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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION:
POLITICAL LEADERSHIP STYLE IN KAZAKHSTAN

Contextual Factors of the Leadership in Kazakhstan

The focus of this study is national leadership style in Kazakhstan. In this introduction, background information will be provided, including historical, geo-political, and cultural factors, related to the context of the leadership phenomenon in Kazakhstan. Next, the major premises and rationale that underpin the study will be furnished, followed by a formulation of research questions. In Chapter 2, a review will be presented of relevant literature concerning previous and existing leadership studies that comprise theories and models as well as cases of real political leaders. In Chapter 3, the chosen theoretical framework and methodology for the proposed study will be articulated. Chapter 4 will feature findings from a field study. Finally, relevant conclusions will be drawn in Chapter 5. The research design elements including the research instrument employed in the field study (Q sample) appear in an appendix.

Having an adequate concept of leadership style, which is authentic and effective for the particular development stage of a nation, is important for every country. Indeed, a nation-specific leadership pattern can be viewed as a “criterion of the values by which that society lives” (Rothwell, 1952, p. 1). This contention is particularly relevant for post-
communist transition nations such as Kazakhstan featuring a largely reformed and dynamic market economy and gradually democratizing political system, albeit with some persisting authoritarian traits. Overall, this Central Asian country of today, led by its both autocratic and entrepreneurial-minded leader, President Nursultan Nazarbaev, features an evolving polity, which can still be characterized as personalist and neo-patrimonial (Ishiyama, 2002, p. 43), although of a soft version. This can be explained as a long-term impact of both a nomadic-age patriarchic legacy and Russian colonial and then Soviet authoritarianism, which even in this post-independence era still exerts dramatic influence on the Kazakh people’s mode of thinking, their view of the government, civic attitudes, and political behavior and activism. On the other hand, in its pre-colonial age from the 15th to the 18th century, Kazakhstan as a decentralized nomadic country was arguably governed based on a “native Parliamentary tradition,” which drew on the political imperative to coordinate and at the same time take into account diverse interests of numerous nomadic communities dispersed over the vast territory (Olcott, 1997, p. 119).

Three other contextual factors—namely, demography, oil, and geopolitics—complicate the task of leadership in post-independence Kazakhstan (Cummings, 2002). Indeed, nowadays Kazakhstan is a reemerging multi-ethnic nation, which has to account for its two major and distinct cultural components (Kazakh and Russian) as well as others (Ukrainian, German, Korean, Tatar, etc.). Thus, “multi-ethnicity was at the root of Kazakhstan’s problems in 1991 as it deprived the elite of an immediate source of legitimacy: mono-ethnic nationalism” (Cummings, 2002, p. 61). Second, vast oil resources in Kazakh soil that have already attracted massive foreign direct investments
and attention of US, West European, Russian, and Asian governments invite the transfer of economic and political management ideas and practices. Third, the land-locked location of the country, which places it at the mercy of other major neighboring states for access to international markets, serves as a “constant reminder to the political elite of its continued vulnerability to external political … influence” (p. 61). Thus, this mixed cultural legacy and current ethnic, economic, and geopolitical variables are being internalized in the current national leadership pattern, which requires viewing it as a multi-dimensional phenomenon.

Situated at the Eurasian heartland between Russia, China, and other Central Asian states, Kazakhstan retains an important geopolitical position deriving from its crossroads location, vast territory (2,717,300 sq km), abundant mineral resources and scant population (about 15 million) consisting of a mix of Kazakh, Russian, and other ethnic groups. Having recovered from a drastic economic downturn triggered by the Soviet Union’s collapse, Kazakhstan today features a largely transformed market economy that has attracted numerous investors, although mostly in its mineral and energy sectors. Moreover, it has recently started gaining regional prominence due to its oil export-driven revenue windfalls, which has enabled Kazakhstan to invest actively in the economies of its neighbor countries and to play a more visible role within the former Soviet Union as well as in Eurasia. In foreign policy terms, the national leadership has sought to maintain a balanced position toward the world powers (USA, Russia, China, European Union), which has been called a multi-vector approach, by upholding their balance of interests in this country through a diversified portfolio of foreign investments in the Kazakh
economy. As another reflection of this balancing policy, Kazakhstan is a member of many regional and international organizations including the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, and the Eurasian Economic Community.

Moreover, since regaining independence in 1991, Kazakhstan faces a need to develop anew a national leadership capacity able to meet societal transformation and new statehood demands and human development needs. That is why matching the ideas of transformational leadership with the pre-existing and unique leadership legacy might help develop new promising national leaders able to address effectively the challenging economic and political transformation goals of the country. This is especially critical in view of globalization trends that have already involved Kazakhstan in myriad economic, political, and cultural-ideological interactions with other nations and the world as a whole.

As was emphasized in a recent cross-country study of post-communist democratization, national discourses, attitudes, and historical legacies “help condition what is possible and likely in terms of political development” (Dryzek & Holmes, 2002, p. 6). Applying this premise to the issue of national leadership development in Kazakhstan, it can be contended that its particular historico-political legacy, attitudinal transition, and nationalism vs. international exposure greatly affect its leadership change dynamic. In fact, as revealed in the RADIR (Revolution and the Development of International Relations) project on comparative elite studies, the “web of cultural and
historical factors which shape the character of the elite within a given country” affects the “direction, intensity, and tempo of its change” (Lasswell, Lerner, & Rothwell, 1952, p. 2). Thus, national leadership capacity can not be viewed as a mere function of how democratic its institutions are, because “institutions have little or no exposure to the habits, traditions, and dispositions necessary to make these particular institutions function” (Dryzek & Holmes, 2002, p. 4).

One important attitudinal change has been the newly evolving sense of national identity caused by the unexpected collapse of the Soviet Union, which made Kazakhstan an “accidental country” (Olcott, 1997, p. 114). In this respect, how the national identity is redefined in leaders’ minds also affects their attitudes and perceptions. In fact, as demonstrated in the case of the Russian “identity crisis” caused by “identity downsizing” in the post-Soviet age, it may have a profound impact on dominant political discourses and respective public perceptions of a desirable leader’s profile (Dryzek & Holmes, 2002, p. 109).

Similar to the Russian case, Kazakhstan as a nation, since unexpectedly gaining independence in 1991, is currently undergoing a psycho-social process of parallel dis-identification as a part of the former Soviet Union and re-identification as a newly independent, multi-ethnic nation-state, some major self-identifying characteristics of which are still to be clarified.
Major Premises and Rationale for the Study

Given the preceding historical sketch, this proposed study draws on the following premises:

- First, major features of actual political leadership style(s) can be identified by means of exploring public perceptions of typical political leaders in this nation.
- Second, the task of identifying possibly more than one distinct perceived and ideal national leadership style can be accomplished through studying the views, attitudes, and expectations of different groups of Kazakhstan citizens.
- Third, these groups include both the general public representing different societal institutions and actual political/public leaders placed in varying sectors and levels in the political system of Kazakhstan.
- Subsequent analysis of typical and ideal leaders’ styles would help clarify whether there exist certain types of leader-follower relations as defined by Little (1985), who identifies three distinct psychosocial leader types (strong, group, and inspiring).

It is contended that a well-grounded concept of **nationally authentic and effective leadership style**, which would account both for the culture-specific characteristics of the modern Kazakhstan nation and its new position in the world, is critical for Kazakhstan’s self-sustained growth. Indeed, as imminent socio-economic and political imbalances and turmoil persist in this part of the post-communist world, the current importance of this issue for Kazakhstan as well as for other Central Asian, post-Soviet, and some Central and East European nations undergoing a problematic transition can hardly be overstated.

Psychosocial Approach to Studying Leadership

This study seeks to gain a better understanding of political leadership styles in Kazakhstan through employing a psychosocial approach, which will bear on a few theories including the psychoanalytic perspective of Lasswell (1948) who emphasizes
that personal power accentuation is shaped by a certain combination of motivation, political skills, and opportunity. In this regard, *homo politicus*’s “intense and ungratified craving for deference” is expressed in his fundamental formula of the political personality type’s motive: “Private Motives displaced on Public Objects and rationalized in terms of Public Interest” (Lasswell, 1948, p. 38). As was demonstrated in a number of studies of different political leaders, this formula seems apt as applied, for instance, in a psychohistory of the Turkish founding father, Mustafa Kemal Ataturk (Volkan & Itzkowitz, 1984).

Another appeal of the psychosocial approach is its long-term relevance to the evolution of the political organization of human societies. In this regard again, the salience of Lasswell’s theory of *homo politicus* to the present issues of political leadership lies in his contention that worldwide democratization trend “calls for … the development of democratic personality and … decision-making process” (Lasswell, 1948, p. 149). Indeed, in order to secure sustainable democracy in a certain society, of particular importance will be the formulation and pursuit of a process of *democratic personality formation*, which posits that the “political myth of democracy is to evoke and crystallize moral sentiment in favor of democracy,” which “undoubtedly depends upon the formation of characters capable of respecting the basic humanity of all men” (p. 149). Thus, to advance democratization, Lasswell proposes nurturing of the democratic personality of the “active and responsible citizen of a free society in which power, though taken seriously, is *subordinated* to the value goals of *human dignity*….” Moreover, Lasswell sees the public interest embodied in “democratic leaders who share the basic
personality structure appropriate to the elite of a society where power is subordinated to respect and to identification with humanity” (p. 152).

A sustainable democracy-building process also involves enlargement of the political leadership base of a particular nation, which thus calls for “elevating the level of the entire democratic elite, which embraces the whole community” (Lasswell, 1948, p. 149). This important issue, as noted in earlier studies (RADIR, Lasswell, and Burns), has apparently been a strength of the Soviet system including Kazakhstan, which, in this respect, had an extended political leadership base and thus provided for the current President Nazarbaev to emerge from humble social origins as its prominent national leader. Unfortunately, since then the current Kazakh political elite has become substantially more limited in its recruitment base. In this regard, democratizing its current political system will require opening new political recruitment and advancement channels to embrace aspirants from various social groups, such as small business, mid-level civil service, academia, minorities, etc. As to the involved values, using Lasswell’s terminology, it can be contended that such interdependent goal variables as shared power and respect should be pursued through enlightening both existing and emerging elites.

Situational Perspective into National Leadership Style

The second distinct approach that this study relies upon is a situational perspective of national leadership styles, which appears potentially insightful for issues of the appropriate political leadership style. Indeed, complex and diverse post-communist transformation conditions in different nations call for a careful analysis of particular
national political cultures that predetermine the national readiness for transformation of a specific transition society. That means that based on identification of its political culture along some distinct dimensions such as, for instance, ability and willingness for transformation (Pansegrouw, 2001), an appropriate political leadership style could be selected, which would feature an appropriate combination of structuring and inspiring actions. In addition, the chosen leadership style would rely upon an appropriate set of power bases.

