

Advances in Developing Human Resources

<http://adh.sagepub.com/>

A Cultural Approach to Evaluating Leadership Development

Gareth Edwards and Sharon Turnbull

Advances in Developing Human Resources 2013 15: 46 originally published online 6

December 2012

DOI: 10.1177/1523422312467144

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://adh.sagepub.com/content/15/1/46>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



[Academy of Human Resource Development](#)

Additional services and information for *Advances in Developing Human Resources* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://adh.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://adh.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations: <http://adh.sagepub.com/content/15/1/46.refs.html>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Jan 16, 2013

[OnlineFirst Version of Record](#) - Dec 6, 2012

[What is This?](#)

A Cultural Approach to Evaluating Leadership Development

Advances in Developing Human
Resources
15(1) 46–60
© 2013 SAGE Publications
Reprints and permission:
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1523422312467144
<http://adhr.sagepub.com>



Gareth Edwards¹ and Sharon Turnbull²

Abstract

The Problem.

Current thinking around the evaluation of leadership development programs pays insufficient attention to the way that learning to lead becomes embedded and affected by the cultural context within which leaders and leadership operate.

The Solution.

We propose an enhanced appreciation of cultural factors, organizationally, regionally, and nationally, when evaluating leadership development programs. We go on to suggest a cultural approach to the evaluation of such programs. This more cultural view enables a greater appreciation of current and contemporary accounts of leadership in the literature that are of a more distributed and cultural nature. This view also enables a more significant appreciation of shifting cultures, contexts, and situations within the process of learning that is a central element of leadership development.

The Stakeholders.

This article will appeal to researchers in the area of leadership and leadership development, as well as those engaged in the design, delivery, and evaluation of leadership development in a professional capacity.

Keywords

leadership development, training evaluation and culture

¹University of the West of England, Bristol, UK

²University of Gloucestershire, UK

Corresponding Author:

Gareth Edwards, Bristol Business School, University of the West of England, Frenchay Campus, Coldharbour Lane, Bristol, B51 6 1QY, UK

Email: gareth3.edwards@uwe.ac.uk

Similar to previous calls made recently (Watkins, Lysø &, deMarris, 2011); we argue in this article for a broad basis for evaluating leadership development programs. We agree with Watkins et al., (2011) when they suggest that evaluation models based on fixed objectives do not capture program outcomes robustly enough. However, we suggest a slightly different model of evaluation to that of Watkins et al., which is based on a cultural focus. We assert, similar to Watkins et al., that existing evaluation models (Belling, James, & Ladkin, 2004; Holton & Baldwin, 2003; Kirkpatrick, 1998) are not able to capture learning outside the individual level based on fixed objectives. Furthermore, these evaluation models appear not to relate to contemporary notions of leadership in the literature that call for more broad based evaluation techniques (see preface to this special issue). Further to the work of Watkins et al., however, we will argue that there has also been an insufficient attention paid to cultural context (organizationally, regionally, and nationally) as an influencing factor.

Focusing evaluation predominantly on the more easily measurable elements of leadership competency frameworks and behaviors (e.g., Atwood, Mora, & Kaplan, 2010; Mann et al., 2008) or Kirkpatrick's framework (e.g., Boaden, 2006) has meant that accounts of leadership learning and development have often tended to overlook the broader organizational impact that can be understood by a more culturally based approach. Furthermore, the more deeply embedded nuances of learning to lead and the unplanned outcomes (Telfer, 2007) of leadership development have arguably been underexplored by the conventional approaches cited above. We will argue here that this is an opportunity for scholars in the field to develop more rigorous methods of evaluation, especially given the considerable advances in organizational cultural theory (Martin, 2002; Parker, 2000), in the field of organizational learning (Easterby-Smith & Araujo, 1999; Easterby-Smith, Crossan, & Nicolini, 2000) and national culture in the field of leadership studies (e.g., Gosling & Mintzberg, 2003; Jepson, 2009; Jepson, 2010a, 2010b; Mendenhall, Oddou, Bird, Osland, & Maznevski, 2007; Turnbull, 2009; Turnbull, Case, Edwards, Jepson, & Simpson, 2012). This literature offers a timely and complementary theoretical base from which to draw on a more culturally based approach to evaluating leadership development.

