



ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Social Science & Medicine

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/socscimed

Review article

Evidence-based leadership development for physicians: A systematic literature review

Jaason M. Geerts^{a,b,*}, Amanda H. Goodall^{c,d}, Stevie Agius^e^a Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge, 184 Hills Rd, Cambridge, CB2 8PQ, UK^b Health Education England (HEE) and the National Health Service (NHS) North West, 3 Piccadilly Place, London Road, Manchester, M1 3BN, UK^c Cass Business School, City, University of London, 106 Bunhill Row, London, EC1Y 8TZ, UK^d IZA Labor Research Institute, Germany^e School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham, NG7 2RD, UK

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Leadership development
Physicians
Systematic literature review
Outcomes
Impact

ABSTRACT

Interest in leadership development in healthcare is substantial. Yet it remains unclear which interventions are most reliably associated with positive outcomes. We focus on the important area of physician leadership development in a systematic literature review of the latest research from 2007 to 2016. The paper applies a validated instrument used for medical education, MERSQI, to the included studies. Ours is the first review in this research area to create a tiered rating system to assess the best available evidence. We concentrate on findings from papers in the highly-rated categories. First, our review concludes that improvements in individual-level outcomes can be achieved (e.g. knowledge, motivation, skills, and behaviour change). Second, development programs can substantially improve organizational and benefit to patients outcomes. Third, some of the most effective interventions include: interactive workshops, videotaped simulations followed by peer and expert feedback, Multisource Feedback (MSF), coaching, action learning, and mentoring. Fourth, the evidence suggests that objective outcome data should be collected at baseline, end of program, and retrospectively. An outcomes-based approach appears to be the most effective design of programs. We also make recommendations for future research and practice.

1. Introduction

Leadership development is a burgeoning global enterprise, with an expanding number of program providers (Lacerenza et al., 2017) and an annual spend estimated at \$50 billion (USD) (Kellerman, 2012, 2018). This equals nearly half of all funds allocated annually to cancer treatment (QuintilesIMS Institute, 2017). Research from healthcare shows that leadership development interventions can improve the capabilities of individuals and contribute to better organizational and benefit to patients outcomes (Burke and Day, 1986; Husebø and Akerjordet, 2016; Komives et al., 1998; Pfeffer, 2016; Rosenman et al., 2014; Steinert et al., 2012; Stoller, 2008, 2009). However, the evidence on the effectiveness of different programs is conflicting. Indeed, questions about efficacy have led to pressure to demonstrate the effect of interventions by linking them to outcomes and establishing a clear return on investment (Avolio et al., 2010; Kellerman, 2018).

Our study provides a new kind of systematic review. With a focus on healthcare, we use an innovative methodology to advance

understanding about which elements of design, delivery, and evaluation of leadership development interventions are most reliably linked to outcomes at the level of the individual, the organization, and of benefit to patients. Analysis is problematic when it is not immediately apparent which studies' findings are substantiated by objective evidence and which are not (Antonakis et al., 2011; Hamlin, 2010; Husebø and Akerjordet, 2016; Pfeffer, 2016; Rousseau and McCarthy, 2007; Rynes et al., 2014). This can be confusing and misleading for readers. We applied the Medical Education Research Study Quality Instrument (MERSQI), a validated instrument used for medical education, to all the included studies to assess the reliability of evidence reported in each. Ours is the first review to produce a transparent category rating system that clearly presents the strength of evidence linking elements of programs to outcomes. This study addresses the research gaps, builds on previous review articles, and highlights the preeminent leadership development strategies.

* Corresponding author. Current address: Canadian College of Health Leaders, 150 Isabella Street, suite 1102, Ottawa, K1S 1V7, Canada.

E-mail addresses: jaasongeerts@cantab.net (J.M. Geerts), amanda.goodall.1@city.ac.uk (A.H. Goodall), Steven.Agius@hee.nhs.uk (S. Agius).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.112709>

Received 20 June 2019; Received in revised form 28 November 2019; Accepted 29 November 2019

Available online 30 November 2019

0277-9536/ © 2019 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

2. Background

Formal leadership development programs are being offered in military academies, business schools, international corporations, and, relatively recently, in medical schools (McKimm, Spurgeon, Needham, and O'Sullivan, 2011; Solansky, 2010). A desire for capable leaders is to be expected given the consequences of disturbingly common leadership failures (Caulkin, 2015; Kellerman, 2018; Pfeffer, 2016) and the positive influence that leaders and managers have on employee job satisfaction (Artz et al., 2017; Rynes et al., 2014; Sellgren et al., 2008), employee performance (Lazear et al., 2015), and organizational performance (Goodall, 2011; Spurgeon et al., 2015; Spurgeon et al., 2011).

In healthcare, leadership development initiatives are found to benefit patients through reduced clinical errors and mortality rates, shorter lengths of stay in hospital (Husebø and Akerjordet, 2016; Rosenman et al., 2014), and reduced costs (Mountford and Webb, 2009). However, the extraordinary growth of leadership development programs has sparked some to suggest that a "great training robbery" is occurring (Beer et al., 2016), while others argue that the investment is wasted and potentially even harmful (Blume et al., 2010; Kellerman, 2012; McDonald, 2017; Pfeffer, 2015; Watkins, Lysø, and deMarrais, 2011). The financial outlay, significant time commitments in delivering and undertaking development programs, and the ensuing opportunity cost for those involved, make leadership development a 'high-stakes game' (Antonakis et al., 2011). Surprisingly, most leadership program designs do not incorporate robust evaluation processes (Alimo-Metcalfe and Lawlor, 2001; Geerts, 2018). Those who do follow up often rely on surveys of participants' satisfaction (Kellerman, 2012), which offer no indication of application to the workplace (immediate or sustained) (Straus et al., 2013). Others frequently confine assessment to the individual, which neglects the broader organizational-level impact (Avolio, 2005). It is also potentially worrying if program designs or funding decisions are made using unsubstantiated evidence (Phillips et al., 2015; Rousseau, 2006; Zaccaro and Horn, 2003), particularly in fields such as healthcare where people's lives, safety, health, or well-being are on the line (Bruppacher et al., 2010; Hannah et al., 2009; Salas et al., 2012). Thus far, the evidence on the effectiveness of different programs is equivocal, with effect sizes ranging from -1.4 to 2.1 (Collins and Holton III, 2004). The majority of leadership interventions are generally well-rated (Frich et al., 2015; Steinert et al., 2012); however, worryingly, some authors report that the transfer of learning to the workplace is low, with as few as five per cent of trainees claiming to have successfully applied their skills on the job (Gilpin-Jackson and Bushe, 2007). More concerning are accounts of programs that have apparently failed altogether (DeNisi and Kluger, 2000; Kwamie et al., 2014; Malling et al., 2009).

This highlights an underlying problem and a need, addressed by this paper, to clarify explicitly which elements of leadership development interventions are empirically linked to improved outcomes at different levels (Day and Sin, 2011; Hannum and Bartholomew, 2010; Ileri et al., 2011; Klimoski and Amos, 2012; Powell and Yalcin, 2010).

2.1. Physician leadership development

Our study examines physician leadership development for several reasons. First, healthcare organizations employ 234 million people globally with a spend projected to reach 8.7 trillion (USD) by 2020 (World Health Organization, 2018). Second, formal leadership development programs for doctors are relatively recent and attempts to examine their impact, while growing, is limited (Dine et al., 2011; Ileri et al., 2011; Lee and Hall, 2010; McAlearney, 2010; Stoller, 2008, 2009). Third, physicians determine how a considerable portion of resources are allocated, and they play a vital role in driving improvement initiatives (Bohmer, 2011; Byrnes, 2016; Chadi, 2009; Daly et al., 2014; Denis and van Gestel, 2016; Dickson and Van Aerde, 2018; Geerts, 2019). Fourth, there is growing evidence showing that engaging

physicians in leadership is linked to improved patient care and organizational performance (Falcone and Santiani, 2008; Goodall, 2011; Perry et al., 2017; Spurgeon et al., 2015, 2011; Tasi et al., 2017). Finally, given the common contention that the currency of success in leadership development is the transfer or application of learning to the workplace, this field provides an additional and important measurable outcome: benefit to patients (Day et al., 2014; Edmonstone, 2013; Lacerenza et al., 2017; Reed et al., 2007).

With reference to the generalizability of our focus on healthcare, the challenges that physicians face may be viewed as analogous to those faced by leaders in other sectors (Edler et al., 2010). For example, physician leaders often function as decision-makers in large, complex, high-intensity environments with constrained budgets, as well as alternating leadership and membership positions within teams or coalitions (Perry, Mobley, & Brubaker, 2017; Taylor, 2010). Similarly, the core skills that physician leaders require, such as adaptability, enabling and motivating others to realize a shared vision, and shaping organizational culture, are common among most leaders. Finally, there is a considerable overlap between approaches to leadership development in healthcare and in other domains (Geerts, 2018). In summary, the features of physician leadership development and the potential generalizability to leadership development in other sectors make it an interesting case.

2.2. Previous reviews

Previous literature reviews on leadership development for physicians have found a link between interventions and self-reported individual-level outcomes, such as increased knowledge, skills, behaviours, and competence, as well as increased self-awareness, motivation, and attitudes toward leadership (Frich et al., 2015; Rosenman et al., 2014; Straus et al., 2013). Leadership programs are also reported to contribute to objective individual outcomes, such as promotions, assuming leadership roles, and improved Multisource Feedback scores and performance ratings (Frich et al., 2015; Rosenman et al., 2014; Straus et al., 2013). Studies have shown that leadership programs can also influence organizational outcomes such as reduced absenteeism (Straus et al., 2013), as well as benefit to patients outcomes, such as length of stay in hospital, decreased clinical error rates, decreased morbidity and mortality rates, and increased scores on quality of care indicators (Frich et al., 2015; Husebø and Akerjordet, 2016; Rosenman et al., 2014).

Lectures have been identified as the most common developmental activity, and, though less frequent, simulations and action learning are also commonly included in development programs (Frich et al., 2015; Rosenman et al., 2014). In terms of program evaluation, a limited number of studies involved a control group, and many relied on self-reports, rather than assessment sometime after the intervention, which leads to greater understanding about the transfer or application of learning to the workplace (Frich et al., 2015; Husebø and Akerjordet, 2016; Rosenman et al., 2014). Finally, while two reviews reported studies of interventions that failed, they did not investigate the suggested causes, which could be helpful to inform the design of future programs (Husebø and Akerjordet, 2016; Straus et al., 2013).