In this respect, the situational approach to leadership style appears to offer potentially insightful explanations of appropriate leadership styles in cases of the previous Soviet and current political leaders in the Soviet successor states, including Gorbachev, Yeltsin, Putin, and others, in cultural and situational terms. Indeed, under Pansegrouw’s (2001) typology, the political culture of the then Soviet Union in the early and mid-1980s can be viewed as a stagnating culture that was unable and unwilling to undergo societal transformation. In this regard, Gorbachev’s predecessor, Andropov, had chosen a seemingly more culturally appropriate enforcing leadership style intended to destroy the status quo and break fixated and resistant public attitudes. On the other hand, it can be argued that Gorbachev apparently placed emphasis on a different leadership style characterized by low structuring actions and greater emphasis on inspiring actions. Thus, this situational mismatch of the Soviet authoritarian political culture and his leadership style might have contributed to his mixed subsequent leadership outcomes and ratings.
As to the case of today’s Kazakhstan, it can be hypothesized that the current political culture has already undergone considerable changes since Gorbachev’s *perestroika* and a certain degree of democratization has been gained since independence. In this respect, Kazakhstan can arguably be classified as a *conserving* culture type, which would thus be better matched by an *enabling* leadership style. This means a relatively high emphasis on *both structuring and inspiring actions* required on the part of the Kazakh leadership that might in this way account for its politically inept, but cooperating and concerned public constituencies.

To demonstrate the importance of leader-follower relations that need to match a particular inherent leadership pattern, reference can again be made to the case of Mikhail Gorbachev. In the case of his leadership style, there might have been a serious *leader-follower gap*, which was expressed in most of the public’s inability to follow the “new thinking” based style that he propagated as a basis for a new leadership model for other Soviet leaders. From this perspective, his further loss of popularity and power to Boris Yeltsin, known for his tough authoritarian pattern of leadership, might be interpreted as a lingering reliance of his followers on the “strong leader” type (Glad & Shiraev, 1999). In this regard, it can be argued that a *single-leader based* and *strong personalist leadership style*, institutionalized in the presidency, made its way via rapid *institutional* changes in the Soviet and then Russian and other former Soviet political systems, including Kazakhstan, in 1988-1995.

In the case of former Russian President Yeltsin, this strong personalist leadership can be considered as a “longstanding Russian tradition” expressed in a culture-embedded
“strong leader” orientation that was, prior in Russian history, institutionalized in the absolutist monarchic regime of tsar (Glad, 1999, p. 78). Indeed, 1990-91 polls revealed prevailing public perceptions in favor of Yeltsin as a straightforward, ambitious, and resolute leader versus a negative image of Gorbachev as a weak, hypocritical, though flexible and adaptive, political leader lacking in self-confidence (White, 1997, p. 38). Another similar illustration of public attitudes was provided by Yeltsin’s boosted image after his strong-hand and harsh way of doing away with Russian Parliamentary opposition in 1993 through the use of military force. This tough, non-cooperative, and zero-sum leadership style has “shifted Russian politics decisively toward super-presidential republic” (p. 47). In his own memoirs, Yeltsin acknowledged relying on his self-image as a “willful, determined, strong politician” (p. 51). The same authoritarian shift in the political system evolution could be noted in the case of Kazakhstan with the first and current long-standing President Nazarbaev who is widely viewed as a founding father of its current super-presidential system.

More evidence for the post-Soviet public’s favorable attitude toward a rather authoritarian leadership style has been found through a study of post-communist democratization related discourses across a few post-communist states. In fact, among three major Russian discourses, “authoritarian development” and “reactionary anti-liberalism” can be characterized as having a clear preference for a strong leader (Dryzek & Holmes, 2002, p. 95). In this respect, Yeltsin’s and current President Putin’s favorable public images as “strong” presidents conform well to these discourses and respective public perceptions. The same kind of public expectations seem to have been revealed in a
1993 field study (Lubin, 1995) in Kazakhstan, which in the aftermath of the Soviet Union collapse has displayed citizens’ endorsement of a strong leader able to restore order and to secure economic revival and social safety.

However, as Kazakhstan has by now largely achieved economic self-sufficiency and growth through marketization and foreign direct investments, its social class structure has also undergone considerable changes. Specifically, this nation today features a new entrepreneurial class, which has already started claiming a greater political role commensurate with its economic weight. Indeed, since 2001, Kazakhstan has been witnessing a rising wave of political leaders, many of whom came from alternative political recruitment channels, namely from business. Another segment of political aspirants, formed within the current regime of Nazarbaev, has split from the political establishment to join the opposition camp. Their political reform demands seek to open up the Kazakh political system and to diversify the structure of political opportunity for all emerging leaders. This mounting local pressure for democratizing the political leadership selection and recruitment base has been demonstrated in the course of both the 2004 parliamentary and 2005 presidential elections in Kazakhstan. So far, the top incumbents have been successful in gaining an overwhelming majority of votes in both instances. This can be accounted for by the demonstrated outcome of Nazarbaev’s 15 year-long leadership since independence was regained in 1991, namely in ensuring economic recovery and steady growth as compared to most other countries in the region. Another important factor is how skillful Nazarbaev has been so far in molding and managing his super-presidential system with himself at the top, which does not seem to
encounter widespread public resistance as long as the top political leader displays an effective, albeit authoritarian, management style. This could also be explained by the slowly evolving national political culture, which still seems to feature largely passive or acquiescent public attitudes as inherited from the recent authoritarian history of the country.

On the other hand, as noted above, the social structure and respective political leadership recruitment base of Kazakhstan has been through substantial changes in the post-independence age. In this regard, using the terms of Maccoby (1982), it can be argued that the newly emerging social character within this nation, represented by entrepreneurs, requires a new political leadership style consistent with its needs and aspirations. In this regard, the purpose of this study is to contribute to a better understanding of current perceptions of the existing typical leadership style as well as to discern new public expectations of desirable political leadership style in today’s Kazakhstan.

**Research Questions**

Thus, in sum, in this study answers are to be sought to the following research questions: (1) What are the characteristics of typical political leadership styles within Kazakhstan? (2) What are the characteristics of ideal political leadership styles for Kazakhstan?
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Factors Relevant to the Research Questions

In reviewing existing sources on leadership style, including political leadership, a number of studies have been examined that range from psychosocial approaches to leadership to situational and transformational leadership models to comparative elite studies to cross-national leadership field research to post-communist political discourses and to personal cases of political leaders in Eurasia, the former Soviet Union and Kazakhstan. In this regard, it has been assumed that the following factors are relevant to the research questions: leader-follower relations, leadership recruitment bases and selection mechanisms, value-based motivations, bases of power, a leader's image, communication and decision-making styles, and propensity for flexibility in ways of managing people, all of which are “indicators of the degree of shared power, shared respect, shared well-being, and shared safety in a given society” (Rothwell, 1952, p. 1).

This review begins with earlier sources on leadership featured by Freud (1922) and Lasswell (1948), the latter being one of the major scholars to have laid the foundations for a psychosocial perspective on politics, as well as having authored a cross-country political elite study (1952), called the RADIR project (Revolution and the Development of International Relations). Second, analysis will focus on more recent
works, with special attention to Burns (1978) and Little (1985), whose theories will serve
as a basis for the framework of this study. Third, coverage will include a number of
contemporary approaches and studies in leadership, which encompass situational and
transformational leadership models, one of which (Kouzes & Posner, 2002) will also be
used as a second major component of the theoretical framework. Finally, this review will
include some current cross-cultural leadership studies such as the GLOBE project as well
as those on political leadership trends and personal case studies related to the regions of
Eurasia, the former Soviet Union, and Kazakhstan.

**Early Leadership and Elite Studies**

In his *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*, Freud (1922) furnishes his
perspective on group processes with some valuable implications for leadership. In
reflecting on group psychology issues with an eye on prior group psychology studies,
Freud refers to Le Bon (*Psychologies des foules*, 1885/1896) who has examined changes
in ways of thinking and acting within an individual placed in a group.

In this regard, first, Le Bon refers to the concept of the *subconscious*, which, in
the group, is no longer suppressed, thereby releasing instincts so that “the sentiment of
responsibility which controls individuals disappears entirely” (cited in Freud, 1922, p. 9).
Second, Le Bon notes that “in a group every sentiment and act is contagious to such a
degree that an individual readily sacrifices his personal interest to collective interest” (p.
10). Third, Le Bon indicates that in a group, new and previously latent characteristics
emerge from within an individual that make him a part of a “psychological group,” which
in turn drive him as well others to feel, think, and act in ways different from their usual patterns. In this respect, he contends that like being hypnotized, “an individual… having lost his conscious personality,… obeys all the suggestions of the operator…. The suggestion being the same for all the individuals in the group, it gains in strength by reciprocity” (p. 11). As Le Bon states, “the group mind … has no critical faculty, it thinks in images,… feelings of a group are always very simple and exaggerated…. it goes directly to extremes,… and it is as intolerant as it is obedient to authority” (p. 11).

Further, Le Bon argues that the group mind “respects force and can only be slightly influenced by kindness, which it regards as a form of weakness. What it demands of its heroes is strength, even violence. It wants to be ruled and oppressed and to fear its masters. Fundamentally it is entirely conservative and … has an unbounded respect for tradition” (p. 15). On the other hand, he emphasizes the lack of self-interest within a group, which is “also capable of high achievements in the shape of abnegation, unselfishness, and devotion to an ideal,” so “whereas the intellectual capacity of a group is always far below that of an individual, its ethical conduct may rise as high above his as it may sink below it” (p. 15). Comparing Le Bon’s thesis with Little’s (1985) psychosocial perspective on leader-follower relations (to be elaborated in detail subsequently), it can be said that followers wish “to be ruled and oppressed” in relationship to a Strong leader type, whereas the tendency toward “abnegation, unselfishness, and devotion to an ideal” parallels expectations related to the Group leader type.
Finally, Le Bon contends that “reason and arguments are incapable of combating certain words and formulas … uttered in solemnity,” the magical power of which is similar to the taboo of primitive people. In fact, he states that “groups never thirsted after truth. They demand illusions and cannot do without them…. they are always as strongly influenced by what is untrue as by what is true,” which implies “predominance of the life of fantasy and of the illusion” (p. 17). In relation to this premise, it will be argued that the indicated indoctrination phenomenon could be related to followers’ propensity to identify particular ideas with a certain leader, so this leader will come to personify respective ideas. To illustrate my point, I refer to the then image of Stalin in the communist world, which became so strongly identified with the early Soviet ideals in the public mind. This person-idea identification has led to the paradox that almost all other Communist Party leaders and rank-and-file members just could not believe in his being responsible for atrocious repressions inflicted upon them.

Overall, with respect to group leadership issues, however, Freud emphasizes Le Bon’s implicit idea of an authoritarian (Strong leader) preference by a group of human beings, which “place themselves instinctively under the authority of a chief” because a group is “an obedient herd, which could never live without a master” as it “has such a thirst for obedience that it submits instinctively to anyone who appoints himself its master” (p. 17).

On the other hand, as to a leader’s traits, although “the needs of a group carry it half-way to meet the leader, yet he too must fit in with it in his personal qualities” (p. 17). A leader himself must “be held in fascination by a strong faith (in an idea) in order
to awaken the group’s faith; he must possess a strong and imposing will, which the
group, which has no will of its own, can accept from him” (p. 17). Thus, Le Bon states
that “the leaders make themselves felt by means of the ideas in which they themselves are
fanatical believers” (p. 18). In this regard, he uses the term “prestige” to denote “a sort of
domination exercised over us by an individual, a work, or an idea,” which “paralyses our
critical faculty and fills us with wonderment and respect” and “arouses a feeling like that
of ‘fascination’ in hypnosis” (p. 18). Again, drawing parallels with the leader types by
Little (1985), this leader is comparable to the *Inspiring leader* type distinct for its
charismatic qualities that engage followers’ imagination.

