

An Integrative Review of Past Prominent Leadership Literature: Future Research Directions in Malaysia

Chew Yew Chee

School of Management, Universiti Sains Malaysia

Email: ycchew@student.usm.my

Siti Rohaida Mohamed Zainal *

School of Management, Universiti Sains Malaysia

Email: siti_rohaida@usm.my

** Corresponding Author*

Abstract

Purpose: The review focuses on past prominent leadership literature, aiming to highlight the emerging thematic evolution of the leadership literature

Design/methodology/approach: Qualitative approach by using the literature synthesize to derive to concept and definition of leadership are applied for this research. The concept and definition are discussed at length to see the application and changes of leadership paradigms.

Findings: Various leadership theories seem to be overwhelmed with different thematic thoughts – from the earliest trait-based charismatic and authoritative style; to the seemingly complete full-range of effective leadership styles and communicational techniques; and finally, the emergence of the more contemporary value-based leadership theories such as authentic, service, servant, ethical, inclusive, and later the paradoxical *yin-yang* leadership style. This research concludes that there is no one style fits all. Due to the these complex dynamics as the VUCA 2.0, the concept and practicality of leadership has changed significantly.

Research limitations/implications: The review opens with an attempt to define the meaning of contemporary leadership, followed by exploration and analysis of emerging themes, identifying the literature gap, and lastly, a comprehensive discussion on new insights. The review concludes with recommendations of potential future research directions in leadership.

Practical implications: this research layout the different perspective of leadership. It begins with the discussion on concept and definition. The practicality of the paper is viewed from the literature standpoint of view.

Originality/value: This research manages to compile various definition and concept of leadership. This is important to build a solid understanding on leadership from various literatures. This holistic view helps to build better perspective of leadership in VUCA 2.0 world.

Keywords: Leadership, Future Leadership, Revolution

Introduction

The fourth industrial revolution is currently making waves in many industries. It is believed that leadership in this digital era is all about skills to influence stakeholders and followers towards accomplishing a set of missions and visions. Many companies have agreed that leaders need to address countless areas of organizational challenges. Collins (2001) suggested that leadership is more than transactional, transformational, or charismatic leadership. However,

the kind of leadership that drives a good company towards becoming a great company remains unclear, as Collins labeled the phenomenon of a great leader as somewhat paradoxical. Organizations have concerned that it requires very different leadership styles at the right place and at the appropriate time. Herder-Wynne et al. (2017) further quoted a speech by Oxford Leadership’s chairman Brian Bacon regarding the definition of leadership during this new era of management:

“Leadership in the 4th Industrial Revolution will be defined by the ability to rapidly align and engage empowered, networked teams with clarity of purpose and fierce resolve to win.” (p. 9)

The same authors further suggested that the 21st-century leaders should not only look at traditional team-building, but the integration of remote teams, networks, and alliances are equally essential to distribute leadership throughout the whole company. Furthermore, leaders should avoid hierarchical management by inspiring and empowering subordinates in order to sustain and grow in the dynamic business environment. Lately, the business world has turned out to be highly competitive and increasingly unpredictable. Quicker change in technology, the increase of prominent global competitors, government deregulation of business sectors, failed ventures due to excess capacity, volatile oil prices, and the changing socioeconomics of the human capital are among the numerous inevitable changes in organizations. Kotter (1999) uniquely defined leadership tasks as how leaders cope with organizational change. According to the author, leaders accomplish three organizational tasks in different ways.

According to Table 1, the first task involved *planning and budgeting*. Next is *organizing and staffing*, and lastly, *controlling and problem-solving*. However, the execution of these tasks is subjective and situational, and there are many approaches to these tasks. The approaches are also subject to many factors, and one dominant and crucial factor is human behavior. Since human behavior is governed by different human traits and other external factors, the most effective behaviors in leadership have overlapped or even become ambiguous over time as there were so many different schools of thought in the leadership literature. For example, in the study of personality and leadership, extroverted behavior was once a typical preferred leadership style in the past (Alkahtani et al., 2011; Han et al. 2017; Koltunovych & Polishchuk, 2019; Ordun & Akun, 2016; Yoo et al., 2013). But this is no more relevant in recent years, as more lights emerged, suggesting that introverted leaders could also function effectively.

Table 1. Task That Leaders Do (Source: Kotter, 1999)

Tasks	Description
Planning & Budgeting	Setting targets and goals; allocating resources to accomplish plans; setting directions which include developing visions, innovations, and strategies.
Organizing & Staffing	Staffing qualified individuals; communicating a plan to people; delegating responsibility to people; devising a system to monitor implementation; aligning the right people and creating coalitions.
Controlling & Problem-solving	Monitoring results versus plan through tools such as reports and meetings; identifying deviations and solving the problems; motivating and inspiring through untapped human needs, values and emotions.

Literature Review

Early Leadership Theories

The early leadership literature was known to consist of two different views of schools. The personality trait theory emphasizes that leaders are born with certain personality traits. In contrast, the leadership style theory claimed that effective leadership consists of various leadership styles or approaches that could be learned (Lee et al., 2010). Throughout the past development of leadership theories, these two branches of literature have become much more complicated, with both sometimes overlapping, such as studies conducted by Shin (1998) and Boe and Holth (2015). The trait-based theory was often criticized as irrelevant, as many felt that leadership could be learned. How leaders interact with the situations was more critical than merely investigating different human temperaments (Stogdill, 1948). However, personality psychologists such as Cattell (1950) believed that one's personality traits predict a person's behavior, and these different behaviors were the basis that formed the various leadership styles discussed throughout the leadership literature development.

