

Leadership development; Reflective insights from a female Head of Education and Senior Lecturer in Nutritional Science.

Michelle Barrow, Centre for Nutrition Education and Lifestyle Management, Wokingham, Berkshire | Middlesex University, London.

Gordon Weller¹, School of Health and Education, Middlesex University, London

Celia Bell, School of Science and Technology, Middlesex University, London

Linda Bell, School of Health and Education, Middlesex University, London.

Abstract

This critical account, by a female Head of Education and senior lecturer in a private higher education institution, gives insights into the dynamics of leadership, followership and change management. Opportunities for leadership development are considered in the context of a wide range of leadership literature, including specific focuses on; feminist leadership and follower style, transformational leadership, systems and complexity theory and shared/ peer leadership. This account concludes with a reflection on actions that were implemented in her own leadership practice as a result of the insights gained from undertaking this review.

Keywords: leadership and followership, professional education, nutritional science, feminist leadership, charismatic and transformational leadership, systems, complexity theory, leadership as coproduction.

Introduction

This critical account appraises a wide range of literature in relation to leadership, followership and change management. It also reflectively reviews actions that were implemented in my own leadership practice as a result of undertaking this review.

From a humanistic and personal moral perspective, effective leaders have the ability to express a worthy vision inspirationally and lead change ethically considering the needs, values and beliefs of others (Bass, Bernard & Steidlmeier, 1999). In my own practice, I hold values of fairness, equality, justice, empowerment and freedom and seek these

¹ Corresponding author: Gordon Weller, G.Weller@mdx.ac.uk

qualities in followers. I am female and work as Head of Education in a private higher education institution which places me in a middle leadership position (Bryman, 2007) although I am a senior manager within my organisation. Numerous external and internal influences and constraints on the organisation impact my leadership, followership and change management approaches. Balancing the variety of working roles which include managing, teaching, researching nutrition practice and supervision, is complex and requires me to respond in complex ways (Bryman, 2007). All these factors influence my ideas in terms of organisation dynamics of leadership and followership and therefore underpin this review as well as my personal and professional practice.

The following concepts will be critically reviewed in turn; my feminist leadership and follower style, charismatic leadership, systems and complexity theory, coproduction/collective and transformational leadership opportunities. This review aims to critically appraise a wide range of literature and reflect on the emergence of my own leadership practice.

Feminist leadership and follower style

It is recognised that followership can be understood as a mirror image of leadership (Yung & Tsai, 2013). Through followership, one can assume and increase responsibilities, authority and leadership status. Kelley (1988) has classified characteristics of followers and describes the effective follower as an enthusiastic, intelligent and self-reliant participator, while the ineffective follower type can be described as passive, uncritical, unenterprising or “yes people”. Exploring follower style and motivation is therefore important. Grint (2005 p33-64) has characterised the variety of relationships between followers and leaders while Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe (2001) focused their research on defining the characteristics of an ideal transformational leadership style.

There is little consensus in the literature about gender differences in leadership style although it has been suggested that women leaders tend to be more transformational and relational than their male counterparts (Bassols, Moreno, Ortega, Ricart, &

Fernandez-Real, 2010; Chapman & Luthans, 1975). People will behave consistently with: societal expectation of their gender; their perceived obligations to an organisation (their psychological contract) (Jackson & Parry, 2011; Rousseau, 1989); and potentially within the expectations of the social group that form an organisational culture (Cooke & Rousseau, 1988). Heffernan (2011 p17) highlights how their biases make people favour those that are most like themselves, and that homogeneity of workers and management is evident in many organisations. Heffernan (2011 p17) claims that this is why women have struggled with gender equality in the workplace. A review of the feminist literature (Saul, 2003; Walters, 2005) has highlighted a range of struggles and issues for women long before Beauvoir's 1949 book "*The Second Sex*".

Even though psychological studies have demonstrated that groups of females have an increased collective intelligence and therefore enhanced group performance, (Woolley et al., 2010). Homogeneity in staff characteristics can limit clear vision and insight as well as rich and constructive conflict (Heffernan, 2015 p17). Conversational turn taking and social sensitivity were also identified to improve team performance (Woolley et al., 2010). Diverse groups may help broaden insight. Board of director diversity is positively correlated with financial performance (Erhardt, Werbel, & Shrader, 2003), however other studies suggest that diversity increases conflict and therefore mediates the value of diversity (Jehn, Northcraft, & Neale, 1999; Watson, Kumar, & Michaelsen, 1993). The Belbin (2010) team roles model provides an overall strategy for developing roles within teams, although there have been criticisms about its validity (Aritzeta, Swailes, & Senior, 2005). It should be used with caution as team and individual roles are likely to change in dynamic environments. Two studies examining Belbin's model and gender had conflicting results which was attributed to the natural variation between sample groups in a 2014 review conducted by Belbin (Belbin, 2014). The review and Belbin's model, have so far failed to explore issues of race or creed on group dynamics. Huffington (2004 p53) explores the discourse of women leaders within an 'ungendered or undifferentiated organisation'. Often the female leader is welcomed into a male dominated management culture that, however well meaning, includes a tacit hegemony of organisation values.

Kellerman's (2012) 'the end of leadership', highlights that much of the leadership literature is leader-centric and skewed towards defining a 'good' leader. Yet, leadership is impossible without followers. Kellerman (2012) further argues that traditional models of hierarchical leadership are in decline due to: the spread of democracy and empowerment, the practice of participation, and the erosion of authority through increased access to information and increased connectivity via social media.