Importantly, and of relevance to our study, the authors of previous reviews indicated that given the relatively low quality of evidence, their ability to determine best practice for leadership development was limited (Husebø and Akerjordet, 2016; Rosenman et al., 2014). They suggest that a higher degree of evidence is needed that links elements of programs to outcomes, particularly at the organizational and benefit to patients levels (Husebø and Akerjordet, 2016; Rosenman et al., 2014). Our study has striven to do this.

Our study attempts to address common methodological flaws that previous review authors highlight, such as relying exclusively on subjective data and incomplete reporting of study details, which restrict readers' ability to learn from articles' findings (Husebø and Akerjordet, 2016; Reed et al., 2008; Straus et al., 2013).

3. Methods

The research question guiding our systematic review was: what reliable evidence exists of approaches to the design, delivery, and evaluation of leadership development for physicians that are associated with improved outcomes?

After establishing a formal research protocol to guide the process (Petticrew and Roberts, 2006), two researchers worked independently to enhance the quality and objectivity of the study (Moher et al., 2009). The design of this review was informed by three resources: The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) (Moher et al., 2009), the Cochrane Review Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (The Cochrane Collaboration et al., 2011), and the Cook and West (2012) strategy for conducting systematic reviews in medical education. We then applied the Participants, Interventions, Comparison, Outcomes, and Study Design (PICOS) framework (Richardson et al., 1995) to specify the key study elements (see Table 1).

Table 1
PICOS framework.

PICOS (Participants, Interventions, Comparison, Outcomes, Study Design)	
P	Physicians
I	Leadership development programs or interventions
C	When possible, compare outcomes to those of physicians who did not participate in leadership development
O	Impact on outcomes at the individual, organizational, and benefit to patients levels
S	Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods designs were included

We categorized the reported outcomes of leadership programs according to a modified version of the four-level Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2006) model for development programs (see Table 2). Level 1 describes participant satisfaction (Post-Program Evaluations (PPE's)), Level 2a reflects changes in participants' attitudes or perspectives, such as increased engagement and aspirations to lead, Level 2b concerns improved knowledge and skills, and Level 3a denotes self-reported changes in participants' behaviour. Level 3b, which refers to objective indications of behaviour change, such as improved Multi-source Feedback (MSF) results (pre and post), was added, and we separated Level 4a, organizational impact, such as decreased absenteeism or implementing a new program, and Level 4b, benefit to patients outcomes, such as a decrease in patient mortality rates.

Table 2
Modified version of Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick's (2006) model of development program outcomes.

Level	Details
1	Participant satisfaction with the program
2a	Changes in participants' attitudes or perspectives
2b	Changes in participants' knowledge and skills
3a	Self-reported changes in participants' behaviour
3b	Objective indicators of changes in participants' behaviour
4a	Organizational impact
4b	Benefit to patients (subjective and objective)

A final preliminary step was to undertake a search for existing literature reviews on leadership development for physicians, through which we identified six articles. We used these reviews to inform the design of this study. To our knowledge, no other review appeared to systematically isolate the most reliable evidence of elements of interventions that are linked to outcomes based on the methodological quality of the included studies. This novel approach separates the more robust evidence from somewhat limited or uncertain reports (Geerts, 2018), which is why we elected to take this approach. Instead, most

review authors tended to present raw data (such as the demographic characteristics of the samples) with descriptions of the studies' reported outcomes and overarching observations.

3.1. Criteria for inclusion and exclusion

The next step involved conducting a systematic literature review of leadership development interventions. Studies were included in our review if they met the following criteria: a) they evaluated the effectiveness of a leadership development intervention (rather than simply presenting a model, theory, or a program that was not evaluated); and b) their sample included physicians, and/or physicians and other healthcare professionals. In addition to the focus on physicians mentioned above, this inclusion criteria enabled comparisons between the outcomes of leadership development programs with physician-only versus interdisciplinary samples, which is an important consideration in the field (Frich et al., 2015).

Reports that focused on one individual task, such as making a business plan, a single capability, such as facilitating innovation, or programs where leadership was only one of many learning outcomes, were not included.

3.2. Literature search

The search strategy was guided by two specialist librarians from the University of Cambridge (Cahill et al., 2018). The search was conducted using the following electronic databases: Business Source Complete, ABI, ERIC, Pubmed/Medline, Embase, Scopus, and Web of Science, as well as the Cochrane Central Registry. Articles were limited to those published in English-language peer-reviewed journals from January 2007 to December 2016. The terms used in all the searches were: "lead*" AND ("educat*" OR "develop*" OR "teach*" OR "taught" OR "train*"). The population was not specified because various synonyms of physician (e.g. doctor, resident, consultant, oncologist) are used in the titles and keywords of articles. Unpublished studies and popular leadership literature were not included. The initial search yielded a provisional sample of 18,999 records, which was predictably large. Scanning the titles of each article reduced the potentially relevant studies to 600 records. In the next stage, we examined the abstracts and, if necessary, the full texts. Relevant studies not identified in the initial search were added via citation chasing after reviewing the bibliographies. Twenty-five unique empirical studies met the inclusion criteria (see Fig. 1).

3.3. Coding

Details of the 25 included studies were then coded in four broad categories: study design, sample, program, and evaluation (see Table 4 and Table 5). The program goals, leadership theories, and the topics or curricular content addressed in the included studies were also coded, but were too heterogenous to include in the analysis.

3.4. MERSQI

In order to isolate the most reliable evidence of leadership development effectiveness, we began by assessing the methodological quality of the included studies using a validated instrument, the Medical Education Research Study Quality Instrument (MERSQI) (Reed et al., 2007). This tool was designed in response to widespread acknowledgement of deficiencies in the quality of medical education research and to a desire for increased methodological rigor (Dauphinee and Wood-Dauphinee, 2004; Lurie, 2003), reminiscent of the Terpstra (1981) classification system. Other instruments were considered for this review, including the Cochrane Assessment Tool for Non-Randomized Studies of Interventions (Sterne et al., 2014), which is not specific to leadership development programs, and the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale




Fig. 1. Literature search process.

(NOS) (Wells et al., 2016), which does not feature numerical score components.

Quantifying aspects of study design highlights those that contribute to robust and reliable findings and enables quick tabulation of these key quality indicators, as well as comparisons among studies. To our knowledge, our review is unique because it includes the complete MERSQI scores for each section, rather than just the total for each study or the mean for the included study set (Rosenman et al., 2014) (see Table 7). This breakdown increases transparency and provides readers with a detailed assessment of the methodological strengths and weaknesses of each reviewed study, which can then be used to assess the validity of their key findings. MERSQI includes ten items pertaining to six domains of study quality: design, sampling, type of data (subjective or objective), validity, data analysis, and outcomes (see Table 5). Each of these aspects is scored on a three-point ordinal scale and the results are summed to produce a total score out of 18, with a minimum of 5. We replaced the instrument term “appropriateness” of data analysis with “comprehensiveness” in order to avoid placing a value judgment on the included studies.

3.5. Category groupings

To focus our key findings, we created three categories of methodological reliability (gold, silver, bronze) (see Table 6). The variable “k” is used to denote an included article, whereas “n” is used to represent a respondent in an included study. The category groupings that we created are similar in concept to the five levels of methodological rigor of organizational development (OD) studies that Terpstra (1981) created. Our groupings were created by analyzing combinations of the total MERSQI scores for each study, plus combinations of key methodological indicators of robust and reliable findings. For example, studies that included a control group (where there was no ‘treatment’ given), collected objective data, used detailed forms of data collection, conducted sophisticated and comprehensive data analysis, and targeted

Level 4b outcomes would receive a minimum of 14 points, the lowest mark of the gold category. Placing studies in this category would indicate a high level of reliability of their findings. Leaving out one of these elements would tend to result in a minimum score of 12, the lowest mark of the silver category. Omitting two of those elements would further challenge the reliability of a study’s findings and consequently result in a score lower than 12, which would be categorized as a bronze study. Bronze studies also tended to rely on self-ratings, which have been shown to be potentially unreliable as single sources of data (Berg and Karlsen, 2012; Blume et al., 2010; Taylor et al., 2009). The intention in creating these groupings was to address the need suggested by previous review authors (Day and O’Connor, 2003), and to identify aspects of program design, delivery, and evaluation that are empirically linked to improved outcomes. These are unique features of this review.

The gold category contains MERSQI scores from 14 to 18. Gold studies correlate objective outcome information by using pre-program data and assessment sometime after the intervention (post-post) to measure whether there has been a relative and sustained change in outcomes. Gold studies also compared the outcomes of the intervention participants to those of a control group (e.g. Ten Have, Nap, and Tulleken, 2013). The silver category includes studies that obtained MERSQI scores of between 12 and 13.5. Silver studies correlated objective data with outcomes, but they had methodological limitations or omitted study details (e.g. Kuo et al., 2010). Lastly, studies in the bronze category received MERSQI scores from 5 to 12. Bronze studies were characterized by the inclusion of findings typically based on subjective ratings or authorial perceptions, rather than objective data, or, again, by methodological limitations or omission of study details.

Finally, once we had isolated the most reliable elements of leadership development program design, delivery, and evaluation based on the gold and silver studies, we tracked the frequency with which programs described in the included studies implemented them. The intention was to ascertain the extent to which there was a research/practice divide.

4. Results

The MERSQI scores for the 25 included studies ranged from 5 to 15 with a median score of 10 and a mean of 10 (+2.6), which places the mean in the bronze category (see Table 7). These results mirror those in the Rosenman et al. (2014) review.

4.1. Raw data findings

The raw data collected from the included studies can be found in Table 3 and Table 4. To summarize, among the 25 studies, the most common research design was case study ($k = 14$), at a single site ($k = 24$), featuring one iteration of the intervention ($k = 19$), that involved collecting both qualitative and quantitative data ($k = 12$). Eight studies used only qualitative information. Data were collected most often using questionnaires ($k = 21$) and self-ratings ($k = 22$), with more than half of the studies ($k = 13$) relying on single raters, which prevents data triangulation and can increase response bias (Malling et al., 2009; Solansky, 2010). Evaluation most often involved assessments at the end of interventions (post) ($k = 14$); however, half of the studies ($k = 12$) did not include a measure sometime after (post-post), which precludes assessing the sustained impact of the intervention in the workplace. Similarly, 56 per cent of studies ($k = 14$) did not include a pre-intervention or baseline measurement, which can serve as a reference point to assess relative change, and only two studies (8%) combined pre, post, and post-post assessments. Most programs took place in North America ($k = 15$), with only one study from Africa and none from Asia, the Middle East, or Central or South America. The durations of the interventions were highly variable, ranging from one day to four years, with the majority being longer than eight months ($k = 14$). Programs were often delivered in-house ($k = 18$), and

Table 3
Coding for the 25 included studies (1/2).

