The Principle Analysis of Perception and Collaboration Between Leader and Follower in Leadership

Mst. Jesmin Ara[1*], Mahbub Bin Shajahan[2], Meer Mosharraf Hossain[3], Abdullah Al Amin[4]

[1]Department of Political Science, National University, Dhaka, Gazipur, Bangladesh
[2]Department of Law and Muslim Jurisprudence, Islamic University, Kushtia, Bangladesh
[3]Department of Political Science, Kushtia Government Girls College, Kushtia, Bangladesh
[4]Department of Political Science, Meherpur Government College, Meherpur, Bangladesh

Email address:
jesmin_nu@yahoo.com (M. J. Ara), shuvokkk@yahoo.com (M. B. Shajahan), mmhossain_kgmc@yahoo.com (M. M. Hossain),
dhumketu.haider@gmail.com (A. A. Amin)

Abstract: Due to scientific applications and its intricacy, political Work and Social Developments are one of the most challenging research fields of natural world. In this study we have to develop the focus on the perception and collaboration of leader member exchange which constrained by social reality. It is assumed that the perceived quality of the relationship is not only related to the actual quality of the relationship, but also to follower's expectancies and preferences. However, little is known about person characteristics that are related to leader member perceptions. This study also seeks to examine how far followers' leadership related characteristics are related to the perception of leader member. The main objective of the paper has to identify the effective leadership contributes to the transformation of this reality through the initiation of structure that mobilizes and redirects a group's identity-based social power.

Keywords: Leadership, Follower, Perception, Collaboration

1. Introduction

Over the past two decades, the study of school leadership has shifted from a focus on traditional, top-down forms of instructional leadership to instructional leadership that is shared with teachers (Blase & Blase, 1999; Hallinger, 2003; Spillane, Hallett, & Diamond, 2003). In fact, shared instructional leadership has been found to have the largest leadership effect on student academic growth (Heck & Hallinger, 2009; Marks & Printy, 2003; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008). This shift to more collective or distributed leadership promotes a restructuring of schools (Marks & Louis, 1999).

In reviewing the historical trajectory of such ideas, Lindholm (1990) charts a lineage which progresses from John Stewart Mill's notion of the genius whose pleasures are of a higher order than the animalistic gratifications of the majority (Mill, 1975), through especially not compassion–stop him satisfying his appetites (Nietzsche, 1977), to Le Bonnotion of the hypnotic crowd leader (Le Bon, 1895/1947) and Weber's concept of charisma (Webe1921, 1947). From this field,

Weber emerged as a seminal figure in the study of leadership and as the high priest of rationalism prophesizing that the future of humanity would lie in an inexorable advance of instrumental rationality and institutional routine. However, it was not a future viewed with equanimity. Only charismata prophets could save society from such a fate, but their time, he thought, was almost gone. Of course, events surrounding World War II proved Weber right about the polar night, but they also showed him to be spectacularly wrong about the role that charismatic leaders would have to play historical progress. For, far from saving the masses from darkness, charismatic dictators created the gloom. A core problem with Weber's analysis lay in a conception which counter posed the will of the leader to that of the rest of the population. According to his view, leaders need agency because masse lacks it and hence heroic leadership is required in order to save the masses from themselves. It is clear, though, that the dictators themselves saw the masses as a material to be used in the service of the leader rather than vice versa.

The knowledge management as well as leadership studies (Mabey & Nicholds, 2015) have improved the performance of leaders with global reach organizations and their workforces

of mobilization. The self-governing and the perceptions (Lee, Martin, Thomas, Guillaume & Maio, 2015) of leadership is viewed by the impact on the global collaboration. They discussed the significance knowledge of the leadership which is based on internationally with businesses purpose. They also described in theoretical approaches of leadership perception which is benefits from leader attitude. The studied of leadership behaviours and on followers identification with their work group investigated by Huettermann, Doering & Boerner, 2014. They basically identified the guidance, encouraging involvement, role modelling and administering by seven team works. The developments of leaders and leadership behaviour (Day, Fleenor, Atwater, Sturm, McKee, 2014; Wang, & Howell, 2012) have been developed theoretical and empirical literature over the past 25 years with group levels. They investigated methodological as well as analytical in the leadership which will be directions in future research.