Instead of hierarchy, Heffernan (2015 p84) and Grint (2005 p138) suggest heterarchy where knowledge is the leader and organisations can change to a more equal structure in response to need. However, heterarchy can co-exist with hierarchy via the interconnected matrix approach where everyone is encouraged to see themselves as leaders instead of followers, where organisation communication is modelled as peer to peer, everyone can communicate with each other, regardless of rank. This model has been thought to increase social conscience, responsibility and commitment within the organisation (Heffernan, 2011 p147). Although this approach raises a number of ethical considerations; pay differentials for example would need to be managed transparently and may be difficult to implement. If a core team collectively agreed to increase their responsibility and ownership of tasks, in essence broaden their psychological contract (Rousseau, 1989), it could help to limit repetition of work amongst different team members, improve efficiency and therefore save on budget. However, it depends on the team and style of followership, some people may require formal updates to their role and employment contract and some may not even want such extra responsibility.

Brookes (2016) recognises that the collective approach to a more equitable leader style, concentrating on the task rather than person, would take considerable courage on behalf of all concerned; not least the leader embarking on such change. This may be achieved by a gradualist approach, investing responsibility in individuals and groups as 'learning projects' from which individuals and groups can grow. The adult learning project was considered by Tough (1971) as a way for individuals to build self confidence in their own potential and agency. Knowles (1973) further developed this through the

use of learning contracts, which were essentially an agreement between parties on an action or process towards a specific achievement. Implicit within the learning project approach is the potential for equality and shared responsibility as part of an *Andragogical* (or adult) learning strategy. Interestingly, so many of these strategies are silent on concepts of gender representation in organisations.

The charismatic leader

Historically, charismatic leadership has studied the “great man” (Klenke, 2004 p26) and masculinity defined authority, power, position and leadership. Charisma is a sociological term defined by Weber (1905), who’s seminal work “*The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*” criticised some aspects of charismatic leadership in favour of more impartial bureaucratic leadership. Today, the trait/styles approach of studies around charismatic leadership is considered to perpetuate the gender biases (Devarachetty, 2012). Feminist leadership theory is considered to provide another perspective. However, authentic leadership has received much attention as a more inclusive, ethical, caring and self-awareness leader and follower model emerged into the 1990s, though the concept is grounded in early the Greek Delphic Maxims (Park & Wormell, 1956; Gardner et al 2005). Hopkins & O’Neil (2015) acknowledge that because leadership styles are built on masculine behaviours, such as assertiveness and competitiveness, and that it is difficult for females to be authentic leaders because these traits are not associated with femininity. Authenticity emerges in the transactions between leaders and followers (Eagly, 2005), it is in the eye of the follower and dependent on social constructs of authenticity and expectations of gender norms (Hopkins & O’Neil, 2015).

A charismatic leadership style may be more dependent upon personality, drive and ambition than a transformative leadership style. The limitation of this perspective of leadership is that it is leader-centred and still does not appropriately consider the important role of the follower. In a study of personality in leadership Bartone *et al* (2009) found that personality was only a slightly better (3%) predictor of leadership than other factors such as gender. The data demonstrating links between personality and leadership behaviours appear counterintuitive, meaning that charisma is no

indication of effective leadership (Jackson & Parry, 2011 P38). Authentic communication, sensory awareness and even the ability to be vulnerable are described by Owen (2015 p175) as vital requisites for the charismatic leader, which highlights that charismatic leadership is much deeper than just exhibiting charisma.

The 'dark side' of charismatic leadership has been explored by numerous authors (Benson & Hogan, 2008; Bligh et al., 2007; Burke, 2006; DeCelles & Pfarrer, 2004; Einarsen, Aasland, & Skogstad, 2007). Followers of charismatic leaders are considered to have their own set of unique traits, such as blind devotion (DeCelles & Pfarrer, 2004). Subservient and uncritical followers may provide a charismatic leader with opportunities for destructive leadership behaviour, towards subordinates and/or their organisation which may lead to corporate corruption (Einarsen et al., 2007). Even with ethical charismatic leaders, issues arise with sustainability and leadership succession: any successor will likely fail because they are unable to step into the (unknown) shoes of a charismatic leader (Hargreaves & Fink, 2004).

Semantics are another confounding factor in leadership theory because the concept of leadership is abstract rather than concrete (Ayres, 2002). This issue is explored in the literature in terms of power hierarchies and hegemony. Ayres (2002) highlights the importance of understanding the rich role that semantics play in communication. Everyone makes inferences, effective leadership means creating shared meaning because this constitutes our collective culture (Ayres, 2002).

Leadership is not only about style, as previously stated, it should also consider context and environment. Leadership in itself is a complex system not understood by its component parts, yet many people assume that it is the highest rank in the organisation who is the leader. This type of tacit knowledge comes from group and individuals beliefs and the perception of mutual obligations known as the psychological contract (as developed by Argyris, 1960). The person at the top may be a manager, not necessarily a leader. The differences between management and leadership have been widely explored in the literature, such that in practice, it is recognised that leadership can reside at any or all levels not necessarily linked to a

person or role (Bush, 2008; Gill, 2002; Middlehurst & Elton, 1992; Popovici, 2012; Smircich & Morgan, 1982; Toor & Ofori, 2008; Yelder & Codling, 2004)

Organisations are the complex interdependent interaction of its people. The process, development and output of an organisation therefore lies in the complex communication of its people, not in the procedures (Stacey, 2000 p5). Although systems science provides tools for dealing with complexity, this is, in itself not sufficient. Effective change is not about managing communication with new information systems and processes but in changing the dialectics.

Systems and complexity theory

Systems theory and science provides a platform for understanding the complexity of self-regulating systems across many disciplines. As with complexity theory it is not a unified theory but rather a collection of concepts and theories. The complex system is not understood by its component parts, they are characterised by their interaction with the environment. Complexity theory tells us that cause and effect in management is dynamic, non-linear and non-deterministic (de Rond & Thiart, R, 2004).

