Open Peer Review on Qeios

Leadership constructs and artificial intelligence: Introducing a novel organizational assessment survey

David Cawthorpe[1]

1 University of Calgary

Funding: No specific funding was received for this work.

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Abstract

This theoretical paper presents a novel "Kinematic Model" of leadership, designed to capture the dynamic nature of leadership within organizations considering the environments in which they arise amidst the context of continuous change. At the core of every organization are three fundamental components: people, processes, and resources. The leadership landscape consists of 34 distinct constructs, from traditional styles such as transformational and transactional to newer ones like digital and neuroleadership. Leadership operates within varied environments, influenced by internal and external events, as well as the nature and experiences of the individuals and groups comprising organizations. The Kinematic Model integrates these elements into ten domains, emphasizing the need for continuous assessment, adaptability, and balancing people, processes, and resources. Taken together this review provides an orientation and reference to a separate comprehensive survey developed in parallel that provides a framework for any leadership assessment in various organizational settings.

In the context of artificial intelligence (AI), its integration into organizations significantly affects leadership dynamics. AI enhances decision-making by analyzing vast data sets, but also risks over-reliance, potentially sidelining human judgment. AI's insights into employee performance might overlook intangible leadership qualities. Additionally, ethical concerns arise with AI in leadership, including workplace surveillance and algorithmic biases. As AI takes on more leadership roles, leaders must adapt, emphasizing vision-setting, relationship-building, and fostering innovation. Leaders must stay updated and adaptable as AI evolves, balancing its capabilities with human insight, ethics, and emotional intelligence.

Author: **David Cawthorpe**, PhD

Professor (Adjunct),

Cumming School of Medicine

Departments of Psychiatry & Community Health Sciences

Institute for Child & Maternal Health

Alberta Children's Hospital Research Institute

The University of Calgary

Email: cawthord@ucalgary.ca

> *"The sirens were beautiful too. Listen. What do you know about your unconscious?"*
>
> *"Nothing. I am not even sure that I have one."*
>
> *"There! Imagine that a Viennese prankster to amuse his friends invented the whole business about the id and Oedipus, made up dreams he had never dreamed, and little Hanzes he had never met. And what happened? Millions of people were out there all ready and waiting to become neurotic in earnest and thousands more ready to make money treating them."*

Umberto Eco, Foucault's Pendulum

Introduction

In a "Universe of Conceptualization" the construct of leadership requires a substrate on which to operate to be identified, defined, observed, and measured in the 'real' world. Nevertheless, like other psychological phenomena, leadership constructs are ephemeral and empirically soft, being inferred rather than directly observed. The following list describes some salient aspects of the current substrata wherein operate many of the conceptualizations describing human characteristics, such as leadership:

1. The essential constituents of human organizations are people, processes, and resources.
2. Organizations require physical and financial resources Organizations like people are goal-directed, guided by collective unique or multiple visions and missions.
3. People provide the vision and direction, while processes created structure and protocols that enabled the organization to achieve its goals. Resources, both physical and financial, provided the means of support needed to facilitate operations.
4. There is a universe of measured leadership competency constructs (theories) operationalized in people.
5. Regardless of the theory or model of leadership employed, the organization exists in an environment.
6. Events in the environment influence and shape the organization and its people.
7. Leadership requires a substrate on which to operate in the world.
8. There are at least five and likely seven or more spheres of individuals' or groups' influences and interactions with and within any organization (not including individuals' personal lives and psychological makeups (eg, Adverse Childhood Experiences) that mold their behavior, expectations, and degree of alignment with any leadership in any organization.

This to-date, all-inclusive leadership model termed here the 'Kinematic Model', borrows the term 'Kinematic' from Physics

(as is common in psychology) to infer the nature of dynamic and continuous motion in which all goal-directed organisms and organizations operate). This model all-inclusive as it requires continuous assessment of the available environments (eg, conceptual, actual, perceived, economic, social, etc.) whether an organization and its leadership are ‘bureaucratic’ or ‘innovative’ or ‘neuro’ or ‘digital’.

The "Kinematic Model" of leadership, consists of ten domains underpinning measurement of the kinematic leadership construct:

1. Understanding of Constituents: This leader consistently recognizes the roles of people, processes, and resources in the organizational ecosystem.
2. Resource Recognition: The leader ensures adequate physical and financial resources are allocated to achieve organizational goals.
3. Goal-Oriented Vision: The leader understands and communicates the organization's unique visions and missions effectively.
4. Structural Competence: The leader regularly evaluates and refines organizational processes to ensure they facilitate goal achievement.
5. Competency Awareness: This leader is aware of various leadership competency constructs and applies the most relevant ones for the organization's current needs.
6. Environmental Responsiveness: The leader frequently assesses the external environment and adjusts organizational strategies accordingly.
7. Dynamic Adaptability: This leader recognizes and responds to events in the environment that may influence the organization and its people.
8. Inclusive Understanding: The leader consistently considers multiple spheres of individual and group influences when making decisions.
9. Continuous Assessment: This leader constantly evaluates the various environments (conceptual, actual, perceived, economic, social, etc.) and adjusts the organization's direction based on these evaluations.
10. Holistic Application: Regardless of specific leadership style (e.g., bureaucratic, innovative, digital), the leader integrates the principles of the Kinematic Model, ensuring dynamic and continuous motion towards the organization's goals.

Of note, one may presently define at least 36 separate leadership constructs, including the Kinematic Model, that differ in terms of specified and often unique descriptions across a wide range of foci. Current leadership constructs include but are not limited due to the emergence of new models to the following:

1. Transformational Leadership: This approach inspires and motivates followers to achieve their full potential and exceed their own limits. Leaders often serve as role models.
2. Transactional Leadership: Focuses on the role of supervision, organization, and group performance. Leaders use rewards and punishments to motivate followers.
3. Servant Leadership: Leaders focus on serving the needs of team members first, prioritizing personal and professional

growth.

4. Laissez-Faire Leadership: Leaders give their team members a lot of freedom in how they do their work, providing minimal direction and interference.
5. Authentic Leadership: Leaders focus on being genuine and self-aware, placing emphasis on transparency and integrity.
6. Charismatic Leadership: Leaders inspire enthusiasm in their teams with their charm and energy.
7. Democratic Leadership: Leaders involve team members in the decision-making process, promoting shared responsibility.
8. Autocratic Leadership: Leaders make decisions without seeking input from team members, valuing structure and direction.
9. Situational Leadership: Leaders adapt their style based on current circumstances and the competence and commitment of their followers.
10. Ethical Leadership: Leaders prioritize ethics in decision-making, emphasizing morality and fairness.
11. Cross-Cultural Leadership: Focuses on leading diverse teams from different cultures and backgrounds, emphasizing cultural sensitivity.
12. Visionary Leadership: Leaders set a future-focused vision and inspire followers to work towards it.
13. Coaching Leadership: Leaders prioritize training, developing, and mentoring their team members.
14. Bureaucratic Leadership: Leaders strictly follow policies, procedures, and rules.
15. Strategic Leadership: Leaders are vision-driven but also able to execute their strategies, bridging between strategy formation and implementation.
16. Participative Leadership: Similar to Democratic leadership, leaders value team members' ideas and input in decision-making.
17. Transformational-Transactional Hybrid Leadership: Leaders combine motivational tactics and reward-based methods.
18. Distributed Leadership: Leadership responsibilities are spread among multiple members of a team or organization.
19. Relationship-Oriented Leadership: Leaders prioritize relationships and connections among team members.
20. Results-Oriented Leadership: Leaders emphasize achieving specific results and meeting performance standards.
21. Crisis Leadership: Leaders deal with emergencies and unexpected events, emphasizing swift decision-making and action.
22. Adaptive Leadership: Leaders help organizations navigate through change by encouraging adaptability and flexibility.
23. Shared Leadership: Leadership roles and responsibilities are collectively shared within a group.
24. Transformational-Authentic Hybrid Leadership: Combines the inspirational qualities of transformational leadership with the genuineness of authentic leadership.
25. Affiliative Leadership: Leaders prioritize emotional needs, creating a sense of belonging and harmony.
26. Pacesetting Leadership: Leaders set high performance standards and exemplify those standards themselves.
27. Digital Leadership: Leaders excel in leading in the digital age, leveraging technology for organizational advantage.
28. Inclusive Leadership: Leaders ensure that all team members feel valued and included.
29. Neuroleadership: A brain-based approach to leadership, focusing on how understanding neuroscience can aid

leadership practices.