2. Importance of Principal Perception

The importance of Principal perception and principal behavior determine the extent to which school leaders influence organizational change for student improvement. Reviews of the past research on the degree of principal influence on students have shown that principals indirectly affect student learning through teachers (Hallinger & Heck, 1996, 1998). However, principals who decide to develop and share leadership with teachers build school capacity, which positively contributes to academic growth (Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Leithwood & Mascall, 2008). Furthermore, this change in school capacity serves as a catalyst for additional reciprocal effects from experiencing academic growth to subsequent advances in shared leadership (Hallinger & Heck, 2011; Louis et al., 2010) and guides its development and distributes responsibility to teachers (Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999, 2000; Marks & Louis, 1999).

Principals improve teacher practice through supportive managerial tasks, such as hiring, spending, and an orderly climate, but more importantly, principals shape instruction through the establishment of a school climate and the frequent communication of a common mission and vision (Firestone & Wilson, 1985; Hallinger & Heck, 2001). Firestone and Wilson (1985) argued for a distinction between these managerial tasks compared to other behaviors that build a positive academic climate within the school. In more recent studies, leadership behaviors that contribute to a creation of a school climate have been found to have an increased influence on teacher and student outcomes compared to managerial tasks (Hoy & Hannum, 1997; Hoy, Sweetland, & Smith, 2002; Hoy, Tarter, & Bliss, 1990; Werblow & Duesbery, 2013). In a meta-analysis of studies on the impact of different leadership styles on student outcomes and effective leadership behaviors, which included establishment of goals, promoting and participating in teacher development, planning, coordinating and evaluating instruction and managerial tasks of resourcing, and creating a safe and orderly environment.

3. Variables Included in the Analysis

Principal perception is based on prior descriptions of leadership styles, principal perception variables were selected for inclusion in the analysis. There were two main groups of variables. First, principals responded to items about their own leadership. Second, principals responded to items about the extent that leadership was shared with teachers. Since the principals' perception about their own leadership did not only contain a neutral response but also social disorder for high standards. For principal perceptions about shared leadership with teachers remained to survey items about the frequency of their behaviors that align with the descriptions of transformational leadership as well as instructional leadership.

4. Leaders as Entrepreneurs of Identity

It is very important that self-categorization theory applies to the behavior of people as members of large social categories such as nations, religions, political parties, corporations or trade unions, and not just too small groups of friends and acquaintances. It is possible to reformulate its tenets concerning social influence in the following terms:

- Social identities provide the parameters of mass mobilization.
- Who is included within a social category determines who will be mobilized.
- The content ascribed to the social category will determine what they will be mobilized for.
- The prototypes of the category will determine who will be in a position to direct the mobilization.

In short, category definitions are the basis of social power (Turner, 2005). They are, quite literally, world-making things. Those who control category definitions are therefore in a position to make and remake the world. This makes the question of how category definitions come about a matter of societal as well as individual concern. Self-categorization theorists view social categories in relation to social reality (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987; Turner, Oakes, Haslam, & McGarty, 1994). They stress the ways in which categories reflect the existing structure of social relations in a given context and hence how they change along with the changing structure of context (Haslam & Turner, 1992, 1995; Oakes, Haslam, & Turner, 1994). However, Reicher and Hopkins (2001, 2003; Hopkins, Reicher, & Kahani-Hopkins, 2003) have complemented this analysis by addressing the other side of the equation— the way in which category definitions are used to create new structures of social relations in the future. The importance of such a two-sided approach to the social reality-social category relationship is that it opens the way to an analysis of the active role of leaders in shaping groups and shaping society. Indeed, we argue that, precisely because social category definitions affect collective mobilization, those concerned with shaping the social world will actively define the nature of categories as a function of their social projects. They will seek to create an inclusive category which embraces all those they seek to mobilize,

whose values and priorities are realized in their proposals and of which they themselves are representative. That is what we mean when we refer to leaders as entrepreneurs of identity.

