THE SHADOW EFFECT ON POLITICAL LEADERSHIP AND LEADERSHIP ETHICS

Mariana Dias

marianaribdias@sapo.pt

Abstract

This article main theme is Leadership and seeks to define the concept in its different meanings according to different authors, in order to demonstrate the evolution of it. Leadership can be defined as well as the ability to influence, in an ethical and positive way, a group with a view to obtaining results. Thus, it is important to highlight ethics as a key factor in Leadership. Throughout this article it will be possible to verify the correlation between concepts such as Ethical Leadership, Charismatic Leadership and Political Leadership in the role of how to be trulyintrinsic as aleader. On the other hand, the Shadow Effect Theory is explained, which demonstrates that as leaders, they can sometimes corrupt the system by taking advantage of themselves.

Keywords: Leadership; Leadership Ethics; Charismatic Leadership; Political Leadership; Shadow Effect Theory

Introduction

The concept of leadership has been the target of severaldefinitions, as the theme develops and new ways of understanding leadership as an essential factor in the success of any organization, whether public or private, are being developed. This leads to several rich teó perspectives onthe concept, although all of them, in the end, conclude that leadership has become and proves to be a key factor in building better human relationships within organizations, and a way for them to achieve the defined goals.

Although little attention has been paid to the relationship between leadership and ethics, we can easily understand its importance when we think of the responsibility that exists in leading people, processes and organizations and also in a political environment. It is, in this sense, that leadership is said to have a strong ethical component, since it implies that the leader takes on a set of values, a commitment to people and the organization, as well as a virtuous attitude. It is due to this expected behavior of the leader that, inrecent years, ethical leadership has gained a prominent role. It began to realize the impact that leaders can have on the behavior of their employees and/or leaders, exerting influence in the sense that they feel committed to work and organization. It is in this search for the involvement of ethics in the leadership process that behaviors arise that are the opposite of what leaders expect.

Thus, the aim of this article is to highlight the importance of the role of ethics in leadership and also in what is called leadership ethics. Through a literature review around the concept of leadership, its origin isrevisited, the most important orias (transactional and transformational theory) plus its evolution over time. Subsequently, the next chapter is reserved for the ethics of Leadership. And then it emerges to speak of Charismatic Leadership and Political Leadership. Finally, the last chapter refers to the Shadow Effect Theory.

In conclusion it will be possible to answer the following question: What are the effects of the Shadow Effect Theory on Leadership Ethics and Political Leadership?

LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Leadership

When talking about organizations, it is always important to talk about leadership and this view is fundamental, given its impact on the contexts in which it is included. Before focusing on the impact of leadership in organizational contexts, it is important to know what significa leadership, its evolution over time and what are the most important theories.

Leadership has come to have different definitions over time. Rost (1991) analyzed materials written from 1900 to 1990 and found more than 200different definitions.

After decades of dissonances, researchers have reached a consensus: leadership is a complex concept for which only one definition will be insufficient (Northouse: 2013; Rost: 1991).

Burns (1978) states that leadership is a processo of mobilization of people and economic and political resources, in a context of conflict and competition, in order to achieve the objectives defined by the leader and collaborators. According to the GLOBE*(Global Leadership and Organizational* Behavior *Effectiveness) project,* leadership can be defined as the ability of an individual to influence, motivate and empower others to contribute to the effectiveness of the processes of the organizations to which they belong (House:1999).

For Ferreira, Neves and Caetano (2001) leadership integrates characteristics of personality in order to induce obedience and influence, adopting specific behaviors, such as persuasion and power relationship, in order to achieve the objectives. Robbins

(2004) also defines leadership as the ability to influence a group towards achieving goals. According to this author, leaders can emerge naturally within a group or by formal indication and their main qualities are intelligence, charisma, decision-making, enthusiasm, strength, courage, integrity, and self-confidence.

For Northouse (2013) leadership is a process in which an individual influences a group of individuals in order to achieve a common goal.

As can be seen, there is a huge variety and a clear evolution in the definition of leadership. Also the theories that support it are varied and have been diverging from the initial positions. Leadership theories increasingly differ from the view of leadership as a position, which assumes that if someone is in charge, then by definition that person will be a leader.

If we think of the genesis of leadership, it can be seen in the light of the perspective of human origins and as a resource for the survival of the group (Van Vugt, Hogan, & Kaiser: 2008). As Kaiser and Hogan (2010) refer, the solution to most survival problems faced by early humans required collective action – to hunt on a large scale, toward off predators, or toppler invading tribes.

