An Effective Leadership Revelation – Blending Dark Side and Positivist Traits

Philip L. Fioravante
Capella University

The "Leadership Phenomenon" debatably has received more attention than any other management rudiment. Defining leadership style in a positivist or dark side construct leads to a broader discussion regarding functionality of emotional intelligence and the role of social-behavioral sciences. This article provides a study of several leadership traits and presents a postulated synthesis of positivist ethics, moral reasoning as well as those of dark side execution. Lastly, this article provides the reader with how and why sycophants follow these leaders and what affect the surrounding milieu has on the establishment of situational boundaries and affected outcomes.

INTRODUCTION

According to Kellerman (2004), "Leaders are like the rest of us: trustworthy and deceitful, cowardly and brave, greedy and generous" (p.45). Personal perspectives are the result of the learned values and attitudes, observed, and experienced during a lifetime. Setting the tone or message of an organization is vital to its foundation and must be levered with effective communication, strong business ethics, and moral reasoning to achieve congruency of follower adherence. Leadership is about two things – clear vision and an ability to incentivize others to follow.

Leaders use framing methods for providing meaning to their message. The most skillful are able to apportion certain aspects of the subject matter and disallow others as a means of controlling the message and placing emphasis in a self-serving manner. This skill resonates in positivist as well as dark side leaders. Goleman (1998) suggested, "Truly effective leaders are also distinguished by a high degree of emotional intelligence, which includes self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skill" (p. 82). In support, Michaelson & Michaelson (2010) offered the importance of leaders concentrating on their own strengths as way to achieve superiority. Both dark side and positivist leadership styles [paths] have references to the synthesis of these trait elements and examples are evidenced in this article.

Leaders rely on what they have been taught and what they have learned from seeing and doing. Establishment of ethical and moral boundaries is within the rights, responsibility, and in a sense, reciprocity of each leader – at least in a positivist frame. Alternatively, dark side leaders tend to work within a construct of fear and compliance, as a means to an end. These boundaries ultimately frame the relationship with followers as a means of defining style, character, and expectations of one another. In addition, communication amongst the *cast list*, in the leader-follower schema, provides power and control channels and simultaneously provides for common speak and feedback. The reference to "cast list" addresses the leader – follower affiliation and the roles and responsibilities as acted out.

The primary theme throughout this paper is the revelation of how leaders use their charismatic and emotional intelligence in enabling sycophants to follow the vision, realize success, encounter failure, and ultimately commit to supporting the leader. Subordinately, a focus on the similarities and differences between the so-called dark side and alternatively the positivist side of leadership will be discussed. The leaders chosen for this article has positivist leadership skills, notably positivist as exhibited by Ernest Shackleton and the dark side phenomena exhibited by Genghis Khan.

Researchers have attempted to address questions such as, is dark side necessarily bad? Does charisma enable both leader types to be successful? How does ethics and morality affect leaders? What role does communication play in effective leadership? Each of these queries contributes to the understanding of leadership qualities and the affect each have on shaping the leader-follower experience.

Choosing one path or another is fundamental to a consistent and definable leadership style. This so-called "path" is the continuum by which leaders are measured by followers and in many instances held accountable to the success or failure of the outcome. Leaders instill accountability and likewise are accountable to subordinates. Leaders are ultimately responsible for the livelihood and extended care of their followers. Therefore by definition, a leader cannot lead without followers. Applying innate traits, deploying learned skills, and sharing common vision are hallmarks of preeminent leaders throughout history. Practicing and applying philosophies while gaining the confidence and followership of others is a basis for leadership.

LEADERSHIP FUNDAMENTALS

Philosophies and Ethics

Portrayed in most, if not all, leaders are certain fundamental personality traits. Brady and Woodward (2005) postulated, "The essence of leadership cannot easily be classified or codified" (p.14). These traits have dependency on the behavioral sciences as well as the situations in which the leaders act out their role which brings challenge to quantification of leadership. As stated in Bennis (2004), "Every new leader faces the misgivings, misperceptions, and the personal needs and agendas of those who are to be led" (p.46). The leader who accepts the role willingly, as in Shackleton's case or unknowingly, in Khan's circumstances, have the unalienable responsibility to adopt values, set a direction, and lead the followers.

Positivist leaders choose to adopt and indoctrinate ethical decision-making, integrity, and moral reasoning into their mantra. This adoption institutes a sense of communitarian ethic and common values amongst the followers. According to Velasquez (2006), "An [communitarian] ethic sees concrete communities and communal relationships as having fundamental value that should be preserved and maintained" (p.103). In this sense, leaders should work to maintain strong allegiance and due care in their responsibilities to their constituency base and can be characterized as follows, "Ethics of care is an ethic that emphasizes caring for the concrete well being of those near to us" (p.102). Leaders, who tend to have moral literacy, in a positivist sense, will have a propensity to have stronger connection with their followers. The critical point here stresses the moral fiber and character traits of the leader in sustaining high integrity and ethical leadership qualities. Notice that charisma is not in this discussion. According to Sankar (2003), "Charisma is not connected to ethics…It is the character of the leader that is connected to these elements of a leader's behaviour" (p. 45). This is a salient point in appreciating the value of dark side and positivist traits.

Whereas the positivist leaders practice ethics of care, dark side leaders are centric on control and abuse of moral reasoning. The interpretation basis of a dark side leader centers on the trials and tribulations of executing the vision. Dark side leaders choose to lead not by communitarian ethic, but rather by autocratic rule. As stated in Conger (1990), "He [the leader] became so enamored of his own ideas that he failed to see competing and ultimately, more successful ideas" (p. 45). This comment is indicative of the dark side of narcissism - a definable leadership term. According to Maccoby (2004), "They [narcissists] are especially suited to act as a support for others, to take on the role of leaders, and to give a fresh stimulus [positivist] to cultural development or damage [dark side] the established state of affairs" (p. 93). Maccoby (2004) further claimed that, narcissism has negative connotations. Dark side

leaders exemplify lack of seeking follower input and poor communication channels and therefore, ultimately do not establish a sustainable, follower-supported organization. This is an outcome not typically evidenced in positivist scenarios and in fact is contrary to most suppositions of this leadership style.

Both leadership types demonstrate the ability to communicate internally as well as externally. Positivist leaders challenge subordinates using query words such as what and how – while darkside use why. Using what and how does not create anxiety and allows the follower [subordinate] to focus on appropriate answers in a more comfortable, less threatening manner which may be created by asking, Why? – a preface with a negative connotation. In both leaders' cases, the research showed their abilities were most predominant in internal [followership] situations. Gosling and Mintzberg (2003) presented the "Five Managerial Mind-sets" and also hypothesized regarding leadership communication approaches. These mind-sets focus on the leader's protocol in dealing with the environment in which they lead and the processes whereby interpretation situations are bestowed. Also presented, was the notion of leadership and the importance of establishment of subordinate connection through strategic communication. "Leadership without [ethical and moral reasoning-based] management encourages a disconnected style, which promotes hubris" (p.54). The resultant depicts dark side leadership at its core and helps to frame the contrast between the two styles.

The ability to convince sycophants becomes dependent on one's achievement of a coherently delivered message and alignment of the followers to its significance. As stated in Javius (2009), leaders develop a proficiency and linkage between "coherence, congruency, and commitment" (p. 30). He further presented, "the key leadership qualities…have proven to be an advantage for helping good leaders become great leaders" (p.32). Therefore, those leaders who are effectual in leading by moral example are able to instill a true sense of bonding with their followers, as this is primarily witnessed in positivist scenarios. According to Sankar (2003), "Excellence unlike efficiency and effectiveness is a value based construct; it is the ethical ground rules of the leader…" (p.50). True leaders are able to indoctrinate their value and attitude system as a "thread" - binding vision and personal commitments and thusly convincing their followers to follow. Consistently executing the vision set before the sycophants is paramount in the establishment of the confidence and ethics of care – based on strong conviction and emotional intelligence. The term "vision set" suggests the leader's perspective vision is comprised of a series of rudiments and is not singular in fashion.