Thus, the above sketch of leader-follower relations provided by Le Bon reveals
elements of all three leader types as defined by Little (1985).

Again, Freud is critical of Le Bon with regard to his underpinning premise of the
“the magic word ‘suggestion’” (p. 27), which is intended to account for the group mind.
Instead, he proposes the concept of *libido* for the purpose of throwing light upon group
psychology, a concept which denotes “the energy … of those instincts which have to do
with all that may be comprised under the word ‘love’” (p. 29). For Freud, libido
incorporates all distinct sorts of devotion/attraction to concrete subjects/objects/abstract
ideas, all of which are “an expression of the same instinctual impulses … diverted from
this aim (sexual union), though always preserving enough of their original nature to keep
their identity recognizable (as in such features as the longing for proximity and self-
sacrifice)” (p. 30). Referring to Plato, who also has drawn on the idea of Eros as a love-
force in a “wider” sense, Freud argues that “love relationships (or to use more neutral
expression, emotional ties) also constitute the essence of the group mind” (p. 31). Besides, Freud hypothesizes that an individual submits to the group “because he feels the need of being in harmony with them rather than in opposition to them” (p. 31).

Freud finds evidence to his arguments in cases of such groups as Catholic Church and the Army. He argues that in both instances “the same illusion holds good of there being a head—in the Catholic Church Christ, in an army its Commander-in-Chief—who loves all the individuals in the group with an equal love… he is their substitute father … everyone has an equal share in his love” (p. 33). Besides, this vertical libidinal tie is supplemented by horizontal ones because “the tie which unites each individual with Christ is also the cause of the tie which unites them with one another. The like holds good of an army” (p. 33). Moreover, a libidinal structure may lean upon “a leading idea being substituted for a leader” (p. 34). Thus, “each individual is bound in two directions by such an intense emotional tie” that can well account for group-induced changes in his behavior. In this regard, Freud provides quite a palatable explanation for panic “provoked either by the greatness of danger or by cessation of emotional ties” (p. 37).

As applied to sociopolitical groupings, he suggests, quite insightfully, potential hostilities imminent in intergroup cleavages such as religion and ideology. Indeed, as a relevant case, reference could be made to the prior world bipolar and antagonistic division into two major camps—capitalist “free world” vs. the Soviet Union-led communist world—as based respectively on mutually exclusive attachments to the ideas of free market and democracy and, on the other hand, to the ideals of social justice and liberated labor.
While stating that “libidinal ties are what characterize a group,” Freud also highlights the importance of exploring in depth such issues as relations between the idea and the leader, implications of negative leaders/ideas, and the role of a leader. He also pinpoints the issue that a certain emotional distance be kept among group members and related issue of ambivalence of feelings, reflected in interplay of self-love (narcissism) and love for others, for objects (p. 43). Indeed, he stresses that “the libido, attached itself to the satisfaction of the great vital needs, chooses as its first objects the people who have a share in this process” (p. 44). Thus, Freud contends that “love alone acts as a civilizing factor in the sense that it brings a change from egoism to altruism” (p. 44). In this regard, when applying the above premise to Little’s perspective on leader-follower relations, the least degree of followers’ libidinal tie to their leader would be in the Strong leader case (self v. other); the highest—with the Group leader type (self in other), and a more balanced (self and other) attachment—would characterize relations with the Inspiring leader type.

Besides, Freud believes that examining the phenomena of being in love will facilitate “finding in them conditions which can be transferred to the ties that exist in groups” (p. 45). In this regard, Freud views identification as a major mechanism for emerging emotional ties in groups, characterizing the act of identification as follows: “the ego has enriched itself with the properties of the object [of love], it has introjected the object into itself…” (p. 57). In examining further the identification phenomenon, Freud distinguishes between ego-self and ego-ideal, the interplay of which provides the ground for varying personal dissatisfactions and may lead to the individual placing the object of
love into the place of the ego-ideal, so that the ego “has surrendered itself to the object” (p. 57). The above concepts of followers’ identifications and ego-ideals are foundational in accounting for the emergence of libidinal (both horizontal and vertical) ties within a group.

Consequently, Freud notes that “it is precisely those sexual impulsions that are inhibited in their aims which achieve such lasting ties between people,” because “it is fate of sensual love to become extinguished when it is satisfied; for it to be able to last, it must from the beginning be mixed with purely affectionate components … inhibited in their aims, or it must itself undergo a transformation of this kind” (p. 60).

Finally, Freud furnishes “the formula for the libidinal constitution of groups … that have a leader…. A primary group of this kind is a number of individuals who put one and the same object in the place of their ego ideal and have consequently identified themselves with one another in their ego” (p. 61). This psychological mechanism for the group, stipulated as foundational by Freud and shown in Figure 1 below, deserves further in-depth examination. At least, as demonstrated in the cases of Catholic Church and Army, it appears to provide explanation in both vertical and horizontal dimensions for one of Little’s leader-follower relations types, namely Solidarity, which underpins the Group leader type.
In his seminal *Power and Personality*, Lasswell (1948) offers a psychological perspective on power relationships in which he explores problems of democratic leadership and democratic personality formation. He contends that “power is an interpersonal situation; those who hold power … depend upon … a continuing stream of empowering responses” and the “power relation is … cue-giving and cue-taking in a continuing spiral of interaction” (p. 10). This contention resonates with the psychosocial approach of Little (1985), who emphasizes that leader vs. followers’ expectations must match, and who places leader-follower relations at the center of his leadership model.

Based on his human value categories (power, respect, affection, rectitude, well-being, wealth, enlightenment, and skill), Lasswell (1948) proposes the following fundamental formula of power and personality relations: “Man pursues Values through Institutions on Resources” (p. 17). In this respect, *homo politicus* within a real political context is characterized by the “accentuation of power in relation to other values within the personality when compared with other persons” (p. 22). Lasswell underscores the culture-defined degree of accentuation of the power value as well as the relativity of its importance among other values across different cultures. He also emphasizes that
personal power accentuation is shaped by a certain combination of motivation, political skills, and opportunity.

To reiterate the initial point on the importance of leader-follower relationships, Lasswell points to “ample confirmation of the significance of dependency and counter-dependency demands in relation to leaders,” and his democratic personality formation vision embraces the whole global community. Overall, Lasswell views the entire “progressive democratization” task as a “process of developing character, technique, and perspective” (p. 173). This point parallels that of the post-communist democratization study by Dryzek and Holmes (2002) on the importance of “habits, traditions, and dispositions” in securing effective democratic institutions.

Applying Lasswell’s approach to the case of Kazakhstan, it is contended that the issue of new leadership style is linked to democratic personality formation. Indeed, now the worldwide “progressive democratization” trend also permeates political dynamics and discourses in the post-communist nations. In this regard, a critical issue involves development of a democratic personality (“character”) as an indispensable trait of the new political elite along with respective institution-building (“technique and perspective”) in Kazakhstan. This distinction has also been highlighted by the Kazakh scholar Masanov (2003) as seen in his definition of the concept of democracy as a “political technology” (p. xxx). It is worth noting a parallel definition by an U.S. scholar as a “political technology for the advancement of human dignity” (Debra Stone?), which offers an important element that clarifies the ultimate goal for the use of this technology.
The RADIR elite trend studies concentrated on examining political elites as a critical part of different national elites, which also include businessmen, media professionals (“those who manipulate symbols”), intellectuals, the military, and labor leaders. The importance of focusing on the political elite was premised on its being the “most formal and authoritative expression of values of the society it represents” (Rothwell, 1952, p. 3). The RADIR focus was on trends in political elite composition and recruitment bases across a few nations including major Western states (USA, UK, France, and Germany), the former Soviet Union, China, and South East Asia during the period 1890-1950. This cross-national historical trend study revealed the prominent place of “specialists in persuasion” (business, law, journalism, civil service) vs. other professional and social bases (military, landowners, etc.) who “dominated the elites of pluralistic societies” (p. 31).

A different trend discovered within Russian and German elites has illuminated the conditions and process of political power “passing from these specialists on persuasion to the specialists on coercion,” which explored changes in typical backgrounds and political careers of Bolshevik and Nazi leaders during the evolutionary process of their respective political regimes (Rothwell, 1952, p. 32). In this respect, it can be argued that a similar pattern of leadership change occurred in the 1980-1990s in the former Soviet Union and its successor states in which political agitators (specialists in persuasion) such as Gorbachev gave way to political administrators (specialists in coordination) such as Putin. In examining more current trends in the political elite composition in Kazakhstan, a more mixed picture has emerged featured by the presence of two background types,
namely the former “class” of Communist Party officials (*nomenklatura*) v. a newly emerging business class (*counter-elite*), the latter representing a new type of “specialists in persuasion.”

**Contemporary Leadership Studies**

Among more recent studies of leadership, a foundational *Leadership* book on transformational leadership by Burns (1978) is important because it offers a new perspective under which leadership and followership concepts and roles are joined together, so that “leaders act as agents of their followers” and leaders are no longer viewed as “heroic figures against the shadowy background of drab, powerless masses” (p. 3). In this regard, Burns looks at leadership as no “mere game among elitists and no mere populist response, but as a *structure of action* that engages persons, to varying degrees, throughout the levels and among the interstices of society” (p. 3).

Burns distinguishes between two leadership types, transactional and transformational, the more prevalent former style approaching followers “with an eye to exchanging one thing for another” whereas the latter seeks “to satisfy higher needs and engages the full person of the follower” (p. 4). Indeed, he sees the primary difference in the transforming leader’s reliance on “a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents” (p. 4). Thus, Burns develops a concept of moral leadership that emphasizes the difference between leaders and mere power holders, addresses fundamental aspirations and values of the public, and seeks to “produce social change that will satisfy followers’ authentic
needs” and help “release human potentials now locked in ungratified needs and crushed expectations” (p. 5).

In sum, one of Burns’s major contributions, similar to Lasswell’s (1948), is in defining power and leadership as human relationships, which makes us view the former in a context of human motives and resources and the latter as “a consequential exercise of mutual persuasion, exchange, elevation, and transformation” (p. 11). Indeed, Burns argues that “power wielders draw from their power bases resources relevant to their own motives and the motives and resources of others upon whom they exercise power,” and that to produce a desired effect, power resources “must be relevant to the motivations of the power recipients” (p. 17).

“The Crucibles of Political Leadership” chapter of the book examines inherent linkages between political leadership motives/ambitions and a structure of political opportunity. An important distinction is drawn between a quest for power, “quest for individual recognition and self-advancement,” “power-wielding” and responsible leadership, the latter seeking to “advance collective purposes that transcend the needs and ambitions of the individual” (p. 106?). This parallels Maslow’s division of an individual motivation toward power into “two subsidiary sets of needs … distinguishing between fame and achievement” (p. 106).