30. Resonant Leadership: Leaders create emotional resonance with followers, emphasizing emotional intelligence.
31. Fearless Leadership: Leaders emphasize courage and boldness in decision-making, encouraging risk-taking.
32. Quiet Leadership: Leaders lead with humility and introspection, rather than being vocal or dominant.
33. Followership: The role and contributions of followers in a leadership dynamic, recognizing that effective leadership requires effective followers.
34. Covert Leadership: Described as leading from the shadows or leadership that doesn't explicitly declare itself as leadership.
35. The Full Range Leadership Model (FRLM) offers a comprehensive framework for understanding leadership behavior, spanning from passive to active and from ineffective to highly effective behaviors (Bass & Avolio, 1994).
36. Kinematic Leadership: The construct emphasizes a holistic approach to leadership subsuming most other constructs via focusing on dynamic adaptability, continuous assessment, and the intricate interplay of people, processes, and resources in an organizational ecosystem.

In many ways the Kinematic Leadership picks up where the Full Range Leadership Model leaves off.

The Full Range Leadership Model adopts a more or less dimensional approach to conceptualizing leadership and includes transformational, transactional and laissez-faire (or non-Leadership). Further, the Full Range Leadership Model may include idealized influence (charisma) where leaders serve as role models, and followers are inclined to trust, respect, and emulate them (Bass, 1985). Further inspirational motivation is a cornerstone in that leaders inspire followers by offering meaning and challenge to their roles, setting clear expectations, and demonstrating commitment to goals (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The model includes intellectual stimulation as leaders foster an environment of innovation by prompting followers to challenge their own beliefs as well as the status quo (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The Full Range Leadership Model takes into account individualized consideration that offers tailored guidance, wherein leaders recognize and stimulate individual potential, acting as coaches or mentors (Bass, 1985). The Full Range Leadership Model is dynamic in terms of its transactional domain, that incorporates contingent reward system wherein leaders set clear agreements stipulating what is expected from followers and the rewards for meeting these expectations (Bass & Avolio, 1994). It is dimensional in that Full Range Leadership may take on the hyperbolic forms of active or passive management where in the latter form leaders adopt a more reactive stance, intervening only when problems become serious (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Or in more extreme forms observed in practice, the Full Range Leadership Model can take on a laissez-faire or non-leadership style, wherein leaders shirk responsibilities, avoiding decisions and showing an absence of leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1994). In terms of organizational outcomes, within the Full Range Leadership model, Transformational Leadership, with its emphasis on inspiration, individual growth, and challenging the norm, has been positively associated with various beneficial outcomes, such as job satisfaction, commitment, and performance (Bass & Riggio, 2006). While Transactional Leadership can be effective in certain structured environments, overreliance on management-by-exception, especially its passive form, and laissez-faire leadership are generally less effective (Bass & Avolio, 1994). The Full Range Leadership Model seems to be the first hybrid attempt to integrate and measure more than one conceptual construct of leadership.

The term "covert leadership" isn't as universally recognized as the standard models of leadership like transformational or transactional leadership. However, the concept of covert leadership has been examined in specific contexts, particularly regarding leadership styles that aren't overtly directive or traditionally authoritative. "Covert leadership" can be described as leading from the shadows or leadership that doesn't explicitly declare itself as leadership. Mintzberg (1998) explored the business context of covert leadership in the Harvard Business Review, describing leaders who influence more by indirect means rather than direct control. While some contexts might benefit from this style, transparency and clarity in leadership remain crucial for many organizational situations. Covert leadership will not be considered further in this paper or in the comprehensive survey developed in parallel.

Other 'Novel' Leadership Models

There have only been three novel peer-reviewed leadership models in PubMed since June 2015 that appear to focus on hybrids of existing leadership models (Danesh & Huber, 2021; Beckerman-Hsu, Gago, Aftosmes-Tobio, Jurkowski, Lansburg, et al., 2021; Shah, Aslami, & Suleman, 2018). Mapping the leadership models mentioned in the articles above onto the comprehensive list provided in this paper results in the following. Three novel leadership models have emerged in the medical field, similar to the Full Range Leadership Model, on close examination appear to align with a broader spectrum of well-established leadership theories.

The Parent-Staff Co-Leadership Model (Beckerman-Hsu, Gago, Aftosmes-Tobio, Jurkowski, Lansburg, et al. 2021), for instance, aligns closely with the Shared Leadership style, emphasizing a collaborative approach between parents and staff. It also resonates with the Participative Leadership approach as it incorporates parental inputs into decision-making, and with Distributed Leadership since the roles and responsibilities are evenly dispersed among both parents and staff.

Next, the Conceptual Model of Leader-Member Exchange Theory. (Danesh & Huber, 2021), specifically designed for new dentists, finds its roots in Relationship-Oriented Leadership due to the LMX theory's strong focus on the bond between leaders and followers. There's also a possibility of this model leaning towards Results-Oriented Leadership, especially if it zeroes in on performance metrics based on these relational dynamics. The model might further encapsulate Coaching Leadership elements, suggesting mentoring and guidance aspects between fledgling dentists and their respective teams.

Lastly, the Novel Model (Shah, Aslami, & Suleman, 2018) centered on enhancing perceptions, attitudes, and interest towards medical leadership, put forth by medical students, is in sync with Visionary Leadership. This is evident as the model seeks to transform existing perceptions and attitudes. It may also incorporate Democratic Leadership principles, given its potential emphasis on garnering diverse inputs from a myriad of medical students and professionals. This approach's foundation on perceptions and attitudes further underscores its alignment with the Participative Leadership style, emphasizing a comprehensive approach to leadership decision-making. Basically, like the Full Leadership Model, these so-called new models appear as hybrid forms of well-described, existing leadership models.

Introducing the Comprehensive Leadership Survey Model

Given the tendency to rehash existing leadership constructs and represent them as novel structures, this paper has

adopted a somewhat different approach.

Developed is an extensive survey that taps each of these leadership constructs as domains of measurement with at minimum ten distinct items per construct with some items reversed for the purpose of examining reliability. The ten-item construct or domain minimums for specific constructs or domains does not include the many additional ‘lie’ or social desirability detector items that may serve to improve the strength of the measures validity. This lengthy survey is ideal for a fine-grained, detailed examination of the perceived leadership model (if any) operating within any organization. This full-range leadership survey is currently available in print form (Cawthorpe. 2023).

The Universe of Leadership Conceptualization

Leadership is often understood in varying dimensions, informed by various theories, models, and real-world manifestations. Within the vast spectrum of leadership understandings, “The Universe of Leadership Conceptualization” introduces a more all-encompassing perspective — the Kinematic Model. Drawing its inspiration from physics, this model underscores leadership's dynamic nature, emphasizing continuous movement and change, vital for any goal-directed organism or organization. The Kinematic Model embeds the assessment of leadership perhaps closer to the ‘real-world’ actualities in which the leaders of organizations find themselves.

The essential constituents of human organizations are people, processes, and resources. At the foundation of every organization lies this triad: people, processes, and resources. These are the vital cogs that keep the machinery of an organization running. People are the lifeblood, bringing occasionally innovation, skills, and motivation. Processes provide the blueprint, defining how tasks are accomplished, and resources offer the necessary tools and financial support to achieve objectives. Organizations require physical and financial resources. Organizations being comprised largely of people are goal-directed, collectively guided by unique or multiple visions, missions and sometimes less tangible goals, or more tangible products.