Uhl-Bien, Russ, & McKelvey (2007), themselves leaders in the complexity theory leadership, highlight that leadership plays an important role in the connectivity of people and the emergent properties of organisations. Stacey (2000) explores the complexity of communication, interaction and relationships in organisations, including the anxiety caused by the gaps between the expectations and the realities of organisational, group and individual behaviour. Stacey (2000 p63) also highlights the importance of relationships, with effective groups having goals and values that align with the personal goals and values of the individuals in the group. Tsai (2011) describes the social or relational role as the glue that holds complex organisations together, while Regan & Brooks (1995 p75) describe the attributes of relational leadership as being 'feminist, collaborative, caring, courageous, intuitive and visionary'. A meta-analysis of gender and leadership style (Eagly et al., 1990) found women to be slightly more concerned with interpersonal relations than men.

The organisational matrix structure (Hall, 2013), more common in global companies, also applies to the smaller organisation where staff may have more than 1 role and more than 1 line manager. Loughney (2014) suggests that lateral communication, creating links and relationships that span boundaries, is key for success. This is communication across the organisational hierarchy, horizontally, vertically and diagonally, rather than just top down. The issue with matrix management is how to make it work (de Laat, 1994; Hall, 2013). Loughney (2014) further states that the challenge is not to build a matrix structure as such, but to create a matrix in the mind of the managers and staff. Other challenges to overcome in matrix organisations are described by Swayne, Duncan, & Ginter (2008):

- “Misaligned goals
- Conflicting loyalties
- Confusion about roles and responsibilities
- Ambiguous authority” (Swayne et al., 2008 p341)

In addition, external agencies such as professional and government bodies, including the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA), shape educational organisations into bureaucratic ones which rely on followers following policy. The limitations of these are well described in the literature and by Grint (2005 p138-145), it can inhibit efficiency, flexibility, creativity and sustainable change. The benefits of traditional structures and bureaucracy are not frequently considered, though have been described since Hegel’s Philosophy of Right was published in 1820. Stazyk & Goerdel (2011) assert that public organisations, like Universities, have a history of efficacy, not least because bureaucracy can provide them with support structures but also, because they can help to clearly define an organisation’s goals.

The mission and vision statements explain an organisation's goals, purpose and direction (Thornbury, 2006 p31-41). Communicating the vision and mission of the company, and the roles and responsibilities of its staff, clearly and explicitly may help to reinforce the direction of transformation. Communicating these effectively may also help to limit conflicting loyalties and improve goal alignment.

When promoting the matrix approach, leaders and management should further consider the influences of external demands on organisational change, the impact of position within the organisation, the impact of individual experience on leadership as well as the ethical issues raised by the matrix approach. For example, Bryman (2007) describes leadership roles in higher education and highlights that a head of department is often not engaged in executive leadership as this is undertaken by leaders at an institutional level and that various roles within the same organisation require a range, and potentially different, leadership behaviours and approaches.

Systems and complexity theory recognises that it is the relationship between the parts that is crucial, and that organisations need to be considered as complex adaptive systems (Stacey, 2000 p106). Complexity, lack of ownership and process driven approaches are contributing factors to wilful blindness (Heffernan, 2014). Although a succinct UK legal definition is lacking, wilful blindness is a term used in criminal law to refer to:

'the acts of a person who intentionally fails to be informed about matters that would make the person criminally liable. It describes an attempt to avoid civil or criminal liability for a wrongful act by intentionally putting oneself in a position to be unaware of facts which create liability' (US Legal, 2015).

Senge (2006 p297) explores the ladder of inference and how our beliefs and values influence the "selective" data we pay attention to, known as "the reflexive loop". The importance of reflection and developing learning teams is key to heightening awareness, change feedback and developing a culture of honesty. Senge (2006 p343) also highlights the importance of using systems diagrams to identify interdependency in organisational and global networks that may have been blind to the organisation and its staff.

Flattened hierarchies and shared leadership may limit the parental and paternal issues and authoritarian power as well as increase empowerment and participation (Paulson, Wajdi, & Manz, 2012). Whether that promotes or inhibits whistle-blowing has not

been well explored. The National Audit Office (2014) report on making a whistle-blowing policy work, provides systems, structures and behaviour recommendations to enable whistle-blowing. Although moving the organisation to a flatter structure could be practically achieved, this, in itself, would not achieve further equality or a shared leadership culture because their complexity is far greater than hierarchical structure. Transformational leadership has been found to have a greater direct positive influence on whistle-blowing culture than transactional leadership (Caillier, 2015; Caillier & Sa, 2017). Transactional versus transformational leadership approaches have been widely explored, both have advantages (Bass, 1990; Currie & Lockett, 2007; Seidman & McCauley, 2011).

Outcomes of complex systems are generally considered to be emergent (Funtowicz & Ravetz, 1994; Lichtenstein & Plowman, 2009; Wolfram, 1985). According to Seel (2006) emergent change is key to success in organisations and creating conditions for emergent change involve a range of factors including: connectivity and improved communication, diversity of agents and the rate of information flow, whilst anxiety is considered to inhibit emergence. Complexity and emergence bring uncertainty which can create anxiety. Menzies (1960) explored the immense anxiety felt by nurses working in hospitals the late 1950's and found that a rigid hierarchy and clearly defined roles helped to diffuse the anxiety of individual nurses via the formal distribution of responsibility on the system/hospital as a whole. Implicit within this understanding was the concept of leaders 'carrying' the anxiety of followers, in this case nurses, and Menzies exemplifies this within a more feminine perspective.

Shared and Peer Leadership

Although bureaucratic, organisation hierarchy is there for accountability. Formal hierarchical organisations are considered to have slow communication and decision making due to the nature of the structure. They may also create a lack of ownership amongst other staff when the leader at the top holds onto power and withholds sanctions for change (Grint, 2005 p36). There needs to be leadership at every level, leadership actions across the whole organisation is critical for success (Pearce, 2004, Weymes, 2002). Complexity theory (Mazzocchi, 2008) recognizes that it is the

relationship between the parts that is crucial, and that organisations need to be considered as complex adaptive systems. For matrix success, all individuals need to know the matrix and work towards maintaining sustainable relationships.

