Chapter 8
Looking Back to Look Forward: Lessons for Leadership Development

Mulyadi Robin and Sen Sendjaya

Abstract From high profile scandals involving corporate, political, and religious leaders to systemic abuses of power and unethical practices that often form the backdrop of contemporary organizations; the lack of an efficacious profession of moral leadership is identified as one of the most fundamental problems in leadership among both academics and practitioners. Using the 2007–2008 global financial crisis (GFC) as a turning point, we analyzed 15 years of leadership development intervention literature published in peer reviewed journal before the GFC using servant leadership as a paradigm for holistic leadership development. Through this research, we sought to look back at what lessons can we learn from the past, so that we are able to better understand what changes are needed to move forward. The study revealed an imbalance in the emphasis of leadership development interventions, and extends the literature the study of destructive leadership and ethical leadership in answering the call for moral, authentic and ethical leaders. Theoretical and practical implications were also discussed.

Keywords Servant leadership · Leadership development · Holistic leadership development

8.1 Introduction

From high profile scandals involving corporate, political, and religious leaders to systemic abuses of power and unethical practices that often form the backdrop of contemporary organizations; the lack of an efficacious profession of moral leadership is identified as one of the most fundamental problems in leadership among both academics and practitioners (Bolden & Gosling, 2006; O'Connell & Bligh, 2009). For

M. Robin
Alphacrucis College, Sydney, Australia
e-mail: mulyadi.robin@ac.edu.au

S. Sendjaya (✉)
Swinburne Business School, Swinburne University of Technology, Hawthorn, VIC 3122, Australia
e-mail: ssendjaya@swin.edu.au

S. Sendjaya (ed.), *Leading for High Performance in Asia*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-6074-9_8

instance, the findings of the investigation into the global financial crisis of 2007–2008 concluded that there was a systemic breakdown in accountability and ethics that goes beyond simply greed and hubris (FCIC, 2011). The authors of the report stated "we do place special responsibility with the public leaders … those entrusted to run our regulatory agencies, and the chief executives of companies whose failures drove us to the crisis. These individuals sought and accepted positions of significant responsibility and obligation. Tone at the top does matter and, in this instance, we were let down. No one said no." (FCIC, 2011, p. 23).

Some argue that the 2007–2008 global financial crisis, the worst since the great depression of the 1930s (Temin, 2010), served as a turning point for leadership development with both academics and practitioners alike rallied for ethical leadership development (Day, Fleenor, Atwater, Sturm, & McKee, 2014; Lee, Wang, & Piccolo, 2018; Schyns & Schilling, 2013; Wright, 2013). However, despite the outcries of both stakeholders and institutional actors and the acknowledgement of the often-heinous nature of their outcomes, it seems that these failures continue to feature permanently in news headlines globally. Among which are high profile cases—the "dieselgate" emissions scandal by Volkswagen (Parloff, 2018), fake accounts at Wells Fargo (Levine, 2016), Japanese scandals involving Olympus (Greenfield, 2012), Toshiba (Farrell, 2015), and Kobe Steel (Shane, 2017), Samsung bribery scandal that led to the impeachment of the South Korean president (Choe, 2017), as well as corruption cases involving palm oil producers (Reuters, 2018) and property developers (Rose, 2018) in Indonesia among others. Not surprisingly, most point to leadership failure and a lack of moral leadership as the key cause.

Furthermore, research has also revealed an alarming presence of systemic leadership problems such as bullying, abuse of power, unethical practices and toxic emotions amongst others in contemporary organizations (Aasland, Skogstad, Notelaers, Nielsen, & Einarsen, 2010). The costs of such practices are staggering—an estimated $24 billion per annum in the United States alone (Tepper, 2007), coupled with negative outcomes such as turnover intention, resistance towards the leader, counterproductive work behaviour and a decrease in wellbeing and individual performance (Schyns & Schilling, 2013; Tepper et al., 2009).

While some have argued that unethical practices are often normalized within organizations, which in turn enables and/or encourages a blind eye to such practices (Ashforth & Anand, 2003; Gino & Bazerman, 2009; Harrison, Ashforth, & Corley, 2009), the increasing presence of toxic leadership has also led many to question whether the mechanisms and motivations of leadership development have a part to play in this leadership crisis (Quatro, Waldman, & Galvin, 2007; Riggio, 2008; Sendjaya, 2015). Specifically, Sendjaya (2015) questioned whether the short-term, profit-orientation that organizational leaders are tasked with have led leaders to sacrifice ethics on the altar of performance.

This echoes with current sentiments in the field of leadership research, with a shift of foci in organizational leadership research towards values and ethics-centered leadership paradigms such as authentic, ethical, and servant leadership from performance-focused paradigms such as transformational leadership. While some bemoan and question the need for the introduction of such ideology into the study of leader-

ship (Mumford & Fried, 2014), recent research indicate that they explain higher variance compared to performance-oriented paradigms like transformational leadership (Hoch, Bommer, Dulebohn, & Wu, 2018). Not to mention, there are also a host of other favorable employee, team, and organizational-level outcomes associated, especially with servant leadership (Eva, Robin, Sendjaya, van Dierendonck, & Liden, 2018; Liden, Wayne, Liao, & Meuser, 2014; Sendjaya, Eva, Butar-Butar, Robin, & Castles, 2018). However, the jury is still out whether this has filtered down to the field of leadership development, or if shifting the focus of training will actually make a difference.

Of further interesting note, is that this crisis of leadership occurs with a backdrop of sustained interest and investment in leadership development over the last two decades (Day et al., 2014; Marques, 2015; Parker & Carroll, 2009; Ready, Hill, & Conger, 2008). This phenomenon is attributable to increasing evidences which suggest that leadership training has a positive correlation to effective leadership behavior (Avolio, Reichard, Hannah, Walumbwa, & Chan, 2009). However, there are also those who echo the lack of both holistic leadership development approach (Quatro et al., 2007; Sendjaya, 2015) and the lack of leadership development theories (Avolio, Avey, & Quisenberry, 2010; Day et al., 2014).

We propose that there is a need to systematically investigate the mechanisms and motivations of leadership development interventions to be able to develop a holistic leadership development approach. As such, this study seeks to look back at what lessons can we learn from leadership development intervention prior to the 2007–2008 global financial crisis, so that we are able to better understand what changes are needed to move forward.

8.2 Leadership Development

Leadership development is defined as the creation of social capital (Iles & Preece, 2006), which is distinct from leader development that generally refers to the development of human capital (Lepak & Snell, 1999). Conger and Benjamin (1999) argued that the since early 1990s leadership development programs have shifted focus from the enhancement of human capital (leader development) towards the development of social capital (leadership development). Hence, the emphasis is less on the improvement of individual skills and job performance and more on the development of worldviews and behaviors of team members and leaders.

However, this has led to a tendency of a lack of holistic approach towards leadership development. Day (2001, p. 605) also warned that there is a need for "a bridge to be well anchored on either side for effective development to occur", and that organizations should not "choose one approach over the other" as the two complement each other. Hence, leadership development should incorporate the development of leadership processes alongside the development of individual leaders, not in exclusion to. Conger and Benjamin (1999) also proposed that for any leadership development to

be maximized, a two-pronged approach must be taken—addressing learning at both the personal and organizational levels simultaneously.

With the importance of leadership development placed in contemporary organizations, it does not come as a surprise that leadership development programs often gets one of the largest percentage allocated from training and development budgets (Feldman & Lankau, 2005; Saslow & Buss, 2005). Existing research indicate that leadership training does indeed result in more effective leadership behavior (Caligiuri, 2006; Collins & Holton, 2004; Herman, 2007; Kesner, 2003), with a meta-analysis finding that "leadership interventions produced a 66% probability of achieving a positive outcome versus a 50-50 random effect for treatment participants" training achieving a positive outcome (Avolio et al., 2009).

However, a review by Doh (2003) revealed that only some aspects of leadership can be taught; specifically that substantial results from leadership training often occurs only when offered to the right people at the right time. This means that a pre-selection of candidates in leadership development training is essential. Conger (in Doh, 2003, p. 59) suggested that leadership comprised of many "skills, perspectives and dispositions", and whilst many of these skills and perspectives can be taught, dispositions cannot. This, however, is often not practiced (Day et al., 2014; Grint, 2007). The importance of pre-selection of candidates through either supervisor discretion or self-acceptance by the candidates as opposed to just using past achievements to predict their leadership capacity cannot be understated (Novicevic, Heames, Paolillo, & Buckley, 2009). These findings suggest that there is a need to select the 'right people' for leadership development to be effective, and that this selection process should be included in any leadership development programs.