Links between culture and leadership are not new. Indeed, scholars such as Schein (2004) have for some time been pointing out the importance of the relationship between leadership and culture, and the field of education research has been progressing these ideas significantly over the past few years (Harris, 2004; Spillane, 2006). However, there is no doubt that mainstream conceptualizations of leadership are fundamentally changing and with it opportunities for leadership development evaluation. Since the turn of the millennium there has been a shift in viewing leadership as a distributed, dispersed or shared phenomenon, as opposed to the more conventional or traditional focus on the leader-follower dyadic relationship (see Bolden, 2011; Edwards, 2011a, and Thorpe, Gold, & Lawler, 2011 for current reviews of distributed leadership). This perspective offers the possibility that leaders and leadership capacity can be developed throughout organizations and societies at all levels (Charan, Drotter, & Noel, 2001; Raelin, 2004), thus strengthening the challenge to the traditional positional or individualistic perspective of leadership.

Further, we have identified a need for more global (Mendenhall et al., 2007) or worldly (Gosling & Mintzberg, 2003) perspectives on leadership and leadership development, because for many organizations today it is not enough simply to develop leaders for a single context (Turnbull, 2009; Turnbull et al., 2012). Organizations are increasingly seeking to grow leaders who are able to operate successfully across different businesses, as well as different national, local, or organizational cultures. A sensitivity to the contexts in which a leader is operating is therefore of increasing importance to organizational success. Increasingly therefore, we need methods of evaluating the impact of leadership development that go further than evaluating leadership behavior in its immediate context, as well as going beyond learned behavioral changes to consider their application across different contexts and cultures. Based on this observation we would suggest, therefore, that any criteria for evaluating leadership development should include an appreciation of differing facets of culture and differing cultural interpretations of leadership behavior. We conclude that the value to be gained from building a cultural understanding of leadership behaviors and organizational changes taking place as a result of leadership development programs can only be teased out by anthropological methodologies, an often overlooked aspect of evaluation practice.

Given these trends, and the possibility for advances in leadership development that they entail, this article focuses on advancing the evaluation of leadership development within the cultural frame. We build here on some of the work presented in Hannum, Martineau, & Reinelt's (2007) edited book *The Handbook of Leadership Development Evaluation* and the work of Watkins et al., (2011) to strengthen and develop a culturally based perspective of the evaluation of leadership development programs.

Anthropological Approaches to Studying Leadership: A Shift Toward the Cultural

With our article based around a cultural perspective, we first look at the recent discussion regarding the anthropological approach to studying leadership. Anthropological ideas and thinking have been influencing organizational studies for some time (Czarniawska, 1997; Geertz, 1973; Martin, 2002; Van Maanen, 1988). Ethnographic studies of organizational life have now become mainstream in depicting thick descriptions of unique contexts. It is only recently, however, that there have been a growing number of calls to consider the context of leadership (Jepson, 2009; Osborn, Hunt, & Jauch, 2002; Osborn & Marion, 2009; Porter & McLaughlin, 2006), both inside the organization and beyond into the global context. It is now increasingly recognised that leaders do not operate in a vacuum, and the study of leadership has started to take a more anthropological approach (e.g., Harter, 2006; Jones, 2005).

The historical study of leadership using anthropological approaches has not been uncommon among anthropologists (see Edwards, 2011b, for a review). In more contemporary terms, Harter's (2006) book on studying leadership, although not explicitly focusing on anthropology, takes a distinctively anthropological perspective. He discusses leadership in terms symbolism, image, and form and emphasizes the

importance of time and space and hence context and culture. Jones (2005) takes an explicitly anthropological viewpoint, articulating a cultural theory of leadership based on leadership legitimacy and power being derived from being global and local at the same time. As Jones (2005) suggests—“ . . . for all the fantastic variety of leadership theory available, the majority of them focus primarily on individuals, and organization, not on culture” (p. 265).

Jones (2005) was one of the first to be explicit about the anthropology of leadership and its translation into corporate life. He is careful to state that his articulation of the cultural perspective of leadership does not seek to replace, but to offer a supplementary perspective on leadership theory, and what he calls “a different scale of analysis” (p. 260). Jones is also alert to the problematic nature of culture and the critics of the construct who point to its potentially “essentializing or totalising assumptions.” Nonetheless, he argues for its utility in understanding how “inherited histories, roles, expectations, and cultural structures condition people’s lives” (Geertz, 1973, p. 262). We concur with Jones on the utility of the anthropological lens, and adopt Jones’s definition of culture for the purposes of this article as follows: ‘Culture consists of the symbolic schema, both linguistic and non-linguistic, through which humans apprehend, act in, and interpret their experience in the world.’ (p. 262)

