The Evolution of Leadership Thinking – A Purposely Selective Perspective

A January 2017 Google search for the term 'leadership' yielded about 787,000,000 results. Even allowing for duplication, this reflects the enormous volume of material that has been written about leadership, including many bestselling leadership biographies and autobiographies by and of leaders that have been broadly perceived as successful at least at the time of publication. A sample of such literature could include Bill Gates, Henry Ford, Steven Spielberg, Sir Richard Branson, Steve Jobs, Donald Trump, Sam Walton, Michael Dell, Andrew Carnegie, George Soros, Walt Disney and many others.

Many relevant leadership development insights can be gleaned from an overview of the evolution of leadership thinking. Cogent writings on leadership can be traced back to Ancient Greek myths, such as those described by Homer in the Odyssey and the Iliad. In these works, many of the necessary qualities of political and military leaders are described, certainly not for the first time, but first in an accessible form for modern readers.

Take, for example, the reference to the quality of being an inspirational leader by Agamemnon, King of Mycenae, in the Trojan War. He speaks to two of his allied officers –

> *'For you', he said, 'I have no orders - exhortation would be out of place. Your very leadership inspires your men to fight their best'* [1]

Homer, in the Odyssey and the Iliad, nominates leadership traits that include qualities such as courage, decisiveness, commitment, tenacity, goal orientation, possessing valour, being an exemplar of integrity, demonstrating selflessness, and having great honesty, among others. These traits are associated with effective or heroic leadership on both sides of the Trojan conflict.[2] Historically similar concepts of leadership traits are portrayed in Japanese, Chinese and Arabic literature.[3]

Over at least the past 4000 years, leadership has been widely perceived as an undertaking essential to the survival and success of human endeavour. Bass (1990, 4-6) argues that "leadership is universal. It is evident in humanity from ancient times and occurs instinctively in many other animal species."[4]

Throughout human history, leadership authority has been vested in those that have the leadership ability to convince potential stakeholders that, in exchange for their support, they can deliver their expectations. The basis for such an exchange can include:

- **Expert power –** The leaders who are supported because key stakeholder(s) perceive them to possess expertise or ability that is valued in the current context. Critical leadership abilities included the perceived ability to secure success in battle, and oratory, administrative, hunting, farming, healing (spiritual or medical) and technical know-how;

- **Legitimate power –** The leaders who are deemed by circumstances to have an acknowledged legitimate right to power by birthright, appointed organisational role, or granted by the relevant voting public; or

---

[1] Homer, The Iliad, Book IV, Translated from Ancient Greek by Rieu, E V, (1950), Penguin, p84
[2] Bass BM (1997) Concepts of Leadership. In Vecchio RP (Ed). Leadership, Understanding the Dynamics of Power and Influence in Organisations. University of Notre Dame Press, Indiana, pp3-23
[3] Based on course notes from a three-month course offered by the University of Alexandria on Classical Arabic Poetry during the summer of 1964.
[4] Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership, Free Press, 1990

- **Despotic power** – The leaders who, given a context, can create a broadly held stakeholder fear of their actual or imagined power to inflict punishment or deliver benefits that have a significantly greater perceived consequence when compared with the cost of compliance to the leadership-declared vision.

All leaders at all organisational levels sustain their support by exhibiting either the ability to infuse a meaningful purpose amongst their key stakeholder power base, by successfully self-publicising their real or imagined success to date, or by establishing an authoritarian communication-control infrastructure. They also typically find ways to build their power base by leveraging success achieved in one leadership context into one or more other leadership contexts; for example, leveraging success in a military context into a community context. Historically the linkage between religious and political leadership contexts has been a powerful combination.

A set of leadership approaches spanning over 3000 years has been purposefully selected to exemplify the relationship between the leadership approach propounded and the prevailing leadership holistic context. Descriptions of the selected leadership approaches are based on assessments and comments drawn from referenced expert reviews:

- **Ramesses II -** The outstanding new kingdom pharaonic leader. Like many other historic leaders, he utilised personal publicity through monuments and biased interpretations of military events to self-publicise and reinforce his self-proclaimed expert military prowess to enhance his standing in other leadership contexts, an approach made possible by the prevailing worldview and cultural context of Ancient Egypt. Ironically, Ramesses II's greatest contribution to leadership was his successful political peace diplomacy. His military campaigns on his northern border in modern day Syria had resulted, after many years of battle, in a battle field stalemate, which led to Ramesses II proposing and concluding the first known formal peace treaty in recorded history with Hattusili III in year 21 of Ramesses's reign (c. 1258 BC).[5] The peace was secured by a high-level hostage exchange. Leaders are often remembered not just for what they did at the time but also for the future possibilities they create.