Emotional Intelligence

Leaders need to have a sense of confidence and fittingly, well-developed social skills. However, there is no place for arrogance in executing a sustainable followership. According to Aaltio-Marjosola and Tuomo (2000) and Goleman (2004), charisma and emotional intelligence are both sine qua non in precisely describing the imago of a leader. Described by many researchers, emotional intelligence, centers on self-awareness, self-assuredness, self-motivation, affinity, and is a prerequisite for successful leadership. Correspondingly, Smith and Elmes (2002) described emotional intelligence as the "sensitivity to self and others, and an awareness and understanding of emotions" (p. 448). The key term is "self" and the recognition given to one's own internal voice, whether subconscious or conscious. Aaltio-Marjosola and Tuomo (2000) stated, "The interrelationships between the leader's inner world and its outcomes affect the nature of organizational culture…" (p.146). The phenomenon can be seen in both leadership styles presented herein.

Moreover, leaders must adapt to the changing environment with regularity – a skill both innate and learned with experiences. "The challenges of the outer life demanding a reorientation of the human being as the most fundamental level" (Smith & Elmes, 2002, p. 450) acquiesces with emotional maturation and intelligence. Continuing, vision [sets] and emotional intelligence (EI) are fundamental rudiments associated with personal traits and leadership prowess. A leader states a vision to establish common direction for the followers. Additionally, the conviction and steadfast nature of a leader's decisions rationale correlate to emotional character and intellect. The personality skill sets of a leader are varied, but align as stated in Smith & Elmes (2002), "Along with linguistic fluidity and personal charisma" (p.448).

EI is not a trait that comes as a byproduct of working harder or smarter. Predicated on innate abilities is intelligence - coupled with basic elements such as, maturation, experiential, and willingness to psychologically self-reflect in an objective lens - all provide for leadership wholeness.

In their précis of the Book of Job, Smith and Elmes (2002) depicted "shadow" in terms of one's psychological consciousness. More relevant perhaps is the "unconscious personality that holds the unknown. Awareness of the shadow is vital because it contains those elements that make us fully human – fears, desires, and hatreds…" (p. 454). Preeminent, positivist leaders such as Shackleton exhibit the intelligence to recognize and address their shortcomings, while having the emotional fortitude to make necessary personality changes. In support, Kramer (2006) presented two distinct intelligence perspectives – socially intelligent and politically intelligent. In this construct, Shackleton is hermeneutically socially intelligent in that he was able to assess his crew's strengths and figure out how to leverage them. These rudiments were underpinnings of his leadership lore.

Conversely, Khan was viewed as a ruling emperor who used power and control in a politically intelligent manner, in that he focused on people's [his army of followers] weaknesses and insecurities. Moreover, Khan used intimidation and "hard power to exploit the anxieties and vulnerabilities [he] detected" (Kramer, 2006, p. 91). The challenges of leadership are omnipresent and represented in many shapes, sizes, and complexity – emotional intelligence is a differentiator between failure and success. Wieand (2002) added some sustenance, "[Peter] Drucker observed that altering emotions is, for the most part, a communications challenge that succeeds only when it breaks through a person's 'emotional glass ceiling'…" (p. 34). The term *glass ceiling* in this construct is the upper limit of which a person [leader] has emotional intelligence boundaries – based on experiences, purpose, and beliefs. A leader's identity is born, nurtured, and fashioned over time. According to Wieand (2002), "Identity is the whole system and emotional intelligence is just one component of that identity" (p. 35) - nurturing affects the manner in which they formulate and utilize communication.

The Role of Communication

Communication is an essential contributor to leader-follower transparency and requisite for goal alignment. In support, Michaelson and Michaelson (2010) suggested the simpler the better when developing and delivering messages. Continuing, O'Hair, Friedrich and Dixon (2002) claimed, "Shared meaning is the mutual understanding that results when the sender and all intended receivers interpret the message the same way" (p.7). Regardless of style (positivist or dark side), effective leadership communication materializes when shared meaning is a cornerstone of the organization's culture. In a corollary, Wieand (2002) discussed the importance of [communication] authenticity in leadership. He stated, "The authentic person communicates trust by being genuine and non-defensive…leaders must be emotionally flexible, paradoxical, emphatic, and values driven" (p.36).

Based on research in relation to Shackleton, it appears he had emulated these traits. Khan was not emotionally elastic and in fact, exhibited a dark side tendency having values and a communication approach inconsistent with the accepted norms of the times. Aaltio-Marjosola and Tuomo (2000) affirmed, "In a very real sense, [effective] communication is the lifeblood of organizations…and an essential reason for major organizational triumphs" (p. 154). There is sufficient evidence that clear messaging drives desired outcomes in high performing organizations. Leaders, being both mindful and skillful, are certain to have proficient communication abilities in their personality arsenal, whilst appreciating its value in the eyes of their followership. Building and sustaining trust is also deemed essential and in fact has been found to be the primary bond in a leader-follower situation.

A primary component in human capital appreciation begins with a fundamental value system. "In this respect, the knowledge creating company is as much about ideals as it is about ideas" (Nonaka, 2007, p.164). Effectively and efficiently utilizing strategic communication in order to share the vision and core values (ideals) with the followers is a vital leadership skill. The most skillful of leaders are able to develop varying approaches of communication within a situational context. Inherent in these methods are strategic exploitation of the leader's control and power as well as the recognition of a shared obligation to

each other. Accountability is a two-way proposition and should be held in check between the relationship constituents to secure the common desired outcomes.

Power, Control, and Followership

Leaders, based on prior experiences, share the aptitude to provide the appropriate situational framework to their followership which undoubtedly has linkage to goals and objectives. Leaders need to adopt patience yet make swift and decisive decisions based on factual data. In a supporting hypothesis, Tversky and Kahneman (1986) presented the notion that "Framing is controlled by the manner in which the choice problem is presented as well as by norms, habits, and expectancies of the decision maker" (p. 257). In this regard, leaders from the follower's perspective are able to unknowingly dictate and control the given situation confronted. In addition, especially in the case of a dark side scenario, the followers accept this as the "right way" and quickly fall in line. Moreover, it is not out of the norm for dark side leaders to seek opportunities for internal and external conflicts. These leaders are able to derive certain followership advantages when creating risky scenarios. In this situation, the followers will tend to rally around the leader for the achievement of success.

Conversely and corollary to Shackleton, Macaulay and Cook (2009) pointed to the ability to provide focused motivation and remain positive in the face of a dilemma. The need to cease power and control was as unavoidable in the Shackleton scenario – the goal: survival. Based on the research findings, he did not abuse the leadership privilege and lead with humility and grace. Being in control was a position Shackleton relished, but only to have the opportunity to lead. Contrarily, Khan desired power and control for selfish, immoral reasons.

The view of behavioral sciences and the ontological [nature of being] influence in effecting positive and negative leadership behaviors is the theoretical thread throughout this research. Leaders and organizations address challenges each day. Whether it is the setting of a vision, addressing loss of market share, the expansion into new geographic regions, or training employees, leaders must develop controlled, effective, and efficient processes to be successful. "A few extraordinarily effective leaders possess a set of potent abilities and intuitive instincts that enable them to readily reposition their organizations in anticipation of [market] change" (Savage & Sales, 2008, p.28) and bring forth scenario analysis and contingency planning.