Culture and Learning in Leadership Development

As we have suggested above, our argument for a greater focus on a cultural approach to the evaluation of leadership development draws on trends in the field of leadership research that are reconfiguring leadership as dispersed and process based. Barker (1997) found that leadership tends to be conceptualized in one of three ways: as ability or skill, as a relationship between leader and follower, or as a dynamic social process. Although all of these might be useful models for understanding the construct, we argue here that it is the latter definition that has been least developed until now, but has the most to offer to the field of leadership development evaluation. Consequently, if leadership is conceived of as a *dynamic social process* then as Barker suggests, leadership development needs to focus on “communicating, coalition building, compromising and negotiating” and “self-awareness.” In turn then we are arguing that the evaluation of leadership development needs also to be able to spotlight the way that leadership learning becomes embedded, encultured, and enacted inside the organization, and how this might differ from context to context and culture to culture. This is more important as we see a recent shift in thinking about leadership development from individualistic perspective toward a socioconstructivist perspective (e.g., Hotho & Dowling, 2010) or a social capital skills perspective (e.g., McCallum & O’Connell, 2009). Indeed, McCallum and O’Connell, in their call for a social capital emphasis in leadership development do so in response to an overvalued emphasis on human capital. In addition, Hotho and Dowling call for a change orientation in leadership development from input to interaction. These orientations in the literature suggest movement toward a social, contextual, cultural and dispersed notion of leadership within development programs.

The evaluation of leadership development is often framed as a static set of measures that evolve along a continuum. However, if we reconceptualize leadership as leading from a process perspective (Barker, 1997), and therefore a dispersed and dynamic process that occurs within and across organizations, and if organizations themselves can be represented as shifting but nevertheless identifiable subcultures (e.g., Hofstede, 1991; Johnson & Scholes, 2002; Schein, 2004) or as shifting but recognizable networks (Parker, 2000), we need a way of thinking about the design and evaluation of leadership development that is compatible with these more dynamic and fluid conceptualisations of both leadership and organization.

This article seeks to advance both the theory and the practice in line with the dispersed and cultural perspective of leadership, and has adopted and researched a cultural approach to leadership development evaluation within organizations. This will first be discussed and the rationale outlined. Second, we will highlight elements of this approach that have been trialled by us in different contexts to evaluate leadership development in general and specific leadership development programs. Last, we will conclude the article by making further suggestions for developing these ideas in both research and practice, and illustrating how this can operate, especially when designing and evaluating leadership development programs for different cultural contexts or the broader global context.

Cultural Approaches to Evaluating Leadership Development Programs: Some Examples From Recent Evaluation Projects

In this section of the article we draw on some of our own examples of culturally based approaches to leadership development evaluation, and highlight elements we feel shed light on gaining an understanding of the sociocultural impact of leadership development. These examples suggest that investment in large scale leadership development programs is often made with a view to bringing about organizational change, but that evaluating the impact of this change is often overlooked or avoided due to its complexity. The examples below are not meant as a complete illustration of the approach itself nor developing a definitive criterion for evaluation instead are representative of reflections from practice that may be of use in evaluating leadership development programs from a cultural perspective.

Example 1

Turnbull (2001) studied a major program for leaders of a large global organization over the course of 18 months as they progressed through the program. The purpose of the program was organizational change, and the adoption by these leaders of a new set of organizational values. It was striking the extent to which adoption of the ideas varied across different parts of the business. The research found that much of the

variation in program impact on individuals and units was explained by context. In this case these contexts could be culturally differentiated very easily, because many of the businesses had been added to the corporation by acquisition, having previously been autonomous or owned by different groups.

Although full ethnographic immersion was not practical, the study involved at least 30 days inside the organization seeking to understand the organizational context, the culture, and subcultures as they were perceived by the program participants and their colleagues; participating fully in the program; and conducting pre and post program interviews to understand how they explained their feelings and responses to the program.

