

Sanyal, C and Haddock-Millar, J (2021) Talent Management and Developing Leadership Talent. In Ibraiz Tarique (Ed.), *Companion to Talent Management (1st edition)*. Routledge: NY, New York

Chapter Title: Developing Leadership Talent

Authors: Dr Chandana Sanyal and Dr Julie Haddock-Millar, Middlesex University Business School, London

Introduction

The aim of the chapter is to examine approaches to leadership development in organisations, drawing on theoretical and empirical literature, in addition to specific case based exemplars. The chapter will begin by briefly considering the role of leadership theories in the development of leaders. Next, we examine the factors that play a key role in developing successful leadership talent. The concepts of what it means to be a *leader* and what is regarded as *leadership development* (Day, 2000; Hanson, 2013; Clarke, 2013) are explored. The need for the interface between individual leadership journeys and the development opportunities offered by organisations is identified (Hanson, 2013) and a framework for holism for leadership development (Drath *et al.*, 2008; O’Connell, 2014) are discussed. Overall, the prerequisite to go beyond a static list of leadership development activities to developing learning interventions that address the needs, environment and context of individuals and organizations (Petrie, 2011; Hanson, 2013) are deliberated.

Based on theoretical and empirical studies, the authors then present ways in which leadership development emerges in organisations and identify the range of practices implemented to facilitate effective leadership. The intrapersonal and interpersonal processes (Day *et al.*, 2014) of the interventions are considered. Methods of evaluating leadership development programmes and assessing impact their on individuals and organisations are also presented. Two case study exemplars are described as examples of leadership development practice. The conclusion highlights the key themes and identifies future research directions.

Role of leadership theories in leadership development

Leadership development research and practice has continued to evolve as theories and interventions to support individuals and organizations have been emerged in the quest to build leadership capability (Hanson, 2013; Day *et al.*, 2013). Conventionally, leadership and

leadership development theory and research has focused on the individual, determining the specific traits, personality, behaviours and competencies leaders need to be effective (Yukl, 2013; Hanson, 2013; Day *et al.*, 2013). Considering a broader perspective, the concept of leadership development is broader in nature, considering the development of leaders and leadership in the context of change and growth of individuals.

The behavioral approach has been the focus of a number of studies (Tannenbaum, Weschler and Massarik, 2013). Although it can be argued that behaviors can be learned, it is suggested that primary interventions for the development of leadership behaviors tend to be based on short-term training interventions (Day *et al.*, 2013). But as challenges facing contemporary leaders are ill-defined and leadership work is reliably subject to unpredictable and unforeseen outcomes, especially in environments characterised as ‘volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous’ (VUCA) (Johnson, 2012) such training interventions which present leadership as a set of positive, individual skills and competencies are inadequate for the messy realities. The contingency and situational leadership theories emphasize this context as the main dimension in leadership i.e. it is not just about who the leader is, or what the leader does but about the context in which the leader works. These theories have helped to inform the relational aspects of leadership development which was previously overlooked. The leader-member exchange theory (Uhi-Bien, 2006) and the theory of shared leadership (Hillier, Day and Vance, 2006) has shifted the emphasis from traditional individualistic focus to collective and social aspects of leadership. More recently, Hanson (2013) highlights the need to explore the relational aspect of leadership beyond the leader–follower dyad to consider individual and organizational contexts.

Thus, leadership development appears to be iterative, multi-relational and contextual (Osborn, Hunt and Jauch, 2002) and leaders and organizations need support and guidance to navigate leadership development as a connected and multifaceted frame and not simply as linear processes (Lowe and Gardner, 2001). Vince and Pedler (2018) therefore strongly argue against leadership development that only emphasizes the positive and draws attention to the contradictions inherent in leadership work. As a result of these challenges, more recent research and practice of leadership has shifted the lens from leadership theories to understanding and enhancing the developmental processes (Day *et al.*, 2013).

Leader and leadership development

Although there are extensive theoretical and empirical studies on leadership theories, in comparison, there is relatively limited scholarly theory and empirical research on leadership development and the practice of leadership development (Day *et al.*, 2014). The complexity of leadership development requires more than the conceptual definition of leadership. Identifying a suitable leadership theory is not sufficient to motivate effective leadership as human development involves a complex set of processes that need to be understood and addressed (Day, Harrison and Halpin, 2009; Day., et al, 2013; Day., et al, 2014). Also, as the organizational context and nature of work has moved away from relying on a single leader to provide leadership of a team, to collaborative and shared processes within an effective team to constitute its collective leadership (Kozlowski and Bell, 2003; Pearce and Conger, 2003; Day, Gronn and Salas, 2004), the approaches to leadership development have also evolved.

