The Full Range Leadership Development Theory: Cultural and Race Implications

Khandicia Randolph, M.P.A., M.A. Law

Abstract:

This article examines the Full Range Leadership Development Theory (FRLD) by Sosoik and Jung (2018). The theory purports a framework that allows leaders to fully develop their leadership aptitude and competencies by understanding leaders' and followers' behaviors and characteristics brought to a contextual environment, time orientation, and various situations. This article examines the cultural and racial implications mitigating the FRLD and the Total Leadership System (TLS) that the system the theory operates in, as outlined by Sosik and Jung. Examples of culture remediation in South Africa, Australia, China, the U.S., and Indigenous populations provide examples to support cultural remediation. Current literature is silent regarding the cultural and racial implications on the theory providing originality to this article. The term cultural remediation introduced by the author is used to describe the overarching effect that culture and race impute on the success of the FRLD and additional challenges caused by the remediation and redaction of culture. This article provides an examination of the transformational leadership theory, the presumed end-state of the FRLD. It offers some counterproductive attributes of transformational leadership in addition to how FRLD fares against other leadership theories. This article's results yield that leaders must not underestimate culture and race remediation and redaction in the FRLD and TLS. Leaders must have the ability to navigate culture and race effectively because it influences every theory aspect.

Keywords: Leaders, organizations, transformational, remediation, communication

Khandicia Randolph is a fourth-year Doctoral Candidate at Regent University's School of Business and Leadership, Doctor of Strategic Leadership Program. A Chicago native, Khandicia holds a B.A. from the University of Missouri, an M.P.A. from Walden University, and an M.A. in Law from Regent University's School of Law. She has presented on the topics of effective communication in member-based organizations and effective communications in leadership development domestically and internationally.

Her passion is helping non-profit organizations develop leaders and leadership pipelines and to create and maintain well-functioning and thriving organizations. Khandicia is the oldest of eight children and currently has seven nieces and nephews.

Introduction

The study of leadership has received significant attention from scholars throughout the twentieth century; each theory growing on what was learned from the previous one. After over 100 years of academic discourse, the phenomenon that is leadership continues to be developed and debated by many. Northouse (2018) defines leadership as the ability to influence a group of people toward (the achievement) of a shared or common goal. Other definitions incorporate or assign various competencies associated with defining leadership (Reed, Klutts, & Mattingly, 2019). Leadership descriptions and comprehension are more varied in their content, with a common nucleic centralization comprising a leader's vision and determination to realize such an image (Kolodziejczyk, 2015).

Whatever definition used, or theory employed in an individual's leadership composition, one commonality among all theories is that intrinsic, innate, and learned assets help individuals and groups enact and dispense the process of leadership. Leadership beliefs contribute to behaviors and attitudes (Marcketti & Kadolph, 2010). These beliefs and attitudes typically dictate which leadership theory people choose to engage in. However, the fallacy in doing so solely considers an individual's behaviors and attitudes, or thinking that said behaviors and attitudes are absolute from inception or conception. Behaviors are learned and thereby can be taught (Heinz et al., 2019). Thus, most leadership theories only include a limited set of behaviors, attributes, and values and subsequently orient the approach toward the leader, follower, or organization. However, the Full Range Leadership Development (FRLD) theory offers a holistic evaluation and incorporation of leadership characteristics, attributes, behaviors, and values in a systematic presentation with multiple orientations spanning the full spectrum of leadership (Sosik, 2011). Such a theory provides a better chance of effective leadership.

This article will address the FRLD theory as it pertains to the wholeness of research theory. Additionally, the article will explore how the behaviors, attributes, and characteristics of the FRLD facilitate a more complete and adequate notion of leadership compared to and against other leadership theories. More specifically, this article will discuss in depth the implications of culture and race on the FRLD theory and the mitigating effects therein (Quintana et al., 2006). The assertion that leadership is redacted or expanded contingent upon factors such as biodiversity, collective vs. individual cultures, geographic diversity, socioeconomic factors, race, nationality, gender, sociopolitics and ethnicity will be presented from a global perspective to understand the influence on the FRLD theory (Perrin et al., 2012).

Full Range Leadership Development Theory Defined

Accentuated by the notion that leadership is a comprehensive entity reliant on many factors and a dynamic and complex system, the Full Range Leadership Development (FRLD) theory approaches leadership from a comprehensively interrogative lens. Sosik and Jung (2018) define the FRLD as leaders "displaying behaviors and creating an organizational culture that encourages leaders to develop future generations of leaders" (p. 2). The theory's idyllic state is achieved by engaging in an active form of leadership instead of passive dispositions, high motivation for followers, allowing for a culture orientated toward results, and accountability for the contextual environment. The theory is research-based, much like servant leadership, transformational, and authentic leadership theories, to name a few, that examine

leaders' and followers' behaviors in a domain and examine the convergence of the behaviors and characteristics on the organization or context (Holmberg & Åkerblom, 2016). However, the behavioral aspect of FRLD is unique.

Initial leadership theories, such as the Great Man and Traits theories, purported that leadership was an innate, genetically predisposed characteristic that a person either possessed or did not. These theories lacked the sophistication to build a more significant contingency of leaders due to the inability to explain leadership's derivation aside from an arbitrary undisclosed gene or incorporation of the cultural influence imposed on leadership (Timothy et al., 2005). Notwithstanding a traceable genetic determinant that implements leadership, a willingness or desire to serve in a leadership capacity is necessary regardless of applicable theories. However, research-based theories such as servant leadership, transformational leadership, laisse-fare and, transactional leadership provide empirical data that leadership behaviors are teachable thus learned by followers (Antonakis & House, 2014). FRLD builds upon the research-based theory models. It proposes leaders should possess a repertoire of varied leadership styles that entail the spectrum of leadership behaviors to create more innovative and ethical organizations (Mittal & Dar, 2015: Zhu et al., 2019). Additionally, the theory is also heavily reliant on transformational leadership as a transfigurative agent in leadership development.