First author and publication year	Design	Samples				Data collection methods	Physicians only?	Level of seniority
		Methodology	No. participants	No. control	Female, male			
Hemmer et al. (2007)	Action research/case study	Questionnaire, document analysis	16	None	NR	No	Residents (internal)	
Korschun et al. (2007)	Action research/case study	Questionnaire, interviews	70	None	NR	No	Mixed	
Miller et al. (2007)	Case study	Questionnaire	210	None	NR	No	Senior leaders	
Dannels et al. (2008)	Experiment	Questionnaire	78	468	78, 0	No	Senior faculty	
Bergman et al. (2009)	Multiple case study	Questionnaire, focus group interviews	109	None	95, 14	No	First-line managers	
Edmonstone (2009)	Case study	Questionnaire, interviews, document analysis	218	None	NR	No	Senior leaders	
Malling et al. (2009)	Quasi-experiment	Questionnaire, statistical analysis	20	28	NR	Yes	Consultant (education)	
Murdoch and Brammer (2011)	Case study	Questionnaire	100	None	NR	Yes	Physicians unspecified	
Cherry et al. (2010)	Case study	Unclear	141	None	NR	Yes	Junior physicians	
Day et al. (2010)	Case study	Questionnaire, document analysis	100	73	NR	Yes	Orthopaedic surgeons (unspecified)	
Kuo et al. (2010)	Case study	Questionnaire	15	None	NR	Yes	Residents (pediatric)	
Edmonstone (2011)	Case study	Questionnaire, document analysis, interviews	125	None	NR	No	Potential senior clinical leaders	

First author and publication year	Intervention		Evaluation		Outcomes				
	Location	Faculty (internal, external, both)	Sites	In-house vs external	Length of intervention	Raters	When	Kirkpatrick levels	Reported outcomes and benefits
Hemmer et al. (2007)	USA	Both	Single	In-house	1 year	Self, faculty	Baseline, post, post-post	1, 2b	1) PPE's; 2b) Increased knowledge tests results
Korschun et al. (2007)	USA	Both	Single	In-house	5 months	Self	Post-post	1, 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 4a, 4b	1) PPE's; 2a) Increased aspirations to lead, increased engagement, increased commitment; 2b) Increased knowledge and interpersonal and teamwork skills; 3a) effectiveness, networking benefits, have taken on more responsibility; 3b) Retention, promotions, have taken on a leadership role, increased committee involvement; 4a) Having launched a new initiative; 4b) Having implemented action learning projects

(continued on next page)

Table 3 (continued)

First author and publication year	Intervention		Evaluation				Outcomes		
	Location	Faculty (internal, external, both)	Sites	In-house vs external	Length of intervention	Raters	When	Kirkpatrick levels	Reported outcomes and benefits
Miller et al. (2007)	USA	Unclear	Single	External	1 year	Self	Post-post, Retrospective post	1, 2a, 2b, 3a, 4a	1) PPE's; 2a) Increased confidence and self-awareness; 2b) Increased leadership knowledge and skills; 3a) Increased leadership behaviours; 4a) General organizational benefits, developing and strengthening their organizations' collaborative relationships, and developing or implementing a new program
Dannels et al. (2008)	USA	Unclear	Single	External	Unclear	Self	Baseline, post-post	2a, 2b, 3b	2a) Increased aspirations to lead; 2b) Increased knowledge; 3b) Improved MSF pre and post, promotions, higher participation in further leadership development following programs
Bergman et al. (2009)	Sweden	External	Single	In-house	1 week	Self	Pre, post-post	1, 2a, 2b, 3a	1) PPE's; 2a) Increased confidence and self-awareness; 2b) Increased knowledge and communication skills; 3a) Increased leadership behaviours
Edmonstone (2009)	England	Both	Four	External	1 year	Self, faculty	Post-post	1, 2a, 2b, 3a, 4a	1) PPE's; 2a) Greater appreciation of others' perspectives, increased engagement, enhanced common identity, increased confidence; 2b) Increased leadership skills; 3a) Increased leadership behaviours, networking benefits, developed PDP's; 4a) Having launched a new initiative
Malling et al. (2009)	Denmark	Unclear	Single	External	6 months	Self, subordinate, peer	Pre, post-post	1, 2b, 3a	1) PPE's; 2b) Increased knowledge; 3a) Increased leadership behaviours
Murdock and Brammer (2011)	USA	Both	Single	External	20 weeks	Self	Pre, post	1, 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b	1) PPE's; 2a) Increased aspirations to lead; 2b) Increased leadership skills; 3a) Increased leadership behaviours; 3b) Having taken on a leadership role
Cherry et al. (2010)	USA	Internal	Single	In-house	9 months	Peer, faculty, superior	N/A	1, 2b, 3b	1) PPE's; 2b) Increased leadership skills; 3b) Research publications

(continued on next page)

Table 3 (continued)

First author and publication year	Intervention		Evaluation			Outcomes			
	Location	Faculty (internal, external, both)	Sites	In-house vs external	Length of intervention	Raters	When	Kirkpatrick levels	Reported outcomes and benefits
Day et al. (2010)	USA	Unclear	Single	External	1 year	Self	Pre, baseline	2a, 2b, 3a, 3b	2a) Increased confidence, 2b) Increased knowledge and skills, 3a) Positive impact on their careers; 3b) Having taken on a leadership role, increased committee involvement, research publications, increased academic rank, hospital administrative rank (chair or chief)
Kuo et al. (2010)	USA	Internal	Single	In-house	3 years	Self, statistics	Post, post-post	1, 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b	1) PPE's; 2a) Increased aspirations to lead; 2b) Increased leadership competence; 3a) Positive impact on their careers; 3b) Awards won, grants earned, and research publications, having taken on leadership roles, promotions
Edmonstone (2011)	Scotland	Unclear	Single	In-house	1 year	Self, subordinate, peer, superior	Pre, post	1, 2a, 2b, 3b, 4a, 4b	1) PPE's; 2a) Increased self-awareness, increased resilience, increased engagement; 2b) Developing interpersonal and networking skills; 3b) Colleagues' feedback on behaviour changes, promotions, 4a) Policy changes, developed organizational capacity; 4b) Implementing action learning projects; Other) Having joined a mentoring network

Note: PPE's = Post program Evaluations. MSF = Multisource Feedback. PDP = Personal Development Plan.

frequently combined internal and external faculty ($k = 9$). Women made up 66 per cent of the samples and 53 per cent of the physician-only samples were women ($k = 15$). The most common level of seniority among participant samples was junior physicians ($k = 9$), and program participants tended to have been nominated ($k = 7$) or they volunteered ($k = 6$).

Thirty-three different developmental activities were included in a heterogeneous series of combinations, with only one study utilizing a single activity. The most common activities were workshops ($k = 14$), reading assignments ($k = 11$), small group discussion/work ($k = 11$), 360-degree assessments (360s)/Multisource Feedback (MSF) ($k = 9$), and simulations/role plays ($k = 9$). Only eight programs involved lectures, possibly suggesting that the traditional didactic default is shifting to include more experiential methods (Blumenthal et al., 2014; Steinert et al., 2012). The most frequently reported outcomes and benefits were Post-Program Evaluations (PPE's) ($n = 21$, Level 1), self-reported increased skills ($n = 13$, Level 2b), knowledge ($n = 12$, Level 2b), and behaviours ($n = 10$, Level 3a). Nearly a third of studies ($k = 7$) relied exclusively on subjective, individual outcomes at the Kirkpatrick Levels 1 – 3a. Only five studies (20%) reported organizational impact outcomes (Level 4a) and only six (24%) claimed benefit to patient outcomes (Level 4b). No study enabled participants to set their own evaluation outcome metrics, despite the potential benefit of increased perceived relevance to their specific professional contexts that personalization offers (Burke and Hutchins, 2007; Knowles, 1984).

4.2. Elements of leadership development programs reliably linked to outcomes and impact

In this section, we isolate the elements of leadership development from our key findings in studies that obtained a gold or silver rating (see Table 8). Evidence from these studies suggests that leadership development can facilitate increased self-ratings of competence, self-efficacy, self-awareness, and leadership knowledge and skills (Dannels et al., 2008; Day et al., 2010; MacPhail et al., 2015; Patel et al., 2015). Interventions are also associated with increased frequency of observable leadership behaviours, including those related to technical performance, decision-making, communication, and teamwork (Ten Have et al., 2013). Development programs have been found to have a positive impact on career progression (Dannels et al., 2008; Day et al., 2010; Kuo et al., 2010) and on increased aspirations to lead following an intervention (Dannels et al., 2008; MacPhail et al., 2015; Patel et al., 2015). Finally, and importantly, leadership development is associated with organizational impact (Level 4a) (Husebø and Akerjordet, 2016; Patel et al., 2015; Rosenman et al., 2014) and benefit to patients (Level 4b) (Ten Have et al., 2013; Weaver et al., 2014).

Several developmental activities were reliably correlated with outcomes. These include interactive workshops, including videotaped simulations with expert and peer feedback, which have been shown to be effective in improving technical, teamwork, communication, and leadership skills, as well as in enhancing self-awareness (Patel et al., 2015; Ten Have et al., 2013). Action learning, or leadership impact projects, can facilitate a variety of outcomes at the organizational and the benefit to patients levels and these activities include the application of learning directly to the workplace (Kuo et al., 2010; MacPhail et al., 2015; Patel et al., 2015). Though a common term in the academic literature, 'action learning' in this context differs from action learning sets, common in the UK, which are akin to group coaching.

Experiential approaches to leadership development are becoming more common. The suggestion that they are more effective for transfer or application of learning than the traditional default of lecture-centric programs was supported in this review (Kolb, 1984; Steinert et al., 2012). For example, interactive workshops were cited in 14 interventions, and action learning projects were included in the same number of interventions as those that used lectures ($k = 8$). Coaching, 360s/Multisource Feedback, and mentoring were also shown to increase

performance, enhance self-awareness, and effectively support other developmental activities (Bowles et al., 2007; Day et al., 2010; Leskiw and Singh, 2007; McCauley, 2008; Watkins et al., 2011).

An outcomes-based program design that explicitly links the goals, desired outcomes, content, delivery, and evaluation seems to be optimal (Geerts, 2018; Kuo et al., 2010; MacPhail et al., 2015; Nabi et al., 2017). It is most beneficial if these desired outcomes are informed by a pre-intervention needs and gap analysis (Kuo et al., 2010; Malling et al., 2009) and a capability framework (Garman et al., 2011; Kuo et al., 2010; Ten Have et al., 2013). Furthermore, incorporating Knowles's (1984) principles of adult learning into the design of leadership interventions is reported to enhance their effectiveness (MacPhail et al., 2015; Ten Have et al., 2013).