- **Plato - the philosopher leader** – Plato proposed the concept of a philosopher leader. The philosopher leader is assumed to have a love of knowledge and truth, as well as being intelligent, reliable, and having a willingness to live a simple frugal life to avoid potential conflicts of interest.[6] This view of leadership clearly reflects its Hellenistic context and is also an early example of the traits approach to identifying the causes of successful leadership.

- **Alexander – the philosopher warrior** – Aristotle was Alexander's tutor; he appears to have immersed him in a Hellenistic worldview and his mother appears to have contributed to his strong need to feel special and to self-glorify; he named 57 cities after himself. These influences had a profound impact on his development as a leader and military strategist able to question existing military thinking, win battles and establish governance systems. However, his major failing was his inability to create a self-sustaining imperial governance legacy. Although his legend lived on through the centuries, none of his generals could unite Macedonia and sustain the empire he created after his death. One notable exception was his creative integration of the

---

[5] Grimal, Nicolas (1992). A History of Ancient Egypt. Oxford: Blackwell. P257, ISBN 0-631-17472-9.
[6] Plato (1991). The Republic: the complete and unabridged Jowett translation. New York: Vintage Books. ISBN 0-679-73387-6.

pantheon of Greek and Egyptian gods, thereby establishing the basis for the legitimacy of the Hellenistic pharaonic dynasty.[7]

- **Pericles - charismatic populism** – Pericles's context was Athens' flowering democracy and the key to leadership power was his military ability combined with a charismatic capacity to generate broad popular support and commitment through effective communication, oratory and relational networking. Pericles was typical of many great leaders throughout history in his ability to leverage military success in the pursuit of political success[8]

- **Machiavelli - political "realism"** – Machiavelli captured the dark side of political reality within the context of the Italian Renaissance and Italia's City State bitter conflicts. He challenged the romantic trait concept of leadership and argued for a despotic approach based on duplicitousness, cunning, and narcissism. He argued that the ends justify the means and that a leader should excel in control and manipulation and should strive to be loved, but not at the expense of being feared or "respected".[9] This aligns with the popular perception of the Mafia's approach to leadership and is typical of all malevolent dictatorships.

Leadership thinking up to the second half of the twentieth century was dominated and driven by the traditional militaristic cultural context, as many of the political cum organisational leadership "CEOs" had been previously senior military officers. Concepts such as hierarchical and divisional structures, rapid communication, top-down decision-making and staff support all had affinities with their former military experiences. In addition, many of the commonly used terms in administering bureaucracies are derived from military antecedents; for example, the use of words like strategy (from an ancient Greek word meaning what generals do with their army in war to win) and campaign (from a Latin word meaning a series of military operations to achieve objectives). It is interesting to note that in recent decades technology and social expectations have also been driving a rethink on the meaning of leadership within military context at military universities and colleges; for example, Zaccaro S. and Klimoski R. (1999)[10] and Leonard Wong et al (2003)[11]. However, Simons (1998)[12] sees "warrior leaders" as still dominating business as a "tribe" or "class" at the end of the 20th century:

> *"The warrior types of our workplace have been good at promoting autocratic, aloof, status conscious, competitive and logical left-brained driven behaviour."*

Some of Simons' specific examples are now clearly dated. However, this warrior leadership concept appears to have been hard-wired into many national cultural perceptions and expectations of leadership. The growing role of females in leadership may facilitate the development of a more participative and collaborative approach to leadership, clearly required in the period ahead.

As the role of leadership evolved in the Western World and despite the Machiavellian view of leadership, the romantic heroic view of leadership was a significant part of educational curricula up to the 20th century in schools and universities. These heroic and "warrior" concepts of leadership

---

[7] *Green, Peter (1970),* Alexander of Macedon, 356–323 B.C.: a historical biography, *University of California Press,* ISBN 978-0-520-07165-0,

[8] Aird, Hamish (2004). Pericles: The Rise and Fall of Athenian Democracy. The Rosen Publishing Group. ISBN 0-8239-3828-X.

