This is an electronic reprint of the original article.
This reprint *may differ* from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Author(s): Takala, Tuomo

Title: Dark-side of Charisma: Elements of Irresponsible Management

Year: 2009

Version:

Please cite the original version:

Takala, T. (2009). Dark-side of Charisma: Elements of Irresponsible Management. Turkish Journal of Business Ethics, 2(4), 43-64. http://isahlakidergisi.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/sayi04-takala.pdf

Dark-side of Charisma: Elements of Irresponsible Leadership

Karizmanın Karanlık Yüzü: Sorumsuz Liderliğin Unsurları

Tuomo Takala*

Abstract: Elements and concepts, and relations between them, of "bad" charisma are rather ambiguous, deserving closer examination. The aim of this paper is to construct a conceptual framework for several empirical studies on charisma. The means for better leadership are searched. This paper draws upon earlier research by the author as well as upon published works of other researchers. The study can be classified as qualitative conceptual study. The nature of the research is explorative. The base for empirical studies are built. The study offers new information about the relation between charisma, good leadership, commitment, and follower-behavior - especially from the perspective of dark-side of charisma. This paper paves the way for better leadership in organizations. A set of advices are given in the end of the paper.

Key Words: Charisma, leadership, ethics.

Özet: "Kötü" karizmanın unsurları, kavramları ve bunlar arasındaki ilişkiler oldukça belirsiz olduğundan daha iyi bir incelemeyi gerektirmektedir. Bu çalışmanın amacı karizma üzerine yapılan pek çok çalışma için kavramsal bir çerçeve inşa etmektir. Daha iyi bir liderliğin imkânları bu çerçevede incelenecektir. Çalışmada hem eski çalışmalarım hem de başka yazarların yayımlanmış çalışmaları kullanılmaktadır. Çalışma nitel kavramsal bir çalışma olarak sınıflandırılabilir. Çalışma doğası itibarıyla açıklayıcı bir tarzdadır. Ampirik çalışma için gerekli zemin oluşturulmuştur. Çalışmada karizma, iyi liderlik, bağlılık ve tabi davranışı arasındaki ilişki hakkında özellikle karizmanın karanlık yüzü perspektifinden bakılarak yeni bilgiler sunmaktadır. Bu çalışma organizasyonlarda daha iyi bir liderlik için zemin hazırlamaktadır. Çalışmanın sonunda bir dizi öneri de sunulmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Karizma, liderlik, etik.

* Dr., yönetim ve liderlik alanında profesördür. Çalışma alanları; kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk, iş ahlakı, ahlaki liderlik, ve karizmatik liderliktir. Business and Organization Ethics Network (BON) tarafından yayımlanan Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organization Studies (EJBO) adlı derginin editörlüğünü yapmaktadır.

İletişim: University of Jyväskylä School of Business and Economics Post Box 35 40014 Jyväskylä, Finland.
§ tatakala@econ.jyu.fi

Introduction

A lot of studies have been written on successful management and leadership, but losses and failures are studied more sparsely. I agree with Gray (2005) when he states that the important factor in "good" management is the ability to recognize the dark side and deal with it. The light side can be allowed to look after itself but much management behavior just interferes with what is going perfectly well. The dark side of an organization consists of both collective behavior and individual behavior. It is very difficult to accept that you yourself might be the problem or a significant part of it. Managers like to see themselves as outside the problems they have to deal with rather -as is only too often the case- part of or even a cause of them. All organizations have problems that are inherently combination of collective behavior and the individual psychological dispositions people bring with them. All organizations are characterized by their own pathology which might be dysfunctional or not. There are different levels of disorder and they are mostly and usually livable with, but more often than we realize they are fatal (see Gray, 2005).

Elements and concepts, and relations between them, of "bad" charisma are rather ambiguous, deserving closer examination. The aim of this article is:

- to be a review of the most recent articles considering (bad) charisma.
- to construct a conceptual framework for several empirical studies on charisma.
- try to pave the way for better leadership in organizations.

Like Burke (2006) I will suggest that taking a more accurate view of leadership given the prevalence of bad leadership, might contribute to our understanding of both leadership effectiveness and the development of leaders. One can learn as much from leadership successes as from leadership failures – the dark side of leadership. But continuing to ignore the dark side will lead to an incomplete understanding of leadership; it is confusing, misleading and limiting to development of good leaders (see Burke, 2006).

This paper try to offer some conceptual considerations. The final outcome would be a compilation of associated text passages from the books and relevant journal articles. For example, the researcher may have listed and described numerous definitions of the concept of charisma and bad leadership. I have found some 140 (mainly years between 1999–2009) relevant articles considering charisma, dark side, failures, narcissism, irresponsibility. In some cases this kind of review could be called as a "*Compilation Essay*" (see Takala & Lämsä, 2005).

Studies on Charisma and Charismatic Leadership

Charisma, in terms used by Max Weber (1964), means literally "*the gift of grace*". It is used by Weber to characterize self-appointed leaders followed up by people who are in distress and who need to follow the leader because they believe him to be extraordinarily qualified (see Takala, 1998). The charismatic leaders' actions are enthusiastic, and in such extraordinary enthusiasm a way is given to fraternization and exuberant community sentiments. For this reason, charismatic heroes and prophets are viewed as truly revolutionary forces in history (see Takala, 2004). Weber characterized charisma as "specifically outside the realm of everyday routine and the profane sphere, a direct antithesis of rational and traditional authority. Inherently transient, volatile, and evanescent, charisma in its pure form 'exist(s) only in the process of originating. It cannot remain stable, but becomes either traditionalized or rationalized, or a combination or both' (Weber, 1964). Furthermore, charisma is a 'typical anti-economic force … [that] can only tolerate, with an attitude of complete emotional indifference, irregular, unsystematic, acquisitive acts" (see also Fanelli & Grasselli, 2005).

Jones (2001) has found that the place of Hegel's World Historical Individual was in Weber's model filled by the rational type of the charismatic leader. Such a person is regarded by followers as "*The God-sent master*", as "set apart from ordinary men" and as endowed with "supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities". If the leader's "divine mission" cannot be said to have an objective meaning, it has nevertheless a meaning in the minds of those who are caught up in it. Humanity's experience of meaning is the province of religion, from the vocabulary of which Weber borrowed his term. Charisma is "the gift of grace". Magicians and prophets are regarded as endowed with it because of a unique personal quality, usually the capacity for ecstatic frenzy. The *magician* and the prophet differ in that the former claims an ability to manipulate the divine power and the latter claims a unique insight into the divine purpose, but in practice the distinction is fluid. Magicians are frequently experts at divination, and prophets rarely establish their authority without a demonstration of miraculous powers. Miracles and insight combine to give people the feeling that they are in contact with a power and a purpose greater than their own. Durkheim's (1915/1965) description of the "mana" may help to elucidate Weber's understanding of charisma. Parsons (1949) argued that without the slightest knowledge of each other, Weber and Durkheim had come to almost identical conclusions about the normative forces that hold a society together (Jones, 2001).

Fanelli and Grasselli argues that their (study) results suggest several considerations concerning the role played by charisma in the stock market and its operation as a mechanism of power. First, charismatic symbolism is important *outside* organizations, not just inside them. Discourse, narratives, and symbolism *constitute* the organizational consciousness of social actors by articulating and embodying a particular reality. As their study shows, charismatic discourse constitutes the consciousness of social actors within a central domain of today's society - the stock market. Through a process of cultural organizing (see also Takala, 2009), charismatic symbolism establishes and reinforces within the stock market certain views about the qualities, decisions, and ways of thinking that characterize successful leaders: - first and foremost the idea that charismatic CEOs affect firm performance. In a way, a charismatic CEO *is* today's Theseus: by controlling investor perceptions, charisma regulates the ambiguity of stock evaluation. As long as analysts and investors *believe* in the CEO's magical qualities, charisma will manifest its effects - regardless of whether employees are motivated or not (Fanelli & Grasselli, 2005).

