

Leadership Under Extreme Conditions: A Human Resource Analysis of Ernest Shackleton's Expedition

Nadia Z. Humbert-Labeaumaz

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Abstract | 2 |
| Introduction | 3 |
| Background: Timeline of the Expedition | 4 |
| Methodology | 5 |
| Findings and Analysis | 6 |
| Leading | 6 |
| Supporting | 8 |
| Improving Capabilities | 10 |
| Discussion | 13 |
| Recommendations | 13 |
| Leading by Example | 14 |
| Implementing a No Blame Culture | 14 |
| Encouraging Feedback | 15 |
| Increasing Transparency | 15 |
| Identifying Future Needs | 15 |
| Delegating | 16 |
| Summary | 16 |
| Conclusion | 17 |
| References | 18 |

Abstract

This paper analyzes Sir Ernest Shackleton's leadership during the Imperial Trans-Antarctic Expedition through a human resource management lens, using the Investors in People framework. Despite the expedition's failure to achieve its original goals, Shackleton's people management turned a potential tragedy into a historic example of leadership under extreme adversity. The analysis reveals a high degree of maturity in inspiring and motivating people, fostering trust, and maintaining morale through transparency and empathy. However, the assessment also highlights critical gaps in delegation, leadership development, and participative decision-making. Shackleton's approach is ultimately characterized by emotional intelligence, adaptability, and resilience, yet constrained by overcontrol and insufficient foresight. The paper concludes with actionable recommendations to strengthen empowerment, feedback culture, and transparency — insights that remain highly relevant for contemporary leaders navigating crisis, uncertainty, and complexity in organizational environments.

Introduction

In 1911, Norwegian explorer Roald Amundsen reached the South Pole ahead of Britain's Robert Falcon Scott, who died in the attempt. It was a massive setback for the British, who had dominated the exploration world up to that point. Eager to restore their reputation, Sir Ernest Shackleton launched the *Imperial Trans-Antarctic Expedition* (ITAE) in 1914 with 27 other crew members, aiming to cross the continent from sea to sea. At the dawn of World War I, this ill-fated expedition marked the end of the great era of polar exploration.

More than a century later, Shackleton's expedition is widely studied as a case of crisis leadership and remains highly relevant in today's uncertain, rapidly changing world. Although the mission failed, he brought every crew member home alive, a testament to his remarkable physical, psychological, and organizational adaptability under extreme conditions.

This report uses Shackleton's expedition to explore how leadership behaviours can shape a team's risk posture and its exposure to upside and downside in environments dominated by uncertainty. To structure this analysis, the report uses the Investors in People (IiP) framework as an analytical structure, grouping observed behaviours across key people-management indicators to surface patterns that illuminate how leaders influence possibilities under extreme conditions.

Background: Timeline of the Expedition

1914 – Departure

Sir Ernest Shackleton set sail aboard the Endurance with 27 men, aiming to cross Antarctica from the Weddell Sea to the Ross Sea. The expedition departed London in August 1914, shortly after the outbreak of World War I.

January 1915 – Trapped in Ice

While navigating the Weddell Sea, the Endurance became trapped in pack ice before ever reaching the continent. For months, Shackleton maintained morale through routine, optimism, and direct engagement with the crew to prevent psychological decline during prolonged immobility.

October–November 1915 – Leaving the Ship

After being crushed by the ice, the Endurance sank on 21 November 1915. Shackleton ordered the men to establish Ocean Camp on the ice and reframed the mission to focus on survival and returning home. He led by example, sharing rations and hardships equally to reinforce solidarity and fairness.

April 1916 – The Open-Boat Journey

As the ice broke apart, the crew launched three lifeboats and reached Elephant Island. Knowing rescue was unlikely, Shackleton selected five men to accompany him on an 800-mile journey across the stormy Southern Ocean in the 22-foot James Caird to reach the whaling stations of South Georgia, one of the most demanding small-boat voyages in recorded history.

May 1916 – Crossing South Georgia

After two weeks at sea, Shackleton's team landed on South Georgia's uninhabited coast. Shackleton, Worsley, and Crean then trekked for 36 hours across the island's glaciers to reach help at Stromness Station without maps, rest, or proper mountaineering equipment.