The literature also show that organizations sponsor these programs for their employee in the belief that these investments will produce results. However, there is also a significant difference in the way organizations across different countries evaluate the effectiveness of leadership development programs (LDPs). Parry and Sinha (2005) found that the majority of American companies measured the effectiveness of LDPs through its impact on the short-term financial bottom line, whereas more than 60% of European companies tend not to measure their return on investments in LDPs through financial measures, rather focusing on non-financial metrics to track the effectiveness of the leadership development solutions (Saslow & Buss, 2005). These could be attributed to two reasons—the first being a byproduct of an indigenization of management education within the European system, where there is a greater willingness to focus on long-term growth as opposed to a fixation on quarterly numbers and growth targets (Jones, 2005, 2006), and second a byproduct of the strong focus of transformational leadership, as the dominant paradigm of the majority of leadership development interventions over the last three decades (Ardichvili & Manderscheid, 2008; Collins & Holton, 2004; Parry & Sinha, 2005).

Our review of the literature also indicate that that despite the immense depth of leadership development research available for low and middle level managers, there is a dearth of published work on dedicated executive-level leadership development with only as much as 5% of the research was focused on executive leadership development

(Zaccaro & Horn, 2003). Storey (2005) also found that only a quarter of senior-level executives are likely to receive leadership development training as compared to half of junior-level managers.

8.3 Approaches to Leadership Development

Research also show that the most commonly used leadership development programs are multi-source feedback (or 360° feedback), executive coaching, mentoring, networking, job assignments and action learning (Day, 2001; Iles & Preece, 2006).

Multisource feedback is also often interchangeably termed as 360° feedback or multi-rater feedback (London & Beatty, 1993). In essence, it is a systematic approach to feedback collection of an individual's perceived performance from his/her relevant colleagues and peers and is considered to be one of the most popular methods to leadership development (Day et al., 2014; London & Beatty, 1993; Smither, London, & Reily, 2005). However, Day (2001) concluded that while it is a valuable tool in developing the individual leader, it in itself is not effective in the development of social capital. This is because 360° feedback builds intra-personal competence in terms of self-knowledge, self-awareness and trustworthiness as opposed to interpersonal competence (Atwater & Brett, 2005; Conger & Fulmer, 2003; Iles & Preece, 2006).

Executive coaching is a developmental intervention that has been gaining popularity amongst practitioners (Duff, 2013; Feldman, 2001; Feldman & Lankau, 2005; Hall, Otazo, & Hollenbeck, 1999; Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson, 2001). It is the process of equipping individuals with tools, knowledge and opportunities they need to develop themselves and it has been found to correct deficiencies in subordinates' performance, as well as to facilitate learning and achieving peak performance (Feldman & Lankau, 2005). Day (2001) identified executive coaching for leadership development as a process that involves pragmatic, goal-focused derivatives of one-on-one learning and behavioral change.

Mentoring has not only been identified as an effective component of leadership development in increasing individual development but is also important in enhancing the cognitive dimension of social capital as well due to its support orientation (Browne-Ferrigno & Muth, 2006; Ragins, Cotton, & Miller, 2000; Schlee, 2000; Stead, 2005). However, despite being identified to offer intangible benefits such as professional development, job satisfaction and leadership-capacity building amongst others, Day (2001) warned against the negative issues regarding mentoring processes—over dependence that may occur when the young mentee becomes too closely aligned with the mentor. Hence, it is important to match the mentors with their protégés as well as to review this relationship, and that developing mentoring skills has the potential to increase the quality and quantity of informal mentoring.

Networking is primarily concerned with the investment and development of social capital and is often incorporated as part of leadership development activities as a way to break down barriers between functional areas of the organization; as well as to develop the 'know who' aspect of the organization (Bartol & Zhang, 2007; Pearce,

2007). Day (2001, p. 596) also argues that networking is a means to "develop leaders beyond merely knowing what and knowing how, to knowing who in terms of problem-solving resources".

Job assignments are argued to be useful in the creation of knowledge and skills in the areas of team building, strategic thinking and influencing (Iles & Preece, 2006). Its emphasis is mainly on the development of human capital, and for it to be most effective; there must be a structure for learning—therefore linking individual development needs with the 'right' jobs, as well as making it intentional. However, there is still relatively little theoretical guidance on conceptualizing work experience within the concept of leadership development (Day, 2001).

Last but not least, *action learning* is an alternative pedagogy in the place of traditional, lecture-based classroom training found in most formal leadership training programs (Day, 2000). The action learning model is based on the assumption that people learn from project work as well as solving real-life experiences in the workplace (Raelin, 1997). Research also shows that skills learnt through work problems are more likely to be practical and hence easily applied to leadership practice (Hirst, Mann, Bain, Pirola-Merlo, & Richver, 2004). Day (2001) proposed that this practice has the potential in the development of both social and human capital. However, it is time-intensive and there is a tendency for practitioners to over-emphasize on the results. He proposed that formal assessment has the potential to work better if used in the selection and assignment of action learning participants.

8.4 Transformational Leadership and Leadership Development

Transformational leadership is undoubtedly one of the most powerful leadership paradigms, and a wealth of research over the last four decades have linked it with a host of desirable outcomes at the employee, team, and organizational levels (Anderson & Sun, 2017; Banks, McCauley, Gardner, & Guler, 2016; Hoch et al., 2018). As a result, it is not surprising that it has been the dominant paradigm in leadership development since the late 1970s.

Often conceptualized as a leadership continuum with transactional leadership on one end, and transformational leadership on the other, researchers argue that transformational leadership behaviors will produce outcome beyond expectations as employees are motivated and inspired. Where followers of transactional leaders are motivated by the promises, praise and rewards of the leaders, transformational leaders motivate employees through idealized influence (charisma), inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Researchers have also posited that although this continuum is distinguished as bipolar opposites, most leaders actually possess the entire range of leadership; including both transformational and transactional factors, but they tend to display more behaviors

on one end of the continuum than the other (Anderson & Sun, 2017; De Hoogh, Den Hartog, & Koopman, 2005; Parolini, Patterson, & Winston, 2009).

However, transformational leadership has come under criticisms on the lack of morality and ethics-orientation in its modern operationalization (Price, 2002). As supported by our earlier anecdotal examples, morality is a necessary and critical factor in leadership which when absent may distort an otherwise powerful leadership model (i.e. transformational leadership) into a disastrous outcome (Sendjaya, 2005). While Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) distinguished between authentic transformational leadership (with a moral and ethical orientation) and pseudo-transformational leadership as a response to criticisms, this distinction alone fails to ground a sufficient response to the ethical concerns as it discounts the potential of immorality being driven by the leaders' blindness to their own values (Price, 2002). Despite these criticisms, scholars agree that transformational leadership is a powerful leadership model whose benefits cannot be discounted. However, given the state of the current leadership crisis and the need for an intentional, holistic leadership development, perhaps a different paradigm is required.

Utilizing Rost (1995)'s view that leadership as a process may be viewed as fundamentally ethical if the conditions of noncoercive behavior, multidirectional influence and mutuality of purposes are met; Griffith (2007) proposed that servant leadership is an essential element of a holistic leadership approach. Arguably, servant leadership is the only leadership paradigm that fundamentally incorporates non-coercion, multidirectional influence (as it is not a leader-centric approach), and mutuality of purpose. While transactional and transformational leadership may meet the conditions of non-coercion and multidirectional influence; servant leadership is required to transcend the last threshold of mutuality of purpose as servant leaders place the good of the followers ahead of their own interests (Eva et al., 2018).

8.5 Servant Leadership and Leadership Development

Conceptually linked to many positive organizational attributes such as altruism, morality, spirituality and authenticity, servant leadership focuses on the primary intent of the leaders to first serve, and a self-concept of being a servant and steward (Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002; van Dierendonck, 2011), as well as the personal integrity of the leaders (Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008). Servant leadership is defined as "an other-oriented approach to leadership manifested through one-on-one prioritizing of follower individual needs and interests, and outward reorienting of their concern for self towards concern for others within the organization and the larger community" (Eva et al., 2018, p. 4). It is based on the premise that the leader is motivated by a 'higher calling' that is beyond just financial success for both the organization and self-gain (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Liden et al., 2008).

