# Complexity Leadership: The Third Decade

**Steven M. Walker**
**National University**

**Daryl V. Watkins**
**Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University**

**Matthew P. Earnhardt**
**Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University**

*Complexity leadership, complex adaptive leadership, and adaptive leadership are distinct yet interconnected research areas, originating in the early 1980s. This article extends a systematic review, focusing on the third decade of literature in these fields. The authors examined 778 business-related articles, narrowing down to 91 published between 2003 and 2012 for detailed deductive analysis. Findings from this decade highlight a shift from traditional, leader-centric models to adaptive, holistic frameworks that emphasize emergence, nonlinearity, feedback loops, and interdependence. Key themes include adaptive capacity, self-organization, and distributed cognition, which underscore the importance of collaborative leadership in managing complex, volatile environments. These insights offer practical guidance, illustrating how organizations can use these principles to foster continuous innovation, adaptability, and resilience—laying the groundwork for the most recent fifteen years of complexity leadership research.*

*Keywords: complexity leadership, complex adaptive leadership, adaptive leadership theory*

## INTRODUCTION

The first two decades of complex adaptive leadership literature were driven by the foresight of what was to come (Earnhardt et al., 2022). Leadership theorists could see the organizational and economic changes approaching and how the current leadership paradigms failed to address the new realities. Globalization and technology alone were on the cusp of disrupting every segment of the global economic structure. Other "factors such as increased competition, shorter product lifecycles, the boundaryless nature of career, cultural complexity, and an increase in mergers and acquisitions" (Good & Sharma, 2010, p. 155) would also play a part in future disruptions. The changes brought forth by these factors, and others that were yet beyond understanding, would require new forms of thinking and leading (Bligh et al., 2006; Bolden & Gosling, 2006; Rowland, 2007; Uhl-Bien et al., 2007; Branson, 2008; Drath et al., 2008).

By the mid-2000s, the predictions made in the 1980s and 1990s began materializing, underscoring the urgency for new leadership paradigms (Earnhardt et al., 2022). However, while the need for change was evident, there was ambiguity regarding the precise nature of this new form of leadership. Through 2004-

2013, complexity research garnered interest from practitioners and empirical researchers alike (Shalley et al., 2004; Sundgren, 2006; Raghavendran & Rajagopalan, 2011). The practice and empirical research of complexity and its connection to the leadership process backed the work the previous two decades theorized on (Houghton & Yoho, 2005; Storey, 2005; Bligh et al., 2006; Paraskevas, 2006). The third decade of complex adaptive leadership research combined theory with practice to start a richer and deeper conversation on the importance of this new leadership theory.

Darling and Heller (2011) observed that the socioeconomic landscape was experiencing profound and widespread changes. Societies were now grappling with unprecedented concerns that touched on broad areas like business, government, politics, education, healthcare, social services, and religion, as well as specific aspects of managing, leading, investing, borrowing, purchasing, ownership, employment, and innovation. They argued that this should not incite fear or panic; instead, it represented an unparalleled opportunity for creative and conscientious leaders to make significant differences in organizational stakeholders' personal and professional lives. It wasn't a question of whether new paradigms of leadership were needed; it was a question of what that new form of leadership would look like. Throughout the decade, leadership theorists danced around titles such as "adaptive leadership" (Randall & Coakley, 2006), "complexity leadership" (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007; Uhl-Bien & Marion, 2009), "complex adaptive leadership" (Chadwick, 2010), "collective leadership" (Brookes, 2011), and "distributed leadership" (Currie & Lockett, 2011). Yet, while authors struggled to find a consistent title for the needed leadership theory, several details did begin to solidify in the literature regarding what this new form of leadership should look like.

**Paradigm Shift**

A fundamental premise underlying complex adaptive leadership is the need for a paradigm shift in conceptualizing leadership. Traditional hierarchical models are increasingly perceived as inadequate in environments characterized by uncertainty, ambiguity, and rapid change (Drath et al., 2008). Authors such as Bligh et al. (2006) and Branson (2008) argue for a shift towards an ontological perspective that views leadership as a dynamic process intertwined with collaboration and interaction, rather than a static position of authority. "The field of leadership studies is entrenched in a conceptual crisis that severely limits our understanding of leadership in contemporary organizations" (DeRue, 2011, p. 125) The change needed to start with the self (Stames, 2010).

> The current, widely accepted leadership ontology — leaders, followers, and shared goals — is becoming less useful for understanding leadership in contexts that are increasingly peer-like and collaborative. The further development of leadership theory calls for a corresponding development at the level of leadership ontology. (Drath et al., 2008, p. 635)

For Drath et al. (2008), Branson (2008), and Stames (2010), complex adaptive leadership had to begin at the ontological level where leadership was viewed as a process in collaboration and interaction with others and the environment, rather than a set of traits or skills. Through self-reflection and self-leadership, a paradigm shift can take place which allows the leader to not only build their emotional and contextual intelligence (Hannah et al., 2011; Shalley et al., 2004; Osborn & Marion, 2009; Uhl-Bien & Marion, 2009; Service, 2012), but how to communicate needs and desired outcomes effectively following the emotional and contextual analysis (Bligh et al., 2006; Drath et al., 2008; Ahem, 2009). Kinicki et al. (2011) further argued that a paradigm shift to seeing organizations through the lens of systems thinking was also critical.

> A paradigm shift toward systems thinking and dynamics, with their ability to clarify processes and structures across levels of management and levels of analysis, enables us to provide a new and relevant lens for studying leadership that will assist in achieving a higher level of theoretical and practical understanding about leadership in organizations. (p. 133)

**Contexts - The Five C's: Change, Crisis, Conflict, Creativity, and Community Engagement**

*Change*

Secondly, researchers clarified the most appropriate contexts for this new form of leadership. Perhaps the most obvious context for complex adaptive leaders to be employed is that of adaptation and change (Bligh et al., 2006; Bolden & Gosling, 2006; Randall & Coakley, 2006; Lauser, 2008; Ford, 2009; Uhl-Bien & Marion, 2009; Kerfoot, 2009; Chadwick, 2010; Good & Sharma, 2010; Stames, 2010; Baker et al., 2011; Child & Rodrigues, 2011). By engaging complex adaptive leadership in contexts of adaptation and change, several important characteristics emerge for leaders. These are: allowing the leader the wisdom and foresight to distinguish between adaptive problems and technical problems, understand the interconnectedness of not only the organizational environment but the surrounding interconnected external environments, continuous learning, and systems thinking (Bligh et al., 2006; Bolden & Gosling, 2006; Randall & Coakley, 2006; Lauser, 2008; Ford, 2009; Uhl-Bien & Marion, 2009; Kerfoot, 2009; Chadwick, 2010; Good & Sharma, 2010; Stames, 2010; Baker et al., 2011; Child & Rodrigues, 2011). When facing change, adaptive leadership is the primary leadership model to be utilized (Randall & Coakley, 2006).

*Crisis*

For Paraskevas (2006), Muffet-Willett and Kruse (2008), and Brookes (2011), complex adaptive leadership was most appropriate in crises. Paraskevas (2006) suggested that organizations need to reconsider how they approach crisis management plans and teams, arguing that crisis response should be treated as a dynamic, evolving system within the organization. By applying principles of complexity theory, organizations can significantly improve the effectiveness of their crisis management strategies. Similarly, Muffet-Willett and Kruse (2008) contended that complexity theory leaders were more flexible and prepared for tough decision-making challenges, whatever the cause or situational context. The emotional and contextual intelligence that complex adaptive leaders were armed with helped them navigate the crisis landscape (Service, 2012). Hannah et al. (2011) echoed this and added perspective, contending that leadership can enhance group performance by influencing both individuals and social dynamics. This approach enables the group to access a diverse range of skills and perspectives that go beyond what a single leader could offer. In this sense, effective leadership maximized the group's collective potential, increasing the complexity it can handle. Leadership shifts among members based on who is best suited—due to their unique knowledge, skills, abilities, temperament, and other traits—for the particular task at hand (p. 216).

*Conflict*

Scholars found complex adaptive leadership useful in conflict scenarios (Wakefield et al., 2008; Chadwick, 2010). Wakefield et al. (2008) argued that the characteristics of clear communication skills and relationship building that were common in complex adaptive leaders helped reduce conflict within the organization. Similarly, Chadwick (2010) posited that the Complex Adaptive Leadership Model would "promote productive conflict. The concepts and relationships presented in [the model] reflect real-world situations and provide leadership and team development strategies. Communication is of the utmost importance" (p. 154). Taylor et al. (2011), Edson (2012), and Siira (2012) echoed the need for complex adaptive leadership in conflict scenarios, highlighting specifically the need in the context of team projects.