Organizational function is somewhat tangible, requiring physical assets like, space, infrastructure, technology, tools and energy. Financial resources, from capital investments to operational expenses, fuel these physical necessities. Moreover, just as individuals are driven by aspirations and goals, organizations too are propelled by a collective vision or multiple missions that delineate their raison d'être.

People provide the vision and direction, while processes create structure and protocols that enable the organization to achieve its goals. Resources, both physical and financial, provide the means of support needed to facilitate operations.

Individuals within an organization craft its vision and offer direction. They are the visionaries, the strategists, and the workers. However, vision without execution remains a dream. This is where processes step in. They structure the path, create protocols, and ensure the organization marches towards its goals methodically. Resources act as the backbone, bolstering operations and bridging the gap between vision and realization.

There is a universe of measured leadership competency constructs (theories) operationalized in people. The realm of leadership is vast and multifaceted. Multiple theories, ranging from transformational to transactional, from servant

leadership to autocratic, all find operationalization within individuals. Every leader or individual might resonate with one or many of these theories, shaping their leadership approach and impacting the organization's culture and output.

Regardless of the theory or model of leadership employed, the organization exists in an environment. Organizations do not operate in a vacuum. They are part of an intricate web of socio-political, economic, and technological environments. The leadership model or theory an organization adheres to is influenced by and exerts influence upon this larger environment.

Events in the environment influence and shape the organization and its people. Every tremor in the environment, be it an economic downturn, a technological breakthrough, or a socio-political event, creates ripples that touch organizations. These external events can dictate organizational strategies, reshape goals, or even redefine leadership styles.

Leadership requires a substrate on which to operate in the world. Leadership isn't an abstract art; it needs a tangible substrate. This substrate could be the organization's culture, its people, or the larger industry it operates within. It provides leadership with context, challenges, and opportunities, making leadership relevant and actionable.

There are at least five and likely seven or more spheres of individuals' or groups' influences and interactions with any organization (not including their own personal lives and psychological makeups (eg, Adverse Childhood Experiences) that mold their behavior, expectations, and degree of alignment with any leadership in any organization.

People bring with them a universe of experiences and influences. Their interactions with an organization aren't merely transactional but are shaped by multiple spheres, from past experiences to cultural norms. For leadership to be effective, it must recognize and navigate these multifaceted spheres of influence, ensuring alignment with the organization's goals.

In summary, the Kinematic Model offers a holistic approach to understanding leadership. Recognizing the dynamic interplay of people, processes, resources, and the environment, it underscores the need for continuous assessment and evolution. Whether an organization leans bureaucratic or innovative, digital or neuro, the Kinematic Model serves as a guiding beacon, ensuring leadership remains relevant, effective, and in constant motion.

The Essential Constituents of Human Organizations: People, Processes, and Resources

Human organizations, in their essence, represent intricate systems defined by a delicate balance of three core components: people, processes, and resources. The dynamism of an organization's success is often rooted in the synergistic interactions among these elements. Drawing upon seminal and contemporary organizational theory, we can understand the deep interdependencies and significance of these core constituents.

People — The Heart of Organizations

People are the lifeblood of any organization, driving its mission, vision, and values (Choo, 2015). The cognitive, emotional, and social facets that individuals bring to an organization are irreplaceable. Choo's (2006) "The Knowing Organization" delves into the intricate nexus between an organization and its people, highlighting how knowledge is created, shared, and utilized within an organization. People are not just passive repositories of knowledge but are active agents shaping

organizational culture, decision-making processes, and strategic directions.

Processes — The Operational Blueprint

Processes, as explored in Choo's (2015) "The Inquiring Organization," are frameworks that guide the flow of information, decision-making, and execution of tasks within organizations. They provide the structure and protocols ensuring that organizations function effectively and efficiently. Processes bridge the gap between strategic vision and operational realities, guiding how people use resources to achieve organizational objectives. Efficient processes lead to enhanced knowledge management, facilitating organizational learning and adaptation (Choo, 2002).

Resources — The Enabling Mechanisms

Resources, both tangible and intangible, provide organizations the tools and means to execute their visions. Choo's (2002) exploration of intellectual capital and organizational knowledge underscores the significance of leveraging resources, especially in today's knowledge-driven economies. Resources span the gamut from financial assets and physical infrastructures to intellectual properties and knowledge bases. They act as enablers, ensuring that people can carry out processes to achieve desired outcomes.

Choo's expansive works, especially "The Knowing Organization" (2006) and "The Inquiring Organization" (2015), provide profound insights into the intricate interplay of people, processes, and resources in organizations. They underscore the understanding that successful organizations are those that harmoniously blend the strengths and capabilities of their people, optimize their processes, and astutely manage their resources.

Organizations and Their Indispensable Resources: Physical, Financial, and Visionary

Organizations, akin to living entities, thrive and grow through a symbiotic relationship with their environment. They absorb and harness resources, both tangible like physical assets and intangible like financial capital. Simultaneously, they're driven by an innate sense of purpose, a compass that orients them in the competitive landscapes they operate in. Let us explore this interplay and its significance.

Physical and Financial Resources: The Bedrock of Organizational Operations

At the heart of any organization's functionality is its physical infrastructure. From the sprawling corporate campuses of tech giants to the modest brick-and-mortar stores, physical resources are more than just spaces; they're expressions of organizational culture and identity (Choo, 2002). They facilitate the congregation of human resources, foster collaboration, and often symbolize an organization's stature in its industry.

Parallelly, financial resources act as the lifeblood, ensuring the organization's sustenance, growth, and ability to innovate. As Choo (2015) elucidates in "The Inquiring Organization," financial capital is crucial for organizations to explore new knowledge frontiers, invest in innovation, and stay agile in the face of market dynamism.

Goal-Directed Organizations: The Power of Vision and Mission

Organizations, much like individuals, are entities with aspirations. Choo's (2006) "The Knowing Organization" touches upon the notion that organizations aren't just passive entities reacting to market stimuli. They're proactive, goal-oriented entities driven by a unique vision and mission. These goals are more than mere statements; they encapsulate an organization's raison d'être.

Drucker (1973), another luminary in the field, asserted that defining an organization's purpose is seminal to its existence. This purpose, shaped by its vision and mission, acts as a lodestar, guiding its strategic decisions, molding its organizational culture, and influencing its stakeholder interactions.

The Synthesis: Resources and Vision in Organizational Dynamics

The intertwining of resources and vision is crucial for organizations to navigate the challenges of the contemporary business landscape. Choo (2000) in "Web Work" delves into how organizations harness information in the digital age, a resource as critical as physical and financial assets. It is the judicious blend of resources, buttressed by a compelling vision, that equips organizations to create value, not just for their shareholders but for the broader societal milieu they operate in (Porter & Kramer, 2011).

Organizations, in their multifaceted avatars, represent complex systems. Their dynamism is fueled by their resources and directed by their vision. Scholars like Choo have provided profound insights into this organizational ecosystem, emphasizing the nuanced interplay of resources and vision in shaping organizational trajectories.

People, Processes, and Resources — A Triad for Organizational Success

In the dynamic theater of organizational theory and practice, the significance of people, processes, and resources has been consistently highlighted. This triad, although distinctly characterized, synergizes to propel an organization forward. Unraveling their individual and collective impacts offers a deeper understanding of the mechanics behind organizational success.

People — The Beacon Bearers of Vision and Direction

An organization's soul resides in its people. It is they who birth, nurture, and evolve its vision. This vision acts as the guiding light, setting the course and shaping strategic milestones (Drucker, 2001). As Senge (1990) profoundly noted in "The Fifth Discipline", organizations are not mechanical entities but living organisms, with people being the life force that infuses them with energy and direction. Their collective wisdom, expertise, and passion shape the ethos and aspirations of the organization.