Relative to other leadership approaches which emphasize on the performance of the organizations, the servant leadership emphasis on the personal development of the subordinates would facilitate the development of both human and social capital,

and therefore making it a naturally suitable paradigm for holistic leadership development. The recognition, development and utilization of the unique talents of an organization's employees are undoubtedly imperative to the organization in achieving effectiveness (Liden et al., 2008; Collins, 2001). The servant leadership approach to leadership is focused on the development of the employees to their fullest potential (Eva et al., 2018). Further, Liden et al. (2008, p. 162) proposed that servant leaders rely on one-on-one communication to "understand the abilities, needs, desires, goals, and potential" of their subordinates; and with this knowledge they assist them in developing and achieving their potentials. This approach differs to others as it stresses on personal integrity of the leaders (Liden et al, 2008); having the primary intent of serving, not leading others first as well as the leaders' self-concept being a servant and steward as opposed to a leader or an owner (Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002).

While rooted in Greenleaf (1977)'s seminal work, recent scholarly developments highlighted three unique paradigms on servant leadership (Eva et al., 2018). The first focused on concern towards the community and conceptual skills of followers (beyond character and behaviors) (Liden et al., 2015; Liden et al., 2008); the second operationalizing both the 'leader'-side and 'servant'-side of servant leadership (van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011; van Dierendonck et al., 2017), and the third taking a holistic aspect of followers' development including spirituality (finding meaning, purpose) (Sendjaya et al., 2008; Sendjaya et al., 2018).

For the purposes of holistic leadership development, we argue that Sen. Sendjaya et al. (2018)'s servant leadership theorizing is the most appropriate. The inclusion of a spirituality dimension represents "a distinguishing feature that makes servant leadership a truly holistic leadership approach relative to other positive leadership approaches" (Eva et al., 2018), and also reflects the initial theorizing that spirituality and humility are key sources of influence for servant leaders (Greenleaf, 1977).

Sendjaya and colleagues (2018) proposed six dimensions of servant leadership, namely voluntary subordination, authentic self, covenantal relationship, responsible morality, transcendental spirituality, and transforming influence.

Voluntary subordination refers to the willingness of servant leaders to take up opportunity to serve others whenever the need arises, regardless of the situation, is central to the concept of servant leadership (Sendjaya et al., 2008). This is also aligned with the extant literature where selfless service is a key feature of a servant leader, in contrast with self-seeking leaders who serve others only when convenient or beneficial to do so. Hence, this highlights that servant leadership is centrally about 'being' a servant rather than 'emulating' a servant's behavior (Eva et al., 2018; Page & Wong, 2000).

Authentic self refers to servant leaders' consistent display of humility, integrity, accountability, security and vulnerability of leaders. As servant leaders do not need constant approval and acknowledgement from others, they are secure can be accountable and vulnerable to others (Sendjaya, 2015).

Covenantal relationship refers to genuine and lasting leader-follower relationships characterized by shared values, mutual trust, and concern for each other's well-being (Sendjaya et al., 2018). The authentic nature of servant leaders forms and guides the

way they relate to others; hence they accept others for who they are, and not how they make the leaders feel (Sendjaya et al., 2008).

Responsible morality is defined as an ethical predisposition that ensures the ends and the means sought by leaders are morally legitimized, thoughtfully reasoned and ethically justified (Sendjaya et al., 2008).

Transcendental spirituality is an important source of motivation for servant leaders' servitude. Sendjaya et al. (2008, p. 408) proposed that "the covenant-based and moral-laden relationships that servant leaders promote are also imbued with spiritual values". This is centered around the notion that servant leaders are actually attuned to the idea of having a personal calling to make a difference in the life of others.

Last but not least, *transforming influence* refers to the positive transformation that servant leaders wants to see among their followers, manifested as positive changes in both the organization and society (Russell & Stone, 2002). Sendjaya et al. (2008) posits that these influences occurs through modeling, visioning, mentoring, empowering others and trust.

8.6 Transformational and Servant Leadership

While they are conceptually distinct, there are similarities between servant and transformational leadership. Both encourages leaders and followers to raise each other's levels of motivation and morality. This is consistent with the view of several other researchers who have cited similarities across both theories; that both models incorporate characteristics such as respect, vision, influence, modeling, trust, integrity and delegation (Parolini et al., 2009; Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2004). However, there are points of variation amongst the similarities as well. Bass (2000) acknowledges that servant leaders go beyond transformational leaders in selecting the needs of others, as well as the emphasis upon service to followers; whereas transformational leaders aim to align their own and others' interests with that of the organization or group.

However, servant leaders are different in that they are more likely to demonstrate an inclination to serve marginalized people; are also more likely to set followers' priority first, organizations second and their own last; and thirdly that servant leaders' role is to serve followers, whereas transformational leaders' role is to inspire followers to pursue organizational goals. A recent experimental study also reveal that the way in which transformational leaders and servant leaders motivate their followers are empirically distinct (van Dierendonck, Stam, Boersma, De Windt, & Alkema, 2014).

8.7 The Study

Upon further investigation of the focus of current leadership development interventions, it becomes clear that there are significant gaps in the development of a holistic leadership development approach. We propose that in order for us to better understand the reasons behind the current crisis in leadership, we need to take a look back to identify lessons that can be learnt from leadership development intervention prior to the 2007–2008 GFC, so that we are able to better understand what changes are needed to move forward.

Using servant leadership as a paradigm for holistic leadership development, and the GFC as a turning point, we reviewed fifteen years (1994–2009) of published leadership development interventions to find out what aspects of leadership have been addressed by current leadership development practitioners. With its service-orientation, holistic outlook and moral-spiritual emphasis, we adopt Sendjaya et al.'s (2008) empirically validated six-factor model as a template for content analysis to understand what elements of leadership development have been neglected prior to the GFC. Initially, we sought to look at all leadership development intervention articles from the 1970s when servant leadership was first introduced as a leadership concept. However, our initial search revealed that the majority of relevant articles that was found in the initial data collection were published within the last 15 years of the GFC.

In essence, we sought to obtain a precise, objective and reliable observation about the frequency of which the six dimensions of servant leadership behavior occurred within the identified leadership development literature between 1994–2009 in order to inform future research and practice on leadership development going forward.

8.8 Methodology

We employed content analysis, which is the systematic approach to analyzing rich (qualitative) data to enable thematic analysis (Tharenou, Donohue, & Cooper, 2007). As the main aim of the study is to obtain an objective and accurate observation about the frequency of which the six dimensions of servant leadership behavior occurs within the leadership development literature; the study adopts the quantitative approach to content analysis (Krippendorff, 2004). There are two approaches to coding data in content analysis; either a priori or posteriori (Tharenou et al., 2007). With the a priori approach, categories (or codes) are established prior to the analysis based on some theory; whereas with posteriori, the categories are established following some preliminary examination of the data (Krippendorff, 2004). As this study uses the theoretical framework provided by (Sendjaya et al., 2008) as a template, it is a priori in nature. This approach to coding allows for the testing of theory, and is often used when there is prior knowledge or literature to guide the process of coding data (Tharenou et al., 2007).

In the template approach to content analysis, the development of a reproducible codebook is essential to the reliability of the study and hence a codebook based on the study's template was developed to ensure that a stable framework for the analysis of the textual data would be present (Krippendorff & Bock, 2009). An inter-coder reliability test was conducted prior to the analysis of the data (Krippendorff & Bock, 2009), with a random sample of 30 articles was utilized, and consistent with recommendations from research method scholars—the Cohen's Kappa was adopted for the present study (Duriau, Reger, & Pfarrer, 2007). The current study's Kappa score was 0.83, which is considered to be very good agreement and would meet the minimum acceptable levels for reliability (Krippendorff & Bock, 2009; Pallant, 2007).

To obtain a fully populated sample of studies, an initial list of keywords was developed to facilitate electronic database search. The initial phase yielded over 1000 articles, consistent with reports in a similar study in the past (Pittinsky & Zhu, 2005). However, as there was a lack of articles that solely focused on the impacts of leadership development interventions, the research scope was narrowed down by imposing parameters of *focus* and *publications*. This ensured that only articles specifically examining leader and leadership development programs published in journals relevant to the field of leadership development were considered.

An expert panel consisting of OB and leadership researchers at a leading Australian university also assisted in the identification of publications relevant to the study. This panel consisted of over 10 academics and was carried out over two research seminars at the university. Major online academic databases (i.e. Business Source Premier, PsycInfo, Emerald among others) were searched. The study also only included specific articles published in English that center on leader and leadership development, as well as their intervention programs. As a result, initial data collected through the Boolean keyword search was then filtered further through a validation of their content (see Table 8.1).