Burns provides illustrations of respective ambition differences in cases of such political leaders as Gandhi whose ambition became “an instrumental motive, a means to the end of destroying injustice” (p. 107). On the contrary, Hitler’s ambition was “essentially terminal,” which he geared completely toward his own dominance as a
“world power wielder” (p. 108) at the expense of his own people. A mixed pattern is arguably featured by Lenin, who developed a concept of revolutionary leadership of the masses by the party and leadership of the party by one man. Here, inherent conflicts have been suppressed and the postulated “merger of leader and led” subverted into “dominance of the led by the leaders” and “demand for obedience and one-man control.” In this regard, “Lenin was a leader, if a contradictory one, until he became a brute power wilder” and his Communist Party as instrument of his ambition “has been used for purposes abhorrent to Leninism as a liberating force” (p. 111). In this respect, it should be emphasized that there is an inherent conflict of ends v. means in which social liberation ideals were pursued based on dictatorial leadership means. (my italics)

Burns contends that “the most potent sources of political motivation … are unfulfilled esteem needs (both self-esteem and esteem by others)” and that “both power wielders and leaders have such needs.” On the other hand, he calls for viewing political ambition as “springing out of a host of motives … depending on roles taken in different cultures and situations” and states that “self-esteem is likely to vary sharply in its ingredients from culture to culture” (p. 113). In this respect, crucial is “the nature of the linkage between … attempts at self-gratification” and gratifying the needs of others, which makes self-esteem “a mixed and ambivalent factor in human personality, one whose expression varies depending on the social context” (p. 114). This point seems particularly noteworthy when considering specific aspirations underpinning political leadership claims by different emerging leaders in Kazakhstan.
Burns also points out that “the hallmark of most leaders in most cultures is not uncontrollable ambition … but prudence, calculation, and management,” so those who display emotions too nakedly “are typically blocked off from the channels of power by societies that esteem restraint and civility” (p. 115). In this regard, he refers to Franklin Delano Roosevelt (FDR) as a one “who knew when to be silent and when to speak out” and whose “sense of security managed to live harmoniously with a towering ambition” even if his “eternal quest for office … is traced to neurotic feelings of insecurity and deprivation” (p. 115). Thus, his ambition can be seen as exhibiting a sense of self-confidence and self-efficacy, which reflects healthy a motivation toward self-actualization (a term coined by Goldstein and given broader currency by Maslow), a “complex class of higher needs … tending toward more creativity and a better balance between individual and collective claims” (p. 116). Thus, self-actualization might be seen as a “need to grow and achieve, to fulfill oneself and respect others’ needs” (p. 116).

Burns also emphasizes the importance of political skills as conducive to ambition fulfillment as “ambition feeds on skill.” He points to their unequal distribution inside a society and a skill struggle (a term coined by Lasswell) alongside a class struggle, “with significant impact on who gets what and when.” One of most important skills is “the capacity to perceive needs of followers in relationship to their own, to help followers move toward fuller self-realization and self-actualization along with the leaders themselves” (p. 116). Here Burns make a noteworthy suggestion that “as self-actualizers are potential leaders at all levels—because of their capacity to grow, their flexibility, creativity, and competence—the concept of self-actualization is a powerful one for
understanding the processes of leadership” versus Maslow’s “almost ‘biologic’ (Smith)
… overemphasis on self-actualization rather than mutual actualization with others” (p.
117).

This description of the self-actualization skill as “tolerant understanding of other
persons, an open and inclusive attitude toward them, an ability to assess themselves in a
‘reflexive self-awareness …” (p. 117) resonates with the current Emotional Intelligence
(EI) concept by Goleman (2002), who defines leaders’ “primordial emotional task” as
“driving the collective emotions in a positive direction” so that “primal leadership work
… lies in the leadership competences of emotional intelligence: how leaders handle
themselves and their relationships” (Goleman, 2002, p. 5).

Thus, “self-actualization ultimately means the ability to lead by being led”
(Burns, 1978, p. 117) by the others’ needs and talents. Moreover, he points out that
“leaders help transform followers’ needs into positive hopes and aspirations” (p. 117),
the levels of which are influenced by leaders. This premise seems closely related to the
inspiring leader type outlined in psychosocial leader model by Little (1985).

In addition, leaders can further facilitate transmission of followers’ hopes and
aspirations into sanctioned expectations, which “carry more psychological and political
force” and are more “purposeful, focused, and affect-laden … directed toward more
specific and explicit goals, ones that are valued by the builders of expectations” (p. 118).
These heightened expectations, confronted with lower or zero realization, can combine to
contribute to “an extreme sense of deprivation in people” (p. 118). In this respect,
“revolution occurs … when major segments of society perceive a discrepancy between
their ‘value expectations’ and ‘the value capabilities of the environment’” (p. 118).

Leaders can play an “even more consequential role in converting economic and social expectations into political demands, that is, specific claims asserted directly against government,” which will be a “logical and almost inescapable culmination of the long process of the conversion of wants into needs, needs into hopes and aspirations, aspirations into expectations” (p. 118).

In this expectation-driven mobilization, leaders play an instrumental role in shaping public “perceptions of their own needs as against ‘objective’ definition of needs” by public officials, bureaucracy, etc. That implies potential choice in “mobilizing support behind certain demands and not behind others … and in organizing support that can be converted into pressures on government and in government in diverse ways and for diverse goals” (p. 119). This in turn enables different leaders to “compete among themselves in their efforts to identify followers’ fundamental wants and needs that can be mobilized and directed in support of the regime or against it…. Thus, leaders have “a central part in shaping, articulating, and targeting popular demands.” However, to fully harness this potential, leadership itself should aspire at “pervading virtually every level and sector of society, rather than being limited to the formal institutions of government” to ensure “the transmutation of ‘lower’ needs into ‘higher’ … demands” (p. 119).

Further, Burns underscores the importance of “the structures of political opportunity” to aspiring leaders seeking public offices, which have “a dynamic of their own.” Respective openings are structured by a specific polity featured by such systems as a Middle East sheikdom or monarchy, one-party or two-party systems, and modern
pluralist systems that provide varying degrees/points of access to leadership positions for different segments of the society. The British Parliament of the nineteenth century exemplifies an evolving structure “responding to the ambitions of nascent political leaders emerging from changing social backgrounds.” It served as “a focus of political ambition and a means of ordering channels of political advancement … through which political ambition flowed” (p. 120). Burns points to the democratizing impact of two reform bills within the then British polity so that “the social sources of political leadership were inexorably broadened,” which in turn resulted in opportunities that the newly formed Labour party could turn into “the vehicle for left-oriented middle-class leadership to rise to power” even as “the formal structure of opportunity remained largely unchanged” (p. 121).

Another pattern was featured by the Soviet Union, which overturned the previous political opportunity structure, so that the highest leadership positions were “to be thrown open to the masses,” which thus gave preferential treatment in selection to aspirants of proletarian origin. Overall, the Soviet leadership recruitment system “like the American, established a layercake of opportunities at the local, regional, republic, and national levels” along another “more formidable pyramid of opportunity … in the Communist Party” (p. 122).

The US political system, which beside a host of national level leadership positions presents “a plethora of state, county, and local offices, … created a wealth of opportunities for men from many socio-economic, ethnic, and racial groupings” (p. 123). Moreover, the American leadership recruitment system also encompasses new
substructures of opportunity “in the parties or in candidates’ personal organizations,” which broadens “the already variegated structure of opportunity” (p. 123).

Burns stresses an investor-like behavior of public office-seekers in the Western polities, who “calculate risks and possibilities … in terms of pay, perquisites, prestige, power, career advancement” alongside considering “the price, financial or otherwise” (p. 123). In this respect, he underlines respective projections of “the type of persons who rule us” based on the fact that in competitive societies “the investing, calculating, transacting, risk-taking quality of politics may attract individualistic, entrepreneurial types of personalities who bring to politics the ethics and the practices of laissez-faire capitalism—with crucial implications for policy-making and political leadership” (p. 124).

Burns also points to an interplay of the array of positions and the calculations of aspirants, which produces “a subsystem of career routes within the overall structure of opportunity, which in turn … makes for varying degrees of collectivity and individuality among politicians” (p.?). At the same time “the structure of openings is also a structure of closures,” which can filter out many aspirants (like Trotsky and Bukharin in Russia) who are nevertheless “not necessarily blocked from power.”

Overall, Burns summarizes his view of political leadership as “a product of personal drives, social influences, political motivations, job skills, and the structure of career possibilities,” which “not only shape the rising politician but influence one another,” so that “leadership is fired in the forge of ambition and opportunity” (p. 126).
On the other hand, in less individualistic societies “the relation between office and aspirant may be reversed,” so that the system itself may “actively recruit potential leaders and indoctrinate and motivate them for established positions.” Such historically renown sources as Erasmus’ *The Education of a Christian Prince* and Machiavelli’s *Prince* provide examples of this type of medieval leader training guides. Surprisingly, both Confucian China and Victorian England seem similar in structuring political opportunity for their public leadership, as both “taught morals by teaching manners … pursued an amateur ideal, the notion that manners (signifying virtue) and classical culture (signifying a well-tuned mind) were better credentials for leadership than any amount of expert, practical training” (p. 127).

Burns contends that the American “Jefferson-Jackson myth of equal opportunity” appears “too potent, the appeals of commerce and the professions too persuasive,” so that the US schools do not serve as effective channels for leadership recruitment and “for every Roosevelt and Kennedy who rose through exclusive institutions there have been many more Hardings, Trumans, and Johnsons who found other channels of advancement” (p. 128). In this respect, he argues that such an elitist school as Groton designed to “purify politics” and offset “political dishonesty and compromise failed to deal with the tough questions of expediency and accommodation that would confront the American politician” (p. 128). His resultant conclusion is that FDR “probably won success despite his Groton education rather than because of it” (p. 128).

The education of developing nations seems more explicitly to seek recruitment of a “politically reliable talent into the opportunity structure,” which may however induce
“tension … between traditionalist political leaders and younger, more specialized graduates … moving into key administrative and technical positions.” Higher educations of Indonesia in the 1960s, the Philippines, and the Soviet Union furnish instances of government-controlled channels to recruit and train political leaders. Burns points to the unpredictable outcome of this control over recruitment channels by noting that “the long-term effect of leadership indoctrination may be incalculable and even self-defeating” because “the formal structure of opportunity is not a cluster of inert targets of ambition” and “has a life and impact of its own as it interacts with psychological and social influences on aspiring leaders” (p. 129).

Further, Burns attributes critical importance to creating adequate leader-follower relations. He refers to Gandhi as an example of an “elitist type of leadership, both in his appeal to the Indian masses and his incitement of, and heavy demands on, his immediate circle of followers.” Thus, Gandhi “created followers who were also leaders, ’aspirants for highest political power’ (Erikson) and the makers of modern India” (p. 129). In this regard, Burns emphasizes “the inadequacy of conventional distinction between leaders and followers” and the need to examine “the complex interrelation of different kinds of leaders, subleaders (or cadres), and followers.” Here, he offers a concept of activation that consists of “any initial act that stimulates a response” and “covers a vast range of acts, from long-term arousal of expectations to precipitating an immediate response—a speech by a prime-minister or president, … revolutionary appeals to masses, a college teacher’s lectures or assignments, … the ‘kindling power’ of a … Demosthenes” (p. 130). There exist the following “patterns of activation: face-to-face conversations … activation
in the context of membership in groups … such as the family, … efforts by political parties, popular movements, … strategies by which established regimes retain or expand their hold on followers, … appeals … to foreign governments and populations.”

