

At its Highest Vibrational Frequency: From Disempowering to Affirmational Leadership

Dr Riffat-un-Nisa Awan
Department of Education,
University of Sargodha, Pakistan
riffarukh@gmail.com

Dr Stephen Bigger
Institute of Education,
University of Worcester, United Kingdom
s.bigger@gmail.com

Abstract

Leadership is a complex phenomenon and has been researched extensively. The leadership literature focuses on the traits, styles, and behaviors of leaders, but the question which is being asked in this research remains generally unanswered. This research intends to explore; what is good leadership and what is bad leadership? Data was collected using a semi structured interview protocol from purposively selected sixteen respondents mainly working in educational organizations at different levels both heads and subordinates in UK and Pakistan. Most subordinates who were interviewed described their leaders as disempowering and non-consultative. Based on the findings and understanding which we got from this research, a rainbow leadership model has been proposed, using rainbow colours as a metaphor for leadership strength, covering the roles and behaviours of the leaders on a spectrum of effective/good leadership and ineffective/bad leadership. An effective violet leader with a high level of energy and frequency is affirmational to individuals' abilities and confidence and capable of empowering staff to support each other in transforming themselves. On the other end of continuum is an ineffective leader who is disempowering and may demotivate and destroy individuals and increase the turnover of good staff.

Keywords: *Affirmative Leadership, Charismatic Leadership, Participative Leadership, Disempowering Leadership*

Introduction

Leadership is a lived experience rather than a checklist of behaviors or traits (Ladkin, 2020). It is an interconnected process among leaders, followers and the context where it takes place (Bratton, 2020). Leadership influences the extent to which institutions achieve. Leaders can facilitate good practice, or unconsciously discourage it. This research looks for evidence of leadership processes which encourage the building of self-confidence and competence: we are calling this ‘affirmative leadership’. The opposite of this is leadership which discourages personal empowerment and inhibits confidence: we are calling this ‘disempowering leadership’. Awan (2003) Awan et al., (2008) conducted quantitative research on leadership in higher education across the higher education establishments of the Punjab, Pakistan, taking a representative sample from every institution. In broad terms, this research discovered that how leadership dynamics work while being affected by many contingency conditions. This tested various variables and demonstrated that leadership needs to be responsive to different situations (the situational theory of leadership) at times directive, and at times delegating power and responsibility. This present paper starts where that research finished with elements of leadership that quantitative research could not tell us. It revealed how various subordinates responded to various leadership styles, but did not particulate provide an answer to the questions ‘What is a good leader’ and ‘What is an ineffective leader’. Using qualitative research, this paper begins to redress the balance.

Some earlier researches on leadership by the authors which were designed to test the path-goal theory came up with unexpected results, some favorable to the theory and some not. The analysis raised more questions than answers. However, it provided pointers for future investigations. The data-set of Awan (2003) Awan et al., (2008) were not designed to ask ‘what is a good leader?’ but it did confirm the situational theory of leadership – that an effective leader understands subordinated and is adaptable to their strengths and limitations, sometimes being giving direction, sometimes allowing freedom. Staff value or resist each approach depending on whether they are themselves achievement oriented or easily stressed. Bennis and Thomas (2002) assert that every human has a unique set of obstacles and assets that they bring to the table. These obstacles include poverty, insecurities, discriminations, personality disorders, flawed values, the burdens which everybody carries. Researchers need to study these perceived reasons for not succeeding and manifesting failure.