Table 8.1 Keywords utilized in the study

Keywords	Justification (if any)
Leader development	
Leader training	
Leadership development	
Leadership training	
Networking	Identified as the most popular/key leadership development activities in organizations. However, only literature specifically addressing leadership development will be considered
360° feedback/multisource feedback	
Mentoring	
Action learning	
Job assignment	
Executive coaching	

A total of 137 articles containing a description of leadership interventions or their outputs were chosen to be in the final sample from a pool of 200 identified articles. Articles were excluded from the analysis if they did not provide enough description on either the method of the leadership interventions used or on the measured outcomes. Content analysis was utilized to analyze data using NVivo, which was then tabulated manually into Microsoft Excel.

8.9 Results and Discussion

Through a frequency count, the study revealed that there was a clear imbalance in the frequencies of which of the 22 sub-dimensions were addressed in current leadership development interventions. As shown in Table 8.2, the sub-dimension *Collaboration* had the highest occurrence (n = 118; 86.13%), followed by *Empowerment* (n = 116; 84.64%) and *Vulnerability* (n = 106; 77.37%), whereas sub-dimensions *Being a Servant* (n = 2; 1.46%), *Religiousness* (n = 4; 2.92%) and *Security* (n = 5; 2.65%) had very low occurrence.

Table 8.2 Frequency count of each sub-dimension

Dimension	Sub dimension	Instances occurred	Percentage
Voluntary subordination	Being a servant	2	1.46
	Acts of service	21	15.33
Authentic self	Humility	54	39.42
	Integrity	31	22.63
	Accountability	56	40.88
	Security	5	3.65
	vulnerability	106	77.37
Covenantal relationship	Acceptance	103	75.18
	Availability	16	11.68
	Equality	70	51.09
	Collaboration	118	86.13
Responsible morality	Moral reasoning	45	32.85
	Moral action	30	21.90
Transcendental spirituality	Religiousness	4	2.92
	Interconnectedness	11	8.03
	Sense of mission	42	30.66
	Wholeness	25	18.25

(continued)

Table 8.2 (continued)

Dimension	Sub dimension	Instances occurred	Percentage
Transforming influence	Vision	58	42.34
	Mentoring	32	23.36
	Modeling	42	30.66
	Trust	97	70.80
	Empowerment	116	84.64

$N = 137$

8.10 Voluntary Subordination

The results show that Being a Servant (n = 2; 1.46%) and Acts of Service (n = 21; 15.33%) have a relatively low occurrence in the leadership development interventions. With the first, a potential explanation for the low occurrence is the oxymoronic nature of the term 'servant' has led to the lack of adoption and popularity of this leadership paradigm (Sendjaya et al., 2008). The sub-dimension Acts of Service has a slightly higher occurrence, and a possible explanation for this is that since it refers to practical deeds that are sincere and reflects the leader's his or her care (Sendjaya et al., 2008); coupled with the growing recognition of the need for organizations to be socially responsible and the potential benefits of purposeful volunteerism (Bowen, Burke, Horry, & Jacques, 2009), leadership development practitioners have started to incorporate this aspect into their leadership development programs.

This approach to learning is seen in a recently operationalized pedagogy called Service Learning, and has been incorporated into college and university curriculum using volunteerism and community service as the main vehicles of delivery (Bowen et al., 2009; Bringle & Hatcher, 1996). Further, a longitudinal study of service learning has shown that it has a positive impact on desired college outcomes (Keen & Hall, 2009). The benefits are potentially transferable across to businesses, with a recent study showing that company support for volunteering programs contributes to the company's value chain by enhancing employee morale, meeting their corporate social responsibility needs and enhancing their public image (Basil, Runte, Easwaramoorthy, & Barr, 2009).

Interventions addressing the development of this dimension were commonly found to be action learning and mentoring respectively. Typical interventions include:

> By engaging in meaningful leadership practice, students were able to make positive contributions to their communities and also to their own development … created the pathways, bridges and corresponding space for students to use their leadership for civic purposes … programs provide opportunities for students to practice leadership and learn through service learning … expose students to a wide breadth of multiple service sites, people and organizations … students can understand how they can serve to make a difference, and they build an increased desire for servant leadership and involvement in leadership for social causes…(Eich, 2008) (being a servant)

> By serving as a mentor, individuals implicitly perform activities that parallel behaviors and skills identified as effective leadership … thus the activities and context of serving as a mentor have implications that go beyond the current mentor role, specifically as a possible avenue of individual leader development…(Middlebrooks & Haberkorn, 2009) (acts of service)

8.11 Authentic Self

The content analysis revealed that there were high occurrence of some elements of authentic self within the leadership development literature. High scores on sub-dimensions of Vulnerability (77.37%), Accountability (40.88%) and Humility (39.42%) could potentially be explained through the identification and high importance placed on the need for trust in the workplace, which can be facilitated through leaders' display of vulnerability and accountability (Espedal, 2008; Scandura & Pellegrini, 2008) and the increased interest on authentic leadership in the mid-2000s (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Cooper, Scandura, & Schriesheim, 2005), which encourages the use of 'life-stories' approach for leaders and hence reduces their tendency to be insecure about their own identity and the need for constant approval and validation.

However, there is a lack of leadership development programs that aim to develop leaders' Integrity (22.63%) and Security (3.65%). A possible explanation is that in the drive for short-term organizational performance, practitioners often overlook the need to ensure that Integrity is a value that leaders have. Last but not least, Security is posited to be manifested from behavioral attributes such as being ready to step aside for a more qualified successor (Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002). Current examples of leadership development programs that include these behavioral attributes are mainly aimed at leadership succession.

Interventions addressing the development of this dimension range from executive coaching, formal learning and action learning, 360° feedback, and mentoring. Examples include:

> We settled on five elements he would communicate to his team … he would need their help both in understanding his strengths and development needs … ask them to meet his coach and share their candid views related to his leadership and development. (This invites his team to become collaborative partners in his development … reality that he will have a hard time turning things around without their cooperation and support) (Winum, 2005) (humility)

> The peer coaching and learning strategies led to what some participants referred to as "accountability". Investment in the process of coaching and being coached created a sense of accountability to one another…a major benefit to peer coaching was the sense of accountability that we shared towards each other…accountable to each other in regards to the transactions in our own peer coaching relationship…. we would highlight any non-adult-to-adult transactions that occurred during our sessions.(Ladyshewsky, 2007) (accountability)

> The relationship between the two consultants, the trust and the vulnerability added to a feeling level or tone with the process that contributed to the participants being able to become more open and vulnerable…they began to gingerly respond from an emotional standpoint, appreciating how emotions and feelings contribute to either function or dysfunction. After a few hours, the consultants began to see some of the shifts …the participants engaged in

> "picking up" on how the two consultants were working together…the team was able to engage in being more open and honest (Blattner & Bacigalupo, 2007). (vulnerability)

8.12 Covenantal Relationship

This dimension is the strongest in terms of frequency observations of its sub-dimensions: *Acceptance* (75.18%), *Equality* (51.09%) and *Collaboration* (86.13%), with the exception of *Availability* (11.68%). The results are aligned with emerging research identifying the importance of collaboration, networking as well as equality in the workplace (Bartol & Zhang, 2007; Elliott & Stead, 2008; Ready et al., 2008; Rhee & Sigler, 2009; Zimmermann, Wit, & Gill, 2008). With regards to *Availability*, the findings are consistent with what scholars and practitioners contend as a lack of selfless, accessible leaders; and have been identified to be a problem in the workplace as well (Iles & Preece, 2006; Kaplan & Kaiser, 2009; Novicevic et al., 2009; Saporito, 1996; Sosik & Dinger, 2007).