Earlier in this discussion we considered the concept of communication, where leadership may be shared top down, bottom up and laterally. Leadership is not a position; it is part of an organisation's culture. Followership is a continuation of leadership and the shared leadership approach rejects the distinction between leaders and followers (Jackson & Parry, 2011). Leadership is not a role but an activity which has an impact on other people, systems and places. The primary purpose of leadership may be emotional and anxiety management (Weymes, 2002). Schein (2010) describes the primary purpose of leadership as culture management and goes on to provide clear definitions of culture and how to manage it.

The difference between followership and mentoring has not been well explored in the literature. Ives (2008) has distinguished mentoring from coaching by suggesting mentoring is instructional and coaching is non-directive but this depends on the aim of coaching or mentoring. The term followership may also suggest it is non-directive but mentoring to specific objectives and competencies may help to develop more dynamic followers, who can become more dynamic leaders (Latour & Rast, 2004).

Evidence for successful application of leadership theories appears to be lacking because leadership is situational (Hersey, 1985). Leaders can show by example, reinforce by behaviour, and move the organisation to a point where collective leadership is cultural and pervasive (Brookes, 2016). This might include being explicit about their own and others leadership actions and facilitate involvement. As a leader and as a follower the implementation of shared leadership also requires the management of emotion and anxiety (Menzies, 1988p113-118) amongst all those involved. The importance and necessity of presence and proximity as a means to manage these is also debated as a strategy for successful collective leadership.

Distribution of power and sanctions for change may help to enhance the growth and capacity of others and reap the rewards of collegial and distributed leadership. However, in reality, a political pyramid exists (Zaleznik, 1970). In a climate where resources are scarce, inappropriately managed distribution of power may lead to competitiveness and interest conflicts (Zaleznik, 1970).

Transformational leadership

Simply, transformational leaders guide change through vision. Smircich & Morgan (1982) and Weick, Sutcliffe, & Obstfeld (2005) highlight that creating meaning or sense making is an important function of leadership. Leaders provide meaning by contextualizing their vision. Lack of meaning and purpose can create anxiety and despair. Angst and despair are important themes in existentialism and managing anxiety in organisations has been explored by Miller (2008) in his book *“the anxious organisation”*.

Transformational leadership style has a number of characteristics which resonate with existential themes, such as: freedom, authenticity, and finding meaning. It is also about identifying the need for change. Jackson & Parry (2011 p31) argue that transformational leadership is about transforming attitudes and motivations and that these consequently change the behaviors of followers. Social capital is considered key for sustainable transformational adaptation (Fischer & Pollock, 2004, Moser & Boykoff, 2013 p122).

Transformational leadership has had numerous criticisms, including that it is autocratic and unidirectional, flowing from leader to follower and not vice versa (Lee, 2014). This could make a transformational leader blind to their power and needs of the followers. It is also argued that it focuses on a behavioral style of leadership (Jackson & Parry, 2011 p30). Being mindful and encouraging whistle-blowing and constructive dissent (Grint, 2005 p42) may help overcome wilful blindness. Heffernan (2011 p329-330) further suggests creating processes where whistle-blowers can demonstrate pride in their actions and the change they created.

Wilful blindness is essentially unethical inaction. O'Brien (2011) highlights the importance of ethical leadership to limit and mitigate risk as well as the need for emotional intelligence which is fundamental to ethical leadership. Ethics is at the heart of leadership (Ciulla, 2004). Leaders play an essential role in setting a culture of ethical behaviour. Leaders should reward, encourage and manage ethical accountability as well as demonstrate ethical decision making (Watts, 2008) but leaders also need to be authentic (Duignan & Bhindi, 1997). Heffernan (2011 p305) highlights the importance of questions such as "*do we mean this?*" and "*what are all the reasons we are wrong?*" as well as questioning the unquestionable. Embedding this questioning culture may promote listening, empathy and social connectedness across an organisation. Further creating time for social support may help to develop trust, candidness, openness and social capital (Heffernan, 2015 p33-38). As discussed, social support and relational leadership may be associated with female traits, even if that perception comes from female leaders themselves rather than followers (Kark, 2004)

Gardner (2011 p 19) first postulated the multiple intelligence theories model. Interpersonal intelligence in Gardner's theory is clearly related to Emotional Intelligence (EI). The links between EI and interpersonal relations are explored by Schutte et al. (2001). It is widely accepted that leadership includes many emotional considerations and that leaders who can manage their own emotions and empathise with the emotions of others are considered to be more effective in the workplace (Antonakis, Ashkanasy, & Dasborough, 2009). EI has a statistically significant ($p < .05$) predictive relationship with transformational leadership style, regardless of gender (Mandell & Pherwani, 2003).

Gardner went on to consider existential philosophy and the ability to tackle deep questions about human existence as one of the multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1999 p 60). The existential view of communication is more about encounters and relationships than just the transmission of information (Ashman & Lawler, 2008). Emotional and existential intelligence appears to come together, with the other intelligences, to establish leaders and support them in achieving their vision.

Gender differences relating to emotional intelligence has been explored in a variety of ways but there appears to be little difference between male and female social and emotional intelligence attributes (Johnson & Spector, 2007; Mandell & Pherwani, 2003; Petrides & Furnham, 2000, 2006; Schutte et al., 2001). It may not even be possible to clearly define gender differences in emotional intelligence, or leadership, when individual difference in personality, behavior and cognitive ability are widely variable (Williams, Myerson, & Hale, 2008).

There is also little consensus in the literature defining what constitutes transformational leadership, varying sources suggest a range of behaviours and styles (Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe, 2001; Bass, 1990; Jackson & Parry, 2011; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990). Although leaders may display transformational leadership behaviours and styles, justifying that they are a transformational leader would be difficult, if not impossible, due to the situational nature of leadership.

