are born to parents who are also leaders. Developing leadership skills through deliberate practice would be unnecessary for outstanding leaders. Both are false, and several historical examples support this statement.

Walt Disney came from humble beginnings and grew up in a home with his unassuming home-maker mother, his entrepreneurial father who failed at most business schemes in which he ventured, and four mostly ordinary siblings. His strict and aloof father disapproved of Walt’s creative leanings and actively forbid his participation in related events. Despite all of this, Walt succeeded, at the age of 29, with Mickey Mouse. He emerged, through perseverance, learning from mistakes and development of his skills to rally a team around an idea, as a pioneer in the field of animation.

Another example of an exceptional leader being made despite a less than leader-like pedigree is John D. Rockefeller Sr., the richest American in history.[23](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5423074/#B23) His father was a “snake oil” salesman and bigamist who abandoned his family when John was just a small boy. Despite this “pedigree,” John created and grew Standard Oil, the largest oil refiner in the world, during the turn of the 20th century. Rockefeller established his immense wealth slowly and deliberately, through success and failure, not through a predetermined set of innate leadership abilities.

In addition to Disney and Rockefeller, President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Roman Emperor Claudius Caesar Augustus are two further examples of outstanding leaders from a less than outstanding parental pedigree. These leaders were mentored, learned from their environment, and developed through time and experience.

Leadership Industry

It has been demonstrated that it takes thousands of hours of deliberate practice to acquire mastery of skill. Research by Ericsson and colleagues in 1993 demonstrated that deliberate practice was responsible for 80% of the difference in outcomes between elite musicians and committed amateurs. While the probability of succeeding at a high level is relatively low without some talent, the small role for talent is overshadowed by the larger role that preparation seems to play. Walt Disney spent 10 years learning and practicing his leadership skills following a first failed business attempt and ultimately went on to transform the entertainment industry. Leaders can indeed be developed, and leadership can be taught and practiced. Even AACP supports leadership development through various resources and programming, particularly the ALFP program to which the authors are participating.

Billions of dollars are spent yearly by corporations seeking to have their employees develop leadership skills. Leadership development is not a single activity, but rather a set of activities that typically occur over a period of time (i.e., several years). Each leadership development activity may contribute to leadership capacity of the individual, of the group, or of the organization.

CONCLUSION

Are leaders born or made? Each ALFP group member, excluding the two leadership facilitators, provided his/her brief opinion on this topic, Consistent themes are noted when reading these statements. The group debating that leaders are born argue that certain innate traits are needed in order to develop into an outstanding leader when life experiences and circumstances present themselves. The group debating that leaders are made argue that training, hard work, and experiences result in the development of outstanding leaders. The answer is likely not just one viewpoint or the other, but rather a combination of both. There is evidence to support a 30% genetic component to being in a leadership role.[7](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5423074/#B7) The genetic evidence, however, largely uses indirect outcomes, such as self-reported leadership role occupancy, which makes no claim to the aptness of leader within that role. Further, studies from nature support that some fish could learn to follow, but were less likely to learn to lead. The translational ability of such a study from fish to humans is not yet demonstrated.

Q.No.2: Through light on what sort of leader Imran Khan is.

**Answer:** There is voluminous literature in social and management sciences on the personality and qualities of a leader. There are many forms of leadership such as charismatic, political, and spiritual. Theorists and authors have consensus that a successful leader should be cool-headed, a good listener, polite to his subordinates/colleagues, respect opposing views and make good judgment. As far as the personality of a leader is concerned, three components are important: character, world view and style. According to political scientist [Dr James David Barber](http://www.google.com.pk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&ved=0CC8QFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fen.wikipedia.org%2Fwiki%2FJames_David_Barber&ei=hcCzUMq6Hca3hQfYmYDQDQ&usg=AFQjCNEZHEwqPl-D3rvQugU2KLrX9sDPnA&sig2=YH4oWfwoE9HV2DJIii9jkQ), these characteristics develop during childhood, adolescent and adulthood years, respectively. All of us have two fundamental orientations or dimensions in our personalities: active-passive and positive-negative. The active-passive orientation denotes a leader’s energy to affect the environment around him. The negative-positive attributes his reactions to what he does either as optimistic or pessimistic. In the light of these two dominant theories, I analyses the leadership of Imran Khan. There are four types of personalities: 1) active-positive; 2) active-negative; 3) passive-positive and 4) passive-negative. Imran Khan fits in the category of an active-negative type personality that is ambitious, striving upwards, power-seeking, impulsive, aggressive, pessimistic and preoccupied with ‘I’m succeeding’ (“tsunami aa raha hay”). Sometimes, the type can have a vague and discontinuous image, persistent problems in managing [aggressive feelings and contradictions between relatively intense effort and low reward](http://i1.tribune.com.pk/story/462136/will-declare-jihad-to-save-pakistan-from-terrorism-imran-khan/). This type of personality has two other traits as it little enjoys its work and has very low self-esteem; however, Imran has the opposite. He derives much enjoyment from his work and has a high sense of self-esteem.