Interventions addressing the development of this dimension range from executive coaching, action learning, and 360° feedback. Examples include:

> The profile of success identified behaviors that were relevant to this task … the CEO would have to be strategic in his or her own thinking and broad based in his or her views of the organization … he or she would have to be psychologically accessible to people, easy to engage, supportive and a strong communicator with this profile of success in hand … our developmental coaching with Howard during the subsequent 6 months focused on helping to figure out exactly what he must do to adopt a broader leadership posture … to move from a top-down, one - on – one management style to a greater emphasis on managing the team as a whole through coaching and constant dialogue…(Saporito, 1996) (availability)

> The learning managers reported most often from this program was learning about self … also learning that others see them differently than they see themselves or that there are a variety of ways they are seen by others … these participants expressed this as learning they needed to listen more, be respectful of others' contributions, and not make decisions too quickly before seeking others' input … respondents (also) talked about learning more about the value of building relationships, the importance to getting to know others better, and the role of showing more interest in others and being friendlier, as ways to develop close, more collaborative relationships (Van Velsor & Ascalon, 2008) (equality)

8.13 Responsible Morality

When analyzed in the context of the current ethical climate, the relatively low-moderate occurrence of both Moral Reasoning (32.85%) and Moral Action (21.90%) identified in the leadership development programs might explain the prevalence of destructive leadership in organizations (Einarsen, Aasland, & Skogstad, 2007; Michael D. Mumford, Gessner, Connelly, O'Connor, & Clifton, 1993; Padilla, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2007). Ironically, for an area with such a sustained high interest (Barling, Christie, & Turner, 2008; Griffith, 2007; Johnson, 2007; McCann &

Holt, 2009; Rost, 1995), the number of programs that addresses ethics and morality is alarmingly low.

Although the potential gap between theory and practice could be a possible explanation (Zaccaro & Horn, 2003), another plausible rationale is the overemphasis in the field of leadership development on the transformational leadership paradigm (Ardichvili & Manderscheid, 2008; Day & Harrison, 2007; Pearce, 2007). Its ethical predispositions have been questioned in the literature (Barling et al., 2008; Price, 2002; Sendjaya, 2005). The focus of the transformational leaders on organizational performance (Parolini et al., 2009) may also potentially provide an insight as to why these two sub-dimensions are not focused upon in the current transformational leadership—driven leadership development field. However, further research is needed before any conclusions are made.

Interventions addressing the development of this dimension range from executive coaching, action learning, and 360° feedback. Examples include:

> Heightened self-awarenes involved gaining an insight into one's own thinking of leadership and management practice… the whole experience was beneficial as it made me re-evaluate my previous management behaviors and actions and allowed me to engage in self-reflection and analysis…(Ladyshewsky, 2007) (moral reasoning)
>
> The development of an executive-level global competency model at 3M … consists of 12 competencies and generalizable behavioral anchors for each competency … (a fundamental competency identified was) ethics and integrity; (the behavioral anchors were) exhibits uncompromising integrity and commitment to 3 M's corporate values, human resource principles and business conduct policies … (and the application of this competency model includes) focusing on development … executives use the behaviors (anchors) to set expectations for leaders within their organizations Individual executives talk through the behaviors that they establish as criteria to be used later for judging performance… (Alldredge & Nilan, 2000) (moral action)

8.14 Transcendent Spirituality

The results showed that Sense of Mission (30.66%) and Wholeness (18.25%) have a relatively low-moderate occurrence, whereas Interconnectedness (8.03%) and Religiousness (2.92%) had low occurrence. Many leaders attribute the origin of their behavior to an experience that is often described in spiritual term, that is a higher purpose which transcends profits or self-gratification (Neal, Lichtenstein, & Banner, 1999; Reave, 2005; Sauser Jr., 2005). Moreover, there is also emerging interests in a holistic, integrated workplace (Quatro et al., 2007) as well as having a work-life balance. In the light of these factors, it is not surprising that Sense of Mission and Wholeness had a relatively low-moderate occurrence. Interconnectedness described as a connection "between the internal self and external world" as well as Religiousness have a low occurrence.

Research on religion and the workplace is still lacking; as the practice is somewhat frowned upon by practitioners and scholars alike—especially as religious views and traditions may be exclusive in their worldviews and thus may lead to an arrogance

that certain types of organizations are better than others; or that it may be used as a manipulative tool. Although research has been done on the potential for the promotion of religious practices in the workplace (Benefiel, 2005; Dent, Higgins, & Wharff, 2005; Kriger & Seng, 2005), it is for the aforementioned reason that this is still not practiced. These may be possible explanations for the low occurrences of the Religious dimension. However, as these four sub-dimensions are identified as the basis of the calling upon which enables servant leaders to engage in meaningful and motivating work; and has been identified as a key element towards a holistic leadership development (Eich, 2008; Quatro et al., 2007), it is essential that leadership development practitioners ensure that these are included when developing their leadership development programs.

Interventions addressing the development of this dimension range from executive coaching, formal workshops, and 36° feedback. Examples include:

> The identification of positive influence characteristics both created early bonding within the larger group and became a touchstone for the intrapersonal, small- group work … inspired personal influence characteristics seem to arise from our spiritual nature or more essential self. These characteristics emerge through such practices as mediation, prayer reflective thought and service … individual influence can be expanded through a deeper understanding of self … an NTL workshop enables individuals to focus on the importance of positive influence characteristics and to overcome inner blockages (Hanna & Glassman, 2004) (religiousness)

> The central precept.. is that managers need to have an inner center to act as an anchor and source of gravity and calm through which they may acknowledge and accept the inherent tensions and paradoxes … by practicing "emptying of the mind" the manager may allow new insights and intuitions to emerge, be more attuned to others' reactions and become more effective by making less effort… being in the center requires a measure of inner vitality and strength as the basis of yielding. It is important for the manager to have this center … to support him or herself … colleagues and cope with changing situations and pressures (Shefy & Sadler-Smith, 2006) (interconnectedness)

8.15 Transforming Influence

Results of the content analysis across the sub-dimensions revealed that Empowerment (84.64%), Trust (70.80%) and Vision (42.34%) have a high occurrence; whereas Modeling (30.66%) and Mentoring (22.36%) has a low-moderate occurrence. As identified prior, the pervasiveness of transformational leadership in the field of leadership development has been identified (Ardichvili & Manderscheid, 2008; Day & Harrison, 2007), moreover empirical research on the relationship between empowerment, trust and vision with organizational and leadership outcomes has been established (Callahan, Whitener, & Sandlin, 2007; Lapidot, Kark, & Shamir, 2007; Pina e Cunha, Campos e Cunha, & Rego, 2009; Scandura & Pellegrini, 2008; Sosik & Dinger, 2007).

Hence, the findings of the study are consistent with that of the extant literature. With regards to Mentoring and Modeling, despite results from empirical research showing positive influence on developmental outcomes (Dixon, 2006; Hobson &

Sharp, 2005; Stead, 2005), adoption by practitioners is still lacking. A possible explanation would be from the perspective that these are hard to measure and evaluate, or that the organization may not have the resources to provide for mentors (Feldman, 1999; Ragins et al., 2000; Stead, 2005). Interventions addressing the development of this dimension were commonly found to be formal learning, 360° Feedback as well as action learning. Examples include:

> Development can be accelerated by increasing current leaders' recognition that they constitute one of the most powerful forms of interventions through role modeling the five developmental readiness factors to future leaders; as well as by training and equipping leader developers with the skills and techniques needed to practice strengths-based leadership and to create a learning- oriented context (Bruce J. Avolio & Hannah, 2008) (modeling)
>
> In order to accomplish a series of relatively demanding missions over a one- week period, the squad leaders will have to share risks and hardships in order to earn trust and confidence from their followers (idealized influence), they must be able to care for other team members (individualized consideration), effectively formulate and communicate goals and visions of the near future (inspirational motivation), and encourage innovation and creative problem solving of followers (intellectual stimulation) (Eid, Helge Johnsen, Bartone, & Arne Nissestad, 2008) (trust)
>
> The central premise of stretch or developmental work experiences is to provide challenging assignments to budding leaders that push them to construct new understandings of their more complex operating environment … essentially it must be something that stretches people, pushes out of the comfort zone and requires them to think differently … problems to solve, dilemmas to resolve, obstacles to overcome, and choices to make under conditions of risk and uncertainty … These assignments are useful because they place leaders in novel situations, requiring them to adapt and display new performance strategies … (leaders are) often required to develop new ways of understanding their environment and new ways of operating in more complex work contexts (Zaccaro & Banks, 2004)(empowerment)

8.16 Theoretical and Practical Contributions

Overall, we propose that the findings of this study contributes to the field of leadership development by providing a servant leadership perspective towards a holistic model of leadership development. It is clear from the content analysis that there is a clear imbalance in the focus of leadership development interventions prior to the 2008 Global Financial Crisis. Of particular note, is the apparent lack of intentional emphasis on the moral aspect of leadership development; thus contributing to one corner of the toxic triangle—by allowing for a conducive environment for destructive leaders to operate and develop in (Collins & Holton, 2004). This may enable destructive leadership theorists to further analyze and research on the implications of the lack of moral leadership development, as well as partially answering the question as to why there is a leadership crisis. Moreover, this also extends the destructive leadership theory by providing a developmental perspective which should be explored in future research. Last but not least, this study also answers the calls by practitioners and scholars alike in the need for a holistic, authentic and moral leadership development in the light of the leadership crisis we face today.