Situational Leadership

The leadership literature of the first half of the twentieth century had always focused on investigating personal traits and competencies that could promote organizational effectiveness (Jenkins, 1947). The preferred traits in the earlier research were always predominantly charismatic, outgoing, aggressive, and authoritative. None had discussed any opposing characteristics or other external influences in the leadership literature. The interest in using the trait approach later began to fade when Stogdill (1948) noted that the approach doesn't always one-fits-all, especially in different situations. The interest in investigating the behavioral aspects of leadership, where leaders adjust their behavior based on various conditions, had later initiated the conception of contingency leadership models.

Some contingency models, such as the one introduced by Fiedler (1967), were based on the fusion of the earlier behavioral models but emphasized interaction with followers. For example, Fiedler distinguished leadership behaviors as task-oriented and relationship-oriented, and he found that task-oriented leaders are incredibly effective during favorable and unfavorable situations. In contrast, relationship-oriented is best when the leaders are intermediate in favorability. Vroom and Yetton (1973), another contingency leadership research that emphasized decision-making participation by subordinates, had similarly explained that the leadership decisions made are connected to different situational variables.

The earlier contingency leadership research had further inspired House (1971), a study that had explored the path-goal theory. This theory emphasized that adapting the leader's leadership and behavioral style to the environment best fits or empowers the followers will further enhance motivation and work performance. The theory identified four effective leadership behaviors: directive, supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented (Phillips & Phillips, 2016).

Emotional Intelligence in Leadership

Like communications skills, emotional intelligence is an ability to recognize and understand one's own emotions while managing and influencing other people's emotions (Boyatzis, 2009). Emotional intelligence, unlike intelligence quotient, is very frequently hailed as a better indicator of leadership success. Riggio et al. (2002) have cited that the earliest person that has noted the gap to the concept of human intelligence during the 1920s was Edward Thorndike, a researcher that had introduced the concept of social intelligence. However, the first scholar that had used the term emotional intelligence could be traced back to Leuner's (1966) work. There were many different views on the construct of the early emotional intelligence models. In general, the concept of emotional intelligence could be classified into three most researched

categories: the ability model, the mixed model – also known as emotional and social competence, and the trait model. (McCleskey, 2014).

It was not until Salovey and Mayer's (1990) article that the modern conception of emotional intelligence was conceived. Mayer and Salovey (1997) further developed their new emotional intelligence framework, which was constructed based on an ability model that consists of four branches of abilities. The four branches of abilities are emotion perception, emotion facilitation, emotion understanding, and emotion regulation. This framework is by far the most accepted model, and many proceeding emotional intelligence researchers have used this framework as inspiration in their studies. Emotion perception is the ability to recognize other people's emotions through facial or voice expressions. Emotion facilitation will help one cognitively by thinking and making the proper judgment. Emotion understanding will be the skills to know the emotional messages and the actions that are accompanied together. In contrast, emotion regulations are the methods used to establish own emotional self-regulation. Unlike Mayer and Salovey's (1997) four branch theory which was initially viewed as a subset of social intelligence, Bar-On's (1988) unpublished doctoral dissertation conceptualizes emotional intelligence as an innate intelligence needed to deal with external demands effectively. Categorized as a mix-model (McCleskey, 2014), the five domains of Bar-On's (1997) emotional intelligence model included intrapersonal skills, interpersonal skills, adaptability scales, stress management, and general mood. Daniel Goleman also explored another popular mix-model concept of emotional intelligence. Goleman (1995) had identified that the skill-set that he investigated in his emotional intelligence study represents the word 'character'. This old-fashioned word was known to be crucial in a person's success. He also defined emotional intelligence as a framework of emotional competence that could result in an outstanding performance, especially at the workplace (Goleman, 2000). As Mayer et al. (2011) described, Goleman's book about emotional intelligence sold millions of copies worldwide and received much attention from the media and the Times magazine. According to Goleman (2000), emotional intelligence consists of five components that could control, assess and identify the emotion of others and one's own emotions. The five components involve self-awareness, self-regulation, internal motivation, empathy, and social skills. Goleman explained that self-awareness is the ability to recognize and understand personal moods, emotions and drives, and their effect on others. On the other hand, self-regulation is the ability to identify and control disruptive impulses and moods while thinking correctly before acting. The author further described internal motivation as an intrinsic emotion that moves and guides a person towards a goal. This ability usually helps a person take the initiative and perseverance to overcome difficulties and hurdles in everyday undertakings. Finally, empathy is the ability to sense, understand and respond to other people's feelings. However, social skill is proficiency in managing relationships and building networks, finding common ground, and building rapport with other people.