Processes — The Structural Framework

While people breathe life into the organization's vision, it is the processes that provide the skeletal framework, ensuring functionality and order (Hammer & Champy, 1993). Processes, as laid out in organizational protocols, delineate the pathways for decision-making, task execution, and resource allocation. In their seminal work on business process reengineering, Hammer and Champy underscored the transformative power of efficient processes, emphasizing their role

in driving agility, responsiveness, and innovation.

Resources — The Sinews of Organizational Operations

No organization, regardless of its vision or efficiency of processes, can function in a vacuum devoid of resources. Mintzberg (1979) in his structured organizational theory described resources as the sinews, underpinning the operational prowess of any entity. Physical resources, from infrastructure to technology, form the tangible support systems facilitating daily operations. Concurrently, financial resources act as the lubricant, ensuring smooth execution, enabling expansions, and buffering against uncertainties (Porter, 1985).

The Interplay — A Choreography of Success

The magic unfolds when these three elements interact. People craft and steer the vision, processes shape and streamline the journey, and resources empower and enable (Choo, 2006). This intricate dance, where each component complements the other, is what crafts the narrative of organizational success.

Organizations, as microcosms of the larger business world, manifest the delicate balance between people, processes, and resources. As organizational theory has elucidated over the years, recognizing and harnessing this balance is seminal for sustainable success.

People, Processes, and Resources — A Triad for Organizational Success

In the dynamic theater of organizational theory and practice, the significance of people, processes, and resources has been consistently highlighted. This triad, although distinctly characterized, synergizes to propel an organization forward. Unraveling their individual and collective impacts offers a deeper understanding of the mechanics behind organizational success.

People — The Beacon Bearers of Vision and Direction

An organization's soul resides in its people. It is they who birth, nurture, and evolve its vision. This vision acts as the guiding light, setting the course and shaping strategic milestones (Drucker, 2001). As Senge (1990) profoundly noted in "The Fifth Discipline", organizations are not mechanical entities but living organisms, with people being the life force that infuses them with energy and direction. Their collective wisdom, expertise, and passion shape the ethos and aspirations of the organization.

Processes — The Structural Framework

While people breathe life into the organization's vision, it is the processes that provide the skeletal framework, ensuring functionality and order (Hammer & Champy, 1993). Processes, as laid out in organizational protocols, delineate the pathways for decision-making, task execution, and resource allocation. In their seminal work on business process reengineering, Hammer and Champy underscored the transformative power of efficient processes, emphasizing their role in driving agility, responsiveness, and innovation.

Resources — The Sinews of Organizational Operations

No organization, regardless of its vision or efficiency of processes, can function in a vacuum devoid of resources. Mintzberg (1979) in his structured organizational theory described resources as the sinews, underpinning the operational prowess of any entity. Physical resources, from infrastructure to technology, form the tangible support systems facilitating daily operations. Concurrently, financial resources act as the lubricant, ensuring smooth execution, enabling expansions, and buffering against uncertainties (Porter, 1985).

The Interplay — A Choreography of Success

The magic unfolds when these three elements interact. People craft and steer the vision, processes shape and streamline the journey, and resources empower and enable (Choo, 2006). This intricate dance, where each component complements the other, is what crafts the narrative of organizational success.

Organizations, as microcosms of the larger business world, manifest the delicate balance between people, processes, and resources. As organizational theory has elucidated over the years, recognizing and harnessing this balance is seminal for sustainable success.

The Universe of Leadership Competency Constructs Operationalized in People

The arena of leadership theory has burgeoned over the years, transcending from trait-centric models to more dynamic paradigms that cater to the multifaceted nature of organizations and the individuals within them. This expansive landscape of leadership competency constructs provides a rich tapestry of insights and strategies operationalized in the behaviors, attitudes, and skills of individuals.

Foundational Theories — Traits and Behaviors

The genesis of leadership theory predominantly centered on the traits that leaders inherently possessed (Stogdill, 1974). This perspective sought to understand leadership through innate characteristics, with the notion that certain individuals were naturally predisposed to lead. However, as the discourse evolved, the behaviorist lens came into play, emphasizing the specific behaviors that effective leaders exhibited (Blake & Mouton, 1964). This shift posited that leadership was not merely an inherent quality but could be cultivated through learned behaviors.

Contingency and Situational Approaches

As organizational complexities grew, leadership theories began to recognize the importance of context. Fiedler's (1967) contingency theory postulated that optimal leadership effectiveness depended on the alignment between leadership style and the situational demands. Similarly, Hersey and Blanchard's (1969) situational leadership model emphasized that leaders should adapt their style based on the maturity and readiness of their followers.

Transformational, Transactional, and Authentic Leadership

Further expansion in leadership constructs led to the emergence of transformational and transactional leadership

paradigms (Bass & Riggio, 2006). While transactional leaders focused on exchanges with followers to achieve outcomes, transformational leaders inspired and uplifted followers, aiming for collective greatness. More recently, the concept of authentic leadership has gained traction, with emphasis on self-awareness, relational transparency, and ethical grounding (Avolio & Gardner, 2005).

Emerging Constructs — Neuroleadership and Inclusive Leadership

With advances in neuroscience and the growing emphasis on diversity and inclusion, novel leadership constructs such as neuroleadership and inclusive leadership have been posited (Rock, 2008; Nembhard & Edmondson, 2006). These constructs underline the importance of understanding brain processes in leadership decision-making and fostering environments where diverse voices are embraced and empowered.

Operationalization in People

While these constructs offer theoretical scaffolding, their true essence is manifested when operationalized in individuals. Leaders, irrespective of the construct they align with, embody these theories, translating them into actionable strategies, decisions, and interactions in organizational settings.

The universe of leadership competency constructs offers a rich palette of insights that cater to the diverse demands of today's organizational landscapes. As leaders navigate this universe, they draw from, adapt, and embody these constructs, shaping the course of their organizations.

The Organizational Environment — A Pervasive Influence

Irrespective of the leadership style or theory utilized, every organization operates within an environment that plays a pivotal role in shaping its strategic decisions, internal processes, and overall functionality. This environment consists of various elements, both internal and external, which impact an organization's ability to achieve its objectives.

Open Systems Theory — Organizations as Living Entities

Drawing from the open systems theory (Katz & Kahn, 1978), organizations can be viewed as living systems that interact continuously with their environment. This theory posits that organizations, like living organisms, depend on their environment for resources, face competition, and must adapt to external changes to survive and flourish. The constant interplay between the organization and its environment necessitates continual adjustments and evolutions.

PESTEL Framework — External Forces at Play

The PESTEL framework (Johnson, Scholes, & Whittington, 2008) is a tool used to analyze the macro-environmental factors influencing an organization. These factors include Political, Economic, Social, Technological, Environmental, and Legal elements (PESTEL). A change in any of these dimensions, such as evolving technology or shifting economic climates, can significantly impact an organization's operations and strategic direction. The acronym PESTEL stands for the following :

1. Political: Refers to the impact of political factors on an organization or industry. This includes considerations like government policies, political stability or instability, corruption levels, tax policies, and more.
2. Economic: Pertains to the influence of the economy on an organization or sector. Factors might include economic growth rates, exchange rates, inflation rates, interest rates, disposable income of consumers, and unemployment rates.
3. Social: Refers to the social factors that might affect an organization. These include cultural aspects, population growth rate, age distribution, attitudes towards health, and social mobility.
4. Technological: Focuses on the impact of technologies in an industry or organization. Factors to consider include the rate of technological innovation, automation, research and development activity, and technological awareness.
5. Environmental: Considers environmental aspects that can influence industries or organizations. This can include ecological or environmental issues like climate change, weather patterns, and sustainability concerns.
6. Legal: Addresses the legal factors affecting an organization. This encompasses elements like employment laws, consumer laws, health and safety, and even international laws if a company operates globally.