In alignment with the Fielder's seminal Contingency Theory Model, leadership control and effectiveness…is "contingent upon the interaction of the leader's orientation and the favorableness of the group task situation" (Rice, 1973, p.281). This model underscores the significance of the leader's personality in relation to the situational context and ability to use power for gain. Shackleton conveyed this leadership model in his approach to leading his crew. Sine qua non in this approach is three elements - listening, interacting, and reacting. According to Koehn (2003), "One of the greatest challenges [in developing strong followership] of managing [and controlling] or leading [power position] in turbulence is being able to play to your stronger suit as a leader and also play to others' stronger suit" (p.1). To ensure sycophant-leader alignment and congruency, leaders of both portrayed styles, through their assumed or bestowed power, develop contingencies and adjustments establishing a clear path forward while gaining and being in control of the situation.

Charismatic Profile

For purposes of this article, the charisma discussion relates to the ethical positivist – where you might expect and arguably to unethical, dark side leaders as well. Howell and Avolio (1992) suggested, "Charismatic leaders are celebrated as the heroes of management" (p.43). However, as researchers and theorists have postulated, an essential element of charisma includes ethical principles. Continuing, Howell and Avolio (1992) presented the notion of charisma being "value neutral" and in support, Aaltio-Marjosola and Tuomo (2000) hypothesized, "A charismatic leader's selfishness and narcissism may together lead to undesired consequences" (p.147). This portrayal provided alignment with the dark side leadership approach.

As stated in Sankar (2003), "Charisma is helpful only if the leader couples character with integrity and with the ideal of service…" (p. 52). Moreover, the consequential profile for ethical charisma is unbiased, having certain aspects stronger in positivist and others in the dark side. As stated in Sankar (2003), "The use of coercive power, intimidation, and deception are some of the strategies used to enhance…" (p.46). This statement insinuates a charismatic dependence relationship between the leader and the sycophant as followers look for balance and fairness. In summary, charisma can be viewed as constructive and positivist in nature or in an unethical sense being used to promote dependence and precarious values symptomatic of dark side leader-follower relationships. These leaders are able to create an addiction seen between themselves (as dark side leaders) and their loyalists in a hypnotic sense.

Fiedler and House (1988) in their description of charismatic leadership hypothesized, leaders articulate a mental picture of their vision and as such create and secure an image of utopia for their sycophants and this solidifies power and control. "These leaders challenge their followers and provide a personal example by behaving in a manner that reinforces the vision and mission of the leaders" (p.78). Similarly, Brady and Woodward (2006), stressed the essence of influence - imposed by teaching, empowering, and character. In this sense, effective leaders regardless of motive – positivist or dark side all have influencer ability and in the end is a product of leadership.

Furthermore, each phase of the leader's career has milestones and opportunities for reflection. According to Bennis (2004), "Each stage of leadership brings new crises and challenges…" (p.47). The phases or as Bennis defines, "stages", utilize the charismatic and emotional intelligence traits to enable the leader's success. Applying the Bennis' "Seven Ages of the Leader" to this article in a dark side context, Khan moved hastily from "Infant Executive" to "General". Khan was best known during the "General" stage and morphed into emperor of many lands, near and far. Khan, through use of charisma, albeit dark side tainted, was exceptional at managing himself and the context in order to have dominance over his followers.

In contrast, Shackleton focused his leadership style on managing relationships and change. He was able to instill confidence and support by way of his charismatic style. Unlike Khan, most of the published, relevant history of Shackleton's prowess was during the stage of "General". In this stage and according to Bennis (2004), "The real test of character for a leader is to nurture those people whose stars may shine as brightly as – or even brighter than – the leader's own" (p.52). Shackleton had high self-confidence and through self-awareness recognized the fate of his crewmembers would require humility, swift actions, and due care. In support, Aaltio-Marjosola & Tuomo (2000) affirmed, "The legitimacy of charisma and charismatic leadership is sociologically and psychologically attributed to the belief of the followers and not so much to quality of the leader" (p.149). His charismatic flair enabled the success of the quest – followers followed and lives were saved. In the end, Howell and Avolio (1992) eloquently suggested that charismatic, ethical leaders articulate ambitions that are follower determined and their visions are eventually responsive to the desires and furthering personal interests of the sycophant. Based on this overture, Shackleton undeniably was symbolic of an ethical, charismatic leader.

Alternatively, Khan embodied the charismatic dark side leading to follower compliance and worship and as put forth in Howell and Avolio (1992), "Unethical charismatics exercise power in dominant and authoritarian ways to serve their self-interests, to manipulate others for their own purpose, and to win at all costs – even death. Moreover, he employed "psychological warfare", both in mind and body relationships with his [warriors] sycophants. In this sense, Khan created a perception of his charisma through unyielding fear and control.

BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES AND ORGANIZATIONAL THEORY

Anthropology and Social Psychology

The selected disciplines correlated to leadership theory for purposes of this research article are anthropology and social psychology. Anthropology focuses its studies on the activities and the abilities of the individual. How does the environment in which an individual or organization resides affect the values,

behaviors, and attitudes? Social psychology is the melding of sociology and psychology – a synthesis of psychology hypotheses and sociology theory which centers on the influence of people on one another.

Whereas, psychology is the applied science seeking to measure, annotate, and occasionally alter the behavior of individuals; sociology examines interactions of individuals in relationship to each other. In assessing leadership practices, social psychology studies how people are aware of and influence others. Moreover, there is the existence of numerous psychological variables affecting leadership. Self-confidence, self-awareness, and self-efficacy are variables contributing to motivation, emotional relationship, organizational culture, and decision-making (Popper & Mayseless, 2007). Each contributes to leadership approach, follower alignment and ultimately achievement (or not) of established desired outcomes.

Anthropological influencers, such as origin of birth, appear to justify innate traits and those crafted and developed through social psychology – experiential learning creates basis for leadership style, character, and authenticity. These resultants of behavioral influence have significance in the development of organizational and leadership theories. For purposes herein, the two theories considered are modernism and symbolic interpretivism and these theories provide parallelism and have hermeneutic purposes in the evaluation of both dark side and positivist leaders.

Organizational Theory (Modernism and Symbolic Interpretivism)

Comparing Modernism and Symbolic Interpretivism (SI) perspectives is centric to leader knowledge and experience and is a theme in this article. Separately, these perspectives take a unique view of organizational theory and have some level of significance in the definable framework of leaders and leadership. For centuries leaders have readily put forth new discoveries, new knowledge, and refined old ones. Gao (2008) hypothetically posed *knowledges* as a composition of knowledge of being, knowledge of doing, knowledge of society and knowledge of humanity, which are disseminated in various disciplines. Each of these knowledges enables rational structures, having a set of processes and systems by which a leader executes a plan – thusly framing the lens of Modernism.

In contrast, SI supports the premise of the individuals in the organization basing their perspectives on a unique set of experiential learning opportunities and the coupling of such with social interaction in a followership and social group setting. In symbolic interpretivism, environments are viewed as social constructs and in this regard, leaders such as Khan and Shackleton developed a vision, schema, and behavioral norms around the construct of shared common beliefs throughout the followers.

Moreover, with respect to early theories, Khan and Shackleton posthumously are associated with the organizational theory and in particular, modernism and symbolic interpretivism. According to Avolio, Gardener, Walumbwa, Luthans and May (2004), "…as those individuals who are deeply aware of how they think and behave and are perceived by others as being aware of their own and others' values/moral perspective, knowledge, and strengths…" (p.804). For purposes herein, Khan's leadership [organizational] style favored symbolic interpretivism based on his use of Mongolian slogans, artifacts, and developing a new language purposefully for establishment of a unified "speak". Amongst his clan of followers, Khan emulated the suppositions of seminal Critical Organization Theory presented by Marx, and focused on organizational design, structure, and the distribution of power within the social system. Using this backdrop, research showed Khan diligently worked to establish a common, artifact-based culture and governed by empirical dominance. However, this directional utopia resulted in leading his followers to the supreme sacrifice – their lives and perhaps souls.