The proliferation of transformational leadership as the preferred leadership ascription in the FRLD theory requires a high cognitive morality level for the theory implementation to succeed. Akin to the charismatic leadership theory, FRLD requires a particular amount of likeability and magnetic personality (Hwang et al.,

2015) to provide the theory's necessary motivational factor. No perfect or singular equation or ratio proportions for these factors exist; nevertheless, if the essential relational aspect of leadership in the approach is absent or diminished, it can derail its effectiveness (Cortez, 2020). Also needed is the follower-centered needs behavior component seen in servant and person-centered leadership (Ebener & O'Connell, 2010). Beyond even the massive levels of selflessness, motivation, and innovative diligence needed within this theory, it is incomplete without the attribute of humility. Humility in leadership adds to leaders' reflection and constant self-improvement ability required in this leadership model (Zhou & Wu, 2018). Consequently, for every facet of the FRLD model to work and the necessary behaviors learned, refined, and mitigated, leaders and followers must understand the significance that culture and race contribute to the exacting execution.

Culture and its Composition and Importance

Whether from the organizational standpoint, sociological, economic, ethnic, racial, geographic, or religious, culture is a phenomenon all its own. Culture, defined in modest terms as a shared experience, permeates every aspect of the human experience, every organization (Schein, 2017), and the entire scope of the FRLD. The nuance and influence in culture shape humans' attitudes, belief systems, and societal norms. The ascription of culture is a byproduct or consequence of human cognition (Tomasello et al., 2005). The existence and extent of cultural domination within any domain or context multiply the complexity of any workplace, organization, or demographic area of society. Tomasello et al. (2005) postulate that the "crucial difference between human cognition and

that of other species is the ability to participate with others in collaborative activities with shared goals and intentions: shared intentionality (p. 1)." Collaboration requires intention, deliberate thought and action, communication, and participation. The collaborative element's direness is partly due to the model's design for leaders to be innovative. Collaboration leads to innovation, which produces creativity (Ponchek & Ponchek, 2016). Yet, the inclusion of collaboration can be contingent upon culture. For example, in collective culture countries such as China, collaboration is infused in the culture compared to the individualist mindset of America. Both internal and external factors precipitate the change amalgamating the culture, which often begs for transformation but requires the change catalyst (Vantrappen & Wirtz, 2018). Thus, those seeking to train FRLD leaders must understand the redacting and remediating effect that culture has on followers and organizations.

Organizational culture, specifically, is a rooted and longstanding set of ideals that direct the organization and those therein (Schein, 2017). The effects of culture impute the daily actions of leaders and followers and provide spoken and unspoken rules regarding what acceptable behavior is within the organization. Furthermore, research shows the innovation necessary for leaders within the FRLD and to achieve transformational leadership relies heavily on a multitude of cultural variables (Büschgens, Bausch, & Balkin, 2013). These cultural variables and inflections determine the alignment between individuals and organizations, along with individuals and leaders. The ability to create the alignment contingent upon the various cultural variables makes or deter the congruency needed within the FRLD, acting as a predictor of organizational and leadership success (Cameron & Qwinn,

2011). Change can begin at the individual level with members of the system. The most impactful changes are made systemically as a component of organizational or systemic policies. Such factors dictate the parameters of the organization's total leadership system that leaders seek to develop, transcend, and transform.

The implications of culture on organizations or domains within the FRLD are not solely limited to the organization's tone or directives regarding the execution of policies and procedures. Culture also influences communication, whether didactic (between the leader and follower), corporate, or contextual (Modaff, 2019). Culture can and often does determine whether collaborative measurements such as knowledge sharing are implemented within corporate structures (Suppiah & Singh, 2011) or if counterproductive communication silos are erected (LugoSantiago, 2018.) Imperatively, leaders and aspiring leaders do not have the luxury to undermine the importance or influence of culture and must learn the appropriate correlation between behaviors and cultural implications, often with agility.

Leadership Systems = Organizational Cultures

Leadership systems are complex organisms and machines that provide parameters and frameworks for leaders and organizations to operate within. The FRLD theory and framework operate in what Sosik and Jung (2018) term the Total Leadership System (TLS). Within this system are leaders, followers, and situations, taking into context the time orientation of past, present, and future while also considering the environment's effect (Pasricha et al., 2018). Within this construct, there are four plausible scenarios: leader-follower, leader-situation, follower-situation, and a confluence of leader-follower-situation. The

preferential state of the system is the latter, one where there exists an amalgamation of situations, circumstances, and elements, thereby allowing the position within the system to fit the leader, the follower, and the situation/circumstance based on relevant contextual factors and appropriate behavior projection (Bigby, & Beadle-Brown, 2011). The desired state versus actual is a prescription of the organizational culture (Fukushige & Spicer, 2007), thereby imputing the importance of culture.

The total leadership system has antecedents. These elements are the personal characteristics and qualities of the leader or follower. These antecedents precede leaders' and followers' behaviors and shape the interactions between the two and an individual's relationship with the total system and context (McClanahan & Rankin, 2016). Notably, these antecedents are molded by the culture, which allows some cross-cultural precursors; however, antecedents also develop immensely different behavior influx contingent upon geographic, cultural mentality— Western vs other (Brem, Brem, Wolfram, & Wolfram, 2017). Yet, research shows that children potentially possess the ability to contour their long-term development amidst the external antecedents of the system (Yan, Ansari, & Wayne, 2019). The precursors within the TLS artifacts are analogous or equivalent to the artifacts of organizational culture. Artifacts are the qualities members of an organization possess and bring to the corporate culture that dictate their actions and behaviors within the organization.