McGregor famously distinguished the X leader (authoritarian, directive leaders who assume staff have to be driven and monitored to ensure compliance) from the Y leader (participative positive relationship oriented). William Ouchi’s ‘theory Z’ inspired by Japanese practice emphasized the facilitation of teamwork. Parallel to these we are exploring positive and negative aspects of leadership: positive leadership wins hearts and minds, encourages, thanks and rewards, shares a broad vision, and works in teams (Zepp

et al., 2009); power orientated negative leadership bosses around, generates mistrust, maintains a blame culture, involves in misadventures, fears criticism and opposition (Zepp et al., 2009) and expects outcomes without thanks. Of course 'leader' is unlikely to be an appropriate word as they may provide direction but not leadership, task masters rather than persuaders. They may be considered as misleaders (Gini & Green, 2012) or non-leaders. According to Allio (2007) good leaders prioritize strategies which are appreciated by all stakeholders. They exert influence instead of coercing, encourage change and show integrity. Good leaders are proficient in their tasks and considerate in their behavior.

The effective leader has vision and is mindful of the policies and politics of the organization and of external pressures and seeks to find advantage, but does not get lost in trivia. Relationships can be viewed in positive and negative ways: the positive about; building trust, being fair, encouraging collaboration; the negative; giving way to anger and stress, showing misbehavior, and encouraging a blame culture. Allio (2007) explains such leaders as toxic, corrupt, and misguided, who damage the benefits of the stakeholders. They cause pain and distress to the individuals and organizations. Allio further states that we are facing an epidemic of misbehavior and suffering from a plague of bad leadership in both the public and private sector. The researchers need to explore this epidemic before it becomes pandemic. These aspects of leadership we explore further in this article.

Methodology

The research underpinning our comments is qualitative and is based on the findings of researches by Awan (2003) and Awan et al., (2008) in which a questionnaire was administered across colleges in the Punjab, Pakistan and analyzed in the light of House's path-goal theory. These researches raised a number of interesting aspects of leadership which have been taken forward through qualitative means using interviews which sought out the experiences and attitudes of people to both leaders they have worked with, and leadership roles they have had. From these 16 interviews, general issues have been raised and case studies extracted to illustrate key leadership issues. The interview schedule was drawn from the questionnaire results, scrutinized from the question 'what is a good leader?' A coding framework was devised after the first five interviews, and progressively refined.

The methodology of this research is qualitative, seeking out the views and experiences of a range of people through interview from UK and Pakistan, and drawing from these interviews both a general picture and individual case studies. Case studies are drawn from several descriptions and are not anecdotal idiosyncratic rare cases. We present these with case studies first to put together the jigsaw of leadership practice from which we will seek to draw out generalizations.

Reflexivity

One interesting aspect of the qualitative research comes from the fact that both writers have been leaders themselves, one in university sector teacher education in the UK and other in university sector teacher education and earlier as head teacher in Pakistan. Both of us also have had experience of being led by leaders. A research issue is whether to lay that information aside as anecdotal and subjective, or whether it is valid and usable. We are aware of the dangers of personal agendas, ego defenses and self-justification; and we are aware that self-critique can be unfairly harsh. Qualitative research routinely uses interviews to draw out personal life stories from a variety of people, and it seems perfectly valid if the research is interviewed as part of this data collection, so long as this version of the issues is not privileged. Joint authorship provides an important safeguard.

Concerns about autobiographic data should extend to all interviews. All interviews that have a degree of life story collection cannot be taken at face value. We noted examples of differences between rhetoric and reality, when leaders presented themselves as they wished to be interpreted, whilst others (and observations) gave a different picture. Sartre talked about autobiographies being acts of ‘bad faith’ at various levels – truth telling, selection of material, and self-promotion (LaCapra, 1982). We might add profiteering when autobiographies are commercial income generators. However, within research interviews (and other autobiographic data production such as diaries) research anonymity reduces the pressure to dissemble. The analysis process also attempts to scrutinise the accounts of informants. For informants who are also the researchers, the need for careful attention to honest self-critique is paramount. Interviews are given in a state of anxiety, however willingly. In the first interview, interviewees have anxieties to release. Some might therefore be over optimistic, others pessimistic. A second interview can then focus on aspects chosen by the interviewer as producing balance. For some, several interviews over time is the only way of producing balanced data.