Continuing, Schein (1987) stated, "Artifacts are manifestations or expressions of the same cultural core that produces and maintains the values and norms" (p.17). Hatch and Cunliffe (2006) recommended that artifacts are objects such as, symbols, verbal expressions such as, enlightenments and theories and activities such as, communication transference. Through the use of these artifacts, leaders (of both styles) are able to leverage power and control over the follower group. In support, Raelin (2003) postulated, "In addition to claiming to have a unique vision and compelling language [artifact], a charismatic leader might also attempt to acquire symbolic accouterments as the role of a savior" (p. 49). Fittingly these rudiments are consistent amid the two leadership perspectives discussed herein.

Conversely to the Khan and SI association, Shackleton's leadership and his conscious (and sub-conscious) execution of organizational theory had a tendency to Modernism. Hatch and Cunliffe (2006) offered, "Modern theorists focus on how to increase efficiency, effectiveness, and other objective indicators of performance" (p. 20). Based on the research, Shackleton's leadership was associated with modernist theory. This leadership portrayal is evidenced in the execution of a survival and rescue mission that empowered his crew while balancing the need to have control to achieve their desired outcomes. His proficiency in effective communication and leadership effectiveness were evidenced outcomes throughout his career. Preeminent leaders, such as Khan and Shackleton, have successful adopted a common speak and a linear path to an envisioned future – capturing the minds and actions of their followers.

GENGHIS KHAN – THE DARK SIDE LEADER FOCUS

Historical Biography

Temüjin, a Mongol later named Genghis Khan ("Khan") by his stepfather, Ong Khan was born in 1162. Known as a charismatic leader, Khan rose to power in about 1185 and assumed a dynamic and aggressive leadership style. May and Keller (2001) stated, he [Khan] was "born to noble family…" (p.1) and they hypothesized this nobility played a key role in the development of Khan's social psychology perspectives throughout his life.

Khan experienced many hardships during his lifetime and each of these events contributed to his personality, leadership perspectives, and the style in which he ruled the Mongolian empire. Moreover, Khan emulated psychopathic traits that correlate with today's behavioral science standards. According to Deutschman (2005), "Psychopaths have a profound lack of empathy. They use other people callously and remorsefully for their own ends" (p. 46). Khan ruled with fervor and pressed his sycophants - accepting of his "psychopathic ways" to follow his narcissistic vision of ruling the world. For over this twenty year timeframe, Khan was successful in amassing a territorial empire spanning from today's country, Korea north and west to Hungary. This empire was essentially amassed through a rather endless quest of battles and wars which formed the reference of Khan as a dark side leader.

Known as a 13th century empire ruler, Khan died in August 1227. During his sixty-five years, he developed various dark side leadership perspectives. However, Khan also exuded some fundamental positivist traits focused on training and providing the correct "tools" to his followers [subjects]. He was instrumental in the overture of certain writing systems in that are the foundation of today's Mongolian education. Khan's zen for a unified people system, led Khan to establishing a "clan-type" mentality portrayed in today's gangs and social clubs – common speak, common ideal and common purpose. This provides an illustrative dichotomy among positivist and dark side leadership approaches.

The Khan Empire

Massacre and destruction were two operatives of Khan's ruling power. Driven by his narcissistic behavior and charismatic dark side style, he reportedly was on a course to rule the world. According to Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991), "It is not just the direction of action that counts, but sticking to the direction chosen" (p. 51). Based upon this focus and will, Khan was successful in aggregating various nomadic Mongolian tribes into a unified empire. Genghis Khan has a Chinese translation meaning, "universal ruler". Captivatingly, he was interested and conscious of the call to maintain a myriad of skills amongst his followers. During raids on towns and cities, he specifically instructed his soldiers not to kill artisans, those possessing multiple language skills, and other skilled people such as, engineers and scribes. This strategic initiative, to cite the phrase, can be viewed as a brilliant leadership move in executing the master plan of cultural supremacy.

As a dark side transformational leader, Khan followed the theory as hypothesized in Parry (2002), "One or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation" (p.75). In this sense, Khan, by exemplifying an aggressive desire to rule the world, found his followers were engaged in his quest and would follow him even if the acts were dark side dominant. Bass (1985) further argued transformational leadership as a positivist theory based on

elements of morality, ethics, and integrity - most of these were not evident throughout Khan's empire or exhibited his follower's actions. However, his followers believed in the words and vision he put forth. Khan did exhibit these leadership traits albeit in a dark side bent and managed to provide leadership to many. An argument here is "his" transformational leadership execution is not consistent with definition or today's accepted behavioral norms.

Leadership Theories - Khan

Khan led by example. He had a difficult childhood which shaped much of his dark side leader perspective. He had the need to prove to the world that he could be an emperor of many lands and people. As proposed in Fink (2009), "Charismatic motivation creates a sense of urgency and purpose" (p.7). Khan convinced himself and his followers that the only way to live their lives was to control as much land as they could, thus unifying the various peoples under a common, singular-focused rule. His constancy of purpose and persistence to the end were hallmark themes of a great leader – Khan's historical legacy.

Moreover, Khan believed in his followers and their value to his conquest. May and Keller (2001) offered, "As an organizational and strategic genius, Genghis Khan created one of the most highly-disciplined and effective armies in history"; this same genius also gave birth to the core administration that ruled it" (p.2). Khan and his followers had a relationship based on the belief of common goals, belief in training one's "workers", and motivation. Supporting, McLaurin and Al Amri (2008) hypothesized, "Leadership is a dynamic relationship which is based on mutual influence [accountability] between leaders and followers which results in a higher level of motivation…" (p.15). Followers were willing to sacrifice their lives in the hope of satisfying his quest. Khan recognized the need to keep his enemies close, so he created strategic [land, people and weapons makers] alliances as a method of highlighting his proactive, charismatic leadership skills. Through these alliances, Khan mobilized armies at a rapid rate, thus enabling his empire to grow to such significance in a short time period. To this end, leaders eventually gain more significant outcomes if they can recognize the value in alliances in supporting current strategies, or more importantly, creating new ones.

As postulated in Smith and Montagno (2004), many leadership theories attempt to address fundamentals of charismatic leadership. The charismatic leadership theory perspective focuses on extraordinary characteristics of inspiration and positions followers to provide commitment to the leaders shared vision and organizational values. Khan inculcated his followers to have faith in his quest and to share his undying desire for a unified region regardless of religions, cultures or race. According to Conger (1990), "Some visionary leaders are so absorbed by the 'big picture' that they fail to understand the essential details" (p. 54). This was not evidenced in Khan's case, as he focused relentlessly on flawless assessment and scenario planning of his next steps leading to high performing results.

Khan had many successes and failures during his imperial reign. For example, his measured success in territories conquered is quite impressive. History also reflects on the successes Khan had by preparing his followers [warriors] for battle while developing an organizational system, providing an assemblance of stability and warfare innovation. Leading the organization [army], sharing common vision, being properly trained and given proper tools are all artifacts of a successful leader, even in a dark side tenet. A key point here is the failures encountered were looked at as opportunities to improve processes and systems within the followership ranks.

Conger (1990) continued his propositions, "He [Khan] became so enamored of his own ideas that he failed to see competing and ultimately, more successful ideas" (p. 45). A corollary example, Khan's "failures" were measured as the lives lost during this expansion of power and reign of terror. These metrics are not necessarily failures, but rather sacrifices in relation to the dark side perspective. Additional failures were due to the lack of attention to succession planning in regards to his followership. Khan was ill prepared to maintain his empire since he reluctantly trained and did not empower some of his key lieutenants. Therefore, the empire's longevity suffered to the extent possible given the lack of sustainable preparedness of human capital. "Moreover, the blind drive to create this very personal vision could result in an inability to see problems and opportunities in the environment" (p. 45). Khan's reign of

the imperial emperorship has been viewed by several historians, as a dynasty of all dynasties; however, it ended without the redeeming feature of a sustainable [operating] model.