August 1916 – Rescue of the Crew

Following several failed attempts blocked by sea ice, Shackleton finally rescued all 22 men stranded on Elephant Island on 30 August 1916. Every crew member survived after nearly two years of isolation.

1917 – Return to England

The crew returned to England amid World War I. Though the expedition never achieved its geographic objective, Shackleton's leadership became a timeless model of resilience, morale management, and crisis navigation, continuing to inform modern leadership research.

Methodology

This paper uses the Investors in People (IiP) framework to structure the analysis of Shackleton's leadership and people practices during the Imperial Trans-Antarctic Expedition (1914–1917), organising the evidence into clear themes that support a focused and coherent examination of his behavioural patterns.

The framework is organized around three main pillars:

- **Leading** – how leaders inspire, motivate, and provide direction.
- **Supporting** – how people are empowered, involved, and trusted to perform.
- **Improving** – how the organization builds capability and continuously develops its people.

Each pillar includes a set of indicators described across five maturity levels:

- Not met
- Developed – in place and understood
- Established – engaging and activating
- Advanced – generating positive outcomes
- High-Performing – embedded and always improving

Shackleton's leadership behaviours and decisions are analyzed qualitatively against these indicators. Evidence is drawn from documented accounts by expedition members and biographical sources to classify Shackleton's "organization" (the Endurance crew) within each area based on observed behaviours. This structured approach allows historical leadership behaviours to be examined systematically without equating outcomes with correctness or causal effectiveness, supporting the extraction of broader insights about leadership practice under extreme uncertainty.

All facts in this report are extracted from a series of books written by, or based upon the writings of, members of the expedition: (Alexander, 1998), (Fisher & Fisher, 1957), (Huntford, 1975), (Hurrey, 1948), (Hussey, 1949), (Lansing, 1959), (Mill, 1923), (Orde-Lees, 1916), (Shackleton, 1919), (Smith, 2015), (Worsley, 1924) and (Worsley, 1931).

Findings and Analysis

Leading

Creating Transparency and Trust

The objectives of the ITAE were unambiguous and outcomes-oriented: cross Antarctica from the Weddell Sea to the Ross Sea, document the journey, and restore Britain's polar prestige (The Times, 29 December 1913).

Shackleton reinforced this clarity by consistently providing a coherent vision to his crew, from recruitment onward. Even if his famous newspaper advertisement is likely apocryphal, its spirit captures his approach: “*Men wanted for hazardous journey. Low wages, bitter cold, long hours of complete darkness. Safe return doubtful. Honour and recognition in event of success*” (Watkins, 1949). Shackleton received many applications and deliberately filtered out the “mad” and “hopeless” applicants who did not fit the culture he intended to build. Moreover, his transparency increased as conditions deteriorated. When it became clear the expedition had shifted from exploration to survival, Shackleton reframed the mission’s purpose with equal clarity: return to civilization alive.

Trust-building came primarily through Shackleton’s personal engagement. He spoke individually with crew members, showed genuine interest in their strengths, and consistently placed their welfare above his own. This behaviour generated extraordinary loyalty and trust. As Worsley later wrote in 1931, “*We would have gone anywhere with him without question just on his order.*” Such devotion is not accidental; it reflects a durable pattern of relational leadership built on credibility, fairness, and emotional awareness.

As a result, crew members accepted high-risk decisions with remarkable confidence, such as sliding down a South Georgia slope in the cold and dark, because they inferred reassurance, competence, and benevolence from their leader’s past behaviour. The crew’s later willingness to rejoin him on future expeditions further illustrates the depth of this trust, showing a durable form of trust capital, not situational compliance.

From a human-resource perspective, Shackleton’s approach demonstrated “**High-performing**” maturity level in clarity, consistency, and relational reliability.

Motivating People to Deliver the Organization's Objectives

Shackleton recruited most of his men within minutes of meeting them, so it is unlikely that the crew began the expedition with an in-depth understanding of the mission's objectives. However, once on board, he compensated for this initial gap by communicating goals clearly and ensuring the crew understood what they needed to do to achieve them. A clear example is how the men immediately jumped overboard with picks and shovels when a crack appeared in the ice, enlarging it to free the ship and reach open water. They also recognized the lifeboats as their "*ultimate salvation*", demonstrating alignment between stated purpose and operational behaviour.