[9] http://themojocompany.com/2013/08/8-characteristics-of-a-machiavellian-leader/#sthash.l0bOTIZS.dpuf

[10] 'Army Leadership in the 21st Century - A Proposed Research Framework' U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioural and Social Sciences

[11] Military leadership: A context specific review, The Leadership Quarterly, Volume 14, Issue 6, Pages 657–692

[12] Simons F (1998) Heroes Warriors, Leaders, Managers. The Australian Financial Review Magazine, October, p26-30

continue to be reflected in many current popularised expectations of leaders. We shall now briefly review the context that gave birth to the emergence of 'Bureaucratic Leadership'.

The increasing scale and complexity of human activity fostered the emergence of bureaucratic command and control hierarchies. The first substantial recorded experiences of large-scale bureaucratic enterprise leadership come from the government bureaucracies of the various ancient civilisations, including Egyptian, Mesopotamian and Chinese imperial dynasties, the Roman Empire, and the Christian Church.

Successful large-scale bureaucracies are depended on prolonged relatively stable macro contexts and are characterised by investment in physical and information communication infrastructure effectiveness during these extended periods of slow change. To facilitate leadership in these large complex bureaucracies, hierarchies evolved to control information transfer.

The immediate forerunners of 21st century business corporations are 16th to 18th century entrepreneurial global corporations, such as the British East India and Dutch East India Companies. Given this context, many contributions to leadership thinking were concerned with the efficient and equitable use of legitimate power as previously defined. Amongst these contributions was Weber's idealised concept of the bureaucratic organisation**:**

- Hierarchical delineated lines of authority;

- Fixed and clearly specified areas of activity;

- Records of action taken;

- Written rules implemented by neutral officials;

- Advancement depending on technical qualifications (it is interesting to note that the French army under Napoleon and the British navy during this period were good examples of merit based promotion that resulted in superior military organisational performance on land and sea);

- Judgements based on organisational policies, not individual preferences; and

- Power to act based on rational-legal, legitimised authority.[13]

From the 1930s onwards challenges to bureaucratic thinking were increasingly driven by the application of the ever-improving communication technology and an emerging concern for the human factor highlighted by the importance of task versus people comparisons, for example:

Blake and Mouton[14] **concern for people versus production** categorises leaders as:

- **Indifferent** - low concern for both people and production. Primary focus avoiding trouble, not held responsible for any mistakes.

- **Accommodating -** a high concern for people and a low concern for production. The resulting atmosphere is usually friendly, but not necessarily very productive.

---

[13] Weber, Max. Economy and Society. Edited Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. New York: Bedminister Press, 1968, vol. 1, Conceptual Exposition, pgs. 956-1005, "Bureaucracy".

[14] Blake, R.; Mouton, J. *(1985).* The Managerial Grid III: The Key to Leadership Excellence. *Houston: Gulf Publishing Co.*

- **Dictatorial** - a high concern for production, and a low concern for people, based on Douglas McGregor theory X,[15] and often used in cases of crisis management.

- **Maintaining** status quo **–** a middle of the road, balance and compromise, neither production nor people needs are met.

- **Sound** - a high concern is paid both to people and production. This is a theory Y[16] approach that relies heavily on making employees feel to be constructive parts of the enterprise.

- **Opportunistic -** there is no fixed location on the grid. They adopt whichever behaviour offers the greatest benefit.

As the pace of change accelerated and competition in business contexts intensified in the 1970s and 1980s, cross functional collaboration was increasingly deemed to be important to rapidly respond to market expectations. Theorists and commentators propounded leadership approaches that facilitated cross-functional collaborations and energised the motivation to change.
Various cross-organisational co-ordination mechanisms, such as multi-functional task forces and transformational leadership driven by a meaningful shared vision received strong advocacy:

- **Kantor's integrative leadership** – Leadership action needs to foster cross-functional integrative action by creating mechanisms for exchange of information across organisational boundaries, supporting collaboration, viewing situations from multiple perspectives, providing resources to support intrapreneurship and providing coherence and direction.[17]

