Concept Paper

From the Cottage to the Cage – Exploring the Efficacy of Complexity Leadership Theory in Addressing 21st Century Workplace Toxicity.

Morgan Danaher[1],

School of Education SOEDU Faculty of Education and Health Sciences, University of Limerick, Ireland; morgan.danaher@ul.ie

Abstract: The issue of workplace toxicity constitutes a major problem for employers, employees and society at large.   Toxicity in a workplace context relates to damaging behaviours perpetrated by individuals and organisations that netatively impact on the health and wellbeing of others.   Workplace toxicty is habitually associated with activities such as bullying, harrassment, unethical and even illegal acts.   In this article, today's workplace is likenened to a cage where ambition and greed drive people to engage in toxic behaviour to fight for whatever scarce rewards are on offer.   Set against a backdrop of continuous demands on employees in a era of constant change and challenge, leadership practice in the 21st century is understandably seeped in complexity.   Whilst conditions of scarcity are in fact constructed by employers in today's lean environments, workplace toxicity has significant implications for organisational leaders in terms of work place disputes, absenteeism and litigation etc.   Twentieth century hierarchial and autocratic leadership models are now deemed to be both obsolete and wholly inadedgate to inform leadership practice in the knowledge era.   This conceptual article looks at the efficacy of complexity leadership theory (CLT) in empowering today's leader to better understand and address 21st century workplace toxicity.

Keywords: workplace, toxicity, leadership, distributive bargaining, zero sum gain, Uhl Bien, complex adaptive systems, complexity leadership theory.

1.   Introduction

The issue of workplace toxicity constitutes a dualistic dilemna for organisations in that it habitually threatens and challenges leaders, but in many cases, it is as a direct result of leadership behaviour itself [1,2].   The term toxicity refers to negative behaviours directed toward individuals when attempting to achieve gain over another for instance [3].   Much empricial evdidence links toxicity with bullying and harrassment behaviours excercised in the workplace [4.5].   Such behaviours manifest in unacceptable levels of threatening and negative approaches to workplace relaiton, resulting in a surge of recorded cases of work related stress figures throughout the world in the past number of decades [3].

A 2016 UK Health and Safety Executive report found that that work related stress outcomes are in fact responsible for 43% of all working days lost due to ill health in the United Kingdom [6].   Empirical research links exposure to workplace toxicity and related stress with a range of negative somatic, psychological and psychosocial issues [7,8].   Worrylingly, research points to the accelaration of toxicity related work stress in the last decades of the 20th centurey and into the 21st Century [9].   A likely explanation for this incresae relates to ongoing changes in the organisaiton of work over the past 100 years.   Befitting the analogy of the cottage to the cage, a neo-liberal global invasion continues.   This is characterised by large scale employers (the cage) emassing vast scale, swallowing up smaller players (cottage) in all markets througout the world.   The adage of the cottage and the cage provides a visual schema in which we can conceptualise, in a generalisable manner, how the changing nature of the working theatre has transcended from the small and localised, to the large and globalised.

The industrial revolution of the mid to late 19th century commenced an unstoppable machine of continuous modernisation and rationalisation.   Such advances assisted in the creation of the perfect formula for work-place toxicity.   In many instances, uncontrollable macro environmental factors such as free market competition place an inordinate existential threat to the viability and long term sustainability of organisations, particularly smaller ones.   Whether the raison d'etre of the employer is to provide essential services in the public sector, or if it is to deliver profit within the private sector, this article will also demonstrate that the economic reality of scarcity acts as the oxygen for the flame of toxicity to ignite and take hold.

As we progress into the mid period of the twentieth century, the need to deliver more with less, promises an increase in the level of complexity that organisational leaders will encounter.   Although a systemic approach to resource optimisation was first seen in large scale manufacturing, all workplaees constitute an environment   where scarcity is not only a threat, it is a condition that is manufactured [10].   In any organisation, there exists an unavoidable and sobering relatity that human capital represents a large liability for any organisation in terms of wages, supplementary payments, overheads, time and risk.   In this paper, the allure of automation, artificial intelligence and robotics are provided as some examples of the motivation to view human capital as expensive waste.   It is within the cauldron of the mixture of limited resources & opportunities, intertwined with organisational and individual ambition, that the practice of distributive bargaining or zero sum gain prevails.   Distributive bargaining encompases toxic tactics that are employed when the pie does divide equally and where there must be winners and losers.

The image of the cage in the paper's title represents the more intensified and centrally owned workplace that has effectively swallowed up the cottage industry.   Global multinational giants are spearheading the future through innovation and invention.   The cost of this development is the place of the worker as a foundation of the route to global dominance embodies the elimination of waste, the maximisation of profitability through the increase in returns on investment.   This has dependacny invariably on mininising the number of people who constitute cost / risk and complexity.   In their stead, we are witnessing the emergence of the a new era of automation, robotics and artificial intelligence.   Situated within the cage are the human collateral overflow, the individual, their needs, wants and their ambition.   This paper will present theoretical predictions about trends in work pressure tend to be unanimously pessimistic.   Scholars indicate an intensification of work pressure in roles that will survive i.e. more highly skilled jobs that carry greater responsibility, involve more complex tasks and require the constant updating of skills [11].

It stands to reason in the mileu of this continuous change that leadership theory and practice has (a) evolved and transended previous iterations as decades roll forward, and (b) continue to require continuous reformation.   Leadership models of the last century have been products of top-down, bureaucratic paradigms [12].   Wilst these models were eminently effective for an economy premised on physical production, they are not well-suited to today's knowledge based economies.   A new leadership paradigm

based on complexity science suggests a different view of leadership—one that frames leadership as a complex interactive dynamic from which adaptive outcomes (e.g., learning, innovation, and adaptability) emerge.

This new approach entitled Complexity Leadership Theory (CLT) is a paragdim focused on enabling learning, creativity and adaptivity of complex systems, within a context of knowledge-producing organisations.   CLT includes three entangled leadership roles (i.e., adaptive leadership, administrative leadership, and enabling leadership), that reflect a dynamic relationship between the bureaucratic, administrative functions of the organization and the emergent, informal dynamics of complex adaptive systems.   This paper argues that CLT provides a mechanism for adapting our notion of what leadership entails from the top-down directive approaches, to a more complex and mulifacted appraoch appropriate for the new knowledge era of the 21st century.

2. Toxicity

The use of the term toxicity was first seen in 1880 to mean the state of being poisonous,   and is derived from the English and Latin word 'toxic'.   The concept of toxic which is defined as something that acts poisonously, or has poisonous effects, is assumed to be derived from the French toxique, from the latin word toxicum [13].   Toxicum stems from the ancient Greek word toksikón τοξικόν and it is used in the meaning of special poison put on the arrowhead. Poison which is used in the Turkish origin of the term was deployed as a war weapon, that people used in order to protect themselves and to destroy their enemy in the Ancient Period [14].

The etyology of the contemporary associtioon with work place toxicity is perfectly deployed to describe the types of caustic and self-preservationist behaviours that are endemic in competitive and emotionally charged working environments.   The theoretical foundations of organisational toxicity were set by Fiedler's leader-member interaction, Turner's self-classification, and Tajfel's social identity theory, according to Pelletier (2009); by Freud's psychodynamic theory according to Lubit (2003); by Bandura's social learning theory according to Glew (1996), by Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory [14].

The term 'toxicity' when applied to human behaviour refers to individual or organisational behaviours that are propelled by personal gain, power struggles, financial disputes, status claims, unethical behaviour, vindictiveness, and sometimes illegal means, manipulation and annoyance [3].   In a workplace context, toxic situations often involve behaviours that are ultimately defeating to organisational objectives, to the health and wellbeing of other employees, and to ethical and professional standards in general.   The issue of workplace toxicity and hostility is reflected in a growing contemporary discourse around bullying in the workplace [4,5]. This refers to harassment, threatening or negative behaviour towards peer employees (or) to the sub-ordinates in the organisation, causing the victim to suffer physically, psychologically and professionally.   Different forms of bullying activities can be carried out in the workplace - verbal bullying, nonverbal bullying, psychological bullying and the physical bullying.   Different forms of bullying activities can be carried out in the workplace - verbal bullying, nonverbal bullying, psychological bullying and the physical bullying [14].

The impacts of organisational toxicity are widescale and create situations that cause employees to suffer physically and mentally, reducing interest in their jobs by negatively affecting their morale and motivation and has the potential to destroy employees' self-confidence and dignity [15]).   Organisational toxicity results in intense, and energy consuming negative emotions that separate individuals from their jobs, colleagues, and workplace [16].   Although the issue has received much empirical attention, the continuing scale of the problem is evidenced by a recent Health and Safety Executive (2016) report indicating that it is responsible for 43% of all working days lost due to ill health in the United Kingdom [9].

Toxicity at work is also linked with negative health outcomes such as heart disease, anxiety, depression, hypoadrenia, immunosuppression, chronic pain and musculoskeletal disorders (7,8,17,18).   Over-activation of the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis leading to chronic elevation of glucocorticoids (e.g. cortisol and pro-inflammatory cytokines); processes linked to accelerated biological ageing and brain ageing is also associated with exposure to workplace toxicity [19].   Toxicity has been extensively linked with the phenomenon of allostatic loading [3,20].   Allostatic loading (AL) is labelled as the price of adaptation or the "wear and tear" from experiencing chronic stress [17].