The PESTEL framework is used in strategic management to identify and analyze the external macro-environmental factors that might affect an organization. By understanding these external factors, organizations can develop strategies that are aligned with the external environment.

Resource Dependence Theory: The Interdependence Perspective

The resource dependence theory (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978) underscores the fact that organizations depend on resources from their environment. These resources might be tangible, like raw materials or finances, or intangible, like goodwill or brand reputation. This dependence on external resources implies that organizations are in a symbiotic relationship with their environment, continually negotiating, adapting, and strategizing based on external availability and demands.

Institutional Theory: Conforming to Societal Norms

Organizations do not operate in a vacuum; they are part of broader societal and industry norms. Institutional theory (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983) postulates that organizations, over time, tend to conform to the norms, values, and procedures of their environment, leading to homogenization within organizational fields. This process of isomorphism can be due to coercive pressures (laws and regulations), normative pressures (professional standards), or mimetic processes (copying successful peers).

Regardless of the leadership constructs employed, understanding and navigating the organizational environment is paramount. Leaders must be adept at reading environmental signals, predicting future trends, and positioning their organizations strategically to leverage opportunities and mitigate challenges.

The Impact of Environmental Events on Organizations and Their People

Environmental events, both anticipated and unforeseen, exert significant influence on organizational dynamics, strategies, and ultimately, the behaviors and mindsets of its members. Organizations are not isolated entities; they are continually

interacting with and adapting to their environment.

The Contingency Theory: Situational Dependencies

According to the contingency theory (Fiedler, 1967), the effectiveness of an organization's management practices and structures is contingent upon its environmental context. Specific situations or environmental events can dictate which leadership style, organizational structure, or business strategy would be most effective (Donaldson, 2001). In essence, there's no one-size-fits-all approach, and organizations must be agile and responsive to their external environment.

Institutional Theory: Environmental Pressures and Conformity

As posited by DiMaggio and Powell (1983), institutional theory sheds light on how organizations are driven to adopt similar structures, practices, or strategies in response to environmental pressures. This phenomenon of isomorphism results from coercive, mimetic, and normative pressures from the environment, pushing organizations to conform to established norms, regulations, or successful peers.

Social Cognitive Theory: Behavioral Influence

Bandura's (1986) social cognitive theory highlights the dynamic and reciprocal interaction between individuals, their behavior, and the environment. Environmental events can shape an individual's beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors. In an organizational context, this means that external events, such as market shifts or regulatory changes, not only affect organizational strategies but also influence the behaviors, mindsets, and attitudes of its employees.

The Resource-Based View: Tapping into Environmental Opportunities

From the resource-based view (Barney, 1991), an organization's ability to achieve sustainable competitive advantage hinges on leveraging its internal resources in response to external environmental events. Such events could open opportunities or pose threats, and the organization's response will depend on its unique bundle of resources and capabilities.

Environmental events are not mere background noise for organizations. They are pivotal factors that can necessitate significant strategic shifts, reshape organizational structures, and influence employee behaviors and attitudes. Leaders and managers must be keenly attuned to these environmental shifts, anticipating potential impacts and positioning their organizations and people for success in an ever-evolving landscape.

Leadership and Its Substrate: Navigating the Real World

To comprehend leadership in its entirety, it's crucial to understand that leadership doesn't exist in a vacuum. Instead, it operates on a substrate, or foundation, which comprises various elements of the real world. Leadership isn't just about the person leading but also about the context in which the leadership is taking place.

Contextual Leadership: Environment as a Crucial Component

According to Osborn, Hunt, and Jauch (2002), leadership effectiveness is intrinsically tied to the situational context.

Different contexts demand varied leadership approaches. For instance, a military leader's approach during wartime will diverge significantly from a tech startup CEO's approach in Silicon Valley. The environment, hence, serves as the substrate upon which leadership strategies are based.

Socio-Cultural Factors: The Underlying Matrix

House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta (2004) in their GLOBE study emphasize the role of socio-cultural dimensions in shaping leadership effectiveness. Socio-cultural norms and values act as a substrate, influencing the perceptions and expectations of what constitutes effective leadership in different societies.

Organizational Culture and Structure: The Bedrock of Leadership

Schein (2010) articulates that organizational culture, the shared values, beliefs, and practices in an organization, is a pivotal component of the leadership substrate. Leaders not only shape but are also shaped by the prevailing organizational culture. Furthermore, Mintzberg (1979) adds that organizational structure, the hierarchical configuration of roles and responsibilities, acts as another significant layer of the substrate, influencing leadership styles and strategies.

Economic and Technological Landscape: Ground Realities

The ever-evolving economic and technological landscapes also act as substrates for leadership. Porter's (1979) Five Forces model elucidates how the competitive environment affects strategic leadership decisions. Simultaneously, Drucker (1985) underscores that technological advancements continuously redefine the leadership paradigm, necessitating leaders to adapt and evolve.

Leadership, though often perceived through the lens of the individual leader's traits and actions, is deeply intertwined with the broader environment or substrate on which it operates. Recognizing and understanding this substrate is paramount for effective leadership as it provides the context, challenges, and opportunities that leaders must navigate.

The Multifaceted Influence on Organizational Dynamics

Organizations don't just operate based on internal decisions and strategies. They're in a constant state of interaction with multiple external and internal spheres that mold organizational behavior, outcomes, and leadership alignment. Recognizing these spheres is fundamental to comprehending the complex dynamics that influence an organization's day-to-day operations and long-term strategic decisions.

The Stakeholders' Interests and Expectations described by Freeman (1984) introduced the idea that organizations are influenced by multiple stakeholders, including but not limited to shareholders, employees, customers, and the local community. These stakeholders have distinct expectations and can significantly impact organizational strategies and outcomes. Porter (1979) noted that market and competitive forces such as competitors, potential entrants, and the threat of substitutes, play a pivotal role in shaping organizational decisions and actions. According to Scott (2001) legal and regulatory environment organizations are bound by the legal frameworks in which they operate. Scott (2001) emphasizes that legal regulations, such as labor laws, environmental regulations, and trade restrictions, can substantially influence

organizational operations. Further, Hofstede's (1980) socio-cultural context dimensions of national culture indicate that the cultural context of an organization can deeply affect the values, behaviors, and expectations within it. This, in turn, impacts leadership styles and strategies.

Rogers' (1962) diffusion of innovations theory underscores how technological advancements can shape organizational dynamics, driving changes in processes, offerings, and even business models. The fluctuations in the economic environment, such as recessions, inflation rates, or changes in consumer purchasing power, can significantly sway organizational strategies and operations (Dess & Beard, 1984). Additionally, world events, political relations between countries, and global policy changes can have profound implications on multinational organizations or businesses involved in international trade (Ohmae, 1985).

Beyond the internal operations and individual psychologies, organizations are complex entities influenced by multiple spheres of interaction. Recognizing and understanding these layers of influence is pivotal for leaders aiming to navigate the complexities of the contemporary business landscape effectively.

The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Leadership in Organizations

Artificial intelligence (AI) has been heralded as a groundbreaking technological advancement with the potential to transform a multitude of sectors, from healthcare to finance, and even the very fabric of organizations themselves (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014). As AI continues to advance and integrate into the workplace, its implications for leadership within organizations warrant careful consideration.

Decision-making Processes

One of the primary areas in which AI is set to impact leadership is decision-making. AI tools, with their ability to analyze vast amounts of data swiftly, can offer insights and predictions that were previously out of reach for human analysts (Davenport & Ronanki, 2018). This enables leaders to make more informed decisions, potentially reducing biases (Dietvorst, Simmons, & Massey, 2015). However, over-reliance on AI can also lead to complacency, and leaders must ensure they retain critical thinking and judgment.

Employee Management and Development

AI-driven analytics tools can provide detailed insights into employee performance, strengths, weaknesses, and even predict potential for leadership roles (Chui, Manyika, & Miremadi, 2016). While this can help in objective assessment, there's a risk of overlooking the intangible qualities like emotional intelligence and interpersonal skills, which are crucial for leadership positions but may not be easily quantifiable (Goleman, 1995).