*Creativity*

A fourth context where complex adaptive leadership was argued to be important was in creative and innovative environments (Sundgren, 2006; Uhl-Bien et al., 2007; Kim & Wilemon, 2009; Osborn & Marion, 2009; Guimaraes, 2011; Dervitsiotis, 2012). For Sundgren (2006) the dialogic communication inherent in complex adaptive leadership is important in research and development projects. Complex adaptive leadership is also the antithesis to traditional, hierarchical organizational models that tended to stifle and constrict the free flow of communication needed in creative and innovation environments (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007; Kim & Wilemon, 2009; Osborn & Marion, 2009; Guimaraes, 2011; Dervitsiotis, 2012).

Leadership models of the last century have been products of top-down, bureaucratic paradigms. These models are effective for an economy premised on physical production but are not well-suited for a more

knowledge-oriented economy. Complexity science suggests a different paradigm for leadership—one that frames leadership as a complex interactive dynamic from which adaptive outcomes (e.g., learning, innovation, and adaptability) emerge. (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007, p. 298)

Through the creation of flatter organizational structures where information channels are opened, complex adaptive leaders unlock the potential for greater innovation and creativity. These leaders "foster environments where high levels of interaction can occur" (Taylor et al., 2011, p. 415). Because of this, "many leaders from across organizational boundaries, such as champions at a project level, come together to innovate, learn, resolve task-related conflict, and collaborate to solve elements of complex challenges" (p. 415).

*Community Engagement*

Community development was the final context in which complex adaptive leadership could be engaged. (Brookes, 2011; Kean et al., 2011; Child & Rodrigues, 2011). As with the other contexts, the authors argued for leadership in community development projects to be the "property and consequence of a community rather than the property and consequence of an individual leader" (Brookes, 2011, p. 175), once again reiterating the idea that leadership is more dynamic than solely residing in one individual. Community development projects, which are often linked to political systems and thus require understanding linkages and interconnected relationships to the political realm, are enhanced by complex adaptive leadership through the systems thinking behaviors inherent in such leaders (Child & Rodrigues, 2011).

**Summary**

In summary, the third decade of research on complex adaptive leadership began solidifying concepts previously theorized during the first two decades. Empirical research on these concepts helped narrow the discussion (Houghton & Yoho, 2005; Storey, 2005; Bligh et al., 2006; Paraskevas, 2006). During the third decade, complex adaptive leadership was argued to begin with a paradigm shift that sees leadership as a process rather than a position of authority (Bligh et al., 2006; Bolden & Gosling, 2006; Rowland, 2007; Uhl-Bien et al., 2007; Branson, 2008; Drath et al., 2008). This paradigm shift would unlock the ability of the leader to understand the emotional and contextual needs inherent in the complex setting the leader was faced with (Bligh et al., 2006; Bolden & Gosling, 2006; Rowland, 2007; Uhl-Bien et al., 2007; Branson, 2008; Drath et al., 2008). Once the emotional and contextual needs are understood, the literature suggests that complex adaptive leadership can be engaged in several contexts. These contexts were change (Bligh et al., 2006; Bolden & Gosling, 2006; Randall & Coakley, 2006; Lauser, 2008; Ford, 2009; Uhl-Bien & Marion, 2009; Kerfoot, 2009; Chadwick, 2010; Good & Sharma, 2010; Stames, 2010; Baker et al., 2011; Child & Rodrigues, 2011), crisis (Paraskevas, 2006; Muffet-Willett & Kruse, 2008; Brookes, 2011), conflict (Wakefield et al., 2008; Chadwick, 2010; Taylor et al., 2011), creativity (Sundgren, 2006; Uhl-Bien et al., 2007; Kim & Wilemon, 2009; Osborn & Marion, 2009; Guimaraes, 2011; Dervitsiotis, 2012), and community engagement (Brookes, 2011; Kean et al., 2011; Child & Rodrigues, 2011). To foster this form of leadership, attention needs to be given to the learning, change, or creativity processes, communication, systems thinking, and interconnected relationships (Bligh et al., 2006; Bolden & Gosling, 2006; Randall & Coakley, 2006; Lauser, 2008; Ford, 2009; Uhl-Bien & Marion, 2009; Kerfoot, 2009; Chadwick, 2010; Good & Sharma, 2010; Stames, 2010; Baker et al., 2011; Child & Rodrigues, 2011).

## METHODOLOGY

This study reviews the development of complexity leadership theory from 2003 to 2012. Following a comprehensive and systematic approach, the methodology is divided into three primary stages: literature search, inductive content analysis, and deductive thematic analysis.

**Literature Search**

*Objective*

To gather a comprehensive collection of academic articles published between 2003 and 2012 related to complex adaptive leadership, complexity leadership, and adaptive leadership.

*Process*

1. Database Selection: The research team utilized the ProQuest database, known for its extensive coverage of scholarly articles within the business discipline.
2. Search Criteria: The search focused on journal articles that were peer-reviewed, published in English, available in full text online, and categorized within the business discipline.
3. Search Terms: The Boolean search string used was ((“complex adaptive leadership”) OR (“complexity leadership”) OR (“adaptive leadership”)).
4. Results: The initial search yielded 153 results. After removing duplicates and false positives, 86 relevant articles were identified for further analysis.

**Inductive Content Analysis**

*Objective*

To identify key themes and subthemes within the collected literature, appropriate when research in an area is fragmented (Elo & Kyngas, 2008).

*Process*

1. File Preparation:
    - The 86 manuscripts were downloaded in PDF format.
    - Each file was renamed using the convention: <Year of Publication>_<First Author Last Name>_<Short Title>.pdf.
    - Files were converted into searchable images using the optical character recognition (OCR) feature of Adobe Acrobat X to preserve document fidelity.
    - The PDFs were imported into NVivo 14 Qualitative Data Analysis Software, with each manuscript assigned as a case.
2. Automatic Coding:
    - NVivo’s automatic coding feature was employed to perform inductive content analysis on the entire dataset (Bazeley, 2009).
    - Codes were organized into a hierarchical structure with parent nodes (higher-order themes) and child nodes (more specific subthemes).
    - NVivo identified a set of main codes and numerous unique subcodes.
3. Code Name Searches:
    - The research team performed code name searches for complex adaptive lead*, complexity lead*, and adaptive lead* within the theory and process nodes related to these terms.
    - The results were inspected for patterns, and manuscripts with relevant subject matter were retained for further analysis.

**Deductive Thematic Analysis**

*Objective*

To conduct a detailed thematic analysis of the identified articles.

*Process*

1. Subsetting:
    - From the identified 91 manuscripts, a subset was selected for detailed thematic analysis based on relevance and contribution to complexity leadership.
2. Initial Review:

- The team skimmed these articles to gain a high-level understanding and to create a preliminary classification schema.
- Manuscripts were reviewed to develop themes and subthemes specifically related to complex adaptive leadership, complexity leadership, and adaptive leadership.

3. Coding and Refinement:
    - Themes and subthemes were coded and iteratively refined. This included renaming nodes, refining node definitions, expanding or collapsing nodes, and re-arranging nodes within the hierarchical structure.
    - The researchers used NVivo's analytic tools, such as word search queries, word frequency queries, word trees, and coding queries, to visualize and verify the results.

**Summary of Key Themes Identified**

1. Complexity Leadership: Adaptive, complex, emergent, generative, participative, self-organizing, systemic, and unpredictable.
2. Leadership Characteristics: Social, emotional, and cultural intelligence; adaptive, culturally intelligent, emotionally intelligent, and ethical leadership practices.
3. Systemic Leadership: Open communication, engagement, shared purpose, and community building within organizations.

## FINDINGS

The third decade of complexity leadership research (2003–2012) findings revealed a significant departure from the traditional leader-centric models that dominated earlier decades. Compared to the first two decades of research, which focused heavily on theoretical underpinnings, the third decade marked a transition toward more adaptive, emergent, and systemic approaches to leadership. Researchers highlighted the shift from hierarchical models toward dynamic and distributed frameworks highlighted the increasing importance of complexity theory in navigating the volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) environments that organizations faced during this period.