Toxic Leadership

In the turn of the 21st century, with the prevalent studies of toxic leadership research (Higgs, 2009; Lipman-Blumen, 2010; Offerman, 2004; Padilla et al., 2007), the literature that highlighted the dark side of leadership has emerged. Leadership could go wrong, and Whicker (1996) was the first theorist who initiated the term toxic leadership, a leadership style described as an abuse of the leader-subordinate relationship that could potentially harm an established organization. For example, Uber is a company with a disruptive start-up. For many years, the entity had managed to enjoy much attention in the media due to its impact on the industry. Its reputation began to subside, along with its renowned CEO, Travis Kalanick. Kalanick's renunciation is the climax of three-month scrutiny by the authorities, charged after a

condemning social media post from a previous worker that had uncovered a work culture scandal portrayed as harmful, misanthropic, as well as with an absence of integrity and responsibility (Ali, 2017). Just like any other start-up, Uber had offered the sort of opportunity, adaptability, and creativity that any employee would enjoy. Still, these can't replace the kind of qualities that are significantly important at work – justice, inclusivity, responsibility, and respect. In reality, problems will still arise with the absence of these essential leadership qualities that motivate, inspire, and cultivate influential organizational culture and a positive environment. Toxic leaders, as described by Lapan (2019), are abusive, demeaning, and self-serving. Subordinates characterize them as arrogant, inflexible, and petty. For example, the majority observed Donald Trump, the previous President of the United States, as a leader with high extreme extroversion coupled with unbelievably low agreeableness (McAdams, 2016). Bridges (2019) highlighted several important traits lacking in Mr. President. Some examples include refusal to accept criticism, failure to divert errors when presented with new information, supports of short-term pressures rather than long-term, carelessness in people's treatment, and lack of empathy. The toxic nature of these human characteristics is clearly related to a failed charismatic and extroverted leadership style.

Value-based Leadership

With the widespread of toxic leadership studies, new research that focused on value-based leadership emerged. At the beginning of the 21st century, Silverthorne and Wang (2001) had studied flexible leadership as a key to positive outcomes in organizations. Collins (2001) studied eleven companies that have turned from good to great, and he found that all eleven CEOs shared the same personality characteristics that demonstrated humility and professional will. George (2003), on the other hand, proposed authentic leadership that has five dimensions: purpose, values, heart, relationships, and self-discipline. Brown et al. (2005) later introduced ethical leadership theories that identified consideration, honesty, trust, fairness, and charisma related to employees' perceived leadership effectiveness, job satisfaction, dedication, and willingness to report problems to management. Van Dierendonck (2011) had also discussed how servant leadership could empower and mold followers through demonstration of stewardship, interpersonal acceptance, authenticity, humility, and the ability to drive the company towards a positive organizational direction. As Greenleaf (1998) indicated before, servant leadership is about acknowledgment, affirmation, and acknowledging every individual's capacities and how the individual could further learn. Similarly, Lorinkova and Perry (2017) found that empowering leadership could significantly reduce employee cynicism. As noted by the author, empowering leadership could be observed from the organizational perspective through four behaviors: highlighting the significance of employee work, allowing employee participation in decision making, emphasizing employee strengths, and removing bureaucratic constraints. On the other hand, individual perspective is driven by four psychological dimensions: meaning, competence, autonomy, and impact.

Shek et al. (2015) had discussed service leadership, a leadership style commonly applied in the service industry, especially in places like Hong Kong and China. Chinese cultural values heavily influenced this leadership style, and sometimes it was related to philosophies such as Buddhism, Confucianism, and Taoism. As noted by the authors, service leadership covers an extensive dimension such as doing, thinking, being, and growing, coupled with traits, competencies, morals, and caring. Another segment of studies focused on inclusive leadership, which discussed the importance of embracing inclusiveness in various areas such as gender, diversity, and creativity. Wells (2012) stressed three qualities of inclusive leadership: adaptability, skill in building diverse talents, and innovation. Wuffli (2016) defined inclusive leadership as a concept of proactively promoting the involvement of the poor and

underprivileged people, as the need for leaders at both macro and micro levels is crucial. The same author also suggested that four integral principles always guide a good leadership framework: it has to be dynamic and change-oriented; horizontal to enable bridging across different sectors in society and across cultures; holistic and broadly applicable by involving as many people and as many diverse situations as possible; and lastly, explicitly normative in terms of encouraging leaders to reflect on and take positions related to their underlying ethics and values.

Paradoxical Leadership

Despite that the leadership literature has undergone many decades of development and changes, some recent literature has looked at the concept of leadership through paradoxical lenses. Paradox research usually is controversial, seemingly senseless, yet interlinked. Jing et al. (2014) had indicated that contradictory studies are neither religious nor attempts to classify them as social philosophy. Still, it is worth exploring the thinking patterns that paradoxical frameworks could offer in forming new insights. Lee and Reade (2018) had proposed that a paradoxical point of view is especially significant in explaining cross-cultural leadership and followership since working in the globalized era has moved toward a complex business environment. Kaplan and Kaiser (2013) have studied over 7000 managers, including mid-level to CEO roles rated by over 60,000 co-workers. They identified two types of leadership styles: forceful-enabling leadership and strategic-operational leadership. For any kind of these leaderships, a balance of both spectra is found the best, and any lopsided of one type of the said leadership styles will usually be described as “too much”. The authors also used the *yin* and *yang* theory to explain the importance of versatility leadership in their following quote:

“According to the concept of yin and yang, the harmonious vibration between opposites constitutes the very stuff of existence. Versatile leadership arises from the continuous vibration between pairs of opposing impulses: to be forceful and at the same time enabling; to be visionary and at the same time to get things done.” (p.18)

The indigenous theory of *yin* and *yang* could be traced back to the 3rd century BCE. It was developed hand-in-hand along with literature of Chinese philosophy and cosmology (Wang, 2012). *Yin* and *yang* are two energies that exist both indivisible and conflicting with each other. Examples of opposing energies that naturally existed in this world include man-woman, day-night, fire-water, and summer-winter. In addition, the vital component of this concept trusted that humanity experiences five elements called *wu xing* – earth, wood, metal, water, and fire. These elements affect the daily well-being of humankind, and they are constantly changing based on the laws of *yin* and *yang* (Jing et al., 2014). The two contrasting energies of *yin* and *yang* complement each other. As indicated in the image of *yin* and *yang* shown in Figure 1, each side of the different energies consists of a component of energy from the opposite, represented by the smaller dots in the image. None of the poles is better than another, as an expansion in one will cause a decline on the other. In order to achieve the proper harmony between the two poles, a balance of both energies has to be established.