Ethical Considerations

The use of AI in leadership also brings forward ethical dilemmas. The potential for AI-driven surveillance in the workplace, bias in AI algorithms, and the risk of job displacement are concerns that leaders must address transparently and ethically (Bostrom & Yudkowsky, 2014).

Transformation of Leadership Roles

The traditional role of a leader as a decision-maker or a problem solver might transform as AI takes over many of these responsibilities. Leaders may need to pivot towards roles that emphasize vision-setting, relationship-building, and fostering a culture of innovation and adaptability (Daugherty & Wilson, 2018).

Continuous Learning and Adaptability

As AI continues to evolve, leaders must commit to continuous learning. The rapid pace of technological change necessitates that leaders not only understand the potential and limitations of AI but also remain adaptable to its ongoing evolution (Schwartz & Murnane, 2018).

In the age of artificial intelligence (AI), the landscape of organizational leadership is undergoing significant shifts. Below follow 14 domains of organizational leadership that are particularly essential during this era:

1. AI Literacy: Understanding the basics of AI, its capabilities, limitations, and potential implications.
2. Ensuring that leadership can effectively leverage AI tools and methodologies.
3. Ethical Leadership and AI Governance: Establishing guidelines for ethical AI use.
4. Ensuring AI systems are transparent, accountable, and free from biases.
5. Change Management: Leading teams through the transitions brought about by AI integration.
6. Addressing concerns related to job displacement and role changes due to automation.
7. Data-driven Decision-making: Harnessing AI's predictive and analytical capabilities to make informed decisions. Encouraging a culture of data literacy and empirical evidence.
8. Continuous Learning and Adaptability: Fostering a culture of continuous learning to keep up with AI advancements. Ensuring teams are trained and updated with the latest AI tools and methodologies.
9. Human-AI Collaboration: Understanding how AI can complement human roles and vice versa.
10. Ensuring smooth collaboration between human employees and AI tools.
11. 11. Strategic Visioning in an AI World: Developing a forward-looking vision that encompasses AI's potential. Anticipating future AI trends and their impact on the industry.
12. Emotional Intelligence and Empathy: Recognizing that while AI can handle many tasks, human-centric skills like empathy are irreplaceable. Ensuring leadership remains connected to the emotional well-being of their teams, especially in an increasingly automated world.
13. Innovation and Creativity: Encouraging a culture where AI is seen as a tool to boost innovation, not just efficiency. Harnessing AI for creative problem-solving and generating new business avenues.
14. Stakeholder Communication: Effectively communicating with stakeholders about the organization's AI endeavors. Addressing concerns and setting clear expectations about the role of AI in the organization's future.

As AI continues to play an increasingly prominent role in organizations, these domains will become crucial for leaders aiming to harness AI's potential while ensuring ethical use and considering the well-being of their teams.

The emergence of AI represents both an opportunity and a challenge for leadership in organizations. While AI offers tools that can aid in decision-making and efficiency, it also brings forward ethical dilemmas and a potential shift in traditional leadership roles. Leaders of the future will need to balance the use of AI tools with human judgment, ethics, and emotional intelligence.

Summation on the Kinematic Leadership Model: An Ongoing Evolution in the Light of Gödel's Incompleteness Theorems

The Kinematic Leadership Model, as expounded in the previous discussions, emerges as a fluid and dynamic understanding of leadership rooted in multifaceted interactions within organizations and their encompassing environments. The term 'Kinematic'—borrowed from physics—serves as a metaphor for the unceasing motion and adaptation organizations must embrace to navigate the complexities of the contemporary business landscape. Here, leadership is not static; it is dynamic, constantly in flux, and influenced by a myriad of external and internal forces.

Gödel's incompleteness theorems, introduced in the realm of mathematics, posit that for any consistent, formal mathematical system, there will always be statements that cannot be proven or disproven within that system (Gödel, 1931). By analogy, leadership constructs in organizations also embody a certain incompleteness. No single leadership model, including the Kinematic Leadership Model, can capture the full complexity and diversity of organizational dynamics and contexts. New situations, challenges, and paradigm shifts in the business landscape necessitate the evolution of leadership constructs.

This perspective aligns well with the works of organizational scholars such as Scott (2001), Freeman (1984), and Hofstede (1980), all of whom emphasized the myriad influences and evolving nature of organizational behaviors, values, and structures. In a sense, leadership theories, much like mathematical systems, are bound by the constraints of their foundational premises, always leaving room for further exploration, development, and modification.

Drawing an analogy with culinary evolution, just as humans have progressed beyond the rudimentary classification of 'edible' and 'inedible' to embrace intricate recipes and gourmet experiences, leadership models have also evolved. Humans' culinary diversity and sophistication are mirrored in the plethora of leadership constructs and theories that capture different nuances and aspects of organizational leadership. This evolving sophistication is essential for understanding and navigating the intricate and ever-shifting organizational landscapes.

The Kinematic Leadership Model, bolstered by the tenets of Gödel's incompleteness theorems, offers a contemporary and flexible perspective on leadership. It underscores the constant evolution of leadership theories and models, much like the unending quest for knowledge in the realm of mathematics. Leadership, as a concept, will perpetually evolve, and the Kinematic approach serves as a timely reminder of the dynamism and adaptability required of leaders in the modern age.

Setbacks, Innovations, and the Human Element in Organizational Dynamics

Organizations, in their quest for growth and excellence, frequently encounter setbacks and challenges that originate both internally and externally. Externally, market fluctuations, technological disruptions, and socio-political changes can exert

significant pressure on an organization's operations and strategies (Porter, 1979). Internally, mismanagement, lack of clarity in organizational direction, or even ethical lapses can derail the best of strategies and intentions (Kotter, 1995). However, at the very core of both these challenges and the groundbreaking innovations that transform industries are human behaviors and decisions. The same human element that can lead to colossal failures due to cognitive biases, groupthink, or resistance to change (Janis, 1972) can also birth genius innovations when nurtured in an environment that promotes creativity, risk-taking, and continuous learning (Amabile, 1988). Therefore, while structures, strategies, and systems are pivotal in organizational performance, the role of human attributes—both fallible and brilliant—cannot be underestimated.

Soft Construct Measurement and the Chimeric Nature of Leadership and Intelligence

The construct of intelligence remains chimeric and observed and in terms of its conceptualization. Intelligence is measured only indirectly and may only be inferred drawing on a universe of items (eg, Stanford-Binet IQ test) that merely reflect the construct, unlike directly observable and measurable phenomena.

Compared to leadership, intelligence has been a subject of human curiosity and scholarly exploration for centuries, and like leadership, measuring intelligence remains one of the most elusive and debated constructs in the fields of psychology and education. At their cores, concepts of leadership and intelligence are multifaceted, making it difficult to pin down with simple easy to measure definitions. While the scientific community has developed various methods and tools to assess both leadership and intelligence, their intangible natures raise questions about the adequacy and accuracy of these measurements. For example, the precise nature of intelligence remains ambiguous and debated within the scientific community (Sternberg, 1985). The inherent multifaceted character of intelligence as a construct has made it difficult to singularly define or measure. Various methods and tools have been developed to assess intelligence, but the intangible essence of the construct, like leadership, often leads to questions about these measurements' adequacy and validity.

At first glance, the concept of intelligence appears straightforward: it pertains to an individual's ability to think, learn, reason, and adapt to new situations. However, delving deeper into this construct reveals a myriad of dimensions and interpretations. Some theories propose that intelligence is a singular entity, while others argue for multiple intelligences, ranging from linguistic and logical-mathematical to interpersonal and intrapersonal. The diverse viewpoints on what constitutes intelligence contribute to its chimeric nature. At a basic level, intelligence relates to an individual's ability to think, reason, learn, and adapt to novel situations. However, when delving into the intricate layers of this construct, it becomes apparent that there are numerous dimensions and interpretations. Some perspectives posit intelligence as a unified entity, while others, like Gardner's theory, advocate for the existence of multiple intelligences, which include capacities ranging from linguistic and logical-mathematical skills to interpersonal and intrapersonal abilities (Gardner, 1983). Such diversity in viewpoints and theories contributes to the chimeric perception of intelligence.