These themes were developed through inductive and deductive content analysis using NVivo, which coded key concepts across various academic literature. This process enabled us to categorize and refine the emergent leadership patterns identified across 91 articles published between 2003 and 2012. The thematic analysis conducted through NVivo allowed us to uncover four core themes: emergence and nonlinearity, distributed cognition and shared leadership, self-organization and adaptive capacity, and reflexivity and relational leadership.

### Emergence and Nonlinearity in Leadership

One key theme was the role of emergence and nonlinearity in leadership processes. Whereas leadership models in the earlier decades often emphasized linear, top-down control, the third decade's research underscored how leadership emerged from interactions between individuals and systems. This dynamic view, characterized by feedback loops and interdependencies, aligned with previous theories of phase transitions and chaos (Abraham, 1994; Stacey, 2007). Leadership was no longer understood as a static position of authority but rather as an emergent property of complex systems, echoing the work of Axelrod and Cohen (1999, 2000) on self-organizing systems. These findings expanded on earlier concepts by demonstrating how nonlinear systems fostered adaptive capacity and continuous learning, as supported by studies on emergent strategy (Boisot, 2003) and organizations at the edge of chaos (Brown & Eisenhardt, 1997; Maguire & McKelvey, 1999).

### Distributed Cognition and Shared Leadership

The research also highlighted the growing relevance of distributed cognition and shared leadership. Building on earlier calls for a more inclusive approach to leadership, the findings of this study demonstrated

that leadership was increasingly seen as a collective function, rather than the sole responsibility of a designated leader. As discussed by Bennett et al. (2003) and Gronn (2002), distributed leadership emerged from the interactions between individuals and teams, challenging the traditional individual-centric view of leadership. The NVivo coding revealed that shared leadership was particularly prevalent in knowledge-intensive and creative environments, reflecting the importance of collective intelligence in managing complex adaptive systems (Plowman & Duchon, 2007; Uhl-Bien, 2006). This shift to distributed cognition allowed organizations to better adapt to dynamic environments, as evidenced in leadership research on innovation and technological development (Bligh, 2006; Howell, Shea, & Higgins, 2005).

**Self-Organization and Adaptive Capacity**

Another critical finding was the emphasis on self-organization and adaptive capacity within complex adaptive systems (CAS). Earlier research identified the need for flexibility in leadership to respond to environmental changes (Axelrod & Cohen, 1999). Still, the third decade provided empirical evidence showing that self-organization was a core mechanism for achieving this flexibility. Leaders in complex systems were not expected to have all the answers or exert direct control but rather to create the conditions that allowed systems to self-organize and adapt to external pressures. This aligns with the work of Bak (1996) on self-organized criticality and Kauffman (1993, 1995) on self-organization in adaptive systems. The NVivo thematic analysis revealed that adaptive capacity was enhanced when leaders acted as catalysts for change rather than controllers of outcomes, a concept supported by Heifetz et al. (2009) and Stacey (2007).

**Reflexivity and Relational Leadership**

The third decade also saw an increased focus on reflexivity and relational leadership. Reflexivity, or reflecting on one's actions, beliefs, and decisions, was identified as a key component of effective leadership in complex environments. Leaders were found to engage in ongoing reflection, which allowed them to adapt more effectively to changing conditions. This built on earlier notions of continuous learning but added a specific emphasis on relational aspects, where leadership emerged from the quality of interactions between individuals rather than being solely vested in formal authority (Bradbury & Lichtenstein, 2000; Griffin, 2002). The NVivo analysis showed that relational leadership was critical in fostering collaboration and innovation, particularly in contexts where formal hierarchies were less effective (Bradbury, 2003; Uhl-Bien & Marion, 2009).

**Complexity Leadership in Various Contexts**

Finally, researchers increasingly applied complexity leadership theory across diverse contexts, including crisis management, innovation, and community engagement. Thematic analysis highlighted that adaptive leadership was most relevant in crisis scenarios (Paraskevas, 2006; Muffet-Willett & Kruse, 2008), where leaders navigated complexity by facilitating self-organization and empowering teams to respond to rapidly changing conditions. Research also indicated that complexity leadership was essential for fostering creativity and innovation, particularly in industries facing technological disruption (Bligh, 2006; Sundgren, 2006). This thematic expansion reflected a maturation of the field, with empirical studies confirming the adaptability and resilience offered by complexity leadership across various organizational environments.

**Continued Development of Leadership Models**

The third decade of research also highlighted the continued development and refinement of the three dominant leadership models: Complexity Leadership Theory (CLT), Adaptive Leadership Theory (ALT), and Complex Adaptive Leadership Theory (CALT). While these models shared foundational principles related to complexity and adaptability, the third decade saw their divergence into distinct frameworks, each with its unique focus and application.

**Complexity Leadership Theory (CLT)**

Complexity Leadership Theory gained considerable traction during the third decade as scholars and practitioners increasingly recognized the limitations of traditional hierarchical leadership in addressing complex, dynamic environments. CLT focused on the entanglement of formal administrative leadership with informal, emergent leadership, as theorized by Marion and Uhl-Bien (2001). Research conducted through the NVivo analysis showed that CLT was particularly effective in fostering innovation and adaptability by enabling emergent processes rather than exerting top-down control (Boal & Schultz, 2007; Uhl-Bien, 2006).

**Adaptive Leadership Theory (ALT)**

Adaptive Leadership Theory (ALT), originally proposed by Heifetz (1994), continued to evolve in the third decade, emphasizing the distinction between technical and adaptive challenges. Studies coded in NVivo validated ALT's applicability in contexts requiring organizational change and crisis management (Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky, 2009). ALT reinforced the role of leaders in catalyzing change and managing disequilibrium by fostering continuous reflection and learning within teams, which was a dominant theme across multiple studies (Stacey, 2007; Boal & Schultz, 2007).

**Complex Adaptive Leadership Theory (CALT)**

Complex Adaptive Leadership Theory (CALT), a hybrid of complexity and adaptive leadership frameworks, also gained prominence during this period. CALT, building on the work of Holland (1995) and Axelrod and Cohen (2000), emphasized leadership as a dynamic process emerging from interactions within a complex adaptive system. The NVivo analysis indicated that CALT was particularly effective in environments characterized by rapid change and unpredictability, where leadership emerged spontaneously based on the needs of the system (Plowman & Duchon, 2007).

Tables 1 through 3 provide an overview of themes related to complexity leadership theory, adaptive leadership theory, and complex adaptive leadership theory. Table 4 describes some thematic differences between the three leadership theories.

**TABLE 1**
**COMPLEXITY LEADERSHIP THEORY TOPICS**

| CONCEPT | DESCRIPTION | SOURCE(S) |
|---|---|---|
| Entanglement of Formal and Informal Leadership | Interaction and interdependence between formal administrative leadership and informal adaptive leadership. | Uhl-Bien, Marion, & McKelvey (2007) |
| Non-agentic Dynamics | Processes that emerge naturally in a system without direct actions from individuals or agents. | Cilliers (1998); Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001) |
| Reflexivity in Leadership | Reflecting on actions, beliefs, and decisions to adapt to changing conditions in complex systems. | Stacey (2003) |
| Relational Leadership | Leadership as an emergent property of relationships rather than individuals; muted individual-collective distinction. | Uhl-Bien et al. (2007); Stacey (2003); Cilliers (1998) |
| Shared Need vs. Shared Vision | Focus on interdependence and shared needs rather than imposing a common vision for collaboration. | Uhl-Bien & Marion (2001) |
| Synchronicity at the Edges of Systems | Adaptive leadership and self-organization are more likely at the boundaries of subsystems in organizations. | Teisman et al. (2009) |