Figure 1. Yin and Yang Symbol

Based upon the indigenous *yin-yang* theory, the traditional conceptualization of philosophies in medicine, architecture, arts, military, and many other areas of life all modeled and utilized the dualism of the two opposing energies. Mintzberg (2001) had proposed a balanced management in leadership, a theory which consists of two very contrasting leadership styles of *yin* and *yang*, as illustrated in Table 2. One style is emotional, forceful, and meddlesome; in the other, cautious, supporting, and inspiring. The former is characterized as *yang*, and it is about the penetration of the present moment. The latter, *yin*, is all about long-term interests. Like other studies investigating introverted and extroverted leadership, Mintzberg highlights the two distinct *yin-yang* leadership as behaviors crucial in the business world. Papers such as Li, X. (2014) and Li, P.P. (2014) had recognized the value of the *yin-yang* framework as it was noted that this is the only framework that appreciates the coexistence of the authentic contradictory components in the same place and time. Even though the framework is still immature, paradoxical in nature, and lacks evidence-based research, the potential that the western world thinks through the lens of this particular Chinese framework is vast, just like how the Chinese are utilizing Western logic.

Table 2. Yin and Yang Balanced Management (Source: Mintzberg, 2001)

Balanced Management	
Yin	Yang
Conservationist culture: engaging, inclusive	Interventionist culture: aggressive, intrusive
Leadership like nursing care	Leadership like medical cure
Communicating by image, feel	Communicating by words, drama
Working more inside the organization: doing, detailing	Working more outside the organization: networking, promoting
Yin stands for dark, mysterious, passive	Yang stands for overt, clear, active,

Virtual Leadership

The word telecommuting is an old term used, and it is a synonym of virtual work, work-from-home, remote work, or virtual collaborations. According to Gupta (2011), the idea of telecommuting was first coined by Nilles (1976) in his book, where he started the notion of moving work to the workers rather than moving the workers to work. Following Nilles's novel idea, the implementation of work from home was introduced for five IBM employees in 1979 as an experiment. Surprisingly, the idea of working from home had even predated the

popularity of commercial computers in the ‘80s. By 1983, the number of people that worked from home soon rose to 2000, and the company JC Penney started to make available the option of working from home for its call center staff. With the enactment of the Appropriations Act in the year 2000, many companies began to create telecommuting policies. Gupta (2011) also added two prominent virtual companies: remote-first and remote-friendly. Remote-first companies such as Toptal, Gitlab, and Zapier are entirely remote companies, with distributed work locations and activities operated anywhere from start-up to launching its first product or service. On the other hand, remote-friendly companies such as Microsoft and Google operated from various physical offices and allowed a certain percentage of its workers to work from home. These companies strike a balance between virtual environments and face-to-face meetings in offices now and then.

Findings

Referring to the summary in Table 3, past leadership theories seem to be overwhelmed with different thematic thoughts – from the earliest trait-based charismatic and authoritative style; to the seemingly complete full-range of effective leadership styles and communicational techniques; and finally, the emergence of the more contemporary value-based leadership theories such as authentic, service, servant, ethical, inclusive, and later the paradoxical *yin-yang* leadership style. The current paper argues that no one style fits all. We are now living in the most “volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous” world, and George (2017) labeled these complex dynamics as the VUCA 2.0. Traditional strategy and leadership theories may be no longer relevant in the new dynamic era. Leadership requires one or more balanced leaders with skills and traits equipped to deal with various situations, people, and challenges (Minzberg, 2001). In other words, a leader’s role is to wear many hats daily to survive in the dynamic business environment. It is difficult to find one leader with such balanced leadership abilities. Therefore, exploring and embracing different human temperaments is worthwhile, such as the dualistic *yin* and *yang* management behavior. However, rather than falling into the danger of a false dichotomy, Kaplan and Kaiser (2013) urged leaders to learn to embrace the diversity of human temperament and become versatile.

Table 3. Summary of Past Prominent Leadership Literature

Literature	Author(s)	Description of Literature
Early Personality Traits Leadership	Terman (1904) Kohs & Irle (1920) Bowden (1926) Cowley (1931) Weber (1947)	Leaders are born with certain traits such as authoritative, charismatic, and more.
Situational Leadership (includes contingency & path-goal leadership)	Stogdill (1948) Fiedler (1967) House (1971) Vroom & Yetton (1973)	Leaders’ behaviors are based on diverse situations, tasks, people, and business environments.
Full-Range Leadership (includes transformational, transactional, laissez-faire leadership)	Burns (1978) Avolio & Bass (1991) Bass & Avolio (1995)	Leadership theories on several effective leadership styles related to motivation, relationships, and monetary rewards.