Jones continues that the charismatic leader is as much the creator as the product of a *crisis*. He or she draws the attention of potential followers to the difference between that which they now experience and that for which they long and calls them to join in a struggle that will close the gap. The charismatic leader's magic is powerful to the extent that many agree in believing it. If the evolving situation is regarded as acceptable by an involved constituency, a new social order begins to emerge around the gift of grace and in confirmation of it. As an increasing number share the experience of being somehow blessed, the leader chooses a small inner group to assist with the mission (Weber, 1964). The members of this 'administrative staff' have a personal relationship with the leader, serve at the leader's pleasure, and set themselves to whatever he or she assigns them. Weber said that in its pure form 'charismatic authority may be said to exist only in the process of originating'. The battle is won, the oppressors are overthrown, or the reform is carried through, and followers (especially members of the administrative staff) seek to legitimate their positions. They want to be recognized as having a right to the powers that they hold. Demands for an orderly system of status relationships, a fixed power structure and a predictable pattern of social exchange begin to make themselves felt. This process of routinization accelerates with the passing of the original leader. The qualifications of his or her successor (which have not yet been proven) must be determined. Among the means for doing this are tradition (e.g. a rule of hereditary succession),

the choice of the community (e.g. an election) or a decision by those whose expertise in the ways of the divine qualify them to recognize the gift of grace. Whatever the process, it is soon in control of those who have the most to gain from the success of the new order. The inherently unstable charismatic situation is gradually institutionalized, the overthrow of the *ancien regime* becomes evident in the new faces that fill the administrative apparatus, and a new status quo makes itself felt (Jones, 2001).

Hoffman (2009) in his excellent study on Cuba regime states that Cuba's post-Fidel succession challenges conventional wisdom on the succession dilemma deemed inherent in charismatic leadership on a number of counts. First, the Cuban case highlights potential antidotes to the "second-man" problem. The historical trajectory of the relationship between Fidel and Raúl Castro certainly is exceptional, and as such hardly represents a replicable model. However, it provides strong evidence that the loyalty networks included in family relations can be a vital resource for political leaders to draw upon, both during their tenure and in resolving the issue of succession. This does not have to take the form of a transfer of charisma by heredity, as envisaged by Weber, but also can hold in the case of a turn to institutionalization and rational-legal authority. Second, as Weber had noted, over time charismatic authority must combine with traditionalized or rationalized forms of authority in order to persist. The case studied in this article (Hoffman) shows how the precise nature of this combination is a crucial variable – and one that is often insufficiently explored in leader-centric studies on charismatic authority – in understanding the dynamics of succession. The empirical study underscores the hybrid nature of the political regime under Fidel Castro, which can be adequately captured by its characterization as "charismatic state socialism." It was precisely the combination of charismatic leadership with bureaucratic-rational authority, in the form of one-party state socialism with strong army participation, which gave the successor government sufficiently strong alternative power structures to turn to as it discontinued the charismatic leadership style. Third, the analysis of the post-Fidel succession has shown how the outgoing leader has maintained limited, but continuous participation in the political arena; this challenges the notion implicit in the Weberian categories which sees succession as a one-time affair. As the outgoing leader has become detached from day-to-day political decision-making power, he has remained important as a legitimator to whom the successor government continuously needs to pay attention (Hoffman, 2009).

Parry and Hansen (2007) state that charismatic leadership is most closely associated with *visionary* leadership. Charismatic leadership can only exist

in the attributions of followers. Hence, charismatic leadership lies not so much in the content of the message but on the impact that the message has on followers. They contend that the "contagious" way in which stories spread could reflect the "social contagion" attribute of leadership. Hence, it is the *story* of the charismatic leader, and the story told by the charismatic leader, that people are likely to follow. For example, Shamir, Dayan-Noresh, and Adler (2005) have articulated persuasively how leadership can be effected through the biography, or life story, of others. Gandhi is one example that they use. It is not the telling of the life story by

Gandhi himself that has the effect, but the retelling of the story by many people over many years that has the leadership effect. In effect, the biography does the leading. Charismatic leadership also enhances the self-concept of followers, who generate an emotional attachment to the leader. Charismatic and visionary leaders often inspire followers using emotion where rational appeals cannot be made because future states or projected outcomes are unclear. Stories are not bound by fact or rational evidence in portraying future states (see Parry & Hansen, 2007).

The typical plots of these stories include for example, and among many others,

- The rule-breaking story;
- When the little person rose to the top;
- How the boss reacts to mistakes;
- How the organization deals with obstacles;
- The change incident;
- The story of the restructure.

Organizational stories seem to have a general theme about overcoming adversity.

However, because they are stories about and within an organization, it is not possible to claim that they have plots that follow the plot taxonomies of more recreational narratives. Leaders affect the way their followers interpret the world around them. Trust and credibility imply that a leader can be taken at face value to provide meaningful appraisal of the situation or crisis the organization faces. But in communicating a vision, leaders probably cannot predict the future. Rather, they provide an appreciation of the possibilities that the future might offer to followers. Put another way, they articulate scenarios that are possible for the future (Parry & Hansen, 2005).

Sosik and Dong (2003) states that *Charismatic leadership* involves profound social influence exerted on followers who make attributions of extraordinary leadership abilities when they observe certain behaviors or images displayed by the leader. Some writers describe charisma as a rare phenomenon, requiring elements of an "extraordinary" leader and a crisis, whereas others have argued that charisma can be displayed in various degrees by leaders in all organizational levels and contexts. Gardner and Avolio (1998) described charismatic leaders as actors who "perform" while interacting with followers and significant others (i.e., their audience). Indeed, charismatic leaders possess a dramatic flair as they enact many roles in interactions with others in various situations. This inclination toward enacting dramatic roles stems, in part, from their extraversion, exceptional expressiveness, and use of rhetoric. To maintain and develop their follower base, charismatic leaders need to get followers and other constituents (e.g., customers, general public) to form a positive impression about them and their ideas (Sosik & Dong, 2003).

Collison (2005) is viewing social *distance* as a moderator of the type of charismatic leadership that might emerge, and making a particularly important distinction between "distant" and "nearby" charismatic leaders. The distance factor is stressed by the fundamental differences between influencing a close circle of *followers in direct contact with the leader* and a larger group of more distant followers. He proposes that socially nearby followers may still ascribe charisma, basing their observations on criteria such as leaders' expertise, dynamism, high standards, consideration for others and humour. Socially distant leaders are more likely to invoke attributions of exceptional qualities because of organizational performance cues, image-building techniques, visionary behaviours, use of rhetoric and the articulation of ideology and so on. Close followers have richer and more varied information about leaders, their attributions of charisma cannot be easily dismissed as romanticism, but must also be viewed as a response to leaders' observed qualities and behaviours. Collison continues, that Yagil (1998) found that the charisma attributions of Israeli soldiers differed according to whether leaders were close or distant. Close leaders had the advantage that they could deliver sensitive information in individually tailored ways and were seen as more realistic and approachable by nearby followers who typically valued leaders' proximity. Followers of distant leaders will have less information about leaders and will, they claim, be more prone to leader-building efforts such as impression management techniques (Collison, 2005).