In this respect, Burns stresses that “the context of activation is a key factor,” which forces us to view the multitude of followers “in their psychological, social, and political settings.” First, he indicates that followers “exist in diverse degrees of latency and potential incitement; they hold beliefs, attitudes, needs, and values of varying intensity.” Particularly, he refers to the following relevant five attitude sets: sense of citizen duty, basic information about politics, perceived stake in political outcomes, sense of political efficacy, and attentiveness to political matters. In this regard, some potential followers “may be so protected or imprisoned by sets of attitudes, needs, and norms that efforts at certain kinds of political activation would be doomed to failure” (p. 131).

Second, another way to discern varying types of followers lies in “their social and psychological matrix,” which encompasses such settings as family, class, status, group, work group, residence, sex, income, race, religion, age, etc., so that “followers, embedded in their settings, can be activated only by stimuli that take context into account…” (p. 131). It is not a mere “membership” that matters, but “a role fixed by attitudes, expectations, and claims by other members whose esteem they value” (p. 131).

Third, Burns also points to the political context of followers, which implies “all degrees of identification, attachment, loyalty, and disposition to activity in parties and organized interests” as well as “various political systems of regimes that seek to mobilize them politically or suppress or channel political participation,” the result of which is that
“the dominant politics may be heavily value-laden and ideological or pragmatic and
‘practical’” (p. 132). In this respect, he contends that “the voter-nonvoter dichotomy is of
limited value in itself” and one should differentiate between the “informed public that
directs a stream of influences on leaders and the mass public that … has to be shaken out
of its latency and shocked or propagandized … into paying attention and participating.”
Here, under Lazarsfeld, one should appreciate “the role of local influential in activating
persons…” (p. 133).

Fourth, as Burns argues, “the vast majority are both activators and respondents,
leaders and followers, at the same time or at different times” (p. 133). He identifies a
“two-step” flow of communication and influence where activators are intermediary
persons, being thus both leader and followers, and “with relatively high exposure to
opinion media” serve as “transmission belts” between national leaders and general public.
Indeed, he refers to multiple flows of influence whereby “national leaders and parties
indoctrinate cadres, who in turn activate local opinion leaders, who in turn appeal to the
wants and needs of potential supporters” (p. 133). In this regard, he furnishes the case of
the Chinese “mass line process” of mobilization, which solicits “mass discussion and
opinions as a means of both directing the people and tapping its energies and
commitment.” He also mentions the famous tatzupao, which is “supposed to express
mass opinion as well as reflect cadre indoctrination,” which makes it hard to discern
“where central direction leaves off and local ‘democratization’ begins” (p. 134).

Thus, Burns concludes that “in most polities there is no clear or sharp line
between the roles of leader and follower … and … moreover, leaders and followers
exchange roles over time and in different political settings” (p. 134). Beside viewing leaders as activators, he points to “complex networks of two-step and multi-step processes” of influence that they build and use. As a result, Burns rejects a “simplistic dichotomy” of dividing all people into “small, intensive, knowledgeable and united elites on the one hand and a great mass of persons in a state of ignorance, inactivity, and low motivation on the other” (p. 134).

Finally, Burns emphasizes that “time … and … exceptional leadership may make a difference in transforming dormant into active followers” (p. 136). He refers to the leadership of Lenin, Gandhi, and Mao who “brought literally hundreds of millions of men and women out of political isolation and into a new kind of political participation” (p. 137). Burns stresses that “heroic, transcending, transforming leadership excites the previously bored and apathetic; it recreates a political connection with the alienated; it reaches even to the wants and needs of the anomic and shapes their motivation … and gives new meaning to issues and concerns. But all this calls for uncommon leadership, and uncommon leadership is just that” (p. 137).

Goleman’s (2002) Primal Leadership furnishes another important leadership perspective based on the above mentioned EI concept, which views leaders’ ability to “prime good feeling in those they lead” through creating “resonance—a reservoir of positivity that frees the best in people” (Goleman, 2002, p. ix). In this regard, he emphasizes that “leaders have always played a primordial emotional role,” because they act “as the group’s emotional guide” and have “maximal power to sway everyone’s emotions” (p. 5). This premise is also congruent with the view of a great emotional
importance attributed to the leadership embodied in the US presidency (Pika & Maltese, 2002). As the underpinning mechanism for this emotional impact, Goleman points to “the open-loop nature of the limbic system, our emotional centers,” interacting with the others’ through “‘interpersonal limbic regulation,’ whereby one person transmits signals that can alter hormone levels, cardiovascular function, sleep rhythm, and even immune function inside the body of another” (p. 7). Indeed, he stresses that “laughter, in particular, demonstrates the power of the open loop in operation—and therefore the contagious nature of all emotion” (p. 10). In this regard, “the greater a leader’s skill at transmitting emotions, the more forcefully the emotions will spread” (p. 11), so that “gifted leadership occurs where heart and head—feeling and thought—meet. These are the two wings that allow a leader to soar” (p. 26). Specifically, Goleman views “each of the four domains of EI—self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management” as a “crucial set of skills for resonant leadership” where self-awareness “is the foundation for the rest” (p. 30). Thus, this premise resonates with Burns’s above contention of the importance of the leaders’ ability to realize their own motives in connection with those of their followers.

As an implication for EI-based leadership development, Goleman offers the concept of self-directed learning, which involves “getting a strong image of your ideal self, as well as an accurate picture of your real self” (p. 109). In this regard, he stresses that “‘the first discovery’ of the self-directed learning process … requires a reach deep inside to one’s gut level … when you feel suddenly passionate about the possibilities your life holds” (p. 116). He contrasts our own ideal self with somebody else’s version of
our ideal self, an image that contributes to our *ought self*, which may become “a box within which we are trapped—what sociologist Max Weber called our ‘iron cage’” (p. 118). Goleman underscores the difference in that “real leadership development … begins with a holistic vision of one’s life, in all its richness,” so “leaders need to be emotionally engaged in their self-development” (p. 119). Indeed, he contends that “our ideal self-image engages our passion, emotion, and motivation,” which would be “the deepest expression of what we want in life, and that image becomes both a guide for our decisions and a barometer of our sense of satisfaction in life” (p. 125). As a next step, to be able to lead others “a leader needs a vision for the organization … to spread the contagion of excitement” among followers. That is the way, Goleman argues, that “the individual ideal self-image evolves into a *shared* vision for the future,” taking into account that “to be in tune with others’ vision, you have to be open to others’ hopes and dreams” (p. 125). This stance completely resonates with Burns’s premise of the imperative for *mutual self-actualization*, which implies linking a leader’s motives with those of his followers, which would make his leadership *resonant*. In this respect and in parallel with Burns, Goleman emphasizes that “leadership is distributed,” which means that a transformational leader is “to develop a critical mass of resonant leaders and thereby transform how people work together, and then to encourage the ongoing development of such leaders” (p. 168).

Another more recent study by Pansegrouw (2001) offers an insightful approach to the issue of leadership styles appropriate for particular organizational transformation contexts. Although applied primarily to organizational transformation—defined as
“substantial and discontinuous change to the shape, structure, and nature of the organization, rather than incremental changes” in the face of environmental pressures”—his perspective can be translated into the public context. In parallel with Lasswell’s views of the role of social institutions, he argues that “leadership must design and put into action an organization … congruent with the new beliefs and values” (Pansegrouw, 2001, p. 419). Through accentuating a “value-anchored vision” of leadership, Pansegrouw parallels Lasswell’s view of leaders’ motives as a pursuit of values defined in public interest terms. Pansegrouw’s situational approach draws on the concept of readiness for transformation, which he views as a function of organizational culture defined primarily through shared assumptions and beliefs (p. 422).

Parallels can be drawn between political and organizational cultures with regard to their contextual roles in selecting appropriate leadership styles. For instance, Pansegrouw sees culture-specific basic assumptions functioning, first, as “coping mechanisms,” also defined as “ability factors” (the extent to which an organization is able to cope with events), and second, as “willingness factors” (what an organization will strive for and how) (p. 423). Thus, he classifies organizational cultures along two dimensions: ability for change and willingness for change. Ability includes tolerance of ambiguity, risk-propensity, entrepreneurial orientation, and innovation, whereas willingness is comprised of sharing of goals and identities, mission orientation, congruence and internal consistency. Based on these criteria, Pansegrouw distinguishes among four different cultures and their degrees of organizational readiness for transformation—namely, stagnating, conserving, competing, and learning cultures (p.
Panseggrou then classifies transformational leadership styles into four strategies based on relative weights assigned to *structuring* and *inspiring* actions: *enforcing* (high structuring, low inspiring), *enabling* (high in both structuring and inspiring), *enlisting* (low structuring, high inspiring), and *endorsing* (low in both structuring and inspiring). Panseggrou’s main point involves the *situational matching of transformational leadership strategies and culture-readiness types*, and he emphasizes that over seven specific phases of transformation, the earlier phases will require more structuring strategies, whereas the later ones will rely on more inspiring styles. He notes, however, that the most suitable leadership style “will be determined by the organization’s readiness to implement that phase,” and that “each phase is … in reality, a ‘situation’” (p. 433).

This situational perspective of transformational leadership styles in organizational context also appears potentially useful with respect to appropriate political leadership styles. In this regard, complex and diverse post-communist transformation conditions in different nations call for a careful analysis of *particular national political cultures* that affect the *national readiness for transformation*. That means that based on identification of its political culture along *dimensions of ability and willingness for transformation*, an appropriate political leadership style could be selected, which would feature an *appropriate combination of structuring and inspiring actions*.¹

¹Consider, as an illustration, the case of Mikhail Gorbachev (Glad & Shirayev, 1999). In terms of Panseggrou’s classification, the political culture of the Soviet public in the early and mid-1980s could be viewed as a stagnating culture that was unable and unwilling to transform. In this regard, Gorbachev’s predecessor, Andropov, had chosen seemingly a more culturally appropriate enforcing leadership style intended to destroy the status quo and overcome resistant public attitudes. On the contrary, it could be argued that Gorbachev emphasized enlisting and endorsing styles characterized by low structuring actions and greater emphasis on inspiring actions. Thus, this situational mismatch of authoritarian political culture...
A promising transformational leadership model has been developed by Kouzes and Posner (2002) and bears on a cross-cultural study of personal-best leadership practices. The underpinning premise is that “leadership is relationship, and relationship skills are what shape success” (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 13). All common personal-best leadership experiences (called practices) are divided into the following five groups: model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart. First, Kouzes and Posner require that transformational leaders be role models based on their personal values, authentic leading style and individual self-expression voice since “people first follow the person, then the plan” (p. 16). Second, their model stresses the ability of transformational leaders to inspire a shared vision among their followers. In this regard, both the role model and inspirational components of the personal-best leadership practices fit well with Little’s (1985) inspiring leader type, which features “I-and-others” relations. Third, Kouzes and Posner view transformational leaders as pioneers willing to challenge a status quo, i.e., existing organizational processes. Fourth, transformational leaders share their power and enable their followers, as true leadership is relational, founded on trust and confidence, which makes followers “take risks, make changes, … and turn into leaders themselves” (p. 19). Finally, practices that encourage the heart uplift the spirits of followers throughout transformation. The leader’s task here is to show genuine appreciation for followers’ contributions. Thus, this best-practice based model inherently relies on the leadership concept as “relationship and Gorbachev’s leadership style might have contributed to his mixed subsequent leadership outcomes and ratings.
between those who aspire to lead and those who choose to follow” and places emphasis on the *inspirational function of leaders* (p. 20). Again, this view of best-practice driven transformational leadership style appears congruent with the Inspiring leader profile as defined by Little (1985).