Distributed Leadership	Gibb (1954) Gronn (2000) Badarraco (2001) Gronn & Harris (2008) Bolden (2011) Zhu et al. (2018) Eva et al. (2019) DeWitt (2017) Gibeau et al. (2020) Hanna et al. (2021)	Leadership theories emphasize group quality rather than on an individual leader. Similar studies using different terms include shared, collective, collaborative, co-leadership, and emergent.
Emotional Intelligence and Leadership	Bar-On's (1988) Salovey & Mayer's (1990) Goleman (1995, 2000) Petrides and Furnham (2001) Boyatzis (2009) Mayer et al. (2011) Petrides et al. (2007)	Leadership models based on social and emotional intelligence.
Communication Based Leadership	De Vries et al. (2010) Neufeld et al. (2010) Asree et al. (2010) Fang & Faure (2011) Lolli (2013)	Leadership based on communication competencies.
Toxic Leadership	Whicker (1996) Offerman (2004) Padilla et al. (2007) Higgs (2009) Lipman-Blumen (2010)	Literature that criticized the abusive leadership power in the workplace.
Morale and Value-based Leadership	Greenleaf (1998) Silverthorne & Wong (2001) Collins (2001) George (2003) Brown et al. (2005) Van Dierendonck (2011) Wuffli (2016) Lorinkova & Perry (2017)	Literature that emphasized moral behaviors of leaders such as flexibility, humility, professional will, authentic, ethical, servant, service, empowering, and inclusive in leadership.
Leadership and management theories based on Chinese paradoxical Yin and Yang theories	Mintzberg (2001) Kaplan & Kaiser (2013) Jing et al. (2014) Li, X. (2014) Li, P.P. (2014)	Contemporary leadership models seem contradictory yet relevant, and the phenomenon is sometimes illogical yet made sense.

	Lee & Reade (2018)
Virtual Leadership	Townsend et al. (1998) Avolio & Kahai (2003) Malhotra et al. (2007) Joshi et al. (2009) Lautsch et al. (2009) Gupta (2011) Stinton (2013) Purvanova & Kenda (2018) De Vaujany et al. (2021) Eisenberg et al. (2021) Helmold (2021) Rahul (2021)

Now is the time to re-think and re-consider a new perspective of leadership that involves the synergy of people from different personalities and abilities. Shelton et al. (2002) once mentioned that when unachievable organizational objectives occur due to trade-offs for other more critical pursuits, we need to be quantum thinkers to bear the unachievable fruits. Quantum thinkers can think out of the box and see from all perspectives, including looking through paradoxical lenses. What happens in life is the consequence of one's action. Action originated from the inner state of a human being. Sadhguru (2016) had quoted in his book about inner engineering in yoga studies:

"...our inner ecology is a mess. Somehow we think that fixing outer conditions will make everything okay on the inside... We need to understand that unless we do the right things, the right things will not happen on us: this is true not just of the outside world, but also the inside." (p. 23)

Essentially, inner engineering means looking internally so that the human mechanism works the best to provide the right actions to manifest the proper consequences. Rant's (2020) grounded theory case study had analyzed a written transcript of over 100,000 words taken from Sadhguru's selected YouTube videos, and he found that effective leadership is all about self-transformation and well-being, especially if we aspired to move towards the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) in the world of businesses. Rant (2020) further quoted Sadhguru's leadership philosophy:

"This should be recognized when the challenge is leading others towards collective good. "The fundamental business of any kind of leadership is human well-being. Everybody's business is human well-being. It is only the scale and scope which is different from person to person. For some, human well-being means only my well-being, and they don't care what happens to somebody. For another, a person's human well-being means him and his family. For another person, human well-being means him and his community. For another person, human well-

being means him and his country. For another person, it is the whole world. Only in scale can human beings be different, otherwise every human aspiration is human well-being ... So, if your scale is larger than your individual well-being, you are a leader...” (p. 6)

Discussion and Conclusion

The posterity mustn't be deluded with the idea that one identity type is better or much preferred over another in the world of leadership. Instead, we should vigorously promote the significance of diverse identities in realizing varying thoughts and creative ideas. Such future research will address the lack of systematic study investigating various personalities in leadership; and how the coexistence of different temperaments could enhance leadership effectiveness in the workplace. This strategy will further bring new light to diversity in the workplace; how working teams are formed; how the workplace is designed; how the company could plan its recruitment and training strategies; and best of all, how diverse people could function better without compromising their very own personality preference in the workplace. New perspectives could help companies form effective leadership training that suits different people. To revamp society's view regarding leadership and inclusiveness, future research could look into the innate source of human behavior in leadership, how different orientations of temperaments could be learned or modeled, and how inclusiveness and synergy of diversity could be the key to outstanding leadership for years to come. In addition to this, technology and digitalization have amplified the importance of remote work in society. However, current research in virtual leadership is still premature, and the feasibility and challenges of virtual team integration could be explored further in various sectors. Helmold (2021) has indicated that the *New Work* concept is all about transformation, and much is still unknown regarding change management in virtual leadership.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

In this paper, the author recommends looking inwards to the source of leadership actions that results in the appropriate inclusive consequences – the human personality. Pendleton et al. (2020) had made a surprising finding that the importance of personality in leadership rules over the significance of intelligence traits. Research on personality and leadership needs to receive revived attention in all future leadership research. Although keywords such as “personality” and “leadership” in the university's electronic library fetched over 100,000 peer reviewed article results, the literature is still missing the core values of personality synergies in leadership. The study on how to reconstruct, revalue and retrain the innermost of leaders, coupled with how the combination of these qualities, perhaps would be crucial in redirecting the business world towards new sustainable innovation. Through a stable inner regulation comes the emerging sustainable leaders.