The TLS includes context (environment) as a factor in the equation of leaders achieving and attaining leadership at its climax. Crossman (2011) notes that similar values exist between environment leadership and spiritual leadership—notions of the standard and social good, stewardship, sustainability, servanthood, calling,

meaning, and connectedness. Connectedness occurs as part of human development and is a learned concept from environmental and spiritual leadership (Grossman & Bulle, 2006). Within the context of the TLS, values are known as attributes used to describe the unique relationship of the leader and follower from the dyad perspective. These values that have an attributed connection are subject to culture and determine fairness and justice within a system or organizational culture (Frankel, Leonard, & Denham, 2006). Parra-Cardona et al. (2018) provide that contextual and cultural factors can often provide barriers to achieving the TLS. Therefore, leaders must be aware of a multiplicity of afflicting factors such as race, gender, and religion imputed by culture on the TLS containing the ability to derail the leader's mission (Al-Ahmad, 2011). For discussion in this article, the referred to effect is cultural remediation. It is the overall propensity and probability that cultural infliction can and may subjugate the purpose of the FRLD.

FRLD Behaviors

Leadership theories are forged based on behaviors exhibited within various approaches. The quintessential difference between the systems that preceded the FRLD was that the behavior orientation was toward the followers and typically minimized to a specific behavior contingency (Sosik & Jung, 2018). A full range of behaviors displayed by leaders compared to the limited scope of behaviors in other leadership theories is the premise of FRLD in addition to the development of leaders' and followers' behaviors, hence the preferred state of the system and the confluence of leader-follower-situation (Zhou & Wu, 2018). By engaging/practicing the FRLD leaders incept and incorporate culture more comprehensively than other theories

Implementation of the Fair and Just Culture method (Frankel, Leonard, & Denham, 2006) within FRLD occurs through the leader's self-reflection, assessment (MLQ), and revamping leadership style and behaviors. A leader's assessment from subordinates, peers, and even self is influenced by cultural characteristics (Frankel, Leonard, & Denham, 2006). The consideration of such factors should be tantamount in attempts to understand relationships between self and others' ratings (Atwater, Wang, Smither, Fleener, 2009). Leaders who actively engage in the reflective disposition of FRLD deter the propensity to deflect their mistakes on others or present with aggressive and angry behavior, which are actions that are contrary to those of narcissistic and authoritarian leaders (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998).

The total Leadership System of the FRLD is appropriated by culture and race, including at the highest level of context, nations, geopolitical and geographical regions, and the earth's biodiversity (McClanahan & Rankin, 2016; Constant & Tshisikhawe, 2018), is appropriated by culture and race. Leaders require a complete sense of awareness for all elements and domains of the TLS, and the impact of time and circumstances play a profound role in leadership execution. One such example is the Indigenous people and Torres of Australia, which continue to fight for equity in healthcare and a longer life expectancy rate as a result (Mazel, 2018). Comparative to other leadership theories, leaders' antecedents and attributes are not expected to address geopolitical and biodiversity issues. Moreover, due to the more traditional ways of thinking and defining leadership specifically from a Western context that is reliant on power, influence, and maintaining control, the cultural remediation of populations such as the Lakota women require that within the

TLS or the FRLD, leaders reverse the adverse effects of insufficient minority populations to alter normalized behavior inconsistent and inconsiderate of the entire contextual population (Gambrell, 2016).

Compared to the FRLD, person-centered leadership is vastly limited as these approaches are rooted in focusing primarily on the follower and work best in person-centered cultures (Cardiff, McCormack, & McCance, 2016). In contrast, FRLD seeks to examine and effectuate leadership through a more holistic approach. It considers multiple factors and contingencies such as time, behaviors, situation, antecedents, and attributes. The exclusion and mitigation of the cultural implication and necessity for the person-centered leadership theory to flourish again display how culture impacts leadership ability and can reduce the synthesis and neural capital (Garfield, Hubbard, & Hagen, 2019). This theory fails in collective societies such as China due to the collaborative culture (Gutman, Gutman, Lucas, & Lucas, 2018). Such behaviors comprise the relational leadership theory, which focuses on the relationship between the leader and followers (Uhl-Bien, 2006). The tendency to not contest leadership development requires cognitive identification and connectivity through behavior and actions (Mumford, Todd, Higgs, & McIntosh, 2017); however, it omits other impactful and mitigating elements, including time and context. Therefore, the singular premise of the relationship is insufficient to attain the leadership aptitude necessary for the FRLD theory and transformational leadership.

FRLD requires compassion and humility, whereas other theories such as Leader-Member Exchange, Traits Theory, Great Man Theory, and the Transactional Leadership Theory do not. The ability to display humility and compassion within the full scope of leadership requires behaviors

consistent with what shows forth from individuals who possess high levels of self-awareness, openness, and transcendence (Morris, Brotheridge, & Boerner, 2008). Humility also requires the attributes of modesty (Morris, Brotheridge, & Boerner, 2008). Moreover, humility is likened to the servant leadership theory, which is encompassed in the FRLD. The moral cognition necessary for humility, specifically in leadership, is the antithesis of attributes such as narcissism (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998). The presence of humility redacts and relegates narcissism, disallowing leaders to take credit for others' accomplishments and not thrust misdirected blame on followers or display anger and aggression on others (Gosling et al., 1998; Sedikides et al., 2002). Moreover, the authentic, servant, and transformational leadership theories all require attributes of humanistic beliefs (Arnold et al., 2007), which comprise humility and proficiency in communication.