Workplace toxicity is increasingly recognised as a risk factor for job loss and exclusion from working life [21].   The number of toxic employees in the workplace appears to be growing in response to increased work related stress [22].   Due to economic uncertainty, employees are becoming more stressed at work, partly from the fear of losing their jobs, and this is in itself, an antecedent of negative work place behaviours and bullying [5].   Within contemporary workplace environments, disputes and disagreements are cornerstones of the working relationship where extant evidence points to the interpersonal nature of working relationships as substantial antecedents of stress [21,22].   Most organisations will argue that it is their people that matter to them.   We live and work however in arenas where there is an ever increasing foci on league tables, measurement, benchmarking and benchmarking against others.   Institutions within all contexts are routinely compared to others, not just at a surface level, but at a level that determines survival through funding or investment.   This external antecedent invariably excerts a gravitational force of toxicity internally, with the push to deliver best results through the optimisation of resources a primordial organisational requirement.   In this paper, the evolution of work and the emergemce of total quality management systems is examined as is the prevalance of distributive bargainging and the toxic related behaviours it promotes.   The toxicity equation in organisations can be denoted by organisational success = unlimited demands / scarce resources & opportunities.

3. The Toxic Cocktail of Scarcity and Unlimited Demands

Within organisations, decision-making processes around the usage of resources is complex and often contentious [23].   Regardless of whether an organisation is tasked with creating profit, or if is tasked with operating within the confines of an aligned budget e.g. in order to provide essential services, the fundamental economic principal of scarcity creates the veritable cage in which workers exist and fight for finite resources.   Whilst scarcity is abudant, the demands on scarce resources are not . The earliest definition proferred by Cantillon in 1755 of economics provides the key to the secret of why scarcity in the working environment is an antecedent of institutional toxicity 'a person who pays a certain price for a product, to resell it at an uncertain price, thereby making decisions about obtaining and using resources, while consequently assuming the risk of enterprise' [24].   In this definition, the reference to obtaining and using resources is figural, as it points to the finite nature of resources at the heart the economics of the working world.   It is within the gap between buying at a certain price, and selling at an uncertain price, that the space for achieving the best return on investment is situated.   It is in this space where toxicity thrives, and where   organisations must achieve the best outcome, with the least amount of input and overhead discharged.

Although a systemic approach to resource optimisation was first seen in large scale manufacturing [10], all workplaees constitute an environment that requires funding and capital to sustain.   Thus, the priniciples of rationalisation and streamlining have permeated all employment arenas.   The use of poison within the earliest definitions of toxicity as implemented as war weapons is significant in terms of understanding why people behave the way they do in various conditions of scarcity [14].   Workplace toxicity employs the same mechanism of self-preservation of war that ultimately comes at the cost of another.   For example, organisaitons are typically hierarchial in structure, encompassing a collection of individuals who all have an engrained drive for self actualisation.   This creates a tension; a natural bottleneck so to speak, where the aggregate of personal aspiration gravitates toward the limited amount of progression available.   From an organisational cost and competition perspective, the economic imperative is to provide limited promotion and career advancement opportunities, financial rewards (such as pay and bonuses), and recognition in terms explicit acknowledgement.   The relative paucity of such opportunity acts a catalyst to the perpetuation of toxic processes.

An essential element to the toxic process in conditions of scarcity is referred to as distributive bargaining [127].   This is a relational approach prevalent in situations of limited resources that involves habitual conflict, resultant from a scramble to achieve the best outcome or dividend, by those fighting over the same resource.   In distributive bargaining, the issue of resource exploitation is settled by an outcome that *must* represent a gain for one party and a loss for the other [25].

It is important to note that the loss might not be total in that one party will achieve their aims and the other may achieve more limited success then what they deem to be an acceptable outcome.   Distributive bargaining takes place in areas such as compensation and benefits, and the allocation of scarce fulfilment or specialist resources.   The goal in DB is not to assure that both sides win, but rather that one side wins as much as it can, generally meaning that the other side will lose, or at least, will get less than

it had originally wanted.   DB tactics rarely assume that the fixed pie will divide equally, and it can also be referred to as "claiming value," "zero-sum," or "win-lose" bargaining [26].

The issue of distributive bargaining over scarce resources has been an inevitable outcome from the adoption of 'Lean' principals in all contexts of the working world e.g. profit, not-for-profit, essential service provision etc.   Lean is a multi-faceted concept and requires organisations to exert effort along several dimensions to ensure the maximisation of efficiency and the minisation of waste related cost.   It is an all embracing continous process improvement approach to resource optimisation that impacts an organisation at all levels.   Another major factor is that lean provides principles for theoretical efficiency, that implies and demands, greater output with fewer resources e.g. labour.   It therefore follows, that in this lean world, there should exist an overarching sense of paranio as a natural outcome fo the continous threat to job security.   The evolution of lean systems is tightly linked to the story of Toyota Motor Company (TMC) going back to 1918.   The term "lean" was introduced in 1990 following the adoption of the Toyota model across different contexts and employers, becuase of the transferable applicability of lean, aligned with the universality of   problems faced by management not just in manufactureing [10].

The Japanese origins of the lean concept have in fact been largely ignored as the grinding wheel of capitalism took hold it.   In particular, the west has chosen to adopt a very   myopic interpretation of the principals of lean to suit their own ends.   The main three characteristics of orignical Japanese management thinking were harmony and group loyalty, consensus in decision-making, and lifetime employment, all encompassed in the concept of "respect for people."   According to lean commentators, this concept was not historically been   understood in the US for example, where companies have only focused on "continuous improvement."   In other words, the humanistic aspects of the lean approach were easily jettisoned in favour of a specific foci on continuous improvement ideology which invariably conceptualises human resources as expensive waste.   This statement is defended in the next section that examines the evolution of the working world and trends in future workplace organisation[10].

4. The Workplace, Past, Present and Future

Origins of contemporary work place organisation can be traced to the first industrial revolution in Britain during the mid 18th Century to the mid 19th century [27].   In Britain, critical infrastructure that buttresses the conditions for ongoing societal development were borne.   These included systems of transportation communication through canals, road and rails.   Other critical infrafucture improved also such as banking and other financial systems to assist in the smooth running of the burgeoning large scale industrial.   Child and infant mortality rate decreased and fertility rate increased.   As a result, population growth had dramatically changed and the template was created for other countries to follow.   The template however for for workplace exploitation and toxic working environments had also been sewn.

During the same period, women and child labour increased exponentially in dangerous and unhygienic condition.   Factory workers had to toil for sixteen hours in a day merely to save the family from starvation.   The industrial revolution created a wide gap between the rich and the poor (Hardahan 2019).   What the industrial revolution really emphasised was that human input into the workplace constitutes in-the-main, a resource to be exploited.   Multidudes of people during this period were forced from their primarily subsistence based existence into large factories, cotton mills etc. simply in order to survive i.e. from the cottage to the cage where the ownership of capital resided with the few, creating toxic working conditions for the many.

Throughout the twentieth century, the plight of workers improved somewhat, not so much out of a genuine sense of altruism by employers, but based on empirical evidence linking improved work place conditions, with increased returns on investment.   Human resource management spawned from the human relations movement, which began in the early twentieth century due to work by Frederick Taylor [28].   Taylor explored what he termed scientific management referred today as Taylorism, striving to improve economic efficiency in manufacturing jobs.   He eventually keyed upon one of the principal inputs into the manufacturing process i.e. labour, sparking inquiry into factors that improve workforce productivity [29].   The movement was formalised following the research of Elton Mayo, whose Hawthorne studies serendipitously documented how stimuli unrelated to financial compensation and working conditions attention and engagement yielded more workers that are productive.   Contemporaneous works by Abraham Maslow, Kurt Lewin, Max Weber, Frederick Herzberg, and David McClelland formed the basis for the studies in

organisational behaviour and organisational theory, giving room for an applied discipline.   The theoretical evidence existed to make a business case for strategic workforce management as an intelligent and organised way optimise the investment into people including creating mechanisms for the continous removal of excess cost where people can be replaced by machines.

The economic development of countries follows a general and logical transitional flow from primary production through various different stages culiminating in the achievement of sophistication within a knowledge or innovation led economy [29].   In the Irish context for example, social partnership of the 1980's removed much of the issues for Ireland in terms of attracting foreign direct investment due for example to a drastic reduction due to strike action as unions were involved for the first time at the national policay making table.   Over the next thiry years, large scale entities chose Ireland to be a location for European, Middle East and Africa (EMEA), due to the proliferation of a well enducated workforce coupled with relatively lower wage demands in contrast to other invstmen locations.   This ensured that companies such as Dell computers would establish manafacturing centres in the Mid West of Ireland whilst also being able to capitalise on low corporate tax rates.

As more and more companies entered into the Irish market, wage demands increased and the pool of manual labour decreased as more and more young adults chose third level education over entering the working world immediately.   This impact was multifacted including a reduction in the available labour pool for manual jobs coupled with an inevaitable increase in wage demands. In the case of Dell for example, the collapse of the Eastern block opened up new lower cost manufacturing destinations and in 2003, this operation relocated to Ludtz in Poland.   As the Irish labour wages and cost of living continued to soar, more and more indisturies have moved / outsourced to lower cost centres of production where transactional labour tasks can be completed at a much reduced cost to the employer.