References

- Aalateeg, S. (2017). Literature Review on Leadership Theories. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 19(11), 35-43. doi:10.9790/487X-1911033543
- Ali, S. (2017). Uber: A leadership failure that consumed a whole business. *Financial Director*. Retrieved from <https://www.financialdirector.co.uk/2017/06/22/uber-a-leadership-failure-that-consumed-a-whole-business/>

- Alkahtani, A.H., Abu-Jarad, I., Sulaiman, M., & Nikbin, D. (2011). The impact of personality and leadership styles on leading change capability of Malaysian managers. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(2), 70-99.
- Asree, S., Zain, M., & Razalli, M.R. (2010). Influence of leadership competency and organizational culture on responsiveness and performance of firms. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 22(4), 500-516. doi:10.1108/09596111011042712
- Avolio, B.J., & Kahai, S.S. (2003). Adding the "E" to E-Leadership: How it may impact your leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 31(4), 325-338. doi:10.1016/S0090-2616(02)00133-X
- Avolio, B.M., & Bass, B.J. (1991). *The full range leadership development programs: basic and advanced manuals*. Binghamton, NY: Bass, Avolio & Associates.
- Badarraco, J.L. (2001). We don't need another hero. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(8), 120-126.
- Bar-On, R. (1988). *The development of an operation concept of psychological well-being*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation), Rhodes University, South Africa.
- Bar-On, R. (1997). *Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory: Technical Manual*. New York, NY: Multi-Health Systems.
- Baškarada, S., Watson, J., & Cromarty, J. (2017). Balancing transactional and transformational leadership. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 25(3), 506-515. doi:10.1108/IJOA-02-2016-0978
- Bass, B.M. (1998). *Transformational Leadership: Industrial, Military, and Educational Impact*. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1995). *Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Redwood, CA: Mindgarden Inc.
- Boe, O., & Holth, T. (2015). Investigating correlations between personality traits and leadership styles in Norwegian military cadets. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 24, 1173-1184. doi:10.1016/S2212-5671(15)00949-1
- Bolden, R. (2011). Distributed Leadership in Organizations: A Review of Theory and Research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13, 251-269. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00306.x
- Bowden, A.O. (1926). A study of the personality of student leaders in colleges in the United States. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 21(2), 149-160. doi:10.1037/h0073378
- Boyatzis, R.E. (2009). Competencies as a behavioral approach to emotional intelligence. *Journal of Management Development*, 28(9), 749-770. doi:10.1108/02621710910987647
- Bridges, F. (2019). How Trump Embodies The Definition Of A Bad Leader. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/francesbridges/2019/04/30/how-trump-embodies-the-definition-of-a-bad-leader/#6df8ac85c0c3>
- Brown, J.S., & Duguid, P. (1991). Organizational learning and communities-of-practice: toward a unified view of working, learning, and innovation. *Organizational Science*, 2(1), 40-57. doi:10.1287/orsc.2.1.40
- Brown, M.E., Treviño, L.K., & Harrison, D.A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97(2), 117-134. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Cattell, R.B. (1950). *Personality: A Systematic Theoretical and Factual Study*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

- Cherniss, C. (2010). Emotional intelligence: Toward clarification of a concept. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 3(2), 110-126. doi:10.1111/j.1754-9434.2010.01231.x
- Collins, J. (2001). *Good to Great: Why Some Companies Make the Leap and Others Don't*. New York, NY: HarperBusiness.
- Cowley, W.H. (1931). Three distinctions in the study of leaders. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 23(2), 144-157. doi:10.1037/h0073661
- De Vaujany, F.X., Leclercq-Vandelannoitte, A., Munro, I., Nama, Y., & Holt, R. (2021). Control and Surveillance in Work Practice: Cultivating Paradox in 'New' Modes of Organizing. *Organization Studies*, 42(5), 675–695. doi:10.1177/01708406211010988
- De Vries, R.E., Bakker-Pieper, A., & Oostenveld, W. (2010). Leadership= communication? The relations of leaders' communication styles with leadership styles, knowledge sharing and leadership outcomes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(3), 367-380. doi:10.1007/s10869-009-9140-2
- DeWitt, P.M. (2017). *Collaborative Leadership: Six Influences That Matter Most*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, A SAGE Company.
- Eisenberg, J., Glikson, E., & Lisak, A. (2021). Multicultural Virtual Team Performance: The Impact of Media Choice and Language Diversity. *Small Group Research*, 52(5), 507-534. doi:10.1177/1046496420985614
- Eva, N., Cox, J.F., Tse, H.H.M., & Lowe, K.B. (2019). From competency to conversation: A multi-perspective approach to collective leadership development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 32(5), 101346. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2019.101346
- Eysenck, H.J. (1998). *Dimensions of Personality*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Fang, T., & Faure, G.O. (2011). Chinese communication characteristics: A Yin Yang perspective. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35(3), 320-333. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2010.06.005
- Fiedler, F.E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- George, B. (2003). *Authentic Leadership: Rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- George, B. (2017). VUCA 2.0: A Strategy For Steady Leadership In An Unsteady World. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/hbsworkingknowledge/2017/02/17/vuca-2-0-a-strategy-for-steady-leadership-in-an-unsteady-world/#28b8b90713d8>
- Gibb, C.A. (1954). Leadership. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 877–917). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Gibeau, E., Langley, A., Denis, J.L., & van Schendel, N. (2020). Bridging competing demands through co-leadership? Potential and limitations. *Human Relations*, 73(4), 464–489. doi:10.1177/0018726719888145
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D. (2000). An EI-based theory of performance. In D. Goleman & C. Cherniss (Eds.), *The Emotionally Intelligent Workplace: How to Select for, Measure, and Improve Emotional Intelligence in Individuals, Groups, and Organizations* (pp. 27-44). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1998). *The power of servant-leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Gronn, P. (2000). Distributed properties: a new architecture for leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 28(3), 317-338. doi:10.1177/0263211X000283006
- Gronn, P., & Harris, A. (2008). The future of distributed leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(2), 141-158. doi:10.1108/09578230810863235