| CONCEPT | DESCRIPTION | SOURCE(S) |
|---|---|---|
| Tension and Paradox in Leadership | Tension between competing forces (e.g., stability and change) fosters creativity and innovation. | Stacey (2007) |
| Catalyzing Emergent Processes | Leaders influence emergent processes by fostering the right enabling conditions for innovation and change. | Uhl-Bien et al. (2007) |
| Complexity Leadership as a Holonic Process | Leadership as both a part and a whole within a system; non-reductive view of leadership. | Koestler (1967); Kupers (2007) |
| Self-leadership | Emphasizes personal autonomy and self-efficacy, especially in knowledge-intensive environments. | Neck & Manz (1996); Prussia et al. (1998) |
| Shared Leadership in Knowledge-Intensive Firms | Leadership responsibilities distributed across teams, allowing collective problem-solving. | Cox et al. (2003); Gronn (2002) |
| Complex Adaptive Systems (CAS) Dynamics | Leadership emerges from interactions within systems without centralized control; focus on adaptability. | Boal & Schultz (2007); Uhl-Bien et al. (2007); Cilliers (1998) |
| Adaptive Leadership | Enabling organizations to adapt to changing environments through emergent leadership processes. | Uhl-Bien et al. (2007) |
| Boundary-Spanning Leadership | Leadership that occurs at the edges of organizational boundaries, facilitating collaboration and innovation. | Teisman et al. (2009) |
| Holonic Systems in Leadership | Leadership is both autonomous and interdependent, functioning within larger systems through integration. | Koestler (1967); Kupers (2007) |
| Emergent Leadership in Complex Systems | Leadership that arises naturally from the system without formal authority, driven by the needs of the group. | Plowman et al. (2007); Uhl-Bien et al. (2007) |
| Responsible Leadership | Leaders must balance the demands of various stakeholders, navigating global challenges and ethical dilemmas. | Maak & Pless (2006); Donaldson (1996) |
| Self-organization in Organizations | Systems organize spontaneously in response to environmental conditions and internal dynamics. | Kauffman (1993); Uhl-Bien & Marion (2009) |
| Double Mutual Adjustment | Integration of organizational units through both horizontal and vertical relationships, requiring self-organization. | Teisman et al. (2009) |
| Emergent States and Social Regulatory Structures | Group norms and identities that arise from team interactions and guide subsequent behavior and leadership. | Marks, Mathieu, & Zaccaro (2001); Lord et al. (2011) |
| Requisite Complexity for Leadership | Leaders and teams need the cognitive and affective complexity to manage adaptive challenges in complex systems. | Lord et al. (2011) |
| Emergence from Interaction of Agents | Complex behaviors and leadership emerge from the dynamic interplay of individuals without central control. | Cilliers (1998); Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001) |

| CONCEPT | DESCRIPTION | SOURCE(S) |
|---|---|---|
| Complexity Leadership and Interdependencies | Leadership is driven by interdependencies among individuals working toward personal and collective goals. | Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001); Uhl-Bien et al. (2007) |
| Self-organized Criticality and Adaptation | Systems maintain themselves at the edge of chaos to foster innovation and resilience. | Bak (1996); Lewin (1992); Kauffman (1993) |

**TABLE 2**
**ADAPTIVE LEADERSHIP THEORY TOPICS**

| CONCEPT | DESCRIPTION | SOURCE(S) |
|---|---|---|
| Adaptive Capacity | The ability of leaders and organizations to continuously adapt to changing conditions and challenges. | Uhl-Bien et al. (2007) |
| Emergent Leadership | Leadership that arises naturally from the system without formal authority, driven by the needs of the group. | Plowman et al. (2007), Uhl-Bien et al. (2007) |
| Catalyzing Change | Leaders act as catalysts for change rather than controlling outcomes, enabling the emergence of new behaviors and innovation. | Uhl-Bien et al. (2007) |
| Interdependence and Collaboration | Emphasizing interdependence among individuals and groups rather than focusing solely on shared goals or visions. | Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001), Uhl-Bien et al. (2007) |
| Reflection and Learning | Adaptive leaders continuously reflect on their decisions and learning, adjusting strategies based on feedback from the environment. | Stacey (2003) |
| Managing Complexity | Leaders in complex environments must facilitate conditions that allow teams and organizations to navigate ambiguity and uncertainty effectively. | Uhl-Bien et al. (2007) |
| Facilitating Team Adaptability | Adaptive leadership involves enabling teams to adjust their behaviors and strategies in response to changing conditions. | Marks, Mathieu, & Zaccaro (2001), Lord et al. (2011) |
| Distributed Leadership | Leadership is shared across multiple individuals or groups, particularly in knowledge-intensive or complex tasks. | Cox et al. (2003), Gronn (2002) |
| Complex Adaptive Systems (CAS) Dynamics | Leaders enable organizations to adapt through emergent processes rather than top-down control, focusing on adaptability in complex environments. | Boal & Schlultz (2007), Uhl-Bien et al. (2007), Cilliers (1998) |
| Self-organized Criticality | Systems naturally tend to operate at the "edge of chaos," and adaptive leadership maintains this balance to foster innovation and resilience. | Bak (1996), Kauffman (1993), Lewin (1992) |
| Double Mutual Adjustment | The process of adapting both horizontally and vertically within organizations, balancing self-organization with alignment to organizational goals. | Teisman et al. (2009) |

| CONCEPT | DESCRIPTION | SOURCE(S) |
|---|---|---|
| Non-Agentic Dynamics | Leadership that emerges without deliberate action by individuals, with the system self-organizing through collective, non-agentic processes. | Cilliers (1998), Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001) |
| Holonic Adaptation | Leadership operates as part of a whole while being a self-contained unit within a system, responding to the dual nature of systemic interactions. | Koestler (1967), Kupers (2007) |
| Reflexive Adaptation | Adaptive leaders constantly reflect on actions and assumptions, adjusting strategies to ensure continuous learning and adaptation. | Stacey (2003) |
| Boundary-Spanning Leadership | Adaptive leadership is particularly effective at organizational boundaries, where collaboration and innovation emerge from cross-departmental interactions. | Teisman et al. (2009) |
| Paradox and Tension as Catalysts for Adaptation | Paradox and tension are viewed as essential for fostering innovation, and leaders facilitate environments where these forces coexist productively. | Stacey (2007) |
| Synchronicity in Adaptive Leadership | Adaptive leaders recognize and enable moments of synchronicity within systems, aligning different organizational parts in response to emerging challenges. | Teisman et al. (2009) |
| Compilational Aggregation | Adaptive leadership brings together diverse knowledge and perspectives to form cohesive responses to complexity, creating system-wide solutions. | Lord et al. (2011), Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001) |
| Emergent States and Social Regulatory Structures | Leadership is shaped by emergent social norms, identities, and regulatory structures that develop through interactions within teams and organizations. | Marks, Mathieu, & Zaccaro (2001), Lord et al. (2011) |

**TABLE 3**
**COMPLEX ADAPTIVE LEADERSHIP THEORY TOPICS**

| CONCEPT | DESCRIPTION | SOURCE(S) |
|---|---|---|
| Self-Organizing Criticality | Systems operate at the "edge of chaos," where small changes can lead to significant shifts. Leadership maintains this balance to foster adaptation and resilience. | Bak (1996), Kauffman (1993), Lewin (1992) |
| Double Mutual Adjustment | Adaptive leadership enables mutual adjustment both horizontally (across teams) and vertically (hierarchically) within organizations. | Teisman et al. (2009) |
| Non-Agentic Social Dynamics | Leadership emerges without deliberate actions by individuals, as the system self-organizes through collective, non-agentic processes. | Cilliers (1998), Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001) |

| CONCEPT | DESCRIPTION | SOURCE(S) |
|---|---|---|
| Entanglement of Emergent and Administrative Leadership | The interplay between emergent (informal) and administrative (formal) leadership, where leaders manage the balance between these two forms. | Uhl-Bien et al. (2007), Dooley et al. (2007) |
| Reflexive Adaptation and Self-Regulation | Leaders engage in continuous reflection and self-regulation to adapt strategies in response to feedback from complex systems. | Stacey (2003), Lord et al. (2011) |
| Attractors and Attractor Patterns | In complex systems, attractors are stable behavioral patterns that arise from system dynamics. Leaders must recognize and manage these attractors. | Waldrop (1992), Stacey (1996) |
| Bottom-Up Leadership Processes | Leadership in complex systems often arises from the bottom up as agents interact and produce emergent structures. | Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001) |
| Shared Need vs. Shared Vision | Instead of focusing on a shared vision, leadership emphasizes shared needs that drive interdependence and collective action. | Uhl-Bien et al. (2007), Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001) |
| Holonic Adaptation | Leadership operates as both a part of a larger whole and a self-contained unit, balancing immediate and systemic goals. | Koestler (1967), Kupers (2007) |
| Synchronicity in Adaptive Leadership | Leaders recognize and facilitate moments of synchronicity within systems, aligning different organizational parts to enable adaptation. | Teisman et al. (2009) |
| Paradox and Tension as Adaptive Catalysts | Leaders leverage paradoxes and tensions as catalysts for innovation and adaptation, rather than attempting to resolve them. | Stacey (2007) |
| Diffuse Informational Networks | Leadership in complex systems involves managing distributed informational networks where information flows among agents without central control. | Kauffman (1993) |
| Relational Leadership in Complex Systems | Leadership emerges through interactions between agents, with an emphasis on the quality of relationships and the dynamics of those interactions. | Lord et al. (2011), Uhl-Bien et al. (2007) |
| Complexity and Nonlinearity in Leadership Impact | In complex systems, leadership impact is nonlinear—small actions may lead to large effects, and vice versa. Leaders must understand these dynamics. | Cilliers (1998), Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001) |
| Distributed Intelligence and Shared Leadership | Leadership is a distributed process where intelligence is shared across agents, with leadership emerging through interactions. | Uhl-Bien et al. (2007), Pearce & Conger (2003) |
| Emergent Leadership Dynamics | Leadership emerges from the collective dynamics of agents interacting within the system, rather than from formal, top-down authority. | Uhl-Bien et al. (2007), Plowman et al. (2007) |
| Enabling Conditions for Emergence | Leaders create enabling conditions that allow for emergent, adaptive behaviors to arise | Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001), Uhl-Bien et al. (2007) |