A distinctive strength of Shackleton's approach was his reliance on observable evidence rather than authority alone. He routinely measured distances, calculated food requirements, and adjusted course accordingly, modelling a literal version of the PDCA (Plan–Do–Check–Adjust) cycle. This rational framing increased understanding and reduced ambiguity, enabling commitment even under extreme uncertainty.

Shackleton also motivated his team by addressing their fundamental needs: physiological, safety, love and self-esteem (Maslow, 1943). He recognised that in a survival context, psychological stability was a prerequisite for physical endurance. His practice of serving hot meals whenever a man showed signs of weakness, without revealing who was struggling, preserved dignity while restoring morale. When the ship was abandoned, Shackleton managed the emotional transition with equal care: raising awareness, easing acceptance, reducing anxiety by stepping beyond his formal role, and providing reassurance through constant presence and optimism. Eventually, the crew internalised and embraced their new mission of returning home by other means.

His influence extended far beyond routine motivation. Through emotional containment, personal courage, and relentless optimism, he inspired performance well outside normal human limits. The 36-hour crossing of South Georgia with two exhausted men — who followed him without complaint — illustrated the extent to which his leadership shaped behaviour. As Worsley wrote, they followed "*the example of [their] leader, did [their] utmost to avoid any cause of annoyance*" (Worsley, 1924).

From a human-resource perspective, Shackleton demonstrated a "**High-performing**" level of maturity in aligning motivation and emotional support with organizational objectives. His ability to translate purpose into action under extreme conditions represents a benchmark for crisis-driven leadership.

Developing Leadership Capability

Frank Wild, Second in Command, carried a substantial share of operational tasks, and the crew trusted him. However, when left in charge on Elephant Island, he revealed significant gaps in leadership and management capability. For example, he failed to gather sufficient food to prepare for the winter, relying instead on the continued presence of seals and penguins. When the animals migrated, tensions and stress rose among the men.

Similarly, Captain Frank Worsley, though highly skilled as a navigator, was often wild, erratic and impulsive. Shackleton frequently felt the need to monitor him closely and eventually reduced his authority after he failed to maintain discipline during the trip to Buenos Aires (at the beginning of the expedition). This pattern illustrates a broader issue: Shackleton's deputies had specialised strengths but lacked balanced leadership competence.

Line managers are crucial enablers of change (Paauwe et al., 2013), yet they failed to meet expectations because Shackleton overlooked their leadership limitations during recruitment, influenced more by compelling personalities and narrative appeal than by managerial capability.

Considering the gathered evidence, Shackleton's organization did not do enough to develop leadership capability. The maturity level for this area is therefore rated “**Not met.**”

Overall Performance Review

The overall performance level for this indicator is “**Advanced.**”

In a “High-performing” organization, managers would know precisely the extent to which they are expected to lead, manage, and develop their people. Shackleton would also have recruited more capable managers and made his expectations explicit. Such managers would be predictable and would proactively encourage feedback from their people.

Supporting

Empowering People

Shackleton provided support and information so that his people could work effectively and develop their skills. For instance, when a seaman made a mistake while manoeuvring the ship and expected Shackleton to be furious, he quietly helped him correct the error and never mentioned the incident again. Shackleton understood that his men were learning, and dwelling on mistakes would only undermine confidence.

However, the maturity level for this theme is only “**Developed**”. Indeed, Shackleton was omnipresent on the ship and constantly requested updates, leaving little room for autonomy. In the rare cases where others took matters into their own hands, he often reprimanded them. For example, when Frank Hurley, the photographer, returned to the ship to retrieve negatives, Shackleton issued a severe scolding, even though handling films and photographs fell squarely within Hurley’s responsibilities. Shackleton was similarly reluctant to delegate leadership tasks; he even refused to let others resolve issues while confined to his tent with acute sciatica.

This discomfort with independent action may be linked to Shackleton’s military background and a period that placed less emphasis on participative leadership than today.