The western hemisphere is an example of a knowledge or innovation economy. Since the advent of new century, the proliferation of manufacturing and production has reduced significantly.   The rise of globalisation has also heralded substantial changes to the orgainisaiton of the workplace.   Technological factor impacts are multifaceted also and have had a profound affect on the for example the control of human resources.   Organisations such as General Electric under Jack Welsh have spearheaded the centralisation of control over a geographically dispersed operations [30].   The effects on workers is substantial in terms of reducing dependency on localised management by adopting more centralised control and monitoring.   This has had an impact in terms of reducing management layers and thus consequently organisations can have a much flatter organisaitonal structure at a local level thus reducing opportunities for advancement and creating the conditions for toxicity to thrive.

The adoption of an intrapreneurial approach to the organisation of work has had a significant impact also.   Entreprenseruhp has now been deemed as the fifth factor of production.   Entreprenesurhip challenges the status quo and destroys that which refuses to change [128].   Although entrepreneurship is often linked our minds with positivity, growth and invention e.g. with the creation of new enterprise, it is habitually seen within organisations through intrapreneurship or the adoption of entrepreneurial intent within an established orgainsaition [129].   Whilst this appears at face falue to be a positive, entrepreneurship pricinciples are aligned to the organisation of scarce resources in the most cost effective manner as to ensure a the optimisation of outcome.   There is little room in an entrepreneurial / intrpraneurial for the familiarly and the status quo to maintain.   The entrepreneurial imperative therefore is create conditions of instability to ensure continous growth and change.

According to Coldwell (2019), the 4th industrial revolution, referred to as a 'second coming' of the 'digital era,' has introduced both positive and negative effects on the workplace [31]. While digitalisation and automation have taken the drudgery out of work for some, others have been thrust into low-paying work or indeed into unemployment through redundancy with negative effects on their well-being and mental health.   In many cases stress and the threat of job loss created by the digital era has generated negative workplace behaviours and workplace outcomes.   The 4th industrial revolution have presented widespread access to information to stakeholders and the general public about organizational business and environmental performance.   This open access to information has driven toxic business leaders to maintain company profitability and environmental sustainability by pressuring employees to find solutions to difficult organisational problems with short timelines attached. Employees often are required to 'go the extra mile' to achieve organizational goals through forms of organisational citizenship behavior [31]. Additionally, although organisational citizenship behaviour can generate significant benefits for a company, toxic and entropic

workplace outcomes can also occur from its more extreme manifestations arising from the stressful circumstances digitalidation and automation of work have created. Extreme forms of organisational citizenship behaviour associated with the digital era can create toxic leaders and business organizations that lead to organizational entropy

In terms of looking to the future, Steiber and Pichler (2014). articulate how the speed of work appears to be increasing [11], and Campbell et al. (2010) spoke of tomorrow's workers typically sacrificing themselves in terms of onerous commitments required to deliver as roles continue to become more demanding [32]. In addition to interpersonal elements of work related stress, between 2005 and 2010 evidence suggests that there has been a significant increase the speed of work [11]. Studies examining European labour markets suggest that many jobs have intensified in the over recent years with this trend likely to continue [34,35]. Theoretical predictions about trends in work pressure tend to be unanimously pessimistic. Scholars anticipate an intensification of work pressure in more highly skilled jobs that carry greater responsibility, involve more complex tasks and require the constant updating of skills [11]. It appears therefore that the cage will become ever more inhospitable and will be furnished by complexity and toxicity because the conditions for those characteristics to flourish are being continously developed.

5. The Evolution of 20th Century Leadership Theory

In setting the scene in terms of how complexity leadership theory has emerged as an accepted conceptual framework to understand leadership challenges in the 21st century, it is important to understand how leadership theory has evolved hitherto. The development of leadership theory has followed a distinct line from an early period, consisting of such well known theories as trait theory, behaviour theory, and contingency / situational theory; a second period, consisting of multilevel approaches; newer leadership period, which emerged in the 1980s and included both transformational and charismatic theories; and finally, post-charismatic and post-transformational leadership models that embrace the complexity of our times [36]. Early models were constructed on an attempt to identify a perfect leader by depicting greatness in terms of innate traits. Such models were profoundly masculine and esoteric, embodied by a veritable a la cartè prescription for greatness.

Trait theory postulates that personal characteristics (e.g., personality traits, cognitive skills, interpersonal skills) determine an individual's potential for leadership roles [37]. Thus, according to trait theory, leadership is something intrinsic to the individual. Parry and Bryman (2006) argue that "nature is more important than nurture" (p. 448); that is to say, that an individual's predisposition to leadership (his or her "nature") has a greater influence than the context [38,39]. Thinking of leadership in terms of a trait submits to the notion that leaders are born as opposed to being made [40,41]. Trait theory has failed to develop a universally agreed list of leadership qualities and successful leaders seem to defy classification from the traits perspective (42; 43). Moreover, because trait theory gave rise to the idea that leaders are born not made, Scouller (2011) argued that its approach is better suited to selecting leaders than developing them [44].

In response to criticisms of the trait approach, theorists began to research leadership as a set of behaviours. They evaluated what successful leaders did and developed a taxonomy of actions and broad patterns that indicated different leadership styles [40]. Behavioural theory also incorporates B.F. Skinner's theory of behavioural modification, which takes into account the effect of reward and punishment on changing behaviour. An example of this theory in action is a manager or leader who motivates desired behaviour by scolding employees who arrive late to meetings and showing appreciation when they are early or on time (Day and [45,44,42].

Contingency / situational leadership theory emerged as a model concerned with the context of applied leadership, which is left unaccounted for in both the trait and behavioural theories [45]. Here, the focus is on situational variables, where the leader modifies his or her leadership style according to his or her own personal characteristics and the context i.e. the current situation [47]. According to proponents of this theory, an effective leader knows how to adapt their personal characteristics to the context [48]. Many different models draw from this trend (such as the Path-Goal theory (1971), Fiedler's Contingency theory (1967), Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership theory (1984), and Vroom and Yetton's Decision-Making model (1973). The transactional leadership model suggests that "there is an implied social contract indicating that if the follower goes along with what the leader wants done, the follower will get certain benefits, such as pay, a promotion, or not getting fired (Krumm 2001). It is a leadership model built on the notion of quid-pro-quo transactional leadership i.e. the provision of contingent rewards and sanctions [49].

In the 1970s and 1980s, researchers such as J. M. Burns and B. M. Bass developed transformational leadership theory.   In contrast to leadership based on individual gain and the exchange of rewards for effort, transformational leaders direct and inspire employee effort by raising their awareness of the importance of organisational values and outcomes [50].   In doing so, such leaders are said to activate the higher-order needs of their employees and encourage them to transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the organisation and its clientele.   Research not only has validated the existence of transformational leadership, but has also consistently linked the practice to improved employee performance and engagement [51, 52].   Charismatic leaders are said to motivate and inspire followers through their strong convictions in their beliefs and ideals; their display of confidence and positive emotions, and the imaginative vision they provide (47: 53).   House (1971) defined charismatic leadership as a "phenomenon that occurs when the leader has a major impact on subordinates" [54].   Given the impact that charismatic and transformational leadership have on employees and organisational outcomes, much effort has been directed toward predicting charismatic leadership measurements and predictive tools.   Early on, personality took centre stage [54].   Numerous studies were conducted aiming to characterise charismatic leaders in terms of their values [55] and traits [56].

Critics of the transactional leadership model argue that this leadership style leads followers into short-term relationships of exchange with the leader [57,58].   These relationships tend toward shallow, temporary exchanges of gratification and often create resentments between the participants.   Additionally, a number of scholars criticise transactional leadership theory because it utilises a one-size-fits-all universal approach to leadership theory construction that disregards situational and contextual factors related to organisational challenges [59,60].   Although empirical research supports the idea that transformational leadership positively influences follower and organisational performance, a number of scholars criticise transformational leadership [61; 59,57].   Yukl (2011) suggests that the underlying mechanisms of leader influence at work in this model are unclear and that little empirical work exists examining the effect of transformational leadership on work groups, teams, or organisations.   Yukl (2010) identifies the overlap between the constructs of idealised influence and inspirational motivation.   He also suggests that the theory lacks sufficient identification of the impact of situational and context variables on leadership effectiveness [59].

The concept of charisma (intrinsic to the transformational and charismatic leadership) has been associated with narcissism [38] and, sometimes, with destructive leaders [63].   Parry and Bryman (2006) suggest that a movement away from the behaviours and styles of the transformational or charismatic leader is a positive one removing the iconisation of powerful figureheads and exploitative leader / worker relationships [59].   Van Knippenberg and Sitkin (2013) question the validity of transformational theory by identifying four issues in terms of theory and research in this area [63].   First, they suggest that clear conceptual definitions of transformational leadership are lacking.   Second, they argue that theories fail to sufficiently specify the causal model capturing how each dimension has a distinct influence on mediating processes and outcomes, and how this is contingent on moderating influences.   Third, they argue that conceptualisation and operationalisation confounds transformational leadership with its effects.   The final challenge is around the fact that most frequently used measurement tools are invalid in that they fail to reproduce the dimensional structure specified by theory.   They also fail to achieve empirical distinctiveness from other aspects of leadership.