According to Sosik and Dong (2003) Gardner and Avolio (1998) argued that the roles or images of trustworthiness, credibility, moral worthiness,

innovativeness, esteem, and power are particularly relevant to perceptions of charismatic leadership. Charismatic leadership may be based on egalitarian, self-transcendent, and empowering leader behavior (i.e., socialized charisma), or dominant, self-aggrandizing, and exploitive leader behavior (i.e., personalized charisma). Leaders who display either type of charismatic behavior are perceived as being extraordinary and histrionic individuals. This perception allows them to influence profoundly their followers, generating various positive outcomes, including internalized commitment to the vision of the leader, exceptionally strong admiration and respect for the leader, and identification of followers with the leader, the vision, and the collective forged by the leader. To project such an image effectively and without misunderstanding, a leader needs to gauge how followers are responding and to present himself or herself accordingly, fitting his or her message to the beliefs, values, and needs of the followers so they will draw the desired conclusion about the leader and his or her message or vision. Thus, the need to project and maintain extraordinary and histrionic images for charismatic leadership is why impression-management strategies and self-awareness are important to understanding social influence processes in charismatic leadership. The effects of charismatic leadership on followers may be heightened by the skilled impression-management capacities of the leader. Five *impression management* strategies could be used by leaders to create charismatic images: (a) *exemplification* to present oneself as a worthy role model, (b) *ingratiation* to make oneself more attractive or likable to others, (c) *self-promotion* to present oneself as highly competent with regard to certain skills or abilities, (d) *intimidation* to present oneself as a dangerous and potent person who is willing to hurt or challenge others, and (e) *supplication* to appear needy with the purpose of soliciting aid from others. Prior research suggests that impression-management behaviors may be a function of how one is seen by oneself and others (Sosik & Dong, 2003).

Ytreberg (2005) set forth that charismatic person makes use of personal powers of persuasion to whip up public sentiments of frustration and protest against this state of affairs. Richard Sennett has proposed that modern charisma, which he calls "secular", works in the exactly opposite way. The broadcasting "personality" exudes a personal charm that functions to soothe and reassure the audience. It produces feelings of intimacy and rapport, a sense that the personality-host unites with the guest in interaction, as well as a sense that the viewer unites with the personality-host onscreen. In Sennett's well-known account the ideal-typical form of mass-mediated charismatic self presentation persuades through an appeal

to immediate, emotional experience. The audience is invited to believe in what the charismatic says because the charismatic communicates his or her personal belief in it so intensely. To be persuasive this subjective belief must seem to be immediate, even instinctive, something that inheres in the individual. Charismatic self-presentation therefore flaunts the individual element, as long as it does not get in the way of an immediately attractive appeal to the emotions of the audience. The *rhetoric of charisma* is all about "getting behind the facades and the role-playing", eschewing all artifice and all mechanisms of social distancing, in order to communicate "soul to soul". As a prominent Norwegian television host says with emphasis: "You cannot *play at* hosting, you have to *be* a host". It is hardly necessary to cite evidence showing how central charismatic self-presentation is to today's broadcasting, public service broadcasting

included. This goes particularly for the insistence on individualization, on a persuasiveness that rests on the individual ethos of the performer. A large body of research shows individualization featuring prominently in entertainment and popular fiction, as well as in the genres of popular journalism (Ytreberg, 2005).

Further Jones (2001) describes the *divine power*, the *mana*. Just as the reality of charisma is demonstrated by the feeling that one is in touch with deeper forces, so an awareness of the mana is associated with a feeling that one is in contact with powers greater than one's own. The members of a community experience their deeply shared feelings about right and wrong as the ultimate source of moral authority. Their reawakened awareness of divine power is in fact a reaffirmation of their common life. The mana is therefore regarded as a benevolent power, and the persons or objects upon which it is believed to rest are treated as the benefactors of the community. Attributions of authority and power (charisma) flow to the people and things that have become symbolic expressions of the collective good. A leader becomes such a symbol on the basis of two things. First there are "specific gifts of body and spirit" that mark a person as unique. These gifts and the behaviours by means of which they can be recognized vary between cultures. The critical thing is not the specific gift, but whether potential followers see it as somehow blessing them. This is the second factor in the recognition of the charismatic leader. Such recognition, though, is more like religious experience than rational analysis. The charismatic leader can gain and hold authority "solely by proving his powers in practice", but this evidence may come in forms that are alien to calculations with regard to personal wellbeing (Jones, 2001).

Going to the Dark Side of Leadership

Gray claims that leaders often build their charismatic reputation around the energetic communication of a vision, designed to solicit ever higher levels of compliance from followers. But the risks are considerable. In particular, many charismatic leaders are seen to be narcissists. They have a strong need for power, high self-confidence and strong convictions. However, whatever their virtues, narcissists tend to be overly sensitive to criticism, can be poor listeners, lack empathy, have a distaste for mentoring and display an intense desire to compete. In addition, it has been argued that charismatic leaders may find themselves prone to:

- Exaggerated self-descriptions.

- Exaggerated claims for the vision.

- A technique of fulfilling stereotypes and images of uniqueness to manipulate audiences.

- A habit of gaining commitment by restricting negative information and maximizing positive information.

- Use of anecdotes to distract attention away from negative statistical information.

- Creation of an illusion of control through affirming information and attributing negative outcomes to external causes (Gray, 2005).

Tourist and Vatcka in their ENRON study, have argued that many of the dynamics found within Enron resemble those of organizations generally regarded as *cults*. In particular, it has described the existence and the downsides of charismatic leadership, a compelling and totalistic vision, intellectual stimulation aimed at transforming employees' goals while subordinating their ethical sense to the needs of the corporation, individual consideration designed to shape behaviour, and the promotion of a common culture which was increasingly maintained by punitive means. The one exception is that, as the general literature testifies, cult members donate most of their money and possessions to their chosen cause. They endure great hardship. Enronians, by contrast, were well paid, with the promise of much greater wealth to come. Overall, the organizational culture strongly resembles that of many well-known cults, as does the behaviour of Enron's leaders. There have been many attempts to portray the Enron scandal as a one-off or at least a rare occurrence. In particular, President Bush characterized it as the product of poor behaviour by a few "bad apples", and therefore as an exceptional event. Others have noted that many business commentators

have effectively used Enron as a "scapegoat", standing as a surrogate for a wider corporate malaise that is hence denied. There is little evidence, to date, that Enron's employees were able to offer significant resistance, least of all resistance that was effective. Rather, the evidence reviewed here indicates that a totalitarian environment was created, in which the penalties for dissent were so severe and well known, while the benefits of conformity appeared so munificent, that critical voice was almost wholly absent from the organization's internal discourse. Of more general significance, the increased primacy afforded to shareholder value, the growing power of CEOs and market pressure for speedy results implies the further erosion of cultures that embrace discussion, debate and dissent (Tourist a& Vatcka, 2005)

Burke (2006) found that *leadership failure* has typically been considered in the context of career derailment. Derailment in a leadership or executive role is defined as being involuntarily plated, demoted or fired below the level of expected achievement or reaching that level but unexpectedly failing. There are some common notions about leadership failure:

- Failing leaders were stupid and incompetent lacking in talent. Most leaders are very intelligent and have considerable industry-specific knowledge.

- Failing leaders were caught by unforeseen events. The available evidence does not support this as a cause of leadership failure.

- Failing leaders exhibited a failure to execute.

- Failing leaders weren't trying or working hard enough.

- Failing leaders lacked leadership ability.