Over the years, researchers have also sought to distinguish between the concepts of leader (leader within) and leadership development (leadership in action) (Day, 2000; McCauley and van Velsor, 2004; Clarke, 2013). McCauley and van Velsor (2004:2) define leader development as being about ‘the expansion of a person’s capacity to be effective in leadership roles and processes’ and is therefore concerned with the development of an individual’s skills, knowledge and competencies associated with formal leader roles (Clarke, 2013). Day (2000) makes a clear distinction between leader development and leadership development and suggests that leader development focus on developing individual leaders whereas leadership development focuses on a process of development that inherently involves multiple individuals (e.g., leaders and followers or among peers in a self-managed work team). Hanson (2013: 108) suggests that this distinction is important *‘because leading is both an internal process of personal discovery of values and beliefs and an external action of influencing, directing, and building teams and organizations’*. He argues that in the plural nature of developing leaders, the leader and leadership development is also an important construct as both are interconnected and essential aspects of building leadership talent (Hernez–Broome and Hughes, 2004).

Thus, leadership development activities cannot continue to be offered without first understanding and evaluating the interfacing relationship with the individual, their needs and as well as the organizational context in which they operate. In essence, Hanson (2013:107) suggests that we need to consider *‘the whole leadership development system before we “do” leadership development, so both leaders and organizations can map their development effort in an aligned and supported way..... and move away from isolated methods toward an*

interconnected process of personal and organizational discovery and learning'. Through his research Hanson (2013) has developed the Leadership Development Interface Model which offers an interconnected perspective of leadership development and explores a “whole system” view so both leaders and organizations can engage, plan, and evaluate their development effort in an aligned and supported way.

Thus, overall to address leader development with the individual level focus a set of intra-personal competencies and skills such as self-awareness, self-regulation and self-motivation (Day, 2000) have to be addressed through the development process. More recently, it has been recognized that with increasing unpredictability and contradictions in leadership work (Vince and Pedler, 2018) a deeper-level personal transformation and self-awareness associated with leader identity (Nicholson and Carroll, 2013) may also need to be considered in developing today's leaders. Research into leader development has therefore focused on understanding and evaluating formal and informal learning and development process that can contribute in this regard and how organisations can engage in a collaborative way to support this process (Day, Gronn, and Salas 2004; Dragoni et al. 2009; Orvis and Ratwani 2010; Reichard and Johnson 2011; Clarke, 2013). Next, to address leadership development which as seen is a dynamic process the focus of leadership development shifts towards building social capital, with emphasis on inter-personal skills development for both the leader and the follower focusing on relational, collective and social concepts to build trust and respect (Day, 2000; McCallum and O'Connell 2009).

Developing the 'leader' – intra-personal learning content

Research suggests that leading starts with individuals developing intra-personal perspective in building self-awareness around values, beliefs, character, spirit and personality (Tichy, 1997). In developing the individual leader, focus has to be placed on his or her life experience, the conscious or unconscious philosophy of life which impact on the values, beliefs and leading authentically (Avolio and Luthans, 2006; Hanson, 2013). Bennis (1995) suggests that if the leader is to be effective attention must be given to the leader within. Leaders that are able to see their whole life as a part of the leadership journey is crucial as building relationships and trust comes from a leader's self-orientation (Green and Howe, 2012; Hanson, 2013). This enables leaders to fully understand their own mind-set and attitude in relation to why and how they lead (Ready and Conger, 2007).

Thus, in exploring intra-personal aspects of developing a leader, researchers have examined cognitive and meta-cognitive skills to assess leadership potential (Marshall-Miles., *et al*, 2007); the role of personality (Day., *et al*, 2009; deVries, 2012); leader performance (Strang and Kuhnert, 2009); experience (Lord and Hill, 2005; Day., *et al*, 2009) and leader identity (Lord and Hill, 2005; Ibarra *et al*, 2010; Vince and Pedlar, 2018). Common to the aforementioned research is the idea that leaders who are able to learn from their experience are able to enhance their leadership facilitative skills. Specific intra-personal skills which can be acquired through learning and development processes include complex problem solving, creative thinking, social judgement skills and solution construction skills (Mumford, Marks *et al*, 2000; Mumford, Zaccaro *et al.*, 2000). Mumford *et al.*, (2007) have presented four leadership skills – cognitive, interpersonal, business and strategic as a conceptualised strataplex (layered) across the organisation and show that specific skills requirements vary by organisational level. Mumford *et al.*, (2000) in their extensive research based on U.S. military leaders also affirm that training assignments to be more effective needs to be tailored to development needs of individuals. Stenberg's (2008) suggests the WICS approach to leaders and leadership development which entails developing and integrating skills of wisdom, intelligence and creativity are essential for effective decision making. Thus through a planned process of skills development a leader advances from a novice (i.e. less experience) to an expert (i.e. highly experienced) leader (Lord and Hill, 2005).

Leader development also requires the input from others through feedback and observation (Hanson, 2013). Leaders require guidance and coaching to consider multi-perspectives and understand internal motivation (London and Smither, 2002). Introspections of self and others can help to make personal shifts leading to change in behaviour (McCauley and Van Velsor, 2005; Kegan and Lahey, 2009). Leader development therefore occurs when an individual is receptive and fully engages with the organisational feedback loops and are committed to acting on them to improve and enhance the way he or she leads (Alldredge and Nilan, 2000, Hanson, 2013). However, facilitation and support is required of the organization in this process to ensure that the feedback is appropriately interpreted and acted on (Rosti and Shipper, 1998; Goldsmith, Lyons and Freas, 2000).