Jiang (2014) demonstrates another issue with transformational leadership in describing the dual side of where one individual is focused on self-actualisation, that may diminish or demean intra-team connectivity [64].   Contingency or situational leadership was a popular conception of leadership, however, problems with the construct were identified in terms of three specific flaws around lack of internal consistency, conceptual contradictions, and ambiguities its consistency [65, 66].   Additional weaknesses of this model have been posited such as the premise of a universally effective leadership style   and behavioural theories relied on abstract leadership types that were difficult to identify [67].

6.Toxic Leadership

The macro environment provides a multidue of threat to the sustainability of organisations.   Danaher (2016) in a study of work related stress found that the issue of the uncontroolable nature of the field threat is substantial in terms of ensuring organisational sustainability [68].   Porters five forces demonstrates the totality of attacks that come from the free global economcy that place an inextricalble strain on the resources and culture of organisations.   The issue of the uncontrollable field, can be an

antecedent of workplace discord as pressures on scarce resources shrink the pie even more.   In such circumstance, the poisonous and self-preservationist tactics associated with related toxicity can intensify.   This instensificaiton can be fuelled from the top, as market share may slip, funding budgets may dry up, but the expectations on organisational resources are either maintained, or indeed, are increased to demonstrate to shareholders, stakeholders or the public, that all is well.

Toxic leadership relates to an apparent lack of concern for the well-being of subordinates, a personality or interpersonal technique that negatively affects organizational climate, and a conviction by subordinates that the leader is motivated primarily by self-interest [69].   Kellerman (2006) heralded that "Anyone not dwelling in a cave is regularly exposed, if only through the media, to people who exercise power in ways that are not good."   She provided a helpful typology of bad leadership that included headings such as: incompetent, rigid, intemperate, callous, corrupt, insular, and evil. Clearly, there are many ways to be a bad leader [70].

Kusy and Holloway (2010) offer a disconcerting commentary statement after they conducted a national research study using both interviews and surveys: "Toxic people thrive only in a toxic system [22].   This explication of toxicity in organisations highlights the role of the tolerance of toxicity and the impact of that tolerance on preservation of conditions for toxicity to thrive.   They suggest that despite the fact that organisational leaders may not intend to create an environment welcoming of toxic personalities, their lack of attention and ignorance of the problem enables toxic behaviour to prevail and sustain. Toxic personalities exist in organisations because people tolerate them, change to accommodate them, or stive to protect them.

Of all the destructive leadership styles discussed in existing literature, toxic leadership is seemingly the most comprehensive in terms of the number and types of negative behaviours included in the definition [71].   Therefore, toxic leadership can be considered an umbrella term that covers several distinct but related dimensions of negative leadership (e.g. workplace bullying, abusive leadership [72].   Toxic leadership is a combination of self-centered attitudes, motivations, and behaviors that have adverse effects on subordinates, the organization, and mission performance.   There are three key elements of this destructive leadership style: an apparent lack of concern for the wellbeing of subordinates, a personality or interpersonal technique that negatively affects organisational climate, and a conviction by subordinates that the superior is motivated primarily by self-interest [73]. Employee's experiencing a toxic leader's behavior may have feelings of helplessness, reduced autonomy, reduced efficiency and innovation, lower job satisfaction, psychosomatic problems such as anxiety, depression, frustration, and gastrointestinal problems (Fowlie & Wood),

Hodgins et al. (2020) completed a study exploring workers experiences of organisational response to workplace bullying with a view to identifying the factors which contribute to poor response [74].   Their study found that organisational cultures of tolerance for rude, aggressive or ignorant behavior were seen to exist and to "trump" the policies that were in place, particularly in two of the three organisations that were under examinsation in their study.   One participant in the study described the organisation as a "macho" culture, and the examples of toxicity in action that included people putting others down, not taking the trouble to be respectful or courteous, calling staff to task publicly over their work, grandstanding, and undermining colleagues.   There were also examples of physically threatening behavior, being tolerated and going unchallenged.   A normalising effect was observed, which meant that policy becomes irrelevant.   Examples of negative behaviours included perpetration by staff in positions of power, where the normalising effect was seen to particularly potent [74].

Glambek et al (2018) completed a study examining the association between workplace bullying and job insecurity using a two-year time lag and a representative sample of 1775 Norwegian employees.   Their study found that the relationship between workplace bullying and job insecurity is mediated by continued exposure to bullying behaviours and that the relationship between baseline bullying and continued victimisation is moderated by laissez-faire leadership (i.e. the enactment of passive-avoidant and non-responsive leadership behaviour) [21].   Thus, laissez-faire leadership appears to represent a condition under which bullying and toxicity processes can endure and progress, and the bullying behaviours associated with such sustained and escalated scenarios seem to be particularly relevant antecedents of job insecurity.   Such results pertaining to the leadership place within the perpetuation of toxicity, represents novel contributions to our understanding of workplace bullying and job insecurity, holding important implications for prevention of workplace bullying and alleviation of its negative consequences.

7. Humanistic Leadership Models

Mirroring criticisms of historical leadeship models, organisational leadership has come under fire across the globe in recent years because of severe ethical lapses in some of very high profile organisations [76, 77].   As a natural response to these ethical lapses, both academics and practitioners have increased their focus on leadership and the inherent obligations in leadership positions [78,79]   In particular, emerging literature on the topic of responsible leadership begain to offer promise to refine and move thinking forward in an integrative way bridging what we know about corporate social responsibility (CSR) and leadership [80, 81, 82].   The evolution from autocratic to more constructivist leadership styles is evidenced in increased references to the blending of action and reflexivity in extant literature placing the relationship between leader and follower as central in the recipe for organisational success [83, 84].

One such approach to leadership is the leader-member exchange (LMX) model.   It is a model that has developed into a significant area of scientific inquiry and has received considerable empirical research attention in the organisational sciences [85].   LMX focuses on the separate dyadic relationships between leaders and each of their followers.   It also stipulates that leaders do not develop the same type of relationship with each follower.   Specifically, LMX theory states that leaders vary their interactions across followers and, in doing so, determine their relationships with followers [86].

Another model, Distributed leadership theory differs from traditional leadership theory in that the influence process involves more than just downward influence on subordinates by an elected leader [87, 88].   Rather, leadership is broadly distributed amongst a set of individuals instead of being centralised in the hands of a single individual who acts in the role of a superior [89].   In this model, leadership is not simply relegated to a position, i.e. to a single authority, but is instead associated with the capacity of individuals to influence peers [89].   Distributed leadership is defined by its relational aspect and the distribution of the leadership itself, a "phenomenon occurring at different levels and dependent on social interactions and networks of influence" [90].   Such constructivist approaches to leadership embrace creativity, innovation, sustainability and a focus on creating symbiotic interpersonal relations [91,92].   Mengel (2012) for example has created a leadership model grounded in existentialism and motivational analysis (EMotiAn) [93].   This model integrates the work of Viktor Frankl (1985) and Steven Reiss (2008).   It is designed to be useful in changing leader mind-sets from the pursuit of wealth and power, to more meaningful aspirations.

Biehl-Missal and Fitzek (2014) also favour a humanistic leadership model and advocate gestalt as being efficacious in improving leadership development [94].   Regarding the lack of contributions from gestalt to leadership discourse, they suggest that "both sides miss opportunities to bring together their potential in research and practice" [94].   The artistic thrust of gestalt can lead to more creative and expansive organisational decision making by "challenging the mundane world of organisations and to apply practical arts-based research approaches to support change and development processes" (Biehl-Missal and Fitzek 2014, p. 13). Naicker and Vethaviasa-Naidoo (2014) also propose a gestalt leadership model [95].   Their work focuses heavily on the relational thrust of gestalt.   This is not a new concept because in the 1950's, the gestaltist Kurt Lewin analysed the psychological field structures and tensions within organisations.   He was able to link gestalt theoretical thinking to the psychology of individuals, groups, organisations and the cultural and social climate as a whole.   Gestalt theory preceded management concepts that later acknowledged that people attempt to make sense of organisations, valuing the multifaceted and subjective motivations of the "social man", the "self-actualising man" and the "complex man"[96].

A relational model introduced by Uhl-Bien (2006) seeks to move beyond a focus on the manager–subordinate dyad or a measure of relationship quality to address the question of what are the relational dynamics by which leadership is developed throughout the workplace [97,98 99,100].   At first sight, in the perspective of a relational analysis of leadership, the answer seems to be in the question.   Essentially, Uhl-Bien defines relational leadership as a social influence process through which emergent coordination (i.e., evolving social order) and change (e.g., new values, attitudes, approaches, behaviours, and ideologies) are constructed and produced [97].

Authentic leadership theory suggests that leaders who are more authentic draw on their life experiences, psychological capacities (i.e. hope, optimism, resilience, and self-efficacy), a sound moral perspective, and a supporting organisational climate to produce greater self-awareness and self-regulated positive behaviours.   This in turn fosters their own and their followers'

authenticity and development, resulting in wellbeing and sustainable / consistent performance [101, 102]).   In simpler terms, authentic leadership is a pattern of transparent and ethical leader behaviours that encourage openness in sharing information needed to make decisions while accepting input from those who follow

The authentic leader builds trust and healthier work environments through four key components: balanced processing, relational transparency, internalised moral perspective, and self- awareness [103].   Leaders who are authentic use 'balanced processing' by requesting from followers' adequate input and perspectives, both positive and negative, prior to making important decisions.   They emphasize a level of openness and truthfulness ('relational transparency') that encourages others to be forthcoming with their ideas, challenges, and opinions.   The authentic leader sets and role models a high standard of ethical and moral conduct (internalised moral perspective) and finally, conveys self-awareness by understanding not only their own strengths and limitations, but how they affect others.   Avolio et al. (2005) suggest that, by enacting these behaviours, authentic leaders facilitate higher quality relationships leading to active engagement of employees in workplace activities, which results in greater job satisfaction and higher productivity and performance.   Authentic leadership theory posits that authentic leader's model and support follower self-determination [101].