Schilling (2005) make conclusion that the concept of *negative leadership* is comprised of both ineffective and destructive leadership. The dimensions of human- versus task-orientation and active versus passive behaviours may be helpful to distinguish between the different types of negative leadership. Besides laissez-faire, the concept of failed leadership represents a new aspect of ineffective leadership which should be explored in more detail in the future. The categories of restrictive, exploiting, dominating, and in - sincere leadership may be helpful to develop a deeper understanding of the sub-dimensions of abusive supervision. While the practitioners regarded these constituent behaviours of abusive supervision (the most prominent concept in the area of destructive leadership) as important or

even prototypical, the concept of destructive leadership is not restricted to it alone. Especially avoiding leadership (passive and active) as destructive behaviour is widely missing in the literature so far. The antecedents of negative leadership include both obstacles to effective and facilitators of destructive leadership. Especially low levels of followers' motivation, work ethic, knowledge, skills, and abilities result in ineffective leadership. In the form of a trickle-down model, destructive leadership can be assumed to spread down the hierarchy of an organization if certain environmental and organizational factors occur. High market competition, organizational and superordinate pressure lead to the experience of stress and perceived injustice, which in turn brings leaders to execute destructive leadership behaviour. Personal characteristics (especially authotarianism, insincerity, emotional instability/fearfulness) are of minor importance for the development of destructive leadership, but they may moderate this relationship. The trickle-down phenomenon is complemented by a downward spiral (vicious circle), in which the relationship between leader and followers deteriorates as the followers take revenge by showing less motivation, performance, and positive affect which in turn intensifies the leader's negative behaviour (see Schilling, 2005).

Tourist and Vatcka (2005) see that recent years have witnessed an extraordinary growth in the power of CEOs, while the power of employees has declined. But a corollary of great power is the anticipation of miraculous results. Such expectations are magnified in a context of social despair or helplessness. Imperial CEOs, all too aware of the limited opportunity they are now afforded by the stock market to make a dramatic difference, may be tempted to resort to the theatrical approaches typical of cult leaders, and which were certainly the norm at Enron. In the process, they encourage conformity and penalize dissent. Yet the evidence indicates that effective leaders need to do the opposite, and in particular should "encourage constructive dissent, rather than destructive consent". Enron suggests that many if not most leaders have yet to grasp this point, with potentially catastrophic results for their organizations. Thus, more leaders are attempting to bind employees to the corporate ideal, while curtailing forums for debate. They project an image of charismatic leadership, stress a compelling vision, depict their companies as a surrogate family and attempt to blur any perceived difference between the interests of managers and non-managers. As an example of where this may lead, there has been a growing interest in "Spiritual Management Development". Within this paradigm, trainers attempt to release managers from "negative thoughts", "fears" or "barriers", which impede the develop-

ment of a successful corporate culture. Such approaches seek to re-engineer the most intimate beliefs of employees, so that they are aligned with whatever the leader deems is helpful to the corporate enterprise.

Alimo-Metcalfe and Alban-Metcalfe (2007) put forth that here is a distinct shift in thinking, away from extolling the charismatic-inspirational, or as is often described, *"heroic"* models of leadership, and even a growing antipathy towards such models. Various reasons are behind this movement, including a concern for the potentially lethal "dark side" of charismatic leadership. This points to the damage that can be inflicted by narcissistic, self-serving leaders – particularly those in the most senior positions, who may not only attribute the organization's success almost exclusively to their own contributions, but perhaps more lethally, ignore or punish any form of criticism or advice offered to them. In the wake of the recent corporate corruption cases, such as the Enron, Amcom and WorldCom scandals, catastrophes have been attributed, at least in part, to the virtually "delusional" and/or untempered arrogance of their top executives. Another line of criticism of the heroic theme has been provided by writers, who strongly challenge the concept of leadership residing in one individual, and contributing uniquely to organizational success, asserting that leadership, and importantly, learning from experience, is distributed throughout the organization.

According to Washburn and Clements (1999), Kets de Vries (1993) has identified several of those shadows that leaders fail to recognize:

(1) Mirroring is the tendency of leaders to see themselves as their followers perceive them and to feel they must act to satisfy the projections or fantasies of followers. A certain amount of mirroring is part of human existence. Our understanding of the world will always reflect some shared perceptions of what is real. But in crisis even the best of us is likely to engage in distorted mirroring. The impact of mirroring distortion is most serious when leaders use their authority and power to initiate actions that have serious, negative consequences for the organization.

(2) Narcissism in leaders reflects a distorted view of self. Narcissists need power, prestige, and drama and they enjoy manipulation of others. These qualities draw them to positions of leadership, but, at more extreme levels, the results are disastrous. They can become intolerant of criticism, unwilling to compromise, and frequently surround themselves with sycophants. While these people appear to be ideal choices for leadership positions, they may fall victim to the distortions of their narcissistic tendencies that are reinforced by their positions.

(3) Leaders can suffer from an inability to differentiate and verbalize emotion, or what can be called emotional illiteracy (or "alexithymia"). These individuals do not respond to their emotions, and are easy prey for the distortions of others. They may be viewed within certain organizations as ideal candidates for leadership positions. While they are controlled, structured, and dispassionate, they lack the emotional abilities to empathize, energize, foster creativity and respond appropriately to conflict. They contribute to mediocrity that drives out excellence.

(4) Leaders at times fall victim to the fear of letting go, even though they know they no longer fit the demands of the job. This may result from strong ego identification with a leadership position. In this case, the loss of position and power suggests a condition of nothingness, which is countered by great intentness, single mindedness and persistence. Another factor contributing to the fear of letting go is the "Talion Principle," or the fear of reprisals. Finally, the fear of nothingness can lead to the "edifice complex." The fear that their legacy will be destroyed motivates them to hold on to power as long as possible and may be expressed in generational envy, inducing them to block younger people's careers. All of these foster actions which are potentially destructive to organizations and their members. Negative contributions from followers are evident (see also Aaltio-Marjosola & Takala, 1995). For example, followers who have strongly authoritarian personalities are likely to conform unquestioningly or they may react to the charismatic qualities of the leader by mimicking or idealizing. Additionally, followers may seek to ingratiate themselves with leaders to be valued and rewarded. Such reactions can deprive leaders of important feedback and alternative perspectives (see Washburn & Clements, 1999).

Burke (2006) continues that focuses on two basic categories of *bad leadership*, ineffective and unethical, identifying seven types of bad leaders that are most common. Type, here, refers to a pattern of leader and follower behavior that is maintained over time:

(1) Incompetent – lack will or skill to create effective action or positive change.

(2) Rigid – stiff, unyielding, unable or willing to adapt to the new.

(3) Intemperate – lacking in self-control.

(4) Callous – uncaring, unkind, ignoring the needs of others.

(5) Corrupt – lies, cheats, steals, places self-interest first.

(6) Insular – ignores the needs and welfare of those outside the group.

(7) Evil – does psychological or physical harm to others.

The first three types of bad leaders are incompetent; the last four types are unethical. Incompetent leaders are the least problematic (damaging) while evil leaders are the most problematic (damaging). One must also consider both means and ends. Ineffective leaders fail to achieve the desired results or to bring about positive changes due to the means falling short. Unethical leaders fail to distinguish between right and wrong. Ethical leaders put followers needs before their own, exhibit private virtues (courage, temperance) and serve the interests of the common good (Takala, 2009). Narcistic leaders are vulnerable for this kind of dangers (Burke, 2006).

According to Sveningsson and Larsson (2006) the organizational and social contexts should here be understood as regulative to the extent that they provide (symbolic, discursive, material, etc.) input that in various ways affects identity work. In psycho-dynamically oriented literature it is often suggested that individuals defend their identity against threatening aspects of the social context. Through a variety of defensive mechanisms, perceptions of reality are distorted or deflected, leaving a valued identity unaffected by actual social interactions. The point here is not to elaborate on various defensive mechanisms but rather to highlight that self-identity in some instances can become loosely connected to actual social interactions. Based on this they suggest that self-identity may assume characteristics of fantasy, that is, an idea or a belief that is not significantly affected by actual behaviour. *Fantasy* as a concept has been used in several ways. It has been understood as: *(a)* a conscious as well as unconscious phenomenon *(b)* as a defensive mechanism and *(c)* as a cognitive belief with various functions (Sveningsson & Larsson, 2006).