"Working across organizational boundaries was a new way of thinking 25 years ago —one that was largely championed by Jack Welch, then CEO of GE. Welch was convinced that the speed of globalization and technological innovation in the 21st century would require companies to work very differently – with shorter decision cycles, more employee engagement, and stronger collaboration than had previously been required to compete. He advocated for a 'boundaryless organization'".[18]

- **Bass's transformational leadership**[19] extended the work of Burns (1978)[20] by explaining the psychological mechanisms that underlie transforming and transactional leadership. Bass introduced the term "transformational" in place of "transforming." Bass added to the initial concepts of Burns to help explain how transformational leadership could be measured. Transformational leadership occurs when leaders broaden and elevate the interests of their employees, when they generate awareness and acceptance of the purposes and mission of the group, and when they stir their employees to look beyond their own self-interest for the good of the group**.**

Disruptive technologies and broadening societal expectations have jointly forged a more complex organisational context, which has stimulated a return to some traditional leadership theories that have become more relevant to current leadership thinking and challenges. For example, the traits checklist approach was resurrected as a guide to leadership behaviour and potential: if you are not

---

[15] McGregor, D. (1960). *The Human Side of Enterprise*, New York, McGraw-Hill.

[16] Ibid

[17] Kanter, Rosabeth Moss *(1984).* The change masters: innovation and entrepreneurship in the American corporation*. Simon and Schuster.* ISBN 978-0-671-52800-3*.*

[18] Ashkenas R, Jack Welch's Approach to Breaking Down Silos Still Works, Harvard Business Review, September 2015

[19] Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (Eds.). (1994). Improving organisational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

[20] Burns, J.M. (1978) Leadership. New York. Harper & Row

able to propose a leadership 'theory' that facilitates directly dealing with complexity then the next best thing is to retreat to the traits believed to be needed to deal with complex changes. It is also interesting to note that leadership traits theorists originally proposed that leadership traits were inherited and peculiar to the upper class in society, another good example of the relationship between context, period in history, and leadership theory.[21]

In the late 1990s and early 21st century, extraordinary developments in technology have resulted in increasing emphasis being placed on 'Holistic Integrative Thinking'; for example, it has been argued that the historic deficiency of the traits theory may be associated with the need to view the integrated effect of traits acting in concert rather than viewed as acting separately. Zoccaro[22] noted that:

> "Behavior, especially complex forms such as leadership, rarely can be grounded in so few personal determinants. Understanding leadership requires a focus not only on multiple personal attributes but also on how these attributes work together to influence performance. Despite the long history of the trait-based approach and its recent resurgence, a consensus about the role of leader traits, the magnitude and mechanisms of their influence, and the determining role of leadership situations has remained elusive."

Additionally, as the pace of change accelerated in the 1990s, Ronald Heifetz and others proposed the adoption of a theory of 'adaptive leadership', utilising an iterative cyclical approach:[23]

> "Adaptive leadership is an iterative process involving three key activities: (1) observing events and patterns around you; (2) interpreting what you are observing—developing multiple hypotheses about what is really going on; and (3) designing interventions based on the observations and interpretations to address the adaptive challenge you have identified. Each of these activities builds on the ones that come before it and the process overall is iterative: you repeatedly refine your observations, interpretations, and interventions. One of the tendencies in organizations is that leaders feel pressure to solve problems quickly, to move to action. So, they minimize the time spent in diagnosis, collecting data, exploring multiple interpretations of the situation, and alternative potential interventions. To diagnose an organization while in the midst of action requires the ability to achieve some distance from the "on-the-ground" events. Heifetz and Linsky use the metaphor of "getting on the balcony" above the "dance floor" to depict what it means to gain the distanced perspective necessary to see what is really happening. When a leader can move back and forth between balcony and dance floor, he or she can 1. Observe 2. Interpret 3. Intervene."

In the emerging context of late 20th and early 21st Century, leadership theory has also tended to increasingly reflect various forms of expert power as a legitimising basis for leadership authority.

---

[21] Galton, F. (1869). Hereditary genius. New York: Appleton.