Another aspect of leader development is the 'it is ultimately about facilitating an identity transition' to create new leadership options (Ibarra *et al*, 2010:673). Nicholson and Carroll (2013) establish that 'identity undoing' (addressed through moments of being destabilised, unravelled and deconstructed in leadership development) through exploration of the role of

power in identity construction using planned and initiated interactions can enable sense making, learning and relational development. Thus, although starting with the individual leader, this developmental aspect takes on a multi-level perspective, shifting the focus from intra-personal to inter-personal content in leadership development. This aspect is explored in the next section.

Developing 'leadership' in organisations – inter-personal learning content

In developing leadership, the emphasis moves from building human capital, which focus primarily on individual leader attributes (i.e. knowledge, skills and attitude) to social capital which is about making connections and interactions within a social context (Day., et. al, 2013). Thus, to develop leaders in organizations it is important to understand the development of social interactions that occur within the leadership process and build those interactive, technical and connective skills required in the process of leading organizational strategy and operations as well as leading people and teams (Kaplan and Kaiser, 2006; Hanon, 2013). Research on leadership development has established that certain psychological processes (such as self- knowledge, interpersonal skills, communication competence, and cultural competence) and contextual influences (such as organisational climate group/organisation composition, economic environment and organisational support for diversity) moderate the development of high quality relationships in diverse leader-member dyads (Boyd and Taylor, 1998; Scandura and Lankau, 1996).

It has been argued that aspects of leadership development can be built into formal and informal learning interventions (Hernez-Broome and Hughes, 2004). Gold, Thorpe and Mumford (2010) suggest that leadership and management development can be both a planned and deliberate process as well as an emergent one where the process of learning for leaders and managers takes place through recognised opportunities. A range of interventions can be developed and initiated to support leaders within this process: strengthen contact within the workplace through building networks, off-site activities and mentoring; assimilate learning and insight through leadership training and 360 degrees feedback and improve identification through job assignments and action learning (Day *et al.*, 2013). Hanson (2013) observes that such leadership development initiatives can either be stand alone or a menu of connected interventions. His overview of the mainstream thinking and literature on how leadership development is approached in organisations includes development of leadership through

leadership competencies or capability indicators, traditional class room based leadership training, action learning which involves working on real organization issues, 360degree feedback and executive coaching. These interventions address the role of process in leadership development.

Some researchers have specifically highlighted the importance of values and emotions in developing leadership, particularly to develop authentic leadership (Avolio and Gardner, 2005). Feedback as a process of development has been particularly identified as a way of ensuring longitudinal evaluation at multilevel focusing on intrapersonal and interpersonal changes to facilitate leadership development. This includes self-assessment not only of how a leader may view himself or herself, and how others view them but also how individuals think others view him or her (Taylor and Hood, 2011; Day., et al, 2013). This helps a leader to gain understanding of expectations at various levels within the organisations. This useful insight can be applied effectively within leadership development to support an individual to enhance their areas of strength and build of areas of lesser strength. However, individuals need to be supported through the 360 degree process to ensure that ‘self-and other agreement’ (i.e. how leaders rate themselves and how others rate them) is interpreted appropriately to maximise learning and development of the leader. Finally, literature suggest that self-narrative as a method in which leaders’ self-stories also contribute their on-going development (Shamir and Eilam, 2005).

There also appears to be shift or at least blending of non-cognitive learning with cognitive learning methods in leadership development to access intuition, feelings, emotions, stories, active listening, empathy, and awareness in the moment (Taylor and Ladkin 2009). These authors identified four processes that are particular to the way in which arts-based methods contribute to the development of individual managers and leaders: through the transference of artistic skills, through projective techniques, through the evocation of “essence,” and through creating, which they refer to as “making” of artefacts such as masks, collages, or sculpture. Other art-based methods and creative techniques introduce leaders to forms of art such as literature, drama, music and drawing (Springborg, 2012; Sutherland, 2013) to provide an experiential learning opportunity through which leaders can learn by ‘transforming aesthetic experiences to develop non-rational, non-logical capabilities and self-knowledge (Sutherland, 2013:25). These experiences have the potential to connect cognitive and

emotional processes which challenges underpinning assumptions and highlights the relational and subjective aspect of human experience (Taylor and Ladkin, 2010).

There are also more recent examples of leadership development that look beyond building capabilities, knowledge, behaviour and performance to focusing on coping with resilience (Romanoska *et al.*, 2013) and improving health and wellbeing (Holmberg, Larson and Backstrom, 2016) that has relevance for leadership roles in turbulent organisations and fluid work situation in current times. Use of mindfulness practice in leadership development is another method to enhance managerial leaders' capacity for self-care and resilience (Sanyal and Rigg, 2017) and build capabilities of collaboration, resilience and leading in complexity (Olivier *et al.*, 2016).