Example 2

In a recent project (Edwards, Turnbull, Stephens, & Johnston, 2008) researching the leadership impact of a Master's degree program in Sustainable Development, members of a range of different cohorts were asked to draw a biographical timeline and then to describe the significant moments in their life that they felt had led them to choose a career in sustainable development and to enroll on the program. The same approach was then used to develop an understanding of significant events after the course and the decisions and actions they attributed to these events since graduating from the program. The research was designed to evaluate outcomes of the program at the individual level. Outcomes evaluation focuses on changes in attitudes, perspectives, behavior, knowledge, skills, status, or level of functioning (Marzano, 1993; Schalock, 2001; Stake, 1967). This study used an inductive approach eliciting autobiographical stories from 15 interviewees and 2 focus group attendees. The interviewees were volunteers who had signed up to be interviewed at a previous Alumni event. Each interviewee was asked to complete a timeline depicting significant dates and events that they believed had shaped their thinking and actions prior to coming on the course, as well as significant dates and events since leaving the course. The purpose of the timeline was to stimulate memory and reflection in the participants of our study. Our aims were to understand how the participants constructed their choice of this program, how they saw it fitting into their life trajectories, the triggers that led them to apply for a place, what they hoped to gain, and how their career plans and outcomes had been informed by their participation in the program. We also sought to understand how the graduates made sense of the experiences they encountered during the course of the program itself, and the impact of different aspects of the program on their current thinking and actions. The interviews were semi-structured and conducted by three different interviewers. The interviewers began with a common set of questions and then probed their respondents with further questions following each response. Each interviewer then coded the transcripts thematically to draw up a matrix of codes, which were then reapplied to each transcript. The research concluded that the program was having an impact on its graduates and how they interact in organizations and sectors based on the sustainability agenda, and provided evidence to support the process

of leadership development that includes work-based learning, theory, and social interaction, and the model of change for sustainable development that includes awareness, agency, and association. The methodology used in this research enabled the researchers to uncover the finding that placements, in particular, hold the key to the development of contextually sensitive leadership ability.

Example 3

In this study (Bentley & Turnbull, 2005) of how leaders in the manufacturing sector in the United Kingdom developed their leadership skills we were seeking to evaluate the relative impact of different leadership development activities, both formal and informal, on manufacturing leaders in their different cultural contexts. Again a biographical timeline was used with the leaders to help them understand and explain the key influences on their leadership from an early age to the present day. Both planned and opportunistic kinds of learning were identified, and the leaders were able to provide us with a rich explanation of the various contexts within which they had applied their learning as well as the “how” and the “why.” Forty individual case studies supported questionnaire data. An entirely new evaluation of different approaches to leadership development emerged as a result of this approach.

Example 4

A leadership development program for a new U.K. university is also a clear indication of our cultural approach to design and evaluation. This piece of research (Turnbull & Edwards, 2005) collected qualitative cultural data from a wide range of participants within the organization before, during, and after the program. We used focus groups, interviews, and ethnographic observation to understand the complexities of our baseline, in terms of perceptions of leadership, behaviors enacted, and more importantly the cultural context within which the leaders were operating. We studied the norms, organizational stories, history, symbols, language, controls, power dynamics, and sector context to establish the dominant culture and subcultures of the organization, as well as the belief systems of the leaders within the organization.

From this baseline, we were able to design a program that was contextualized to meet the development requirements of this specific organization as well as to enable different leaders to take from the experience whatever they needed in terms of the challenges they were currently facing. We were then able to monitor the participants’ behavioral and attitudinal changes as they applied their experiences on the program back in their own work context, as well as to rigorously evaluate the organizational impact of their actions and changes in their behavior. We have, for example, supported the university to collect participants’ stories of specific changes and outcomes each of which can be shown to have impacted more broadly than the individual and in many cases have been measurable using reassuring quantifiable measures.

Example 5

A leadership development program designed for a regional sport partnership started with a qualitative diagnosis of the leadership issues facing them at individual, team, organizational, regional, and national level (Edwards & Turnbull, 2005). These issues formed the basis of the design of the program, and our post-course evaluation process was designed to monitor both initial outcomes and longer-term impact. Soon after completion of the program, a semi-structured questionnaire was used to interview program delegates. The data were then compared with the pre-course diagnostic study to identify changes taking place as well as any blocks to progress. A deep understanding of where the organizational blockages lay enabled us to make important recommendations for action. A further diagnostic exercise was implemented 18 months to 2 years after the course to measure the ongoing effectiveness of the leadership development for the organization.