According to relational theory the process can be considered from both perspectives in the context of a social dynamic.   Members of the organisation participate in "knowledge systems" through the relational dialogue [97,99,100].   Relational leadership allows us to consider processes that are not just about the quality of the relationship or eve n the type of relationship, but rather about the social dynamics by which leadership relationships form and evolve in the workplace.   In this way, it moves leadership beyond a focus on simply getting alignment (and productivity) or a manager's view of what is productive, to a consideration of how leadership arises through the interactions and negotiation of social order among organisational members [97].   Although Uhl-Bien's work proposes only a theoretical reflection upon the question, this theory presents a promising way of rethinking, reconceptualising, and re-measuring the social influence process in leadership.   Beyond being employees, managers, leaders or followers, we are individuals; the organisations to which we happen to belong are merely systems in which individuals participate together in order to construct social order.   Thus, an examination of the influence processes of these hierarchical relationships ought to automatically imply a consideration of the concomitant social interaction which unfolds [99].

8. Complexity Leadership Theory

The leadership models of the last century presented in this paper have been products of top-down, bureaucratic paradigms. These models are as such, products of their times and thus their efficacy has been demonstrated time and time again in empirical studies throughout the decades.   Indeed, leadership is a concept that is pervasively researched and in contemporary literature, there are now over 350 theories in existence positing to decree that leadership theory itself is a testament to the fact that everything old becomes new again [104,130].   A lack of synthesis and collaboration in this area is in itself a mediator of the volume of theory in existence.   As the twentieth century drew to a close, the leadership author Peter Drucker (1998) offered a state of the nation summation on the state of leadership theory at that time [105].   He concluded that the basic assumptions underlining much of what is taught and practiced in the name of management is hopelessly out of date.   Most of our assumptions about business, technology and organization are at least 50 years old. They have outlived their time [105].

Drucker bemoaned that although we are living in a knowledge economy, the way we manage and govern organisations systems are stuck in the industrial era.   He called for the establishment of a whole new model [106].   This challenge was picked up on by contributors who promoted more humanistic leadership models toward the end of the century such Mary Uhl Bien.   What has emerged is a theory of leadership for the 21st century, a theory whose time has come at the intersection of complexity with complexity.   Whilst historical leadership models were eminently more pertinent to economies premised on physical production, their applicability within knowledge-oriented economies of the knowledge are largely obsolete and inefficacious [97].   Complexity science suggests a different paradigm for leadership, one that frames leadership as a complex interactive dynamic from which adaptive outcomes (e.g., learning, innovation, and adaptability) emerge.

Complexity leadership theory (CLT) begins to address limitations of historical leadership models by replacing fixed notions of embedded practice, with a framework for leadership for the fast-paced, volatile context of the Knowledge Era [13,107].   The model extends beyond bureaucracy premises by drawing from complexity science, the "study of the behaviour of large collections of simple, interacting units, endowed with the potential to evolve with time" [108].   Using the concept of complex adaptive systems (CAS), the model proposes that leadership should be seen not only as position and authority, but also as an emergent, interactive dynamic— a complex interplay from which a collective impetus for action and change emerges when heterogeneous agents interact in networks in ways that produce new patterns of behaviour or new modes of operating [109, 110].

The Complexity Leadership perspective is premised on several critical notions. First, the informal dynamic is embedded in context [111,112].   Context in complex adaptive systems is not an antecedent, mediator, or moderator variable; rather, it is the ambiance that spawns a given system's dynamic persona—in the case of complex system personae, it refers to the nature of interactions and interdependencies among agents (people, ideas, etc.), hierarchical divisions, organizations, and environments. CAS and leadership are socially constructed in and from this context—a context in which patterns over time must be considered and where history matters [112-115].

Second, a complexity leadership perspective requires that we distinguish between leadership and leaders.   Complexity Leadership Theory will add a view of leadership as an emergent, interactive dynamic that is productive of adaptive outcomes (which we call adaptive leadership [109].   It will consider leaders as individuals who act in ways that influence this dynamic and the outcomes.   Leadership theory has largely focused on leaders—the actions of individuals.   It has not examined the dynamic, complex systems and processes that comprise leadership.   Because of this, earlier models have been criticized for being incomplete and impractical [112,116,117].

Rost (1991) refers to this as the problem of focusing on the "periphery" and "content" of leadership with disregard for the essential nature of what leadership is—a process [117].   Third, complexity leadership perspectives help to distinguish leadership from managerial positions or "offices" (a bureaucratic notion) [118].   The vast majority of leadership research has studied leadership in formal, most often managerial, roles and has not adequately addressed leadership that occurs throughout the organization [114,119].   To address this, the term administrative leadership to refer to formal acts that serve to co-ordinate and structure organizsational activities (i.e., the bureaucratic function), and introduce the concept of adaptive leadership to refer to the leadership that occurs in emergent, informal adaptive dynamics throughout the organisation [109,120].

Finally, complexity leadership occurs in the face of adaptive challenges (typical of the Knowledge Era) rather than technical problems (more characteristic of the Industrial Age).   As defined by adaptive challenges are problems that require new learning, innovation, and new patterns of behaviour [121].   They are different from technical problems, which can be solved with knowledge and procedures already in hand [122].   Adaptive challenges are not amenable to authoritative fiat or standard operating procedures, but rather require exploration, new discoveries, and adjustments.   Day (2000) refers to this as the difference between management and leadership development [123].   Management development involves the application of proven solutions to known problems, whereas leadership development refers to situations in which groups need to learn their way out of problems that could not have been predicted (e.g., disintegration of traditional organizational structures)

9. CLT – A Dynamic Leadership Approach to Addressing Toxicity

Evidence presented in this paper points to the inadequancy of historical leadership models to adequately address the issue of toxicity in the workplace.   Complexity leadership theory (CLT) however posseses characteristics that appear appropriate to effectively confine to the pages of history, leadership approaches instilled in organisations based on a preoccupation with the leader. By using the concept of complex adaptive systems (CAS), the model employs a greater degree of sophistication appropriate for the knowledge era [97]   It does so by reframing the very construct of leadership as a *process* not only just as *position* and *authority* [106]. Instead, CLT provides a conceptual framework, a schema grounded in the emergent, interactive dynamic of complex adaptive systems that embrace the notion of individual difference, and how this shapes the more abstract and fluid organisation of the 21st Century.

Leadership theory that has largely focused on leaders i.e. the actions of individuals, has not explored the potential of the dynamic, complex systems and processes that comprise *leadership*. The issue of focusing on the periphery, and on the content of leadership, invariably involves complicity in the perpetuation of toxicity due to the inherent top down directive led thrust of organisational leadership. Historical models that have been predicated on control and compliance, have rightly been labelled as being incomplete and impractical for the modern era [97,112,117]. Such fixed contructs of structure are now deemed to be at odds with a future defined by continuous and fast paced change [114]. One practical implication of this from a toxicity perspective is that where organisations refuse to adapt and to change, we know that the environment is changing around them. The consequence for the twentieth century organisation operating in the 21st century is that they will invariably be left behind by other more progressive and adaptive organisations sharing the same space. Thus, the conditions for distributive bargaining to infect the organisation will naturally be facilitated by the catalyst of ever-shrinking opportunities for employee actualisation whilst employers will be forced to place even more demands on those same employees. In the context of an entrepreneurial oriented knowledge era, that which refuses to change will be destroyed by change. Process drive complex adaptive systems however that embrace the ability to change, will have the capacity and imagination to open the doors of the veritable cage and create the freedom of thought and practice appropriate for competing within the dynamism of the 21st century macro-environment.

In this paper, the practice of laissez faire leadership has not only been critiqued in a broad manner, it has been demonstrated to be a direct antecedent of workplace toxicity [21]. A laissez faire culture has been linked with antequated leadership models that have for instance, facilitated the perpetuation of macho-cultures where followers are sheperded to comply within the confines of traditional notions of strenght and control. CLT clearly differentiates from those approaches, but does not inadvertently postulate an approach that can be critiqued for being too abstract or laissez faire vicariously. It does so by seperating out and distinguishing leadership from managerial positions or "offices" (a bureaucratic notion) [118]. Leadership theory in the past has positioned leadership in *formal* and often *managerial,* roles but has not adequately addressed leadership that occurs *throughout* the organisation [114,119]. By reframing the managerial aspect into administrative leadership, CLT identifies the required formal functions that serve to coordinate and structure organisational activities (i.e., the bureaucratic function). This arrangement facilitates adaptive leadership to occur in emergent, informal adaptive dynamics throughout the organisation [109;120]. In progressive organisational cultures that can now predicated upon creating the space for individual voices in creating an adaptive dynamic, the administrative function rightly becomes more transactional and serving of the dynamic organisation, as opposed to serving- as- the- control function of a static and oppressive entity.