Subsequently, humility fosters the innovation needed for transformational leadership (Fei & Yenchu, 2018). Cultural inflections of humility are more prevalent in collectivist cultures. Song and Zhang (2020) show that humble leadership positively moderates the relationship between leaders and followers on multiple personal and organizational levels. Thus, the innovation created by the attribute of humility is essential to acquiring the FRLD, as transformational leaders themselves are innovative (Johnson & Hackman, 2018). Transformational leaders look for ways to improve products and processes before issues, problems, and systems break. This behavior requires rejection of management by exception (active and passive) and catapults future-orientation and foresight to the most effective disposition of transformational leadership (Sosik & Jung, 2018). Conclusively it provides that the

FRLD theory is an integrated and holistic theory that integrates cultural collectivism.

Communication in FRLD

Didactic transmission throughout the TLS is necessary to implement FRLD theory and can be highly altered and affected by race and cultural differences. Zaidi et al. (2016) suggest that cross-cultural discussions are essential to actively facilitate and transform learners' frames of reference, create critical consciousness, and develop cultural competence. Symbols create reality, and the primary symbolic implementation for humans is words (Denning, 2007). Therefore, leaders within the FRLD must be informed, engaged, intentional, and vigilant regarding word and communication selection as it pertains to cultural competencies and understanding the consequence of cultural remediation. Stellar communication competencies are necessary to move within the FRLD, TLS and achieve transformational leadership (Johnson & Hackman, 2018). Though the TLS has five levels—individual, dyad, group, organization, and context (Sosik & Jung, 2018)—didactic transmission formerly occurs in the second level of the TLS. It sets the tone for communication throughout the remaining levels. More importantly, the cultural remediation of communication includes race and context affecting the system's behaviors henceforth (Ayman & Korabik, 2010).

Antiquated leadership communication models remain prevalent in Western societies (Gambrell, 2016: Al-Ahmadi, 2011) and impact and derail success in the FRLD. The initial step to implementing the necessary didactic transmission within the TLS is to acknowledge the antecedents and their effect on communication. Followers' orientation towards acculturation impacts the didactic and systematic communication between leader-follower, follower-follower,

and leader-leader communication (McEvoy et al., 2017). Leaders must relinquish the desire to change or alter cultural remediation's influence on transmission. Instead, leaders must learn the followers' nuances to effectuate better communication, relationships, and idealized influence.

Transformational Leadership

A review of the FRLD begs the question: Is the ultimate goal of FRLD transformational leadership? If so, is it achieved in another theory? Indeed the transformational leadership theory termed by Downtown (1973) but fully emerged by Burns in 1978 (Northouse, 2018) appropriately engages and dispenses transformational leadership. Before determining if transformational leadership is the upshot and end-state of the FRLD, it is necessary to define the theory and its composition. The transformational leadership theory encompasses the elements of transactional leadership, charismatic leadership, and other behavioral attributes. It is concerned with improving the performance and productivity of followers while helping to elevate them to their fullest potential (Northouse, 2018). Studies show that environments and leadership systems led by transformational leadership have high employee satisfaction, and performance presents higher indicators (Schaubroeck., Lam, & Cha, 2017). Transactional leadership and other forms of primary leadership and primitive leadership, such as laissez-faire leadership, are the foundation for transformational leadership. Contrary to transactional leadership, where the relationship is premised on exchanging one good for another, transformational leaders ascribe to help followers unearth internal attributes previously unknown (Resick et al., 2009).

Transformational leaders are not satisfied with the status quo and are often classified as having divergent opinions or dispositions (Johnson & Hackman, 2018). Because of the propensity to have diverging views, leaders must master symbol manipulation and articulation, otherwise known as the process of communication. Culture predicates values and values direct communication (Modaff, 2019). Consequently, culture remediates and mitigates communication, thereby having a direct cultural remediation impact on the ability to engage in transformational leadership, TLS, and FRLD (Eagly & Chin, 2010). Hence, an efficacious communication command is pivotal to carry out transformational leadership through the FRLD theory effectively. Adequate appropriation of language combined with culture can aid in egalitarian creation (Smollan & Morrison, 2019), while ineffective cultural competency with language perpetuates negative cultural stereotypes (Lyons & Kashima, 2001). Therefore, it is critical to the full development of the leader and follower that leaders engaged in FRLD and transformational leadership understand the cultural remediation of communication and make concerted efforts to eradicate elements such as bias that might prevent motivation through contact.

In the FRLD theoretical framework by Sosik and Jung (2018), the five Is of transformational leadership are highlighted as necessary ingredients to provide positive and motivational changes, bring out the best in followers, push them toward increased performance and meet their intrinsic and extrinsic needs. These five Is of transformational leadership are idealized influence (attributes), idealized influence (behaviors), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Antonakis & House, 2014). Through the comprehension and actualization of these five Is, FRLD can be achieved. Nevertheless, idealism and

components of the FRLD theory and transformational leadership can yield negative consequences.