Participating and Collaborating

Wild, Worsley and Hurley were regularly consulted on strategic decisions (Hurley was included in this “directive committee” largely so that Shackleton could keep an eye on him). Nevertheless, Shackleton consistently retained final authority and rarely integrated dissenting views. For instance, he ordered a march toward Paulet Island despite Worsley’s strong objections, and later insisted on attempting another march even when sentiment among the group was divided.

With the rest of the crew, Shackleton often acted unilaterally, acting without consulting those affected. Despite whalers advising him to wait because of dangerous ice floes — a warning that ultimately sealed their fate — he chose to depart for Antarctica without sharing this information. He also ordered the killing of most animals during the journey, including the dogs and the carpenter’s cat, a decision that intensified resentment and had a profound emotional impact on the crew.

In summary, Shackleton did consult a small circle of representatives, but he frequently discounted their input and proceeded independently. Consequently, the maturity level for this theme cannot be higher than “**Developed**”.

Making Decisions

During the expedition, Shackleton repeatedly gave his people responsibilities. On “Ocean Camp”, he divided the crew into five tents. He put people with strong character at their head and trusted them to ensure discipline and maintain high morale. Also, when he had to depart Elephant Island, he left Wild in charge of watching his interests “_on [their] return to England,” saying that he had “every confidence in [him]” (Lansing, 1959). He similarly asked Hurley to take full responsibility for managing the films and negatives. Shackleton trusted these men to make the right calls, but there is no evidence that he involved them in defining the scope or limits of their authority.

However, Shackleton was not open and transparent about sharing information. As discussed above, he withheld the whalers' warnings about ice conditions. When the crew failed to free the Endurance from the pack ice, he feared the expedition was over, yet he told them it was merely a delay. These behaviours reflect a consistent reluctance to disclose reasoning, risk assessments, or uncertainty, even when greater openness might have supported better collective judgement.

Shackleton also closely monitored those who challenged him, limiting their ability to express dissent. After McNeish (the carpenter) confronted him, Shackleton deliberately distanced him from the rest of the group. This pattern was systemic: on Elephant Island, Orde-Lees (skier and motor expert from the Navy) grew deeply frustrated as Wild routinely dismissed his suggestions (Orde-Lees, 1916). By suppressing contrary views rather than channelling them constructively, Shackleton reduced the team's access to alternative thinking at a time when adaptation was critical to survival.

Overall, the organization demonstrated a “**Developed**” maturity level in decision-making. Indeed, Shackleton trusted and supported others to act within limited domains, but his lack of transparency and his tendency to marginalize opposing viewpoints constrained the crew’s ability to contribute fully to high-stakes decisions.

Overall Performance Review

The overall performance level for this indicator is “**Developed**”.

In a better-performing organization, people would take the lead without being perceived as rebels. Shackleton would be more transparent, involve everyone on the ship and listen to what they have to say. Also, independent-minded people would serve as a source of insight and innovation instead of being ostracized. This shift would strengthen collective judgement and reduce the risks associated with over-centralised decision-making.

Improving Capabilities

Understanding People’s Potential

According to Orde-Lees, Shackleton “[knew] one’s limitation better than one [did] oneself” (Orde-Lees, 1914). However, there is little evidence that he systematically assessed or supported their learning and development needs to help them reach their full potential. For example, Orde-Lees, the only reasonable skier among the crew, was surprised that Shackleton did not insist on every man learning how to ski. Even if they had managed to reach the land, it would have been nearly impossible to maintain the expected pace due to their poor skiing skills. Such omissions reveal an inconsistent approach to capability development. Thus, the maturity level for this theme is “**Not met**”.

Supporting Learning and Development

Throughout the journey, Shackleton ensured that idle periods were productive. As a result, the crew began to function as a learning organization, experimenting and transforming experience into knowledge (Senge, 1990). They learned how to drive dog sleds, which proved crucial for moving gear and boats on the ice, and developed their hunting skills, which were essential for their survival.

Shackleton tried to make the most out of challenging conditions by encouraging continuous improvement. However, his efforts reflected opportunistic adaptation rather than a deliberate development strategy. Had the journey unfolded as planned, the crew would have reached land without knowing how to use dog sleds, a missing capability that would have severely reduced their chances of success.

