Leadership Development and Organizational Culture: Which Comes First?

Michael G. Hasler
Texas A&M University

Much has been written about the definitional role organizational leadership plays in the culture of an organization. Likewise, when leadership development is considered, it is often referred to as one of the tools used by leadership to help create and reinforce the desired organizational culture. This literature review explores the current thinking and future research questions about the relationship between leadership development and organizational culture in an environmental context.

Keywords: Leadership, Organizational Culture, Career Development

Edgar Schein (1985) wrote extensively on organizational leadership and culture nearly twenty years ago, and the words he stated then hold true perhaps even more today than at that time.

> A deeper understanding of cultural issues in organizations is necessary not only to decipher what goes on in them but, even more important, to identify what may be the priority issues for leaders and leadership. Organizational cultures are created by leaders, and one of the most decisive functions of leadership may well be the creation, the management, and--if and when that may become necessary--the destruction of culture. Culture and leadership, when one examines them closely, are two sides of the same coin, and neither can really be understood by itself. In fact, there is a possibility--underemphasized in leadership research--that the only thing of real importance that leaders do is to create and manage culture and that the unique talent of leaders is their ability to work with culture. (Schein, 1985, p. 2)

The focus on culture in organizations has broadened to include a variety of topics: the global nature of the economy (Montesino, 2003); the issues surrounding large, multi-group organizations (Locander, Hamilton, Ladik, & Stuart, 2002); and the impact of leadership and leadership development on culture (Sharkey, 1999). While this is not an all-inclusive list, it shows that there is a strong recognition of the importance of culture in managing and leading an effective organization. The recognition of culture's importance, however, is not easily translated into the necessary practice of leadership development. This investigation is the starting point for ongoing research into the importance of organizational culture as part of the context within which leadership development must take place.

Problem Statement

HRD professionals responsible for development of future organizational leaders have long understood the need to consider the context of their efforts. Likewise, organizational leaders constantly wrestle with the problems of identifying future leadership, properly developing them, and retaining them in the organization. The operational context of the organization includes the obvious aspects of economics, demographics, and the market (for commercial operations). However, the more subtle aspects of the environmental context also include the organizational culture; a topic about which much has been written, but for which no strong consensus for action concerning leadership development has emerged. Organizational leaders, including HRD professionals, must include consideration of the organizational culture in the design and implementation of leadership development efforts.

Research Questions

This investigation will review a sample of literature focusing on the link between leadership, organizational culture, and leadership development. The study will attempt to systematically note the progress of thinking in this area from foundational research and seminal work to current literature. Early research on leadership and culture details a clear progression that shows leadership defining and driving culture (Sashkin, 1995; Schein, 1985; Yukl, 1989). From this perspective, one can extrapolate that effective leadership utilizes development of future leaders as one of the many tools available to affect and manage the organizational culture.

The questions used to define this study are:
1. What is the contemporary thinking in the field of HRD about leadership and its linkage to culture?

2. What is the contemporary thinking in the field of HRD about leadership and its role in defining leadership development?
3. What is the contemporary thinking in the field of HRD about leadership development as a defining agent of the organizational culture or as a function derived from the culture of an organization, and does the difference matter?
4. Does a gap exist in the knowledge of leadership development and its relationship to organizational culture that can inform future research, theory, and practice?

Theoretical Framework

Three related topics--leadership, leadership development, and organizational culture--provide the basis for understanding the operational context of an organization that drives its leadership development activities. For purposes of this study, these three topics are defined as noted in Table 1.

Table 1. *Definitions of Key Terms*

Term	Definition
Leadership	"Leadership is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal" (Northouse, 2004, p. 3)
Leadership Development	The continuous organizational process of identifying potential leadership talent, developing both the externally observable skills and internally nourished personal character of that talent, and providing an appropriately challenging outlet for individual development within the leadership ranks of the organization.
Organizational Culture	"A pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and fell in relation to those problems" (Schein, 1985, p. 12)