Tourish and Pinnington (2002) see following possible liabilities in the leader's communication and impression management, of particular importance in this case:

- Exaggerated self-descriptions.
- Exaggerated claims for the vision.
- A technique of fulfilling stereotypes and images of uniqueness to manipulate audiences.
- A habit of gaining commitment by restricting negative information and maximizing positive information.
- Use of anecdotes to distract attention away from negative statistical information.
- Creation of an illusion of control through affirming information and attributing negative outcomes to external causes.

The consequences of such defects are clear. They are destructing. Further, according to Tourish and Pinnington charismatic leadership is an indispensable ingredient of *cultic organization* It has been observed in doomsday cults in the 1950s, the Jonestown cult of the 1970s, the suicidal Heavens Gate cult in California, and more recently in the homicidal Aum cult in Japan. Frequently, the leader's charisma turns out to be no more substantial than the magical powers possessed by the Wizard of Oz. Cult leaders have been variously exposed as alcoholics, drug addicts or semi-literates, whose major pronouncements are often written for them by others.

Followers often believe that their leaders are people of genius, insight, outstanding organizational ability and uncommon compassion. They then perceive only munificent qualities in the leader's behaviour, irrespective of what they actually do: expectations have become self-fulfilling, (Tourish & Pinnington, 2002).

Some Viewpoints Considering Ethical Leadership

New fresh look is offered by Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsig, and Peterson (2008). Specifically, they define *authentic leadership* as a pattern of leader behavior that draws upon and promotes both positive psychological capacities and a positive ethical climate, to foster greater self-awareness, an internalized moral perspective, balanced processing of information, and relational transparency on the part of leaders working with followers, fostering positive self-development. Aspect of ethical leadership involves making "ethics an explicit part of their leadership agenda by communicating an ethics and values message, by visibly and intentionally role modelling ethical behaviour. Walumbwa et al. continues that a review of the literature reveals some conceptual overlap between the constructs of authentic and ethical leadership as well as some notable distinctions. Authentic leadership theory likewise contains distinctive components that are not considered by ethical leadership theory. Specifically, the focus on self-awareness, relational transparency, and balanced processing all represent features of authentic leadership not captured in operational definitions of ethical leadership. As is the case with ethical leadership, there is some conceptual overlap between authentic and transformational leadership. *Transformational leadership* is composed of five components: attributed charisma, idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. However, attributed charisma has been described as representing leadership impact and reflecting followers' attributions, and

not necessarily leader behaviour. Leaders with idealized influence tend to place followers' needs over their own needs, share risks with followers, and demonstrate devotion to a set of underlying principles and values. Such leaders are "role models for followers to emulate; can be counted on to do the right thing; and display high standards of ethical and moral conduct" compared to values of efficiency and professional integrity and may require change efforts (Walumbva et al., 2008)

Tourish & Pinnington (2002) suggest**:**

(1) Emphasize the key elements found in transactional leadership. These include recognizing the independent goals of leaders and followers; the exchange of rewards in systems of reciprocal influence; people's right to retain a sense of identity, place and purpose beyond their employer's orbit.

(2) Acknowledge the ubiquity of power differentials in the workplace, and the damaging effect such differentials can have on perceptions, attitudes, relationships and organizational effectiveness. We have, for example, alluded to the fundamental difficulty of people with superior status obtaining accurate feedback about their performance from people with lower status. This impairs decision-making and may encourage those at the top of organizational charts to exaggerate their contribution to obtaining corporate goals while diminishing that of others. Alternative leadership models would legitimize the existence of multiple visions, and facilitate their resolution through processes of negotiation, conflict resolution, debate and free speech.

(3) Look again at democratic and stakeholder perspectives for organizational restructuring. TL models presume the right of those at the top to a disproportionate role in the decision-making process. We suggest a new ethic of managerial leadership, in which both sides recognize the need to cross the line frequently between leadership and followership. It is not our intention to question the need for leadership per se. It is our intention to argue that the dominant models within the rubric of TL are fundamentally flawed.

Washburn and Clements (1999) propose that those who purport *to train and educate* leaders need to incorporate these broader perspectives into their programs. The following are some suggestions for ways to do this:

- Define leadership authentically in terms of both its positive and negative aspects.
- Challenge students to develop true pictures of themselves as part of an ongoing, lifelong process.

- Help students develop an understanding of the sources of feedback, the implications of feedback, and an openness to information in order to protect themselves from distortion and bias.

- Provide students with methods for understanding their own and others' personalities.

- Help students learn to develop the leadership potential of others.

- Provide students with broad exposure to theories and techniques of leadership, motivation and communication.

Lawler (2005) relies heavily on Sartrean philosophy, *existentialism*, and states that as nothing is predetermined according to existential thinking, "everything could have been". If we describe different relationships we might have different criteria as to whether they are seen as being positive to those involved. There is no necessity about us: "It is not a necessary truth that there should ever have existed someone with the properties which I happen to have". This is what Sartre means by absurdity. As we assume an objectivist view, we ignore the consciousness, the "being for itself" of participants in the dynamic relationship which might or might not contain some or all the elements indicated as necessary for effective leadership. If there is no essence of leadership there is no "logically compelling reason" why it should be this way and not that. We may assume that any observed or reported relationship has "being for itself", creates its own meanings. Much leadership writing implies the centrality of work in people's lives. By examining leadership relationships within the wider context of members' "*existence*" we may achieve good results.

Conclusions

I have put forth several points of view considering bad leadership, charisma, management failures and irresponsible management practices. This review offers some results. As we can see there are many traps and pitfalls to fall in: leader has responsibilities to many interessent groups. But there are also some possibilities to change and survive. Charismatic leadership is an important part of moral leadership; it has possibility to bad, but to good, too (see Takala, 2009).

(1) One direction is to develop so called servant leadership.

Leader can be seen as a servant, not a ruler or controller. They are leaders who put other people's needs, aspirations and interests above their own. According to Hale and Fields (2007) well known Greenleafs' -model contains three major descriptors. These are:

Service: to followers, an organization or society. Based on the alternative descriptions of servant leadership noted above, this dimension may include service-orientation, follower development, organizational stewardship, follower empowerment, covenantal relationship, responsible morality, helping subordinates grow and putting subordinates first.

Humility: putting the success of followers ahead of the leader's personal gain. This dimension may include relational power, altruistic calling, emotional healing, moral love, altruism, credibility, voluntary subordination, authentic self, transcendental spirituality, emotional healing, and behaving ethically from the various alternative servant leadership formulations above.

Vision: having foresight combined with the ability to communicate vision to, and influence followers in, developing a shared vision for an organization. This dimension includes wisdom, persuasive mapping, influence, transforming influence, credibility, creating value for the community, and conceptual skills from the various alternative servant leadership formulations above (Hale & Fields, 2007). To serve and obey must be their guide of action. Sense of community, empowerment, shared authority, and relational power. It is believed that the final goal of servanthood is to help others become servants themselves so that society benefits as well. The ideal type of this kind leader may be Jesus Christ. This is true moral leadership (see Sendjay & Sarros, 2002).

(2) Leadership communication: do it by more dialogical way.

As Seeger and Ulmer (2003) has found in their *Enron* research, Enron case calls for a broader notion of managerial communication that situates responsibility more centrally in understandings of management and in management practice. Responsibility, perhaps because it is so fundamental to organizational relationships and processes, is often overlooked in contemporary inquiry. Rather than attending to responsibility as a set of instrumental and morally based duties and obligations, the focus of much inquiry is on strategies, processes, and functions of effective managerial communication. Responsibility, however, concerns both the functional communication obligations of managers as well as their moral duty to communicate in ethically appropriate ways. Responsibility is also limited, however, by its general nature. Specific leader obligations and duties must be operationalized in ways that privilege some values and stakeholders over others. Although the very general nature of responsibility limits its utility as a precise ethical framework, it does have broad albeit general utility as a standard for managerial communication (see also Takala, 2006).