Intellectual stimulation and idealized influence, two of the necessary components of transformational leadership and FRLD, possess the ability to have unintended negative consequences. Studies show that because of the encouragement and intellectual stimulation, transformational leadership promotes creativity but, by the same occurrence, increases the followers' dependency on the leader, thereby decreasing creativity (Eisenbeiß, & Boerner, 2013). Additionally, idealized influence is difficult to impose when hierarchical linear organizational systems exist within the TLS (Walumbwa & Hartnell, 2011)—concluding that perhaps, transformational leadership should be a theory within a theory, not the end-state. Nonetheless, transformational leadership positively relates to followers' dependence, empowerment, and personal identification with a leader that mediates the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' reliance on the leader (Kark, Shamir, & Chen, 2003). In contrast, social identification mediates the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' empowerment, illustrating that follower empowerment can avert negative consequences.

What Role Does Race Play?

Leadership relevant to race begins as early as child development. A study comparing elementary students' leadership trajectory was especially pronounced when the parity of Black students to obtain leadership roles primarily only existed when the student population was majority Black with a Black teacher (Quintana et al., 2006). Notably, the idea of race is a socially constructed term connotated by biological and genetic compositions, according to Quintana et al. (2006), resulting in a

nurtured behavior predicated on natural elements. Such research implications exhibit the inherent need for racial appropriation and consideration at every level of the leadership system within the FRLD. Additionally, most studies continue to show a disparaging gap pertaining to race, culture, religion, and gender in healthcare, politics, and legislative opportunities for women (Koburtay, Syed, & Haloub, 2020). Such stagnation and inequitable distribution of leadership equity alters and shapes the context of the TLS. Moreover, it increases the cultural remediation factor in the FRLD theory.

Equitable distribution of opportunities for leadership roles is necessary for leaders and followers to achieve the FRLD. From a geospatial science lens, inequality can occur based on the leadership orientation predisposed by a person's location (Nunez, Rivera, & Hallmark, 2020). As previously mentioned, organizations and contextual domains operate with a collective cultural mindset in countries such as China and Japan. Simultaneously, in the Western module, especially in the United States, the individualist competitive paradigm is most prevalent (Gambrell, 2016). Cultural remediation of beliefs and practices impose the TLS in South Africa based on ethnobotanical knowledge (Constant & Tshisikhawe, 2018). Pertaining to mental health, which has a direct impact on behaviors that infiltrate the TLS and FRLD, notwithstanding the additional resources, the accessibility of services for 'under-served' ethnic and religious minority groups is immensely insufficient. The necessary echelons and appropriation of access required to offset the health inequalities created by their different exposure to services, results in adverse dyad transmission and interaction due to the racially disparate context (McEvoy et al., 2017). The racial inequities and disparities

perpetuate an incursion and mitigation of actualizing the full range of behaviors of the FRLD theory and the full development of leaders and followers.

Economic equality and justice, which alter the contextual domain, affect organizations, and alter didactic efficacy and communication, are greatly hindered by racial and cultural remediation (Kuada, 2010). Such opposing factors within the TLS make it problematic and extraordinarily grim for leaders to enact the entire scope of FRLD due to cultural and racial redaction. Riad (2011) posits that power relations derived within a cultural context shape how leadership is defined and identified without the TLS. Thereby surmising from cultural studies that the intersecting dynamics of power, distance, and context shapes people's knowledge and perception of leadership. Optimizing leadership in a contemporary theoretical construct requires the interplay and amalgamation of leadership and diversity (Eagly & Chin, 2010). Failure to understand the remediation and impact of cultural and racial diversity on leadership results in failing to comprehend and sufficiently shape leaders' behavior.

Leadership effectiveness and efficacy within the FRLD theory are profoundly reliant upon cross-culture leadership competencies and abilities predicated and dictated by race and culture. However, many leadership theories, including the FRLD, do not address the need for attributional knowledge that reduces cultural distance (Laksman, 2013), yielding effectiveness in leadership theory and application. The cross-cultural leadership effectiveness framework developed by Laksman (2013) incorporates critical factors necessary to address the emotional, cognitive, and behavioral impositions presented and exaggerated by race. The deficiency of the required racial and cultural aptitudes projects negative imagery into the TLS, thereby widening the

cultural distance and depleting leadership opportunities for marginalized races, cultures, and gender (Nkomo, 2011). Reduced proficiency increases the remediation of culture and race on leadership and copiously redacts the ability to engross in the act of leadership development.

Conclusion

The FRLD theory engages leadership beyond the scope of a leader's behavior or disposition. The theory's parameter expands to consider the leaders' and followers' values, attributes, behaviors, and the external elements of time orientation, situation, and context (Longenecker, 2013). Moreover, the FRLD postulates that leadership is not a linearly executed dispersion of random factors and components but a complex system subject to people, place, time, and situations. The total leadership system examines the system occupants' behavioral and communication interaction from the rudimentary level of self through the highest level of context, incorporating entire populations of people and geographical landscapes (Floyd & Fuller, 2016). Each stage provides the leaders and followers the opportunity to reflect and digest the idealism of leadership. Furthermore, it offers the chance to experience the entire gamut of leadership while simultaneously uplifting and motivating others—the ultimate end game, providing transformational leadership that revolutionizes the followers and the system (Antonakis & House, 2014). Nevertheless, the plausibility of achieving such altruistic and coveted heights is contingent upon the ability to navigate culture and race appropriately. The attrition of leaders to transformational leadership also requires the keen ability to recognize skills and talents within followers unbeknownst to themselves while employing cultural and racial agility,

transmuting followers to leaders and system stakeholders.