Several theoretical foundations have been used to inform this study. Chief among them are General Systems Theory (Bertalanffy, 1976), and Human Capital Theory (Becker, 1993), and the Organization Development Performance System (Lynham, 2000). The foundational concepts of General Systems Theory have significant impact on thinking in the HRD community. Bertalanffy (1976) highlights the need to consider the unity of the whole while attempting to understand the place and impact of a system in its environment. The systems approach informs the study as a starting point for investigating culture as a component of the organizational environment. Human Capital Theory (Becker, 1993) has been used extensively in HRD research and practice. This theory informs the study by providing an underlying assumption about the value of effective leadership to the strength of the organization. Finally, Lynham's (2000) ODPS approach to organizations and performance informs the study from the perspective of recognizing the role of leadership and its responsibility of ensuring performance through all of the various tools--including development of future leaders--at its disposal.

Methodology

The answers to the research questions were sought through a review of literature beginning with works widely considered to be foundational or seminal. The literature review is then presented through a discussion of linkages: leadership and culture, leadership and leadership development, and culture and leadership development. Finally, the results of the literature review were compared to the research questions to validate whether they were sufficiently answered.

Literature review was conducted by using common research databases. Keywords used in the search included: leadership, leadership development, organizational culture, career development, management development, management education, and corporate change. While other search words were used in the research, these terms proved to be the most effective.

Literature Review

The review of literature was undertaken to seek a thread from early, seminal works on leadership and culture to more current thinking on leadership development. This review is organized by exploring the linkages revealed in the range of works--early to current--that are group by leadership and culture, leadership and leadership development,

and, finally, leadership development and culture.

Leadership and Culture

Several different leadership theories have developed over the years that approach leadership from a variety of perspectives. Initially, the focus was on the traits possessed by great leaders (Bass, 1985), and the skills required to be effective as a leader (Katz, 1955 as cited in Northouse, 2004). The theories that brought the focus onto culture as a byproduct of leadership centered on transformational leadership. Northouse (2004) notes that "transformational leadership is a process that changes and transforms individuals" (p. 169). This process drives and defines the culture in the new organization under the leadership of an individual who often is identified as possessing charisma (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978).

It is the work of Bass (1985) and Burns (1978) that defined most of the initial work in the field and laid the groundwork for Edgar Schein (1985) to focus on culture as the fundamental role of the leader in bringing about and solidifying the implementation of change in an organization. Schein's theories on culture seek to dispel several common myths about organizational culture. For instance, Schein contends that common meanings for culture that include terms such as norms, dominant values, rules of the game, and climate fall short of the true meaning of culture. In his opinion, these meanings are mere reflections of the culture, not the culture itself.

The term "culture" should be reserved for the deeper level of basic assumptions and beliefs that are shared by members of an organization, that operate unconsciously, and that define in a basic "taken-for-granted" fashion an organization's view of itself and its environment. (1985, p. 6)

The assumptions to which Schein refers must be differentiated from the commonly held meanings that may describe the surface context of the culture but not the essence. Since these are commonly held, then they must be a learned product of a group and that group's experience. Such a set of experience can really only come from a social unit that has reached some stability and has enough history to actually have sufficient shared events to constitute common experience. This leads Schein to his operational definition of culture that has become the benchmark for following studies.

A pattern of basic assumptions--invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration--that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (Schein, 1985, p. 9)

Schein's contention that behaviors and styles are mere reflections of the culture is validated by the presence of survey instruments such as the Organizational Culture Inventory (OCI) (Cooke, 1997 as cited in Sharkey, 1999). This instrument measures the culture of an organization by focusing on different styles: constructive, passive/defensive, and aggressive/defensive. Each of the styles has different cultural elements that make up an array of twelve, and the instrument reveals the organizational style through the description of the different cultural elements that apply to it.

It is the theory of transformational leadership that receives the greatest attention from researchers interested in the interplay between leadership and culture. The very name transformational leadership was originated in the seventies and was popularized by the sociologist Burns in his analysis linking the roles of leaders and followers (Burns, 1978). As noted earlier, Burns, and later Bass (1985) further developed the concept of transformational leadership by placing greater emphasis on the follower. Bass posited that transformational leaders motivated followers to achieve results beyond expectations by sharing a clear vision for excellent performance, seeking to have followers place the goals of the organization above their own self-interest, and getting followers to address their higher-level needs. Through this process, Bass theorized, leaders could bring about fundamental and long-lasting change in an organization. The underlying premise in the transformational leadership theory was the need for organizational change. The need for change was exemplified by the realization that some critical aspect of organizational performance was below expectations, either due to shifts in the operating environment or degradation of the internal operating effectiveness. Once need for change was realized, transformational leadership was shown to be effective in bringing about positive change (Bass, 1985).