From the results, we also argue that the servant leadership behavior dimensions identified by Sendjaya et al. (2008) provides a strong base for a holistic leadership development approach as it is a holistic approach that also includes elements that are often ignored or sidelined by popular leadership development approaches. For instance, given what we know about the importance of altruistic behavior and leaders' values (Sosik, Jung, & Dinger, 2009), as well as the key role that spirituality play in holistic leadership development (Quatro et al., 2007; Shefy & Sadler-Smith, 2006), it is essential that leadership development practitioners ensure that these are included when designing leadership development interventions.

Moreover, as the transfer of training should be an important outcome of any leadership development program (Conger & Benjamin, 1999), we propose that the SLBS may also be used as a back-end analysis in conjunction with other evaluative measures to evaluate the effectiveness of the program. In short, the findings of this study can guide the design of the leadership development programs.

The findings of the current study also provide the argument for the need of a holistic leadership development approach to ensure retention as well as succession of talents within the organizations. While organizations are investing a lot of money into leadership development, it is clear that more often than not, these programs are not holistic in nature. We argue that the servant leadership-driven holistic leadership development model presented in this study may be used to design a high-quality leadership development program. For HR practitioners and consultants, the findings of this study provide another developmental tool—the use of the SLBS as a front-end and a back-end analysis to measure training transfer. The results also provide a perspective on the need for the systematic development of the 22 sub-dimensions of the SLBS to ensure a holistic leadership development. Moreover, it provides an alternative approach to from the transformational-leadership dominated paradigm of leadership development.

8.17 Limitations and Future Research Directions

Although steps were taken to ensure that the content analysis was exhaustive and robust in both reliability and validity, caution must be used in the interpretation of the findings reported. As only interventions published in major journals were included, articles published in books or other journal titles that were not accessible at the time of the research were excluded. Furthermore, as the content analysis is qualitative in nature; and coupled with the fact that not all articles published detail their programs—several aspects of the interventions may not have been fully analyzed.

This study aims to provide a basis for investigating a holistic leadership development approach, specifically one that is rooted in servant-leadership. As the growing body of empirical findings continue to surface and the paradigm's theoretical rigor is strengthened; future researchers should consider developing and researching servant leadership—driven leadership development for organizations. Secondly, it would be

interesting to see a longitudinal research on the development of servant leaders at college/university, as well as the organizational levels and their outcomes. Thirdly, a study of servant leadership development in not for profit organizations (e.g. charity, religion-based organizations) would greatly add on to the body of the literature on servant leadership development as these organizations espouse servant leadership as the tenet of their leadership practices. Such a study can be done across large organizational samples and may also provide an insight into religiousness in the workplace. Lastly, an international study looking at the cultural differences of servant leadership—driven leadership development will add on to the small body of international studies on servant leadership. Research could focus on whether cultural differences contribute to the differences in developmental levels or approaches.

References

Aasland, M. S., Skogstad, A., Notelaers, G., Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. (2010). The prevalence of destructive leadership behaviour. *British Journal of Management, 21,* 438–452.

Alldredge, M., & Nilan, K. (2000). 3 M's leadership competency model: An internally developed solution. *Human Resource Management, 39*(2–3), 133–145.

Anderson, M. H., & Sun, P. Y. T. (2017). Reviewing leadership styles: Overlaps and the need for a new 'full-range' theory. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 19*(1), 76–96. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12082.

Ardichvili, A., & Manderscheid, S. V. (2008). Emerging practices in leadership development: An introduction. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 10*(5), 619–631.

Ashforth, B. E., & Anand, V. (2003). The Normalization of Corruption in Organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 25,* 1–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085(03)25001-2.

Atwater, L. E., & Brett, J. F. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of reactions to developmental 360° feedback. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66*(3), 532–548. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2004.05.003.

Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Quisenberry, D. (2010). Estimating return on leadership development investment. *The Leadership Quarterly, 21*(4), 633–644.

Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 16*(3), 315–338.

Avolio, B. J., & Hannah, S. T. (2008). Developmental readiness: Accelerating leader development. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 60*(4), 331–347. https://doi.org/10.1037/1065-9293.60.4.331.

Avolio, B. J., Reichard, R. J., Hannah, S. T., Walumbwa, F., & Chan, A. (2009). A meta-analytic review of leadership impact research: Experimental and quasi-experimental studies. *The Leadership Quarterly, 20,* 764–784.

Banks, G. C., McCauley, K. D., Gardner, W. L., & Guler, C. E. (2016). A meta-analytic review of authentic and transformational leadership: A test for redundancy. *The Leadership Quarterly, 27*(4), 634–652. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.02.006.

Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group and Organization Management, 31*(3), 300–326.

Barling, J., Christie, A., & Turner, N. (2008). Pseudo-Transformational leadership: Towards the development and test of a model. *Journal of Business Ethics, 81*(4), 851–861.

Bartol, K. M., & Zhang, X. (2007). Networks and leadership development: Building linkages for capacity acquisition and capital accrual. *Human Resource Management Review, 17*(4), 388–401.

Basil, D. Z., Runte, M. S., Easwaramoorthy, M., & Barr, C. (2009). Company support for employee volunteering. *Journal of Business Ethics, 8,* 387–398.
Bass, B. M. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 7*(3), 18–40.
Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. *Research in Organizational Change and Development, 4*, 231–272.
Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly, 10*(2), 181–217.
Benefiel, M. (2005). The second half of the journey: Spiritual leadership for organizational transformation. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*(5), 732–747.
Blattner, J., & Bacigalupo, A. (2007). Using emotional intelligence to develop executive leadership and team and organizational development. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 59*(3), 209–219.
Bolden, R., & Gosling, J. (2006). Leadership competencies: Time to change the tune? *Leadership, 2*(2), 147–163.
Bowen, G. A., Burke, D. B., Horry, B. L. L., & Jacques, P. H. (2009). A comparison of service-learning and employee volunteering programs. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, 13*(3), 1–16.
Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1996). Implementing service learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 67,* 221.
Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Muth, R. (2006). Leadership mentoring and situated learning: Catalysts in principalship readiness and lifelong mentoring. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 14*(3), 275–295.
Caligiuri, P. (2006). Developing global leaders. *Human Resource Management Review, 16*(2), 219–228.
Callahan, J. L., Whitener, J. K., & Sandlin, J. A. (2007). The art of creating leaders: Popular culture artifacts as pathways for development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 9*(2), 146–165.
Choe, S.-H. (2017, February 16). Lee Jae-yong, Samsung Heir, is arrested on Bribery Charges. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/16/world/asia/korea-samsung-lee-jae-yong.html.
Collins, J. (2001). Level 5 leadership-The triumph of humility and fierce resolve. *Harvard Business Review, 79*, 67–76.
Collins, D. B., & Holton, E. F. (2004). The effectiveness of managerial leadership programs: A meta-analysis of studies from 1982 to 2001. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 15*(2), 217–248.
Conger, J. A., & Benjamin, B. (1999). *Building leaders: How successful companies develop the next generation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Conger, J. A., & Fulmer, R. M. (2003). Developing your leadership pipeline. *Harvard Business Review, 81*(12), 76–84.
Cooper, C. D., Scandura, T. A., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2005). Looking forward but learning from our past: Potential challenges to developing authentic leadership theory and authentic leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*(3), 475–493.
Day, D. V. (2000). Leadership development: A review in context. *The Leadership Quarterly, 11*, 581–613.
Day, D. V. (2001). Leadership development: a review in vontext. *Leadership Quarterly, 11*(4), 581–613.
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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.004.
Day, D. V., & Harrison, M. M. (2007). A multilevel, identity-based approach to leadership development. *Human Resource Management Review, 17*(4), 360–373.

De Hoogh, A. H. B., Den Hartog, D. N., & Koopman, P. L. (2005). Linking the big five-factors of personality to charismatic and transactional leadership; perceived dynamic work environment as a moderator. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*(7), 839–865. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.344.

Dent, E. B., Higgins, A. E., & Wharff, D. M. (2005). Spirituality and leadership: an empirical review of definitions, distinctions and embedded assumptions. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16,* 625–653.

