

International Conference on Research Paradigms Transformation in Social Sciences 2014

Leadership as a control method in the period of changes

Zhanar S. Allayarova^{*}, Tatiana V. Kalashnikova, Yulia A. Moiseenko

National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University, Lenin Avenue, 30, Tomsk, 634050, Russia

Abstract

The article provides an overview of the conceptual understanding of leadership in social management development. Authors differentiate between leadership comprehensions. Particular attention has been paid to value-based theories and modern 21st century leadership models, where the world is understood as dynamic, constantly changing and risky. Leadership is considered as a process of effective modern organization management.

© 2015 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license

(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>).

Peer-review under responsibility of Tomsk Polytechnic University.

Keywords: Leadership, leader, charismatic leader, charisma, power, leader's value, management, effective leadership

1. Introduction

Society and its nature are tightly connected with the group organization process, its structuring and power institution formation. Historically, organized society groups were categorized as the dominant minority and the subordinate majority. These categories pattern might have been the framework for power institution development in society.

During its development path, human civilization has been obtaining diverse social power distribution configurations. Authority had become the essential starting point of human reality that stratificated society structured it and constituted many hierarchical patterns.

Moreover, various aspects of human existence contributed to the development of the authority patterns diversity - economic, political, cultural and religious authority - as well as to the development of different command types and styles. In society power was exercised through personification, particularly because of the leadership institution formation.

In the context of authority relations leadership implied enduring and non-spardical power exercise, commonly linked to personal characteristics of a leader. According to Oxford Dictionary the term "leader" emerged in XVIII century and was employed to "an authoritative member of a social organization, whose personal ascendancy allows him to play a significant role in social processes and situations, in collective, group and society

^{*} Corresponding author. Tel.: +7-903-951-5173

E-mail address: tvkalash@tpu.ru

relationship adjustment; a person capable of influencing others in order to integrate a group's joint-cooperation geared to serving the interests of this group" (Semigin, 1999). In different historical periods, image of leader had been the most captivating and appreciable role model, matter of critics, matter of conceptualization and later matter of scientific research. As in the former times, today the majority of the researchers consider leadership to have emerged at the earliest stage of the human civilization. This eternal, universal and inevitable wonder of the human reality is also a universal historical phenomenon. Over a period of several centuries, leadership has been a subject of philosophical discussion and disquisitions. Today it still engages researchers.

Philosophers had a discourse on the topic of leadership in society; they have suggested parameters of leaders' actions and created models of perfect leadership patterns. The nature of leadership has been conceptualized in multiple ways. Originally, leaders were described as outstanding historical figures. Herodotus and Plutarch, in their biographical works of sovereigns and noble strategists, put their characters in the narrative center of historical event. According to Plato, Confucius and Laozi governors served as the examples of the philosophic models of leadership. However, the first philosophical concept of leadership is said to be provided by the Italian philosopher of the XVI century, Niccolò Machiavelli.

In his treatise "The Prince", first distributed in 1513, Machiavelli considers diverse authority patterns; the leader's personality is presented as the matter of his research. N. Machiavelli provided the image of the leader whose personal authority is a mean toward particular political objective. According to Machiavelli, sovereigns should consider the stimuli of human actions, for instance, *desire for property* and govern "using the ability to predict concealed desires of the human soul" (Machiavelli N., 1982).

The philosopher discourse on his ideal governor's specific traits: "Every prince ought to desire to be considered rather austere than clement. A prince, therefore, must not mind incurring the charge of austerity for the purpose of keeping his subjects united and confident; He must, however, take care not to misuse this mercifulness in order to not be despised. Nevertheless, a prince ought to inspire fear in such a way that, if he does not win love, he avoids hatred; because he can endure very well being feared whilst he is not hated" (Machiavelli N., 1982).