The ongoing argument that occurs throughout the discussion of transformational leadership is its relative effectiveness when compared with transactional leadership (Bass, 1985). The comparison normally describes transactional leadership in the nomenclature of management or administration. That is, the ongoing maintenance and continuous improvement of the status quo. This comparison is not necessarily meant to demean transactional leadership, in fact, most authors are quick to note that the use of transactional leadership is entirely appropriate in particular situations when the need for change has not yet been made (Bass, 1985; Sashkin, 1995; Sashkin & Rosenbach, 2001). Ongoing research to determine the validity and application of transformational leadership in an organizational context has caused several topics to emerge, two of which include emotional intelligence (Palmer, Walls, Burgess, & Stough, 2001) and organizational conflict (Cloke & Goldsmith, 2000).

Emotional Intelligence (EI) has become a topic of interest because of the apparent correlation between the measurement of EI and the effectiveness of transformational leadership (Palmer et al., 2001). As the linkage between leadership and organizational culture continues to strengthen, the corresponding recognition of leader emotional maturity and intelligence comes into sharper focus as an important attribute of a transformational leader. Just as Bass (1985) noted that transformational leaders use symbols, inspirational motivation, and emotional appeals to focus followers' efforts to achieve a shared vision, recent research in EI makes clear the link between leaders' emotional intelligence and their ability to inspire their followers (Palmer et al., 2001). This increased sensitivity to the emotional needs of their employees enables transformational leaders to effectively communicate the essence of their vision and create a need for followers to accomplish that vision.

Cloke and Goldsmith (2000) have studied organizational conflict from the perspective of mediators who seek to help members of organizations deal with conflict. Through their studies Cloke and Goldsmith found that organizational conflict creates and presents opportunity for change as existing patterns of behavior and performance are called into question. The transformational leader recognizes this situation as an opportunity to tear down one culture and replace it with a culture that is conducive to change and acceptance of a new vision for the organization. This thought of linking cultural destruction and subsequent recreation is a fundamental component of Schein's model of culture and leadership (Schein, 1985).

Leadership and Leadership Development

Any review of current popular management literature will reveal a significant amount of written work on the need for management and leadership development. The difference between these two topics is critical, however. Management training and development is most often concentrated on skills and knowledge (Noe, 2002) through the use of lectures, modeling, role playing, and simulations. Leadership development, however, is different. The difference lies in the fundamental comparison between management and leadership.

Bass (1985) attempts to make the distinction between management and leadership through the parallel definitions of transformational and transactional leadership. In most contemporary organizations, management is linked with improvement of the current model and leadership is linked with change. The need for leadership development and the role of leadership in defining the vision for that development is the critical link between the need for change and the role of leadership development in cementing transformational organizational change into the new organizational reality. Sashkin has studied various models of leadership and development of leaders and has been explicit in its importance.

> Development calls for action on several fronts, including behavioral skill training of the sort commonly associated with leadership development (which is relatively easy), new forms of knowledge-based training in organizational culture and culture-building (which is harder), and training centered on development of the three personal capabilities (hardest of all). (Sashkin, 1995, p. 22)

Sashkin (1995) notes that the personal capabilities of effective transformational leaders cluster around three areas: the ability to construct a compelling organizational vision; an intellectually and emotionally mature understanding of power and its positive use, not merely its acquisition; and, self-confidence as manifested in the empowerment, inspiration, and motivation of others.

An effective leadership development activity, then, begins with the identification of future leadership and the gaps between current skills, knowledge, and characteristics of the individuals with the current and future needs of the organization. Throughout the recent literature on leadership development, involvement of and commitment by organizational leadership is crucial to the success of any development activity (Connaughton, Lawrence, & Ruben, 2003; Kelloway, Barling, & Helleur, 2000; Larsson et al., 2002; McElroy & Stark, 1992; Prewitt, 2002; Sashkin, 1995; Sashkin & Rosenbach, 2001; Schein, 1985). Understanding the gaps between the current state and the future state of the organization is the function that defines all of the ensuing developmental activities.