[22] Zaccaro S J, *traits based perspective of leadership*, American Psychologist Jan 2007

[23] Ronald A. Heifetz, Leadership Without Easy Answers (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1994); and Ronald A. Heifetz and Marty Linsky, Leadership on the Line: Staying Alive Through the Dangers of Leading (Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 2002). Gary De Carolis, A View from the Balcony (Dallas: Brown Books, 2005); Stacie Goffin and Valora Washington, Ready or Not (New York: Teachers College Press, 2007); Shifra Bronznick, Didi Goldenhar, and Marty Linsky, Leveling the Playing Field (New York:

Some of the theories that gained broad popularity involved a re-packaging of older theories; for example, "emotional intelligence"[24] and several other theories including:

- **Greenleaf's servant leadership** – the purpose of leadership is to serve the needs of stakeholders. Three core values provide the basis for servant leadership: trust, appreciation of others, and empowerment. Underpinning values separate servant leadership from all other leadership relational approaches and to an extent they align with some of Plato's and other philosophical and quasi-religious views on leadership.[25]

- **Good and Lyddy et al, mindful leadership –** Mindful leadership requires a state of active, open attention to the present. When you're mindful, you can observe your thoughts and feelings from a distance, without judging them as good or bad. The aim is to counter mindlessness; that is, being trapped in the past by a single perspective, not conscious of context or tending to unquestioned compliance. "*If evidence continues to accumulate on the effects of mindfulness in organisational processes and outcomes, we may one day think of mindfulness as a root construct in organisational science, as it shapes human experiences in a wide variety of functional domains, including thought, emotion, and action. For the time being, mindfulness stands as a construct with both great possibilities and challenges worth investigating in further research*."[26]

- **Avolio et al authentic leadership –** the theory defines authentic leaders as those who are: deeply aware of how they think and behave and are perceived by others as being aware of their own and others' values, moral perspectives, knowledge, and strengths; aware of the context in which they operate; and who are confident, hopeful, optimistic, resilient, and of high moral character. "*We pointed out that authenticity involves being true to oneself, not others. When the focus shifts to authentic leadership, however, it shifts to the leader's relations with others because all leadership is relational at its core. Hence, we have emphasized the relational nature of authentic leadership, and focused on the development of authentic relationships, which is a core component process in authentic leadership development*." It is argued that authentic, servant leadership and concern for self-awareness simply highlight the requirements nested in other proposed leadership approaches; that is, the re-emerging trait theory checklists serve to enhance at least in part other leadership approaches.[27]

We have argued that the evolution of leadership theory has typically reflected the prevailing macro context of the relevant period. The early 21st century has been dominated by disruptive technology that has delivered increasing inter-connectivity, supporting the continuing demise of bureaucratic theories of leadership and replacing them with an increasing realisation that leadership approaches must align with the specified internal and external contexts in which the leadership is immersed, leading to an increasingly integrative approach to leadership:

---

[24] The ability to identify, assess and influence one's own feelings and those of others. http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/emotional-intelligence.html (4/7/17)
Read more: http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/emotional-intelligence.html
[25] Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press
[26] Good DJ, Lyddy CJ, et al. (Jan 2016). "Contemplating Mindfulness at Work an Integrative Review". *Journal of Management*. 42 (1).
[27] Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., & Walumba, F. O. (2004). Authentic leadership: Theory building for veritable sustained performance. Working paper: Gallup Leadership Institute, University of Nebraska-Lincoln. (p4)

- **Fred Fiedler's contingency leadership**[28] **-** This context based approach outlines a relationship between leadership style and the favourable-ness of the situation. Situational favourable-ness was described by Fiedler in terms of three empirically derived dimensions:

  o **Leader-member relationship** – high if the leader is generally accepted and respected by followers;

  o **Degree of task structure** – high if the task is very structured; and

  o **Leader's position power** – high if a great deal of authority and power are formally attributed to the leader's position. Situations are favourable to the leader if all three of these dimensions are high.

- **Vroom-Yetton's contingency leadership**[29] - the Vroom–Yetton contingency model is another contingency leadership theory developed by Victor Vroom in collaboration with Phillip Yetton (1973) and later with Arthur Jago (1988).[30] This decision model identifies five different leadership styles (from autocratic to consultative) based on the situation and level of involvement. Vroom and Yetton (1973) took the earlier generalised situational theories that noted how situational factors cause almost unpredictable leadership behaviour and reduced decision options to a more limited set of behaviours. The model was defined more by rational logic than by researched observations, which limited its authoritativeness. The model is most likely to provide some guidance when there are clear and accessible opinions about the decision quality importance and decision acceptance.