Critical Factors in a Culturally Based Approach

Below is a summary of the critical factors that we have identified thus far for developing a culturally based approach to the evaluation of leadership development programs. This approach:

- (1) Focuses on all levels of change (e.g., examples 1 and 5) from the individual and his or her team to the wider organization and beyond (community, society, global context), where appropriate. This approach focuses on differing levels and functions within organizations, whether they have been part of the leadership program or not, to gain a wider perspective of the impact of the program than just those groups involved. Thinking of the organization as a process and networked as well as cultural highlights the interconnectedness of organization members, as well as highlighting the interrelationships between the people and organizations that may perceive themselves to be beneficiaries or the reverse of any leadership intervention. This, therefore, assumes that there are always multiple stakeholders in leadership development, and that the needs and measures of all stakeholders need to be taken into account. In the university (example 4), for instance, we had to meet the needs of the Vice Chancellor, the University Leadership Group, the faculty deans, the 150 delegates themselves, their teams and colleagues, other staff of the university, the students, delegates' families, and the government. The list of those who stood to benefit from improved leadership in the university was extensive.
- (2) Wherever possible focuses on the taking an ethnographic perspective (e.g., examples 1 and 4), getting inside the organization is essential in developing a deep understanding of management, leadership, culture, context and subcultures (e.g., Watson, 2001), and hence cultural and contextual impact.

- Furthermore, we would also advocate organizational members and/or program participants themselves being involved in the data collection and analysis to provide a genuine ethnographic or auto-ethnographic perspective.
- (3) Gathers information around the program and, in particular, makes use of biographical timelines that include significant events before and after the program (examples 2 and 3). This enables a focus on both short-term outcomes and long-term impact, and considers individual, unit, and the organization's history as well as the impact of this on current perceptions and action. The use of a biographical timeline and diagnostic data helps gain this historical perspective that focuses on changes in attitudes, perspectives, behavior, knowledge and so forth (Marzano, 1993; Schalock, 2001; Stake, 1967), as a result of stimulating memory and reflection.
 - (4) Uses formal and informal data gathering (e.g., example 3), for instance, interviewees and/or ethnographic participants to gather information and reflect on practice both inside and outside the work context. This enables reflection upon attitudes toward the organization and work-life balance.
 - (5) Uses Socratic investigation (using open questions such as how, why, what and when) in interview questions and participant reflection (e.g., example 3), which opens up issues and reflective discussions instead of closing discussion down.
 - (6) Reflects upon a number of differing aspects of culture (e.g., example 4—stories, myths, history, symbols, language, controls, power dynamics etc.), this enables a deeper appreciation of context before and after the program implementation.
 - (7) Starts the evaluation at the design stage (e.g., example 5). Gaining insights from the very beginning of a program enables a richer picture of what has or has not happened as a result.

In summary, our observations assume that there are always multiple stakeholders in leadership development, and that the needs and measures of all stakeholders need to be taken into account. In any evaluation process, therefore, we are required to balance the wider stakeholder needs and perceptions with the immediate beneficiaries, and it is a matter of judgment and resource how widely to poll. Whenever a trade-off has to be made, the cultural approach will tend to favor depth to breadth. In other words, 12 “deep” interviews are likely to tell us more about the “what,” “why” and “how” of the progress of leadership development than 120 questionnaires, which are likely to address only the “what” questions but may falter with the “why” and “how.”

In these cases, at its very simplest, a cultural approach can be about capturing the cumulative effects of numerous behavioral changes. These individual changes are usually reported by participants to take place as a result of a combination of increased awareness, understanding, self-confidence, self-reflection, knowledge, changed attitudes, beliefs and values, and so on. In the past, the majority of leadership development programs were designed to impact on individual behaviors,

with organizational change being primarily about the sum of the cumulative individual changes.

Even where a program is designed with individual change in mind, however, we have observed that the organizational impact of these cumulative individual changes will always be mediated by the cultural context: the structure, style, power, controls, communication networks, products, technology, and existing leadership style of the organization. These elements of both design and evaluation of leadership development programs are too often overlooked, and yet there is significant anecdotal evidence of leaders who are highly successful in one culture or context failing badly in another (one well documented example is Sir Winston Churchill, considered a great leader in wartime Britain but not in a period of peace).

We know that the legacy of history is an important mediator of the impact of leadership behaviors in and on an organization (e.g., Ford, Harding, & Learmonth, 2008). For example, past events, common experiences, people, ownership, technology, place, and previous training courses, initiatives and programs are all lenses through which leaders are judged and evaluated by their followers. Often leaders make the mistake of assuming that organizations are a blank canvas on which to paint their desired leadership behaviors, instead of recognizing that outcomes will inevitably be directly mediated by the past and present, and therefore that any design should take the past and present cultures, and values into account.