Several distinct areas make up the common core of curriculum in leadership development activities. This curriculum is, by necessity, organization-specific and is an outgrowth of the identified capability gaps between the current organizational state and the future state consistent with the vision of organizational leadership. In this context, the training focuses on skills, competencies, and capabilities. The common understanding of these terms is that a skill is a specific expertise that can be taught, while competencies are an aggregate of several skills. Capability is then considered to be the ability to apply skills and competencies within the context of a specific situation in a way that is perceived to add value (Jackson, Farndale, & Kakabadse, 2003). With that in mind, the general areas that receive the most attention in development include: administrative skills, communication, interpersonal, motivation, and general leadership (Hunt & Baruch, 2003). The premise of this list is that it encompasses the common core necessary skills and behaviors, although it is clearly not exhaustive.

Administrative skills, while appearing mundane to most researchers concerned with leadership, constitute the underlying foundation of transactional and management skills that provide the infrastructure for any organization to

function at even a minimal level. Fundamental administrative skills allow the true transformational leadership and its consequent culture changes to take place, because without them basic needs cannot be adequately met, and followers in a period of change will be focused on survival, not organizational effectiveness. Using Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs as a model, it is clear that unless survival needs and questions (Will I be paid?, Are my benefits up to date?, Will the electricity bill for the company be paid on time?, Are the organization's legal responsibilities being met with the government?) are adequately addressed, organizational members will not be open to any opportunity for higher level organizational considerations (Schein, 1985). Even though it is fashionable to dismiss administrative skills as too basic for serious inquiry, lack of these skills prohibits the opportunity to address other issues.

Communication skills and competencies become critical as leaders attempt to frame and articulate their vision for the future state of the organization. Several authors have noted the correlation between success organizational transformation and the communication skills of the leadership. Cloke and Goldsmith (2000)--well known for their studies on mediation, organizational communication, and conflict resolution--note that breakdowns in communication can occur whether intentional, part of the organizational culture, or simply a poorly articulated statement. It is that communication breakdown that is most often the underlying cause for conflict in an organization that drives the need for cultural change. Skill in communication takes a variety of forms, including the ability to actively listen, giving and receiving feedback immediately, understanding nonverbal cues, and, of course, speaking persuasively before a large group (Sashkin, 1995). Sashkin includes communication as one of his five central behavioral dimensions along with clarity, consistency, caring, and creating opportunities. With communication skills playing such a large role in a leader's success, the enhancement and development of those skills are included in virtually every leadership development curriculum (Jackson et al., 2003).

Noted consistently throughout the literature on leadership development, the topic of interpersonal skills is addressed as an essential skill of an effective leader (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Connaughton et al., 2003; Jackson et al., 2003; Sheard & Kakabadse, 2004). This is particularly so as the working environment becomes increasingly team-oriented and structured as work groups. At this point, leadership becomes substantially based on emergent power, as opposed to formal authority granted through one's position in the organizational hierarchy (Connaughton et al., 2003). Because of these trends, development of leadership talent is critically linked with the interpersonal skills. This is highlighted by noting that the work of leading depends significantly on the presence and participation of followers; a leader cannot lead when alone. The idea that interpersonal skills are critical to leadership is evidenced by the debate that surrounds the very definition of interpersonal skills. There is a body of researchers who feel that competencies such as structuring a vision, motivating others, providing feedback, and leading make up interpersonal skills. However, the vast majority of people who have studied this area define interpersonal skills as a necessary capability of leadership that has a significant overlap with the other competencies noted above (Hunt & Baruch, 2003). The critical question is how one develops interpersonal skills in a current or future leader, since many would argue that those skills are a function of personality or "common sense" (Hunt & Baruch, 2003, p. 733).