The maturity level for this aspect cannot be higher than “**Established**”, since Shackleton focused primarily on organizational goals rather than his men’s personal growth.

Deploying the Right People at the Right Time

As discussed above, Shackleton’s recruitment process was more focused on character than abilities. He especially looked for optimism and cheerfulness, which he thought were essential for such a perilous journey. This process accomplished its purpose: the crew never gave up, and, despite their differences, they “*seem to be a wonderful, happy family*” (Orde-Lees, 1915).

Nevertheless, the interviews were always concise, and some of the questions seemed utterly random. Macklin, the surgeon, had been accepted after he made a joke about his spectacles and Hussey, the meteorologist, was on board because Shackleton was “*amused to [receive an] application from the heart of Africa*” (Hussey, 1949). On the other hand, Shackleton did not consider it necessary to acquire basic skills, such as skiing, even though one of the organization’s objectives was to travel through Antarctica as quickly as Amundsen, who heavily relied on skis and sled dogs.

During this journey, Shackleton faced many situations he did not anticipate. As explained in (Markides, 2000), no strategy remains the same forever. When external conditions forced Shackleton to a strategic change of direction, he adopted a dynamic capabilities approach. He used his in-depth knowledge of his men to assign them the right tasks, maximizing efficiency and likelihood of success. For instance, he chose the carpenter to come on the *James Caird* because of his abilities as a sailor. Also, he took advantage of the photographer’s survivalist skills to fix and improvise equipment despite the lack of tools.

The maturity level for this theme is “**Established**” because Shackleton did not ensure that critical roles were adequately filled. A memorable example is his failure to secure a dog driver when he realized it would not be an easy task. This gap in essential expertise illustrates how his character-first recruitment sometimes left the organization structurally underprepared. He even discarded a ship’s officer who had travelled with Amundsen and ultimately left for Antarctica without a dog driver.

Overall Performance Review

The overall performance level for this indicator is “**Developed**”.

A better-performing organization would have identified the learning and development needs of its members and offered opportunities aligned with its strategic objectives. It would have anticipated capability requirements, recruited accordingly, and invested purposefully in personal development while assessing the outcomes of these efforts.

Discussion

Popular accounts of Shackleton's expedition often portray him as a hero, emphasizing his courage and humanity while overlooking the mission's complete operational failure. This narrative bias tends to cloud assessments of his leadership and organizational practices. Applying the Investors in People framework offers a more objective lens through which to evaluate Shackleton's performance, separating emotional admiration from evidence-based analysis.

The assessment confirmed Shackleton's exceptional ability to inspire trust, maintain morale, and lead with empathy under extreme conditions. However, it also revealed structural weaknesses within his organization, particularly in leadership development and delegation. Decision-making remained highly centralized, and feedback from subordinates was limited. These findings suggest that while Shackleton excelled in personal influence, he did not fully empower others to lead or contribute strategically.

Finally, the analysis highlights a less-discussed aspect of Shackleton's leadership: his limited planning and foresight. While he demonstrated extraordinary adaptability in crisis, this reactive strength may have compensated for earlier shortcomings in preparation. The expedition's near-catastrophic circumstances can thus be partly attributed to weaknesses in risk anticipation and strategic thinking, a reminder that resilience, however admirable, cannot replace proactive planning and distributed leadership.

Recommendations

Shackleton was a leader who could get people out of trouble in an extraordinary way. Every person who worked with him has praised his leadership, and he is probably the reason why the whole crew made it alive. However, his lack of transparency and his inability to anticipate future needs have had a significant role in the failure of the original mission. In this regard, he acted like an overprotective father who genuinely wants to take care of his children but believes he always knows best, leaving them unprepared to be on their own.

The following graph displays a summary of the organization's overall performance.

This section will formulate recommendations to help the organization move forward and improve.



Figure 1: Organization's overall performance

Leading by Example

During this expedition, the organization had to face rapidly changing situations. Shackleton played a crucial role in helping it get through these changes by maintaining “*levels of energy and momentum throughout the [...] process*” (CIPD | Change Management, 2018). Moreover, studies have shown that leaders who, like Shackleton, “act creatively”, make themselves “*available for creative emulation, which in turn produces more creativity in followers*” (Jaussi & Dionne, 2003). These behaviours should be maintained to keep performing in these areas.