Dixon, N. M. (2006). Peer-to-Peer leadership development. *Harvard Business Review, 84*(2), 56–57.

Doh, J. P. (2003). Can leadership be taught? Perspectives from management educators. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 2*(1), 54–67. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2003.9324025.

Duff, A. J. (2013). Performance management coaching: Servant leadership and gender implications. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 34*(3), 204–221.

Duriau, V. J., Reger, R. K., & Pfarrer, M. D. (2007). A content analysis of the content analysis literature in organization studies. *Organizational Research Methods, 10*(1), 5–34.

Eich, D. (2008). A grounded theory of high-quality leadership programs: Perspectives from student leadership development programs in higher education. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 2008*(15), 176–187.

Eid, J., Helge Johnsen, B., Bartone, P. T., & Arne Nissestad, O. (2008). Growing transformational leaders: Exploring the role of personality hardiness. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 29*(1), 4–23. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730810845270.

Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Desctructive leadership behaviour: A definition and conceptual model. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18,* 207–216.

Elliott, C., & Stead, V. (2008). Learning from leading women's experience: Towards a sociological understanding. *Leadership, 4*(2), 159–180. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715008089636.

Espedal, B. (2008). Making sense of leadership in Norway: The view from management consultants. *Leadership, 4*(2), 181–200. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715008089637.

Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2018). Servant leadership: A systematic review and call for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly*.

Farrell, S. (2015, July 22). Toshiba boss quits over £780 m accounting scandal. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/jul/21/toshiba-boss-quits-hisao-tanaka-accounting-scandal.

FCIC. (2011). *The financial crisis inquiry report: Final report of the national commission on the causes of the financial and economic crisis in the United States*. Retrieved from https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/GPO-FCIC/pdf/GPO-FCIC.pdf.

Feldman, D. C. (1999). Toxic mentors or toxic proteges? A critical re-examination of dysfunctional mentoring. *Human Resource Management Review, 9*(3), 247–278.

Feldman, D. C. (2001). Career coaching: What HR professionals and managers need to know. *Human Resource Management Review, 24,* 26–35.

Feldman, D. C., & Lankau, M. J. (2005). Executive coaching: A review for future research. *Journal of Management, 31*(6), 829–848.

Gino, F., & Bazerman, M. H. (2009). When misconduct goes unnoticed: The acceptability of gradual erosion in others' unethical behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*(4), 708–719. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.03.013.

Greenfield, K. T. (2012). The story behind the olympus scandal. *Bloomberg*. Retrieved from https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2012–02-16/the-story-behind-the-olympus-scandal.

Greenleaf, R. (1977). *Servant leadership*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.

Griffith, S. D. (2007). *Servant leadership, ethics and the domains of leadership.* Paper presented at the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable Regent University.

Grint, K. (2007). Learning to lead: Can aristotle help us find the road to wisdom? *Leadership, 3*(2), 231–246. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715007076215.

Hall, D. T., Otazo, K. L., & Hollenbeck, G. P. (1999). Behind closed doors: What really happens in executive coaching. *Organizational Dynamics, 27,* 39–53.

Hanna, R. W., & Glassman, A. M. (2004). Enhancing human systems change learning from an NTL® workshop and field applications. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 13*(1), 7–18. https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492603262105.

Harrison, S. H., Ashforth, B. E., & Corley, K. G. (2009). Organizational sacralization and sacrilege. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 29,* 225–254. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2009.06.002.

Herman, S. (2007). Leadership training in a "Not-Leadership" society. *Journal of Management Education, 31*(2), 151–155. https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562906298875.

Hirst, G., Mann, L., Bain, P., Pirola-Merlo, A., & Richver, A. (2004). Learning to lead: The development and testing of a model of leadership learning. *The Leadership Quarterly, 15*(3), 311–327.

Hobson, A. J., & Sharp, C. (2005). Head to head: A systematic review of the research evidence on mentoring new head teachers. *School Leadership and Management, 25*(1), 25–42.

Hoch, J. E., Bommer, W. H., Dulebohn, J. H., & Wu, D. (2018). Do ethical, authentic, and servant leadership explain variance above and beyond transformational leadership? A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management, 44*(2), 501–529.

Iles, P., & Preece, D. (2006). Developing leaders or developing leadership? The academy of chief executives' programmes in the North East of England. *Leadership, 2*(3), 317–340. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715006066024.

Johnson, C. (2007). *Ethics in the workplace: Tools and tactics for organizational transformation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jones, A. (2006). Leading questions: Developing what? An anthropological look at the leadership development process across cultures. *Leadership, 2*(4), 481–498. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715006068935.

Jones, A. M. (2005). The anthropology of leadership: Culture and corporate leadership in the American South. *Leadership, 1*(3), 259–278. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715005054437.

Kampa-Kokesch, S., & Anderson, M. Z. (2001). Executive coaching: A comprehensive review of the literature. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 53,* 205–228.

Kaplan, R. E., & Kaiser, R. B. (2009). Stop overdoing your strengths. *Harvard Business Review, 87*(2), 100–103.

Keen, C., & Hall, K. (2009). Engaging with difference matters: Longitudinal student outcomes of co-curricular service-learning programs. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80*(1), 59–79.

Kesner, I. F. (2003). Leadership development: Perk or priority? *Harvard Business Review, 5,* 29–38.

Kriger, M., & Seng, Y. (2005). Leadership with inner meaning: A contingency theory of leadership based on the worldviews of five religions. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*(5), 771–806.

Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Krippendorff, K., & Bock, M. A. (2009). *The content analysis reader*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Ladyshewsky, R. K. (2007). A strategic approach for integrating theory to practice in leadership development. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 28*(5), 426–443. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730710761733.

Lapidot, Y., Kark, R., & Shamir, B. (2007). The impact of situational vulnerability on the development and erosion of followers' trust in their leader. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(1), 16–34.

Lee, J., Wang, G., & Piccolo, R. F. (2018). Jekyll and Hyde leadership: A multilevel, multisample examination of charisma and abuse on follower and team outcomes. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 25*(4), 399–415. https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051818757692.

Lepak, D. P., & Snell, S. A. (1999). The human resource architecture: Toward a theory of human capital allocation and development. *Academy of Management Review, 24,* 31–48.

Levine, M. (2016). Wells fargo opened a couple million fake accounts. *Bloomberg*.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Liao, C., & Meuser, J. D. (2014). Servant leadership and serving culture: Influence on individual and unit performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 57*(5), 1434–1452.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Meuser, J. D., Hu, J., Wu, J., & Liao, C. (2015). Servant leadership: Validation of a short form of the SL-28. *The Leadership Quarterly, 26*(2), 254–269.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *Leadership Quarterly, 19*(2), 161–177.
London, M., & Beatty, R. W. (1993). 360° feedback as a competitive advantage. *Human Resource Management, 32*(2–3), 353–372. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.3930320211.
Marques, J. (2015). The changed leadership landscape: What matters today. *Journal of Management Development, 34*(10), 1310–1322.
McCann, J., & Holt, R. (2009). Ethical leadership and organizations: An analysis of leadership in the manufacturing industry based on the perceived leadership integrity scale. *Journal of Business Ethics, 87*(2), 211–220.
Middlebrooks, A. E., & Haberkorn, J. T. (2009). Implicit leader development: The mentor role as prefatory leadership context. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 2*(4), 7–22. https://doi.org/10.1002/jls.20077.
Mumford, M. D., & Fried, Y. (2014). Give them what they want or give them what they need? Ideology in the study of leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 35*(5), 622–634.
Mumford, M. D., Gessner, T. L., Connelly, M. S., O'Connor, J. A., & Clifton, T. C. (1993). Leaders and destructive acts: Individual and situational influences. *The Leadership Quarterly, 4*(2), 115–147.
Neal, J. A., Lichtenstein, B. M. B., & Banner, D. (1999). Spiritual perspectives on individual, organizational, and societal transformation. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 12*(3), 175–185.
Novicevic, M. M., Heames, J. T., Paolillo, J. G. P., & Buckley, M. R. (2009). Executive development: History lessons learned from Barnard. *The Leadership Quarterly, 20*(2), 155–161.
O'Connell, W., & Bligh, M. (2009). Emerging from ethical scandal: Can corruption really have a happy ending? *Leadership, 5*(2), 213–235. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715009102935.
Padilla, A., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2007). The toxic triangle: Destructive leaders, susceptible followers and conducive environments. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18,* 176–194.
Page, D., & Wong, T. P. (2000). A conceptual framework for measuring servant-leadership. In *The human factor in shaping the course of history and development*. Lanham MD: University Press of America.
Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual—A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for windows* (3rd ed.). Maidenhead Open University Press.
Parker, P., & Carroll, B. (2009). Leadership development: Insights from a careers perspective. *Leadership, 5*(2), 261–283. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715009102940.
Parloff, R. (2018, 6th February 2018). How VW paid $25 billion for 'Dieselgate'—and Got Off Easy. *Fortune*.
Parolini, J. L., Patterson, K., & Winston, B. (2009). Distinguishing between transformational and servant leadership. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal, 30*(3), 274–291.
Parry, K. W., & Sinha, P. N. (2005). Researching the trainability of transformational organizational leadership. *Human Resource Development International, 8*(2), 165–183. https://doi.org/10.1080/13678860500100186.
Pearce, C. L. (2007). The future of leadership development: The importance of identity, multi-level approaches, self-leadership, physical fitness, shared leadership, networking, creativity, emotions, spirituality and on-boarding processes. *Human Resource Management Review, 17*(4), 355–359.
Pina e Cunha, M., Campos e Cunha, R., & Rego, A. (2009). Exploring the role of leader–subordinate interactions in the construction of organizational positivity. *Leadership*, *5*(1), 81–101. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715008098311.
Pittinsky, T. L., & Zhu, C. (2005). Contemporary public leadership in China: A research review and consideration. *Leadership Quarterly, 16*(6), 921–939.
Price, T. (2002). The ethics of authentic transformational leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*(1), 67–81.
Quatro, S. A., Waldman, D. A., & Galvin, B. M. (2007). Developing holistic leaders: Four domains for leadership development and practice. *Human Resource Management Review, 17*(4), 427–441.