Teaching interpersonal skills is often considered problematic, but those who attempt to address the need utilize several different tools. One of those used most often is the 360° feedback process. This tool is used by many organizations to help leaders become more self-aware and cognizant of how others perceive their individual actions and interpersonal actions relative to their own perceptions (Hunt & Baruch, 2003; Jackson et al., 2003; McMillen, Luebbe, & Lauber, 2003). The 360° survey participant group is made up of individuals who have supervisory, peer, and direct report relationships with the subject. The participants are given the same survey as the subject and are asked to provide anonymous input on a relative scale on specific questions, as well as provide open-ended input on leadership behaviors exhibited by the subject. The subject gets the opportunity to validate their own view of their leadership styles, behavior, and effectiveness with the perceptions of the people with whom they interact on a daily basis. This process is not without its detractors, however. Critics of the process note that unless monitored very closely, data is fairly easily misinterpreted and when part of an ongoing cycle of surveys can be susceptible to loss of anonymity and "revenge" answers (Hunt & Baruch, 2003).

The ability to inspire and motivate followers is one of the critical dimensions of a transformational leader using Bass' (1985) model of the transformational leader. Most of the other models that deal with transformational leadership also list the ability to motivate their followers as one of the critical characteristics of an effective leader (Burns, 1978; Kelloway et al., 2000; Sashkin, 1995). The concern, when operating in the context of leadership development, is how to teach someone to be motivational. As noted previously in the area of interpersonal skills, there is a strong school of thought that the ability to inspire and motivate is a personal characteristic or trait and therefore cannot be taught or learned (Connaughton et al., 2003; Hunt & Baruch, 2003). To address this issue, researchers have taken note of those traits, characteristics, and behaviors that lend themselves to personal credibility and influence. Consequently, a range of issues are combined to raise the self-awareness of the student being

developed into a leader. These issues include personal and business ethics, communication skills, active listening skills, and a sense of one's own personal integrity (Connaughton et al., 2003).

Spending time learning skills, developing insight into business processes, becoming self-aware about one's own style are all important steps to take in becoming a leader. However, the literature confirms several times in many contexts the need to practice these new skills and test new attitudes and insights. A classroom or seminar experience will only provide a small portion of the development time necessary for these skills and attitudes to become natural in their use (Andrew, 2003; Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Connaughton et al., 2003). The method of choice in those organizations known for strong leadership development is some form of job rotation and experience-broadening assignments.

Companies that have mastered this process first identify the positions that will be used for development. Often referred to as "linchpin" or "mission-critical" roles, these positions are defined as the "jobs that are essential to the long-term health of the organization" (Conger & Fulmer, 2003, p. 79). These roles are often difficult to fill, and are normally in the existing, critical section of the business or in an emerging line of business that will likely become critical. By using these critical roles as job rotation sites, the organization has the opportunity to assist individuals with identified potential learn their craft in an environment where they will be surrounded by other people with leadership talent and knowledge of the organization. The notion of assisting these high potential leadership candidates is vital to the overall success of the activity, and it must not be overlooked. Rather than creating a "sink or swim" environment with individuals being developed, companies with effective development activities ensure success by creating a mentoring relationship and ongoing support and feedback during the job assignment (McMillen et al., 2003).

Since not all organizations have sufficient mission critical roles to fill all of its leadership development needs, some organizations have begun innovating with specially created positions. Examples of this concept are small joint ventures, factory-within-a-factory arrangements, and job swaps between development candidates. The idea is to create a position with sufficient depth and breadth to challenge the candidate and enhance their experience while still being a size that is manageable and within their capabilities (Conger & Fulmer, 2003).

The most common theme across all development templates is leadership commitment and support. Unless the top leadership in an organization takes a visible, personal, and critical role in the development of future leadership, the activity is virtually guaranteed to decline into failure, or worse, irrelevance. Aside from ensuring that the activity was appropriately funded, leadership commitment involved personal interaction such as being a mentor, following up on mission critical assignments and job rotations, placing a high priority on their schedule for reviews of talent and discussions of development progress, modeling behavior consistent with the organizational vision and being visible in support of the activity. As Schein notes, "One of the best mechanisms that founders, leaders, managers, or even colleagues have available for communicating what they believe in or care about is what they systematically pay attention to" (1985, p. 225). It is by systematically paying attention to leadership development that leaders ensure that the organization realizes its importance.