| CONCEPT | DESCRIPTION | SOURCE(S) |
|---|---|---|
| | from the system rather than imposing solutions top-down. | |
| Self-Regulating Systems | Complex systems exhibit self-regulation through feedback loops, where agents adapt their behavior based on feedback from the environment. | Cilliers (1998) |
| Tipping Points and Phase Transitions | Leaders must recognize critical tipping points where small changes lead to large system-wide transitions, facilitating these transitions wisely. | Waldrop (1992), Kauffman (1993) |
| Emergent States and Social Regulatory Structures | Leadership is shaped by emergent social norms, identities, and regulatory structures that develop through team and organizational interactions. | Marks, Mathieu, & Zaccaro (2001), Lord et al. (2011) |
| Self-Organization of Networks | Leadership in complex systems involves guiding the self-organization of networks within organizations, where informal, emergent structures arise. | Roethlisberger & Dickson (1939), Trist & Bamforth (1951) |
| Leadership as a Facilitator of Emergence | Leaders in complex systems act as facilitators of emergent processes, enabling new behaviors and solutions to arise from the system. | Plowman et al. (2007) |
| Adaptive Leadership Through Informal Networks | Leadership occurs through informal, emergent networks where adaptation and creativity take place without formal control. | Uhl-Bien et al. (2007) |
| Informal Systems and Adaptive Capacity | The interplay between formal and informal systems creates the adaptive capacity of organizations, with leadership emerging from informal structures. | Crozier (1964), Roethlisberger & Dickson (1939) |
| Complex Feedback Mechanisms | Leaders manage complex feedback loops within systems, where both positive and negative feedback drive adaptation and system behavior. | Mitleton-Kelly (2003), Brown & Eisenhardt (1997) |
| CAS (Complex Adaptive Systems) Leadership | Leadership is a dynamic process within complex adaptive systems (CAS), focusing on enabling adaptive behaviors and responses to change. | Boal & Schultz (2007), Uhl-Bien et al. (2007) |
| Emergence Through Interdependence | Leadership emerges through the interdependence of agents in complex systems, where collective actions arise to address shared needs or goals. | Uhl-Bien et al. (2007), Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001) |
| Complexity and Ambiguity in Decision Making | Leaders in complex systems must navigate ambiguity and complexity, often making decisions based on partial or emerging information. | Lord et al. (2011), Stacey (2003) |
| Complex Leadership and Innovation | Leadership in complex systems fosters innovation by creating environments that allow for the emergence of new ideas and adaptive solutions. | Plowman et al. (2007), Uhl-Bien et al. (2007) |

| CONCEPT | DESCRIPTION | SOURCE(S) |
|---|---|---|
| Meso-Level Leadership Dynamics | Leadership operates at the meso-level in organizations, where micro-level interactions lead to macro-level adaptations and system-wide behaviors. | Boal & Schlultz (2007), Uhl-Bien et al. (2007) |
| Enabling Adaptive Systems | Leaders create the conditions that enable systems to adapt dynamically, fostering resilience and responsiveness to environmental changes. | Uhl-Bien et al. (2007) |
| Adaptive Leadership and Complexity Science | Leadership in complex systems is grounded in complexity science, where emergent behaviors and self-organization drive system performance. | Cilliers (1998), Uhl-Bien et a |

**TABLE 4**
**COMPARISON OF COMPLEXITY LEADERSHIP TOPICS**

| ASPECT | COMPLEX ADAPTIVE LEADERSHIP THEORY (CALT) | COMPLEXITY LEADERSHIP THEORY (CLT) | ADAPTIVE LEADERSHIP THEORY (ALT) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Leadership Focus | Leadership emerges through self-organization and complex interactions within the system. The role of the leader is to facilitate emergence rather than direct action. Non-agentic leadership emerges from collective dynamics. Sources: Cilliers (1998), Kauffman (1993), Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001) | CLT focuses on how leaders enable adaptability within organizations, balancing administrative (formal) and adaptive (informal) leadership. The entanglement of these forms is critical to CLT. Sources: Uhl-Bien et al. (2007), Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001), Boal & Schlultz (2007) | ALT emphasizes individual leaders navigating adaptive challenges. Leaders diagnose the situation and mobilize people to solve complex problems. It is leader-centric and action-oriented, focusing on individual roles in facilitating change. Sources: Heifetz & Linsky (2002), Heifetz (1994), Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky (2009) |
| Role of Leadership | Leaders facilitate self-organization and act as enablers of criticality, guiding the system at the edge of chaos where adaptation happens. Sources: Kauffman (1993), Cilliers (1998), Stacey (1996) | Leaders in CLT enable the organization's adaptive capacity by fostering conditions for emergence while balancing administrative leadership to maintain order. Sources: Uhl-Bien et al. (2007), Boal & Schlultz (2007), Stacey (2003) | ALT focuses on diagnosing adaptive challenges and mobilizing people. Leadership is about engaging people to address complex, value-laden problems and orchestrating conflict for productive purposes. Sources: Heifetz (1994), Heifetz & Linsky (2002), Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky (2009) |

| ASPECT | COMPLEX ADAPTIVE LEADERSHIP THEORY (CALT) | COMPLEXITY LEADERSHIP THEORY (CLT) | ADAPTIVE LEADERSHIP THEORY (ALT) |
|---|---|---|---|
| System Perspective | CALT emphasizes complex adaptive systems (CAS), where leadership is an emergent phenomenon that arises through the interactions of agents within the system. Leadership is decentralized and non-hierarchical. Sources: Kauffman (1993), Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001), Cilliers (1998) | CLT considers leadership as both top-down and bottom-up, where formal hierarchical structures and informal emergent leadership coexist and interact. Leadership emerges from interdependent networks within organizations. Sources: Uhl-Bien et al. (2007), Dooley et al. (2007), Cilliers (1998) | ALT emphasizes the individual leader's role within the system, focusing on the need for adaptive responses to complex challenges that require behavior changes rather than technical solutions. It is more hierarchical, with leaders diagnosing and acting. Sources: Heifetz (1994), Heifetz & Linsky (2002), Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky (2009) |
| Action vs. Emergence | Leadership is emergent and decentralized, arising naturally from the system's dynamics. Leadership actions are not directed; they emerge from non-agentic processes that guide the system. Sources: Cilliers (1998), Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001), Kauffman (1993) | Leadership is a combination of action and emergence, where formal leaders create enabling conditions for emergent leadership to arise. Leaders balance adaptive (emergent) and administrative (formal) functions. Sources: Uhl-Bien et al. (2007), Dooley et al. (2007), Boal & Schlultz (2007) | ALT emphasizes deliberate, agentic action by leaders to diagnose and resolve adaptive challenges. It is more action-oriented than emergence-based, with a focus on leadership driving change. Sources: Heifetz (1994), Heifetz & Linsky (2002), Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky (2009) |
| Central Concepts | Self-organization, criticality, and non-agentic dynamics are key. Leadership is about facilitating emergence and operating at the edge of chaos. Sources: Kauffman (1993), Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001), Cilliers (1998) | The core concepts include entanglement between administrative (formal) and adaptive (emergent) leadership, interdependence, and creating enabling conditions for adaptation. Sources: Uhl-Bien et al. (2007), Boal & Schlultz (2007), Stacey (2003), Dooley et al. (2007) | Central concepts include adaptive challenges, diagnosis, mobilization of people, and conflict orchestration. ALT focuses on how leaders tackle complex problems requiring adaptive work rather than technical solutions. Sources: Heifetz (1994), Heifetz & Linsky (2002), Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky (2009) |