Second, politicians differ profoundly in the way that they characterize the meaning of nationhood. In Scotland, for instance, separatist parties tend to portray the Scots as an independently minded people, socialist politicians tend to define them as communal, while cooperative and conservative politicians tend to celebrate their entrepreneurial instincts (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001). In each case party policy is presented as a realization in practice of who we are in principle.

Third, whether by descriptions of their background, through autobiography or even through the ways they dress, politicians seek to create an image of themselves that matches their image of the category more generally. At the extreme, leaders may even create a personal mythology through which they become the living embodiment of the nation. Wilner (1984), for example, details the way in which the Indonesian leader Sukharno came to be represented as Bima, the legendary hero and demigod of Javanese and Balinese mythology. This was along multiple dimensions. The tale of Sukharno's career was told so as to emphasize how he embodied Bima's two key attributes—bravery and a stubborn will. The parallels between Bima's muscular appearance and that of Sukharno were accentuated. Sukharno spoke in a booming voice and a low Javanese dialect that violated the norms of Indonesia's dominant cultural groups but which resonated with Bima's usage. Sukharno was brutal in his gestures and his verbal style, once again violating aristocratic manners but emulating Bima. Sukharno even alluded to Bima's association with the color black (which symbolizes strength) by invariably carrying a black baton which, for some Indonesians, was a repository of sacred power.

Having outlined some of the principles concerning what leaders do as entrepreneurs of identity, let us return to the Experiment in order to put some more flesh on these arguments. In particular, let us return to the case of trade union organizer (DMp). In the previous section we showed how he was able to emerge as a leader of the prisoners because he was able to articulate a shared consensus based on a shared prisoner identity. Now we will consider the ways in which he sought to construct shared identities amongst participants as a whole. This is important in order to understand both his aims and the skills he deployed in the study as a whole. In particular, DMp's project was not limited to leading the prisoners. Rather, he sought to unite both prisoners and guards in order to challenge the experimenters over the conditions imposed within the study. DMp challenged this view, saying that whatever else he might have agreed to, the heat was not part of the experimenter–participant contract.

The principles of context-sensitive social categorization that underpin this restructuring are well understood within self-categorization theory (e. g., Haslam & Turner, 1992). What we see here, though, is not simply that changes in comparative context have the capacity to change the nature of social identity, but that comparative context is politically managed in order to bring about particular changes that make both particular identities and particular leaders viable. Indeed, this point was tacitly recognized by Hitler (1925/1998) when he wrote in Mein Kamp: The art of leadership consists in consolidating the attention of the people against a single adversary and making sure that nothing will split up that attention.

5. Leadership, Followership, and Identity in Practice

We argued that (a) leaders and followers are dependent upon the nature of social reality and hence the definition of social categories and (b) that leaders define social categories and thereby mobilize group members to transform social reality. But what then determines the balance between these two sides of the equation? When are leaders and followers able to redefine social conditions and when are they defined by them? When are they architects of the future and when are they prisoners of the present? Or, to put it slightly differently, what determines whether leaders and their groups are able to realize their vision of the social world in practice? We suggest that the answer lies in considering the balance between the power generated by any social mobilization and the nature of the resistances that this mobilization must overcome.

In this way, the balance between creating reality and being created by reality is a matter of the development of intergroup relations over time. There are many factors are critical here:
- The ability to mobilize people and create social power through a compelling construction of social
- Identity
- The ability to organize the exercise of group power based on an accurate analysis of where out-group
- Resistance lies.
- The effectiveness and power of counter-mobilizations.

The ability to create compelling constructions of social identity is partly the product of a combination of cultural knowledge and verbal skill which is akin to what Billig (1987). That is, it depends upon the ability to draw upon commonly available understandings of identity as contained, for instance, in school history books, public monuments, the works of revered writers and poets and even depictions of landscape and environment, and then weave them into a coherent account of who we are (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001; Hobsbawm & Ranger, 1983). Equally it depends upon the ability to take ambiguous or novel circumstances and, using metaphor and analogy, make sense of them in terms of familiar constructions of social identities. This is akin to the processes of anchoring and concretization as described by social representations theorists (Farr & Moscovici, 1984). It is important to note, though, that these processes presuppose an active audience and a dialogue rather than monologue between leaders and followers. Followers do not automatically accept what is put to them; rather they weigh it and evaluate it on the basis of their prior experiences and the other sources of information available to them. To borrow

from social representations theory again, followers (like leaders) are not dupes but fully-fledged members of a thinking society (Moscovici, 1993).