Raelin, J. A. (1997). Individual and situational precursors of successful action learning. *Journal of Management Education, 21*(3), 368–394. https://doi.org/10.1177/105256299702100308.

Ragins, B. R., Cotton, J. L., & Miller, J. S. (2000). Marginal Mentoring: The effects of the type of mentor, quality of relationship and program design on work and career attitudes. *Academy of Management Journal, 4*(6), 1177–1194.

Ready, D. A., Hill, L. A., & Conger, J. A. (2008). Winning the race for talent in emerging markets. (cover story). *Harvard Business Review, 86*(11), 62–70.

Reave, L. (2005). Spiritual values and practices related to leadership effectiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*(5), 655–687.

Reuters. (2018). *Indonesia arrests executives of palm firms in bribery probe*. Retrieved from https://www.reuters.com/article/us-indonesia-corruption-sinar-mas-agro/indonesia-arrests-executives-of-palm-firms-in-bribery-probe-idUSKCN1N2097.

Rhee, K. S., & Sigler, T. H. (2009). Developing enlightened leaders for industry and community: Executive education and service-learning. *Journal of Management Education*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562909338143.

Riggio, R. E. (2008). Leadership development: The current state and future expectations. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 60*(4), 383–392.

Rose, D. G. (2018, October 19). Has corruption stalled 'the Shenzhen of Indonesia'? *South China Morning Post*. Retrieved from https://www.scmp.com/week-asia/economics/article/2169205/has-corruption-stalled-shenzhen-indonesia.

Rost, J. (1995). Leadership: A discussion about ethics. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 5*(1), 129–142.

Russell, R. F., & Stone, A. G. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 23*(3), 145–157.

Saporito, T. J. (1996). Business-linked executive development: Coaching senior executives. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 48*(2), 96–103.

Saslow, S., & Buss, I. (2005). Leadership development in Europe: Challenges and best practices. Retrieved from.

Sauser, W. I., Jr. (2005). Ethics in business: Answering the call. *Journal of Business Ethics, 58*(4), 345.

Scandura, T. A., & Pellegrini, E. K. (2008). Trust and leader—member exchange: A look at relational vulnerability. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 15*(2), 101–110.

Schlee, R. P. (2000). Mentoring and the professional development of business students. *Journal of Management Education, 24*(3), 322–337. https://doi.org/10.1177/105256290002400304.

Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2013). How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly, 24*(1), 138–158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.09.001.

Sendjaya, S. (2005). Morality and leadership: Examining the ethics of transformational leadership. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 3,* 75–86.

Sendjaya, S. (2015). *Personal and organizational excellence through servant leadership: Learning to serve, serving to lead, leading to transform*. Switzerland: Springer.

Sendjaya, S., Eva, N., Butar-Butar, I., Robin, M., & Castles, S. (2018). SLBS-6: Validation of a short form of the servant leadership behavior scale. *Journal of Business Ethics*.

Sendjaya, S., & Sarros, J. C. (2002). Servant Leadership: Its origin, development and application in organizations. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 9,* 57–64.

Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J. C., & Santora, J. C. (2008). Defining and measuring servant leadership behaviour in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies, 45*(2), 402–424.

Shane, D. (2017). The Kobe Steel scandal: What we know so far. Retrieved from https://money.cnn.com/2017/10/16/news/companies/kobe-steel-scandal-what-we-know/index.html.

Shefy, E., & Sadler-Smith, E. (2006). Applying holistic principles in management development. *Journal of Management Development, 25*(4), 368–385. https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710610655837.

Smither, J. M., London, M., & Reily, R. (2005). Does performance improve following multisource feedback? A theoretical model, meta-analysis, and review of empirical findings. *Personnel Psychology, 58*(1), 33–66. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.514_1.x.

Sosik, J. J., & Dinger, S. L. (2007). Relationships between leadership style and vision content: The moderating role of need for social approval, self-monitoring, and need for social power. *Leadership Quarterly, 18*(2), 134–153.

Sosik, J. J., Jung, D., & Dinger, S. L. (2009). Values in authentic action: examining the roots and rewards of altruistic leadership. *Group and Organization Management, 34*(4), 395–431.

Stead, V. (2005). Mentoring: a model for leadership development? *International Journal of Training and Development, 9*(3), 170–184.

Stone, G. A., Russell, R. F., & Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership: A difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 25*(4), 349–361.

Storey. (2005). What next for strategic-level leadership research? *Leadership*, *1*(1), 89–104.

Temin, P. (2010). The great recession & the great depression. *Daedalus, 139*(4), 115–124.

Tepper, B. J. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research Agenda. *Journal of Management, 33*(3), 261–289. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307300812.

Tepper, B. J., Carr, J. C., Breaux, D. M., Geider, S., Hu, C., & Hua, W. (2009). Abusive supervision, intentions to quit, and employees' workplace deviance: A power/dependence analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 109*(2), 156–167. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2009.03.004.

Tharenou, P., Donohue, R., & Cooper, B. (2007). *Management research methods*. Melbourne: Cambridge.

van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management, 37*(2).

van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011). The servant leadership survey: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 26*(3), 249–267.

van Dierendonck, D., Sousa, M., Gunnarsdóttir, S., Bobbio, A., Hakanen, J., Pircher Verdorfer, A., et al. (2017). The cross-cultural invariance of the servant leadership survey: A comparative study across eight countries. *Administrative Sciences, 7*(2), 8.

van Dierendonck, D., Stam, D., Boersma, P., De Windt, N., & Alkema, J. (2014). Same difference? Exploring the differential mechanisms linking servant leadership and transformational leadership to follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(3), 544–562.

Van Velsor, E., & Ascalon, E. (2008). The role and impact of leadership development in supporting ethical action in organisations. *Journal of Management Development, 27*(2), 187–195. https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710810849326.

Winum, P. C. (2005). Effectiveness of a high-potential African American executive: The anatomy of a coaching engagement. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 57*(1), 71.

Wright, C. S. (2013). Developing ethical leaders: Is there inconsistency between theory and practice? *Journal of Human Values, 19*(1), 29–38.

Zaccaro, S. J., & Banks, D. (2004). Leader visioning and adaptability: Bridging the gap between research and practice on developing the ability to manage change. *Human Resource Management, 43*(4), 367–380. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20030.

Zaccaro, S. J., & Horn, Z. N. J. (2003). Leadership theory and practice: Fostering an effective symbiosis. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*(6), 769–806.

Zimmermann, P., Wit, A., & Gill, R. (2008). The relative importance of leadership behaviours in virtual and face-to-face communication settings. *Leadership, 4*(3), 321–337. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715008092388.