History recounts Khan is a dichotomist view - a leader of great charisma, strong followership, and vision on the positive side; ruthless and narcissistic on the dark side. These points shed light on the revelation of dark side traits in concert with positivist character and as such can be praised and result in desired outcomes. Following this section is an appraisal of Ernest Shackleton - a positivist leader and role model in situational context and transformational leadership theory.

ERNEST SHACKLETON – THE POSITIVIST LEADER FOCUS

Historical Biography

Ernest Shackleton, an explorer of British origins, was born in 1874 in County Kildare, Ireland. Shackleton was a young merchant sailor who learned several leadership skills while in the Navy and at the age of 27 boarded a ship to the Antarctic. Due to his penchant for reading, Shackleton successfully spouted off factoids to fellow ship mates. This intellect positioned him to be admired and thusly, formed the foundation of his role as a leader. Fink (2009) suggested the "intellectual motivation" (IM) leadership trait in that it promotes novel, thoughtful problem-solving. Shackleton exhibited these leadership traits during the *Endurance* tragedy. Unfortunately, he never made it to the pinnacle of distinction due to sickness, but his historical prominence came to be while on his expedition to Antarctica. The irony in this situation was the expedition was a failure by most accounts. Exploits derived from this tragic, yet heralded, quest coincide with numerous leadership skills presented in this article.

Shackleton and his crew boarded the *Endurance* in 1901 with the goal of being the first vessel crossing the continental southern polar region. Unfortunately, this quest resulted in the *Endurance* becoming frozen and crushed in the ice. Thereafter, Shackleton made it back to Britain and after several attempts he was successful in rescuing his entire crew and bringing all back to England. Upon his return, with his crew alive, Shackleton lectured and wrote books until his unexpected death in 1922 at age 48.

The Shackleton Quest

Shackleton demonstrated innate leadership traits. Telfer (2009) affirmed, "When we lead effectively… we surely strive to display characteristics and behaviours consistent with values and principles needed to win both 'hearts and minds' of those we lead" (p.1). In this sense, the valiant and decisive decision-making of Shackleton was extraordinary. As a cited in Weatherford (2004), "For Ernest Shackleton…his followers stood 'shoulder to shoulder' alongside him" (p.103) - they felt empowered. Moreover, Telfer continued and stated, "His [Shackleton] language spoke of our aims; our goal" (p. 2). Even though Shackleton never reached Antarctic's South Pole, his legacy centers on the leadership and determination to have his crew stay alive over the two-year period of this quest. Shackleton succeeded in bringing himself and his crew to safe harbor. No lives were lost. However, upon his return home, he suffered failure in a sense of not financially capitalizing on his grand victory in life. Notwithstanding, the journey provided immense satisfaction and demonstrated a myriad of leadership accomplishments.

Leadership Theories - Shackleton

Shackleton is a positivist leader for many reasons. Coupled with having charismatic traits, he also provided inspirational and individual motivation (Fink 2009). His inspiration was exhibited in the manner in which he kept his crew enthusiastically, even in the face of tragedy, focused on the end goal of staying alive during the two-year ordeal. Additionally, he established short and long-term goals as part of his survival plan. Koehn (2003) provided some insight to Shackleton's style by stating, "One thing Shackleton did very well was to revise, and reset, his objectives as the context changed" (p. 2). This statement is reflective of practicing the Contingency Leadership Theory principles earlier presented.

As stated in Telfer (2009), "People follow leaders because they have to or because they respect them for what they are…" (p.2). Shackleton, by primarily knowing his own limits, was able to demonstrate his leadership and will. Socrates, the Greek philosopher stated, "Know thyself". Shackleton knew his own

physical and mental limits and developed his leadership and in this case, survival skills, under tremendous pressure. Seemingly developed in a reactive mode, his leadership prowess was in fact developed over years of study and resulting experiences that enabled him to lead with confidence. In support, Aaltio-Marjosola and Tuomo, (2000) posed, "Whereas the unselfish and sacrificing of charismatic leaders may be seen to bring about desirable or admirable consequences" (p. 147). This strong presence, in the face of imminent danger, established a strong followership between him and his crew. The bond created amid the team enabled them to stay focused on the common goals and objectives at-hand.

Moreover, Shackleton was a transformational leader. According to Koehn (2003), "Ernest Shackleton, like all of us, is as flawed as he is brilliant, or as flawed as he is effective" (p.2). As previously mentioned, his leadership style was comparable to the contingency theory model. For example, he made adjustments based on the changing environmental conditions while maintaining focus on the mission. These are distinctive characteristics of both a transformational and contingent leader. He exuded several characteristics of leadership that provided for a strong relationship with the crew. Telfer (2009) stated, "Good followership requires the right kind of leadership…transformationally through those less tangible qualities such as integrity, moral courage, and decency" (p.3). These positivist traits were a hallmark of Shackleton's "reign" - ultimately providing the right tools to survive. He and Khan both exhibited the use of leadership tool kits in their respective situations. This leads to a historical lore discussion regarding the overall appraisal of the style by which they have been measured and revered as famous leaders.

LEADERSHIP STYLE APPRAISAL

Similarities

Khan and Shackleton were remarkable, effective leaders and admired albeit for contradictory styles and yet parallel approaches. According to Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991), "Effective leaders must keep pushing themselves and others [followers] toward the goal" (p. 51). Both leaders exhibited personality qualities such as charisma, transformational and transactional leadership styles in establishing dynamic and stimulative relationships with their followers. Telfer (2009) stated, "To lead effectively is to somehow engage people [sycophants] in both a common purpose and a compelling vision" (p.1). Efficacy enabled Khan and Shackleton to provide their respective followers with purpose and meaning – empire building or a survival quest alike. According to Andersen (2006), "Personality traits helps us explain why a person acts the way he/she does when in a leadership position" (p. 1086) and in specific, Michaelson and Michaelson (2010) stressed the significance of knowledge in "stacking the odds" in support of leadership penchant. The differing traits lead to the positivist or dark side leadership perspectives discussed in the next section of this article.

Leaders exude effective power in their postures and have the ability to structure, motivate, and lead. Similarly, effective leaders wield power and self-confidence. According to Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991), "Power is an 'expandable pie', not fixed sum; effective leaders give power to others as a means of increasing their own power" (p.52). In this orientation, transformational leadership having a corollary meaning is a leadership style witnessed in Khan and Shackleton. Both leaders had charisma, albeit it in unique demonstrations, and similarly acted as McLaurin & Al Amri (2008) put forth, "change agents and social architects" (p. 17). In addition, as presented in Conger (1990), "Ultimately, then, the success of a leader's strategic vision depends on a realistic assessment of both the opportunities and the constraints…in the environment and a sensitivity to constituent's needs" (p.45). This vision or path forward is a critical success factor in followership care. Leaders must take due care of their followers in the expectation of a sustainable future.

Charismatic leaders can be defined as McLaurin and Al Amri (2008) postulated, "those who have high self-confidence, a clear vision, engage in unconventional behavior, and act as a change agent, while remaining realistic about environmental constraints" (p. 16). Khan and Shackleton shared several of the fundamental behavioral traits as both being charismatic, but on opposite sides of the "leadership coin" – dark side and positive respectively. One thing for sure, both worked to establish cohesiveness in their

storied lives. According to Stogdill (1966), "Cohesiveness is defined as the maintenance of, capacity to maintain, structure and operations under stress" (p. 674). Moreover, Khan and Shackleton both shared the innate ability to comprehend the changing scenarios encountered and develop tactics and strategies to address solution execution.

Both profiled leaders were risk takers as they went about their respective lives. For Khan it was about conquering another land and converting its people to followers. While for Shackleton, it remained the desire to ensure his followers have food and drink for survival. Both approaches were uniformly focused on initiative and drive. Personal hardship or the need to conquer - both of these leaders shared the zest for life and maintained authenticity in their own manner. In support, Avolio et al. (2004) stated, "The essence of authenticity is to know, accept, and remain true to one's self" (p.802) and to a point Cashman (2009) suggested, "Lead more with presence" (p.8). Self-awareness positions individuals to consider the attitudes and actions of others. Khan and Shackleton had self-awareness which was manifest in their respective styles.