Reflection and implemented actions

In my own practice, my responsibilities, authority and leadership status have increased within the organisation through followership. I have been fortunate to have an inspirational female leader who has taken the time to mentor me and has afforded time for my learning in action, the development of leadership skills and practical wisdom or *phronesis* (as described by Heidegger, 1997). Brewer (2014) focuses on the value of coaching in her work on "*Leadership, Coaching and Followership: An important equation*". In addition, a range of texts are emerging, which specifically support the development of female leaders (Baecke, Burema, & Frijters, 1982; Eagly & Carli, 2012; Rhode, 2016; Sandberg & Scovell, 2013.)

A personal contribution that emerges from this review is to recognise the personal power and advocacy that one holds within an organisation. Context is a complex variable in organisations, though in seeking new ways of engaging team members, there is a responsibility to 'embrace equity and to foster strategies necessary to achieve it' (Kellerman & Rhode, 2012, p. 144).

Leaders need to consider the 'eye of the beholder' (Smothers, Absher, & White, 2012) follower as key to successful shared leadership. My own belief is that effective leaders have the ability to express a worthy vision inspirationally and lead change ethically considering the needs, values and beliefs of others. A feminist perspective such as my own, may enable female potential to be realised as positive change. I probably would not have called myself a feminist before undertaking this review because I did not fully understand what feminism was. Subscribing to women's rights news and exploring the feminist and post-feminist literature (McRobbie, 2004; Saul, 2003; Walters, 2005) has also helped me to understand the argument more deeply.

Critically appraising a wide range of change and leadership/followership knowledge, theories and practice have highlighted numerous opportunities for developing leadership practice and achieving sustainable change. Actions that were implemented as a result of the insights gained from undertaking this review includes:

- Development of relationships with colleagues in an effort to build capital.
- Building collaborate networks through networking.
- Understanding and re-enforcing organisational culture by explicitly communicating the vision and mission statements of my organisation in staff newsletters in order to align staff towards them.
- Support and develop of mentoring schemes, including changing the staff review process to a peer support process where staff can choose who should give them feedback and support.
- Creating greater variety and diversity in leaders across organisations who are also focused on creating diverse leaders. I now explicitly recognise leadership behaviour in the bi-monthly staff memorandum.
- Disseminating leadership learning, raising awareness and encouraging everyone to be a leader in an effort to strengthening personal responsibility.
- Promoting a shared leadership culture in the workplace, mostly achieved through explicitly praising good leadership amongst colleagues.

- Understanding that listening to colleague anxiety in an effort to help to relieve organisational anxiety (Huffington, Armstrong, Halton, Hoyle, & Pooley, 2004 p. 78).
- Creating a culture of truth, as well as creating policies and procedures for whistleblowing were other valuable concepts that came out of this review.
- Broadening the tacit concept of the psychological contract through ethical leadership and highlighting the broader social values of striving towards the organisations vision and mission (O'Donohue & Nelson, 2009).
- Reconsidering the efficacy of my organisation's communication processes and social connectedness led to the explicit embedding of a communication plan within project planning documents.
- Highlighting the issues of wilful blindness and encouraging creative questioning as well as promoting reflection.

The contribution of Margaret Heffernan (2011, 2015) exemplifies useful leadership strategies, such as; Creating creative conflict through questioning (transformational leadership), building social capital (emotional intelligence and transformational leadership), creating time for high-order thinking (emotional intelligence), building rich collaborative networks (systems thinking) and promoting leadership activities amongst everyone (transformational leadership).

Conclusions

Undertaking this review has been instrumental in my development as a leader as well as my followership. I have taken positive action to disseminate my learning, promote shared leadership and acknowledge positive leadership action amongst my peers. My own values align well with my organisation's values and vision, this drives me to continue to develop my own personal and professional growth as well as enhance my organisation's environment and support the development of the professions I work within. Numerous complexities of organisational leadership have been reviewed, ensuring the changes implemented are sustainable means continuing to review and

reflect on the leadership literature so learning can be disseminated, shared meaning communicated and further developments evaluated.

References:

- Alimo-Metcalfe, B., & Alban-Metcalfe, R. J. (2001). The development of a new Transformational Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74(1), 1–27.
<https://doi.org/10.1348/096317901167208>
- Antonakis, J., Ashkanasy, N. M., & Dasborough, M. T. (2009). Does leadership need emotional intelligence? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(2), 247–261.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.01.006>
- Argyris, C. (1960). *Understanding organizational behavior*. Illinois: Dorsey Press.
- Aritzeta, A., Swailes, S., & Senior, B. (2005). *Team Roles: Psychometric Evidence Construct Validity and Team Building*. Hull: Business School, University of Hull.
Retrieved from <http://www2.hull.ac.uk/hubs/pdf/memorandum51.pdf>
- Armstrong, D. (2004). *Working Below the Surface: The Emotional Life of Contemporary Organizations*. Karnac.
- Ashman, I., & Lawler, J. (2008). Existential Communication and Leadership. *Leadership*, 4(3), 253–269. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715008092361>
- Ayres, M. (2002). Leadership, shared meaning and semantics. *A Review of General Semantics*, 59(3), 287.
- Baecke, J. A., Burema, J., & Frijters, J. E. (1982). A short questionnaire for the measurement of habitual physical activity in epidemiological studies. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 36(5), 936–42. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7137077>
- Bartone, P. T., Eid, J., Helge Johnsen, B., Christian Laberg, J., & Snook, S. A. (2009). Big five personality factors, hardiness, and social judgment as predictors of leader performance. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 30(6), 498–521.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730910981908>

WBL e-journal international, Vol. 7, n. 1 (2017)