Consequently, the authors mentioned see leadership as an adaptive solution for the coordination of collective efforts, believing that leadership emerges as a mechanism that allows individuals to transcend their selfish interests in the short term and work together for the group's long-term well-being. From this point of view, leadership involves building a team and the ability to lead itin order to achieve the common objectives and overcome competition (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan:1994; Hogan & Kaiser: 2005; Van Vugt et al.: 2008).

Currently, two dominant styles can be considered in the most recent theories about leadership: transactional leadership and transformational leadership. Burns (1978)

argued that leadership manifested itself according to these two forms, that is, in a transactional or transformational way.

Transactional leadership is characterized by the exchange relationship so that the needs of the leader and employees are taken into account. However, this type of leadership does not result in organizational change, contrary to what happens in transformational leadership, since, in the latter, leaders give their employees greater responsibilities, thus abdicating their own interests and favoring common interests, promoting change.

The origin of transformational leadership is based on Weber's Theory of Charismatic Leadership (1947), in which the charismatic leader is seenas an inmate of divine, exceptional powers and with a strong emotional bond to his collaborators, however, charisma, although a necessary condition, is not enough for transformational leadership. Avolio (1999) believes that the transformationalleader can achieve greater results because he can make his collaborators aware of the objectives and4 of the importance of achieving them.

There is also another factor, considered non-leadership and that diverges from transactional leadership and which represents *laissez-faire*. This factor represents the absence of leadership, that is, the leader abdicates responsibility, does not make decisions, gives no feedback andmakes little effort to meet the needs of employees (Northouse: 2013).

1.1.Leadership Ethics

The theme of ethics in leadership, although growing, is quite small in literature (Brown & Treviño, 2006; Den Hartog & De Hoogh,2009; Toor & Ofori,2009).

The specific references to ethics in leadership witheça, more consistently, in the 1990s. A small group of researchers examined how leadership theory and practice could be used to build a fairer and more caring society (Northouse: 2013). The interesse about the

nature of ethical leadership has continued, particularly due to recent financial scandals and in the political sphere. In the academic world too, interest has been growing on thistopic.

Gini (1998) defined ethical leadersas leaders who use their social power in their decisions, in their actions and in their influence over others, in such a way that they act in the best interests of employees, so as not to cause harm andrespecting the rights of all parties(Kanungo: 2001). Instead of focusing on the intent or motivation of ethical leaders, Brown et al. (2005) specified ethical leadership in terms of behavior, referring to it as the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, as well as the promotion of such conduct for employees, through two-way communication: reinforcement and decision-making. Thus, ethical leaders model and encourageethical behavior inemployees by communicating their standards, using rewards, and reinforcing the necessary discipline in the face of more or less appropriate behaviors. Furthermore, it is implied in this definition that the intention of the leader is to avoid damage to the speakers colaband act inthe best interests of others. This definition found wide acceptance in scientific-social research (Detert et al., 2007: Mayer, Kuenzi, Greenbaum, Bardes, & Salvador: 2009; Piccolo et al.: 2010; Walumbwa & Schaubroeck:2009).

Thus, considering leadership a process in which the leader influences others to achieve a common goal, this requires the leader to have an impact on the lives of his or her leaders. Promoting change implies a huge ethical awareness and responsibility. Dad,what leaders are always in a position of greater power vis-à-vis their employees, have an ethical responsibility to treat them with dignity and respect and to ensure their individuality. Although everyone should be careful, not just leaders, you havea greater responsibility, since theyare in a special position that allows them to influence others in various ways (Northouse:

2013).

There are several theories and views on the theme of ethics and leadership, however, present, according to Northouse (2013), the most prominent thoughts were to seek references to the perspectives of Heifetz (1994) and Burns (1978).

Heifetz's (1994) perspective emphasizes how leaders help their employees confront conflictand resolve it through specific changes. This perspective is related to ethical leadership to the extent that it is associated with values, both to the values of workers, as well as to those of the organization and community in which they work. Dand according to this author, the leader provides a container and safe environment in which confidence and empathy stand out. As for leadership, it involves the exercise of authority, that is, leaders use their authority to mobilize people to difficult issues, to deal with these same issues, to orchestrate perspectives that can generate conflicts and to facilitate decision-making (Heifetz: 1994).

Burns' theory of transformational leadership (1978) placesa strong emphasis on the needs, values and moral issues of employees, and involves the attempts and efforts of the leader to bring his collaborators to higher levels of moral responsibility, as well as to levels that will promote the values of freedom, justice and equality (Ciulla: 1998). In this sense, aspects that relate to ethics in leadership can be found.