Certain factors of organizational culture can significantly enhance or corrode the effectiveness of programs and, most importantly, the transfer or application of learning to the workplace (Cheng and Hampson, 2008; Kuo et al., 2010; Malling et al., 2009; Tracey and Tews, 2005). While both physician-only (Day et al., 2010; Ten Have et al., 2013) and interdisciplinary (Dannels et al., 2008) leadership development programs have been shown to be effective, these two approaches have not been directly compared. Embedding a leadership program in a medical residency program has been shown to work (Patel et al., 2015) and can contribute to self-reports of increased clinical skills (Kuo et al., 2010).

Our findings support several effective evaluation components, such as targeting objective behaviour change (Level 3b), organizational impact (Level 4a), and benefit to patients (Level 4b) outcomes by collecting data at different points. These time points comprise measuring at baseline, at the end of an intervention (post), and retrospectively (post-post) to assess the relative and sustained outcomes (Dannels et al., 2008; Ten Have et al., 2013). Other key factors include collecting quantitative and objective data through external raters and by using formal statistics (Dannels et al., 2008; Malling et al., 2009; Ten Have et al., 2013), as well as comparing individual or team performance to those in a control group or a non-intervention population (Dannels et al., 2008; Day et al., 2010). This application can take time (Abrell et al., 2011; Dannels et al., 2008). Participants' self-ratings of leadership capabilities can also decrease from baseline to the end of an intervention because of having developed a deeper understanding of leadership or as a result of increased self-awareness. In other situations, participants' self-ratings of their leadership capabilities, confidence, and self-efficacy can decrease from the end of the intervention to post-post ratings when they experience challenges applying their learning to the workplace (Fernandez et al., 2016; Sanfey et al., 2011). This may also extend to substantial declines in team performance and clinical outcomes over time (Kwamie et al., 2014). Evaluation is not only beneficial from a research and demonstrating ROI perspective, it has been shown to enhance the outcomes of programs (Latham and Locke, 1983; Watkins, Lysø, and deMarrais, 2011).

Program outcomes measurements tend to be focused at the level of the individual, with only 20 per cent of included studies measuring and reporting organizational impact outcomes. However, it is important to assess outcomes beyond the individual to organizational (Level 4a) and benefit to patients (Level 4b) levels (Ten Have et al., 2013). Mixed methods are arguably preferable for analyzing the complexities of leadership development. Quantitative data can substantiate findings and track frequency distribution among responses, while qualitative responses can illuminate the nuances of how, for whom, to what extent, or in what circumstances interventions were effective or not (Kwamie et al., 2014; Steinert et al., 2012).

Many questions are not addressed in these studies. For example, evidence supporting optimal development strategies for different levels of seniority, domains, or professions, is absent. Research that examines the providers of programs is also missing. It might be interesting to compare programs designed and facilitated by university academics to those designed by private-sector consultants and to those created by in-

Table 4
Coding for the 25 included studies (1/2).

First author and publication year	Design	Sample				Physicians only?	Level of seniority
		No. participants	No. control	Female, male	Physicians only?		
Sanfey et al. (2011)	Grounded theory	142	None	50, 92	No	Mixed	
Bearman et al. (2012)	Case study	12	None	NR	Yes	Surgical residents	
Shah et al. (2013)	Case study	40	None	NR	Yes	Consultant (ophthalmic surgeons)	
Ten Have et al. (2013)	Quasi-experiment	9	10	7, 12	Yes	Midlevel surgeons	
Vimr and Dickens (2013)	Action research/case study	-	None	NR	Yes	Physicians unspecified	
Blumenthal et al. (2014)	Action research	16	None	10, 6	Yes	Residents (Internal medicine)	
Dickey et al. (2014)	Action research/case study	-	None	NR	Yes	Residents (psychiatry)	
MacPhail et al. (2015)	Case study	39	None	32, 7	No	Middle and senior leaders	
Satiani et al. (2014)	Case study	-	None	NR	Yes	Physicians (early to mid career high potentials)	
Nakanjako et al. (2015)	Case study	15	None	NR	No	Physicians unspecified	
Patel et al. (2015)	Action research	62	None	NR	Yes	Residents	
Fernandez et al. (2016)	Quasi-experiment	37	None	26, 11	Yes	Junior fellows	
Pradarelli et al. (2016)	Case study	21	None	2, 5	Yes	Surgeon unspecified	

First author and publication year	Intervention	Evaluation				Outcomes
		Location	Faculty (internal, external, both)	Sites	Length of intervention	
Sanfey et al. (2011)	USA	Both	Single	In-house	10 weeks	1) PPEs; 2a) Increased aspirations to lead, increased self-awareness, increased leadership self-identity; 2b) Increased knowledge and skills; 3a) Increased leadership behaviours, networking benefits; 3b) Promotions
Bearman et al. (2012)	Australia and New Zealand	Unclear	Single	In-house	2 days	1) PPEs; 2a) Increased engagement, 2b) Increased knowledge and skills, 3a) Increased leadership behaviours
Shah et al. (2013)	UK	External	Single	In-house	2 days	3b) Improved MSF pre and post 1) PPEs; 2a) Improved self-awareness, developed a systems view; 3a) Increased leadership behaviours; 4b) Having implemented action learning projects
Ten Have et al. (2013)	Netherlands	Internal	Single	In-house	1 day	1) PPEs; 2a) Increased confidence, increased self-awareness, increased awareness of different leadership styles, increased interest in further development programs; 2b) Increased knowledge and skills
Vimr and Dickens (2013)	Canada	Unclear	Single	In-house	8 months	1) Authors' perceptions of program strengths; 2b) Developed negotiation skills
Blumenthal et al. (2014)	USA	Internal	Single	In-house	1 month	1, 2a, 2b
Dickey et al. (2014)	USA	Internal	Single	In-house	4 years	1, 2b

Table 4 (continued)

First author and publication year	Intervention		Evaluation			Outcomes			
	Location	Faculty (internal, external, both)	Sites	In-house vs external	Length of intervention	Raters	When	Kirkpatrick levels	Reported outcomes and benefits
MacPhail et al. (2015)	Australia	Both	Single	In-house	9–10 months	Self, superior	Post-post	1, 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b	1) PPEs; 2a) Increased aspirations to lead, increased leadership capacity, plan to change their approach to patient care; 2b) Increased leadership knowledge and skills, developed ideas for improving patient care; 3a) Increased leadership behaviours; 3b) Have taken on a leadership role, retention, promotions. 1) PPEs; 2a) Increased self-awareness and confidence; 2b) Increased leadership skills, increased negotiation skills, developed interpersonal skills; 3a) Networking benefits; 3b) Supervisors' ratings of increased leadership skill levels and changes in behaviour. 2b) Increased leadership skills, increased leadership capability; 3a) Have taken on more responsibility; 3b) Retention, awards won, research publications; 4a) General organizational benefits, increased organizational capacity; 4b) Having implemented action learning projects, used innovative approaches to improve healthcare delivery
Satiani et al. (2014)	USA	Both	Single	In-house	18 months	Self, superior	During, post	1, 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b	1) PPEs; 2a) Increased self-awareness and confidence; 2b) Increased leadership skills, increased negotiation skills, developed interpersonal skills; 3a) Networking benefits; 3b) Supervisors' ratings of increased leadership skill levels and changes in behaviour. 2b) Increased leadership skills, increased leadership capability; 3a) Have taken on more responsibility; 3b) Retention, awards won, research publications; 4a) General organizational benefits, increased organizational capacity; 4b) Having implemented action learning projects, used innovative approaches to improve healthcare delivery
Nakanjako et al. (2015)	Uganda	Both	Single	In-house	1 year	Self	Post	2b, 3a, 3b, 4a, 4b	1) PPEs; 2a) Increased self-awareness and confidence; 2b) Increased leadership skills, increased negotiation skills, developed interpersonal skills; 3a) Networking benefits; 3b) Supervisors' ratings of increased leadership skill levels and changes in behaviour. 2b) Increased leadership skills, increased leadership capability; 3a) Have taken on more responsibility; 3b) Retention, awards won, research publications; 4a) General organizational benefits, increased organizational capacity; 4b) Having implemented action learning projects, used innovative approaches to improve healthcare delivery
Patel et al. (2015)	USA	Internal	Single	In-house	2 years	Self, faculty	Pre, post	1, 2a, 2b, 3b, 4b	1) PPEs; 2a) Increased confidence, increased aspirations to lead; 2b) Increased leadership knowledge; 3b) Have taken on a leadership role, 4b) Having implemented an action learning project 1) PPEs; 2a) Increased confidence; 2b) Increased leadership skills, increased communication and teamwork skills; 3a) Increased leadership behaviours, have taken on more responsibility, positive impact on their careers; 3b) Promotions; 4b) Self-reports of providing better healthcare to patients
Fernandez et al. (2016)	USA	Both	Single	External	3.5 days	Self	Post, post-post, retrospective pre	1, 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 4b	1) PPEs; 2a) Increased self-awareness and confidence; 2b) Increase knowledge and skills; 3a) Positive impact on their careers
Pradarelli et al. (2016)	USA	Internal	Single	In-house	8 months	Self, peer, subordinate, superior	Baseline, post	1, 2a, 2b, 3a	1) PPEs; 2a) Increased self-awareness and confidence; 2b) Increase knowledge and skills; 3a) Positive impact on their careers

Note: PPEs = Post program Evaluations. MSF = Multisource Feedback. PDP = Personal Development Plan.

Table 5
Medical Education Research Study Quality Instrument (MERSQI).

Domain	Item	Item score	Maximum domain score
1. Study design	Single group cross-sectional or single group post-test only	1	3
	Single group pre and post-test	1.5	
	Non-randomized, two-group	2	
	Randomized controlled experiment	3	
Sampling			
2. Institutions	One	0.5	3
	Two	1	
	> Two	1.5	
3. Response rate	< 50% or Not reported	0.5	
	50–74%	1	
	≥ 75%	1.5	
4. Type of data	Assessment by study subject	1	3
	Objective measurement	3	
Validity of evaluation instruments' scores			
5. Internal structure	Not reported	0	3
	Reported	1	
6. Content	Not reported	0	
	Reported	1	
7. Relationships to other variables	Not reported	0	
	Reported	1	
Data analysis			
8. Comprehensiveness ^a	Less comprehensive data analysis given the study design or incomplete data sets	0	3
	Comprehensive data analysis given the study design and provided complete data sets	1	
9. Sophistication	Descriptive analysis only	1	
	Beyond descriptive analysis	2	
10. Outcomes	Satisfaction, attitudes, perceptions, opinions, general facts (Level 1 and 2a)	1	3
	Knowledge, skills (Level 2b)	1.5	
	Behaviours (Level 3a and 3b)	2	
	Benefit to patients outcome (Level 4b)	3	
Total			18

^a “Appropriateness” in the original instrument, modified to “comprehensive” avoid a strong value judgement.

house human resources or organizational development professionals. Other factors for future research inquiries include the optimal location and length of program, ideal combinations of developmental activities,

and innovative approaches to leadership development. Finally, leadership development research tends to focus exclusively on individual interventions in isolation, rather than considering leadership

Table 6
Methodological quality groupings.