The implications of culture and race are present throughout the total leadership system and FRLD theory with the power to impede and abrogate the ability to achieve full leadership development. Ignorance of the effect culture and race have on the system or failure to possess proficiencies in adjudicating the contribution and consequence of race and culture can lead to deterioration in communication, and inability to influence, inspire, and motivate followers (Pasricha et al., 2020). Success contingency of the theory is highly dependent on followers' ability to relate to leaders, and reciprocally, leaders must understand followers (Gelei, Losonci, & Matyusz, 2015). It is impossible to understand people without understanding their attributes. Their cultural affiliation and ascription immensely contribute to these attributes. Equally as challenging is the ability to understand a culture without understanding the artifacts contributed by individuals. Summarily in the absence of the necessary aptitude to completely comprehend the remediation of culture and race on individuals, groups, and organizations, the didactic exchange required at the leader-follower level of the system to understand cultural implications at the context or context squared (nations, geographical areas, etc.) is impossible.

Thereby, this article's results provide that the actual accomplishment of the FRLD theory is in establishing an approach and framework that allows for a complete examination of leadership development. However, the theory does not guarantee success as mitigating factors include culture, race, communication, and elements of the exalted transformational leadership (Abdullahi, Anarfo, & Anyigba, 2020). Nevertheless, the approach does provide ample opportunity for the full range of

leadership development. Recommendations for future and additional research include exploring the potential negative impacts of transformational leadership due to charismatic attributes of leaders, more extensive probing of the mitigation factor of race and culture in the total leadership system, and the FRLD. An additional recommendation is to examine the juncture within the TLS where culture and race have the most significant impact. A final proposal for future research is to expand the literature developing the terms cultural remediation and redaction.

References

Abdullahi, A. Z., Anarfo, E. B., & Anyigba, H. (2020). The impact of leadership style on organizational citizenship behavior: Does leaders' emotional intelligence play a moderating role? The Journal of Management Development, 39(9/10), 963-987. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-01-2020-0012

Al-Ahmadi, H. (2011). Challenges facing women leaders in saudi arabia. Human Resource Development International, 14(2), 149-166. https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2011.558311

Atwater, L., Wang, M., Smither, J. W., & Fleenor, J. W. (2009). Are cultural characteristics associated with the relationship between self and others' ratings of leadership? Journal of Applied Psychology, 94(4), 876-886. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014561

Antonakis, J., & House, R. J. (2014). Instrumental leadership: Measurement and extension of transformational–transactional leadership theory. The Leadership

Quarterly, 25(4), 746-771. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.04.005

Ayman, R., & Korabik, K. (2010). Leadership: Why gender and culture matter. The American Psychologist, 65(3), 157-170. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018806

Bigby, C., & Beadle-Brown, J. (2016). Culture in better group homes for people with intellectual disability at severe levels. Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, 54(5), 316-331. https://doi.org/10.1352/1934-9556-54.5.316

Brem, A., Brem, A., Wolfram, P., & Wolfram, P. (2017). Organisation of new product development in asia and europe: Results from western multinationals R&D sites in germany, india, and china. Review of Managerial Science, 11(1), 159-190. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-015-0183-7

Büschgens, T., Bausch, A., & Balkin, D. B. (2013). Organizational culture and innovation: A Meta-Analytic review. The Journal of Product Innovation Management, 30(4), 763-781. https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12021

Bushman, B.F. & Baumeister, R.F. Threatened egotism, narcissism, self-esteem and direct and displaced aggression: Docs self-love or self-hate lead to violence? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1998, 78, 219-29.

Bush, R. D. (2019). The internal colony hybrid: Reformulating structure, culture, and agency. Human Architecture, 12, 341-458.

Cameron, K. & Quinn, R. (2011). Diagnosing and changing organizational culture. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.: Hoboken, New Jersey.

Cardiff, S., McCormack, B., & McCance, T. (2018). Person-centred leadership: A relational approach to leadership derived through action research. Journal of Clinical Nursing, 27(15-16), 3056-3069. https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.14492

Cheung, F. M., & Halpern, D. F. (2010). Women at the top: Powerful leaders define success as work + family in a culture of gender. The American Psychologist, 65(3), 182-193. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017309

Constant, N. L., & Tshisikhawe, M. P. (2018). Hierarchies of knowledge: Ethnobotanical knowledge, practices and beliefs of the vhavenda in south africa for biodiversity conservation. Journal of Ethnobiology and Ethnomedicine, 14(1), 56-56. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13002-018-0255-2

Cortez, S. (2020). Relational aspects of leadership: A mixed-methods study of perceptions related to creating an environment of change through developing a positive school culture

Crossman, J. (2011). Environmental and spiritual leadership: Tracing the synergies from an organizational perspective. Journal of Business Ethics, 103(4), 553-565. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0880-3

Denning, S. (2007). The Secret Language of Leadership: How Leaders Inspire Action Through Narrative. Josey-Bass. San Francisco, CA.

Dowding, Keith. (2011). Encyclopedia of Power. SAGE Publications, Inc. Thousand Oaks, CA. Eagly, A. H., & Chin, J. L. (2010). Diversity and leadership in a changing world. The American Psychologist, 65(3), 216-224. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018957

Ebener, D. R., & O'Connell, D. J. (2010). How might servant leadership work? Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 20(3), 315-335. https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.256

Eisenbeiß, S. A., & Boerner, S. (2013). A Double-edged sword: Transformational leadership and individual creativity. British Journal of Management, 24(1), 54-68. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2011.00786.x

Floyd, A., & Fuller, C. (2016). Leadership identity in a small island developing state: The jamaican context. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2014.936365

Frankel, A. S., Leonard, M. W., & Denham, C. R. (2006). Fair and just culture, team behavior, and leadership engagement: The tools to achieve high reliability. Health Services Research, 41(4p2), 1690-1709. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6773.2006.00572.x

Fukushige, A., & Spicer, D. P. (2007). Leadership preferences in japan: An exploratory study. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 28(6), 508-530. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730710780967

Gambrell, K. M. (2016). Lakota women leaders: Getting things done quietly. Leadership (London, England), 12(3), 293-307. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715015608234

Garfield, Z. H., Hubbard, R. L., & Hagen, E. H. (2019). Evolutionary models of leadership: Tests and synthesis. Human Nature (Hawthorne, N.Y.), 30(1), 23-58. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12110-019-09338-4

Gelei, A., Losonci, D., & Matyusz, Z. (2015). Lean production and leadership attribute – the case of hungarian production managers. Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management, 26(4), 477-500. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMTM-05-2013-0059

Gosling, S.D., John, O.P., Craik, K.H., & Robins, R. W. Do people know how they behave? Self-reported act frequencies compared with on-line coding by observers. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1998, 74, 1337-49.