| ASPECT | COMPLEX ADAPTIVE LEADERSHIP THEORY (CALT) | COMPLEXITY LEADERSHIP THEORY (CLT) | ADAPTIVE LEADERSHIP THEORY (ALT) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Leadership's Role in Change | Leaders are facilitators of emergent processes and allow for self-organization. They guide the system at critical points, such as tipping points or phase transitions, to foster adaptation. Sources: Kauffman (1993), Stacey (1996), Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001) | Leaders balance formal administrative roles with emergent leadership to create the conditions for adaptive change. They enable the system to adapt by fostering emergent behaviors while maintaining organizational coherence. Sources: Uhl-Bien et al. (2007), Boal & Schlultz (2007), Stacey (2003) | ALT leaders are change agents who diagnose adaptive challenges and lead people through change by mobilizing followers, engaging them in adaptive work, and orchestrating productive conflict. Sources: Heifetz (1994), Heifetz & Linsky (2002), Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky (2009) |
| Hierarchy and Authority | CALT is typically non-hierarchical, focusing on distributed leadership and emergence. Leadership is not vested in formal positions but arises from collective dynamics. Sources: Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001), Cilliers (1998) | CLT involves a balance of formal (hierarchical) leadership with informal (emergent) leadership. Leadership occurs across multiple levels and is both top-down and bottom-up. Sources: Uhl-Bien et al. (2007), Boal & Schlultz (2007) | ALT is more leader-centric, where individual leaders play a central role in diagnosing and solving adaptive challenges. It tends to focus more on hierarchical relationships and formal roles within organizations. Sources: Heifetz (1994), Heifetz & Linsky (2002), Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky (2009) |
| Nature of Leadership | Leadership is emergent and collective, arising from interactions within the system. The system adapts through self-organization without centralized control. Sources: Kauffman (1993), Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001), Cilliers (1998) | CLT views leadership as occurring at the intersection of formal and informal dynamics. Leaders foster interdependence and create enabling conditions for emergent behaviors to occur within the system. Sources: Uhl-Bien et al. (2007), Dooley et al. (2007), Boal & Schlultz (2007) | Leadership is about the individual leader's role in guiding the organization through adaptive challenges. Leaders are responsible for engaging others in the process of change, solving problems, and achieving adaptive goals. Sources: Heifetz (1994), Heifetz & Linsky (2002), Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky (2009) |

| ASPECT | COMPLEX ADAPTIVE LEADERSHIP THEORY (CALT) | COMPLEXITY LEADERSHIP THEORY (CLT) | ADAPTIVE LEADERSHIP THEORY (ALT) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Role of Feedback | Feedback loops guide system behavior and adaptation. Leaders manage the system's self-regulation through complex feedback mechanisms. Sources: Stacey (1996), Kauffman (1993), Cilliers (1998) | Feedback is a key part of CLT, as leaders facilitate adaptive capacity through feedback mechanisms that allow for ongoing adjustments and learning. Sources: Uhl-Bien et al. (2007), Boal & Schlultz (2007), Cilliers (1998) | Feedback is used by leaders to diagnose adaptive challenges and engage people in solving them. Leaders use feedback to identify resistance, guide adaptation, and monitor progress in solving complex problems. Sources: Heifetz (1994), Heifetz & Linsky (2002), Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky (2009) |

## DISCUSSION

The findings highlighted significant advancements in leadership theory over the third decade of complexity leadership research (2003–2012). During this time, the field evolved from traditional leader-centric models to more adaptive, emergent, and distributed frameworks, driven by significant socio-economic and technological changes. This discussion explores these findings in the context of historical influences on theory development, inferences on why the theory evolved in the way it did, and potential avenues for future research based on the literature reviewed.

### Historical Context and Theoretical Evolution

The third decade of complexity leadership theory, from 2003 to 2012, was marked by a notable shift from traditional, leader-centric models to more adaptive, emergent frameworks. These new models responded to the increasing complexity of organizational environments driven by technological advancements, globalization, and economic disruptions. Early leadership models in the 1980s and 1990s primarily focused on leader-follower dynamics and hierarchical control, which became inadequate in addressing the emerging challenges of volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) contexts (Stacey, 1995; Wheatley, 1999; Waldrop, 1992).

The rise of complexity leadership theory, as articulated by Uhl-Bien, Marion, and McKelvey (2007), recognized organizations as complex adaptive systems (CAS). This perspective shifted the focus from individual leadership traits to systems' dynamic, interactive processes (Axelrod & Cohen, 2000). As they suggested, leadership effectiveness became contingent upon fostering emergence, feedback loops, and adaptive capacity within the organization (Cilliers, 1998; Prigogine, 1997). By the mid-2000s, the predictions from previous decades about globalization and technological disruption materialized, underscoring the need for new leadership paradigms capable of navigating complex, rapidly changing environments (Senge, 2000).

During this decade, empirical research began to solidify the previously theorized concepts of complexity leadership. For example, leadership was increasingly viewed as a process, rather than a position of authority, allowing for self-organization, distributed cognition, and adaptive behaviors across organizations (Boal & Schultz, 2007; Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky, 2009). Research during this time highlighted the importance of leaders acting as facilitators rather than traditional authority figures, enabling teams to respond to challenges by leveraging collective intelligence and emergent solutions (Lichtenstein, 2000; Goldstein, 2007).

This evolution in leadership thinking was driven by the growing complexity of global markets and the need for continuous innovation. Complexity leadership theory provided a framework emphasizing the importance of fostering adaptive capacities, enabling organizations to remain resilient in the face of rapid change (Lewin, 1992; Gunderson & Holling, 2002). As a result, leadership practices during this period became more holistic, recognizing the interconnectedness of systems and the role of leaders in facilitating conditions for emergence and adaptability (Capra, 2002; Brown & Eisenhardt, 1997).

The third decade laid the groundwork for a richer understanding of complexity leadership, combining theoretical advancements with practical applications. These developments set the stage for further exploration of how organizations could effectively harness complexity to drive innovation, learning, and long-term success (Hazy, 2006).

**Inferences on the Evolution of Complexity Leadership Theory**

Why did complexity leadership theory evolve as it did during this period? One possible inference is that the theory evolved in response to the growing recognition that traditional hierarchical models were increasingly inadequate for handling complexity. Leaders in this era were required to navigate environments characterized by rapid technological advancements and the need for innovation (Axelrod & Cohen, 1999; Anderson, 1999). As organizational structures flattened, leadership had to be less about authority and more about enabling networks of people to self-organize and adapt (Wheatley, 2006; Griffin, 2002).

The literature supports this shift. Uhl-Bien and Marion (2009) argued for the necessity of leaders to act as enablers of emergent processes, focusing on creating conditions that allowed for self-organization rather than imposing solutions (Boisot, 2003). This evolution can also be traced back to the influence of complexity science, which revealed that systems function best when leaders manage the conditions for emergence, rather than attempting to control outcomes (Kauffman, 1995; Cilliers, 1998).

In sum, the third decade saw leadership theory evolve in ways that mirrored the growing complexity of the organizational and technological environment. Leadership became less about directing outcomes and more about navigating and leveraging complex interactions within systems (Stacey, 2007; Hazy, 2006).

**Future Research**

Based on the reviewed literature, several authors have suggested future research directions for complexity leadership theory. These suggestions reflect the need for further exploration into adaptive leadership and its real-world applications:

Emergence and Adaptive Leadership: Authors such as Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001) and Goldstein (2007) suggested that further research explore the conditions under which leadership emerges in complex adaptive systems. Gronn (2002) and Ibarra & Hunter (2007) recommended investigating network dynamics, such as how formal and informal interactions shape emergent leadership behaviors, particularly in team environments. With the growing prevalence of virtual teams, Bligh (2006) suggested that studying how leadership emerges in digital and remote environments could yield important insights for modern organizations.

Balancing Control and Adaptability: Heifetz (1994) and Dooley et al. (2007) indicated a need for examining how organizations maintain the balance between structure and adaptability, especially in industries where creativity and compliance coexist. Authors such as Eisenhardt (1989) and Holland (2002) pointed out that understanding the balance between autonomy and control in complex adaptive systems is crucial, particularly as organizations transition from hierarchical to networked models. Stacey (2003) highlighted that further studies should examine these systems' thresholds of autonomy and control.