Evidence	Characteristics	MERSQI scores	k	Studies and MERSQI score
Gold	Correlated objective outcome data	14–18	2	Dannels et al., 2008 (14.5) Ten Have et al., 2013 (15)
	Pre and post-post measures			
	Control group			
Silver	Correlated objective outcome data	12–13.5	4	Malling et al., 2009 (12) Day et al., 2010 (13.5) Kuo et al., 2010 (12) Patel et al., 2015 (12.5)
	Details or study elements left out			
Bronze	Based largely on participants' or authors' perceptions, or	< 12	19	Hemmer et al., 2007 (7.5) Korschun et al., 2007 (10) Miller et al., 2007 (11.5) Bergman et al., 2009 (10) Edmonstone (2009) (7) Murdock and Brammer, 2011 (8) Cherry et al., 2010 (7) Edmonstone (2011) (11) Sanfey et al., 2011 (11) Bearman et al., 2012 (7.5) Shah et al., 2013 (5) Vimr and Dickens, 2013 (9.5) Dickey et al., 2014 (4.5) MacPhail et al., 2015 (11.5) Satiani et al. (2014) 7.5 Blumenthal et al., 2014 (8.5) Nakanjako et al., 2015 (11) Fernandez et al., 2016 (10.5) Pradarelli et al., 2016 (9.5)
	Elements of the study left out			

Note. k = The number of included studies (K = 25).

Table 7
MERSI applied to the 25 included studies.

Author	Study design	Sampling	Validity of Evaluation Instruments			Data Analysis	Sophistication of analysis	Outcome level	Total score		
			Response rate	Type of data	Internal structure					Content	Relationships to other variables
Hemmer et al. (2007)	SGPP	1	NR	Objective	NR	NR	NR	Less comprehensive	Descriptive only	2b	7.5
Korschun et al. (2007)	SGCS/P	1	79%	Self-reported	NR	Reported	NR	Less comprehensive	Beyond descriptive	4b	10
Miller et al. (2007)	SGCS/P	1	66%	Self-reported	Reported	Reported	Reported	Comprehensive	Beyond descriptive	3	11.5
Dannels et al. (2008)	NR2GP	1	71%	Objective	Reported	Reported	Reported	Comprehensive	Beyond descriptive	3	14.5
Bergman et al. (2009)	SGPP	1	74%	Self-reported	Reported	Reported	Reported	Less comprehensive	Descriptive only	3	10
Edmonstone (2009)	SGCS/P	1	57%	Self-reported	NR	NR	NR	Less comprehensive	Descriptive only	3	7
Malling et al. (2009)	NR2GP	1	77%	Objective	Reported	NR	NR	Less comprehensive	Beyond descriptive	3	12
Murdock and Brammer (2011)	SGPP	1	NR	Objective	NR	NR	NR	Less comprehensive	Descriptive only	3	8
Cherry et al. (2010)	SGCS/P	1	NR	Objective	NR	NR	NR	Less comprehensive	Descriptive only	2b	7
Day et al. (2010)	NR2GP	1	53%	Objective	Reported	Reported	Reported	Comprehensive	Beyond descriptive	3	13.5
Kuo et al. (2010)	SGCS/P	1	94%	Objective	Reported	Reported	NR	Less comprehensive	Beyond descriptive	3	12
Edmonstone (2011)	SGPP	1	NR	Objective	Reported	NR	NR	Less comprehensive	Beyond descriptive	4b	11
Sanfey et al. (2011)	SGPP	1	50%	Objective	NR	NR	Reported	Less comprehensive	Beyond descriptive	3	11
Bearman et al. (2012)	SGCS/P	1	92%	Self-reported	NR	Reported	NR	Less comprehensive	Descriptive only	2b	7.5
Shah et al. (2013)	SGCS/P	1	NR	Self-reported	NR	NR	NR	Less comprehensive	Beyond descriptive	2b	6
Ten Have et al. (2013)	NR2GP	4	100%	Objective	Reported	Reported	NR	Comprehensive	Beyond descriptive	3	15
Vinm and Dickens (2013)	SGCS/P	1	NR	Objective	Reported	Reported	NR	Less comprehensive	Descriptive only	4b	9.5
Blumenthal et al. (2014)	SGCS/P	1	100%	Self-reported	NR	Reported	NR	Comprehensive	Descriptive only	2b	8.5
Dickey et al. (2014)	SGCS/P	1	NR	Self-reported	NR	NR	NR	Less comprehensive	Descriptive only	1/2a	5
MacPhail et al. (2015)	SGCS/P	1	70%	Objective	NR	Reported	Reported	Less comprehensive	Beyond descriptive	3	11.5
Satiani et al. (2014)	SGCS/P	1	NR	Objective	NR	NR	NR	Less comprehensive	Descriptive only	3	7.5
Nakanjako et al. (2015)	SGCS/P	1	100%	Self-reported	NR	Reported	Reported	Less comprehensive	Beyond descriptive	4b	11
Patel et al. (2015)	SGPP	1	77%	Objective	NR	Reported	Reported	Less comprehensive	Descriptive only	4b	12.5
Fernandez et al. (2016)	SGCS/P	1	60%	Objective	NR	NR	NR	Less comprehensive	Beyond descriptive	4b	10.5
Pradarelli et al. (2016)	SGPP	1	100%	Self-reported	NR	Reported	Reported	Less comprehensive	Descriptive only	3	9.5

Note. RCT = Randomized controlled trial. NR2GP = Non-randomized, two groups. SGPP = Single group, pre and post-test. SGCS/P = Single group, cross-sectional or posttest only. NR = Not reported.
^a "Appropriateness" in the original instrument.

Table 8
Key factors associated with effective leadership development.

Factors associated with effective leadership development		Representation of factors in the included studies	
Major category	Factor	Effective practice	All included studies (K = 25)
Design	Clearly described goals for the program	Yes	Yes (17), no (8)
	Used an outcomes-based approach	Yes	Yes (12), no (13)
	Incorporated the Principles of Adult Learning	Yes	Yes (3), no (22)
Sample Program	Conducted a pre-program needs analysis	Yes	Yes (10), no (15)
	Used a capability framework	Yes	Yes (8), no (17)
	Control group	Yes	Yes (4), no (21)
Outcomes	Developmental activities	Interactive workshops, simulations, action learning, coaching, mentoring	Interactive workshops (14), reading assignments (11), small group discussion (11)
	Kirkpatrick level	2a, 2b, 3b, 4a, 4b	Level (n): 1 (21), 2a (39), 2b (41), 3a (23), 3b (29), 4a (9), 4b (9), (2a, 2b, 3b, 4a, and 4b) (3)
	Reported outcomes	Objective outcomes at the individual (2a - 3b), organizational (4a), and benefit to patients (4b) levels	Confidence (9) (Level 2a), increased skills (13) (Level 2b), knowledge (12) (Level 2b), behaviours (9) (Level 3a) Participants only (5), program only (5), both (15)
Evaluation	Focus of evaluation (participants, program, or both)	Both	Quantitative only (5), qualitative only (8), both (12)
	Type of data collected (quantitative, qualitative, or both)	Both	Objective (15), subjective (10)
	Type of data collected (objective, subjective)	Objective	Self (22), peer (5), facilitator (5), supervisor (5), single rater (13), multiple raters (11)
	Raters	Multiple	Pre or baseline (11), post (14), post-post (13), pre, post, and post-post (2)
	When data were collected	Pre, post, and post-post	Pre or baseline (5), post-post (5), post (2), Pre, post, and post-post (0)

Note: K = The number of included studies.

development more broadly across an organization, as a combination of programs and formal and informal activities.

5. Discussion

This study was inspired by the growing cost and associated skepticism about the true yield of leadership development interventions in the field of healthcare. We have attempted to respond to demands from previous review authors and practitioners for further empirical clarification about specific, effective approaches to, and benefits of, different types of leadership programs. In our study, we investigated the most reliable elements of design, delivery, and evaluation of interventions that are linked to improved outcomes, including at the organizational impact and benefit to patients levels. To isolate these, our literature review used a validated instrument, MERSQI, to evaluate the quality of evidence. To our knowledge, this is the only review of leadership development for physicians to publish transparently the full set of MERSQI scores and to base the key findings on the most reliable evidence.

As suggested above, our review findings demonstrate that leadership interventions can positively influence outcomes at the individual level and can help to facilitate organizational impact and benefit to patients outcomes, including quality improvement in a healthcare setting.

5.1. Implications for future research

Our study highlights several areas for future research consideration. To continue to address the need to isolate the most reliable available evidence, we suggest a strategy to augment an empirical approach for future studies. We propose that investigators design and conduct studies that can answer outstanding questions in the field using a rigorous methodology, akin to the gold standard criteria used in this review. In addition, it may be helpful if authors, when submitting manuscripts for publication, provide clear and transparent descriptions of the methods, analysis, findings, and conclusions in a standardized form and report the MERSQI (or other instrument) scores for each domain, as well as the total score. This process could precipitate two potential benefits: it would offer a standardized approach for publications, allowing readers to easily appraise the reliability of evidence; and this transparency may also motivate researchers to include key elements of high-quality research. For example, knowing that they will need to report their outcomes score explicitly may encourage researchers to include Level 4a or 4b outcome metrics in their studies to receive the highest points for this category. This process could make the evidence supporting the knowledge base in the field more transparent and potentially, more robust.