The main points are well illustrated by the way in which DMp in his conversations with his cell-mates uses analogies between the uniforms of prisoners and those of workers and also draws upon the heat in the study as a Health and Safety issue in order to make it seem obvious that participants should see themselves as united in opposition to the managing experimenters rather than divided into prisoners and guards. DMp may well have initiated these conversations but their success was dependent upon the way in which the analogies he offered were taken up and developed with equal creativity by his interlocutors.

However, successful constructions of social identity require more than skillful rhetoric. They also need to be structured into the practices of the social movement which seeks to affect the wider society. In this way, one can demonstrate in the present the practical adequacy of a vision for the society of the future. Consider, for instance, the way in which Hitler matched his vision of Germany, his rhetoric, and the physical organization of the Nuremburg rallies. Likewise, Ozouf (1989) shows how the leaders of the French revolution set about creating a set of new Festivals to replace those of the ancient regime: organization in terms of fixed social status gave way to inherently transitory categories such as age. The actions of DMp also illustrate the second factor in successful leadership: the ability to use collective power to the greatest effect. That is, he analyzed where the weakness of the guards lay—namely in their ambivalence about the exercise of power and in their disquiet at the resultant disorder within the prison. He then directed the strength of the prisoners against this weakness by demanding a cooperative forum that would deliver order at the cost of major concessions from the guards.

However, the Commune faced dissent from participants who wished to impose a hierarchical system. The Communards also believed that the experimenters disapproved of the system and would not allow it to survive. However, they were not prepared to initiate structures that would direct their power against either the internal or the external opposition. Thus, when the principal organizer of the Commune, FCp, was asked what he would do if participants refused to perform a chore that had been allocated to them, he replied give them another chore when asked what would happen if they refused that too, he simply remained silent. The Commune may have been self-organizing, but it failed to be self-disciplining. In this context, the Communards began to lose faith in their ability to create a communal world and their organization fell apart. Instead of being able to transform a hierarchical set of social relations, their beliefs began to shift towards an acceptance of hierarchy. Over time, they scored increasingly highly on measures of authoritarianism such that, when the dissenters openly proposed a new and more draconian prisoner guard system, the Communards displayed little willingness to resist it. As one committed supporter commented, the situation in the Commune was worse than before, since the group had the increasingly difficult challenge

both of trying to make a faltering system work and of accepting responsibility for its failure. In sum, these examples show, first, that it may be necessary for leaders to use category definitions in order to create social power. However, social power is not sufficient for social transformation unless it is yoked to structures that function in such a way as to overcome resistance to the collective project. Where it is so structured, as in the case of the cooperative forum, new category definitions can lead to a new social reality in their image. Where it is not, as in the case of the Commune, new category definitions are discarded in favor of those which reflect existing realities.

6. Conclusion

This article has argued that an integral approach to leadership enables a consequent and more inclusive exertion and offers practical implications for a different discourse and practice of leadership and followership as well as their interrelationship. Taking into account the integral and relational dimensions of personal, interpersonal, and structural dimensions and influences allows developing a much needed decentered perspective on the leadership and followership connection. Furthermore, by considering stages and lines of development in an integral cycle, dynamic processes of leadership and followership can be assessed more systemically. As a consequence, the integral model provides a powerful heuristic framework in which we can make sense of how leadership and followership are interwoven. The comparative advantage of an integral theory with respect to leadership and followership research lies in its potential to generate theory that is inclusive prevailing conceptions of human beings.

References

[1] Drury, J., & Reicher, S. (2005). Explaining enduring empowerment: A comparative study of collective action and psychological outcomes. European Journal of Social Psychology, 35, 35–58.