Apart from the above-mentioned philosophical and theoretical analyses, Imran Khan has tremendous potential and opportunity to lead the nation if he objectively reviews his personality. It is interesting to note that all politicians who left the Pakistan Tehreek-e-Insaf (PTI) had [differences only with Imran](http://i1.tribune.com.pk/story/442814/only-opportunists-are-leaving-pti-says-imran-khan/), not with the party or programmed. Most of them blamed Imran for being arrogant, inflexible and unpragmatic. Imran is not the ‘man of people’ given his lifestyle and attitude. He also flip-flops on both national and international issues. However, as far as the strengths of Imran are concerned, he has charisma and aura. He is a great philanthropist and fundraiser and an amazing social/community worker. He is energetic, brave and popular among the youth and women. Most importantly, he has a huge and unparalleled organizational capacity or political machine for [elegantly using social/electronic media](https://www.google.com/url?q=http://i1.tribune.com.pk/story/364905/cyberspace--new-battleground-for-political-parties/&sa=U&ei=PMOzUPXbGIiEhQfc4IHwCw&ved=0CAcQFjAA&client=internal-uds-cse&usg=AFQjCNHoM1Yaei7L-s_xpdPz0XJak_KG2Q) and the latest technological tools to raise money and hope among the people. He also has support, both moral and financial, of the upper class overseas Pakistani community. But I would like to remind all of the fact that leading a nation of 180 million people is absolutely different from captaining an 11-member cricket team.

I agree that there are other factors besides leadership for achieving political success. However, I do not agree that Imran is emerging like Zulfikar Ali Bhutto in the late 1960s. Bhutto emerged in a ‘vacuum’ due to the lack of general elections for the past 24 years. Political parties and politicians had no opportunity to test their ranks. But after Ziaul Haq, there have been eight general elections from 1985 to 2008 and the next election is scheduled soon. Politicians and parties have been participating in those elections. There are two major political forces in the country, the Pakistan People’s Party (PPP) and the Muslim League, along with some other regional and national parties. There is no ‘vacuum’ in politics at all and there is little space for a third major political force. Imran’s vote bank is the same as that of traditional right-wing votes, which will absolutely be divided. His vote will benefit the PPP alliance in rural parts of the country just as the PPP alliance votes could benefit Imran in urban areas of Punjab. Collectively, this will badly hurt the Muslim League.

As far as young voters are concerned, the youth matters in a huge constituency, as in the US presidential elections where the whole nation votes for only one man but not in a parliamentary form where constituencies are small and controlled by traditional, cast-ridden and hereditary politicians. The major drawback with the PTI is the dearth of electable or winnable candidates in the party. Imran needs over 2,000 candidates/covering candidates all over the country to contest on all seats in all assemblies of Pakistan. Does the PTI have these numbers? The answer is simple: no.

Cliched but true. Change is one of those few abstract solids that are consistent but come with one caveat: change that has real and long-term significance is never an overnight phenomenon. From doing an HIIT workout every second day to sticking to the natural circadian clock for optimum sleep, I have never found change easy. It, nevertheless, remains a constant in my life. I want my life to be better in ways that matter, in ways that would make me a happier, better human being. The word “change” matters to me.

The word change, tabdeeli, is the credo of Pakistan-Tehreek-E-Insaf, Imran Khan’s party in power. Khan is working for tabdeeli. His main agenda is to ensure the tangible results of his promise of a “Naya Pakistan”. Will it happen?

Pakistan is trying to change. It won’t happen in two years, perhaps, not in five years. It may even take a decade. A naya Pakistan won’t be like the kaleidoscopic backdrop in a movie chronicling two decades of the protagonist’s life, the makeover of an ugly duckling, Cinderella’s dainty foot slipping into the glass slipper in the hands of a Prince Charming who kneels, besotted, in front of her. The problems of my beloved homeland are unqualifiable; solutions hard to perfect; and mis governance and slips, Freudian and intentional, intertwined like poison ivy covering the façade of a crumbling, white-columned haunted house on the hill.

A stronger Pakistan needs decreased prices, a better taxation system, a business-friendly system, employment opportunities, better healthcare and education, and safety of life. Khan’s government is doing its best. At times, even that seems insufficient or is mis-applied. Consistency to do better is the short- and long-term stimulus.

Without trying to google hyperboles to camouflage the reality, what I know with the certainty of the knowledge of my own name: Prime Minister Imran Khan is turning all his promises into action, one step at a time. Reiteration, the process may take years but what has the certainty of the sun not rising in the west: Khan’s intentions are clear, coherent, and blemish-free. Pakistan will change for better, and for that I don’t have to check my phone contacts to ask my buddies who are economists and financial gurus and governance experts and national and foreign policy veterans. I voted for Khan. I trust Khan. So far. And I turned to his twitter timeline for a study of his last three months’ performance.