- Bass, Bernard, M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 181–217.
- Bass, B. (1990). From Transactional to Transformational Leadership: Learning to Share the Vision. *Organizational Dynamics; Winter 90*, 18(3), 19–31.
- Bassols, J., Moreno, J. M., Ortega, F., Ricart, W., & Fernandez-Real, J. M. (2010). Characterization of herpes virus entry mediator as a factor linked to obesity. *Obesity (Silver Spring, Md.)*, 18(2), 239–46. <https://doi.org/10.1038/oby.2009.250>
- Beauvoir, S. (1949). *The Second Sex*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Belbin. (2014). BELBIN(UK) A Comprehensive Review. Retrieved February 6, 2017, from <https://www.scribd.com/document/299071342/BELBIN-Uk-2014-a-Comprehensive-Review>
- Belbin, M. (2010). *Team Roles at Work*. London: Routledge.
- Benson, M. J., & Hogan, R. (2008). How Dark Side Leadership Personality Destroys Trust and Degrades Organisational Effectiveness. *E-Organisations & People*, 15(3), 10. Retrieved from <http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles/34904640/how-dark-side-leadership-personality-destroys-trust-degrades-organisational-effectiveness>
- Bligh, M. C., Kohles, J. C., Pearce, C. L., Justin, J. E., Stovall, J. F., & Bligh, L. (2007). When the romance is over: Follower perspectives of aversive leadership. *Published in Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 56(4), 528–557. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2007.00303.x>
- Brewer, A. M. (2014). *Leadership, coaching and followership : an important equation*. Springer.
- Brookes, S. (2016). *The selfless leader : a compass for collective leadership* (1st ed.). London: Palgrave.
- Bryman, A. (2007). Effective leadership in higher education: a literature review. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(6), 693–710. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070701685114>
- Burke, R. J. (2006). Why leaders fail: exploring the darkside. *International Journal of*

Manpower, 27(1), 91–100. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437720610652862>

Bush, T. (2008). From Management to Leadership: Semantic or Meaningful Change? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 36(2), 271–288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143207087777>

Caillier, J. G. (2015). Transformational Leadership and Whistle-Blowing Attitudes: Is This Relationship Mediated by Organizational Commitment and Public Service Motivation? *The American Review of Public Administration*, 45(4), 458–475. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074013515299>

Caillier, J. G., & Sa, Y. (2017). Do transformational-oriented leadership and transactional-oriented leadership have an impact on whistle-blowing attitudes? A longitudinal examination conducted in US federal agencies. *Public Management Review*, 19(4), 406–422. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2016.1177109>

Chapman, J. B., & Luthans, F. (1975). The Female Leadership Dilemma. *Public Personnel Management*, 4(3), 173–179. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009102607500400306>

Ciulla, J. B. (2004). *Ethics, the Heart of Leadership*. (2nd ed.). London: Praeger.

Cooke, R. A., & Rousseau, D. M. (1988). Behavioral Norms and Expectations: A Quantitative Approach To the Assessment of Organizational Culture. *Group & Organization Management*, 13(3), 245–273. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105960118801300302>

Currie, G., & Lockett, A. (2007). A critique of transformational leadership: Moral, professional and contingent dimensions of leadership within public services organizations. *Human Relations*, 60(2), 341–370. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726707075884>

de Laat, P. B. (1994). Matrix Management of Projects and Power Struggles: A Case Study of an R&D Laboratory. *Human Relations*, 47(9), 1089–1119. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679404700904>

de Rond, M., & Thiart, R. A. (2004). Chance, choice and determinism in strategy. *Research Papers in Management Studies*, 5.

DeCelles, K. A., & Pfarrer, M. D. (2004). Heroes or Villains? Corruption and the

- Charismatic Leader. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 11(1), 67–77.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/107179190401100108>
- Devarachetty, S. (2012). Women as Charismatic Leaders. Retrieved from
http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=akron1342500744
- Duignan, P. A., & Bhindi, N. (1997). Authenticity in leadership: an emerging perspective. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 35(3), 195–209.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/09578239710170119>
- Eagly, A. H. (2005). Achieving relational authenticity in leadership: Does gender matter? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 459–474.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.007>
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2012). Women and the Labyrinth of Leadership. In W. E. Rosenbach, R. L. Taylor, & M. A. Youndt (Eds.), *Contemporary Issues in Leadership* (7th ed., pp. 147–162). Colorado: Westview Press.
- Eagly, A. H., Johnson, B. T., Hall, J., Hollander, E. E., Komaki, J., Sternberg, L., & Weiss, H. (1990). Gender and Leadership Style: A Meta-Analysis, 108(2), 233–256.
Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/chip_docs
- Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behaviour: A definition and conceptual model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(3), 207–216.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.002>
- Erhardt, N. L., Werbel, J. D., & Shrader, C. B. (2003). Board of Director Diversity and Firm Financial Performance. *Corporate Governance*, 11(2), 102–111.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8683.00011>
- Fischer, H. M., & Pollock, T. G. (2004). Effects of social capital and power on surviving transformational change: The case of initial public offerings. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(4), 463–481. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20159597>
- Funtowicz, S., & Ravetz, J. (1994). Emergent Complex Systems. *Futures*, 26(6), 568–582.
- Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligences reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st Century*. USA: Basic Books.

WBL e-journal international, Vol. 7, n. 1 (2017)

- Gardner, H. (2011). *Frames of Mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. USA: Basic Books.
- Gill, R. (2002). Change management--or change leadership? *Journal of Change Management*, 3(4), 307–318. <https://doi.org/10.1080/714023845>
- Grint, K. (2005). *Leadership: Limits and Possibilities (Management, Work and Organisations)*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Hall, K. (2013). *Making the matrix work : how matrix managers engage people and cut through complexity*. Nicholas Brealey Publishing.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fink, D. (2004). The Seven Principles of Sustainable Leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 61(7), 8–13. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/apr04/vol61/num07/The-Seven-Principles-of-Sustainable-Leadership.aspx>
- Heffernan, M. (2011). *Wilful Blindness: Why We Ignore the Obvious*. London: Simon & Schuster UK Ltd.
- Heffernan, M. (2014). Just Culture. Radio 4 Analysis. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b04n31d2>
- Heffernan, M. (2015). *Beyond Measure: The Big Impact of Small Changes*. London: Simon & Schuster UK Ltd.
- Heidegger, M. (1997). *Plato's Sophist* (1st ed.). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hersey, P. (1985). *The Situational Leader* (4th ed.). New York: Warner books.
- Hopkins, M. M., & O'Neil, D. A. (2015). Authentic leadership: application to women leaders. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 959. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00959>
- Huffington, C., Armstrong, D., Halton, W., Hoyle, L., & Pooley, J. (2004). *Working Below the Surface: The Emotional Life of Contemporary Organizations*. London: Karnac.
- Ives, Y. (2008). What Is "Coaching"? An Exploration of Conflicting Paradigms. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, (6), 100–113.