To demonstrate how their model conforms to reality, Kouzes and Posner underscore the dynamics of leader-follower relationships as a *reciprocal* process, which stresses that those who aspire to lead must embrace their constituents’ expectations. In this regard, cross-national surveys conducted during two decades across six continents have revealed the following four most prominent characteristics that the majority of followers admire in their leaders: *honest, forward-looking, competent, and inspiring* (p. 25), considered as the basis of leaders’ credibility.

In sum, Kouzes and Posner’s best-practices based leadership model reveals similarities with Little’s (1985) typology: Both approaches are anchored in viewing *leader-follower relations as foundational* in defining a leadership style. Specifically, the leadership model espoused by Kouzes and Posner is comparable to Little’s *ensemble*, which corresponds to the inspiring leader type.

A similar approach to organizational transformation is offered by Tichy and Ulrich (2003) who contend that “the revamping of the political and cultural systems is what most distinguishes the transformational leader from the transactional one” (p. 77). In this respect, they point to such steps as creating a vision of success, mobilizing a “process of evolving commitment among managers,” and institutionalizing “new patterns of behavior within an organization” (p. 83). These steps seem to match certain best
practices as defined by Kouzes and Posner—namely, inspiring a shared vision, enabling followers, and challenging the status quo. Second, Tichy and Ulrich identify three distinct phases in a transformational process: endings (disengagement), “neutral zone” (death and rebirth zone, disintegration and reintegration), and consolidation (growth based on newly shaped meanings and values). Applied to the national level, significant psychodynamic changes in a society must be understood and managed by its new national leadership that needs to help followers deal with “simultaneous positive and negative feelings: fear and hope, pressure and stimulation, loss of meaning and new meaning, threat to self-esteem and new sense of value” (p. 83).

Another comprehensive cross-cultural leadership study is the book by House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, and Gupta (2004), which features the outcome of GLOBE, a multimethod, multiphase research program designed to “explore the fascinating and complex effects of culture on leadership, organizational effectiveness, economic competitiveness of societies, and the human condition of members of the societies studied” (p. 10). In this book, the authors report on the parts of the integrated theory that focus on the relationship among culture, leadership, and societal effectiveness.

As an overview, during the mid-1990s, a large multinational team of 170 researchers and their support groups throughout the world collected data from more than 17,000 middle managers in 951 organizations in telecommunications, food processing, and finance industries in 62 societies (House et al., 2004). This book reports the findings of the first two phases of the GLOBE project.
In their study, culture was conceptualized in terms of nine attributes that, when quantified, were referred to as cultural dimensions. GLOBE measured both cultural practices (the way things are) and values (the way things should be) at the organizational and societal levels of analysis. Those nine cultural dimensions were defined as follows: uncertainty avoidance, power distance, institutional collectivism, in-group collectivism, gender egalitarianism, assertiveness, future orientation, performance orientation, and humane orientation.

The study was premised on the assumption that a “societal culture influences and regulates human behavior in this society,” so that “cultural values and practices help identify socially acceptable and unacceptable behavior” (House et al., 2004, p. 276). Two specific arenas for the impact of these values are organizational culture and effective leadership attributes. The work posited that “organizations are a micro version of the society in which they operate. They are populated by individuals who have grown up in the host culture, and their success in external adaptation and internal integration depends on their ability to assimilate their broader environment” (p. 276). In this regard, the authors have demonstrated that organizations are reported to reflect the culture (practices and values) of the society in which they are embedded.

The theory that guides the GLOBE research program is an integration of implicit leadership theory (Lord & Maher, 1991), value-belief theory of culture (Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 1995), implicit motivation theory (McClelland, 1985), and structural contingency theory of organizational form and effectiveness (Donaldson, 1993; Hickson, Hinings, McMillan, & Schwitter, 1974). The resultant integrated theory is called Culturally
Endorsed Implicit Theory of Leadership (CLT). The central proposition of this integrated theory is that “the attributes that differentiate a specified culture are predictive of organizational practices and leader attributes and behaviors that are most frequently enacted and effective in that culture” (House et al., 2004, p. 17). Thus, the integrated theory draws on the premise that societal cultural norms of shared values and practices affect leaders’ behavior, which means that dominant cultural norms induce leader behavior patterns that are expected and viewed as legitimate.

National leadership attributes were measured in GLOBE through a questionnaire containing 112 leadership items, each defined and measured on a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 7.

• GLOBE identified 22 leadership attributes that are universally desirable. Ninety-five percent of the societal average scores for these attributes were higher than 5 on a 7-point scale, and the worldwide grand mean score exceeded 6 on a 7-point scale. Decisiveness and foresight are examples of such attributes.

• Eight leadership attributes were identified as universally undesirable. Ninety-five percent of the societal average scores for these attributes were less than 3 on a 7-point scale, and the worldwide grand mean score was lower than 3. Irritable and ruthless are examples of such attributes.

• Many leadership attributes are culturally contingent. They are desirable in some cultures and undesirable in others. Ambitious is an example with a societal score ranging from 2.85 to 6.73. Elitist is another example with a societal score range of 1.61 to 5.00. In some cultures the concept of leadership is romanticized and leaders are given exceptional
privileges and status and are held in great esteem. On the other hand, in some cultures like the Netherlands or Switzerland, the concept of leadership is denigrated and members of the cultures are highly suspicious of individuals who are in positions of authority for fear that they will acquire and abuse power. In these cultures, substantial constraints are placed on what individuals in positions of authority can and cannot do, and such individuals are given no special treatment, status, or privileges (House et al., 2004).

Overall, GLOBE was based on the premise that leaders are seen as the “society's instruments for change” and as the “embodiment of the ideal state of affairs” (House et al., 2004, p. 276). Project findings also suggest how big the challenge facing the leaders is as they have to work under cultural practices that often may not be supportive, but they are assessed to a significant extent on their ability to fulfill the expectations of their followers.

As the cross-country findings display, Charismatic/Value-Based leadership has significant associations with Performance Orientation at both organizational and societal levels of analysis (House et al., 2004). It is the reported “most-effective attribute of leaders in societies that value performance,” because “performance-oriented societies are in pursuit of excellence. They desire innovation, challenge, and ambition” (p. 276). In this respect, Charismatic/Value-Based leadership was defined as visionary, inspirational, decisive, and performance-oriented leadership with high integrity and willingness to accept self-sacrifice to achieve a vision. When compared to Little’s (1985) leader typology, this definition appears to incorporate traits of the Inspiring and Group leader types.
Thus, the book states that “because almost all societies in our study scored very high on societal Performance Orientation values, it appears that charismatic leadership is a universally endorsed instrument for satisfaction of human ideals” (House et al., 2004, p. 276). Specifically, GLOBE findings have shown that there seems to be a universal demand for leaders who set high standards and encourage performance. Even though there were significant differences among geographic regions as to the importance of Performance Orientation to effective leadership, the range of scores was 4.92 to 6.58 (p. 248), indicating a strong desire for this attribute in all regions.

As a conclusion, the book confirms that societal and organizational cultures have an impact on the content of the societies' desirable leadership styles, or culturally endorsed leadership theories (CLTs) (House et al., 2004). In this regard, two specific CLTs received particularly strong endorsement at both organizational and societal levels: Charismatic/Value-Based leadership and Participative leadership. In other words, “societies and organizations that value Performance Orientation seem to look to charismatic leaders who paint a picture of an ambitious and enticing future, but leave it to the people to build it” (p. 278).

The GLOBE study also provides findings on common leadership patterns and traits for 62 countries as grouped into 10 cultural clusters (Javidan, 2002, p. 2), which focus specifically on “effective leader behaviors and attributes” (Nahavandi, 2003, p. 23). This clustering approach derives from the theory and methodology developed in a pioneer cross-cultural study by Hofstede (1980), which measured and compared different cultural dimensions of a number of nations around the globe. Kazakhstan, considered as
a part of the Eastern European cultural cluster, was covered by GLOBE, which reported that this region’s societal practices (“as is”) rate high, on average, on group collectivism and power distance, whereas cultural dimensions such as uncertainty avoidance and future orientation are scored relatively low, and humane orientation, institutional collectivism, and performance orientation are rated in the mid-range. Overall, the East European cluster was viewed as tolerant of uncertainty, highly group oriented, hierarchical, and gender egalitarian (Bacacsi, Sandor, Karacsonyi, & Imrek, 2002, p. 75). As to the picture of outstanding leadership traits, or values (“should be”), this cultural cluster stands high (in descending order) on performance orientation, group and family collectivism, humane orientation, future orientation, and uncertainty avoidance. Thus, the study finds societal cultures of this region to be highly group oriented and dominated by a hierarchical management attitude, and contends that a “group-oriented power distance is the hallmark of this cluster,” which shows a preference for a “continuation of a strong group collectivism” (p. 75).

In exploring cluster-specific traits of outstanding leadership, the study reveals the importance of the following features: inspirational charisma, integrity, decisiveness, performance orientation, team-building, competence, and diplomatic and collaborative skills. In sum, it defines the ideal style as transformational-charismatic and team-oriented leadership. In this respect, it views charismatic style as “logically derived from high power stratification.” The team-oriented (participative) component is explained by a historically “paternalistic leadership style (asking opinion of others)” seen as a “dominant pattern in status conscious eastern societies” (p. 77).
Leadership Relating to Kazakhstan

Leadership as a field of scholarly study has not yet been established in Kazakhstan, a view recently expressed by a leading Kazakh political science scholar, Nurbolat Masanov (personal interview, April 22, 2004). In Masanov’s view, the Kazakh national leadership profile is characterized primarily by a traditional paternalist type of leader (“strong hand”), position in the government hierarchy, and family ties with the ruling elite. Masanov attributes this paternalism and personalist leadership style to the prior lack of modern statehood in Kazakhstan, and argues that the previous Kazakh nomadic society did have power institutions, but not a state per se, i.e., an institutionalized monopoly of political power over its territory. Those prior institutions exercised power over certain groups of tribes/clans, not over a particular territory. If some of those tribes/clans decided not to stay under the power of a certain power holder (khan), they would exit his area and assumed protection either to lead their own lives or to join another khan. Masanov contends that the absence of stable territory-based institutionalized governance structures as well as a semi-nomadic lifestyle and volatile livestock-breeding economy have not contributed to the emergence of a modern type nation, nor to a sense of national interest, which is why, in his view, most current Kazakh public leaders tend to identify today’s public institutions with their own respective egos. In this regard, they have also inherited an embedded view of the state and its power as a tool for arbitrarily carrying out public policies and pursuing their own personal interests. Masanov views the present public leadership style as ultimatum-like, suppressing, and driven by hidden personal interest. As a Soviet legacy, this style reveals a proclivity for
declarative and rhetorical public communication, which for the most part does not readily demonstrate the true intentions of the speaker. In characterizing the inherent nature of prevalent relations in the Kazakh political context, Masanov refers to them as a patron-client and corporatist-network based on the “principle of mutual utility.” This network is usually built around a “patron” (a formal top position holder within the hierarchy of each public institution) who selects “clients” from among loyal subordinates and relatives. Thus, Masanov regards existing leader-follower relations as shaped by either patron-client personalist or autocratic domineering attitudes. In this regard, his premise resonates with Ishiyama’s (2002) neo-patrimonial Kazakh leader who maintain his authority through personal patronage rather than ideology or law, and who awards personal favors in exchange for loyalty on the part of followers (transactional leader type). Masanov also emphasizes the verbal, short-lived, and not self-committing character of leaders’ communication style, which largely presupposes falseness in its espoused meaning.