[2] Duck, J. M., & Fielding, K. S. (1999). Leaders and subgroups: One of us or one of them? Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 2, 203–230.

[3] Duck, J. M., & Fielding, K. S. (2003). Leaders and their treatment of subgroups: Implications for evaluations of the leader and the superordinate group. European Journal of Social Psychology, 33, 387–401.

[4] Ellemers, N. (1993). The influence of socio-structural variables on identity enhancement strategies. European Review of Social Psychology, 4, 27–57.

[5] Ellemers, N., De Gilder, D., & Haslam, S. A. (2004). Motivating individuals and groups at work: A social identity perspective on leadership and group performance. Academy of Management Review, 29, 459–478.

[6] Farr, R., & Moscovici, S. (1984). Social representations. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

[7]   Fiedler, F. E. (1964). A contingency model of leader effectiveness. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 1. (pp. 149–190) New York 7 Academic Press.

[8]   Fiedler, F. E., & Garcia, J. E. (1987). New approaches to effective leadership. New York Wiley.

[9]   Fleishman, E. A. (1953). The description of supervisory behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 523–532.

[10] Fleishman, E. A., & Peters, D. A. (1962). Interpersonal values, leadership attitudes, and managerial success. Personnel Psychology, 15, 43–56.

[11] Gibb, C. A. (1958). An interactional view of the emergence of leadership. Australian Journal of Psychology, 10, 101–110.

[12] Haslam, S. A., & McGarty, C. (2001). A hundred years of certitude? Social psychology, the experimental method and the management of scientific uncertainty. British Journal of Social Psychology, 40, 1–21.

[13] Haslam, S. A., & Platow, M. J. (2001). The link between leadership and followership: How affirming a social identity translates vision into action. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27, 1469–1479.

[14] Haslam, S. A., Platow, M. J., Turner, J. C., Reynolds, K. J., McGarty, C., Oakesm P. J., et al. (2001). Social identity and the romance of leadership: The importance of being seen to be ddoing it for usT. Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 4, 191–205.

[15] Haslam, S. A., Postmes, T., & Ellemers, N. (2003). More than a metaphor: Organizational identity makes organizational life possible. British Journal of Management, 14, 357–369.

[16] Haslam, S. A., & Turner, J. C. (1992). Context-dependent variation in social stereotyping: The relationship between frame of reference, self-categorization and accentuation. European Journal of Social Psychology, 22, 251–277.

[17] Haslam, S. A., & Turner, J. C. (1995). Context-dependent variation in social stereotyping: 3. Extremism as a self-categorical basis for polarized judgement. European Journal of Social Psychology, 25, 341–371.

[18] Haslam, S. A., Turner, J. C., Oakes, P. J., McGarty, C., & Reynolds, K. J. (1998). The group as a basis for emergent stereotype consensus. European Review of Social Psychology, 8, 203–239.

[19] Hobsbawm, E., & Ranger, T. (1983). The invention of tradition. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

[20] Hogg, M. A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 5, 184–200.

[21] Mabey, C., & Nicholds, A. (2015). Discourses of knowledge across global networks: What can be learnt about knowledge leadership from the ATLAS collaboration? International Business Review, 24, 43–54.

[22] Huettermann, H., Doering, S., & Boerner, S., (2014). Leadership and team identification: Exploring the followers' perspective. The Leadership Quarterly, 25, 413–432.

[23] Day, D. V., Fleenor, J. W., Atwater, L. E., Sturm, R. E., McKee, R. A., (2014). Advances in leader and leadership development: A review of 25 years of research and theory, The Leadership Quarterly, 25, 63–82.

[24] Allan Lee, A., Martin, R., Thomas, G., Guillaume, Y., & Maio, G, R., (2015). Conceptualizing leadership perceptions as attitudes: Using attitude theory to further understand the leadership process, The Leadership Quarterly 26, 910–934.

[25] Wang, Xiao-Hua., & Howell, J. M. (2012). A multilevel study of transformational leadership, identification, and follower outcomes. The Leadership Quarterly, 23, 775–790.