- Jackson, B., & Parry, K. (2011). *A very short, fairly interesting and reasonably cheap book about studying leadership*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Jehn, K. A., Northcraft, G. B., & Neale, M. A. (1999). Why Differences Make a Difference: A Field Study of Diversity, Conflict, and Performance in Workgroups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(4), 741. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2667054>
- Johnson, H.-A. M., & Spector, P. E. (2007). Service with a smile: Do emotional intelligence, gender, and autonomy moderate the emotional labor process? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12(4), 319–333. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.4.319>
- Kark, R. (2004). The transformational leader: who is (s)he? A feminist perspective. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17(2), 160–176. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09534810410530593>
- Kellerman, B., & Rhode, D. L. (2012). Viable Options: Rethinking women and leadership. In W. E. Rosenbach, R. L. Taylor, & M. A. Youndt (Eds.), *Contemporary Issues in Leadership* (7th ed., pp. 135–145). Colorado: Westview Press.
- Kelley, R. E. (1988). In praise of followers. *Harvard Business Review*, 66, 142–148.
- Klenke, K. (2004). *Women and Leadership: A Contextual Perspective*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Knowles, M. (1973). *The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species*. Gulf Publishing Company, P.O. Box 2608, Houston, TX 77001 (\$7.95). Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED084368>
- Latour, S. M., & Rast, V. J. (2004). Dynamic followership: the prerequisite for effective leadership. *Air & Space Power Journal*, 18(4), 102–111. Retrieved from <http://go.galegroup.com/ps/anonymous?id=GALE%7CA127871762&sid=googleScholar&v=2.1&it=r&linkaccess=fulltext&issn=1555385X&p=AONE&sw=w&authCount=1&isAnonymousEntry=true>
- Lee, M. (2014, August 22). Transformational leadership: is it time for a recall. *International Journal of Management and Applied Research*. Retrieved from <http://ijmar.org/v1n1/14-002.html>

WBL e-journal international, Vol. 7, n. 1 (2017)

- Lichtenstein, B., & Plowman, D. (2009). The leadership of emergence: A complex systems leadership theory of emergence at successive organizational levels. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(4), 617–630.
- Loughney, C. (2014). Leadership Lecture at Middlesex University. London.: MU.
- Mandell, B., & Pherwani, S. (2003). Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence and Transformational Leadership Style: A Gender Comparison. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17(3), 387–404. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022816409059>
- Mazzocchi, F. (2008). Exceeding the limits of reductionism and determinism using complexity theory. *Molecular Biology*.
- McRobbie, A. (2004). Post-feminism and popular culture. *Feminist Media Studies*, 4(3), 255–264. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1468077042000309937>
- Menzies, I. E. P. (1960). The functioning of social systems as a defence against anxiety : a report on a study of the nursing service of a general hospital. *Human Relations*, 13, 95–121.
- Menzies, L. (1988). *Containing Anxiety in Organisations* (1st ed.). London: Free Association Books.
- Middlehurst, R., & Elton, L. (1992). Leadership and management in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 17(3), 251–264. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079212331382527>
- Miller, J. A. (2008). *The Anxious Organisation: why smart companies do dumb thing* (2nd ed.). Facts on Demand.
- Moser, S. C., & Boykoff, M. T. (2013). *Successful Adaptation to Climate Change: Linking Science and Policy in a Rapidly Changing World*. Routledge.
- National Audit Office. (2014). *Making a whistleblowing policy work*. Retrieved from <http://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Making-a-whistleblowing-policy-work.pdf>
- O'Donohue, W., & Nelson, L. (2009). The Role of Ethical Values in an Expanded Psychological Contract. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 90(2), 251–263. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0040-1>

- O'Brien. (2011). Ethical Leadership and how it mitigates risk. *The Week in Ethics*. Retrieved from <https://theweekinethics.wordpress.com/tag/willful-blindness/>
- Owen, N. (2015). *Charismatic to the Core: A Fresh Approach to Authentic Leadership*: SRA Books.
- Paulson, R., Wajdi, H., & Manz, C. (2012). Succeeding Through Collaborative Conflict: The Paradoxical Lessons of Shared Leadership. *The Journal of Values-Based Leadership*. Retrieved from <http://scholar.valpo.edu/jvbl/vol2/iss1/7>
- Pearce, C. L. (2004). The future of leadership: Combining vertical and shared leadership to transform knowledge work. *Academy of Management Executive*, 18(1), 47–57. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AME.2004.12690298>
- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2000). Gender Differences in Measured and Self-Estimated Trait Emotional Intelligence. *Sex Roles*, 42(5/6), 449–461. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007006523133>
- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2006). The Role of Trait Emotional Intelligence in a Gender-Specific Model of Organizational Variables¹. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36(2), 552–569. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00019.x>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107–142. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(90\)90009-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7)
- Popovici, V. (2012). Similarities And Differences Between Management And Leadership. *Annals - Economy Series*, 2, 126–135. Retrieved from <http://ideas.repec.org/a/cbu/jrnlec/y2012v2p126-135.html>
- Regan, H. B., & Brooks, G. H. (1995). *Out of women's experience : creating relational leadership*. Corwin Press.
- Rhode, D. L. (n.d.). *Women and leadership*.
- Rosenbach, W. E., & Taylor, R. L. (2006). *Contemporary Issues in Leadership*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organizations.

Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 2(2), 121–139.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01384942>

Sandberg, S., & Scovell, N. (n.d.). *Lean in : women, work, and the will to lead*.

Saul, J. M. (2003). Feminism: Issues & Arguments. Retrieved from

<http://philpapers.org/rec/SAUFI>

Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Bobik, C., Coston, T. D., Greeson, C., Jedlicka, C., ...

Wendorf, G. (2001). Emotional intelligence and interpersonal relations. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 141(4), 523–36.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224540109600569>

Seel, R. (2006). Emergence in Organisations. Retrieved October 31, 2015, from

<http://www.new-paradigm.co.uk/emergence-2.htm>

Seidman, W., & McCauley, M. (2011). Transformational Leadership in a Transactional World. *OD Practitioner*, 43(2).

Senge, P. M. (2006). *The Fifth Discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization* (2nd ed.). Sydney: Random House.

Smircich, L., & Morgan, G. (1982). Leadership: the management of meaning. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 18(3), 257–73. Retrieved from

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10260212>

Smothers, J., Absher, K. R., & White, D. W. (2012). In the Eye of the Beholder: A Configurational Analysis of Followers' Conceptualizations of the Ideal Academic Department Leader at Private Universities. Retrieved from

<http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2020106>

Stacey, R. D. (2000). *Complexity and Management: Fad or Radical Challenge to Systems Thinking?* Routledge.

Stazyk, E. C., & Goerdel, H. T. (2011). The Benefits of Bureaucracy: Public Managers' Perceptions of Political Support, Goal Ambiguity, and Organizational Effectiveness. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21(4), 645–672. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muq047>

- Swayne, L. E., Duncan, W. J. (Walter J., & Ginter, P. M. (2008). *Strategic management of health care organizations*. Jossey-Bass. Retrieved from [https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=InjBkmPVTUUC&pg=PA341&lpg=PA341&dq=matrix+organisation+Misaligned+goals,+Conflicting+loyalties,+Confusion+about+roles+and+responsibilities,+Delayed+decisions&source=bl&ots=joLqrzzSZ5&sig=Y04AS7zJYeAHbcQyPvQ2QNdn9s&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi-hP-yhf7SAhVHXBoKHaRwA14Q6AEIlzAB#v=onepage&q=matrix organisation Misaligned goals%2C Conflicting loyalties%2C Confusion about roles and responsibilities%2C Delayed decisions&f=false](https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=InjBkmPVTUUC&pg=PA341&lpg=PA341&dq=matrix+organisation+Misaligned+goals,+Conflicting+loyalties,+Confusion+about+roles+and+responsibilities,+Delayed+decisions&source=bl&ots=joLqrzzSZ5&sig=Y04AS7zJYeAHbcQyPvQ2QNdn9s&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi-hP-yhf7SAhVHXBoKHaRwA14Q6AEIlzAB#v=onepage&q=matrix%20organisation%20Misaligned%20goals%20Conflicting%20loyalties%20Confusion%20about%20roles%20and%20responsibilities%20Delayed%20decisions&f=false)
- Thornbury, N. (2006). *Contemporary Issues in Leadership* (7th ed.). Colorado: Westview Press.
- Toor, S.-R., & Ofori, G. (2008). Leadership versus Management: How They Are Different, and Why. *Leadership and Management in Engineering*, 8(2), 61–71. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)1532-6748\(2008\)8:2\(61\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)1532-6748(2008)8:2(61))
- Tough, A. (1971). *The Adult's Learning Projects: A Fresh Approach to Theory and Practice in Adult Learning*. Toronto: OISE. Retrieved from https://books.google.co.uk/books/about/The_adult_s_learning_projects.html?id=evKeAAAAMAAJ&redir_esc=y
- Tsai, Y. (2011). Relationship between organizational culture, leadership behavior and job satisfaction. *BMC Health Services Research*, 11, 98. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-11-98>
- Uhl-Bien, A., Russ, M., & McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity Leadership Theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era - viewcontent.cgi. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 298–318. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1017&context=leadershipfacpub>
- US Legal. (2015). Retrieved August 1, 2015, from <http://definitions.uslegal.com/w/willful-blindness/>
- Walters, M. (2005). *Feminism: A Very Short Introduction (Very Short Introductions)*. Oxford: OUP.

- Watson, W. E., Kumar, K., & Michaelsen, L. K. (1993). Cultural Diversity's Impact on Interaction Process and Performance: Comparing Homogeneous and Diverse Task Groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 590–602.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/256593>
- Watts, T. (2008). *Business Leaders' Values and Beliefs Regarding Decision Making Ethics*. Lulu.com.
- Weber, M. (1905). *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. New York: Scribner.
- Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the Process of Sensemaking. *Organization Science*, 16(4), 409–421.
<https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1050.0133>
- Weymes, E. (2002). Relationships not leadership sustain successful organisations. *Journal of Change Management*, 3(4), 319–331.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/714023844>
- Williams, B., Myerson, J., & Hale, S. (2008). Individual differences, intelligence, and behavior analysis. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 90(2), 219–31.
<https://doi.org/10.1901/jeab.2008.90-219>
- Wolfram, S. (1985). *Complex Systems Theory*. Princeton.
- Woolley, A. W., Chabris, C. F., Pentland, A., Hashmi, N., & Malone, T. W. (2010). Evidence for a collective intelligence factor in the performance of human groups. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, 330(6004), 686–8.
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1193147>
- Yelder *, J., & Codling, A. (2004). Management and Leadership in the Contemporary University. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 26(3), 315–328.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080042000290177>
- Yung, C. T., & Tsai, K. C. (2013). Followership: An Important Partner of Leadership. *Business and Management Horizons*, 1(2), 47–55.
- Zaleznik, A. (1970). Power and Politics in Organizational Life. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/1970/05/power-and-politics-in-organizational-life>