Results

Case study 1: The Disempowering ‘Leader’

Most interviewed subordinates described their leaders as disempowering, non-consultative on important agendas, and distant from their staff, often not knowing what really goes on. Bullying by managers was highlighted as a particular issue of concern that leaders were either unaware of or unwilling to tackle. Different styles of leadership are associated to the occurrence of bullying in work groups (Nielsen, 2013). This model unfortunately comes from a variety of reports and is clearly quite common. Many of those with long career experience reported this as the norm in their experience rather than the exception.

Interviews reported the following traits:

- *Lack of friendship and empathy*
- *Obsession with personal power*

-
- *Stress and anger at personal loss of face*
 - *Bullying*
 - *Favoritism*
 - *Belittling colleagues and never being satisfied or praising*
 - *Victimizing colleagues who are threats, such as by speaking out critically*
 - *Using the position of power to blackmail e.g. by threatening dismissal or poor reference.*
 - *Unwillingness to consult*
 - *Dividing and ruling*
 - *Delegating jobs but not power*
 - *Looking for faults and using blame as a weapon*

These situations were described as generating poor working ethos, job dissatisfaction and staff burnout. There were reported consequences also in health and welfare of staff and stress related illness, some even leading to premature death. Disempowerment is linked with loss of confidence and loss of opportunities to be innovative and take responsibility. Empowerment improves efficiency and performance of employees (Xue et al., 2011). Staff does what they need to keep out of trouble, but it is risky to be innovative in disempowering environment. As they are not involved in decision making, the work of the organization is an imposition rather than an enthusiasm. There may be loyalty between staff but this comes out of common suffering rather than creative performance. Loyalty will cease if being loyal to a victim might draw victimization on oneself.

Case study 2: Risk Averse and Risk Open

This case starts with an assessment of a leader by subordinates as avoiding risk, or encouraging it. One respondent described a change from a risk averse leader who retired, to a risk open replacement. Only the change made them aware that previously opportunities had been missed and the organization had been constrained by being limited to safe business. In fact, some of the ‘safe’ business had proved to be unsafe and problematic, leaving issues for the new leader to sort out. The risk-open leader is willing to pursue ideas and agendas from any subordinate so a more enterprising culture can develop as being the leader often involves making risky decisions that affect the payoffs of all group members (Ertac & Gurdal, 2012). Of course, the risk has to be managed so that it is in control and the organization is not committed to impossible agendas at the whim of a charismatic but unwise figurehead.

Case study 3: The Bottleneck Leader (Non-Delegator)

This is the leader who needs to approve every item personally, so that they create a log-jam that prevents the organization moving forward at a proper speed as there are

major delays in making decisions at all levels. Research shows that employees are less satisfied when their bosses display directive and controlling leadership and are less delegative (Oshagbemi & Gill, 2003).

“I am delegative, there was a time when I did not delegate because I could not trust anybody. I am perfectionist that’s the biggest drawback in my personality I need everything done on time and to my satisfaction. And if it is not done to my satisfaction then I am stressed and my level goes up.”

Case study 4: Delegated or Devolved Leadership

In this model leadership and power is devolved down an organizational system so that a number of key people are viewed as leaders under the guidance of a supremo (head teacher or principal). Employees are involved in decision making and thus they take the responsibility and own their organizations (Awan, et al., 2008).

“For a lot of work of this nature, I have passed on to course leaders and I don’t get involved in the minutiae of what’s going on. I try to keep more strategic view and every day running of the courses and programs and so on I leave up to staff. So, my course leaders are responsible for different courses and they get on with that. I just check on with them every now and then to make sure that things are happening and going smoothly.”