By replacing the fixed notion of a rigid structure of autocratic and beurocatric simplistic hierarchial models, its rudimentary applicability and conducive allure harbours an acceptance of the complex interplay from which a collective impetus for action and change emerges. Such an approach tethers well to the transactional conceptualisation of contemporary work relationship theory postulated by such authors as Lazarous and Folkman (1998). , Cox and Griffiths (2010), Houdmount (2009), [124-126]. The fact that a CLT perspective requires that we distinguish between leadership and leaders, it creates new perspectives that simply does not allow for fixed notions of what attributes make a great leader. Any conceptualisation of a dominant leader, fixed in terms of traits or behaviours is substituted in CLT with the conceptualisation that leadership development is more emergent, interactive, and dynamic. This has the effect of producing adaptive outcomes (adaptive leadership) [109]. CLT considers leaders as individuals who act in ways that influence this dynamic and the outcomes and thus provides a more equitable route to facilite self actualisation and to the avoidance of conditions condusive to toxic behaviour. .

What Uhl Bien et al. (2007) have achieved with this model is to addresses limitations of the he reformational humanistic models that were a precursor to the CLT toward the end of the twentieth century. In relational leadership theory for example, the model has been criticised over its overtly positive view of human behaviour and notions supporting the efficacy of the organisation to flourish without internal competition. By heterogeneous agents interacting in networks and in ways that produce new patterns of behaviour or new modes of operating., there is an explicit recognition given to the role and place for individual difference which creates an appropriate framework of the conditions for a complex adaptive system [109, 110]. CLT does not promote a utopian, harmonious and simplistic leadership model, in fact, it proposes a complex and dynamic ever changing organisation. It is by

allowing the flexibility and creative potential of the individual to take precedence that is seen to contribute to the adaptive potential of the systems that make up the organisation itself.

We need look no further than the traditional high street store as to examples of toxic dinosours whose survival is being threatended through the veritable meteorite of tecnological change. Working conditions the retail have deteoriated rapidly into the twenty first century with a number challenges to the practice of offering zero hour contracts flooding the daily news bulletins. Multiple examples of the collapse of large scale retailers are contemporary examples of where organisational sustainability is challenged significantly by the burden of been highly geared particularly in relation to the high cost or real-estate.   Incapable of adaptive transition, these archaically structured organisations with have been targted by more agile and online providers, who hav capitalised on the new buying behaviours of today's customer.   Such changes in consumer behaviour coupled with global events such as the Covid-19 pandemic have all but sealed the fate of the high street shop as we know it.   With retail employees acting as collatoral damage, the world of retail today provides a harrowing and toxic vignette, an obituary to the once mighty and all conquering monster of the large and unweilding semendted super store.

One of principal characteristics of complexity leadership theory is premise of the complex system personae, as they relate to interactions and interdependencies among agents that include people, ideas, etc., hierarchical divisions, organisations, and environments.   The   working organisation is a systemic interplay of heterogenous organisms within an ever emergent process orientation adaptability.   Focusing on the relationality and transactionality of the informal dynamic, embedded in a fluide context, the ambiance gives a system's its unique dynamic persona, paying deference to the the nature of interactions and interdependencies among agents.   Complex adaptive systems and leadership processes are socially constructed therefore both within in, and from this context—a context in which patterns over time must be considered and where history matters [112,113].   Such an approach can promote inclusion and participation because there should be a place for call in the creation of both the ongoing narrative, but one that appreciates lessons learned from the past.   In so many of today's high profile organisational scandals and failures, the question has to be asked how many downfalls have occurred due to the overtly masculine culture where creative voices have been stifled and decision making within toxic cultures has been the privalage of the 'Great Man/Men'.

It is because of the social constructivist bias of the CLT model, that positive implications exist for more inclusive decision making.   Whilst addressing limitationso of the reformational humanistic models of the late twentieth century, CLT embraces however the aspects such as the gestalt practices of dialogue and creative thinking where multiple perspectives and opinions are welcome through a process of crystalisation (the ability to look at a phenomenon from several vantage positions).   Such approaches are tremendously condusive to holistic decision making, ensuring that solutions are well rounded and comprehensive given the diversity of richness of thought processes involved.   The phenomenological underpin the CLT is provided by embracing the notion of allowiong the emergent to become figural.   Many organisations that exist within the rhetoric of their own prowess, fail to spot the icebergs of threat that loom in the surronding ocean.   Such an approach to the creation of adapability holds that knowledge is never complete due to the dynamic nature of life, and that knowledge will always be obsolete in the context of an ever changing environment [131].   Complexity leadership occurs in the face of adaptive challenges (typical of the Knowledge Era) rather than technical problems (more characteristic of the Industrial Age).   Adaptive challenges are problems that require new learning, innovation, and new patterns of behaviour.   They are different from technical problems, which can be solved with knowledge and procedures already in hand [120,121].   Adaptive challenges are not amenable to authoritative flat or standard operating procedures, but rather require exploration, new discoveries, and adjustments [123].

10. Conclusion

The advent of the 21st century sees a world experiencing a crisis of identity depicted by seismic shifts in how we live and work. The first decades of the century have seen substantial revolutions across various domains.   Rapid change enveloped within a distinctly knowledge and innovation driven era have expedited the demise of traditional leadership models.   These models that enjoyed precedence within the industrialisation tenure of the twentieth century and before, were identified as being obsolete and

inadequate entering into this century.   Their continued place in attempting to conceptualise appropriate leadership theory and practice in the twenty first century was signposted as a threat by commentators towards the end of the last century.   By being continuously tethered to antiquated notions of what constitutes effective leadership, the alarming data around both the prevalence and consequences of workplace toxicity point to the need for reformed thinking.   Building on humanistic approaches to effective leadership theory and practice, complexity leadership theory has emerged as viable alternative that requires much discourse and review over the twenty first century.   It proposes that we replace those fixed notions of embedded historical leadership practices by replacing with a framework that is appropriate for the fast-paced, volatile context of the knowledge era. As a attempt to address workplace toxicity, it provides three domains of hope.   Firstly, the informal dynamic of the organization is embedded in context allowing organizational identity to emerge over time through collective impetus.   Secondly, it removes the historical notion of the great leader, replacing with the concept of process driven leadership.   This has implications or extending the benefits of previous shared and distributed leadership by creating more fluid and inclusive key decision making.   Finally, it occurs in the face of adaptive challenge associated with the knowledge era, rather than maintaining a preoccupation with technical issues more aligned to the industrial era.   CLT therefore places the employee in a much more influential and ownership position.   It does so by positioning the individual within the confines of autocratic top down entity, but within the adaptive and process oriented freedom of a dynamic and sustainable 21st century organisation.   In this model, successful organisations in this century will be the ones who can empower their people by dismantling the toxic cages of historical leadership practice.

Bibliography

1. Neuman, J. H., Baron, R. A., Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. (2011). Social antecedents of bullying: A social interactionist perspective. *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice*, 201-225.
2. Olweus, D. (2001). Bullying at school: Tackling the problem. *OECD observer*, 24-24.
3. Durré, L. (2010) *Surviving the Toxic Workplace: Protect Yourself Against Coworkers, Bosses, and Work Environments that Poison Your Day*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
4. Rajalakshmi, M., & Gomathi, S. (2015). A study on the factors influencing workplace bullying and its impact on employee stress. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *6*(1), 292-292.
5. Gomes, J. F. and Coelho J. P. (2014) 'Values in Shock: The Role of Contrasting Management, Economic, and Religious Paradigms in the Workplace, ISSWOV [online] 288-298

6. Edwards, J. A. and Webster S. (2012) 'Psychosocial Risk Assessment: Measurement Invariance of the UK Health and Safety Executive's Management Standards Indicator Tool Across Public and Private Sector Organisations', *Journal of Work and Stress,* 26(2), 130-142.

7. Korosi, A., and Baram, T. Z. (2010) 'Plasticity of the stress response early in life: mechanisms and significance', *Developmental Psychobiology*, 52(7), 661-670.

8. Khamisa, N., Oldenburg, B., Peltzer, K., and Ilic, D. (2015). Work related stress, burnout, job satisfaction and general health of nurses. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 12(1), 652-666.

9. Health and Safety Executive (2015) Work related Stress, Anxiety and Depression Statistics in Great Britain 2015[online], available Http://www.hse.gov.uk/statistics/causdis/stress/stress.pdf [accessed 13 Jan 2016]

10. Teich, S. T., & Faddoul, F. F. (2013). Lean management—the journey from Toyota to healthcare. *Rambam Maimonides Medical Journal*, 4(2).

11. Steiber, N. and F. Pichler (2014) Trends in Work Stress and Exhaustion in Advanced Economies', *Social Indicators Research,* 121(1), 1-25.

12. Marion, R., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2011). Implications of complexity science for the study of leadership. *The Sage handbook of complexity and management*, 385-399.

13. Lipman-Blumen, J. (2006). *The allure of toxic leaders: Why we follow destructive bosses and corrupt politicians--and how we can survive them*. Oxford University Press, USA.

14. Kasalak, G., 2019. Toxic Behaviors in Workplace: Examining the Effects of the Demographic Factors on Faculty Members' Perceptions of Organizational Toxicity. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 5(1), pp.272-282.

15. Frost, P. (2003), Toxic Emotions at Work, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA

16. Lilius, J. M., Worline, M. C., Maitlis, S., Kanov, J., Dutton, J. E., & Frost, P. (2008). The contours and consequences of compassion at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 29(2), 193-218.

17. Juster, R.-P. and B. S. McEwen (2014). 'Sleep and Chronic Stress: New Directions for Allsotatic Load Research', *Journal of Sleep Medicine*, 2015(16), 7-8.