Consequently, leadership development is more dynamic than linear and the leader can be supported through more than one interrelated learning interventions to build knowledge, engage in sense making and to create shared meaning within his or her context to lead effectively. There are a number of studies that have adopted a complexity perspective which require leaders to develop skills in developing and managing networks effectively, engage in sense making with teams to promote shared understanding, counteract barriers to knowledge exchange and foster the positive value of tension to build social capital (Umble *et al.*, 2005; Bovaird, 2008; Clarke, 2013). Thus the discourses of leadership development now encompasses not just the *functional discourse* with emphasis on building and retaining leadership capabilities for optimum performance but also *interpretive discourse* to enable social construction and understanding of lived experiences within the context of work, the *dialogic discourse* through activities to explore identity and relational aspects of leadership which can be liberating and challenging at the same time and the *critical discourse* which emphasised value of the 'whole experience' engaging with the emotional and moral issues inherent in leadership practice (Mabey, 2013).

A 'whole system approach' to leadership development

The significance of the organizational context, its purpose for leader and leadership development and the interfacing relationships between the organization and the leader are key dimensions within leadership development (Olivares, Peterson and Hess, 2007). Hanson

(2013) has developed a four quadrant leadership development interface model that connects leaders and leadership development with individuals and organisations for which they work. Through his empirical research he presents '*an aligned systemic view of the leadership development interface [which] will lead to more effective and measurable leadership development outcomes*' (2007:108). His model consists of the leader development at individual level through the *leader reflection and discovery* i.e. leader's own understanding of how they view themselves and the world around them and how this impacts on the way they lead. Self-assessment, personality diagnostics, personal narrative, mind mapping can be used as development tools for leaders to ascertain and challenge their values, personality, personal well-being, authenticity, character/ qualities and personal goals/vision. Second, leader development at organizational level can be best achieved through *leader multi-level feedback* i.e. formal assessment, 360 degree feedback, uncovering multi-stakeholder perspectives, measuring ability/ potential and coaching to ascertain how they are doing and to highlight areas of development as mentioned earlier. Third, leadership development needs a learning place that is real and supported, and has a *context and purpose and is fit* both for the individual and organizational performance. This can be addressed through performance expectations, providing an appropriate learning space, succession planning, action learning and ability to work within the organisational leadership culture. This can add a critical aspect to leadership development. Finally, leadership development can build skills and behavior that lead to effective leadership learning as an outcome and action. This can be achieved through competence/ skills training, building networks and connections within the organisation, formal and informal life-long education, team and hierarchical interactions. Here, appropriate interventions and processes can be mapped and implemented.

These four aspects within Hason's (2013) model offer classification of development activities and processes. However, although leaders may spend some time of their leadership journey in each of the quadrants, the alignment and interconnectedness of these four aspects provide a holistic framework for both leader and leadership development '*offering opportunity towards more meaningful, measures and successful leadership improvement for both individuals and organizations*' (2013: 113).

Another simplified framework for development of both intrapersonal and interpersonal leadership capacities across the individual's career and life span is offered by O'Connell (2014) which incorporates key capabilities required for 21st century leaders. He offers five 'web of belief' synthesised from established and emerging leadership scholarship – *learning*

(creativity/expertise), *reverence* (rational/ collective), *purpose* (self-regulation), *authenticity* (self-awareness/ positive moral perspective) and *flaneur* (balance / reflexivity) as constructs as a guide for leaders to adapt to new information, new experiences, new levels of complexities and new context over the course of the life the career spans. These ‘webs of beliefs’ with their associated behavioural practices create a doctrine for holism for leadership development. (Drath et al, 2008; O’Connell, 2014). This framework also offer a basis for mediating shared meaning and developing common understanding between the leader and groups with diverse ideas and orientations with possibilities for interpretative, dialogic and critical leadership development discourses (Mabey, 2013).

Evaluating leadership development

As leadership development continues to be redefined in the changing context of the organization and work, new approaches and models of evaluating leadership development interventions have been considered both in research and practice. Taking into account content, process and outcome, few studies examine the behavioural, psychological and financial impact of leadership development. Traditionally, evaluation approaches tend to focus primarily on the individual leader (Belling, James and Ladkin, 2004; Holton and Baldwin, 2003; Kirkpatrick, 1998). However, in light of recent trends in relation to leadership development investment there is an increased emphasis on the return on investment and impact evaluation. Identifying appropriate markets and proxies to track over time has received increased attention. Consequently, the long-term impact of leadership development at the organizational level has become an important consideration (Collins, 2001). It is also suggested that leadership development can achieve community-wide goals such as improvements in health and public welfare (Martineau and Patterson, 2010), extending the evaluation of leadership development beyond the organizational level to encompass and community and social perspective.