Moreover, leaders must exude confidence and undeniable mental strength in their role. The similarities of the two profiled leaders are hermeneutic and anecdotal. Perhaps a greater portion of the article ought to focus on the differences in the leadership appraisals – this might be foolhardy. Great leaders share a significant set of "equipment" such as charisma, vision, and drive to cite a few. The similarities discussed herein draw much thought and possible future research – the differences may require less so.

Differences

Research has shown most leaders possess in some shape and form both transactional and transformational leadership traits. From the dark side perspective, Khan had suffered many early year hardships and used his self-awareness and greed to conquer by massacre; thusly, expanding his empire in many far off lands. Conversely, Shackleton had a somewhat traditional Anglo-Saxon upbringing and faced most of his personal adversity during his Antarctic exploration and subsequent mission to save his crew.

Notwithstanding the similarities cited, Khan exhibited more of a tendency to one of transactional leadership than transformational. In this regard, he led his sycophants to the intended outcome rather than a transformational style instilling follower confidence to exceed expectations. In support, McLaurin and Al Amri (2008) described transactional leaders as "not considering the needs of the followers on an individual basis" (p.18). Khan exemplified the lack of compassion by not developing (through succession planning) future leaders within his ranks. This point as presented in Maccoby (2004), "Lack of empathy and extreme independence make it difficult for [dark side] narcissists to mentor…" (p. 98) emulates a core failure of Khan.

Conversely, Shackleton exhibited a tendency towards a transformational leader with a strong, self-awareness personality and the desire to mentor his followers. He used his inner being, empathy, and calm to lead successfully. According to Farrington (2006), "[Shackleton] cultivated a sense of compassion and responsibility for others [crew]. As a leader you have a bigger impact on the lives of those under you than you can imagine" (p.1). Correspondingly, Parry and Proctor-Thomson (2002) hypothesized relationship between charisma and the transformational leadership theory. Closely coupled with charisma is integrity – connecting positivist leadership to followership.

Where Khan was less interested in resolving differences and instead killed those in disagreement, Shackleton used his leadership skills in finding a plethora of solutions at the deepest levels of resolve. He knew that his followers [crew] could be instrumental in developing a survival game plan such as where to find food. Consequently, Shackleton developed comprehensive approaches to maintain a sense of balance and awareness. This served him and his crew well during their ordeal.

One being from the dark side and the other being from the positive side of leadership, creates differences by the very nature of the perspectives. Khan was a narcissistic, intimidating leader and exuded many of these traits. Maccoby (2000) confirmed, "Not surprising, most people think of narcissists in a primarily negative ways (p. 94). Coined after the Greek mythological image, Narcissus – narcissism has

correlation to Khan's personality. Continuing, Maccoby (2000) avowed, "Throughout history, narcissists have always emerged to inspire people and to shape the future" (p. 93). He [Khan] was especially interested in his own image and lived to prove he was born to be emperor even though he was bestowed power by his stepfather. In support Kramer (2006) added, "In addition to aggressive physical demeanors, intimidators routinely use the weapons of language – taunts and slurs – to provoke their [sycophants] victims" (p. 92). Khan's use of intimidation proved to be legendary.

The research suggests dark side leadership is centric on narcissism, as the means to an end, whilst widely claimed to be answerable for followership disillusionment. Race (2002) hypothesized, "Beyond simple self-regard, the narcissistic disorder refers to destructive pattern of thought and behavior whose traits include an unrealistic sense of one's importance and power, excessive need for admiration…" (p.4). Khan's fit to dark side leader model exemplified this disorder. Race (2002) further argued that an individual's sense of overstated significance and prerogative provides for immunity to corporeal laws and in some sense divinely cosseted and shielded from the inevitable consequences of doings and misdoings. Notwithstanding, narcissists can be charismatic by appealing to their followers using false praise and rhetoric. Continuing, Raelin (2003) stated, "They're also poor listeners, show little empathy, can be brutally exploitative…and are not constrained by conscience" (p.48). Based on the research, Khan fit both of these personality descriptions in carrying out his leadership role or better said, rule.

Leaders who are narcissistic and favor dark side tendencies tend to utilize propaganda and other manipulates as advantage over followers. As Aaltio-Marjosola and Tuomo (2000) stated, "Propaganda means the deliberate and systematic attempt to shape perceptions, manipulate cognitions, and direct behavior…" (p.162). Khan exemplified a leader who successfully instituted propaganda and "psychological warfare" on his followers and victims alike. His sycophants believed in a unified culture and executed the plan to the death. Khan, by instruction, convinced his warriors to kill those who added no empirical value and forcibly indenture those who could further his world dominance vision.

Conversely, Shackleton was the "anti-narcissist" and authentically worked to advance his personal hardships and those of his crew – survival. Similarly, according to Maccoby (2004), there are also leaders revered as model prophets and dubbed, "productive narcissists". Furthermore, these leaders are gifted and imaginative strategists who see the big picture and find sense in the precarious challenge [Shackleton's quest to save his crew] … leaving behind a legacy. Shackleton had fringe narcissistic traits, but favored positivist elements; unlike Khan, who was obsessed with conquer and adulation by his sycophants.

As the consummate transformational leader, Ernest Shackleton exemplified heroic deeds in the eyes of his crew. As stated in Smith, Montagno and Kuzmenko (2004), "The transformational leader is motivated by a sense of mission to recreate the organization to survive in a challenging external [to survive] environment" (p. 86). The idealized leadership influence and motivational prowess in a heroic sense, displayed during the tale of the *Endurance* undeniably qualified him as such. In support Raelin (2003) postulated, "Heroic qualities because they're thought to persist in spite of the odds against…" (p.48), as exhibited during the years of the Shackleton quest.

Khan draws similarities to one who prescribes to a Machiavellian persona. Sankar (2003) synthesized this reference to dark side leaders in that "maximizing one's self interest at the expense [lives] of others through use of manipulation and deceit" (p. 46). An example was Khan's dominance of new territories resulting in massacre and mass destruction of property. He focused on the exploitation of others for his success, which substantiates many of the dark side traits he exuded throughout his years of emperor.

Shackleton was a charismatic leader whose positivist approach underscored his focus on the journey's objectives and the survival of his crew. Unlike Khan, who represented a "personalized" charismatic trait, Shackleton was a "socialized" charismatic leader (Sankar, 2003). The theory supporting socialized leadership stipulates "a high need for power, it is counterbalanced with…low authoritarianism, an internal locus of control, high self esteem, and low Machiavellianism" (p.47). Alternatively, Khan exhibited a personalized character which had a "need for power, high authoritarianism…high narcissism and high Machiavellianism" (p.47). Whereas Shackleton favored interdependence of his followers – but reliance on each other for survival, Khan fostered sycophant reliance and deference to him.

While, Khan lacked authenticity and empathy, Shackleton's actions and fortitude exemplified these traits. According to Avolio, Gardner, Luthans, et al. (2004), the definition of authentic leaders is "those individuals who are deeply aware of how they think and behave and are perceived by others as being aware of their own and others' values…knowledge , and strengths" (p.804). Shackleton's crew recognized his sincerity and trusted his actions – enabling swift decision-making and shared commitment. Conversely, Khan used coerciveness and rhetoric with his sycophants convincing them into accepting his decisions and followed suit regardless of the outcomes – death and destruction.

To sum up, Khan and Shackleton were both charismatic, heroic leaders – but on different sides of the "leadership ledger". Andersen (2006) posed the question, "Can personality explain why some people reach leadership positions while others do not" (p.1078). Similarly, are leadership skills innate or learned and do these skills contribute to the success of the leader? Both of these questions lead to discussions about the success factors viewed in those leaders who gain prominence.