The author of "The Prince" described his vision of the ideal leader's traits an autocratic-spirited governor ("the prince" who is "the first to seize political authority" (Machiavelli N., 1982) as, and he also suggested social leadership obtainment methodology. In the XIX century, rising concern on leadership issues triggered numerous philosophical, psychological and social concepts. These concepts not only explore the nature of authority, but also the anthropological aspect of it, in particular theories of *headman* and leader. Moreover, superhuman concept became prevalent in the XIX century. It might have become particular measure of humans and things. (Volobueva M.M., 2003) Friedrich Nietzsche, representative of the philosophic schools of irrationalism and voluntarism, considered leadership in respect to the "creative power" of an individual. In works of Nietzsche morality is presented as an obstacle to developing into a leadership, and the progress of history is dependent on great personalities striving for power. Along the same lines, the nature of leadership is analyzed by the English historian Thomas Carlyle, whose works later on featured prominently in the philosophy of leadership. According to Carlyle, leadership is connected with worship of an exceptional individual – a hero. The English researcher says: "A hero worship, cringing admiration coming from the heart of hearts, strong, unbounded conformity to the more generous, divine hypostasis of a human – this is the *source* of Christianity, isn't it?" (Moscovici S., 2004) To Carlyle, only exceptional individual endowed with sincerity and intuition could be a part of the leadership institution.

One should determine several methodological approaches to leadership issues: social, political and psychological approaches. The social approach considers the nature of power in its supreme hierarchical quintessence and transformation in the society. The greatest contribution to the leadership study from the social perspective was made by Max Weber, Gustav Le Bon, Gabriel Tarde and et al. The French philosopher and sociologist Gustav Le Bon define a leader as "a leader of a crowd". There are leaders in every aspect of life, they can be subdivided into two categories – the leaders of strong and short-term will and the leaders of consistent

will. Le Bon considered affirmation, repetition and social disease (when the masses get significantly inspired by the ideas of the leader) the main crowd-influence approach. Gabriel Tarde in his works “Social laws” and “Transformation of power” strove to determine the main traits of a leader or a headman. “When the crowd admires its leader, when the army admires its general, they actually admire themselves; they assign themselves the high self-esteem of their leader” (Moscovici S., 2004). The obedient nature of society presumes the existence of leaders. The main traits of a leader are determined by the engendered society. The German sociologist Max Weber presented broader characteristics of a leader. In his theory, critical traits are passion (dedication), responsibility and an eye (the ability to estimate the situation precisely)

Max Weber was the first to introduce the socio-philosophic term “charismatic leader”. Socializing the concept of “charisma”, the scientist determined it in a following way: “.. a personal trait, acknowledged as exceptional; a charismatic person is appreciated as gifted by supernatural, superhuman or at least distinctive characteristics and traits that are unobtainable for others. It is considered as sent by God or as a model”. (Psychology and psychoanalysis of power, 1999)

Developing the concept of charismatic authority, Max Weber claimed that its basis is heroism, fanatic devotion to the idea, sanctity, etc.

Weber’s concept of the nature of charisma became a major focus of the attention in the scientific world; it brought socio-political psychologists, particularly Jean Blondel, to the attempt of adopting the concept of charismatic leader into the political environment, creating the theory of political leadership.

The Austrian scientist Sigmund Freud is considered a founder of the psychological approach to leadership. He relied on personal psychology in the research of social and political institutions. According to Freud, the Oedipus complex forms the basis of any power institution. In Freud’s model, the masses require a leader that is similar to the autocratic father in the family; for him, the secret of leadership lies in “fatherlikeness”. The Austrian scientist explained the aspiration for power with the competition between the cruel and possessive father and his sons. As reported by Freud, history develops under the influence of great leaders.

Following Freud, Carl Gustav Jung (“The Psychology of Dictatorship”), Erich Fromm (“The Authoritarian personality”), Theodor Adorno (“The Authoritarian State”), Erik Erikson (“The Hitler’s imagery”), Serge Moscovici (“The Psychology of the Charismatic Leader”), Daniel Rancour-Laferriere (“The mind of Stalin”) and other power psychologists and psychoanalysts considered the leadership issues. C.G. Jung thought of a leader as a personality, whose actions are driven by “inside voices” from the subconscious. Erich Fomm considered a strong yearning to satisfy sadomasochistic needs to be the main trait of the leader. Theodor Adorno named dominating personality a rebel and psychopath, sublimating the Oedipus complex. Serge Moscovici declares charismatic leader a person who is admired and, at some point, who appears to have abnormal behavior.