Day’s (2000) review of effectiveness of popular leadership development practices makes a distinction between leader development (human capital) and leadership development (social capital). Gardner *et al.*, (2005) have offered a model of authentic leadership evaluation that includes cognitive elements focusing on leader and follower self-awareness, individual leader-follow behavior, the historical and proximal contexts, taking into account previous experiences of individuals as well as the organizational climate. Here, the primary evaluation

criteria was at the individual level. Ely *et al.*, (2010)'s evaluation model is an integrative framework for evaluating leadership coaching based on Kirkpatrick's four-level taxonomy which takes into account the factors that bring about positive coaching outcomes such as rapport, trust and collaboration in the relationship as well as the challenges and support as a part of the process. Orvis and Langkamer (2010) also focus on both the process and the outcomes in their model for evaluating leader self-development with specific emphasis on content relevancy, learner engagement, challenge, structure and experiential variety. Hoppe and Reinelt (2010) shifted the focus of leadership evaluation to impact on leadership networks, highlighting the need for evaluation at community level.

Several authors advocate a layered approach to evaluation of leadership development. For example, the EvaluLead Framework (Grove, Kibel and Hass, 2007), offers a comprehensive methodology that advocates evaluating four parameters of leadership training and development – the context (purpose), results types (forms/ depth of change required), domains of evaluation (personal growth, job/career performance, social systems change, organisational outputs and values, community norms) forms of inquiry (approaches to collecting data). Similarly, Clarke (2012) put forward a multilevel evaluation model following calls from the practitioner and academic community for more integrated approaches to theory building in leadership. His model consists of five levels of analysis – individual (leader/ follower), dyad (leader-follower), team, organisation and community. Here, at individual level, the leader's knowledge, skills, behaviours, identity and self-awareness is assessed alongside the follower motivation, trust, organizational commitment and performance. The relational quality and building of social capital is analysed at the dyad level. The leadership impact at the team and organisational level is evaluated through its effectiveness and performance at these levels. This model recognizes the need to shift the emphasis of evaluating leadership development from individual level to analysing patterns of relationships and overall impact at team and organizational levels. This is taken a step further by Edwards and Turnbull (2013) who advocate that the cultural context in which leaders are developed must be integrated within the evaluation process. They suggest a cultural approach to evaluating leadership development involving multiple stakeholders with multiple perspectives across the organization and community.

Thus, overall the impact of leadership development in today's organizations needs to be considered at individual, organizational and community levels (Clarke and Higgs, 2010; Clarke, 2012) *and* take into account content, process and outcomes.

Examples of leadership development practice

There are numerous examples the authors can draw on in relation to the own experience of leadership development in practice, as both lead, manage and teach a number of work-based leadership programmes for senior practitioners in their role as Academic Practitioners. In this section, the authors outline two case exemplars, illustrating different approaches to bespoke partnerships between a Higher Education Institution in the United Kingdom and two large public sector and private sector organisations.

The Postgraduate Certificate in Strategic Leadership is a one-year work-based learning programme specifically designed by Middlesex University Business School in collaboration with an English NHS Mental Health Trust to develop the skills and strategic capability of leaders and managers in the Trust. The aim of the programme is to enable senior leaders to address the challenges facing them in the context of the organizational changes and to enhance their leadership skills for meeting these challenges successfully within a strategic context. The programme has been validated in partnership with the organization to a postgraduate level academic qualification.

The programme consists of four dedicated leadership development workshops incorporating content on understanding leadership strategy, leadership style and impact, leading quality improvement and transformational change in organisations. These workshops are designed in partnership with the organisation and delivered jointly by Middlesex tutors and key personnel from the Trust. A key component of the programme is action learning which takes place in-between these workshops. Peer learning is key to the action learning process and each of the three 'set' is facilitated by experienced tutors from Middlesex University to support the set members to think and reflect together on the practice of leadership. Each participant is supported to undertake a 360 degree feedback, including one-to-one support to interpret the feedback and act upon them. Assessment comprises a reflective review of professional learning and literature on leadership and critical reflection of their personal leadership journey in the implementation of a 'stretch-project' within their workplace. The overall programme starts and ends with two conferences which is aimed at the beginning to embed the organisational strategies within the leadership development practice and at the end to showcase key learning from individual leadership projects and share learning journeys stories

with peers and other organisational stakeholders. The impact of the programme, both for individual participants and the Trust is evaluated through a pre-and post-evaluation questionnaire, including self-assessment on personal and organisational impact and a focus group is structured to capture participants' experiences of this programme.

Thus this programme has been designed to fully address the leader and the leadership development. The alignment between the individual participants and the organization has been addressed by ensuring that key messages and expectations from the organization is delivered within the workshop content to present a connected and meaningful understanding of the topics covered within the programme. This aligned the theory and practice of leadership so that participants could relate one to the other.