- Gupta, A. (2011). The History Of Remote Work: How It Came To Be What It Is Today. *Sorry, I Was On Mute*. Retrieved from <https://www.sorryonmute.com/history-remote-work-industries/>
- Han, M.P., Seok, B.I., & Kim, J.H. (2017). Effects of six personality factors of CEOs at small and medium-sized enterprises on performance in business management: Focusing on learning and growth. *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, 22(2), 97-128. doi:10.21315/aamj2017.22.2.4
- Hanna, A.A., Smith, T.A., Kirkman, B.L., & Griffin, R.W. (2021). The Emergence of Emergent Leadership: A Comprehensive Framework and Directions for Future Research. *Journal of Management*, 47(1), 76–104. doi:10.1177/0149206320965683
- Helmold, M. (2021). *New Work, Transformational and Virtual Leadership: Lessons from COVID-19 and Other Crises*. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Herder-Wynne, F., Amato, R., & Uit de Weerd, F. (2017). *Leadership 4.0: A review of the thinking*. Retrieved from <https://www.oxfordleadership.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/OL-Leadership-4.0---A-review-of-the-thinking.pdf>
- Higgs, M. (2009). The Good, the Bad and the Ugly: Leadership and Narcissism. *Journal of Change Management*, 9(2), 165-178. doi:10.1080/14697010902879111
- Kerr, R., Garvin, J., Heaton, N., & Boyle, E. (2006). Emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 27(4), 265-279. doi:10.1108/01437730610666028
- Kohs, S., & Irle, K. (1920). Prophesying army promotion. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 4(1), 73-87. doi:10.1037/h0070002
- Koltunovych, T., & Polishchuk, O. (2019). Personality Characteristics of Preschool Education Students with Different Levels of Emotional Intelligence. *Romanian Journal for Multidimensional Education*, 11(1), 100-116. doi:10.18662/rrem/99
- Kotter, J.P. (1999). *John P. Kotter on what leaders really do*. Brighton, Massachusetts: Harvard Business Press.
- Lapan, D. (2019). The commander-in-chief is a toxic leader. *Business Insider*. Retrieved from <https://www.businessinsider.com/president-donald-trump-commander-in-chief-and-a-toxic-leader-2019-8>
- Lautsch, B.A., Kossek, E.E., & Eaton, S.C. (2009). Supervisory approaches and paradoxes in managing telecommuting implementation. *Human Relations*, 62(6), 795-827. doi:10.1177/0018726709104543
- Lee, H.J., & Reade, C. (2018). The role of Yin-Yang leadership and cosmopolitan followership in fostering employee commitment in China: a paradox perspective. *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management*, 25(2), 276-298. doi:10.1108/CCSM-12-2016-0216
- Lee, W.J., Koenigsberg, M.R., Davidson, C., & Beto, D.R. (2010). A pilot survey linking personality, leadership style, and leadership success among probation directors in the US. *Federal Probation*, 74(3), 34-56.
- Leuner, B. (1966). Emotional intelligence and emancipation. A psychodynamic study on women. *Praxis der Kinderpsychologie und Kinderpsychiatrie*, 196-203.
- Lorinkova, N.M., & Perry, S.J. (2017). When is empowerment effective? The role of leader-leader exchange in empowering leadership, cynicism, and time theft. *Journal of Management*, 43(5), 1631-1654. doi:10.1177/0149206314560411
- Malhotra, A., Majchrzak, A., & Rosen, B. (2007). Leading Virtual Teams. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(1), 60-70. doi:10.5465/amp.2007.24286164
- Mayer, J.D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Implications for educators* (pp. 3-31). New York, NY: Basic Books.

- Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D.R., & Cherkasskiy, L. (2011). Emotional Intelligence. In R.J. Sternberg & S.B. Kaufman (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Intelligence* (pp. 528-549). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- McAdams, D.P. (2016). The Mind of Donald Trump. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2016/06/the-mind-of-donald-trump/480771/>
- McCleskey, J. (2014). Emotional intelligence and leadership: A review of the progress, controversy, and criticism. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 22(1), 76-93. doi:10.1108/IJOA-03-2012-0568
- Mintzberg, H. (2001). The Yin and the Yang of Managing. *Organizational Dynamics*, 29(4), 306-312. doi:10.1016/S0090-2616(01)00035-3
- Mohamad, M., & Jais, J. (2016). Emotional intelligence and job performance: A study among Malaysian teachers. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 35, 674-682. doi:10.1016/S2212-5671(16)00083-6
- Pea, R.D. (1995). Practices of distributed intelligence and designs for education. In G. Salomon (Ed.), *Distributed Cognition: Psychological and Educational Considerations* (pp. 47-87). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pearce, C.L., & Sims, H.P. (2000). Shared leadership: Toward a multi-level theory of leadership. *Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams*, 7, 115-139. doi:10.1016/S1572-0977(00)07008-4
- Pendleton, D.A., Furnham, A.F., & Jonathan, C. (2021). *Leadership: No More Heroes*. Switzerland: Springer Nature.
- Petrides, K.V., & Furnham, A. (2001). Trait emotional intelligence: psychometric investigation with reference to established trait taxonomies. *European Journal of Personality*, 15(6), 425-448. doi:10.1002/per.416
- Petrides, K.V., Pita, R., & Kokkinaki, F. (2007). The location of trait emotional intelligence in personality factor space. *British Journal of Psychology*, 98(2), 273-289. doi:10.1348/000712606X120618
- Phillips, A.S., & Phillips, C.R. (2016). Behavioral styles of path-goal theory: An exercise for developing leadership skills. *Management Teaching Review*, 1(3), 148-154. doi:10.1177/2379298116639725
- Poser, N. (2016). *Distance Leadership in International Corporations*. Switzerland: Springer.
- Purvanova, R. K., & Kenda, R. (2018). Paradoxical Virtual Leadership: Reconsidering Virtuality Through a Paradox Lens. *Group & Organization Management*, 43(5), 752-786. doi:10.1177/1059601118794102
- Rahul, P. (2021). Trust Leadership: A Work-from-Home Scenario in Its Sector During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Jindal Journal of Business Research*, 10(2), 251-269. doi:10.1177/22786821211047613
- Rant, M.B. (2020). Sustainable development goals (SDGs), leadership, and Sadhguru: SELF-TRANSFORMATION becoming the aim of leadership development. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 18(3), 100426. doi:10.106/j.ijme.2020.100426
- Resnick, L.B. (1991). Shared cognition: thinking as social practice. In L.B. Resnick, J.M. Levine, & S.D. Teasley (Eds.), *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition* (pp. 1-22). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Riggio, R. E., Murphy, S.E., & Pirozzolo, F.J. (2002). *Multiple Intelligences and Leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Sadhguru, V.J. (2016). *Inner Engineering: A Yogi's Guide To Joy*. New York: Spiegel & Grau.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J.D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, cognition and personality*, 9(3), 185-211. doi:10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG

- Shek, D.T., Chung, P.P., & Leung, H. (2015). How unique is the service leadership model? A comparison with contemporary leadership approaches. *International Journal on Disability and Human Development*, 14(3), 217-231. doi:10.1515/ijdh-2015-0403
- Shelton, C.D., McKenna, M.K., & Darling, J.R. (2002). Leading in the age of paradox: optimizing behavioral style, job fit and cultural cohesion. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23(7), 372-379. doi:10.1108/01437730210445801
- Shin, Y.K. (1998). The traits and leadership styles of CEOs in Korean companies. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 28(4), 40-48. doi:10.1080/00208825.1998.11656748
- Silverthorne, C., & Wang, T.H. (2001). Situational leadership style as a predictor of success and productivity among Taiwanese business organizations. *The Journal of Psychology*, 135(4), 399-412. doi:10.1080/00223980109603707
- Stinton, N. (2013). Diversity In Virtual Teams. In *STTS: Working in a Virtual World* (pp. 105-136). Singapore: Marshall Cavendish International (Asia) Private Limited.
- Stogdill, R.M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *The Journal of Psychology*, 25(1), 35-71. doi:10.1080/00223980.1948.9917362
- Terman, L.M. (1904). A preliminary study in the psychology and pedagogy of leadership. *The Pedagogical Seminary*, 11(4), 413-451. doi:10.1080/08919402.1904.10534107
- Townsend, A.M., DeMarie, S.M., & Hendrickson, A.R. (1998). Virtual teams: Technology and the workplace of the future. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 12(3), 17-29. doi:10.5465/ame.1998.1109047
- Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant Leadership: A Review and Synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1228-1261. doi:10.1177/0149206310380462
- Vroom, V.H., & Yetton, P.W. (1973). *Leadership and decision-making*. London: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Wang, R.R. (2012). *Yinyang : The way of heaven and earth in Chinese thought and culture*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Yahaya, R., & Ebrahim, F. (2016). Leadership styles and organizational commitment: literature review. *Journal of Management Development*, 35(2), 190-216. doi:10.1108/JMD-01-2015-0004
- Yang, I. (2015). Positive effects of laissez-faire leadership: conceptual exploration. *Journal of Management Development*, 35(2), 1246-1261. doi:10.1108/JMD-02-2015-0016
- Yoo, B., Neelankavil, J.P., de Guzman, G.M., & Lim, R.A. (2013). Personality Type Preferences of Asian Managers: A Cross-Country Analysis Using the MBTI Instrument. *International Journal of Global Management Studies*, 5(1), 1-23.
- Yukl, G.A. (1998). *Leadership in Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Zhu, J., Liao, Z., Yam, K.C., & Johnson, R.E. (2018). Shared leadership: A state-of-the-art review and future research agenda. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(7), 834-852. doi:10.1002/job.2296