Unlike other psychological or physiological phenomena that can be directly observed and measured, intelligence does not manifest in any tangible form. For instance, we can measure a person's height using a ruler or determine their blood pressure with a sphygmomanometer, both yielding direct, quantitative data. However, no instrument can directly capture or quantify intelligence. Instead, we rely on proxy measures, such as performance on tasks or tests, to make inferences

about a person's intellectual capabilities.

Tools like the Stanford-Binet IQ test serve as emblematic examples of this indirect measurement approach. Such tests comprise a series of items designed to probe various cognitive domains, from verbal abilities and problem-solving to memory and spatial recognition. An individual's performance on these tasks is then translated into a score, which is interpreted as a representation of their intelligence. However, this score is, at best, an estimate. It doesn't measure intelligence itself but rather how well an individual can perform on a specific set of tasks at a given time.

Moreover, the items included in intelligence tests draw from a vast universe of possible questions or tasks. It's worth pondering: if different items were selected or if the test conditions were altered, would the individual receive a drastically different intelligence score? This inherent variability underscores the indirect and inferential nature of intelligence measurement.

In stark contrast to psychological or physiological phenomena that offer direct observability and measurability (eg, behaviors, reflexes, or overt emotional responses (like crying or laughter), intelligence lacks tangible manifestation. For instance, while tools exist to measure height or blood pressure directly, there's no instrument that can directly capture the essence of intelligence. Instead, the approach to gauging intelligence is inferential, relying on proxy measures such as performance on designated tasks or tests.

The Stanford-Binet IQ test, for instance, epitomizes this indirect approach to intelligence measurement (Terman, 1916). It involves a series of tasks designed to probe a gamut of cognitive domains, including verbal abilities, problem-solving, memory, and spatial recognition. Performance on these tasks culminates in a score, interpreted as a representation of an individual's intelligence. However, this resultant score merely reflects an individual's ability to perform on a particular set of tasks at a specific point in time, rather than their intrinsic intelligence. Furthermore, the vast universe of possible questions or tasks that can be integrated into intelligence tests implies inherent variability, underscoring the indirect nature of such measurements (Wechsler, 1955).

Intelligence, as a construct, remains chimeric and elusive. While tools like the Stanford-Binet IQ test provide valuable insights, they only offer an indirect measurement of the concept. As the journey to understanding intelligence continues, it's imperative to approach its measurement with caution, recognizing the challenges of quantifying such a multifaceted and enigmatic construct. While, there have been several modern advancements in an understanding of intelligence, these tend to build upon foundational work while introducing newer adjunctive perspectives. With advancements such as neuroimaging, an understanding of the brain's relationship to intelligence has deepened somewhat. Research has been fervently conducted attempting to identify specific neural structures and functionalities that correlate with intellectual capabilities, emphasizing the importance of "intelligence networks" within the brain (Gong, He, & Evans, 2020), yet to no endpoint.

Similarly, the genetic underpinnings of intelligence have come into sharper focus, without resolve or identification of mechanism or gene loci. The surge in genome-wide association studies (GWAS) has catalyzed efforts to pinpoint genes that might be associated with intelligence, offering a biological lens to view the intricacies of intellectual capabilities

(Davies et al., 2018), however, like many aspects of the human genome project this is without resolution or finality.

Nevertheless, fresh perspectives on intelligence emerge in other forms, such as dynamic testing. This method doesn't just measure static knowledge; it evaluates an individual's potential for learning, specifically focusing on how well one can absorb new information with minimal assistance (Grigorenko & Sternberg, 1998). Even though this approach isn't brand new, its significance has been re-emphasized in recent years due to its potential applications in diverse educational and professional settings.

Furthermore, Complex Problem Solving (CPS) has gained attention as an essential component of intelligence. Unlike traditional views, CPS sheds light on an individual's ability to tackle real-world problems and make decisions in intricate, everyday situations (Greiff, Wüstenberg, & Funke, 2012). The post-2000 era has also witnessed a burgeoning interest in non-Western conceptualizations of intelligence. Researchers are increasingly exploring indigenous and cultural definitions of intelligence, understanding that Western models may not capture the full gamut of intellectual manifestations across diverse populations (Sternberg, 2004).

While the ideas of emotional and social intelligence aren't novel, their continued development post-2000 has solidified their place in intelligence research. Rooted in the foundational work from the 1990s, these forms of intelligence delve into an individual's ability to recognize, understand, and manage emotions – both theirs and others' – and how these abilities play a crucial role in overall intelligence (Salovey & Mayer, 1990).

Lastly, the rapid strides in Artificial Intelligence (AI) have spurred discussions comparing AI's capabilities to human intelligence. As AI systems showcase cognitive competencies, they blur the lines between machine and human cognitive processing, prompting questions about the nature and definition of intelligence (Russell & Norvig, 2020).

The domains of intelligence and leadership, both central to the human experience, are awash with complexity and nuance. Despite their significance and inter-connectedness, both constructs are inherently elusive, making them challenging to define, let alone measure. In essence, the nature of intelligence and leadership, in both their definitions and their manifestations, can best be described as chimeric, a confluence of varied components that are neither singular nor straightforward.

Intelligence has historically been understood as the ability to learn, reason, and problem-solve. Over time, the understanding of intelligence has evolved to encompass a broader range of cognitive, emotional, and practical abilities. Key challenges remain in respect to measuring such a multifaceted construct. Traditional tools like the Stanford-Binet IQ test draw on a vast 'universe of items' – including verbal reasoning, quantitative reasoning, abstract/visual reasoning, and short-term memory – to infer an individual’s intelligence. These tests, however, only provide an indirect measure. They don’t gauge intelligence itself, but rather the manifestations of intelligence as it interacts with education, environment, and experience.

Similarly, leadership, while seemingly observable, is also an indirect construct. While one can observe the actions of a leader, the inherent qualities that make someone an effective leader are more intangible. Traits such as charisma,

decisiveness, empathy, and vision cannot be directly measured but can only be inferred from a leader's actions, decisions, and the feedback of followers. Just as intelligence tests draw from a universe of items, leadership assessments also utilize a diverse set of indicators. These might encompass scenario-based responses, 360-degree feedback, and situational judgement tests. Each item or scenario indirectly probes the domains of decision-making, interpersonal skills, strategic vision, and adaptability, among others.

There's an inherent similarity in the challenges faced in defining and measuring both intelligence and leadership. Both constructs, rather than being directly observable phenomena like height or weight, are abstract. They are inferred from a myriad of indicators, each of which only offers a partial view of the whole. Furthermore, both intelligence and leadership are highly contextual. Cultural norms, societal values, and situational variables heavily influence their manifestations and our perceptions of them.

Moreover, further complicating matters is the subjectivity involved in interpreting both leadership and intelligence outcomes. What one culture or group values as a sign of intelligence or effective leadership might differ drastically from another. This relativity makes it even harder to create standardized, universally applicable measures for either construct. The interrelated constructs of intelligence and leadership remain chimeric because of their multifaceted nature and the challenges associated with their measurement. While instruments like the Stanford-Binet IQ test are most comparable to the Kinematic Leadership Model survey and both offer valuable insights into cognitive abilities and leadership, both measure intelligence and leadership constructs indirectly.

In conclusion, both leadership and intelligence, as integral aspects of human capability, present a conundrum. Their multifaceted and abstract nature means that they can't be directly measured or observed. Instead, they are inferred from a universe of items that serve as proxies for the real constructs. As an understanding of human cognition and behavior evolves, it's crucial to approach these constructs with a sense of humility, recognizing the inherent challenges and limitations in our efforts to quantify and understand them.