18. Koob, G. F. and Le Moal M. (2001) 'Drug Addiction, Dysregulation of Reward, and Allostasis', *Neuropsychopharmacology*, 24(2), 97-129.

19. Andel, R., Crowe, M., Hahn, E.A., Mortimer, J.A., Pederson, N.L., Fratiglioni, L. Johansson, B. and Gatz, M. (2012) 'Work-Related Stress May Increase the Risk of Vascular Dementia', *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 60(1), 60-67.

20. Roberts, C. (2014) 'Stress and Coping Strategies among Ghanaian Women in Managerial Positions', *European Scientific Journal*, 10(14), 205-211.

21. Glambek, M., Skogstad, A., & Einarsen, S. (2018). Workplace bullying, the development of job insecurity and the role of laissez-faire leadership: A two-wave moderated mediation study. *Work & Stress*, 32(3), 297-312.

22. Kusy, M. and Holloway, E. (2009) *Toxic workplace! Managing Toxic Personalities and their Systems of Power*, San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons.

23. Wood, R., & Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory of organizational management. *Academy of management Review*, 14(3), 361-384.

24. Aspromourgos, T. (2012). The Managerialist University: An Economic Interpretation. *Australian Universities' Review*, 54(2), 44-49.

25. Coleman, R., & Fraser, C. (1979). Integrative versus distributive bargaining: choosing a problem resolution process. *Relations industrielles/Industrial Relations, 34*(3), 546-562.

26. Ten-Brinke, L., Black, P. J., Porter, S., and Carney, D. R. (2015) 'Psychopathic Personality Traits Predict Competitive Wins and Cooperative Losses in Negotiation Personality and Individual Differences', Elsevier Science Publishing, 79(2015), 116-122.

27. Mohajan, H. (2019). The first industrial revolution: creation of a new global human era.

28. Obedgiu, V. (2017). Human resource management, historical perspectives, evolution and professional development. *Journal of Management Development*.

29. Merkle, J. A., & Riley, J. M. (1980). *Management and ideology: The legacy of the international scientific management movement*. Univ of California Press.

30. O'Boyle, T. F. (2011). *At any cost: Jack Welch, General Electric, and the pursuit of profit*. Vintage.

31. Coldwell, D. (2019). Negative influences of the 4th industrial revolution on the workplace: Towards a theoretical model of entropic citizen behavior in toxic organizations. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *16*(15), 2670.

32. Campbell, D. J., Hannah, S. T., and Matthews, M. D. (2010) Leadership in military and other dangerous contexts: Introduction to the special topic issue, *Military Psychology*, *22*, S1-S14.

33. Zhou, Z. E., Yan, Y., Che, X. X. and Meier, L. L. (2015) 'Effect of Workplace Incivility on End-of-Work Negative Affect: Examining Individual and Organisational Moderators in a Daily Diary Study', *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 20(1), 117-130.

34. Gallie, D., and Zhou, Y. (2013) 'Job control, work intensity, and work stress', in Gallie, D. ed. (2013) *Economic Crisis, Quality of Work, and Social Integration: The European Economic Crisis*, Oxford: University Press.

35. Russell, H., and McGinnity, F. (2011a) 'The Impact of Recession on Work Pressure: The Case of Ireland', In Spring Meeting of the ISA RC28 University of Essex, UK 13th-16th April.

36. Seow, J. H. I., (2012) 'Understanding leadership and management development in a health board of NHS Scotland', *OpenAIR@RGU*. [online] 1-440, available; http://openair.rgu.ac.uk

37. Hogan, R., & Blickle, G. (2013). Socioanalytic theory. *Handbook of personality at work*, *53*.

38. Parry, K., & Bryman, A. (2006). I: 2.1 Leadership in organizations. *The SAGE handbook of organization studies*, *5*(3), 447-465.

39. Avolio, B.J., Walumbwa, F.O. and Weber, T.J., (2009) 'Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions', *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 421-449.

40. Northouse, P. G. (2014). *Introduction to leadership: Concepts and practice*. Sage.

41. Bryman, A. (Ed.). (2013). *Leadership and organizations (RLE: Organizations)*. Routledge.

42. Matthews, J. B. (2015). Leadership Traits: Are People Born to Lead?. In *Leadership in surgery* (pp. 59-66). Springer, Cham.

43. Buchanan, D. A., & Huczynski, A. A. (2019). *Organizational behaviour*. Pearson UK.

44. Scouller, J. (2011). *The three levels of leadership: How to develop your leadership presence, knowhow, and skill*. Management Books 2000.

45. Antonakis, J. (2012). Transformational and charismatic leadership. *The nature of leadership*, 256-288.

46. Skog, A., Peyre, S.E., Pozner, C.N., Thorndike, M., Hicks, G. and Dellaripa, P.F., (2012) 'Assessing physician leadership styles: application of the situational leadership model to transitions in patient acuity', *Teaching and learning in medicine*, 24(3), pp.225-230.

47. Oreg, S., & Berson, Y. (2015). Personality and charismatic leadership in context: The moderating role of situational stress. *Personnel Psychology*, *68*(1), 49-77.

48. Van de Ven, A. H., Ganco, M., & Hinings, C. R. (2013). Returning to the frontier of contingency theory of organizational and institutional designs. *Academy of Management Annals*, *7*(1), 393-440.

49. Antonakis, J., & House, R. J. (2014). Instrumental leadership: Measurement and extension of transformational–transactional leadership theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *25*(4), 746-771.

50. Wright, B.E., Moynihan, D.P. and Pandey, S.K., (2012) 'Pulling the levers: Transformational leadership, public service motivation, and mission valence', *Public Administration Review*, 72(2), 206-215.

51. Bass, B.M. and Riggio, R.E., (2006) *Transformational leadership*, London: Psychology Press.

52. Givens, R.J., (2008) 'Transformational leadership: The impact on organizational and personal outcomes', *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, 1(1), pp.4-24.

53. Shamir, B., House, R.J. and Arthur, M.B., 1993. The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization science*, 4(4), pp.577-594.

54. House, R. J. (1971). A path goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative science quarterly*, 321-339.

55. Sosik, J.J., (2005) The role of personal values in the charismatic leadership of corporate managers: A model and preliminary field study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *16*(2), 221-244.

56. Resick, C.J., Whitman, D.S., Weingarden, S.M. and Hiller, N.J., 2009. The bright-side and the dark-side of CEO personality: examining core self-evaluations, narcissism, transformational leadership, and strategic influence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(6), p.1365.

57. McCleskey, J.A., 2014. Situational, transformational, and transactional leadership and leadership development. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly, 5(4), p.117*

58. Burns, J. M. (1984) *The Power to Lead: The Crisis of the American Presidency*, New York: Simon & Schuster.

59. Yukl, G. (2010) *Leadership in Organisations,* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

60. Yukl, G. and Mahsud, R., 2010. Why flexible and adaptive leadership is essential. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 62(2), p.81.

61. Diaz-Saenz, H. R. (2011). Transformational leadership. *The SAGE handbook of leadership*, *5*(1), 299-310.

62. Krumm, D., (2001) *Psychology at work: An introduction to industrial/organizational psychology,* New York: Krumm Publishers.

63. Van Knippenberg, D. and Sitkin S. B. (2013) 'A Critical Assessment of Charismatic—Transformational Leadership Research: Back to the Drawing Board?' *The Academy of Management Annals*, 7(1), 1-60.

64. Jiang, J. (2014) 'The Study of the Relationship between Leadership Style and Project Success' *American Journal of Trade and Policy*, 1(1), 51-55.

65. Bass, B. I. (2014) *The Effects of Student Violence against School Employees on Employee Burnout and Work Engagement: The Roles of Perceived School Unsafety and Transformational Leadership,* unpublished thesis (PhD), Old Dominion University.

66. Nichols, T. 2008. "Authentic Transformational Leadership and Implicit Leadership Theories." Dissertation, University of North Texas.

67. Glynn, M.A. and DeJordy, R., (2010) Leadership through an organization behavior lens. In *Handbook of Leadership Theory and Practice: An HBS Centennial Colloquium on Advancing Leadership* (p. 119), Harvard Business Review Press.

68. Danaher M.P., (2016) 'In Search of the Elan Vital – A gestalt exploration of the role of self-regulation in the mastery of work related stress – an autoethnographic study using directed content analysis', unpublished thesis (Ph.D.), University of Limerick, available: http://hdl.handle.net/10344/5559

69. Reed, G. E., & Olsen, R. A. (2010). *Toxic leadership: Part deux*. ARMY COMBINED ARMS CENTER FORT LEAVENWORTH KS MILITARY REVIEW.

70. Kellerman, B. (2006). When should a leader apologize and when not?. *Harvard business review*, *84*(4), 72-81.

71. Pelletier, K. L. (2010). Leader toxicity: An empirical investigation of toxic behavior and rhetoric. *Leadership*, *6*(4), 373-389.

72. Smith, N., & Fredricks-Lowman, I. (2020). Conflict in the workplace: a 10-year review of toxic leadership in higher education. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *23*(5), 538-551.

73. Whicker, M. (1996), Toxic Leaders: When Organizations Go Bad, Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

74. Hodgins, M., Lewis, D., MacCurtain, S., McNamara, P., Hogan, V., & Pursell, L. (2020). "... A bit of a joke": Policy and workplace bullying. *SAGE Open*, *10*(2), 2158244020934493.