Leadership Development and Culture

As Schein stated, "Organizational cultures are created by leaders, and one of the decisive functions of leadership may well be the creation, the management, and--if and when that may become necessary--the destruction of culture" (1985, p. 2). If this is indeed true, and if transformational leaders achieve their organizational transformation through the culture, then there must be a link between leadership development and culture if both are critical to organizational success. A study of leadership development and organizational change has produced results that support the validity of the link between the two (Sharkey, 1999). In her study, Sharkey attempted to isolate the impact of leadership development as a specific tool of transformational leaders to change the existing culture of an organization and solidify the new culture. Sharkey's research findings showed very little impact on the culture in the short to mid term (6 to 12 months after the start of the development program). However, further analysis of several different organizations led Sharkey to posit that a longer time period is necessary to "cement" a new cultural identity into place (Sharkey, 1999, p. 35). The story of Jack Welch at General Electric was used to illustrate the long term positive effect of leadership involvement in the development process as a counter to the study results in the short term. The key observation from Sharkey, however, was that while potential leaders seemed to improve their leadership skills and characteristics (as noted by their direct reports), the turnover rate for high potential individuals in the company remained high 12 months after the initiation of the development program. The conclusion was that the effectiveness of the development program in enhancing leadership and management skills might be realized more permanently by the next employer of these individuals. Sharkey's contention was that while cultural change was being impacted by the leadership development, as measured by a lower employee turnover rate, the change was not becoming solidified in the organization quickly enough to rapidly lower the turnover rate. Cultural change in an organization is positively affected by leadership development, but it is not a rapid change (Sharkey, 1999). Other

studies linking organizational culture and employee retention serve to support these conclusions (Egan, Yang, & Bartlett, 2004).

As Schein (1985) noted earlier, it is important to recognize the linkage between top leadership attention and culture. As top leadership focuses on leadership development, the organization will recognize that attention and understand the importance of the development activity. By utilizing the development activity properly, it becomes another lever to be used by the transformational leader in tearing down the previous, ineffective culture and replacing it with a new culture that supports and enhances the new organizational vision.

Conclusion

The four research questions focused on current thinking regarding leadership, leadership development, and organizational culture. The first two questions have been addressed in the literature review. It is question three and question four dealing with the linkage between leadership development and organizational culture that deserve more in depth discussion.

The literature review section on leadership development and culture was notably smaller than the other two sections, primarily due to the dearth of recent literature specifically describing a significant link between the two. Culture is often discussed and described as the outcome of leadership efforts. Likewise leadership development is noted as one of several tools leaders must use to affect organizational culture in the long run (Andrew, 2003; Connaughton et al., 2003; Gardner & Stough, 2002; Kotter & Heskett, 1992; Schein, 1985).

One of the original motivations for the researcher to perform this study included the contention that there are specific, distinct organizational cultures that support effective leadership development activities. The search conducted for this study did not reveal any scholarly works that specifically supported this contention, however, there were statements on the part of key theorists in transformational leadership that specifically addressed the link between leadership and culture and leadership development (Sashkin, 1995).

A significant opportunity exists for future research and study in the arena of the context of leadership development and its effectiveness. As an example, Sharkey (1999) noted that the time frame for the study on leadership development and culture precluded any conclusions beyond conjecture. It is possible that the length of the business cycle for certain industries makes use of the development activity a less effective tool for cultural change when used by transformational leaders. An organization in a volatile industry such as semiconductors, that has a significant amount of turnover and movement of talent among different companies in the industry, should carefully consider the type and timing of leadership development. A five year process for developing a future leader could find the company having endured several business cycles, changes in technology, and even different types of business than when the program began. This is not to say that development should not occur, but that the time frame must be taken into account in the program design so that the industry environment factors are considered. A company in a more established, slower-growth industry such as furniture or automotive might be completely justified in having a five to ten year development cycle for top executives and leaders.

Recommendations and Contributions to New Knowledge in HRD

The combination of environment, organizational culture, the pool of available talent, the impact of technological change, and commitment of existing leadership has an immense impact on the cultural context for leadership development. Future research will focus on these factors and their influence on the structure and content of leadership development for various organizations.