“I would discuss with them what they feel, what they think they can contribute to start with. I think I would ask them where you see your strengths and weaknesses, you want to see your role and then suggest particular role and particular jobs functions they could carry out. But it’s very much negotiation”

Case study 5: Team leadership Approach

In this leadership approach, a group of leaders share power and responsibility, combining their strengths and remedying inexperience and personal agenda. This approach explains the distribution of leadership role within a team (Morgeson et al., 2010). Although this picture is drawn from one particular school, the general features can be found elsewhere in the working of a cohesive senior management team. In the case study, the leadership role is divided between three individuals whose contribution is decided by their strengths and by school needs. Communication is by note or email so that lengthy meetings do not interfere with work. There are times when decisions have to be made and are made democratically. This has the advantage of spotting and preventing potential mistakes before they happen. It was felt essential that all of the leadership team is comfortable with the division of power and authority. It is also emphasized that effective leadership processes signify the critical factor in the success of teams (Zaccaro et al., 2001).

Case study 6: Achievement-Oriented Leaders

Achievement-oriented leader sets challenging goals, expects subordinates to perform at the highest level, and continually seeks improvement in performance. The leader delegates task and emphasizes excellence. These leaders encourage subordinate to exert high effort and strive for a high level of goal achievement. They express confidence that subordinate can reach these goals. Achievement oriented leadership sets clear and challenging objectives for employees (House, 1971). The extent of this challenge sometimes leads towards stress if subordinates don't possess relevant task ability.

“When I was first in post, I was asking my team to consider lot of new things, and to challenge their own concepts and their own areas of safety and to be brave and take some risks. When people are doing a good job it's very easy for them to say, oh! We are doing a good job. Yes, you are doing good but I want you to do an excellent job. I want you challenge yourself and not to be comfortable of that and say everything is fine. Teacher education has changed a lot in Britain over the last few years and many of the colleagues here were not in touch with how the changes were developing. So it was very important for me not to make the people feel threatened and frightened but to help them engage with those changes and to move things on.”

Case Study 7: Leaders as Mentors

Mentoring is defined as a kind of social support provided by the leaders to the employee in order to enhance their career growth and personal development (Shek & Lin, 2015). This case is distinguished by the leader consciously training subordinates into first management and then leadership. In one case, a leader divided the task to be managed (PGCE provision in University) into three areas – secondary, primary and early years. Each course leader was supported and mentored over a five-year period until each had become autonomous leaders and needed little overseeing. The leader was increasingly free to take on further leadership responsibilities. This case has dangers – that the leader becomes redundant and a potential target for redundancy, which explains why some leaders are reluctant to delegate power and precious about their ‘empire’. There is a difference in attitude between those who prefer stability and doing the same job for a long period, and those who wish to stabilize the organization and then move on to another challenge. For the latter, the fear of redundancy is less of a problem as finishing one job provides an opportunity to find another.

Case study 8: Participative Leadership

Participative leader consults with subordinates about work related matters and uses their suggestions, opinions and ideas before reaching a decision (House, 1996). Participative leaders typically encourage their people to play an active role in assuming control of their work. People are more motivated by being consulted on action affecting them. The right kind of participation yields both motivation and knowledge valuable for affiliation and acceptance. It gives people a sense of accomplishment.

“I think you got to be able to listen, you got to be able to make people feel that they are valued, that they want to work for you. You want to try and maximize their potential and to do that, they have to feel that you are interested in people and you are interested in what they are doing so that they feel important.”

Case study 9: The empowering transformational leader

Transformational leaders are the persons who inspire and motivate others to trust and follow (Tucker & Russell, 2004). Encouraging team members for active roles so that they could get involved and take responsibilities is very important for enabling them to make day to day decisions or often times some bigger decisions themselves without relying on others especially the seniors. It must be something more than delegation. It's the idea and concept that is very important for effective learning organizations. No doubt employee empowerment leaves the leader with more time to engage in broad-based thinking and visioning.

One head described, “From management to dinner lady the leadership can be seen in every person.” The interviewee ascribed this to trust and praise that acknowledged effort; that she uses the strengths of her staff very carefully and technically, instead of highlighting their weaknesses. She felt that is a boost to morale and encouraged staff to work their hardest. She treats everyone with respect and offers helpful guidance when appropriate.