In the XX century, interest in the study of leadership increased. The issue of the nature of the phenomenon became one of the contemporary and fundamental topics in social, philosophic and political anthropology research. Works of Harold Dwight Lasswell, Fred Irvin Greenstein, John MacGregor, D. Page, Robert Tucker, Cecil Gibb, Fred Fiedler, et al are dedicated to socio-psychological and political analyses of the leadership institute. In philosophic and socio-political tradition of Russia, leadership issue was approached in the context of narodnik movement ideology, the variety of utopian socialism that reflected antithesis of two possible paths of bourgeois development: so called “Prussian” (liberal-feudal) and “American” (peasantry –revolution) paths.

In the 1970s century, narodniks had no unified understanding of the forms and methods of revolution. The rebel movement played a prevalent role; particularly the idea of the leader from the intellectuals belongs to bakunists, who considered that a crowd is always ready for revolution. They proposed that the only aim of the revolutionary intellectuals is “to unite all nation’s rebels in one shattering riot, in the national revolution” (Bakunin M.A., 1907). New specific interpretation of social issues, in particular, of the decision of the leaders-intellectuals on the country’s development path, was generated by narodniks ideologists (N.K.Mihalkovski, P.N. Tkachev, M.A. Bakunin, P.L. Lavrov) on the basis of the faith in determinative influence of the revolutionary intellectuals on the crowd.

This interpretation can also be seen in the works of liberal narodnik N.K. Mihalkovski. In his article “Heros and Crowd”, he proved the thesis that living circumstances of the society condemn the masses to poverty, parochiality and narrowness of mental activity. Devastated consciousness and exhausted volition form the crowd from the masses; leader-hero captivate the crowd to commit either feat or crime. In the conceptual interpretation of P.L.Lavrov the leaders are said to be the history’s driving force and described as the critically thinking intellectuals.

Today Russian scientists G.K.Ahin, G.A.Avinzova, O.V.Velikanova, T.M.Riskova, G.G.Dilenski, E.B.Shestopal and other representatives of political psychology study the modern state leadership issue. In general, they consider political leadership as an institute and study typology of political leaders, their personality, behavioral motivation and other issues. In Russian social psychology, leadership issues are expounded in the works of Yu.N.Emelianov, N.S.Zherebova, A.I.Kravchenko, V.I.Zachepin. They consist of an elaboration of leaders’ functions description, typology and authority style analyses of modern governors, a description of the modern group and social authority image, etc. One should mention that political leadership study has emerged as a priority in general leadership research.

All leadership theories and researches developed in the XX century should be read in conjunction. Their boundaries are relative. The leadership theories are mutually reinforcing and influencing. In the end of the 1970s – the beginning of the 1980s a new phase of leadership study started and value-based leadership theories evolved. E.Kudriashova suggested in her dissertation: “The main characteristics of the value-based leader are consistent self-perfection of his personality; partnership based on the mutual trust with the followers, their empowerment and involvement in the decision-making; motivation of all managerial process participants for demonstration and development of leadership skills. Effective and innovative development of the organization would be the consequence of this actions” [7]. Robert Greenleaf and Christopher Hodgkinson are considered to be the authors of the philosophical approach to the value-based leadership theory that was later developed by applied works of Gilbert W. Fairholm and Thomas and. Susan Kuczmarski.

R.Greenleaf established religious movement in the valued-based leadership study. He focused on the analysis of the religious leaders’ actions, their influence on the reinforcement of the social role of religious institutions, Christian leadership and theology issues.

Basic ideas of the Greenleaf’s work on the ethical side of leaders’ influence on the subjects of managerial process had a significant impact on the value-based theory of leadership designed by C. Hodgkinson that was published in his monographs “Towards a Philosophy of Administration” (1978), “The Philosophy of Leadership” (1983) and “Educational Leadership” (1991). One should highlight that Hodgkinson not just provided the methodological foundation of the values in administration, leadership and management, but he also proved that leadership administration appears to be transformational, value-based and new opportunity targeted, and could be called the “philosophy in action”.