- **Integrative theories of leadership –** Since Chandler's proposition that structure follows strategy, based on four case studies of American conglomerates that dominated their industry from the 1920s onward,[31] significant research effort has been committed to better understand the interdependencies between context and a variety of behaviour related variables and to "*conceptualise major transformations of the firm in terms of linkages between the content of change and its context and process and to regard leadership behaviour as a central ingredient, but only one of the ingredients, in a complex analytical, political, and cultural process of challenging and changing the core beliefs, structure, and strategy of the firm*"[32].
  Burns (1978) had already directly linked leadership behaviour to large system change and did it in a way that draws attention to the context and process of leadership.[33]

---

[28] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Contingency_theory (Jan 2017)

[29] *Vroom V H, Yetton, P W. (1973). Leadership and Decision-Making. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.* ISBN 0-8229-3266-0

[30] *Vroom V H., Jago, Arthur G. (1988). The New Leadership: Managing Participation in Organisations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.* ISBN 0-13-615030-6

[31] Chandler, A.D. Jr. (1962). *Strategy and Structure: Chapters in the History of the American Industrial Enterprise*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

[32] Pettigrew AM*, Context and Action in the Transformation of the firm*, Journal oj Management Studies 24:6 November 1987 0022-2380 $3.50

[33] Burns, J.M. (1978) Leadership. New York. Harper & Row.

Integrative theories of leadership tend to adopt different perspectives regarding the leadership integration process. The term 'integrative leadership' was used by Mary Parker Follett [34] in the 1920s. She viewed leadership integration as being concerned with finding the commonalities across diverse views to secure collaborative action. Other researchers have identified the broad categories of elements that would need to be taken account of in developing integrative leadership theory. For example, Avolio[35] included the following; cognitive elements, individual and group behavior, historical context, proximal context and distal context. Whilst Nelson[36] and other have focussed on the principles needed to underpin integrative leadership; *Principles I: —Intention and Purpose, Principle II —Engaging Others, Principle III—Design Informed by Our Differences, Principle IV— Enacting Ideas as Choices and Behaviors, Principle V—Adaptive Self-Evaluation and Change.*

From this brief review of the history of leadership theory we make the following observations:

1. Leadership theory has progressively evolved as it addressed issues arising from the current perceived leadership context;

2. Underpinning leadership theory concepts evolve over time to capture more effectively through increasing complexity the reality of leadership by incorporating a greater number of contingent situational considerations. The evolution of transformational, servant and traits leadership theories over extended time periods are good examples of this process:

   > "*Like many other leadership theories, transformational leadership started out without sufficient attention to contextual contingencies, with later revisions to the theory incorporating a number of soft contingencies to provide a more complete picture of the relationship between transformational leadership and performance. These contingencies now include cultural differences, environmental stability, industry type, organizational characteristics, task characteristics, nature of the goals, nature of the performance criterion, characteristics of followers, and group membership.*"[37]

3. Leadership theories have paid limited attention to how leadership is developed to deal with an increasingly demanding reality:

   > "*Most of the attention in the leadership literature has been focused on determining what causes leaders to emerge and be effective. Relatively little effort has been devoted to systematically explaining how such leaders and leadership develop*"[38]

4. Leadership theories tend to over-simplify reality by assuming limited categories of context and personal conditions, to then provide category related generic practice guidelines. However, leadership action can no longer be based on generic postulations; attention needs to be given to the development of individualised leadership approaches, given each leader's unique self and unique internal and external contexts in which they and their stakeholders are embedded.

---

[34] Metcalf, H C, Urwick, Lyndall, *The early sociology of management and organizations* (edited by Kenneth Thompson): volume 3 dynamic administration - the collected papers of Mary Parker Follett. London, UK: Taylor & Francis e-Library. (2004)

[35] Avolio B J, *Promoting More Integrative Strategies for Leadership Theory-Building*, American Psychologist January 2007

[36] *Nelson G—Integrative Leadership, TMS, Jordan Institute for Families, September 19, 2012*

[37] Avolio Ibid

[38] Avolio Ibid