Northouse (2013) also states that theories about ethics in leadership can be considered taking into account two domains: *theories about the conduct* and *the character* of leaders, that is, about actions and about who leaders are as people.

Theories related to *conduct can* be divided into those that emphasize the consequences of the actions of leaders (teleological theories) and those that emphasize the duty and rules that are at the origin of these same actions (deontological theories). In the former, three different approaches to decision-making can be considered, considering moral conduct: ethical selfishness, utilitarianism and altruism.

Ethical selfishness suggests that the person must act in a way to create the best for himself (Avolio & Locke: 2002). This self-interest is close to the transactional theories of leadership (Bass & Steidlmeier: 1999).

The second teleological approach, utilitarianism, says that individuals have to behave in order to create the best for the largest number of people. From this point of view, morally correct actions are those that maximize social benefits and minimize social costs (Schumann: 2001).

Close to utilitarianism and to ethical selfishness is the third teleological approach, that is, altruism, which suggests that actions should, first, promotethe best interests of others, even if it goes against their own interests (Bowie: 1991).

Also, in the theories about conduct are, as mentioned, the theories of deontological or "duty". This perspective focuses on the actions of the leader and his moral obligations and responsibilities to do the right thing. The actions of the leader will be moral if the líder has the moral right to do them and if these actions do not infringe and interfere in therights, also moral, of others (Schumann: 2001).

Finally, theories *about character*, also called" virtue-based" theories, focus, as mentioned, on what leaders are as people, believing that virtues and moral capacities are not innate, but rather acquired and learned throughout practical experience.

To be an ethical leader it is essential to be honest, aberto and respectful to employees (Brown & Treviño: 2006; Howell & Avolio:1992).

Northouse (2013) also mentions that five principles of ethical leadership can be considered, whose origin still dates back to Aristotle. These principles are respect for others, serve others; be fair; be honest; and contribute to community building.

1.2. Charismatic leadership

According to Yukl (1999), weber's original charismatic leadership theory in 1947 is based on the perception of the right-runners, who believe that their leader is endowed with exceptional abilities and talents. However, recently and following new investigations into Weber's theory other new theories have emerged. Although there are differences between the theories, which has caused confusion about the definition of

Charismatic leadership(Bryman: 1993), most of them are in accordance with Weber's assumption and emphasize the attribution of extraordinary qualities to the leader by his followers.

Although it isa return to the past of leadership theories based on the theory of "Great Man", this trend of the resurgence of leadership theories based on personal attributes has a major difference. These emerging new perspectives, despite assuming that some people are born with innate qualities to be leaders, also assumes that most people are made leaders, that is, learn to be leaders either through experience or through formal processes (McGonagill & Pruyn: 2010).

According to these new hypotheses, Charismatic Leadership is analyzed taking into account the amount of influence that the leader exerts on his followers and also the type of relationship that exists between leader and follower (Yukl: 1999). These emergenttheories are also part of Transformational Leadership, however, the way Bass (1985) defined the influence of the charismatic aspect is reduced, being limited to the formulation of a vision or challenging objectives (Conger & Kanungo:1998). However, in recent theories, charisma is seen as a fundamental factor in the process of Transformational Leadership and is described as the ability of the leader to producegreat symbolic power (Barbuto: 2005). Conger & Kanungo (1998) also argue, based on empirical results, that the charismatic factor is the aspect that bestexplains Transformational Leadership.

In this way Transformational Leadership is often included in the lot of Charismatic Leadership theories or sometimes the two denominations aroused indistinctly – although Bass (1985) argues that a leader can be charismatic without being transformational. In addition to Transformational Leadership, visionary leadership is also seen as a charismatic behavioral approach (Conger & Kanungo:1998 ; Shamir et al.:1993) On the other side of the coin, Yukl (1999), although assuming that there are overlay characteristics, defends the distinction between charismatic and transformational theory.

For him, there are no students who are able to offer a definitive explanation of the compatibility that exists between the two. Although there are behaviors that are relevant to both types of leadership, there are differences as to how these behaviors are conduzidos – a transformational leader has more preponderance to act in a way that empowers his followers and makes them partners in the pursuit of a goal. On the other hand, for a charismatic leader, the only way to achieve certain goals are only if his followers place full confidence in himself and his wisdom (Yukl: 1999). For a charismatic leader it is critical that followers believe in him, while for a transformational leader it is critical that his followers acredihas in themselves. These differences and similarities between Charismatic Leadership and Transformational Leadership, cause some authors to seek a solution that appeases this confusion of denominations. Shamir et al. (1993), along with Conger & Kanungo (1998) preferred simply to call it Charismatic Leadership.