Our second recommendation is to reevaluate MERSQI, particularly the categories that are not immediately objective, such as the "appropriateness of data analysis". Making each category objective could potentially minimize bias when assessing future studies. It would also be valuable to assess the extent to which MERSQI is generalizable to other domains or sectors. The majority of categories, such as collecting objective versus subjective data and including a control group, do not appear to be domain-specific (Geerts, 2018; Terpstra, 1981). Other components require further consideration, such as whether there are comparable Level 4b outcomes in other domains. For example, would organizations in the financial sector really consider benefit to clients to be the ultimate outcome of leadership development, rather than profit? It seems that in many private sector corporations, this is not the case (Kellerman, 2018). Similarly, who would the "clients" be for the military? Clarifying the generalizability of a study quality assessment instrument could facilitate comparisons of studies and their findings across domains. Our third recommendation identifies some of the unanswered questions about designing optimal development programs for physicians and other professionals. Many aspects of leadership

development warrant further investigation, such as the value of physician-only programs or physician-only components of programs, which proponents suggest enhance learning, since they provide a safe space to discuss issues to which fellow learners can relate, given their similar backgrounds and responsibilities (McAlearney et al., 2005; Vimr and Dickens, 2013). A comparable argument is made in favor of role- or level of seniority-specific interventions or components, such as executive leaders. Conversely, many believe that interdisciplinary or mixed leadership programs are advantageous, mainly for the purpose of mirroring the collaboration that is needed in the workplace and breaking down silos. Should interventions be modified according to different models of leadership in healthcare organizations, such as unitary, dyadic, or team-based approaches? And what strategies are there for maximizing the transfer or application of learning from leadership interventions to the workplace, or "training transfer", a need which was also highlighted in the Rosenman et al. (2014) review. A further question concerns the extent to which principles of optimal leadership development are generalizable to different professional domains and cultures, as well as how those principles for individual interventions relate to leadership development more broadly across an organization?

Another consideration is how leadership development can contribute to health promotion, community development, and capacity-building beyond individual organizations. This can advance culture change aimed at tackling health needs or inequalities in populations by way of the multiplier effect (Hawe and Shiell, 2000).

Finally, in a field where a substantial portion of formal leadership development is offered by private companies, we believe that healthcare and management scholars in universities could play a more central role by serving as arbiters of quality in both the design of optimal leadership development and in the assessment of program effectiveness.

5.2. Implications for practice

Practitioners could attempt to apply and thereby test the key findings of this review in their organizations. It seems surprising that so few are being consistently implemented. For example, fewer than half of the studies included in our review reported conducting a needs analysis ($k = 10$), and only two collected baseline, post, and post-post data. Benefit to patients is recognized as an important goal of leadership development for physicians; and yet, only five included studies used it as an outcome metric. One possible explanation for why these elements are included so seldom is feasibility linked to time and cost, or suspicions regarding attribution between programs and outcomes. However, the potential impact of leadership development programs and the pressure to justify the return on investment (ROI) may in future prompt providers to consider these principles more carefully. Further concrete examples of best practice in both research and program design, delivery, and evaluation may demonstrate convincingly the viability of these strategies. This level of testing is beneficial for the academic and practitioner worlds alike. Experiments in local contexts can provide further evidence, insights, nuances, and collective learning (Dietz et al., 2014). This application includes attempting to apply Knowles's principles of adult learning to leadership development programs, while concomitantly investigating if these principles should be modified or if a new set should be created specifically for leadership development.

Given that interventions have the potential to underperform or fail, it is important to take an evidence-based approach to leadership development. Rather than prescribing one program for all, which is not an optimal approach, we believe that the process involved in applying an outcomes-based theoretical model (Geerts, 2018), along with the evidence-based program components identified in this review, is most effective.

The first step involves conducting a needs and gap analysis with relevant stakeholders to inform the selection of the program's desired outcomes.

Step two is selecting the desired outcomes for the program. These

outcomes should include enhancing self-awareness, self-efficacy, and leadership knowledge, skills, and behaviours. In healthcare leadership development, it is important to also include organizational impact (Level 4A) and benefit to patients outcomes (Level 4B). Enabling participants to select their own goals and desired outcomes aligns with the principles of adult learning and can enhance their perception of the relevance and utility of the program.

Step three is selecting explicit goals for the program that are aligned with organizational strategy or priorities and are linked directly to the desired outcomes and the evaluation framework.

Step four is selecting the participants intentionally based on their suitability to fill the needs and gaps identified during step one.

Step five is selecting the program structure, content, faculty, and developmental activities using an outcomes-based design that are included specifically according to their intended efficacy in facilitating the achievement of the desired outcomes (Dale, 1969). In terms of the developmental activities, offering a variety is important to accommodate different learning preferences. Consideration should be given to experiential activities, including action learning projects and interactive workshops involving video-taped simulations and peer and expert feedback, as well as to coaching, 360 assessments or Multisource Feedback, and mentoring.

Step six is devising an evaluation framework for the program overall, for individual activities, and for participants. The framework should include subjective and objective data at the individual level, as well as metrics pertaining to organizational impact and benefit to patients outcomes. Data should be collected at baseline, at the end of the intervention, and six to nine months following to assess relative and sustained outcomes.

Step seven is conducting a barriers assessment of organizational cultural factors that may hinder the achievement of desired outcomes and attempting to circumvent or remove them by incorporating “training transfer” or application of learning strategies.

The final step is ensuring that the principles of adult learning or principles of leadership development have been addressed in the program design.

Therefore, the most effective approach to designing leadership development programs is to incorporate an outcomes-based model using the most reliable evidence-based components identified in this review.

6. Limitations

Our systematic review has some limitations. Restricting it to published peer-reviewed articles may have limited the scope; however, this choice aligned with our goals of isolating the highest-quality evidence (Cook and West, 2012). We chose to focus on physicians, which may have reduced the generalizability to other groups; however, common principles are known to apply across professions and domains in leadership development (Bryson et al., 2017). A further possible limitation is the high level of heterogeneity of the designs, reporting, interventions, and assessments of the included studies. This heterogeneity, as well as the small sample size, precluded a formal meta-analysis.

7. Conclusion

The global interest and investment in leadership development calls for clear evidence of impact, especially in domains as important as healthcare, which is under great financial stress. Because of the growing evidence demonstrating the benefits of physician leadership and having doctors in leadership positions, our study focuses on physician leadership development. Through an innovative methodology, this review has clarified the most reliable elements of design, delivery, and evaluation of leadership interventions that are empirically linked to positive outcomes. We hope this review advances understanding about effective leadership development for physicians.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Dr William Geerts (University of Toronto), Dr Andrew Ostwald (University of Warwick), the senior editor, and anonymous reviewers for their insightful suggestions.

References

- Abrell, C., Rowold, J., Weibler, J., Moeninghoff, M., 2011. Evaluation of a long-term transformational leadership development program. *Z. für Pers.* 25 (3), 205–224.
- Alimo-Metcalfe, B., Lawlor, J., 2001. Leadership development in UK companies at the beginning of the twenty-first century: lessons for the NHS? *J. Manag. Med.* 15 (5), 387–404.
- Antonakis, J., Fenley, M., Liechti, S., 2011. Can charisma be taught? Tests of two interventions. *Acad. Manag. Learn. Educ.* 10 (3), 374–396. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2010.0012>. Retrieved from.
- Artz, B.M., Goodall, A.H., Oswald, A.J., 2017. Boss competence and worker well-being. *Ind. Labor Relat. Rev.* 70 (2), 419–450. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0019793916650451>. Retrieved from.
- Avolio, B.J., 2005. *Leadership Development in Balance: Made/born*. Psychology Press, Oxford.
- Avolio, B.J., Avey, J.B., Quisenberry, D., 2010. Estimating return on leadership development investment. *Leadersh. Q.* 21 (4), 633–644.
- Bearman, M., O'Brien, R., Anthony, A., Civil, I., Flanagan, B., Jolly, B., Nestel, D., 2012. Learning surgical communication, leadership and teamwork through simulation. *J. Surg. Educ.* 69 (2), 201–207.
- Beer, M., Finnström, M., Schrader, D., 2016. Why leadership training fails - and what to do about it. *Harv. Bus. Rev.* 94 (10), 50–57.
- Berg, M.E., Karlsen, J.T., 2012. An evaluation of management training and coaching. *J. Workplace Learn.* 24 (3), 177–199.
- Bergman, D., Fransson-Sellgren, S., Wahlstrom, R., Sandahl, C., 2009. Impact of short-term intensive and long-term less intensive training programmes. *Leadersh. Health Serv.* 22 (2), 161–175.
- Blume, B.D., Ford, J.K., Baldwin, T.T., Huang, J.L., 2010. Training transfer: a meta-analytic review. *J. Manag.* 38 (4), 1065–1105.
- Blumenthal, D.M., Bernard, K., Fraser, T.N., Bohnen, J., Zeidman, J., Stone, V.E., 2014. Implementing a pilot leadership course for internal medicine residents: design considerations, participant impressions, and lessons learned. *BMC Med. Educ.* 14 (257), 1–11.
- Bohmer, R.M.J., 2011. The four habits of high-value health care organizations. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 365 (22), 2045–2047. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1111087>. Retrieved from.
- Bowles, S., Cunningham, C.J.L., Rosa, G.M.D.L., Picano, J., 2007. Coaching leaders in middle and executive management: goals, performance, buy-in. *Leadersh. Organ. Dev. J.* 28 (5), 388–408.
- Bruppacher, H.R., Alam, S.K., LeBlanc, V.R., Latter, D., Naik, V.N., Savoldelli, G.L., et al., 2010. Simulation-based training improves physicians' performance in patient care in high-stakes clinical setting of cardiac surgery. *Anesthesiology* 112 (4), 985–992. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ALN.0b013e3181d3e31c>. Retrieved from.
- Bryson, A., Forth, J., Stokes, L., 2017. Does employees' subjective well-being affect workplace performance? *Hum. Relat.* 70 (8), 1017–1037.
- Burke, L.A., Hutchins, H.M., 2007. Training transfer: an integrative literature review. *Hum. Resour. Dev. Rev.* 6 (3), 263–296.
- Burke, M.J., Day, R.R., 1986. A cumulative study of the effectiveness of managerial training. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 71 (2), 232–245. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.2.232>. Retrieved from.
- Byrnes, J., 2016. The value of physician leaders. *J. Healthc. Manag.* 61 (4), 251–255.
- Cahill, M., Robinson, K., Pettigrew, J., Galvin, R., Stanley, M., 2018. Qualitative synthesis: a guide to conducting a meta-ethnography. *Br. J. Occup. Ther.* 81 (3), 129–137. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308022617745016>. Retrieved from.
- Caulkin, S., 2015. Have We Created an Unachievable Myth of Leadership? *Financial Times* Retrieved from. <https://www.ft.com/content/07ed132e-8fa3-11e5-8be4-3506bf20cc2b>.
- Chadi, N., 2009. Medical leadership: doctors at the helm of change. *McGill J. Med.* 12 (1), 52–57.
- Cheng, E.W.L., Hampson, I., 2008. Transfer of training: a review and new insights. *Int. J. Manag. Rev.* 10 (4), 327–341.
- Cherry, R., Davis, D., Thorndyke, L., 2010. Transforming culture through physician leadership. *Physician Exec.* 36 (3), 38–44.
- Collins, D.B., Holton III, E.E., 2004. The effectiveness of managerial leadership development programs: a meta-analysis of studies from 1982 to 2001. *Hum. Resour. Dev. Q.* 15 (2), 217–248.
- Cook, D.A., West, C.P., 2012. Conducting systematic reviews in medical education: a stepwise approach. *Med. Educ.* 46, 943–952.
- Daly, J., Jackson, D., Mannix, J., Davidson, P.M., Hutchinson, M., 2014. The importance of clinical leadership in the hospital setting. *J. Healthc. Leadersh.* 6, 75–83. <https://doi.org/10.2147/JHL.S46161>. Retrieved from.
- Dannels, S.A., Yamagata, H., McDade, S.A., Chuang, Y.C., Gleason, K.A., McLaughlin, J.M., Morahan, P.S., 2008. Evaluating a leadership program: a comparative, longitudinal study to assess the impact of the Executive Leadership in Academic Medicine (ELAM) program for women. *Acad. Med.* 83 (5), 488–495.
- Dauphinee, W.D., Wood-Dauphinee, S., 2004. The need for evidence in medical education: the development of best evidence medical education as an opportunity to