Grossman, J. B., & Bulle, M. J. (2006). Review of what youth programs do to increase the connectedness of youth with adults. Journal of Adolescent Health, 39(6), 788-799. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2006.08.004

Gutmann, J., Gutmann, J., Lucas, V., & Lucas, V. (2018). Private-sector corruption: Measurement and cultural origins. Social Indicators Research, 138(2), 747-770. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-017-1684-3

Heinz, A., Beck, A., Halil, M. G., Pilhatsch, M., Smolka, M. N., & Liu, S. (2019). Addiction as learned behavior patterns. Journal of Clinical Medicine, 8(8), 1086. https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm8081086

Holmberg, I., & Åkerblom, S. (2006). Modelling leadership—Implicit leadership theories in sweden. Scandinavian Journal of Management, 22(4), 307-329. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2006.10.002

Hwang, S. J., Quast, L. N., Center, B. A., Chung, C. N., Hahn, H., & Wohkittel, J. (2015). The impact of leadership behaviours on leaders' perceived job performance across cultures: Comparing the role of charismatic, directive, participative, and supportive leadership behaviours in the U.S. and four confucian asian countries. Human Resource Development International, 18(3), 259-277. https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2015.1036226

Johnson & Hackman (2018). Leadership: A Communication Perspective (7th ed.). Waveland Press, Inc. Long Grove, IL.

Kark, R., Shamir, B., & Chen, G. (2003). The two faces of transformational leadership: Empowerment and dependency. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88(2), 246-255. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.246

Koburtay, T., Syed, J., & Haloub, R. (2020). Implications of religion, culture, and legislation for gender equality at work: Qualitative insights from jordan. Journal of Business Ethics, 164(3), 421-436. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-4036-6

Kolodziejczyk, J. (2015). Leadership and management in the definitions of school heads. Athens Journal of Education, 2(2), 123.

Kuada, J. (2010). Culture and leadership in africa: A conceptual model and research agenda. African Journal of Economic and Management Studies, 1(1), 9-24. https://doi.org/10.1108/20400701011028130

Lakshman, C. (2013). Biculturalism and attributional complexity: Cross-cultural leadership effectiveness. Journal of International Business Studies, 44(9), 922-940. https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2013.36

Longenecker, P. D. (2013). The positive impact of individual core values. Journal of Business Ethics, 115(3), 429-434. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1409-0

Lyons, A., & Kashima, Y. (2001). The reproduction of culture: Communication processes tend to maintain cultural stereotypes. Social Cognition, 19(3), 372-394. https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.19.3.372.21470

Marcketti, S. B., & Kadolph, S. J. (2010). Empowering student leadership beliefs: An exploratory study. International Journal on Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 22(2), 131.

Mazel, O. (2018). Indigenous health and human rights: A reflection on law and culture. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 15(4), 789. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15040789

McClanahan, T. R., & Rankin, P. S. (2016). Geography of conservation spending, biodiversity, and culture. Conservation Biology, 30(5), 1089-1101. https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12720

McEvoy, P., Williamson, T., Kada, R., Frazer, D., Dhliwayo, C., & Gask, L. (2017). Improving access to mental health care in an orthodox jewish community: A critical reflection upon the accommodation of otherness. BMC Health Services Research, 17(1), 557-557. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-017-2509-4

Mittal, S., & Dhar, R. L. (2015). Transformational leadership and employee creativity: Mediating role of creative self-efficacy and moderating role of knowledge sharing. Management Decision, 53(5), 894-910. https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-07-2014-0464

Modaff, D. P. (2019). Mitakuye oyasin (we are all related): Connecting communication and culture of the lakota. Great Plains Quarterly, 39(4), 341-362. https://doi.org/10.1353/gpq.2019.0055

Morris, J. A., Brotheridge, C. M., & Urbanski, J. C. (2005). Bringing humility to leadership: Antecedents and consequences of leader humility. Human Relations (New York), 58(10), 1323-1350. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726705059929

Mumford, M. D., Todd, E. M., Higgs, C., & McIntosh, T. (2017). Cognitive skills and leadership performance: The nine critical skills. The Leadership Quarterly, 28(1), 24-39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.10.012

Nkomo, S. M. (2011). A postcolonial and anti-colonial reading of 'African' leadership and management in organization studies: Tensions,

contradictions and possibilities. Organization (London, England), 18(3), 365-386. https://doi.org/10.1177/13505084113 98731

Northouse, P. G. (2018). Leadership: Theory and practice (8th ed). Sage. Thousand Oaks, CA.