However, other denominations have emerged as neo-charismatic leadership. This new term was proposed in an article by Fiol, Harris & House (1999), in which they seek to identify the implications of Charismatic Leadership in social change. They argue, however, that with this new namethey do not intend to eliminate the differences that they admit existing between theories, but rather frame them in a more general paradigm, which represents the essential common aspects. Fiol et al. (1999) come to empirically demonstrate that both charismatic, transformational and visionary leaders (tamem included in the paradigm of neo-charismatic leadership)can encourage followers to high levels of commitment to the mission of the leader, as well as make personal sacrifices for the objectives to be achieved, achieving performances in additiontoexpectations. For Yukl (1999), there are essentially two theoretical currents under discussion – the proposals of Conger & Kanungo (1988, 1998) and the proposals of House (1997) and Shamir et al. (1993). The authors of the book Charismatic Leadership in Organizations (Conger & Kanungo,1998) admit that there is a great overlap of their model and model by Shamir et al. Each of them refers to different behaviors typical of

the leader who practices Charismatic leadership and Yukl (1999),synthesizing or as follows, Chart 1.

CONGER & KANUNGO (1988, 1998)	HOUSE (1997) and SHAMIR et al. (1993)
Innovative strategic vision;	Appealing vision;
Take personal risks;	Highlight ideological aspects of the work;
Show sensitivity to the environment (restrictions, threats and opportunities);	Transmit high performance expectations;
	Transmit confidence in the capabilities of subordinates;
	Show self-confidence;

Table 1: Typical behaviors of Charismatic Leadership. Adapted from Yukl (1999)

Yukl (1999), further clarifies other differences. While Conger & Kanungo (1998) define charismatic behavior taking into account the characteristics of the leader, the seguidores and the environment. House & Shamir (1993) are   more on the aspect of how the leader influences the attitudes and motivations of followers, regardless of whether they consider him extraordinary or not (what Conger & Kanungo call the endorsement of the status quo).

1.3. Political Leadership

The study of political leadership reflects the two basic principles of understanding the term.

The first type of leadership studies examines the functions and powers of office holders. The study of political leadership in this sense is intrinsically linked with the fields of constitutional law, public administration, and government in general. Among other things, it includes country or government-specific comparative studies, central and sub-central numbers, official state powers and party leaders, profiles of elected

representatives and political appointees, as well as the holding of electoral and/or political camps. As befits the generality of this type of leadership studies, the subject can also be addressed through a variety of methodological, behavioral, rational and/or institutional choice points of view. The result isa rich and very varied literature. Classic examples include Neustadt (1965) and Linz and Valenzuela (1994).

The second theme in the work of political leadership concerns the study of how and why leadership in behavioral sense happens, if it exists. And in this respect the literature is a little more specialized. Something that is also developed by working in other disciplines, mainly in studies on social psychology and administration and business. The first studies of this kindsuggested that leaders possessinnate qualities that set them apart from others, which meant that they had a natural gift for reaching followers and therefore to create history (Carlyle: 1840). This approach, however, was later against.

There is now a general consensus that the study of political leadership should be addressed from an interactionist perspective (Greenstein:1992). This is up to: how far can individuals be able to influence the political process? What if this depends on theinteraction between individuals and the environment in which theyare? Are people who hold official positions of authority or not capable of affecting the behaviour of others dependent on the qualities of the people involved and the circumstances they areconfronted with at any time?

Contemporary examples of this type leadership studies focused predominantly on the first element of the interactionist approach, namely the motivations of individual political leaders. One dest andwork aspect concerns the long-standing question: whether certain personality traits (such as intelligence or appearance) are positively correlated with leadership success? The results suggest that the importance of the characteristics is specific to the situation (Van Fleet and Yukl 1989). Another aspect concerns the concept of leadership styles, that is, the accuracy of the classification depends on the

different ways in which leaders faced tasks. The best known one example is Barb er'sstudy of the U.S. presidential character (Barber 1972). One of the main reasons for the interest in Barber's thesis was because he seemed to have predicted that Richard Nixon would not be a success as president. So far, however, it has not yet been appliedsystematisedly outside the context of US policy.

Another aspect concern work in political psychology. The literature in this subfield is very broad, but of particular interest for leadership studies is the work of psycho biography, or the explanation of political events in terms of an explicit explanation about personality theory. A good example of this approach is the study of Woodrow Wilson by George and George (1956).