In our own leadership development programs, we have found that Johnson and Scholes' (2002) Cultural Web can be an effective tool for analyzing and reflecting on the current culture or subcultures, envisioning the longer-term desired culture, and then focusing on the leadership behaviors and actions required to get there. This is most effective when conducted by the participants themselves as part of their leadership development agenda. And it can be a helpful tool for increasing awareness of context and for supporting participants engaged in implementing their individual and personal learning back in their workplaces.

Longitudinal evaluation data can then be obtained by conducting focus groups and deep biographical interviewing—both prior to and after any leadership development program. This is most effective when carried out inductively, without preconceptions and deliberately free of hypotheses. Obtaining and analyzing participants' stories and narratives is one of the most effective ways to elicit this type of cultural data.

Implications for Research and Practice

Although there are some potential limitations for this form of leadership development evaluation we believe it has important considerations for practicing managers, trainers, and developers. First, although some organizations may not be willing to embark on a search for evidence that could involve considerable time, expense, and toil. Instead, if expediency is their motivation, they may prefer to continue with the more unidimensional approaches we have critiqued above. Our experience is that this can

at least partially be overcome by developing strong relationships with organizations where program providers act as partners in designing, developing, and delivering programs as opposed to stand alone contractors.

The examples illustrated above have not yet exploited the full potential of a culture-based approach to evaluating leadership development, however, the richness of the data that is emerging convinces us that such an approach is worth developing further. Using more than one tool for data collection and analysis has, in each case, added to the richness of the data, and we plan to develop the use of additional methodologies. We have, for example, already experimented with the use of video diaries with participants of an overseas experiential leadership development initiative with great success.

We suggest that further research could also develop a fully ethnographic evaluation process where a researcher spends a period of months on the inside of an organization before during and after a leadership development intervention. In addition to studying the behavioral changes displayed by the leaders over this period and their organizational impact, the ethnographer will draw on observation, interviews, participants' learning journals, and video diaries to more deeply understand how leadership and context mutually constitute. In blending a sociocultural understanding of organizational learning with more conventional psychological measures for studying individual behaviors we are able to paint a colorful portrait of the way leadership development impacts on organizational change.

This culturally based approach to the evaluation of leadership development programs therefore will also enable researchers to use applied data to develop better contextual studies of leadership, a practice that is increasingly becoming popular in Scandinavia (e.g., Alvesson & Sveningsson, 2003a, 2003b), and, we would hope, complement existing evaluation approaches by offering new insights into leadership development and context.

Clearly there are tensions in doing culturally based evaluative research inside organizations where commercial imperatives demand immediate solutions. Furthermore, the costs and risks do not make this type of venture unproblematic. However, even while acknowledging the expenses involved in researchers' time, as well as the possibility of researchers going native while studying the organization from the inside, our argument is that this type of venture will enrich our understanding in many situations.

The discussion regarding the culture-based approach held in this article also has implications for the design of leadership development interventions and programs. For example, it promotes the use of evaluation-led design, for the outcomes and impact sought by the organization to be designed into the program from the start, as well as to enable selection of the most appropriate tools and approaches for measuring the changes planned to take place (as well as any unexpected outcomes). A culture-based approach therefore challenges the mainstream view of evaluation as a post intervention activity.

Conclusions

If we follow these ideas further, we might imagine that the design, delivery, and evaluation of leadership development become harmonized to the extent that they are no longer disconnected as separate and distinct processes, but become mutually supporting and shaping. It is then no longer simply a question of designing and delivering an intervention, and then measuring impact and outcomes at various levels. Instead the cultural contexts (both inside and outside the organization) become embedded and diffused throughout the entire learning journey, with evaluation being a constant instead of a beginning and end point.

This approach then takes the evaluation discourse in a different direction from the ROI discourse that seeks to identify increasingly smarter and more accurate ways to measure impact of leadership development on the bottom line. It brings us closer to a more multifaceted understanding of how leadership development works in practice. Action before, during or after a program can never be a-contextual. The approach proposed here takes both a holistic view of evaluation to see development in its broader context, but also drills deeply into the micro-interactions inside the organization and seeks to surface and examine the many interconnections and networks that exist. It also seeks to understand how the leadership dynamic is affected by an organization's history, and is therefore much more sensitive to such cultural dimensions as time, language, symbols, rituals, mythology, and power structures. This is not to sweep away the many tried and tested mechanisms for capturing data for evaluation, but to add a new lens to the evaluator's toolkit.