Success Factors

Leaders of prominence share a number of commonalities in their effectiveness – with success being a primary driver. According to Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991), "Effective leaders must not only be full of drive and ambition, they must want to lead others" (p. 52). Noteworthy traits include persistence, focus, initiative, and due care for followers – even dark side leaders exude care for their sycophants as they cannot be leaders without them. Khan and Shackleton demonstrated a willingness to lead by example and be uniquely, yet similarly, transformational stewards. As put forth in Macaulay and Cook (2009), "Shackleton turned around a disaster and made it a triumph through teamwork and leadership" (p.2). As a positivist leader, Shackleton revealed his leadership traits in many contexts. Optimism, trust, motivation, and faith in oneself are examples. Known to have personal success before the journey on *Endurance,* he also convinced many benefactors to fund such an ambitious expedition even in the face of the risks associated.

Furthermore, transformational leaders are able, in a modernist sense, to integrate various traits allowing them to achieve significant feats. Shackleton had the innate ability to see a challenge as an opportunity and worked tirelessly to empower and coerce his crew into believing in him and the mission. In addition to being technically astute, he was pragmatic in his approach to matching up people with their strengths. Thusly, he positioned the crew to have faith in him and themselves – imperative in survival mode.

Similarly, Khan had fringe transformational leadership traits as well as charisma in that he empowered his people to attack and conquer other tribes in the quest for unification around a central theme. According to Raelin (2003), there are several accounts of charismatic leaders who needed to engage in "impression management, in image building, and in manipulation of meaning in order to bind 'subordinates [sycophants] closely to them and to their [dark side] vision" (p.49). In this sense, the theme was imperial rule under Khan and his belief system. People killed for this dark side leader and followed him to all corners of the globe.

As a change agent, Khan influenced his followers by utilizing a charismatic and visionary approach. His success was measured by the ability to gain commitment and undying adherence to his unification vision across Asia and others. The morality factor, being dark side centric, focused his followers on doing what he [Khan] felt was best for them. According to Clements & Washbush (1999), "Common wisdom would suggest that people who employ personal power see followers as utilitarian tools, incapable of independent thought, and captured by the magnetism of an overwhelming personality" (p. 171). Khan used his skills to dictate the direction and will of his followers. These followers realized a sense of motivation, personal significance, and loyalty to the leader. He was extremely successful at bring his followers [warriors] to the dark side by effectively utilizing this stratagem.

Whereas Khan used charisma and vision to "successfully" destroy people and property, Shackleton used his charisma, emotional intelligence, and psychological console to achieve the success of saving his crew. Raelin (2003) supported and put forth, "Such leaders might be able to turn the uncertainty [being stranded] of their followers into a vision of opportunity and success" (p. 49). Achievement of success for

both Khan and Shackleton did not come without setbacks and failure. Determination of these failures was meet as a challenge and the leaders used their skills, whether positivist or dark side, to maintain their vision and drive for success.

Failure Causals

Failure to lead – is this true failure? Measuring failure is multifaceted and rather nebulous. "One only fails when they stop trying" (Author unknown). Both Khan and Shackleton had failures. According to Clements and Washbush (1999), "There are many effects of this failure: bad decision-making, frustration, dysfunctional organizations…" (p. 171). In addition, leadership does not definitively provide for heralded triumph. In fact, Clements and Washbush (1999) furthered this notion and stated, "It is clear that effective leadership can be instrumental in promoting social good, but should be equally clear is that effective leadership can also be instrumental in promoting social disaster" (p. 172). A main point noted, it is not solely the responsibility of the leader for success – followers are part of the equation. "It is clear that shadow aspects of both leaders and followers can combine to produce a negative effect" (p. 173). For example, Khan had failures in timely execution of his empire's growth. Some targets [enemies] were more difficult to conquer than others were. Some followers lost confidence in him and thusly either was able to escape his authority, which was unlikely or killed for betrayal.

Similarly, Shackleton had failures and setbacks throughout his expedition and lifetime. Running into incredible ice floats and insufficient supplies to last two years are some examples of failure to plan for adversity. Leaders must be able to comprehend strategic uncertainties. The mastering of this considering is paramount to sustainability. Ultimately however, Shackleton was more successful than not and proved to have the mettle to turn adversity into success. Farrington (2006) stated, "Find ways to turn setbacks and failures to your advantage" (p.1). This mantra was essential to the leader skills Shackleton exhibited. In researching leadership, there was an awakening to the tendencies and traits shared and opposing - a clear divergence was not evident, but rather correlation and triangulations.

VISION FOR EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

Leadership has many definitions while being both revered and reviled over the centuries. [Envisioned] leadership is an art, not a science – it's about creation from a single revelation; perhaps it's a synergy or intersection of art and [behavioral] science. The relationship between leader and sycophant is critical for both parties to be effective and efficient – communication being paramount in the exchange. According to Telfer (2009), "Leadership and followership are, in effect, 'two sides of the same coin'. Without good followership, leaders stop hearing the truth because good leaders need good followers as much as good followers need good leaders" (p.2). Therefore, a communitarian and ethical leadership approach to establishing a network of followers is essential to sustainable success and Shackleton during the two-year survival ordeal executed this approach flawlessly as did Khan in his years of reign over arguably the largest land mass in history. Paramount is the recognition of accountability to each other – leader and follower.

Leaders play countless roles in their day-to-day lives. Traits, whether innate or learned, can lead to proficiency or even failure. Khan and Shackleton, as leaders, recognized the need to turn crisis into a challenge for their respective sycophants. Moreover, each used their leadership tool kit comprised of charisma, narcissism, and character in leading the followers to the envisioned future. The term "tool kit" is used to represent the set of leadership elements such as communication, mentoring, and providing clear direction. As stated in Popper and Mayseless (2007), "Thus, the formula for 'becoming a leader' consists of the potential to lead, motivation to lead, and certain developmental contextual processes and conditions" (p. 666). Each individual [leader] has to decide which path he or she will follow, as he/she executes the agency of change within the organization. According to Conger (1990), "It's clear that many qualities of a strong leader have both a positive and a negative face" (p. 55) and this is the essence of this article.

Regardless of the path taken, it is imperative the organization understands and acts as a focused entity. Organizations have been successful in achieving goals in dark side situations such as during Khan's reign. Similarly, organizations with a positivist bent have prevailed, as well in Shackleton's survival mission or the explosive, yet seemingly sustainable growth at companies such as, Starbucks and Apple.

Organizations must continually adapt to environmental influences in order to have long-term business model viability. Positivist leaders employ varying control and power techniques to drive the organization toward an envisioned future. Through the use of charisma, (both consciously and subconsciously), ethical and moral reasoning standards, and best practices, effective leaders will be successful if and only if their followers (i.e. crew, team, subordinates) can see the vision, comprehend the objectives and deploy the strategies as set forth by the leader. According to Raelin (2003), "Charisma is more of a social process, often implicitly set up between follower and leader to keep the leader in power" (p. 50). This statement speaks to the complexity of conveying charisma to leader personality style – whether dark side or positivist.

Furthermore, a leader's personality sets the tone for the organization as a whole. Vision, actions, and execution all rely on the social and psychological perspective of the leader. Developing high-performing groups starts with organizational design, then implementing a structure of subordinates (intellectual capital) that enables, empowers and achieves success. According to Andersen (2006), "Personality usually refers to the distinctive patterns of behavior that characterize each individual's adaptation to situations of his life" (p. 1086). It is with unreasonableness to solely put forward individuals endowed with the proper training, experiential learning, and broad socialization to become skillful, ethically-based leaders (Conger, 1990). Positive leaders will typically garner these attributes, while the dark side leader will take turns along the way creating or resulting in negative traits. Andersen (2006) furthered this claim and stated, "Human behavior reflects the continuous interaction of many forces both in person and in the environment or situation" (p. 1086). Based on organizational theory research, the relationship between the constituents is fundamental to a sustainable future. One must work diligently each day, whilst flawlessly executing the business strategy. Self-awareness, due care, ethics and effective communication all play a significant role along the way is defining and executing leadership.