In short, the study of Political Leadership covers a wide variety oftruplets that address the subject from several different perspectives. That said, one of the weaknesses of literature as a whole is the absence of a theory, no matter the theories in dispute. The nature of the subject is such that it hardly lends itself to such a grand project (Elgie: 2001).

2. Shadow Effect Theory

On the basis of what has been explained, and given that governments and elected officials are sometimes accused of struggling to secure their seats, it makes it seem that there is a greater tendency not to respect ethical issues in a context not only organizational but also political. Do these themes are part of the so-called *Shadow Effect in Leadership* (SEL)? Uthat is, if you see what is called the "shadow effect", that is, whether leaders choose and interact with employees on the basis of merit, or by perceiting that they will be a threat to their position ("shadow effect").

The need for this constructo seems here supported by the bibliographic review carried out, that is, considering ethics, integrity and humility in leadership, it is contact that the

issue of leadership centered on an extreme concern with the possibility of the leader may lose his position, is often transversal to the behaviors evidenced by a leader.

However, a construct that evaluates this type of specific behavior does not seem to have yet been defined. As Owens and Hekman (2012) refer, humility is negatively relatedtonarcissism, therefore, with self-centered behaviors (Nielsen et al.: 2010). Leaders who are in a quest to focus their actions not favoring what others know or their contributions – "shadow effect" – is the antititisof such behaviors of humility, in an unethical and unhealthy conduct. Just like May et al. (2003) mention, there may be a variety of reasons why leaders do not act ethically, in particular to preservethe survival of their owncareer. Thus, the "shadow effect" can be integrated into this idea expressed here, since one of the main factors behind this construct is the concern of the loss of status, position or power.

Conclusion

In short, Ethical Leadership translates into an appropriate conduta on personal actions and interpersonal relationships, which is manifested through bilateral communication, monitoring of employees and support during the decision-making process. When the leader follows ethical principles and adapts his conduct to moral codes, he promotes organizational justice and influences behavior.

However, it is important to point out that the values present in the leaders' discourse should also be visible in their actions, because only then will they serve as models of ethical conduct, something that is fundamental regarding political leadership, so that the effects on the so-called Shadow Effect will be neglected because they promote dissatisfaction or denial on the part of the leaders, i.e.society in general, which may claim air through social movements or pressure groups.

References

Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. 1st American edn. Oxford University Press: New York.

Tannenbaum R, Schmidt W H. (1958). *How to choose a leadership pattern.* Harvard Business Review.

House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Huns & L. L. Larson (Eds.), Leadership: The cutting edge. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois Press.

Zaleznik, A. (1977). *Managers and leaders: Are they different?* Harvard Business Review.

Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York: Harper & Row.

Howell, J.M., & Avolio, B. J. (1992). *The ethics of charismatic leadership: Submission or liberation?* Academy of Management Executive.

Shamir B, House R J, Arthur M B. (1993). *The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: a self-concept based theory.* Organization Science.

Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kuhnert, K. W. (1994). Transforming leadership: developing people through delegation. In B.M. Bass & B. J. Avolio (Eds.), *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership* (pp. 10-25). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kanungo, R. N., & Mendonca, M. (1996). *Ethical Dimensions of Leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Avolio, B. J. (1999). *Full leadership development: building the vital forces in organizations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

House, R. (1999). *Cultural influences on leadership and organizations: Project GLOBE.*

Kanungo, R. N. (2001). Ethical values of transactional and transformational leaders. Canadian *Journal of Administrative Sciences.*

Avolio, B. J. & Locke, E. E. (2002). Contrasting different philosophies of leader motivation: Altruism versus egoism. *Leadership Barracks,*

May, D. R., Chan, A. Y. L., Hodges, T. D., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Developing the moral component of authentic leadership. *Organizational Dynamics, 32*, 247–260.

Melo, Carlos. (2012). *Notes and reflections on "Political Leadership": contribution to the delimitation of a field of study*. São Paulo: Art, media and politics magazine.

Bhatti, N., Maitlo, G., Shaikh,N., Hashmi, M., & Shaikh, F. (2012). *The impact of autocratic and democratic leadership style on job*satisfaction. International Business Research, 5(2), 192-201. Doi: 10.5539/ibr.v5n2p192

Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Neves, L., Jordão, F., Cunha, M., Vieira, D., & Coimbra, J. (2016). *Study of adaptation and validation of an ethical leadership perception scale for Portuguese* leaders. Psychological Analysis, 34(2), 165-176. doi: 10.14417/ap.1028.

Insured, Rosemary; dandAlmeida, Rodrigo Estramanho; Chaia,Vera. (2018). Politics *and leadership: Theories and Practices*. PUCSP: São Paulo.