Khan is changing Pakistan, not one tweet at a time. He may falter and err. What he understands: failure is not an option. Khan’s agenda’s authentic manifestation is with one solid plan-and-action at a time.

On December 10, 2019, Khan tweeted: “Inspired by the ideals preached by our Prophet PBUH, especially in his last sermon, and duties enshrined in our Constitution, my govt is committed to the protection of human rights for all its citizens without discrimination.”

Pakistan is not close to being Khan’s ideal of the Riyasat-e-Madinah.

But as the Hadith states “Verily actions are by intentions, and for every person is what he intended,” I believe justice and equality won’t just be catchphrases in Khan’s Pakistan.

Not a very kind and just place at the moment but based on Khan’s words and actions it is a safe assumption that Pakistan may become the best of itself someday.

On December 12, 2019, Khan tweeted: “Our govt has increased the EOBI old-age pension by 62% from Rs.5250 to Rs.8500 within a year. This helps us provide pensioners' security in their post-retirement yrs. Much of this contribution comes from improving the institution itself. Another step towards Madinah ki Riyasat.”

One of the strengths of Khan’s government is its attention to the voiceless, the forgotten.

On December 18, 2019, Khan tweeted: “On Kisan Day I want to reiterate our commitment to facilitating our small farmers in increasing their yields, getting fair prices for their crops & improving market access. We are also ensuring their access to Sehat Health Cards & to educational scholarships through Ehsaas prog.”

In Khan’s Pakistan, there are no “small”, invisible-in-plain-sight people. There is no issue that would go unnoticed. Khan sees those who thought their life didn’t matter.

On December 25, 2019, Khan tweeted: “All our young aspiring leaders should make our Quaid their role model. He was Sadiq & Ameen; & his 40-year struggle was not for personal gain but to achieve a Homeland for the Muslims of the subcontinent where they could live as free citizens second to none.”

The young of a country is its bright today and its glorious tomorrow. Be it in politics, governance, self-employment and or in a salaried job, the youth of Pakistan has the capability to achieve the “impossible”. No one has endorsed this idea more than Khan in his decades’-long political career and his one and a half year of prime ministership.

On December 25, 2019, Khan tweeted: “Today, on Quaid-i-Azam's birthday, we as a nation must resolve to build Pakistan in accordance with his vision of an Islamic welfare state based on compassion & human dignity; justice & rule of law; & a plural inclusivist society.”

The naya Pakistan that is for all was Khan’s political promise, his electoral rallying slogan and the fundamental principle of his government. That Pakistan would be kind, fair and inclusive. No one would be left behind.

On December 29, 2019, Khan tweeted: “Given the extremely cold weather conditions I have asked CMs of Punjab & KP to ensure that no person is left out without shelter; & their administrations must take immediate action to provide temporary shelters plus food for those who cannot be accommodated in existing Panagahs.”

Panagahs, shelters, for the homeless and destitute weren’t just one tweet months ago. The provision of temporary shelter for those who need instant help is assured in Khan’s government. It is not everywhere but it is a start.

A CARING LEADER

On January 14, 2020, Khan tweeted: “The severe snowfalls and landslides in AJK have caused misery & deaths. I have asked the NDMA, the military & all our federal ministers to immediately provide all humanitarian assistance on an emergency footing to the affected people in AJK.”

The pain of Kashmiris does not go unnoticed in Pakistan–be it the constant suffering of Kashmiris in the Indian-administered Kashmir or the agony caused by a natural disaster on our side of the Line of Control.

On January 24, 2020, Khan tweeted: “This is great news as it will address two most important econ issues facing Pak today: employment & our current account deficit, by bringing in tourism & investment which in turn will provide employment opportunities esp for our youth.”

Pakistan is a country of great resources, both natural and human. And with the right input, individual and governmental, there is no limit to the heights that are attainable and sustainable. Khan believes and practices that. On February 9, 2020, Khan tweeted: “I understand the difficulties ordinary people incl salaried class are confronting & have decided, come what may, my govt will be announcing various measures that will be taken to reduce prices of basic food items for the common man in Cabinet on Tuesday.”

the ordinary Pakistani lamented the increase in everyday essentials without any increase in their earnings, I expected a concerned-for-public Khan to react. He did. Prices are being brought under control.

On February 11, 2020, Khan tweeted: “Congratulations to Ali Zafar & mbrs of PM's Prisoners Aid Committee, which finalized its reform package report for effective prison reform. It will ensure greater public safety & rehab of prisoners on the principle that a prison sentence does not imply deprivation of human rights.

Prisons, other than for criminals serving life sentences for capital crimes, must not be a place of neglect and cruelty. Rehabilitation not retribution becomes the incentive for personal and collective change.

On February 24, 2020, Khan tweeted: “As a result of Govt focus on price control, substantial decrease in prices, especially in vegetable prices, can now be seen. I assure our people that I will not relent until all involved in artificially created price hikes are identified & punished.”