(3) Care: Leader must care more on people.

As Miller (2009) found in her study that there are an indication that leaders who are perceived as having a personal relational basis of "empathy with action" were also perceived as being proficient in the task of leading organizationally. The role of leader as mentor and coach has taken increasing prominence because of the increased complexity within the workplace. Care-ethics may pave to way more better business practices (Miller, 2009). Care comes close to the idea of mercy.

I will state that "Management by Mercy" could be a new Christian based leadership doctrine. It says that we must take care of our fellows in work communities, and give them mercy as often as possible. This is our duty as human beings, as Immanuel Kant may state it (see Kylliäinen, 2009). This "Mercy" - doctrine will offer some fresh proceedings in the future.

(4) Management and Leadership Training.

If we take the position of the follower, we believe there is much to be gained by understanding how leaders use their skills to achieve influence in a constructive and/or manipulative sense.

In designing a training program, one could coach future leaders on the importance of getting followers to identify with their values in order to increase the changes of their message being embraced. With a higher level of identification, followers are more likely to exert their best efforts to achieve the vision (see Takala, 2007). The ability of leaders to develop a consensus among followers regarding how the situation is defined is also critical to their success. One aspect of training leaders requires that they under signals emanating from the followers, as well as the context.

Finally we can identify some principles of morally good charismatic leadership; these can also be called as professional practices:

- do not use manipulative speech practices
- do not misuse rhetorics
- avoid being false superior
- do not use manipulative training strategies (Takala, 1997).

(5) Resisting the asymmetrical power positions related to followers.

Resistance leadership, as Zoller and Fairhurst put it forth, presents that we can adopt the dialectical approach to understanding resistance and control. Hence we take issue with iterations of the dialectic that presume the interlocking of resistance and control, and in so doing, discourage discursive efforts towards transformational change (Zoller & Fairhurst, 2007).

Milley (2002) states the researchers adhered to the injunction to recognize the subjective dimension of ethical experience in organization. They recognized that this approach provides the means to develop rich descriptions of the ethical conditions of organizational life. But they also found that it fails to provide the ground upon which to justify a critical interpretation of those conditions or any substantive recommendations for improvement. To deal with these problems, the researchers turned to *discourse ethics*. Here they identified a formal procedure to test and warrant normative interpretations. Drawing on the substantive notion of social justice that is procedurally embedded at the heart of discourse ethics, and combining it with a concern for the specific others they encountered in the research process, these presenters aimed to view *community* and not *order* as the ideal endpoint of the imagination that language affords. This approach can equally apply to educational organizations and their leadership (Milley, 2002).

My mind is that the Habermasian discourse-ethics may offer a good starting point.

The German social philosopher Jurgen Habermas has put forth a theory of communicative action. It is called "The theory of distorted communication" and includes some strong contractual elements. Communication is a central element in leadership and the work of Habermas offers a theory of equal negotiating partners and an opportunity for domination-free communication. The theory displays a rational way to proceed in communication practices; it assumes that it is possible for the parties to achieve an agreement by using effective negotiating mechanisms. The basic idea is that every individual has the right to domination-free action. An application to leader – follower relation: every L – F relation should be evaluated and reconstructed on the base of ethics of mutual communication. (see Takala & Uusitalo, 1996).

(6) We must confess the power of charisma, but accept only the good charisma.

To be a "bad" charismatic leader would mean to manipulate followers, being egoistic, aggressive, to lead a group of followers for evil consequences. *Female (bad or good) charisma* might work in another way. Leading people to wrong direction in a chaotic way, manipulate, lead with uncontrolled emotions, making people to follow without their own consideration.. They are charismatic leaders, but only to their own followers – for the others, they become enemies with evil acts and consequences. From relational point of view "good" and "bad" charisma are much more difficult to separate than it first looks. There are much fewer female leaders than men, and there

are much fewer charismatic female leaders than male ones. The whole idea that leaders use power, fit better to male ideals compared to female ones. Transformational leadership, part of any charismatic leadership, with a strong, visionary and change agent- type of leading style fits better to male stereotypes than to female ones. Again the bad consequences of charismatic leadership- style seems to be gendered again: men's actions lead to e.g. wars, women´s actions to chaos and manipulation that threatens the ruling class. They both use the magic, the divine vision and the holy truth with divine origin, but end with bad consequences: killing people or rising patriotism that leads to war. A bad female charismatic leader might look as a witch, and a bad male charismatic leader as a devil, the sins they commit with, differs. A good charismatic leader is portrayed as self-sacrifycing, inegoistic, and visionary in a sense that does not hurt anybody else, but works for other, more commonly shared and accepted targets, the holy mother and the humble saint would be the examples (see Takala & Aaltio, 2001).

Karizmanın Karanlık Yüzü:
Sorumsuz Liderliğin Unsurları

Dark-side of Charisma: Elements of Irresponsible Leadership

Tuomo Takala*

Özet: "Kötü" karizmanın unsurları, kavramları ve bunlar arasındaki ilişkiler oldukça belirsiz olduğundan daha iyi bir incelemeyi gerektirmektedir. Bu çalışmanın amacı karizma üzerine yapılan pek çok çalışma için kavramsal bir çerçeve inşa etmektir. Daha iyi bir liderliğin imkânları bu çerçevede incelenecektir. Çalışmada hem eski çalışmalarım hem de başka yazarların yayımlanmış çalışmaları kullanılmaktadır. Çalışma nitel kavramsal bir çalışma olarak sınıflandırılabilir. Çalışma doğası itibarıyla açıklayıcı bir tarzdadır. Ampirik çalışma için gerekli zemin oluşturulmuştur. Çalışmada karizma, iyi liderlik, bağlılık ve tabi davranışı arasındaki ilişki hakkında özellikle karizmanın karanlık yüzü perspektifinden bakılarak yeni bilgiler sunmaktadır. Bu çalışma organizasyonlarda daha iyi bir liderlik için zemin hazırlamaktadır. Çalışmanın sonunda bir dizi öneri de sunulmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Karizma, liderlik, etik.

Abstract: Elements and concepts, and relations between them, of "bad" charisma are rather ambiguous, deserving closer examination. The aim of this paper is to construct a conceptual framework for several empirical studies on charisma. The means for better leadership are searched. This paper draws upon earlier research by the author as well as upon published works of other researchers. The study can be classified as qualitative conceptual study. The nature of the research is explorative. The base for empirical studies are built. The study offers new information about the relation between charisma, good leadership, commitment, and follower-behavior - especially from the perspective of dark-side of charisma. This paper paves the way for better leadership in organizations. A set of advices are given in the end of the paper.

Key Words: Charisma, leadership, ethics.

* Dr., yönetim ve liderlik alanında profesördür. Çalışma alanları; kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk, iş ahlakı, ahlaki liderlik, ve karizmatik liderliktir. Business and Organization Ethics Network (BON) tarafından yayımlanan Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organization Studies (EJBO) adlı derginin editörlüğünü yapmaktadır.