Leadership development is both very simple and at the same time very complex. At its most straightforward it is about impacting on the behavior of individuals. But even at this level we cannot judge its effectiveness without an understanding of the "raw material" that is our starting point and the culture in which these individuals are operating. At its most complex we seek to understand not only individual impact but also impact on the organization, community, and society, across time, place, related networks and, organizational levels and beyond. We need to consider multiple stakeholders with multiple perceptions and to acknowledge that leadership can never be an absolute science, but is primarily an art (Grint, 2000).

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

- Alvesson, M., & Sveningsson, S. (2003a). Good visions, bad micro-management and ugly ambiguity: Contradictions of (non-)leadership in a knowledge-intensive organization. *Organization Studies*, 24, 961-988.

- Alvesson, M., & Sveningsson, S. (2003b). Managers doing leadership: The extra-ordinization of the mundane. *Human Relations*, 56, 1435-1459.
- Atwood, M. A., Mora, J. W., & Kaplan, A. W. (2010). Learning to lead: Evaluating leadership and organizational learning. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 31, 576-595.
- Barker, R. (1997). How can we train leaders if we do not know what leadership is? *Human Relations*, 50, 343-362.
- Belling, R., James, K., & Ladkin, D. (2004). Back to the workplace: How organizations can improve support for management learning and development. *Journal of Management Development*, 21, 234-255.
- Bentley, J., & Turnbull, S. (2005). Stimulating leadership—The ten key triggers of leadership development. In: R. W. T. Gill (Ed.), *Leadership under the microscope* (pp. 35-53). Ross-on-Wye, Herefordshire: The Leadership Trust Foundation, UK.
- Boaden, R. J. (2006). Leadership development: Does it make a difference. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 27(1), 5-27.
- Bolden, R. (2011). Distributed leadership in organizations: A review of theory and research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13, 251-269.
- Charan, R., Drotter, S., & Noel, J. (2001). *The leadership pipeline: How to build the leadership powered company*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Czarniawska, B. (1997). *Narrating the organization: Dramas of institutional identity*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Easterby-Smith, M., & Araujo, L. (1999). Current debates and opportunities. In M. Easterby-Smith, L. Araujo, & J. Burgoyne (Eds.), *Organizational learning and the learning organization* (pp. 1-22). London, UK: Sage.
- Easterby-Smith, M., Crossan, M., & Nicolini, D. (2000). Organizational learning: Debates past, present and future. *Journal of Management Studies*, 37, 783-796.
- Edwards, G. P. (2011a). Concepts of community: A framework for contextualizing distributed leadership. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13, 301-312.
- Edwards, G. P. (2011b, June 1-4). *Cultural leadership theory and research: The importance of history and the relative unimportance of geography*. Paper presented at the European Academy of Management (EURAM) Conference, Tallinn, Estonia.
- Edwards, G. P., & Turnbull, S. (2005). Evaluating the impact of leadership development in a regional sports partnership: A case study. In: R. W. T. Gill (Ed.), *Leadership under the microscope* (pp. 83-100). Ross-on-Wye, Herefordshire: The Leadership Trust Foundation, UK.
- Edwards, G. P., Turnbull, S., Stephens, D., & Johnston, A. (2008). Developing leaders for sustainable development: An investigation into the impact and outcomes of a UK-based masters program. In N. Huber & M. Harvey (Eds.), *Leadership: Impact, culture and sustainability* (pp. 118-133). College Park, MD: ILA Building Leadership Bridges Series.
- Ford, J., Harding, N., & Learmonth, M. (2008). *Leadership as identity*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*, New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Gosling, J., & Mintzberg, H. (2003, November). The five minds of a manager. *Harvard Business Review*, 1-12.