The Masters in Administration in Management International Payments Ecosystem is a two-year work-based learning programme specifically designed by Middlesex University Business School in collaboration with a Global Payment Company. The overall purpose of the postgraduate programmes at Middlesex University is to develop professionals who can manage ethically, sensitively and holistically in a range of organizations in an increasingly global and rapidly changing environment. For the Global Payment Company the programme enables the organization to attract, develop and retain talent to further strengthen its pre-eminent position in the payments industry. More specifically, the programme aims to develop industry-specific expertise, strategic thinking and leadership capability; to enable participants to contribute to key strategic issues, to develop critical thinking and to drive networking and exposure of participants across/within and beyond the organization. The programme also aims to develop individuals to manage successfully and ethically across their organization(s) in an increasingly global, diverse and dynamic business environment.

The programme is split into four interrelated phases. The first phase enables participants to develop skills in reflective practice in order to distil their learning from their organization's leadership development programme and to facilitate the application of this learning through a leadership development project to enhance their practice in their organizational setting. This phase provides participants with the opportunity to undertake and report upon a relevant leadership and management project to reinforce and embed their understanding of their own leadership practice. The second and third phases enables participants to focus on specific aspects of their leadership knowledge and behavior, including strategy, value creation and ethics. In the final phase, participants engage in a research project of their own choosing,

focusing on a particular organizational challenge, applying their knowledge and skills as appropriate through an action research approach, to instigate, and in some cases, evaluate change.

The impact of the programme is evaluated through a variety of methods which takes into account content, process and outcomes. Questionnaires are various check-points assess participants' engagement with the programme. The module and phase assessment captures the participants learning, the changes that occur at the individual, group, team and organizational level, where applicable.

Currently neither the *Postgraduate Certificate in Strategic Leadership* or *The Masters in Administration in Management International Payments Ecosystem* have longitudinal evaluation methods in place at the University level. The Global Payment Companies tracks retention and progress on an ongoing basis which provides an indication of the return on leadership development investment. However, the degree to which retention and progression can be attributed to the programme is questionable in the absence of the explicit alignment between these measures and participant engagement with the programme.

Conclusion

Leadership development is both simple and complex (Edwards and Turnbull, 2013). At the simplistic level, leadership development focuses on the interpersonal, the skills, experience, learning, and personality of the individual leader. At a complex level, leadership development encompasses the organization, community, and society, recognising that leadership is dynamic and is present at all levels in the system; individuals work with groups, teams, organizations and the wider context. For those engaged in leadership, the need to recognize and work within a complex adaptive system with unpredictable with unforeseen outcomes, is a necessity. We believe that in developing leadership talent in organizations today both the leader *and* approaches to leadership development need to be aligned to achieve both individual development as well as organizational impact. In practice, this will require a blended learning approach using a range of interventions, both planned and emergent, offering opportunities for interpersonal and intrapersonal learning. Thus, alongside workshops and taught sessions, individual leadership development through coaching and/or mentoring, action learning, organizational theme based conferences, networking opportunities and project work will enable the exploration of leader identity, emotional and ethical issues as

well as relational and social construction and interpretation of lived experiences within the context of the work environment.

There are a number of future research directions; perhaps the most compelling is the need to work with organizations' agendas. Organizations primary concerns encompass how to develop leaders and leadership effectively and efficiently, directing resources at the right time and the right place. This is not without difficulties and challenges, hence the number of studies undertaken over the last 25 years and the ongoing need to re-define and test models and methodologies, underpinning the longitudinal nature of this subject area. In light of the changing environment and the impact this has on business practices, future studies which can provide a spotlight effect which illuminates the what (leadership theory) and how (approaches to leadership development), defining primary concepts and distilling the evidence which demonstrates effectiveness and efficiency will be a necessity.

References

- Allredge, M. E., & Nilan, K. J. (2000). 3M's leadership competency model: An internally developed solution. *Human resource management, 39*(2-3), 133-145.
- Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., & Ryan, C. (2006). *The high impact leader*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Belling, R., James, K., & Ladkin, D. (2004). Back to the workplace: How organisations can improve their support for management learning and development. *Journal of Management Development, 23*(3), 234-255.
- Bennis, W. (1995). Creating Leaders: Leaders are created by experience, and they coach others from experience. *Executive excellence, 12*, 5-5.
- Boyd, N. G., & Taylor, R. R. (1998). A developmental approach to the examination of friendship in leader-follower relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly, 9*(1), 1-25.
- Bovaird, T. (2008). Emergent strategic management and planning mechanisms in complex adaptive systems: the case of the UK Best Value initiative. *Public Management Review, 10*(3), 319-340.
- Clarke, N., & Higgs, M. (2010). Leadership Training Across Business Sectors: Report to the University Forum for Human Resource Development,(UFHRD). *University of Southampton School of Management*.
- Clarke, N. (2012). Evaluating Leadership Training and Development: A Levels-of-Analysis Perspective. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 23*(4), 441-460.
- Collins, D. B. (2001). Organizational performance: The future focus of leadership development programs. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 7*(4), 43-54.
- Day, D. V. (2000). Leadership development: A review in context. *The Leadership Quarterly, 11*(4), 5
- Day, D. V., Gronn, P., & Salas, E. (2004). Leadership capacity in teams. *The Leadership Quarterly, 15*(6), 857-880.