- inform, guide, and sustain medical education research. *Acad. Med.: J. Assoc. Am. Med. Colleges* 79 (10), 925–930.
- Day, C.S., Tabrizi, S., Kramer, J., Yule, A., Ahn, B., 2010. Effectiveness of the AAOS leadership fellows program for orthopaedic surgeons. *J. Bone Joint Surg. Am.* 92 (16), 2700–2708.
- 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. *Leadersh. Q.* 25 (1), 63–82.
- Day, D.V., O'Connor, P.M., 2003. Leadership development: understanding the process. In: Murphy, S.E., Riggio, P. (Eds.), *The Future of Leadership Development*. 11–28. Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.
- Day, D.V., Sin, H.-P., 2011. Longitudinal tests of an integrative model of leader development: charting and understanding developmental trajectories. *Leadersh. Q.* 22 (3), 545–560. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.04.011>. Retrieved from.
- Denis, J.-L., van Gestel, N., 2016. Medical doctors in healthcare leadership: theoretical and practical challenges. *BMC Health Serv. Res.* 16, 158. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-016-1392-8>. Retrieved from.
- DeNisi, A.S., Kluger, A.N., 2000. Feedback effectiveness: can 360-degree appraisals be improved? *Acad. Manag. Exec.* 14 (1), 129–139.
- Dickey, C., Dismukes, R., Topor, D., 2014. Creating Opportunities for Organizational Leadership (COOL): creating a culture and curriculum that fosters psychiatric leadership development and quality improvement. *Acad. Psychiatr.* 38 (3), 383–387.
- Dickson, G., Van Aerde, J., 2018. Enabling physicians to lead: Canada's LEADS framework. *Leadersh. Health Serv.* 31 (2), 183–194. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LHS-12-2017-0077>. Retrieved from.
- Dietz, J., Antonakis, J., Hoffrage, U., Krings, F., Marewski, J.N., Zehnder, C., 2014. Teaching Evidence-Based Management with a focus on producing local evidence. *Acad. Manag. Learn. Educ.* 13 (3), 397–414. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2013.0197>. Retrieved from.
- Dine, C.J., Kahn, J.M., Abella, B.S., Shea, J.A., 2011. Key elements of clinical physician leadership at an academic medical center. *J. Grad. Med. Educ.* 3 (1), 31–36.
- Edler, A., Adamshick, M., Fanning, R., Piro, N., 2010. Leadership lessons from military education for postgraduate medical curricular improvement. *Clin. Teach.* 7 (1), 26–31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1743-498X.2009.00336.x>. Retrieved from.
- Edmonstone, J., 2009. Evaluating clinical leadership: a case study. *Leadersh. Health Serv.* 22 (3), 210–224.
- Edmonstone, J., 2011. The development of strategic clinical leaders in the National Health Service in Scotland. *Leadersh. Health Serv.* 24 (4), 337–353.
- Edmonstone, J., 2013. Healthcare leadership: learning from evaluation. *Leadersh. Health Serv.* 26 (2), 148–158.
- Falcone, R.E., Santiani, B., 2008. Physician as hospital chief executive officer. *Vasc. Endovasc. Surg.* 42 (1), 88–94.
- Fernandez, C.S.P., Noble, C.C., Jensen, E.T., Chapin, J., 2016. Improving leadership skills in physicians: a 6-month retrospective study. *J. Leadersh. Stud.* 9 (4), 6–19.
- Frich, J.C., Brewster, A.L., Cherlin, E.J., Bradley, E.H., 2015. Leadership development programs for physicians: a systematic review. *J. Gen. Int. Med.* 30 (5), 656–674.
- Garman, Andrew N., McAlearney, A.S., Harrison, M.I., Song, P.H., McHugh, M., 2011. High-performance work systems in health care management, Part 1: development of an evidence-informed model. *Health Care Manag. Rev.* 36 (3), 201–213. <https://doi.org/10.1097/HMR.0b013e318201d1bf>. Retrieved from.
- Geerts, J.M., 2018. Optimal Leadership Development for Professionals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK.
- Geerts, J.M., 2019. Leadership defined for our generation and the next. *Can. J. Phys. Leadersh.* 5 (4), 207–214.
- Gilpin-Jackson, Y., Bushe, G.R., 2007. Leadership development training transfer: a case study of post-training determinants. *J. Manag. Dev.* 26 (10), 980–1004.
- Goodall, A.H., 2011. Physician-leaders and hospital performance: is there an association? *Soc. Sci. Med.* 73 (4), 535–539.
- Hamlin, B., 2010. Evidence-based leadership and management development. In: Gold, J., Thorpe, R., Mumford, A. (Eds.), *Gower Handbook of Leadership and Management Development*, fifth ed. Gower, Surrey, England, pp. 197–220.
- Hannah, S.T., Uhl-Bien, M., Avolio, B.J., Cavarretta, F.L., 2009. A framework for examining leadership in extreme contexts. *Leadersh. Q.* 20 (6), 897–919. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.09.006>. Retrieved from.
- Hannum, K.M., Bartholomew, C.S., 2010. Introduction to special issue on leadership development evaluation. *Leadersh. Q.* 21 (4), 581–582.
- Hawe, P., Shiell, A., 2000. Social capital and health promotion: a review. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 51 (6), 871–885. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(00\)00067-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(00)00067-8). Retrieved from.
- Hemmer, P.R., Karon, B.S., Hernandez, J.S., Cuthbert, C., Fidler, M.E., Tazelaar, H.D., 2007. Leadership and management training for residents and fellows: a curriculum for future medical directors. *Arch. Pathol. Lab Med.* 131, 610–614.
- Husebø, S.E., Akerjordet, K., 2016. Quantitative systematic review of multi professional teamwork and leadership training to optimize patient outcomes in acute hospital settings. *J. Adv. Nurs.* 72 (12), 2980–3000. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13035>. Retrieved from.
- Ireri, S., Walshe, K., Benson, L., Mwanthi, M., 2011. A qualitative and quantitative study of medical leadership and management: experiences, competencies, and development needs of doctor managers in the United Kingdom. *J. Manag. Mark. Healthc.* 4 (1), 16–29.
- Kellerman, B., 2012. *The End of Leadership*. Harper Collins, New York.
- Kellerman, B., 2018. *Professionalizing Leadership*. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- Kirkpatrick, D., Kirkpatrick, J., 2006. *Evaluating Training Programs*, third ed. Berrett Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.
- Klimoski, R., Amos, B., 2012. Practicing evidence-based education in leadership development. *Acad. Manag. Learn. Educ.* 11 (4), 685–702. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2012.0018>. Retrieved from.
- Knowles, M.S., 1984. *Andragogy in Action*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Kolb, D.A., 1984. *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Komives, S.R., Nance, L., McMahon, T.R., 1998. *Nurturing Leadership: for College Students Who Want to Make a Difference*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Korschun, H.W., Redding, D., Teal, G.L., Johns, M.M.E., 2007. Realizing the vision of leadership development in an academic health center: the Woodruff Leadership Academy. *Acad. Med.* 82 (3), 264–271.
- Kuo, A.K., Thyne, S.M., Chen, H.C., West, D.C., Kamei, R.K., 2010. An innovative residency program designed to develop leaders to improve the health of children. *Acad. Med.* 85 (10), 1603–1608.
- Kwame, A., van Dijk, H., Agyepong, I.A., 2014. Advancing the application of systems thinking in health: realist evaluation of the Leadership Development Programme for district manager decision-making in Ghana. *Health Res. Policy Syst.* 12 (29), 1–12.
- Lacerenza, C.N., Reyes, D.L., Marlow, S.L., Joseph, D.L., Salas, E., 2017. Leadership training design, delivery, and implementation: a meta-analysis. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 102 (12), 1686–1718. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000241>. Retrieved from.
- Latham, G.P., Locke, E.A., 1983. Goal setting—a motivational technique that works. In: Hackman, J.R., Lawlor, E.E., Porter, L.W. (Eds.), *Perspectives on Behavior in Organizations*. 296–304. McGraw Hill, New York.
- Lazear, E.P., Shaw, K.L., Stanton, C.T., 2015. The value of bosses. *J. Labor Econ.* 33 (4), 823–861. <https://doi.org/10.1086/681097>.
- Lee, T.H., Hall, K.W., 2010. Turning doctors into leaders. *Harv. Bus. Rev.* 88 (4), 50–58.
- Leskiv, S., Singh, P., 2007. Leadership development: learning from best practices. *Leadersh. Organ. Dev. J.* 28 (5), 444–464. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730710761742>. Retrieved from.
- Lurie, S.J., 2003. Raising the passing grade for studies of medical education. *J. Am. Med. Assoc.* 290 (9), 1210–1212. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.290.9.1210>. Retrieved from.
- MacPhail, A., Young, C., Ibrahim, J.E., 2015. Workplace-based clinical leadership training increases willingness to lead. *Leadersh. Health Serv.* 28 (2), 100–118.
- Malling, B., Mortensen, L., Bonderup, T., Scherpbier, A., Ringstead, C., 2009. Combining a leadership course and multisource feedback has no effect on leadership skills of leaders in postgraduate medical education. An intervention study with a control group. *BMC Med. Educ.* 9 (72), 1–7.
- McAlearney, A.S., 2010. Executive leadership development in U.S. health systems. *J. Healthc. Manag.* 55 (3), 206–224.
- McAlearney, A.S., Fisher, D., Heiser, K., Robbins, D., Kelleher, K., 2005. Developing effective physician leaders: changing cultures and transforming organizations. *Hosp. Top.* 83 (2), 11–18.
- McCauley, C.D., 2008. *Leader Development: a Review of Research*. Center for Creative Leadership.
- McDonald, D., 2017. *The Golden Passport: Harvard Business School, the Limits of Capitalism, and the Moral Failure of the MBA Elite*. HarperCollins, New York.
- McKim, J., Spurgeon, P., Needham, G., O'Sullivan, H., 2011. Clinical leadership: the challenge for senior leaders. *Br. J. Hosp. Med.* 72 (9), 525–528. <https://doi.org/10.12968/hmed.2011.72.9.525>. Retrieved from.
- Miller, D.L., Umble, K.E., Frederick, S.L., Dinkin, D.R., 2007. Linking learning methods to outcomes in public health leadership development. *Leadersh. Health Serv.* 20 (2), 97–123.
- Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D.G., 2009. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *J. Clin. Epidemiol.* 62 (10), 1006–1012.
- Mountford, J., Webb, C., 2009. When clinicians lead. *McKinsey Q.* 1–8 (February).
- Murdock, J., Brammer, C., 2011. A successful model of leadership development for community practice physicians. *Phys. Exec. J.* 37 (2), 52–56.
- Nabi, G., Liñán, F., Fayoelle, A., Krueger, N., Walmsley, A., 2017. The impact of entrepreneurship education in higher education: a systematic review and research agenda. *Acad. Manag. Learn. Educ.* 16 (2), 277–299. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2015.0026>. Retrieved from.
- Nakanjako, D., Namagala, E., Semeere, A., Kigozi, J., Sempa, J., Ddamulira, J.B., Sewankambo, N., 2015. Global health leadership training in resource-limited settings: a collaborative approach by academic institutions and local health care programs in Uganda. *Hum. Resour. Health* 13 (1), 87.
- Patel, N., Brennan, P.J., Metlay, J., Bellini, L., Shannon, R.P., Myers, J.S., 2015. Building the pipeline: the creation of a residency training pathway for future physician leaders in health care quality. *J. Assoc. Am. Med. Colleges* 90 (2), 185–190. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000000546>. Retrieved from.
- Petticrew, M., Roberts, H., 2006. *Systematic Reviews in the Social Sciences: a Practical Guide*, vol. 6 Blackwell, Oxford.
- Pfeffer, J., 2015. *Leadership BS*. HarperCollins, New York.
- Pfeffer, J., 2016. Getting beyond the BS of leadership literature. *McKinsey Q.* 1–7.
- Phillips, P.P., Phillips, J.J., Ray, R., 2015. *Measuring the Success of Leadership Development*. ATD Press, Alexandria, Virginia.
- Powell, S.K., Yalcin, S., 2010. Managerial training effectiveness. *Pers. Rev.* 39 (2), 227–241.
- Pradarelli, J.C., Jaffe, G.A., Lemak, C.H., Mulholland, M.W., Dimick, J.B., 2016. Designing a leadership development program for surgeons. *J. Surg. Res.* 200 (1), 53–58.
- QuintilesIMS Institute, 2017. *Global Oncology Trends 2017*. QuintilesIMS Institute, Parsippany, NJ.
- Reed, D.A., Beckman, T.J., Wright, S.M., Levine, R.B., Kern, D.E., Cook, D.A., 2008. Predictive validity evidence for medical education research study quality instrument scores: quality of submissions to JGIM's medical education special issue. *J. Gen. Int. Med.* 23 (7), 903–907. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-008-0664-3>. Retrieved from.