- Grint, K. (2000). *The arts of leadership*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hannum, K. M., Martineau, J. W., & Reinelt, C. (Eds., 2007). *The handbook of leadership development evaluation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Harris, A. (2004). Distributed leadership and school improvement: Leading or misleading? *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 32(1), 11-24.
- Harter, N. (2006). *Clearings in the forest: On the study of leadership*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations*. Maidenhead, Berkshire, UK: McGraw-Hill.
- Holton, E. F., III., & Baldwin, T. T. (2003). Making transfer happen. In E. F. Holton, III. & T. T. Baldwin, (Eds.), *Improving learning transfer in organizations* (pp. 3-15). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hotho, S., & Dowling, M. (2010). Revisiting leadership development: The participant perspective. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 31, 609-629.
- Jepson (now Schedlitzki), D. (2009). Studying leadership at cross-country level: A critical analysis. *Leadership*, 5, 61-80.
- Jepson (now Schedlitzki), D. (2010a). Is organizational leadership theory and discourse converging internationally? An examination of the German case. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 26(1), 1-12.
- Jepson (now Schedlitzki), D. (2010b). The importance of national language as a level of discourse within individuals' theorizing of leadership—A qualitative study of German and English employees. *Leadership*, 6, 425-445.
- Johnson, G., & Scholes, K. (2002). *Exploring corporate strategy*, 6th ed. Harlow, UK: Prentice-Hall.
- Jones, A. M. (2005). The anthropology of leadership: Culture and corporate leadership in the American south. *Leadership*, 1, 259-278.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1998). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Mann, R., Scallan, S., Deane, M., Watson, A., Leach, C., & Kibble, S. (2008). Developing competent and capable improvement in NHS general practice: An evaluation of the Practice Leaders Program (Portsmouth, UK). *International Journal of Clinical Leadership*, 16, 167-177.
- Martin, J. (2002). *Organizational culture, Mapping the terrain*. London, UK: Sage.
- Marzano, R. J. (1993). Lessons from the field about outcomes-based performance assessment. *Educational Leadership*, 51(6), 44-50.
- McCallum, S., & O'Connell, D. (2009). Social capital and leadership development. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 30, 152-166.
- Mendenhall, M., Oddou, G., Bird, A., Osland, J., & Maznevski, M. L. (2007). *Global leadership: Research, practice and development*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Osborn, R. N., Hunt, J. G., & Jauch, L. R. (2002). Toward a contextual theory of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 797-837.
- Osborn, R. N., & Marion, R. (2009). Contextual leadership, transformational leadership and the performance of international innovation seeking alliances. *Leadership Quarterly*, 20, 191-206.

- Parker, M. (2000). *Organizational culture and identity*. London, UK: Sage.
- Porter, L. W., & McLaughlin, G. B. (2006). Leadership and the organizational context: Like the weather? *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 559-576.
- Raelin, J. (2004, March). Preparing for leaderful practice. *Training and Development*, 58(3), 65-70.
- Schalock, R. L. (2001). *Outcomes-based evaluation*. New York, NY: Plenum.
- Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership*, 3rd ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Stake, R. (1967). The countenance of educational evaluation, *Teachers College Record*, 68, 523-540.
- Telfer, G. (2007). *Unforeseen outcomes in leadership development programs* (Unpublished MBA Dissertation). The University of Strathclyde Graduate School of Business, Glasgow, Scotland.
- Thorpe, R., Gold, J., & Lawler, J. (2011). Locating distributed leadership. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13, 239-250.
- Turnbull, S. (2001). Corporate ideology—Meanings and contradictions for middle managers, *British Journal of Management*, 12, 231-242.
- Turnbull, S. (2009). Worldly leadership for a global world. In M. Harvey & J. Barbour (Eds.), *Global leadership, portraits of the past, visions for the future. Building leadership bridges* (pp. 82-94). College Park, MD: International Leadership Association.
- Turnbull, S., Case, P., Edwards, G., Jepson (now Schedlitzki), D., & Simpson, P. (2012). *Worldly leadership*, London, UK: Palgrave.
- Turnbull, S., & Edwards, G. P. (2005). Leadership for organizational change in a new UK University. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 7, 396-413.
- Van Maanen, J. (1988). *Tales from the field: On writing ethnography*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Watkins, K. E., Lysø, I. H., & deMarris, K. (2011). Evaluating executive leadership programs: A theory of change approach. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13, 208-239.
- Watson, T. J. (2001). *In search of management: Culture, chaos and control in managerial work*. London, UK: Thomson Learning.

Bios

Gareth Edwards is a senior lecturer in Organization Studies at Bristol Business School, United Kingdom. His current interests are in the application of ideas on aesthetics and leadership, community, and dispersed theories of leadership. Before entering academia Gareth spent 12 years working for a leadership and executive development company.

Sharon Turnbull is an independent academic and visiting professor at the University of Gloucestershire Business School and the University of Worcester Business School in the United Kingdom. She was director of the Centre for Applied Leadership Research at The Leadership Trust Foundation. Her current research interests are global and worldly leadership, responsible leadership, and leadership development.