İletişim: University of Jyväskylä School of Business and Economics Post Box 35 40014 Jyväskylä, Finland. § tatakala@econ.jyu.fi

Başarılı yönetim ve liderlik üzerine pek çok çalışma yapılmıştır, ama liderliğin hataları ve kusurları pek az incelenmiştir. Gray (2005)'in "iyi yönetim" meselesinde asıl faktör işin karanlık yüzünü anlayabilmek ve onunla başa çıkabilmektir. Yönetimin görünen tarafının kendi kendisini idare etmesine izin verilebilir, fakat pek çok yönetim davranışı tam da çok iyi yürüyen süreçlere müdahale eder. Bir organizasyonun karanlık yüzü hem kolektif hem de bireysel davranışlardan oluşmaktadır. Kendinizin problemin kendisi veyahut da onun önemli bir parçası olduğunuzu kabul etmeniz tabi ki zordur. Yöneticiler kendilerini çözmeye çalıştıkları problemin dışında görmek isterler. Çok az durumda ise problemin bir parçası veya onun sebeplerinden biri olarak görürler. Bütün organizasyonların doğal bir şekilde bireylerin psikolojik mizaçlarının ve kolektif davranışların bileşiminden meydana gelen problemleri vardır. Bütün organizasyonlar olumsuz veya olumsuz etkileri olan kendi patolojileri tarafından şekillenirler. Bozulmanın farklı düzeyleri vardır ve bunlar genelde idare edilebilir düzeydedir, ama çoğunlukla bunların hayati olduklarını fark edemeyiz (bk. Gray, 2005).

"Kötü" karizmanın unsurları, kavramları ve bunlar arasındaki ilişkiler oldukça belirsiz olduğundan daha iyi bir incelemeyi gerektirmektedir. Bu çalışmanın amacı;

• (Kötü) karizmayı konu edinen son dönemde yazılmış makalelerin bir değerlendirmesini yapmak,

• Karizma üzerine yapılan pek çok çalışma için kavramsal bir çerçeve inşa etmek,

• Organizasyonlara daha iyi bir liderlik için zemin hazırlamaktır.

Burke (2006) gibi ben de kötü liderliğin yaygınlığını ortaya koyarak daha bütüncül bir liderlik yaklaşımı benimsemenin hem liderlik etkinliğini hem de liderlerin gelişimini anlamamıza yardımcı olabilecektir. Liderlik başarılarından olduğu kadar liderlik hatalarından da -liderliğin karanlık yüzü- öğrenilecek şeyler vardır. Liderliğin karanlık yüzünü göz ardı etmek eksik bir liderlik algısına yol açacaktır, bu da iyi liderlerin gelişimini muğlaklaştıracak, yanlı yöne sevk edecek ve sınırlayacaktır (bk. Burke, 2006).

Bu çalışma bazı kavramsal mülahazalar önermeye çalışmaktadır. Nihai olarak çalışma kitapların ilgili bölümleri ve makalelerin bir derlemesini sunacaktır. Örneğin çalışmada karizma ve kötü liderlik kavramlarıyla alakalı pek çok farklı tanım verilecektir. Yine bu çalışmada (çoğu 1999-2009 yılları arasında) karizma, karanlık yüz, hatalar, narsisizm ve sorumsuzluk ile ilişkili 140 makale bulunmaktadır. Genelde bu tip çalışmalara "derleme türü makale" denilmektedir (bk. Takala & Lämsä, 2005).

Çalışmada kötü liderlik, karizma, yönetim hataları ve sorumsuz yönetim uygulamaları ile ilgili farklı bakış açıları ortaya konulmaktadır. Bu derleme çalışması da birtakım sonuçlar ortaya koyacaktır. Görüleceği üzere bu meselede pek çok gizli tehlike mevcuttur: Lider birçok çıkar grubunun sorumluluğunu taşımaktadır. Diğer taraftan değişim ve ayakta kalmanın da imkânları mevcuttur. Hem iyi hem de kötü olma ihtimali bulunan karizmatik liderlik ahlaki liderliğin bir parçasıdır.

(1) Hizmetkâr lider denilen yönelimi geliştirmek.

Lider bir yönetici ve kontrol edici değil de bir hizmetkâr olarak görülebilir. Bu liderler diğer insanların istek, ihtiyaç ve çıkarlarına öncelik tanırlar. Hale ve Fields (2007)'in meşhur Greenleafs modellerine göre üç temel gösterge vardır. Bunlar şöyledir:

Hizmet: Alt kademedekilere, organizasyona veya topluma. Yukarıdaki alternatif hizmetkâr liderlik tanımlamasına göre bu liderlik tipinin hizmet yönelimli, astların gelişimini esas alan, organizasyonu korumaya meyilli, alt kademelerde çalışanların konumunu sağlamlaştıran, sözleşme ilişkisine dayalı, sorumlu etiği önemseyen ve çalışanları önceleyen bir yönelimi vardır.

Tevazu: Astların başarılarını liderin kişisel kazanımlarının önüne koymak. Bu boyut içerisine ilişkisel otorite, özgeci görev aşkı, duygusal iyileştirme, etik sevgi, fedakârlık, itibar, gönüllü itaat, gerçek ben, aşkın maneviyat ve yukarıda sayılan muhtelif hizmetkâr liderlik unsurlarından kaynaklanan ahlaki davranışları katabiliriz.

Vizyon: organizasyon için ortak bir vizyonun geliştirilmesi ve çalışanların bunu paylaşmaları noktasında onları etkilemek ve ileri görüşlü olmak. Bu boyut içerisine hikmet, inandırıcı eşleştirme, dönüştürücü etkileme, etkileme, itibar, topluluk için değer üretme ve yukarıda sayılan muhtelif hizmetkâr liderlik unsurlarından kaynaklanan kavramsal yetenekleri katabiliriz.

(2) Liderlik iletişimi: Daha diyalojik yolla yapmak.

Organizasyon ilişkilerinde ve süreçlerinde temel bir unsur olduğundan dolayı sorumluluk günümüz incelemelerinde gözden kaçmaktadır. Diğer taraftan sorumluluk, yöneticilerin işlevsel iletişim vazifelerini ilgilendirdiği kadar onların etik olarak doğru bir şekilde iletişim kurmalarını sağlayan ahlaki görevlerini de ilgilendirmektedir.

Sorumluluk doğası itibarıyla da sınırlıdır. Belirli lider zorunlulukları ve vazifeleri, bazı değerleri ve paydaşları diğerlerine tercih etmek biçiminde işlevsel hâle getirilmelidir. Sorumluluğun genel tabiatı, onun tam bir etik çerçe-

ve olarak kullanılmasını sınırlıyor olsa da yönetimsel iletişim standardı olarak genel bir kullanıma sahiptir (bk. Takala, 2006).

(3) İtina: Lider, insanlarla daha çok ilgilenmelidir.

Miller (2009)'in çalışmasında da görüleceği üzere ilişkilerinde davranışları ile empati gösterdiği düşünülen liderlerin organizasyonları yönetme işinde de mahir oldukları yönünde bir gösterge vardır. Bir mentor ve koç olarak liderlerin rolü iş yerlerindeki karmaşıklığın artması ile birlikte giderek öne çıkmaktadır. İtina ahlakı daha iyi iş uygulamalarına imkân açacaktır (Miller, 2009). İtina merhamet fikri ile yakınlaşmaktadır. "Merhametle yönetim"in Hristiyanlık temelli yeni bir liderlik yaklaşımı olabilir. Bu yaklaşıma göre çalışma ortamlarında mümkün olduğu kadar çalışanlara merhametli olunmalı ve onlara ilgi gösterilmelidir. Bu aynı zamanda Immanuel Kant'ın da ifade ettiği üzere insan olma vazifesi ile alakalıdır (Kylliäinen, 2009). Bu merhamet doktrini ileride yeni yönelimler önerecektir.

(4) Yönetim ve liderlik eğitimi.

Çalışanların gözüyle bakıldığında, liderlerin yapıcı ve manipülatif anlamda bir etkiyi yaratmak için yeteneklerini nasıl kullandıkları anlamak noktasında onlardan öğrenilecek pek çok unsur vardır.

Ahlaki bakımdan iyi karizmatik liderliğin bazı niteliklerini tanımlayabiliriz. Bunlar aynı zamanda profesyonel uygulamalar olarak da isimlendirilebilirler.