Implementing a No Blame Culture

The crew functions as a high-reliability organization (HRO), where any error “*could lead to the destruction of the organization*” (Roberts, 1990) and thus requires “*nearly error-free operations all the time*” (Weick & Roberts, 1993). In this context, it is recommended to adopt a “no blame” approach, creating an “*atmosphere of trust in which people are encouraged, even rewarded, for providing essential safety-related information*” (Reason, 1997). (Provera, Montefuco, & Canato, 2010) demonstrated that HROs can benefit from implementing such a culture, as it improves communication, facilitates knowledge sharing, and strengthens preparedness for variability.

Encouraging Feedback

Shackleton did his best to mute the voices of people who disagreed with him. This behaviour ignored the potential of the team and diminished the effectiveness of the strategies he designed. (Gratton, 2011) emphasizes that open innovation is crucial for organizations that want to create innovative and effective strategies. Open innovation implies that members at every level of the organization are invited to contribute to highly strategic debates. Different opinions should be embraced because they enable the discovery of more innovative ways to achieve the organization's objectives. The goal is to create a culture where everyone's participation is encouraged and valued, fostering creativity and innovation (Robinson, 2001), and become a learning organization in which collective intelligence consistently exceeds individual contributions (Senge, 1990).

Increasing Transparency

This report highlighted that Shackleton lacked openness and transparency in sharing relevant information and his feelings. A study found that transparent leadership boosts employees' creativity (Yi et al., 2016). The idea is that leaders should share information, reveal the reasons behind their decisions, and express their true feelings and vulnerabilities. Moreover, (Gratton, 2011) showed evidence that employees' participation creates more value when leaders give them access to rich data, including confidential data about the organization, thereby reinforcing both trust and alignment.

Identifying Future Needs

Shackleton communicated extensively with people on an intimate level. As a result, he knew them well, which is a behaviour that should be perpetuated. However, he did not accurately assess the organization's future needs and thus was not able to proactively develop his people to fit these needs while fulfilling their aspirations. Also, the recruitment process was sometimes random partly because of this lack of future thinking.

The ESTEMPLE analysis, for example, is an appropriate and efficient tool to identify the organization's future needs and design a learning strategy accordingly. It is then easier to recruit competent people and develop them in alignment with this strategy.

Delegating

Evidence has shown that Shackleton sometimes struggled to delegate, particularly in matters of leadership. To move forward and improve, he could have empowered his people and provided them with greater autonomy. For instance, transferring the full implementation of certain decisions to other crew members would have deepened capability and ownership. Indeed, several studies support a positive relationship between delegation and “*both idea generation and application behaviour*” (de Jong, Hartog, & Deanne, 2007).

Summary

The figure and table below summarise the key recommendations, including the estimated effort required for implementation, the potential impact on the organization, and the indicators they will improve. This tool allows leaders to prioritize the implementation of recommendations.



Figure 2: Recommendations ROI

| # | Recommendation | Relevant indicator |
|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | Implementing a “no blame” culture | Supporting |
| 2 | Encouraging and valuing feedback | Supporting |

| # | Recommendation | Relevant indicator |
|---|--|--------------------|
| 3 | Sharing all relevant information | Supporting |
| 4 | Sharing true feelings | Leading |
| 5 | Identifying future needs | Improving |
| 6 | Recruiting competent and relevant people | Improving |
| 7 | Delegating the implementation of decisions | Supporting |

Conclusion

This analysis of Sir Ernest Shackleton's leadership through the Investors in People framework highlights both his extraordinary strengths and organizational shortcomings. Shackleton demonstrated exceptional emotional intelligence, communication, and courage, successfully maintaining morale and cohesion under life-threatening conditions. However, his leadership was also highly centralized and reactive, with limited delegation, transparency, and strategic foresight. These gaps reduced the crew's autonomy and learning capacity, revealing the limits of a purely heroic leadership model.