- Reed, D., Cook, D.A., Beckman, T.J., Levine, R.B., Kern, D.E., Wright, S.M., 2007. Association between funding and quality of published medical education research. *J. Am. Med. Assoc.* 298 (9), 1002–1009.
- Richardson, W., Wilson, M., Nishikawa, J., Hayward, R., 1995. The well-built clinical question: a key to evidence-based decisions. *ACP J. Club* 123 (3), A12–A13.
- Rosenman, E.D., Shandro, J.R., Ilgen, J.S., Harper, A.L., Fernandez, R., 2014. Leadership training in health care action teams: a systematic review. *Acad. Med.* 89 (9), 1295–1306.
- Rousseau, D.M., 2006. Is there such a thing as 'evidence-based management'? *Acad. Manag. Rev.* 31 (2), 256–269.
- Rousseau, D.M., McCarthy, S., 2007. Educating managers from an evidence-based perspective. *Acad. Manag. Learn. Educ.* 6 (1), 84–101. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMLE.2007.24401705>. Retrieved from.
- Rynes, S.L., Rousseau, D.M., Barends, E., 2014. From the guest editors: change the world: teach evidence-based practice!. *Acad. Manag. Learn. Educ.* 13 (3), 305–321. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2014.0203>. Retrieved from.
- Salas, E., Tannenbaum, S.I., Kraiger, K., Smith-Jentsch, K.A., 2012. The science of training and development in organizations: what matters in practice. *Psychol. Sci. Public Interest* 13, 74–101.
- Sanfey, H., Harris, I., Pollart, S., Schwartz, A., 2011. Evaluation of the university of Virginia leadership in academic medicine program. *Teach. Learn. Med.* 23 (4), 347–358.
- Satiani, B., Sena, J., Ruberg, R., Ellison, E.C., 2014. Talent management and physician leadership training is essential for preparing tomorrow's physician leaders. *J. Vasc. Surg.* 59 (2), 542–546.
- Sellgren, S.F., Ekvall, G., Tomson, G., 2008. Leadership behaviour of nurse managers in relation to job satisfaction and work climate. *J. Nurs. Manag.* 16 (5), 578–587.
- Shah, P., Cross, V., Sii, F., 2013. Sailing a safe ship: improving patient safety by enhancing the leadership skills of new consultant specialist surgeons. *J. Continuing Educ. Health Prof.* 33 (3), 190–200.
- Solansky, S.T., 2010. The evaluation of two key leadership development program components: leadership skills assessment and leadership mentoring. *Leadersh. Q.* 21, 675–681. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.06.009>. Retrieved from.
- Spurgeon, Peter, Long, P., Clark, J., Daly, F., 2015. Do we need medical leadership or medical engagement? *Leadersh. Health Serv.* 28 (3), 173–184. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LHS-03-20140029>. Retrieved from.
- Spurgeon, P., Mazelan, P., Barwell, F., 2011. Medical engagement: a crucial underpinning to organizational performance. *Health Serv. Manag. Res.* 24 (3), 114–120.
- Steinert, Y., Naismith, L., Mann, K., 2012. Faculty development initiatives designed to promote leadership in medical education. a BEME systematic review: BEME guide no. 19. *Int. J. Med. Technol.* 34 (6), 483–503. <https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2012.680937>. Retrieved from.
- Sterne, J.A., Higgins, J.P., Reeves, B.C., 2014. A Cochrane Risk of Bias Assessment Tool for Non-randomised Studies of Interventions. Cochrane Colloquium Retrieved from. <http://www.riskofbias.info>, Version 1.0.0.
- Stoller, J.K., 2008. Developing physician-leaders: key competencies and available programs. *J. Health Adm. Educ.* 25 (4), 307–328.
- Stoller, J.K., 2009. Developing physician-leaders: a call to action. *J. Gen. Int. Med.* 24 (7), 876–878.
- Straus, S.E., Soabiah, C., Levinson, W., 2013. The impact of leadership training programs on physicians in Academic Medical Centers: a systematic review. *Acad. Med.* 88 (5), 1–15.
- Tasi, M.C., Keswani, A., Bozic, K.J., 2017. Does physician leadership affect hospital quality, operational efficiency, and financial performance? *Health Care Management Review.* Retrieved from. <https://doi.org/10.1097/HMR.0000000000000173>.
- Taylor, B., 2010. *Effective Medical Leadership*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- Taylor, P.J., Russ-Eft, D.F., Taylor, H., 2009. Transfer of management training from alternative perspectives. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 94, 104–121.
- Ten Have, E.C.M., Nap, R.E., Tulleken, J.E., 2013. Quality improvement of interdisciplinary rounds by leadership training based on essential quality indicators of the interdisciplinary rounds assessment scale. *Intensive Care Med.* 39 (10), 1800–1807. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-013-3002-0>. Retrieved from.
- Terpstra, D.E., 1981. Relationship between methodological rigor and reported outcomes in organization development evaluation research. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 66 (5), 541–543. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.66.5.541>. Retrieved from.
- The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. In: Higgins, J.P., Green, S. (Eds.), *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*, Retrieved from. <http://handbook-5-1.cochrane.org>, 5.1.0.
- Tracey, J.B., Tews, M.J., 2005. Construct validity of a general training climate scale. *Organ. Res. Methods* 8 (4), 353–374.
- Vimr, M., Dickens, P., 2013. Building physician capacity for transformational leadership - Revisited. *Healthc. Manag. Forum* 26 (1), 16–19.
- Watkins, K.E., Lyso, I.H., deMarrais, K., 2011. Evaluating executive leadership programmes: a theory of change approach. *Adv. Develop. Hum. Resour.* 13 (2), 208–239.
- Weaver, S.J., Dy, S.M., Rosen, M.A., 2014. Team-training in health care: a narrative synthesis of the literature. *Br. Med. J. Qual. Saf.* 23, 359–372.
- Wells, G., Shea, B., O'Connell, D., Peterson, J., Welch, V., Losos, M., Tugwell, P., 2016. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of non-randomised studies in meta-analyses. Retrieved from. http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp.
- World Health Organization, 2018. Global Health Expenditure Database. Retrieved from. <http://apps.who.int/nha/database>.
- Zaccaro, S.J., Horn, Z.N.J., 2003. Leadership theory and practice: fostering an effective symbiosis. *Leadersh. Q.* 14 (6), 769–806. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.09.009>. Retrieved from.

Further reading

- Dale, E., 1969. *Audio-visual Methods in Teaching*, third ed. The Dryden Press, New York.
- Day, D.V., 2001. Leadership development: a review in context. *Leadersh. Q.* 11 (4), 581–613.
- Day, D.V., Dragoni, L., 2015. Leadership development: an outcome-oriented review based on time and levels of analyses. In: Morgeson, F.P. (Ed.), *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behaviour*, vol. 2 Annual Reviews, Palo Alto, CA 133–156.
- Hartley, J., Hinksman, B., 2003. *Leadership Development: a Systematic Literature Review. A Report for the NHS Leadership Centre*. Warwick Institute of Governance and Public Management, Warwick, UK, pp. 1–77.
- Nowacki, A.S., Barss, C., Spencer, S.M., Christensen, T., Fralich, R., Stoller, J.K., 2016. Emotional intelligence and physician leadership potential: a longitudinal study supporting a link. *J. Health Adm.* 33 (1), 23–41.
- Perry, J., Mobley, F., Brubaker, M., 2017. Most Doctors Have Little or No Management Training, and That's a Problem. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from. <https://hbr.org/2017/12/most-doctors-have-little-or-no-management-training-and-thats-a-problem>.