Day, D. V., Harrison, M. M., & Halpin, S. M. (2009). An integrative approach to leader development. *New York, NY: Psychology Press. Physicians' Perceptions of Institutional and Leadership Factors Influencing Their Job Satisfaction at One Academic Medical Center. Academic Medicine, 77*(12), 1235-1240.

Day, D. V., Fleenor, J. W., Atwater, L. E., Sturm, R. E., & McKee, R. A. (2014). Advances in leader and leadership development: A review of 25 years of research and theory. *The leadership quarterly, 25*(1), 63-82.81-613.

De Vries, R. E. (2012). Personality predictors of leadership styles and the self–other agreement problem. *The Leadership Quarterly, 23*(5), 809-821.

Dragoni, L., Tesluk, P. E., Russell, J. E., & Oh, I. S. (2009). Understanding managerial development: Integrating developmental assignments, learning orientation, and access to developmental opportunities in predicting managerial competencies. *Academy of Management Journal, 52*(4), 731-743.

Drath, W. H., McCauley, C. D., Palus, C. J., Van Velsor, E., O'Connor, P. M., & McGuire, J. B. (2008). Direction, alignment, commitment: Toward a more integrative ontology of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*(6), 635-653.

Edwards, G., & Turnbull, S. (2013). A cultural approach to evaluating leadership development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 15*(1), 46-60.

Ely, K., Boyce, L. A., Nelson, J. K., Zaccaro, S. J., Hernez-Broome, G., & Whyman, W. (2010). Evaluating leadership coaching: A review and integrated framework. *The leadership quarterly, 21*(4), 585-599.

Gardner, W. L., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., May, D. R., & Walumbwa, F. (2005). “Can you see the real me?” A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*(3), 343-372.

Gold, J., Thorpe, R., & Mumford, A. (2010). *Leadership and management development*. Kogan Page Publishers.

Goldsmith, M., Lyons, L., & Freas, A. (2000). *Coaching for leadership*. San Francisco,CA: Jossey-Bass

- Green, C. H., & Howe, A. P. (2011). *The Trusted Advisor Fieldbook: A Comprehensive Toolkit for Leading with Trust*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Grove, J., Kibel, B., & Haas, T. (2007). EvaluLEAD: An open-systems perspective on evaluating leadership development In Hannum, K.M. Martineau, J.W. & Reinelt. C. (Eds.) *The handbook of leadership development evaluation*, 71-110, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hanson, B. (2013). The leadership development interface: Aligning leaders and organizations toward more effective leadership learning. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 15(1), 106-120.
- Hernez-Broome, G., & Hughes, R. J. (2004). Leadership development: Past, present, and future. *Human Resource Planning*, 27(1).
- Hiller, N. J., Day, D. V., & Vance, R. J. (2006). Collective enactment of leadership roles and team effectiveness: A field study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(4), 387-397.
- Holmberg, R., Larsson, M., & Bäckström, M. (2016). Developing leadership skills and resilience in turbulent times: A quasi-experimental evaluation study. *Journal of Management Development*, 35(2), 154-169.
- Hoppe, B., & Reinelt, C. (2010). Social network analysis and the evaluation of leadership networks. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(4), 600-619.
- Holton III, E. F., & Baldwin, T. T. (2003). *Improving learning transfer in organizations*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Ibarra, H., Snook, S., & Guillen Ramo, L. (2010). Identity-based leader development. *Handbook of leadership theory and practice*, 657-678.
- Johansen, R. (2012). *Leaders make the future: Ten new leadership skills for an uncertain world*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Kegan, R., & Lahey, L. L. (2009). *Immunity to change: How to overcome it and unlock potential in yourself and your organization*. Harvard Business Press.
- Kirkpatrick, D. I. (1998). Evaluating training programs. The four levels. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

- Kozlowski, S. W., & Bell, B. S. (2003). Work groups and teams in organizations. *Handbook of psychology*, 333-375.
- London, M., & Smither, J. W. (2002). Feedback orientation, feedback culture, and the longitudinal performance management process. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(1), 81-100.
- Lord, R. G., & Hall, R. J. (2005). Identity, deep structure and the development of leadership skill. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(4), 591-615.
- Lowe, K. B., & Gardner, W. L. (2000). Ten years of the leadership quarterly: Contributions and challenges for the future. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 459-514.
- Mabey, C. (2013). Leadership development in organizations: Multiple discourses and diverse practice. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 15(4), 359-380.
- Marshall-Mies, J. C., Fleishman, E. A., Martin, J. A., Zaccaro, S. J., Baughman, W. A., & McGee, M. L. (2000). Development and evaluation of cognitive and metacognitive measures for predicting leadership potential. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(1), 135-153.
- Martineau, J., & Patterson, T. (2010). Evaluating leader development. In E. Van Velsor, C.D. McCauley, & M.N. Ruderman, (Eds.) *Handbook of leadership development*, 3rd ed. (pp251-281). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- McCallum, S., & O'Connell, D. (2009). Social capital and leadership development: Building stronger leadership through enhanced relational skills. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 30(2), 152-166.
- McCauley, C. D., & Van Velsor, E. (Eds.). (2004). *The center for creative leadership handbook of leadership development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mumford, T. V., Campion, M. A., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). The leadership skills strataplex: Leadership skill requirements across organizational levels. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(2), 154-166.
- Mumford, M. D., Marks, M. A., Connelly, M. S., Zaccaro, S. J., & Reiter-Palmon, R. (2000). Development of leadership skills: Experience and timing. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(1), 87-114.