“It does not mean that she doesn't have authority. When she thinks she needs to be a head she does so. She is in a way very subtle and dominant. She knows how to get people to work and she knows how to get best out of them. She clears her expectations and in a way you do it happily.” She summed up that as a result of this leadership style: “Our school is family like where everybody takes care of each other.”

Generalisations

Leaders exist throughout an organisation so have varying degrees of autonomy in that they may be subject to a line manager or a board. We have used the term ‘leader’ to refer to someone placed in a leadership role responsible for the work of others, and demonstrated a continuum or spectrum of effective leadership and ineffective leadership. At the ineffective end of the continuum, the person in the leadership position is not a leader at all, merely ‘in charge’. At worst this negativity can demotivate and destroy individuals and increase the turnover of good staff; or it may make management and leadership at lower levels increasingly problematic for juniors.

Charismatic leaders

The charismatic leaders possess drive and inner conviction and can bring the majority along with them. They are supportive, nurturing, sensitive, and considerate in their

behaviour (House, & Howell, 1992). We might dispute whether charisma is a helpful quality or a liability if it inhibits consultation. So we might have a charismatic leader who is a dictator: Hitler won over the German people through a mix of fear, nationalism and optimism and through oratory. He got things done and maintained power for years until defeated. The allies were to present acceptance of this charismatic view as a disease to be cured, which provided focus for post-war rebuilding. On the other hand a charismatic leader who is democratically consultative would operate in a very different way. Charisma is Greek for ‘spiritual gift’ and refers to behaviour which speaks to the heart rather than to the intellect. We might see in it a range of different conditions: the extrovert; the entrepreneur; the driven; the confident; and the persuader. Of these, the ability to persuade others is central since the other personality types could exist in non-charismatic forms. Whether the ability to persuade is good or bad depends on what is being decided. Rwandan genocide was spurred on by charismatic makers and shakers.

Influencing the leader:

Leaders reach their decisions after consultation, but have varying ways of achieving this. Some consult in an inner circle of advisors, deliberately chosen as approved points of view showing ‘cabinet solidarity’. Thinking here will tend to be ‘inside the box’, within laid down philosophies and guidelines. The need for power means that the leader might lay aside all advice and act in an idiosyncratic way. This raises the issue about how others need to respond to leaders if decisions are to be in their favor. The middle manager, a leader in a sense, has to relate to the leadership style of the supremo. If this style is to hold central power and for policy decisions, then the middle manager has to make sure that the interests of the group are communicated vociferously. In other words, institutional decisions are made in accordance to the extent to which the middle manager has nagged the leader. Some leaders are said to be over-influenced by the last person to talk to them persuasively. We might dub this ‘gullible leadership’. A middle manager may have to spend time seeking out opportunities to influence rather than building an effective staff team. ‘Golf course leadership’ is one example; or in one large local authority, the best way to influence was in the bar.

A leader with a holistic view and with vision should make a decision on the overall institutional fit, even if the middle manager involved has chosen not to devote time to influencing the leader. Leadership would then be proactive rather than reactive to the last influential conversation. Policy is then likely to be more balanced.

The Transformational Leaders:

This leader wins the hearts and minds of staff, and shows gratitude to successful aspects of work, using praise as a form of reward. Consultation will take place at all levels (Tucker, & Russell, 2004), with the leader regarding himself/herself as a member of the team rather than the privileged voice. There is an issue over whether such a leader can

relinquish responsibility for the decisions made by the team. In particular what should a leader do when the team reach a decision or plan an initiative which is against the leader's wishes and values? To some extent policy planning is part of a long process of team building and identifying values by which the organisation will operate. The transformational leader will seek to establish processes which are empowering to all and discourage personal power ambitions. These processes are likely to ensure that all people have a say, not just those who speak first and loudest. The values that will underlie decisions will have been fully discussed by the whole team and eventual innovations will be in line with these values, so this potential tension should not arrive. The leader will have a voice alongside everyone else, but not regard it as a privileged or dominant voice.