Overall, Masanov views the current Kazakh president’s style as a symbol and an adequately reflected portrait of a typical public leader in this country today, which is largely mirrored at all lower government levels. However, he also sees a newly emerging leader type within the “middle class,” which comprises businessmen and middle and lower level civil servants who allegedly exhibit different characteristics, such as a willingness for compromise, consensus-seeking, and a sense of public interest. He views these groups as a recruitment base for a new, open, and liberal political elite, which would be driven more by the public interest. Masanov does not believe in the leadership potential of most present day intellectuals (writers and artists) as traditional “specialists in
persuasion.” Instead, he attributes a greater prospective role to the new business class
driven by economic and political interests. He still finds in the newly emerging elite some
traits that are part of the Kazakh paternalist and autocratic political legacy, but he is more
optimistic about their overall leadership style.

In sum, Masanov’s overall assessment of the political leadership style in
Kazakhstan deserves critical consideration. On the other hand, it seems possibly to
overstate the impact of Kazakhstan’s tribal past and Soviet authoritarian legacy on its
current national leader. His identification of the patron-client network as a key is
certainly of interest and could be considered as one of the basic forms of imminent
leader-follower relations in the Kazakh context, which, as a part of paternalist legacy
under Little’s typology, could be viewed as a specific manifestation of the strong leader’s
way of solving the self/other dilemma. In addition, as noted above, Masanov’s view of
the newly emerging open-type elite that shows more propensity for compromise and
flexibility contains, under Little’s typology, some inspiring leader features.

With the exception of Olcott and Cummings, few Western scholars have
addressed national leadership issues in Kazakhstan. Olcott (1997) examines formal and
informal power bases of the first and long-standing incumbent president, Nursultan
Nazarbaev, whose formal base draws upon superior constitutional prerogatives
(promulgated by the second Constitution of Kazakhstan of 1995) vested in the
presidency, which effectively turns the political system into a “super-presidential
republic.” The informal base bears upon the legacy carried over from the influence and
leader’s image of the “first man” in the former Communist Party hierarchy as well as
upon the presidential executive office comprised of a “staff of several hundred who can conduct informal interventions or offer necessary persuasion” to covertly promote the “big man’s” line (Olcott, 1997, p. 107). Finally, I would add a third dimension of this “one-man rule”—the president’s public image, meticulously nurtured, as centrist and integrative in the eyes of his multi-ethnic citizenry. This popularity is also skillfully boosted through cultivating and advertising his positive relations with most major states and international agencies. In this regard, similarly to the American presidency in terms of its great psychological importance for the US public (Pika & Maltese, 2002), the Kazakh president tends to be viewed as a national super-leader in charge of the entire government and the nation. Another parallel could be drawn between George Washington and Nazarbaev as the first presidents of their respective nations. Indeed, the former is revered universally as a centrist fatherly figure who, at the historic founding stage, was able to combine in his transitional leader profile both aristocratic traits and democratic-minded attitude (Maccoby, 1982). Likewise, Nazarbaev, as the Kazakh “Founding Father” (as an indication of his status, his informal nickname is “Papa”), seems to be seen as a recognized national “super-leader” who has successfully managed the “transformation of Kazakhstan from a post-Soviet administrative leftover into a true nation” (Olcott, 1993, p. 169).

To provide an idea of the new political system building process in Kazakhstan mirrored by the first man’s ascension to the top leadership position, Olcott depicts the recent history of Nazarbaev’s repeated and successful show of power in earlier struggles with the newly fledged, yet “increasingly assertive” Kazakh national legislative body.
Olcott contends that, as an institutionalized outcome of this wrestling of these two power branches, a “strong presidential system” and “long-term presidential rule appears to be the future norm” for Kazakhstan (p. 122). In this respect, she also points to the “ossification of existing political order” and to the “growing tendency … to regard present elites as the only ones who can be trusted to govern” (p. 128). Thus, her conclusions seem to support classical elite theory premises with regard to the emerging national leadership recruitment base in Kazakhstan that would comprise, primarily, the incumbent president’s family, his personal patronage network in the government, and probably some politically loyal business elite members.

As to possible implications for the leadership style, based on Olcott’s assessment of trends in the local political system, I could point to the persisting authoritarian-minded pattern consistent with Little’s Strong leader type. On the other hand, Olcott’s study does not report other emerging patterns such as the one presented by the local business elite, which may be accounted for by the fact that her study was conducted in the mid-1990s so it was probably too early to discover the more recent dynamic.

Cummings (2002) analyzes the mechanisms through which Nazarbaev achieved and has maintained power, and although she does not assert that his “power building has been accompanied by a legitimization of his regime and … personal authority” (Cummings, 2002, p. 59), she leaves open the question of a culture-endorsed political leadership style in Kazakhstan. Similar to Olcott, Cummings characterizes the current presidential leadership as shaped by such formal factors as the constitution-based supremacy of presidential authority over all three major power branches. Among
informal means, she points to an “absence of ideology in favor of a managerial type of leadership; kleptocratic economy; and strong personalism buttressed by corruption, patrimonialism, and venality” (p. 66). Here, personalism works through “cadre politics” expressed in “two forms of patronage: creating patron-client bonds … and drawing on pre-existing bonds” (p. 66). In this regard, the indicated personalism and patronage-based leadership pattern, similar to Masanov’s premises outlined above, would appear to imply rather a Strong leader type as a major local leadership style.

Cummings corroborates the findings of Olcott on the Kazakh political leadership’s unwillingness “to draw upon nationalism (including religion) to build … a power base.” Another shared premise about the emerging Kazakh political system concerns a “strong emphasis on personalism … increasingly dynastic in content” as the Kazakh “political elite becomes smaller and more homogenous” (p. 63). In this respect, one could again infer a strong leader orientation inherent in leadership patterns, which primarily relies on leaders’ “tough hand” in the polity. However, Cummings describes the current system as a “hybrid regime dominated by the President” that prefers to use “implied threats rather than direct force or intimidation” (p. 63). She supports this premise by indicating that “Nazarbaev’s recruitment policy was an effective blend of balancing clan interests, recognizing the need to bring in technocrats, and offering gifts to family and friends” (p. 66). Indeed, among his steps taken to uphold the “smart authoritarianism,” she mentions “cadre reshuffling, increased centralization through elite recruitment and territorial changes, and careful balancing of both domestic and foreign constituencies” (p. 64).
In sum, Cummings in part bolsters classical elite theory by concluding that, in the Kazakhstan context, building the leader’s authority is to “target the right constituency,” which “appears to remain the elite rather than the society at large.” On the other hand, she makes note of “new forces of elite formation that constrain Nazarbaev’s role of a patron,” which are driven by “marketization … creating a business elite that is increasingly separate from the political elite” (p. 72). Thus, Cummings’s study concludes that “formation of Kazakh elite is likely to fall out of Nazarbaev’s control” as “this new elite is co-opted by necessity rather than by will” (p. 72). This premise on the emergence of alternative leadership bases within Kazakhstan bolsters the above view by Masanov of the new wave of leaders, which, under Lasswell’s value-based typology, apart from businessmen, can also include such middle-class groups as civil service professionals, education leaders, and scholars as well as prominent writers, journalists, and artists (intelligentsia). Indeed, the rising conflict within the local political system has been manifested by ongoing signs of mounting political opposition on the part of the young business elite and some former senior government officials who have recently exerted efforts on building opposition parties and rallying support among the general public on the eve of the December 2005 presidential elections as an attempt to challenge the power monopoly of the incumbent.

A recent study on the political liberalization in the Arab Gulf monarchies (Askar, 2005) reveals interesting parallels in both the nature and dynamics of change within political leadership patterns of Kazakhstan and various Middle East Arab nations. Generally, the author provides a comprehensive overview of different factors that account
for liberalization dynamics in the Arab Gulf monarchies. Their particular characteristics, which are similar to those associated with the Kazakh political system, are as follows:

1. *Tribalism*, which is demonstrated “in the forms of informality, personalism, and patrimonialism, and patron-client relationship” (Askar, 2005, p. 3) that seem to intermingle with the formal elected institutions, which thus prevents them from being fully functional in the Western democracy sense. Interesting in this regard are the de facto superior prerogatives of the head of the ruling family as an ultimate leader residing on top of the whole political system. Indeed, an Arab Gulf hereditary “ruler generally exhibits an authoritarian character and he largely controls all the political institutions within the system” (p. 35). He appears to be above all existing power branches, so the checks and balances condition seems to be out of question. This “super-leader” premise could also perfectly apply to the current Kazakhstan as a "super-presidential republic" with the superior unquestioned power vested with the presidency.

Another effect of “tribalism as a legitimizing tool” is displayed in that “the access to tribal connections is … significant for a ruling family to establish its rule” and even “for the further survival of that ruling family” (Askar, 2005, p. 4). In the Kazakh context, as a former nomadic society, similar awareness of clan relations and their use in maintaining the informal inter-clan balance of interests in the system is essential for the top leader.

2. There is also a parallel with regard to *informality* as a dominant mode for decision-making patterns within the Arab Gulf polities. Indeed, their “leaders are not bound by formal contracts or limited by institutional constraints” (p. 9), so real policy-
making is “conducted along informal, personal lines with only minimal reference to institutions” (p. 9), which, in this respect, would serve primarily as a facade to legitimize informally decided-upon policies.

3. The existence of underpinning vested interests such as “the privileged positions of the ruling families” to occupy keys positions in the executive branch institutions “such as the ministries of defense, interior, and foreign affairs” (p. 9) serves to account for the political status quo and lack of will to promote political reforms in those countries. On the other hand, nowadays, their ruling elites encounter the dilemma of liberalizing vs. conserving the system, which is fueled by both external and internal pressures. Indeed, the current democratic crusade of U.S. President George W. Bush in the region as espoused in his “Greater Middle Eastern Initiative” and mounting signs of political violence from inside, makes them go for political maneuvering (p. 10). Respective reforms are designed in a way that rulers would appear open to changes, but the tempo and nature of those reforms would remain under their control.

The same scenario seems to be taking place in Kazakhstan where the ruling elite seeks to promote a "balanced" democratization scenario from the top down by envisaging elections of local-level mayors. However, these reforms would not likely change the balance of power in favor of the legislative branch. Indeed, as ensured constitutionally, the supreme legislative body (Mazhilis) would in no way be in a position to question the supreme authority of the president as a "guarantor of stability" of the whole system.

4. Finally, I can refer to such relevant historic and economic factors as the British political legacy of sustaining a monarchy as the most convenient and loyal type of regime
to serve “the purpose of the grand imperial design” (p. 11) and an economic pattern featured by the “rentier state” taking care of the populace through oil revenues and thus reinforcing hierarchical “patron-client relationships among the rulers and the people” (p. 13).