Organizational Resilience: Gunderson & Holling (2002) and Lichtenstein (2000) suggested exploring the link between complex adaptive leadership and organizational resilience. They noted that while adaptive leadership is effective during crises, there is a gap in understanding its impact on long-term resilience and innovation. Bradbury (2003) emphasized the importance of longitudinal studies to track the sustainability of adaptive leadership principles, while Boisot (2003) suggested further investigation into how these principles affect performance over time.

Context-Specific Applications: Authors such as Bennis & Thomas (2002) and Black et al. (1999) emphasized expanding complexity leadership theory across different sectors and cultural contexts. While most studies have focused on knowledge-intensive industries, there is a need for research on how adaptive leadership manifests in healthcare, manufacturing, and other sectors (Lewin, 1992). Black et al. (1999) also pointed to the role of cultural differences in shaping adaptive leadership behaviors in global organizations.

Technology and Leadership: Bligh (2006) and Cusumano (2001) highlighted that the role of technology in enabling or constraining adaptive leadership deserves further attention. Kelly & Allison (1999) noted that digital platforms, collaboration tools, and artificial intelligence can influence leadership emergence and decision-making in complex systems. Axelrod & Cohen (1999) suggested further research into how technology supports or hinders adaptive capacities in distributed teams and digital environments.

Leadership Development: Capra (2002) and Cacioppe (2000a) recommended examining the effectiveness of leadership development programs to enhance cognitive flexibility, systems thinking, and emotional intelligence in complex systems. Manz & Sims (2001) suggested that exploring the training interventions that foster adaptive leadership behaviors would be critical to improving leadership in dynamic and complex environments.

### Limitations

This study focused on a specific period (2003–2012) in developing complexity leadership theory, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to the broader evolution of the field. The reliance on secondary literature, particularly key sources from this period, may have introduced bias, as some perspectives may have been underrepresented. Additionally, the complexity of leadership within certain cultural or industrial contexts was not comprehensively explored, limiting the scope of application to specific sectors.

### Delimitations

The study deliberately concentrated on complexity leadership theory within the timeframe of its third decade to provide a more focused historical analysis. The research excluded leadership models outside of the complexity framework, such as transformational or transactional leadership, as well as empirical case studies, to maintain a theoretical focus on the evolution of complexity leadership. The study also did not address developments in complexity leadership post-2012, leaving this for future exploration.

## CONCLUSION

The third decade of complexity leadership research marked a significant shift from traditional leader-centric models to more adaptive, emergent, and distributed frameworks. This evolution addressed the increasing demand for leadership models capable of navigating the complexities of VUCA (volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous) environments. Our analysis revealed that key concepts such as self-organization, distributed cognition, and reflexivity became essential to effective leadership in complex systems. These findings reinforced the theoretical advancements of complexity leadership and provided practical insights for fostering innovation, resilience, and adaptability in organizations.

As we look ahead, applying complexity leadership across diverse contexts—ranging from crisis management to community development and innovation—underscores the framework's versatility and growing relevance. However, the rapidly evolving nature of global challenges, including technological disruption and shifting societal expectations, highlights the need for further empirical research. Future studies should focus on operationalizing complexity leadership principles across various industries, leadership levels, and cultural contexts. Additionally, there is a growing opportunity to develop tools that measure complexity leadership's real-time application and outcomes, bridging the gap between theory and practice.

In conclusion, complexity leadership offers a powerful framework for navigating the interconnected and unpredictable realities modern organizations face. As leadership continues to evolve, scholars and practitioners must embrace the challenges and opportunities of complexity. By fostering adaptive leadership practices, organizations can respond to change and actively shape the future of work. Continued research

and practical application of complexity leadership principles will ensure leaders remain agile in a world that demands continuous transformation.

## REFERENCES


Abraham, R. (1994). *Chaos, Gaia, Eros: A Chaos Pioneer Uncovers the Three Great Streams of History*. Harper San Francisco.

Ahem, P. (2009). Serving the Led: Democratic Options for a Nigerian Village. *International Journal of Servant Leadership, 5*(1), 223–242.

Anderson, P. (1999). Complexity theory and organization science. *Organization Science, 10*(3), 216–232. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.10.3.216

Axelrod, R., & Cohen, M.D. (1999). *Harnessing complexity: Organizational implications of a scientific frontier*. Free Press.

Axelrod, R., & Cohen, M.D. (2000). *Harnessing complexity: Organizational implications of a scientific frontier*. Basic Books.

Baker, E., Kan, M., & Teo, S. (2011). Developing a collaborative network organization: Leadership challenges at multiple levels. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 24*(6), 853–875.

Bazeley, P. (2009). Editorial: Integrating data analyses in mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 3*(3), 203–207.

Bligh, M., Pearce, C., & Kohles, J. (2006). The importance of self and shared leadership in team based knowledge work: A meso-level model of leadership dynamics. *Journal of Management Psychology, 21*(4), 296–318.

Boal, K.B., & Schultz, P.L. (2007). Storytelling, time, and evolution: The role of strategic leadership in complex adaptive systems. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(4), 411–428. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.04.008

Boisot, M. (2003). *Explorations in information space: Knowledge, agents, and organization*. Oxford University Press.

Bolden, R., & Gosling, J. (2006). Leadership Competencies: Time to Change the Tune? *Leadership, 2*(2), 147–163.

Bradbury, H., & Lichtenstein, B.M.B. (2000). Relationality in organizational research: Exploring the space between. *Organization Science, 11*(5), 551–564. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.11.5.551.15203

Bradbury, H. (2003). *Learning with the natural step: Action research to promote conversations for sustainable development*. Sage.

Branson, C. (2008). Finding a philosophical framework in support of "Presence". *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal, 30*(3), 224–239.

Brookes, S. (2011). Crisis, confidence, and collectivity: Responding to the new public leadership challenge. *Leadership, 7*(2), 175–194.

Brown, B. (2012). Leading complex change with post-conventional consciousness. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 25*(4), 560–575.

Capra, F. (2002). *The hidden connections: Integrating the biological, cognitive, and social dimensions of life into a science of sustainability*. Doubleday.

Child, J., & Rodrigues, S. (2011). How organizations engage with external complexity: A political action perspective. *Organization Studies, 32*(6), 803–824.

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

Currie, G., & Lockett, A. (2011). Distributing leadership in health and social care: Concertive, conjoint, or collective? *International Journal of Management Reviews, 13*, 286–300

Chadwick, M. (2010). *AORN Journal, 19*, No 1.

Drath, W., McCauley, C., Palus, C., Velsor, E., O'Conner, P., & McGuire, J. (2008). Direction, alignment, commitment: Toward a more integrated ontology of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*, 635–653

Darling, J., & Utecht, R. (2010). Leadership responsiveness to the key in an era of socioeconomic stress. *Organization Development Journal*, *28*(3), 47

Darling, J., & Heller, V. (2011). The key for effective stress management: Importance of responsive leadership in organizational development. *Organizational Development Journal*, *29*(1), 9

DeRue, S. (2011). Adaptive Leadership Theory: Leading and Following as a Complex Adaptive Process. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *31*, 125–150

Dervitsiotis, K. (2012) An innovation-based approach for coping with increasing complexity in the global economy. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, *23*(9-10), 997–1011

Desai, D. (2010). Co-creating Learning: Insights from Complexity Theory. *The Learning Organization*, *17*(5), 388–403

Earnhardt, M.P., Watkins, D.V., & Walker, S.M. (2022). Complexity leadership: The first two decades. *Journal of Leadership Accountability and Ethics*, *19*(3), 22–38.

Edson, M. (2012). A complex adaptive systems view of resilience in team projects. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, *29*, 499–516

Elo, S., & Kyngas, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *62*(1), 107–115. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x

Ford, R. (2009). Complex adaptive leadership and open-processional change processes. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, *31*(5), 420–435

Guimaraes, T. (2011). Industry Clockspeed's Impact on Business Innovation Success Factors. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, *14*(3), 322–344

Gibney, J., Copeland, S., & Murie, A. (2009). Toward a "new" strategic leadership of place for the knowledge-based economy. *Leadership*, *5*(1), 5–23

Goldstein, J. (2007). A new model of emergence and its leadership implications. *Emergence: Complexity and Organization*, *9*(4), 23–34.