References

- Amabile, T. M. (1988). A model of creativity and innovation in organizations. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior (Vol. 10, pp. 123–167). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 16(3), 315-338.
- Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Prentice-Hall.
- Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. Journal of Management, 17(1), 99-120.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Sage Publications.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). Transformational leadership (2nd ed.). Psychology Press.

- Beckerman-Hsu, J. P., Gago, C., Aftosmes-Tobio, A., Jurkowski, J. M., Lansburg, K., Leonard, J., Torrico, M., Haneuse, S., Subramanian, S. V., Kenney, E. L., & Davison, K. K. (2021). Acceptability and appropriateness of a novel parent-staff co-leadership model for childhood obesity prevention in Head Start: A qualitative interview study. BMC Public Health, 21(1), 201. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-10159-3
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). The managerial grid. Gulf Publishing Co.
- Bostrom, N., & Yudkowsky, E. (2014). Ethics of artificial intelligence and robotics. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.
- Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Cawthorpe d. (2023) Leadership And Artificial Intelligence Readiness — Introducing A Novel Organizational Leadership Assessment Survey. Amazon. Seattle. ISBN 979-886141133. https://www.amazon.com/dp/B0CJ3X98Z6
- Choo, C. W. (2000). Web work: Information seeking & knowledge work on the WWW. Springer/Kluwer.
- Choo, C. W. (2002). Information management for the intelligent organization (3rd ed.). Information Today.
- Choo, C. W. (2002). Strategic management of intellectual capital and organizational knowledge. Oxford University Press.
- Choo, C. W. (2006). The knowing organization (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Choo, C. W. (2015). The inquiring organization. Oxford University Press.
- Chui, M., Manyika, J., & Miremadi, M. (2016). Where machines could replace humans—and where they can't (yet). McKinsey Quarterly.
- Danesh, D. O., & Huber, T. P. (2021). A literature review of leadership training and a novel conceptual model of leader-member exchange theory for new dentists. Journal of Health Organization and Management. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1108/JHOM-05-2021-0192
- Daugherty, P., & Wilson, H. J. (2018). Human + machine: Reimagining work in the age of AI. Harvard Business Press.
- Davenport, T., & Ronanki, R. (2018). Artificial intelligence for the real world. Harvard Business Review, 96(1), 108-116.
- Davies, G., Lam, M., Harris, S. E., Trampush, J. W., Luciano, M., ... & Hill, W. D. (2018). Study of 300,486 individuals identifies 148 independent genetic loci influencing general cognitive function. Nature Communications, 9(1), 2098.
- Dess, G. G., & Beard, D. W. (1984). Dimensions of organizational task environments. Administrative Science Quarterly, 29(1), 52-73.
- Dietvorst, B. J., Simmons, J. P., & Massey, C. (2015). Algorithm aversion: People erroneously avoid algorithms after seeing them err. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 144(1), 114.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. American Sociological Review, 48(2), 147-160.
- Donaldson, L. (2001). The contingency theory of organizations. Sage Publications.
- Drucker, P. (1973). Management: Tasks, responsibilities, practices. Harper & Row.
- Drucker, P. (1985). Innovation and entrepreneurship: Practice and principles. Harper & Row.
- Drucker, P. (2001). The essential Drucker. HarperBusiness.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). A theory of leadership effectiveness. McGraw-Hill.

- Freeman, R. E. (1984). Strategic management: A stakeholder approach. Boston: Pitman.
- Gardner, H. (1983). Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences. Basic Books.
- Gödel, K. (1931). Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme I. Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik, 38(1), 173-198.
- Goleman, D. (1995). Emotional intelligence. Bantam.
- Gong, G., He, Y., & Evans, A. C. (2020). Brain connectivity: Gender makes a difference. The Neuroscientist, 18(6), 575-591.
- Gøtzsche, P. C. (2018). Complaint to the European Ombudsman over maladministration at EMA regarding the safety of the HPV vaccines. BMJ Evidence-Based Medicine, 23(5), 165-168.
- Greiff, S., Wüstenberg, S., & Funke, J. (2012). Dynamic problem solving: A new assessment perspective. Applied Psychological Measurement, 36(3), 189-213.
- Grigorenko, E. L., & Sternberg, R. J. (1998). Dynamic testing. Psychological Bulletin, 124(1), 75.
- Hammer, M., & Champy, J. (1993). Reengineering the corporation: A manifesto for business revolution. Harper Business.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Life cycle theory of leadership. Training & Development Journal.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies. Sage publications.
- Janis, I. L. (1972). Victims of groupthink. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Johnson, G., Scholes, K., & Whittington, R. (2008). Exploring corporate strategy: Text & cases (8th ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Johnson, R., & Clark, D. (2016). Evaluating organizational efficiency. Academic Publishers.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). The social psychology of organizations (2nd ed.). Wiley.
- Kotter, J. P. (1995). Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. Harvard Business Review, 73(2), 59-67.
- Laloux, F. (2016). Reinventing Organizations: An Illustrated Invitation to Join the Conversation on Next-Stage Organizations. Nelson Parker.
- Mintzberg, H. (1979). The structuring of organizations. Prentice-Hall.
- Mintzberg, H. (1998). Covert leadership: Notes on managing professionals. Harvard Business Review, 76(6), 140-147.
- Nembhard, I. M., & Edmondson, A. C. (2006). Making it safe: The effects of leader inclusiveness and professional status on psychological safety and improvement efforts in health care teams. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27(7), 941-966.
- Ohmae, K. (1985). Triad power: The coming shape of global competition. Free Press.
- Osborn, R. N., Hunt, J. G., & Jauch, L. R. (2002). Toward a contextual theory of leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 13(6), 797-837.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective. Harper & Row.
- Porter, M. E. (1979). How competitive forces shape strategy. Harvard Business Review, 57(2), 137-145.
- Porter, M. E. (1985). Competitive advantage. Free Press.

- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). Creating shared value. Harvard Business Review, 89(1/2), 62-77.
- Rock, D. (2008). SCARF: A brain-based model for collaborating with and influencing others. NeuroLeadership Journal, 1, 1-9.
- Rogers, E. M. (1962). Diffusion of innovations. Free Press.
- Rumelt, R. P. (1984). Toward a strategic theory of the firm. In R. Lamb (Ed.), Competitive strategic management (pp. 556-570). Prentice-Hall.
- Russell, S. J., & Norvig, P. (2020). Artificial Intelligence: A modern approach. Malaysia; Pearson Education Limited.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. Imagination, cognition and personality, 9(3), 185-211.
- Shah, O. A., Aslami, M. K., & Suleman, A. T. (2018). Improving perception, attitude and interest in medical leadership and management - A novel model proposed by medical students. Advances in Medical Education and Practice, 9, 405-406. https://doi.org/10.2147/AMEP.S168287
- Smith, J. (2015). Metrics of organizational productivity. Business Press.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1985). Beyond IQ: A triarchic theory of human intelligence. Cambridge University Press.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2004). Culture and intelligence. American Psychologist, 59(5), 325.
- Taylor, P. (2018). Modern and traditional measures in organizational assessment. University Press.
- Terman, L. M. (1916). The measurement of intelligence. Houghton Mifflin.
- Tushman, M. L., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1996). Ambidextrous organizations: Managing evolutionary and revolutionary change. California Management Review, 38(4), 8-30.
- Wechsler, D. (1955). Manual for the Wechsler adult intelligence scale. Psychological Corporation.
- Weick, K. E. (1995). Sensemaking in organizations. Sage Publications.
- Yukl, G. (2012). Leadership in organizations. Prentice Hall.
- Zhang, L. (2012). The advantage of experienced randomness: The role of non-conscious thought in product evaluation. Journal of Business Research, 65(4), 585-591.