Núñez, A., Rivera, J., & Hallmark, T. (2020). Applying an intersectionality lens to expand equity in the geosciences. Journal of Geoscience Education, 68(2), 97-114. https://doi.org/10.1080/10899995.20 19.1675131

Parra-Cardona, R., Leijten, P., Lachman, J. M., Mejía, A., Baumann, A. A., Amador Buenabad, N. G., Cluver, L., Doubt, J., Gardner, F., Hutchings, J., Ward, C. L., Wessels, I. M., Calam, R., Chavira, V., & Domenech Rodríguez, M. M. (2018). Strengthening a culture of prevention in low- and middle-income countries: Balancing scientific expectations and contextual realities. Prevention Science, , 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-018-0935-0

Pasricha, P., Pasricha, P., Singh, B., Singh, B., Verma, P., & Verma, P. (2018). Ethical leadership, organic organizational cultures and corporate social responsibility: An empirical study in social enterprises. Journal of Business Ethics, 151(4), 941-958

Perrin, C., Perrin, P. B., Blauth, C., Apthorp, E., Duffy, R. D., Bonterre, M., & Daniels, S. (2012). Factor analysis of global trends in twenty-first century leadership. Leadership &

Organization Development Journal, 33(2), 175-199. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437731211 203474

Ponchek, T. (2016). To collaborate or not to collaborate? A study of the value of innovation from a sectoral perspective. Journal of the Knowledge Economy, 7(1), 43-79. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-015-0290-3

Quintana, S. M., Aboud, F. E., Chao, R. K., Contreras-Grau, J., Cross, W. E., Hudley, C., Hughes, D., Liben, L. S., Nelson-Le Gall, S., & Vietze, D. L. (2006). Race, ethnicity, and culture in child development: Contemporary research and future directions. Child Development, 77(5), 1129-1141. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2006.00951.x

Reed, B. N., Klutts, A. M., & Mattingly, 2, T Joseph. (2019). A systematic review of leadership definitions, competencies, and assessment methods in pharmacy education. American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 83(9), 7520-7532. https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7520

Resick, C. J., Whitman, D. S., Weingarden, S. M., & Hiller, N. J. (2009). The bright-side and the dark-side of CEO personality: Examining core self-evaluations, narcissism, transformational leadership, and strategic influence. Journal of Applied Psychology, 94(6), 1365-1381. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016238

Riad, S. (2011). Invoking cleopatra to examine the shifting ground of leadership. The Leadership Quarterly, 22(5), 831-850. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.07.006

Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S. S. K., & Cha, S. E. (2007). Embracing transformational leadership: Team values and the impact of leader behavior on team performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 92(4), 1020-1030. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1020

Schein, E.(2017). Organizational culture and leadership. (5th Ed). Wiley. Hoboken, NJ

Sosik, J. J. (2011). Full-range leadership development: Pathways for people, profit and planet. Human Resource Management International Digest, 19(1)https://doi.org/10.1108/hrmid.2011.04419aae.003

Sosik, J. & Jung, D. (2018). Full range leadership development: Pathways for people, profit, and plant. Routledge. New York, NY

Smith, J. D. (2017). "Stern champion of the human race, of man as human": Alexander F. chamberlain and reform in the age of imperialism and jim crow. Journal of American Studies, 51(3), 833-864. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021875816001274

Smollan, R. K., & Morrison, R. L. (2019). Office design and organizational change: The influence of communication and organizational culture. Journal of Organizational Change Management, 32(4), 426-440. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-03-2018-0076

Song, P., & Zhang, Z. (2020). Multi-level effects of humble leadership on employees' work well-being: The roles of psychological safety and error management climate. Frontiers in Psychology, 11, 571840-571840. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.571840

Suppiah, V., & Singh Sandhu, M. (2011). Organisational culture's influence on tacit knowledge-sharing behaviour. Journal of Knowledge Management, 15(3), 462-477. https://doi.org/10.1108/13673271111137439

Timothy Church, A., Ortiz, F. A., Katigbak, M. S., Avdeyeva, T. V., Emerson, A. M., Vargas Flores, José de Jesús, & Reyes, J. I. (2003). Measuring individual and cultural differences in implicit trait theories. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85(2), 332-347. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.2.332

Tomasello, M., Carpenter, M., Call, J., Behne, T., & Moll, H. (2005). Understanding and sharing intentions: The origins of cultural cognition. The Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 28(5), 675-691. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X05000129

Uhl-Bien, M. (2006). Relational leadership theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. The Leadership Quarterly, 17(6), 654-676.

Vantrappen, H., & Wirtz, F. (2018). A smarter process for managing and explaining organization design change. Strategy & Leadership, 46(5), 36-43. https://doi.org/10.1108/SL-06-2018-0057

Walumbwa, F. O., & Hartnell, C. A. (2011). Understanding transformational leadership–employee performance links: The role of relational identification and self-efficacy. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 84(1), 153-172. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317910X485818

Yan, N., Ansari, A., & Wang, Y. (2019). Intrusive parenting and child externalizing behaviors across childhood: The antecedents and consequences of child-driven effects. Journal of Family Psychology, 33(6), 661-670. https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000551

Zaidi, Z., Verstegen, D., Naqvi, R., Morahan, P., & Dornan, T. (2016). Gender, religion, and sociopolitical issues in cross-cultural online education. Advances in Health Sciences Education : Theory and Practice, 21(2), 287-301. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-015-9631-z

Zhou, F., & Wu, Y. J. (2018). How humble leadership fosters employee innovation behavior: A two-way perspective on the leader-employee interaction. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 39(3), 375-387. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-07-2017-0181

Zhu, W., Zhu, W., Zheng, X., Zheng, X., He, H., He, H., Wang, G., Wang, G., Zhang, X., & Zhang, X. (2019;2017;). Ethical leadership with both "Moral person" and "Moral manager" aspects: Scale development and cross-cultural validation. Journal of Business Ethics, 158(2), 547-565. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3740-y