Khan and Shackleton were change agents in their own right. They led with charismatic power and control – dark side and positivist respectively. In support, Gosling and Mintzberg (2003) put forth a leadership supposition, "The dominant view of managing change is Cartesian: Action results from deliberate strategies, carefully planned, that unfold as systematically managed sequences of decisions" (p.61). Shackleton managed to lead with a procession of ethics of care, authenticity, common focus and motivation. He cared deeply for his crew and worked to ensure the safe return to the homeland. Conversely, Khan lead more in the sense of anarchy due to lack of continuity in managing the changes occurring during his reign – invading territories without considering the results of carnage and death to his own sycophants (Gosling & Mintzberg, 2003).

Leadership has more than a few exacting descriptors as discussed in this article. There is evidence of shared traits such as charisma, the need to effectively communicate, and vision -linking positivist to dark side leaders. As verified in the discussion, the behavioral sciences contribute to the establishment and synthesis of several leadership traits resulting in style, character, and (un-) ethical position. Furthermore, a tendency towards narcissism seems to have its functional place in dark side and positivist perspectives. An ongoing theory argument states, leadership is an innate trait and not learned, whilst other research hypotheses stand firm on narcissism as a common leadership trait and a result of the situational residence of the leader. All the same, leaders come in all shapes and sizes and are effective or fail based on differing factors. In the end, regardless of being a dark side clairvoyant or a positivist, the adherence to *the* envisioned future enables him to have a followership and hence defines a leader.

Leadership is dependent on a need to alter the status quo and leave today better than yesterday, but not as good as tomorrow. It's about perseverance to attain an intended purpose or stated vision. The ability to provide and articulate a common vision is sine qua non to achieving greatness – dark side and positivist alike.

REFERENCES

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

Andersen, J. (2006). Leadership, personality and effectiveness. *The Journal of Socio-Economics, 35*(6), 1078-1091.

Avolio, B., Gardner, W., Walumbwa, F., Luthans, F., & May, D. (2004). Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders' impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly, 15*(3), 801-823.

Banaji, M., Bazerman, M. & Chugh, D. (2003). How (Un) ethical are you? *Harvard Business Review, 81*(2), 56-64.

Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.

Bennis, W. (2004). The seven ages of the leader. *Harvard Business Review, 82*(1), 46-53.

Brady, C. & Woodward, O. (2005). Launching a Leadership Revolution. New York, NY: Hachette Book Group

Cashman, K. (2009). Being a leader. *Leadership Excellence, 26*(1), 8.

Clements, C. & Washbush, J. (1999). The two faces of leadership: considering the dark side of leader-follower dynamics. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 11*(5), 170-175.

Conger, J. (1990). The dark side of leadership. *Organizational Dynamics, 19*(2), 44-55.

Dearlove, D. (2003). Interview: Manfred Kets de Vries: The Dark Side of Leadership. *Business Strategy Review, 14*(3), 25-28.

Deutschman, A. (2005, July). Is your boss a psychopath? *Fast Company*, *96,* 44-51.

Farrington, J. (2006, December 4). *Lessons in leadership from Ernest Shackleton*.

Fiedler, F. & House, R. (1988). Leadership theory and research: A report of progress. In Cooper, C. and Robertson, I. (Eds.). *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology.*

Fink, S. (2009, March). Born leaders? *Leadership Excellence*, *26*(3), 7-7.

Gao, F. (2008). Is management science or art? *Systems Research & Behavioral Science*, *25*(1), 125-136.

Goleman, D. (2004). What makes a leader? *Harvard Business Review*, *82*(1), 82-91.

Gosling, J. & Mintzberg, H. (2003). The five minds of a manager. *Harvard Business Review, 81*(11), 54-63.

Hatch, M.J. & Cunliffe, A. (2006). *Organization theory: Modern, symbolic, and postmodern perspectives* (2nd ed.). Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

Howell, J., & Avolio, B. (1992). The ethics of charismatic leadership: submission or liberation? *Academy of Management Executive*, *6*(2), 43-54.

Javius, E. (2009). Skills for courageous leaders. *Leadership, 38*(3), 30-32.

Kellerman, B. (2004). Leadership Warts and All. (cover story). *Harvard Business Review*, *82*(1), 40-45.

Kirkpatrick, S. & Locke, E. (1991, May). Leadership: Do traits matter. *The Executive, 5*(2), 48-60.

Koehn, N. (2003, August). Shackleton: An entrepreneur of survival. *Harvard Business School Working Knowledge*.

Kramer, R. (2006). The great intimidators. *Harvard Business Review, 84*(2), 88-96.

Macaulay, S. & Cook, S. (2009). Shackleton and the antarctic – Leadership lessons. *The Stairway Consultancy*.

Maccoby, M. (2007). Narcissistic leaders: Who succeeds and who fails. Boston: Harvard Business Press.

May, T. & Keller, C.(2001). Genghis Khan. Retrieved April 13, 2009, from http://www.accd.edu/sac/history/keller/Mongols/empsub1.html

McLaurin, J. & Al-Amri, M. (2008). Developing an understanding of charismatic and transformational leadership. Proceedings from the Academy of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict, 13(2), 15-19. Conference conducted at the Allied Academics International Conference, Reno, NV.

Michaelson, G.A. & Michaelson, S. (2010). *Sun Tzu: The Art of War for Managers* (2nd ed.). Avon, MA: Adams Media

Nonaka, I. (2007). The knowledge-creating company. *Harvard Business Review*, *85*(7/8), 162-171.

O'Hair, D., Friedrich, G., & Dixon, L. (2002). *Strategic Communication in Business and the Professions* (4th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Parry, K. & Proctor-Thomson, S. (2002). Perceived integrity of transformational leaders in organizational settings. *Journal of Business Ethics, 35*(2), 75-96.

Popper, M., Mayseless, O. (2007). The building blocks of leader development: A psychological conceptual framework. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 28*(7), 664-684.

Race, T. (2002, July 22). New economy; like narcissus, executives are smitten, and undone, by their own images. *The New York Times*, p.C4.

Raelin, J. (2003). The Myth of Charismatic Leaders. *T+D*, *57*(3), 46.

Rice R. & Chemers, M. (1973). Predicting the emergence of leaders using Fielder's contingency model of leadership effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology. 57* (3), 281-287.

Sankar, Y. (2003). Character not charisma is the critical measure of leadership excellence. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 9*(4), 45-55.

Savage, A. & Sales, M. (2008). The anticipatory leader: Futurist, strategist and integrator. *Strategy & Leadership, 36*(6), 28-35.

Schein, E. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, B., Montagno, R, & Kuzmenko, T. (2004). Transformational and Servant Leadership: Content and Contextual Comparisons. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 10*(4), 80-91.

Smith, C. & Elmes, M. (2002). Leading change: Insights from Jungian interpretation of the book of Job. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 15*(5), 448-60.

Stogdill, R. (1967). Basic concepts for theory of organization. *Management Science, 13*(10), B666-B677.

Telfer, G. (2009, Winter). In the shadow of leadership. *The Leadership Trust*.

Tversky, A. & Kahneman, D. (1986). Rational choice and the framing of decisions. *Journal of Business, 59*(4), 251-278.

Velasquez, M. (2006). *Business ethics: Concepts and cases.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Wieand, P. (2002). Drucker's challenge: Communication and the emotional glass ceiling. *Ivey Business Journal, 66*(5). 32-37.

Weatherford, J. (2004). *Genghis Khan and the making of the modern world*. New York: Three Rivers Press.