- Mumford, M. D., Zaccaro, S. J., Johnson, J. F., Diana, M., Gilbert, J. A., & Threlfall, K. V. (2000). Patterns of leader characteristics: Implications for performance and development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *11*(1), 115-133.
- Nicholson, H., & Carroll, B. (2013). Identity undoing and power relations in leadership development. *Human Relations*, *66*(9), 1225-1248.
- O'Connell, P. K. (2014). A simplified framework for 21st century leader development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *25*(2), 183-203.
- Olivares, O. J., Peterson, G., & Hess, K. P. (2007). An existential-phenomenological framework for understanding leadership development experiences. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *28*(1), 76-91.
- Olivier, M. R. M. C. S., & Waller, L. (2016). *The Mindful Leader*.
- Orvis, K. A., & Ratwani, K. L. (2010). Leader self-development: A contemporary context for leader development evaluation. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *21*(4), 657-674.
- Osborn, R. N., Hunt, J. G., & Jauch, L. R. (2002). Toward a contextual theory of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*(6), 797-837. Osborn, R. N., Hunt, J. G., & Jauch, L. R. (2002). Toward a contextual theory of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*(6), 797-837.
- Orvis, K. A., & Ratwani, K. L. (2010). Leader self-development: A contemporary context for leader development evaluation. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *21*(4), 657-674.
- Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (2003). All those years ago. *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*, 1-18.
- Ready, D. A., & Conger, J. A. (2007). Make your company a talent factory. *Harvard business review*, *85*(6), 68.
- Romanowska, J., Larsson, G., & Theorell, T. (2013). Effects on leaders of an art-based leadership intervention. *Journal of Management Development*, *32*(9), 1004-1022.
- Rosti Jr, R. T., & Shipper, F. (1998). A study of the impact of training in a management development program based on 360 feedback. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *13*(1/2), 77-89.

Sanyal, C. and Rigg, C. (2017) *In what ways does the introduction of 'mindfulness' in a Leadership and Management programme help managers to learn about self-care and resilience: a pilot case study within a Public Sector Leadership and Management post-graduate programme*. UFHRD Annual Conference 2017: Indigenous Research and Identity in HRD in a Globalized World, Lisbon, Portugal.

Scandura, T. A., & Lankau, M. J. (1996). Developing diverse leaders: A leader-member exchange approach. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7(2), 243-263.

Shamir, B., & Eilam-Shamir, G. (2018). "What's your story?" A life-stories approach to authentic leadership development. In *Leadership Now: Reflections on the Legacy of Boas Shamir*(pp. 51-76). Emerald Publishing Limited.

Springborg, C. (2012). Perceptual refinement: Art-based methods in managerial education. *Organizational Aesthetics*, 1(1), 116-137. Springborg, C. (2012). Perceptual refinement: Art-based methods in managerial education. *Organizational Aesthetics*, 1(1), 116-137.

Sternberg, R. J. (2008). The WICS approach to leadership: Stories of leadership and the structures and processes that support them. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(3), 360-371.

Strang, S. E., & Kuhnert, K. W. (2009). Personality and leadership developmental levels as predictors of leader performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(3), 421-433.

Sutherland, I. (2013). Arts-based methods in leadership development: Affording aesthetic workspaces, reflexivity and memories with momentum. *Management Learning*, 44(1), 25-43.

Taylor, S. N., & Hood, J. N. (2011). It may not be what you think: Gender differences in predicting emotional and social competence. *Human Relations*, 64(5), 627-652.

Taylor, S. S., & Ladkin, D. (2009). Understanding arts-based methods in managerial development. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8(1), 55-69.

Tichy, N. M., & Cohen, E. (1997). *The leadership engine*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Tannenbaum, R., Weschler, I., & Massarik, F. (2013). *Leadership and Organization (RLE: Organizations): A Behavioural Science Approach*. Routledge.

Uhl-Bien, M. (2011). Relational leadership theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. In *Leadership, gender, and organization* (pp. 75-108). Springer, Dordrecht.

Umble, K., Steffen, D., Porter, J., Miller, D., Hummer-McLaughlin, K., Lowman, A., & Zelt, S. (2005). The National Public Health Leadership Institute: evaluation of a team-based approach to developing collaborative public health leaders. *American Journal of Public Health, 95*(4), 641-644.

Vince, R., & Pedler, M. (2018). Putting the contradictions back into leadership development. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 39*(7), 859-872.

Yukl, G. A. (2013). *Leadership in organizations*. Pearson Education India.