E.V.Kudriashova in her work “Leader and leadership” claims that C. Hodgkinson provided the novel value paradigmatic typology with four main basis: preferences, consensus, consequences and policies. He suggested psychological and philosophic conformances for every level and type of values; in particular, he developed a unique leadership typology (four leaders archetype distinguished: careerist, politician, technician and poet) in the value-based theory and described a leadership-administration process on its basis. Moreover, Hodgkinson proposed a functional typology determining the range of philosophic responsibilities existing in managerial practice that ideal leader should bear [8]. In the 1990s, works of Fairholm “Value-based leadership” (1995) and Kuczmarski “Innovation: Leadership Strategies for the Competitive Edge” (1996) were published. The novelty of value models consisted in the attempt to perform philosophical changes in the value-based leadership theory. These changes would define the main dominate policies of the value-based leadership philosophy, form the set of values and determine the relationship between the leader and the followers (Kudriashova E.V., 1996).

Having established basic philosophic value policies of leadership, Fairholm indicated that the purpose of leadership is the internalization of value-based policies promoting self-government development and

organizational aims attainment. He also considered leadership as a process reflected in the “leader-follower” relations.

S. and T. Kuczmarski expanded and completed the range of values of leadership that was proposed by Fairholm earlier with such policies as creation (construction) of interpersonal relations; knowledge of personal aims of every member of leadership process, sense of belonging to society; interpersonal conflict resolution; education of all subject of a managerial process on the question of the leaders’ behavior and actions; providing opportunities for talent realization of the followers; creation of an affinity group; dialogism, interaction with a certain feedback; junction of the inner culture with the outer representation; demonstration of the attraction to the work and variability encouragement (Kudriashova E.V., 1996).

The XXI century introduces new leadership models. Modern leadership theories are based on “dynamic, constantly changing, risky and complex world” concept (Daft R.L., 2006). The transition to a new philosophic paradigm, a new comprehension of the world and its perception create new leadership concepts.

Conclusion:

The concept of leadership was analyzed as a holistic social development phenomenon. The notion that the power problem accompanies the leadership issue in the social governance evolution process was advanced. The evolution and the correlation of leadership theories were deduced. The fact that, in modern fast changing economic situations, the role of leaders is increasingly prominent due to constant, rapid and unpredictable changes occurring was ascertained. Therefore, the role of leadership is considered to be the essential and effective managerial impact that drives results and leads organization upwards.

Online Licence

All authors must Transfer the Online Licence before the article can be published. This transfer agreement enables Elsevier to protect the copyrighted material for the authors, but does not relinquish the authors' proprietary rights. The copyright transfer covers the exclusive rights to reproduce and distribute the article, including reprints, photographic reproductions, microfilm or any other reproductions of similar nature and translations. Authors are responsible for obtaining from the copyright holder permission to reproduce any figures for which copyright exists.

References

- Semigin, GU (Ed.) (1999). Political Encyclopedia. Moscow: 2, pp. 628-629.
- Machiavelli N. (1982). Selected works. Moscow.
- Volobueva M.M. (2003). Philosophy of charismatic leadership and its implicitness in humanitarian science. *Philosophy*, 35, Vol.1, pp. 69-73
- Moscovici S. (2004). The crowd century: Historical treatise on crowd psychology. Moscow.
- Psychology and psychoanalysis of power (1999). Samara: 1-2.
- Bakunin M.A. (1907). Complete set of works. St.Peterburg: 2.
- Kudriashova E.V. (1996). Leadership as a subject of socio-philosophical analysis. (Doctoral dissertation)
- Kudriashova E.V. (1996). Leader and Leadership. The research on leadership issue in the modern western socio-political thought. Arhangelsk.
- Daft R.L., Lane P.G. (2006). The leadership experience. (A.V.Kozlova, Trans., I.V. Andreeva, Ed.). Moscow.