Discussion and Conclusion

Affirmative/Affirmational Leadership

Davis (2017) considers affirmational leadership similar of authentic and servant leadership, an ethically-inclined leadership model. We consider this idea as empowering, and delegating leader. The leader is affirmational to individuals' abilities and confidence and capable of empowering staff to support each other in transforming their area of expertise.

Leaders exist throughout an organization so have varying degrees of autonomy in that they may be subject to a line manager or a board. The term 'leader' has been used to refer to someone placed in a leadership role responsible for the work of others, and demonstrated a continuum or spectrum of effective leadership and ineffective leadership. At the ineffective end of the continuum, the person in the leadership position is not a leader at all, merely 'in charge'. At worst this negativity can demotivate and destroy individuals and increase the turnover of good staff; or it may make management and leadership at lower levels increasingly problematic for junior but better individuals. Studying the dark side of leadership may help in damage control which destructive and bad leader do to the employees (Schilling & Schyns, 2014).

Table 1. *The Rainbow Leadership Model*

Leadership level	Leadership characteristics
Red Leader	Power centred, the boss, demotivating to staff. The disempowering leader.
Orange Leader	Authoritarian and directive, but creating good relationships with subordinated. The friendly boss.
Yellow Leader	Directive and achievement-oriented, able to devolve but needing to monitor in order to reach excellence. The achieving boss.
Green Leader	Participative, generating the agenda through consultation and encouraging subordinate staff to express ideas. The facilitator.
Blue Leader	Supportive, democratic, encouraging to innovation and new ideas, open to manage risk. The encouraging facilitator.
Indigo Leader	Participative achievement-oriented, able to devolve whilst encouraging autonomy in pursuit of excellence. The achieving leader.
Violet Leader	High in energy and commitment, affirmational to staff abilities and confidence, able to facilitate a corporately generated and owned vision and capable of empowering staff to support each other in transforming their area of endeavor. The affirmative leader.

Source: Interview data

The above leadership rainbow model is a spectrum from self-power orientated to affirmational leadership. This model is not a self-assessment schedule. In interviews leaders chose the higher levels, whilst their staff viewed them as the lower. This is therefore primarily a way of looking at leadership. In researchers' view the spectrum is developmental, with red being the lowest and violet the highest. Rainbow colours provide us with a useful metaphor for leader effectiveness. Red light is considered having the lowest energy, vibration and frequency while violet light is reflected having the highest energy, vibration and frequency and the shortest wavelength (Trussell, 2008). The higher the frequency and energy of a person (leader), the greater is the experience of personal power, joy, clarity, and peace (Dussault, 2012). Violet leaders experience more emotional strength, positive thinking and firm commitment.

However the leadership styles could be viewed descriptively rather than qualitatively, taking a pragmatic view of which style is the most efficient. This model of leadership is that leaders who build and trust teams are likely to create a structure of enthusiastic colleagues who believe in what they are doing and are energized by their contribution, not wishing to let colleagues down. Is violet leader activity oriented? Is an ideal leader an effective leader? The inner relationship with a good leader made team members work 10 times harder and with more enthusiasm. A constructive relationship between leader and follower is associated with charisma and makes miracles happen in organizations (Campbell et al., 2008). Issues might be whether a violet leader, a superb team builder and empowerer, can successfully operate in a world dominated by red leaders, who are mainly line managers. Interviews with subordinates mostly described their leaders in terms of red or orange levels. A test of five big personality types may help to know the leaders emotional stability, agreeableness, extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness

to experience, (Hassan et al., 2016; Murphy & Meisgeier, 2008). An idea of exploration of association between Big 5 and our model of leadership rainbow may raise inquisitiveness in the minds of the future researchers to find out new lengths and heights of leadership dynamics.