75. Glambek, M., Skogstad, A., & Einarsen, S. (2018). Workplace bullying, the development of job insecurity and the role of laissez-faire leadership: A two-wave moderated mediation study. *Work & Stress*, *32*(3), 297-312.

76. Alves, J. C., Lovelace, K. J., Manz, C. C., Matsypura, D., Toyasaki, F., & Ke, K. G. (2006). A cross-cultural perspective of self-leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*.

77. Stahl, G. K., & Sully de Luque, M. (2014). Antecedents of responsible leader behavior: A research synthesis, conceptual framework, and agenda for future research. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *28*(3), 235-254.

78. Pless, N. M., Maak, T., & Waldman, D. A. (2012). Different approaches toward doing the right thing: Mapping the responsibility orientations of leaders. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *26*(4), 51-65.

79. Waldman, D. A., & Siegel, D. (2008). Defining the socially responsible leader. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *19*(1), 117-131.

80. McWilliams, A., & Siegel, D. (2001). Profit maximizing corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, *26*(4), 504-505.

81. Siegel, Donald S. "Responsible leadership." (2014): 221-223.

82. Waldman, D. A., De Luque, M. S., Washburn, N., House, R. J., Adetoun, B., Barrasa, A., ... & Wilderom, C. P. (2006). Cultural and leadership predictors of corporate social responsibility values of top management: A GLOBE study of 15 countries. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *37*(6), 823-837.

83. Pirson, M. A. (2014). Reconnecting management theory and social welfare: A humanistic perspective. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 2014, No. 1, p. 12245). Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510: Academy of Management.

84. Lawrence, P. R. and Pirson, M. (2014) 'Economistic and Humanistic Narratives of Leadership in the Age of Globality: Toward a Renewed Darwinian Theory of Leadership'. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 2015(128), 288-294.

85. Dulebohn, J. H., Bommer, W. H., Liden, R. C., Brouer, R. L., & Ferris, G. R. (2012). A meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of leader-member exchange integrating the past with an eye toward the future. *Journal of Management*, 38(6), 1715-1759.

86. Wakabayashi, M., Chen, Z. and Graen, G.B., 2005. The global Asian way: Managerial efficacy profile (MEP) and LMX relationship in Asia. *LMX leadership: The series. New frontiers of leadership*, Vol 2,121-137.

87. Pearce, C.L. and Sims Jr, H.P., 2002. Vertical versus shared leadership as predictors of the effectiveness of change management teams: An examination of aversive, directive, transactional, transformational, and empowering leader behaviors. *Group dynamics: Theory, research, and practice*, *6*(2), p.172.

88. Pearce, C.L., Wassenaar, C.L. and Manz, C.C., 2014. Is shared leadership the key to responsible leadership? *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, *28*(3), pp.275-288.

89. Conger, J.A. and Pearce, C.L., 2003. *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*. London: Sage Publications.

90. Fletcher, J. K., & Kaufer, K. (2003). Shared leadership. *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*, 21-47.

91. Gagliardi, P. and Czarniawska B., eds. (2006) *Management Education and Humanities,* Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing Inc.

92. Adler, N. J. (2006) 'The Arts and Leadership: Now that we can do anything; what will we do?', *Academy of Management Learning and Education,* 5(4), 486-499.

93. Mengel, T. (2012) 'Leading with Emotional Intelligence – Existential and Motivational Analysis in Leadership and Leadership Development', *Journal on Educational Psychology* 5(4), 24-31.

94. Biehl-Missal, B. and Fitzek, H. (2014) 'Hidden Heritage: A Gestalt Theoretical Approach to the Aesthetics of Management and Organisation', *Gestalt Theory*, 36(3), 251-266.

95. Naicker, I., & Naidoo, S. V. (2014). Is the whole more than the sum of its parts? A community of practice approach to leadership development of school principals. *International Journal of Educational Sciences*, *7*(2), 289-298.

96. Lück, H. E. (2011) 'Anfänge der Wirtschaftspsychologie bei Kurt Lewin', *Gestalt Theory,* 33(2), 91-114.

97. Uhl-Bien, M. (2007). Relational leadership approaches. *Encyclopaedia of leadership*, 1305-1308.

98. Reitz, M., 2015. Megan Reitz, Dialogue in organizations: Developing relational leadership. *Leadership*, p.1742715015617864.

99. Fulop, L. and Mark, A., (2013) 'Relational leadership, decision-making and the messiness of context in healthcare' *Leadership*, 9(2), 554-277.

100. Carmeli, A., Tishler, A. and Edmondson, A.C., 2012. CEO relational leadership and strategic decision quality in top management teams: The role of team trust and learning from failure. *Strategic Organization*, 10(1), pp.31-54.

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

102. Gardner, W.L., Avolio, B.J. and Walumbwa, F.O., 2005. Authentic leadership development: Emergent trends and future directions. *Authentic leadership theory and practice: Origins, effects, and development*, pp.387-406.

103. Laschinger, H.K.S., Wong, C.A. and Grau, A.L., 2013. Authentic leadership, empowerment and burnout: a comparison in new graduates and experienced nurses. *Journal of nursing management*, 21(3), pp.541-552.

104. Grint, K., 2014. The hedgehog and the fox: Leadership lessons from D-Day. *Leadership*, 10(2), 210-240.

105. Drucker, P. F. (1998). The discipline of innovation. *Harvard business review*, *76*(6), 149-157.

106. Manville, B., & Ober, J. (2003). Beyond empowerment: Building a company of citizens. *Harvard business review*, *81*(1), 48-53.

107. Schneider, M., & Somers, M. (2006). Organizations as complex adaptive systems: Implications of complexity theory for leadership research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*(4), 351-365.

108. Coveney, P. (2003). Self-organization and complexity: A new age for theory, computation and experiment. Paper presented at the Nobel symposium on self-organization. Stockholm: Karolinska Institutet.

109. Heifetz, R. A. (1994). Leadership without easy answers. : Cambridge Harvard University Press

110. Plowman, D., Baker, L. T., Beck, T., Kulkarni, M., Solansky, S., & Travis, D. (2007). Radical change accidentally: The emergence and amplification of small change. Academy of Management Journal, 50(3)

111. Hunt, J. (1999). Transformational/charismatic leadership's transformation of the field: A historical essay. The Leadership Quarterly, 10(2), 129–144

112. Osborn, R., Hunt, J. G., & Jauch, L. R. (2002). Toward a contextual theory of leadership. The Leadership Quarterly, 13, 797–837.

113. Cilliers, P. (1998). Complexity and postmodernism: Understanding complex systems. London: Routledge.

114. Rost, J. C. (1991).Leadership for the twenty-first century.London: Praeger.

115. Dooley, K. J. (1996, 10.26.96).Complex adaptive systems: A nominal definition.Retrieved September, 2006, fromhttp://www.eas.asu.edu/~kdooley/casopdef.htmlDougherty,

116. Hosking, D. M. (1988). Organizing, leadership and skilful process.Journal of Management Studies,25, 147–166.

117. Gronn, P. (1999). A realist view of leadership.Paper presented at the educational leaders for the new millenium-leaders with soul. ELO-AusAsiaOn-line Conference

118. Heckscher, C. (1994). Defining the post-bureaucratic type. In C. Heckscher & A. Donnellon (Eds.),The post-bureaucratic organization: Newperspectives on organizational change. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

119. Bedeian, A. G., & Hunt, J. G. (2006). Academic amnesia and vestigial assumptions of our forefathers.The Leadership Quarterly,17(2), 190–205

120. Heifetz, R. A., & Linsky, M. (2002).Leadership on the line: Staying alive through the dangers of leading.Boston: Harvard University Press.

121. Heifetz, R. A., & Laurie, D. L. (2001). The work of leadership.Harvard Business Review,79(11), 131–141.

122. Parks, S. D. (2005).Leadership can be taught: A bold approach for a complex world.Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

123. Day, D. V. (2000). Leadership development: A review in context.The Leadership Quarterly,11(4), 581–613

124. Lazarus, R. S., and Folkman, S. (1987). Transactional theory and research on emotions and coping. *European Journal of personality*, 1(3), 141-169.

125. Cox, T., and Griffiths, A. (2010). Work-related stress: A theoretical perspective. In S. Leka and J. Houdmont (Eds.), Occupational health psychology (pp. 31–56). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

126. Houdmont, J. (2009) *Defining a Case of Work-Related Stress*, unpublished thesis (PhD), University of Nottingham.

127. Fischer, C. (2013) 'Labor-Management Bargaining Ethics: A Transformational Exercise for Students', *B> Quest*, 1-14, available: http://web.a.ebscohost.com.proxy.lib.ul.ie/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=71afe394-c7ad-45b5/ [accessed 26 Jun 2014].

128. Engle, R. L., Dimitriadi, N., Gavidia, J. V., Schlaegel, C., Delanoe, S., Alvarado, I., ... & Wolff, B. (2010). Entrepreneurial intent. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*.

129. Hisrich, R. D. (1990). Entrepreneurship/intrapreneurship. *American psychologist*, *45*(2), 209.

130. Cote, R. (2017). Vision of effective leadership. *International Journal of Business Administration*, *8*(6), 1-10.

131. McNiff, J. (2013) *Action Research: Principles and Practice*, 3rd ed., Abington: Routledge.