Gravells, J. (2006) The myth of change management: A reflection on personal change and its lessons for leadership development. *Human Resource Development International*, *9*(2), 283–2

Griffin, D. (2002). *The emergence of leadership: Linking self-organization and ethics*. Routledge.

Good, D. & Sharma. (2010). A little more rigidity: Firming the construct of leader flexibility, *Journal of Change Management*, *10*(2), 155–174

Gunderson, L.H., & Holling, C.S. (2002). *Panarchy: Understanding transformations in human and natural systems*. Island Press.

Hannah, S., Uhl-Bien, M., Avolio, B., & Cavarretta, F. (2009). A framework for examining leadership in extreme contexts. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *20*, 897–919

Hannah, S., Lord, R., & Pearce, C. (2011). Leadership and collective requisite complexity. *Organizational Psychology Review*, *1*(3), 215–238

Hazy, J.K. (2006). Measuring leadership effectiveness in complex socio-technical systems. *Emergence: Complexity and Organization*, *8*(2), 58–77.

Heifetz, R.A., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership: Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world*. Harvard Business Press.

Hogan, T. (2008). The Adaptive Leadership Maturity Model. *Organizational Development Journal*, *26*(1), 65

Horton-Deutsch, S., Young, P., & Nelson, K. (2010). Becoming a nurse faculty leader: Facing challenges through reflecting, persevering, and relating in new ways. *Journal of Nursing Management*, *18*, 487–493

Houghton, J., & Yoho, S. (2005). Toward a contingency model of leadership and psychological empowerment. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, *11*(4).

Howell, J.M., Shea, C.M., & Higgins, C.A. (2005). Champions of product innovations: Defining, developing, and validating a measure of champion behavior. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *20*(5), 641–661.

Kauffman, S.A. (1995). *At home in the universe: The search for laws of self-organization and complexity*. Oxford University Press.

Kerfoot, K. (2009). Leading in times of turmoil: Adaptation when there are no easy answers. *Nursing Economics*, *27*.
Kim, J., & Wilemon, D. (2009) An empirical investigation of complexity and its management in new product development, *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, *21*(4), 547–564
Kean, S., Haycock-Stuart, E., Baggeley, S., & Carsen, M. (2011). Followers and the co-construction of leadership. *Journal of Nursing Management*, *19*, 507–516
Kinicki, A., Jacobson, K., Galvin, B., & Prussia, G. (2011). A multilevel systems model of leadership. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, *18*(2), 133–149
Kupers, W., & Weibler, J. (2008). Inter-Leadership: Why and how should we think of leadership and followership integrally? *Leadership*, *4*(4), 443–475
Lane, D., & Down, M. (2010). The art of managing for the future: leadership of turbulence. *Management Decisions*, *48*(4), 512–527
Lauser, B. (2008). Post-merger integration and change processes from a complexity perspective. *Baltic Journal of Management*, *5*(1), 6–27
Leavy, B. (2011). Leading adaptive change by harnessing the power of positive deviance. *Strategy and Leadership*, *39*(2), 18–27
Lewin, R. (1992). *Complexity: Life at the edge of chaos*. Macmillan.
Lichtenstein, B.M.B. (2000). Self-organized transitions: A pattern amid the chaos of transformative change. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *14*(4), 128–141. https://doi.org/10.5465/AME.2000.3979821
Lord, R., Hannah, S., & Jennings, P. (2011). A Framework for Understanding Leadership and Individual Requisite Complexity. *Organizational Psychology Review*, *1*(2), 104–127
Maak, T., & Pless, N. (2006). Responsible Leadership in a Stakeholder Society: A Relational Perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *66*, 99–115
MacGillivary, A. (2010). Leadership in a network of communities: A phenomenological study. *The Learning Organization*, *17*(1), 24–40
Maguire, S., & McKelvey, B. (1999). Complexity and management: Moving from fad to firm foundations. *Emergence*, *1*(2), 19–61.
Muffet-Willett, S., & Kruse, S. (2008). Crisis leadership: Past research and future directions. *Journal of Business Continuity and Emergency Planning*, *3*(3), 248–258
Nooteboom, S., & Marks, P. (2010). Adaptive networks as second order governance systems. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, *27*, 61–69
Osborn, R., & Marion, R. (2009). Contextual leadership, transformational leadership, and the performance of international innovation seeking alliances. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *20*, 191–206
Paraskevas, A. (2006). Crisis management or crisis response system? A complexity science approach to organizational crisis. *Management decisions*, *44*(7), 892–907
Painter-Morland, M. (2008). Systemic leadership and emergence of ethical responsiveness. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *82*, 509–524
Plowman, D.A., & Duchon, D. (2007). Emergent leadership: Getting beyond heroes and scapegoats. In J. K. Hazy, J.A. Goldstein, & B.B. Lichtenstein (Eds.), *Complex Systems Leadership Theory*, 109–127. ISCE Publishing.
Plowman, D.A., Solansky, S., Beck, T.E., Baker, L., Kulkarni, M., & Travis, D.V. (2007). The role of leadership in emergent, self-organization. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *18*(4), 341–356. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.04.004
Porter, T., & Derry, R. (2012). Sustainability and business in a complex world. *Business and Society Review*, *117*(1), 33–53
Prigogine, I. (1997). *The end of certainty: Time, chaos, and the new laws of nature*. Free Press.
Randall, L., & Coakley, L. (2006). Applying adaptive leadership to successful change initiatives in academia. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *28*(4), 325–335.

Raghavendran, S., & Rajagopalan, P. (2011). Sensemaking of complexity: Leadership in financial services. *Journal of Business Strategy*, *32*(3), 19–28
Rowland, G. (2007). The challenge of the new science: A primer on complexity. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, *20*(2) 9–20
Saari, E., & Taljia, H. (2009). Towards communication and learning based leadership. *The Learning Organization*, *16*(3), 251–260
Scott, E. (2010). Perspectives on healthcare leader and leadership development. *Journal of Healthcare Leadership*, *2*, 83–90
Senge, P.M. (2000). *The fifth discipline: The art & practice of the learning organization*. Doubleday.
Shondrick, S., Dihn, J., & Lord, R. (2010). Developments in implicit leadership theory and cognitive science: Applications to improving measurement and understanding alternatives to hierarchical leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *21*, 959–978
Service, R. (2012). Leadership and innovation across cultures: The CIQ-contextual intelligence quotient. *Southern Business Review.*
Siira, K. (2012). Conceptualizing managerial influence in organizational conflict: A qualitative examination. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, *5*(2), 182–209
Stames, P. (2010). A leadership credo for times of uncertainty and change. *Journal of Psychological Issues in Organizational Culture*, *1*(2).
Shalley, C., Zhou, J., & Oldham, G. (2004). The effects of personal and contextual characteristics on creativity: Where should we go from here? *Journal of Management*, *30*(9) 933–958
Simpson, P. (2006). Organizing in the mist: A case study in leadership and complexity. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, *28*(5), 465–482
Stacey, R.D. (1995). *Strategic management and organisational dynamics*. Pitman Publishing.
Storey, J. (2005). What Next for Strategic-Level Leadership Research? *Leadership*, *1*(1)
Sundgren, M. (2006). Leadership as De-paradoxification: Leading new drug development at three pharmaceutical companies. *Leadership*, *2*(1), 31–52
Taylor, A., Cocklin, C., Brown, R., & Wilson-Evered, E. (2011). an investigation of champion-driven leadership processes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *22*, 412–433
Teisman, G., & Edelenbos, J. (2011). Towards a perspective of system synchronization in water governance *International Review of Administrative Science*, *77*(1), 101–118
Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., & McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity leadership theory: Shifting Leadership from the Industrial Age to the Knowledge Era. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *18*(2), 298–318
Uhl-Bien, M., & Marion, R. (2009). Complexity leadership in bureaucratic forms of organizing: A meso model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *20*, 631–650
Waldrop, M.M. (1992). *Complexity: The emerging science at the edge of order and chaos*. Simon & Schuster.
Wakefield, R., Leidner, D., & Garrison, G. (2008). A model of conflict, leadership, and performance in virtual teams. *Information Systems Research*, *19*(4), 434–455.
Wheatley, M.J. (1999). *Leadership and the new science: Discovering order in a chaotic world* (2nd ed.). Berrett-Koehler Publishers.