This review of current literature and research provides an analysis of the linkages between leadership, leadership development and organizational culture, and reveals a gap in the study of organizational culture as a significant contextual factor in the design of leadership development activities. These linkages provide one valid framework for future research on contextual leadership development and the legitimacy of a systems approach in the consideration of the operational environment on the practice of leadership development.

References

Andrew, M. (2003). Winning Strategies for Leadership Development. *Chief Learning Officer, 2*(8), 42-49.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.

Becker, G. S. (1993). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education* (3rd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bertalanffy, L., von. (1976). *General system theory: Foundations, development, applications*. New York: George Braziller, Inc.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Cloke, K., & Goldsmith, J. (2000). *Resolving personal and organizational conflict: Stories of transformation and forgiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Conger, J. A., & Fulmer, R. M. (2003). Developing Your Leadership Pipeline. *Harvard Business Review, 81*(12), 76-84.

Connaughton, S. L., Lawrence, F. L., & Ruben, B. D. (2003). Leadership Development as a Systematic and Multidisciplinary Enterprise. *Journal of Education for Business, 79*(1), 46-51.

Egan, T. M., Yang, B., & Bartlett, K. R. (2004). The effects of organizational learning culture and job satisfaction on motivation to transfer learning and turnover intention. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 15*(3), 279-300.

Gardner, L., & Stough, C. (2002). Examining the relationship between leadership and emotional intelligence in senior level managers. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 23*(2), 68-78.

Hunt, J. W., & Baruch, Y. (2003). Developing top managers: the impact of interpersonal skills training. *Journal of Management Development, 22*(8), 729-752.

Jackson, S., Farndale, E., & Kakabadse, A. (2003). Executive Development: Meeting the Needs of Top Teams and Boards. *Journal of Management Development, 22*(3), 185-265.

Kelloway, E. K., Barling, J., & Helleur, J. (2000). Enhancing transformational leadership: The roles of training and feedback. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 21*(3), 145-149.

Kotter, J. P., & Heskett, J. L. (1992). *Corporate culture and performance*. New York: Free Press.

Larsson, G., Carlstedt, L., Andersson, J., Andersson, L., Danielsson, E., Johansson, A., et al. (2002). A comprehensive system for leader evaluation and development. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 24*(1), 16-25.

Locander, W. B., Hamilton, F., Ladik, D., & Stuart, J. (2002). Developing a Leadership-Rich Culture: The Missing Link to Creating a Market-Focused Organization. *Journal of Market - Focused Management, 5*(2), 149.

Lynham, S. A. (2000). *Organization Development for Performance System*. St. Paul: University of Minnesota Human Resource Development Research Center.

McElroy, J. C., & Stark, E. (1992). A thematic approach to leadership training. *Journal of Managerial Issues, IV*(2), 241-253.

McMillen, S., Luebbe, D., & Lauber, M. (2003). Hillenbrand Industries Builds Leadership Capabilities to Drive Its New Business Strategy. *Journal of Organizational Excellence, 23*(1), 23-36.

Montesino, M. (2003). Leadership/followership similarities between people in a developed and a developing country: The case of Dominicans in NYC and Dominicans on the island. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 10*(1), 82.

Noe, R. A. (2002). *Employee training and development* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Northouse, P. G. (2004). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Palmer, B., Walls, M., Burgess, Z., & Stough, C. (2001). Emotional intelligence and effective leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 22*(1), 5-10.

Prewitt, V. (2002). Leadership development for learning organizations. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 24*(2), 58-61.

Sashkin, M. (1995). *Transformational leadership: A review and synthesis* (Working Paper). Washington, DC: The George Washington University, Institute for the Study of Learning.

Sashkin, M., & Rosenbach, W. E. (2001). A new vision of leadership. In W. E. Rosenbach & R. L. Taylor (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in leadership* (5th ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership: A dynamic view*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sharkey, L. D. (1999). Changing organizational culture through leadership development: A case in leadership transformation. *Organization Development Journal, 17*(3), 29.

Sheard, A. G., & Kakabadse, A. P. (2004). A Process Perspective on Leadership and Team Development. *Journal of Management Development, 23*(1), 7-106.

Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial Leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management, 15*(2), 251-289.