- Manipülatif bir şekilde konuşmayın.
- Retoriği suiistimal etmeyin.
- Hatalı bir üst olmaktan kaçının.
- Manipülatif eğitim stratejileri kullanmayın.

(5) Astlarla ilişkilerde asimetrik güce direnmek.

Direnen Liderlik'te direnme ve kontrolün iç içe geçtiğini varsayan diyalektiğin tekrar etmesini konu edinmiş ve böyle yaparak dönüşümsel değişime yönelik söylemsel çabaları caydırmak istemiştik. Burada Habermas'ın müzakere ahlakı (discourse-ethics) iyi bir başlangıç noktası olabilir. Alman toplum felsefecisi Jurgen Habermas iletişimsel eylem kuramını ortaya koymuştu. Buna "çarpık iletişim teorisi" denmekte ve bu teoride bazı güçlü akdi unsurlar bulunmaktadır. Teorinin temel yaklaşımı her bireyin baskı olmadan eylemde bulunma hakkı olduğudur. Lider-tâbi ilişkisine uygulanırsa şunu ifade edebiliriz; her lider-tabi ilişkisi karşılıklı iletişim ahlakı üzerine inşa edilmeli ve bunun üzerinden değerlendirilmelidir (Takala & Uusitalo, 1996).

(6) Karizmanın gücünü kabul etmeliyiz ama sadece iyi karizmanın gücünü.

Kötü bir karizmatik lider olmak tabileri manipüle etmek, egoist ve müte-caviz olmak anlamına gelip, tabiler açısından istenmeyen kötü sonuçlara yol açar. İyi bir karizmatik lider ise kendini adayan, egoist olmayan, kim-seyi kırmayan, diğerleri, kabul görmüş ortak değer ve hedefler için çalışan ileri görüşlü kimse olarak tasvir edilmektedir. Bunun en iyi örnekleri kutsal Meryem ve mütavazi azizlerdir.

References/Kaynakça

Aaltio, I. & Takala, T. (2000). Charismatic leadership, manipulation and the complexity of organizational life. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, *12*(4), 146-158.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B. & Alban-Metcalfe, J. (2005). Time for a new direction? *Leadership*, *1*(1), 51-71.

Burke, R. (2006). Why leaders fail: Exploring the darkside. *International Journal of Manpower*, *27*(1), 91-100.

Collison, D. (2005). Questions of distance. *Leadership*, *1*(2), 235-250.

Durkheim, E. (1965). The elementary forms of the religious life (J. W. Swain, Trans.). New York: The Free Press. (Original work published 1915).

Fanelli, A. & Grasselli, N. (2005**).** Defeating the minotaur: The construction of CEO charisma on the US stock market. *Organization Studies*, *27*(6), 811-832.

Gardner, B. & Avolio, B. A. (1998). The charismatic relationship: A dramaturgical perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*, 32-58.

Gray, H. (2005). The dark side of organizations: Forensic management - an emerging theoretical perspec-tive. *Development and Learning in Organizations*, *19*(6), 4-6.

Hale, J. & Fields, D. (2007). Exploring servant leadership across cultures: A study of followers in Ghana and the USA**.** *Leadership*, *3*, 397-417.

Hoffman, B. (2009). Succession charismatic authority and leadership change: Lessons from Cuba's post-fidel era. *International Political Science Review*, *30*(3), 229-248.

Jones, H. (2001). Magic, meaning and leadership: Weber's model and the empirical literature. *Human Relations*, *54*(6), pp. 753-771.

Kets de Vries, M. (1993). *Leaders, fools and imposters: Essays on the psychology of Leadership*. San Francisco,. CA: Jossey Bass.

Kylliäinen, A. (2009). *Mercy in working life*. Ottawa: Otava Publishing.

Lawler, J. (2005). The essence of leadership? Existentialism and leadership. *Leadership*, *1*(2), 215–231.

Miller, M. (2009). Transformational leadership behaviours and empathy with action. *International Journal of Holistic Mission Studies*, *26*, 45.

Milley, K. (2002). Imagining good organizations: Moral orders or moral communities? *Educational Management Administration Leadership*, *30*(1), 47-61.

Parry, K. & Hansen, H. (2007). The organizational story as leadership. *Leadership*, *3*(3), 281-300.

Parsons, T. (1949). *The structure of social action*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Schilling, J. (2005). From ineffectiveness to destruction: A qualitative study on the meaning of negative leadership. *Leadership*, *5*(1), 102-128.

Seeger, M. & Ulmer, R. (2003). Explaining enron: Communication and responsible leadership. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *17*(1), 58-84.

Sendjay, S. & Sarros, J. (2002). Servant leadership: Its origin, development, and application in organizations. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, *9*, 57-64.

Shamir, B., Dayan-Noresh, H., & Adler, D. (2005). Leading by biography: Towards a life-story approach to the study of leadership. *Leadership*, *1*(1), 13-29.

Sosik, J. & Dung, I. (2003). Impression management strategies and performance in information technology consulting: The role of self-other rating agreement on charismatic leadership. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *17*(3), 81-108.

Sveningsson, S. & Larsson, M. (2006). Fantasies of leadership: Identity work. *Leadership*, *2*(2), 203-224.

Takala, T. (1997). Charismatic leadership: A key factor in organizational communication. *Corporate Communication – An International Journal*, *1*, 8-14.

Takala, T. (1998). Plato on leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *17*(2), 785-798.

Takala, T. (2004). Charismatic leadership and power. *Journal of Problems and Perspectives in Management*, *3*(3), 45-57.

Takala, T. (2006). How to be an effective charismatic leader: Lessons for leadership development. *Journal of Development and Learning in Organizations*, *20*(4), 19-21.

Takala, T. (2009). Charismatic leader's dilemma: How to be a good charismatic leader in the context of racism. *China-USA Business Review*, *8*(1).

Takala, T. & Aaltio, I. (2001). Charismatic leadership and ethics in gender perspective. *Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organization Studies*, 9(1), 21-31.

Takala, T. & Kemppainen, K. (2007). "Great finns" – perspectives on greatness, charisma and good leadership. *Journal of Problems and Perspectives in Management*, *5*(1), 115-127.

Takala, T. & Lämsä, A. M. (2005). Interpretative study of concepts in management studies. *EBS Review*, *3*(19), 24-31.

Takala, T. & Sintonen, T. (2002). Racism and ethics in globalized business. *International Journal of Social Economics*, *29*(11), 849-860.

Takala, T. & Uusitalo, O. (1996). An alternative view of relationship marketing: A framework for ethical analysis. *European Journal of Marketing*, *30*(2), 45-60.

Tourish, D. & Pinnington, A. (2002). Transformational leadership, corporate cultism and the spirituality paradigm: An unholy trinity in the workplace? *Human Relations*, *55*(2), 147-172.

Tourist, D. & Vatcka, C. (2005). Charismatic leadership and corporate cultism at enron: The elimination of dissent, the promotion of conformity and organizational collapse. *Leadership*, *1*(4), 455-480.

Walumbwa, F., Avolio, B., Gardner, W., Wernsig, T., & Peterson, S. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. Journal of Management, 34(1), 89-126. Washburn, J. & Clements, C. (1999). Two faces of leadership. *Career Development International*, *4*(3), 146-148.

Weber, M. (1964). *The theory of social economic organizations*. New York: The Free Press.

Yagil, D. (1998). Charismatic leadership and organizational hierarchy: Attribution of charisma to close and distance leaders. *Leadership Quarterly*, *9*(2), 161-76.

Ytreberg, E. (2005). Ideal types in public service television: Paternalists and bureaucrats, charismatics and avant-gardists. *Leadership*, *2*(1).

Zoller, H. & Fairhurst, G. (2007). Resistance leadership: The overlooked poential in critical organization and leadership studies. *Human Relations*, *60*(9), 1331-1360.