References

- Allio, R. J. (2007). Bad leaders: How they get that way and what to do about them. *Strategy & Leadership*, 35 (3), 2-17.
- Awan, R. N. (2003). *A study of relationship among leadership behavior of college principals and their subordinates' job satisfaction and acceptance of leader: A path-goal approach*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of the Punjab, Pakistan.
- Awan, R.N., Zaidi, N. R. & Bigger, S. (2008). Relationships between higher education leaders and subordinates in Pakistan: A path-goal approach. *Bulletin of Education and Research*. 30 (2), 29-44.
- Bennis, W. G., & Thomas, R. J. (2002). *Geeks and geezers: how era, values, and defining moments shape leaders-how tough times shape good leaders*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Bratton, J. (Ed.). (2020). *Organizational leadership*. SAGE Publications Limited.
- Campbell, S. M., Ward, A. J., Sonnenfeld, J. A., & Agle, B. R. (2008). Relational ties that bind: Leader–follower relationship dimensions and charismatic attribution. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(5), 556-568.
- Davis, H. J. (2017). Discerning the servant's path: Applying pre-committal questioning to greenleaf's servant leadership. *The Journal of Values-Based Leadership*, 10(2), 10.
- Dussault, P. (2021). The Benefits of Being in a Higher Vibration. Retrieved from https://www.huffpost.com/entry/positive-energy_b_1715767
- Ertac, S., & Gurdal, M. Y. (2012). Deciding to decide: Gender, leadership and risk-taking in groups. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 83(1), 24-30.
- Gini, A., & Green, R. M. (2012). Bad leaders/misleaders. *Business and Society Review*, 117(2), 143-154.
- Hassan, H., Asad, S., & Hoshino, Y. (2016). Determinants of leadership style in big five personality dimensions. *Universal Journal of Management*, 4(4), 161-179.
- House, R. J., & Howell, J. M. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 3(2), 81-108.
- LaCapra, D. (1982). Sartre and the question of biography. *The French Review. Special Issue*, 55(7), 22-56.
- Ladkin, D. (2020). *Rethinking leadership: A new look at old questions*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

-
- Morgeson, F. P., DeRue, D. S., & Karam, E. P. (2010). Leadership in teams: A functional approach to understanding leadership structures and processes. *Journal of management*, 36(1), 5-39.
- Murphy, E & Meisgeier, C. (2008). MMTIC Manual – *A guide to the development and use of the Murphy-Meigeiser Type Indicator for Children*, 25-26, Center for the applications of Type, Gainesville FL.
- Nielsen, M. B. (2013). Bullying in work groups: The impact of leadership. *Scandinavian journal of psychology*, 54(2), 127-136.
- Oshagbemi, T., & Gill, R. (2003). Gender differences and similarities in the leadership styles and behaviour of UK managers, *Women in Management Review*, 18 (6), 288-298.
- Schilling, J., & Schyns, B. (2014). The causes and consequences of bad leadership. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie* 22(2), 187-189. <https://doi.org/10.1027/2151-2604/a000185>
- Shek, D. T., & Lin, L. (2015). Leadership and mentorship: Service leaders as mentors of the followers. *International Journal on Disability and Human Development*, 14(4), 351-359.
- Trussell, D. (2008). Truth About Colour. Retrieved from <http://diannetrussell.com/energy/articles-2/truth-about-colour/>
- Tucker, B. A., & Russell, R. F. (2004). The influence of the transformational leader. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 10(4), 103-111.
- Xue, Y., Bradley, J., & Liang, H. (2011). Team climate, empowering leadership, and knowledge sharing. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. 15(2). 299-312.
- Zaccaro, S. J., Rittman, A. L., & Marks, M. A. (2001). Team leadership. *The leadership quarterly*, 12(4), 451-483.