Shackleton's legacy endures as a lesson in balancing inspiration with empowerment. Effective leadership requires not only the ability to guide people through crises but also the foresight to prepare them for independence and change. His example reminds modern leaders that resilience and empathy must be matched by openness, collaboration, and long-term vision to create organizations capable of thriving beyond adversity.

References

- CIPD / Change Management. (2018, November 7). CIPD. <https://www.cipd.asia/knowledge/factsheets/change-management>
- Alexander, C. (1998). *The Endurance: Shackleton's Legendary Antarctic Expedition*. Knopf.
- CIPD. (2021, December 6). *PESTLE Analysis*. CIPD. <https://www.cipd.co.uk/knowledge/strategy/organisational-development/pestle-analysis-factsheet>
- de Jong, J. P. J., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2007). How leaders influence employees' innovative behaviour. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 10(1), 41–64.
- Fisher, M., & Fisher, J. (1957). *Shackleton*. James Barrie Books Ltd.
- Gratton, L. (2011). Workplace 2025 - What will it look like? *Organizational Dynamics*, 246-254.
- Huntford, R. (1975). *Shackleton*. Carroll & Graf Publishers.
- Hurley, F. (1948). *Shackleton's Argonauts*. Angus and Robertson.
- Hussey, L. (1949). *South with Shackleton*. Sampson Low.
- Jaussi, K. S., & Dionne, S. D. (2003). Leading for creativity: The role of unconventional leader behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(4-5), 475–498. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1048-9843\(03\)00048-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1048-9843(03)00048-1)
- Lansing, A. (1959). *Endurance: Shackleton's Incredible Voyage*. Carroll & Graf Publishers.
- Markides, C. (2000). All the Right Moves: A Guide to Crafting Breakthrough Strategy. *Choice Reviews Online*, 37(11), 37–635137–6351. <https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.37-6351>
- Maslow, A. (1943). Theory of Human Motivation. In *Psychological Review* (Vol. 50). Wilder Publications.
- McDeavitt, J., K.E., W., R.E., S., & G., W. (2012). Understanding change management. *PM&R*, 4(2), 141-143.
- Mill, H. (1923). *The Life of Sir Ernest Shackleton*. Little, Brown and Co.
- Orde-Lees, T.H. (1916). *Diary*.
- Paauwe, J., Wright, P. M., & Guest, D. E. (2013). *HRM and Performance: What do we know and where should we go?* 1–14.
- Provera, B., Montefuco, A., & Canato, A. (2010). A 'No Blame' Approach to Organizational Leadership. *British Journal of Management*, 21, 1057-1074.
- Reason, J. (1997). *Managing the Risks of Organizational Accidents*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

- Roberts, K. H. (1990). Some Characteristics of One Type of High Reliability Organization. *Organization Science*, 1(2), 160–176. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1.2.160>.
- Robinson, K. (2001). Out of Our Minds: Learning to Be Creative. *Work Study*, 51(1). <https://doi.org/10.1108/ws.2002.07951aae.005>
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline : the art and practice of the learning organization*. Doubleday/Currency.
- Shackleton, E. (1919). *South! The Story of Shackleton's Last Expedition 1914-1917*. Heinemann Publishing House.
- Smith, M. (2000). *An Unsung Hero: Tom Crean - Antarctic Survivor*. Mountaineers Books.
- Smith, M. (2015). *Shackleton: By Endurance We Conquer*. Oneworld Publications.
- Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509–533. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3088148>
- Watkins, J. (1949). *The 100 Greatest Advertisements 1852-1958: Who Wrote Them and What They Did*. Dover Publications.
- Weick, K. E., & Roberts, K. H. (1993). Collective Mind in Organizations: Heedful Interrelating on Flight Decks. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38(3), 357. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393372>
- Worsley, F. (1924, August). Crossing South Georgia. *The Blue Peter*.
- Worsley, F. (1931). *Endurance: An Epic of Polar Adventure*. P. Allan & Co.
- Yi, H., Hao, P., Yang, B., & Liu, W. (2016). How Leaders' Transparent Behavior Influences Employee Creativity: The Mediating Roles of Psychological Safety and Ability to Focus Attention. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 24(3), 335–344. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051816670306>