There are parallels between Askar’s (2005) analysis of Arab states and the Kazakhstan case in which can be discerned a legacy of the former Soviet authoritarian political pattern and the current reliance on oil-boom generated windfalls in state revenues that are used by the ruling regime to buy off oppositions and keep citizens acquiescent by sustaining their relatively decent standards of living.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research design for the exploratory study of political leadership styles in Kazakhstan. First, a conceptual framework is conceived that develops a new approach to the topic of national leadership style by drawing upon existing studies of general and nation-specific leadership style reviewed in the previous chapter. This conceptual framework is intended to bridge knowledge gaps exploring actual public perceptions of political leadership style in Kazakhstan. Except for the GLOBE research project (House, 2004) on organizational leadership style and its relationship with national culture, no prior field study seems to have been published that examines public perceptions of political leadership style within a particular nation. There also seems to be a lack of studies of nation-specific leadership style using non-conventional methodologies, which attempt to explore directly such fields of subjectivity as public opinions, views, and attitudes with regard to typical and ideal political leadership styles in the cultural context of a single country.

Q methodology is employed in this study to facilitate acquiring authentic knowledge of public perceptions of political leadership style in Kazakhstan. In the interest of methodological triangulation, intensive interviews are utilized following Q sorting.
Conceptual Framework

This study of political leadership styles based on Q methodology has drawn on the overarching premise that identifying characteristics of political leadership style(s), as pertinent for a typical and ideal political leader in a particular national context, can be accomplished through exploring the respective opinions, views, and attitudes of the general public, i.e., individuals sampled from different socio-professional groups in Kazakhstan. In this regard, the study builds on a premise similar to the one used in the GLOBE project, namely the Culturally Endorsed Implicit Theory of Leadership (CLT). More specifically, it presumes that the socio-cultural context stemming from the socio-economic, political, and cultural history of a particular nation molds certain patterns of public views and attitudes toward political leadership. The major philosophical difference in the approach undertaken in this study is that it does not postulate a priori the existence of a single and uniform national leadership style, which would exclusively and “objectively” represent all existing types of political leaders in a country. Rather, by premising itself in “self-referent subjectivity,” which searches for the underpinning rationale concerning political leadership patterns in evolving public opinions, views, and sentiments, this study attributes the primary role to non-static and diverse public expectations of what constitutes typical and ideal leadership styles in Kazakhstan at this particular development stage of its history. Using Stephenson’s (1987) words, the study’s differing “involvement is with states of feeling at fundamental levels” (p. 95) as related to individual perceptions of leadership, which implies a focus on “not only self-referent but also emotionally involved” (p. 96) responses. It is from this stance that the general public
as representing diverse groups of followers is viewed to be the primary source of knowledge for discerning the “structure of subjectivity,” in contrast to CLT, which tends to “objectivize” national leadership style as a uniform and rather static phenomenon anchored in a given national culture. Consequently, by seeking to explore the perceptions of various public segments, this study is open to the discovery of potentially more than one distinct national leadership style, both in typical and ideal dimensions. This way, it seeks to account for the dynamic and diverse nature of leadership phenomena, both generally and in cultural terms.

Another distinguishing characteristic of the proposed approach is a psychological emphasis on what is perceived by the public as national leadership style. In contrast to the GLOBE approach that relies on CLT as an integrated leadership theory, which as one of its pillars bears on the cultural dimensions theory of Hofstede (1980), this national leadership study draws on a different conceptual framework, which attributes primary importance to the psychological dimension of leadership phenomena. Specifically, it seeks clues to crucial characteristics of potentially more than one national leadership style in the subjective understandings of citizens of a particular country. These diverse understandings are viewed as stemming from a myriad of individual daily experiences of citizens including their political socialization, exposure to public discourses, and personal interactions with political leaders. The outcome of these experiences are conceptions of typical relationship patterns that political leaders demonstrate in their interactions with the citizenry. Once formed, these conceptions of what constitutes a typical leadership style evoke feelings and sentiments, which give way to a desire for an ideal leader, the
reality or embodiment of which may or may not be present in their country. What is more important in this regard is that, in accordance with the view of leader-follower relations as outlined by Freud (1922), the general public may experience a gap in their views of a current political leader and a desirable leader that they would equate with their own ego-ideal. In turn, this psychological gap between the perceived actual and ideal may imply serious distortions, in Freud’s terms, of libidinal ties, i.e., social bonds in a society between its political elite and ordinary citizenry. In Little’s (1985) terms, the resultant pattern of leader-follower relations would be likely to engender certain images of a typical and an ideal leader in the public psyche. That is why this study has embarked on exploring both typical and ideal leadership styles based on the indicated psychosocial approach, which signifies a departure from previous national leadership studies such as GLOBE.

As indicated in Chapter 2, the chosen theoretical framework features a combination of a psychosocial leader model (Little, 1985) and a best-practices leadership theory (Kouzes & Posner, 2001). In this study, undertaken in Kazakhstan, the combination of these two theories has furnished an effective research tool to secure data drawn from a relatively small number of respondents.

Little’s (1985) typology of leadership styles provides a conceptual framework about leader-follower relations that is of general utility and features a distinct psychosocial approach to leadership that brings “self-aware, person-to-person relations into society and politics, and shows the self-other dilemma buried but active wherever we look” (Little, 1985, p. 11). The essence of Little’s view of all leader-follower relations is
that leaders and followers find one another if their expectations coincide, and the primary basis for selection of a leader by a follower is “whether the leader is his kind of man”—the one who “will act and get things done” (Strong leader), “does care and is one of us” (Group leader), or “has a vision and knows how to express himself” (Inspiring leader) (p. 139). As another part of the theoretical framework, the study employs Kouzes and Posner’s (2002) practice-based, transformational leadership model, which bears on a cross-cultural study of personal-best leadership practices, and maintains an underpinning premise that “leadership is relationship, and relationship skills are what shape success” (p. 13).

**Description of Methodology**

Political leadership style, a cross-disciplinary area in which such disciplines as leadership, political psychology, and socio-cultural studies converge, necessarily requires an adequate choice of methodology. Indeed, gauging public perceptions of national leadership style calls for a method that focuses on individual subjective understandings of what constitutes typical and ideal leadership. On the other hand, a designated method employed in examining public perceptions should be able to offset drawbacks of methodological individualism in order to furnish a picture of patterns of subjectivity across different groups of citizens. Besides, this method would have to address concerns generally associated with limitations of both quantitative and qualitative research. In this regard, the method of choice that is well positioned to meet all the above criteria is Q methodology (Brown, 1980; McKeown & Thomas, 1988).
Indeed, Q methodology, as the “best-developed paradigm for the investigation of human subjectivity,” is an interpretive approach, but “unlike interpretive methods … the interpretations are constrained by statistical results” (Dryzek & Holmes, 2002, p. 20). Specifically, in this study of leadership styles in Kazakhstan, Q methodology, in as much as it is anchored in “self-referent subjectivity,” is expected to help reveal differentiations among national leaders as perceived by their respective publics. In this regard, applying Q methodology as a research method with “a distinctive set of psychometric and operational principles … conjoined with … correlational and factor-analytical techniques … provides a systematic and rigorously quantitative means for examining human subjectivity” (McKeown & Thomas, 1988, p. 12), as demonstrated in a study of authoritarian personality in the USA (Rhoads, 2000) and in a recent collection of applications to national identity among members of EU states (Robyn, 2005).

Q technique involves the rank-ordering of a fixed number of different statements (Q sample) related to a particular issue-area by respondents who would sort those statements based on their “saliency of feeling” (Stephenson, 1987), i.e., subjective understandings or sentiments toward the issue in question. In view of a “shared communicability” (Stephenson, 1978) of most issues of public importance or concern within a nation, it is possible to compile a “concourse” of statements that would encompass the breadth of public opinions about those issues. This concourse is to be viewed as “a ‘population’ of statements, not a statement of fact” (Stephenson, 1978, p. 96), so that “we regard the collection of statements as a statistical population, to which statistical theory can apply” (p. 97). It is the structure of subjective preferences on an
issue in question that Q method seeks to capture by means of correlation and factor-analytic techniques. That is, Q method involves the application of factor-analytic operations to a sample of statements in an attempt to discern common patterns of subjectivity. The resultant output is usually a few statistically significant groupings (factors) that have emerged from the diversity of individual responses. This provides for further in-depth analysis of the respective factor-based groupings in order to interpret their meaning and gain more in-depth understanding.

The principal difference between Q methodology and the traditional host of methods that represent so called “R” methodology is in placing a primary locus of attention on searching for relationships within a participant. Indeed, R searches for correlations between an opinion and certain “objective” traits of respondents, such as sex or education level, whereas Q looks for correlating patterns of opinion between persons (Stephenson, 1953; Brown, 1980). In this respect, Q methodology is regarded as a sound and viable technique for the scientific study of “naturalistic subjectivity” (Brown, 1980, p. 43) on par with the “objective” reality of natural science subjects and capable of being examined with the same scientific rigor.

Being viewed until recently as an out-of-mainstream research method, Q methodology, created in the 1930s by William Stephenson, is currently experiencing a renaissance in the scholarly world, as evidenced by a growing body of applications, now in excess of 2500 entries (Brown, 2000), in a number of disciplines ranging from psychology and mass communication (Stephenson, 1987) to phenomenology (Brown, 1994; Delprato & Knapp, 1994), education (Banks, 2005; Stone, 1966), public
administration (Brown, Durning & Selden, 1999), political psychology (Dryzek & Holmes, 2002; Robyn, 2005), health care (Rogers, 1991), and music (Maxwell, 1999).

Of particular interest are Q methodology applications to political disciplines (Brown, 1980). In this regard, there have been interesting studies of national identity and attachments in France to the EU (Robyn, 2000) and of deep structures of identification among citizens of Turkey and China (Brown, Sezgin & Kanra, 2005). In view of its exploratory and distinguishing capacity, Q methodology is especially well positioned to delve into political discourses and public views and attitudes, as demonstrated by Dryzek and Holmes (2002) in their studies of post-communist democratization discourses in Europe and the former Soviet Union. Indeed, this cross-country study of public attitudes toward the concept and practice of democracy has revealed a whole range of strikingly different perspectives among the general public of each country as to how its citizens understand and what is associated in their minds with democratization. Another example of the discerning capacity of Q method is the above noted study of authoritarian personality (Rhoads, 2000), which has uncovered important differences within the allegedly single authoritarian type. What is more, it has also illuminated a complex underlying structure of subjectivity within a single individual, which has been brought to light by examining his views of himself as if from the perspectives of different persons.

There have been multiple Q method based studies of leadership in the US, which demonstrate a promising potential of Q in this scholarly area. Among those studies having approached leadership by means of Q method are efforts by Baas (1979, 1984; Baas & Brown, 1973; Baas & Thomas, 1980) and Brown (1978, 1981, 1982, 1994;
Brown & Ellithorp, 1970; Brown & Hendrick, 1971). Of particular interest are works by Thomas et al. on how identification with various American Presidents was related to mass-public evaluations and compliance with their policies (Thomas & Baas, 1982; Thomas & Sigelman, 1984; Thomas, Sigelman, & Baas, 1984). Another series of laboratory leadership studies worthy of mention is by Lipgar (1989, 1990, 1992; Lipgar, Bair, & Fichtner, 2004).

However, no Q methodology anchored research appears to have been undertaken so far in political leadership studies that would draw upon an integrated conceptual framework of different leadership theories such as the above-named models by Little (1985) and Kouzes and Posner (2002). In this regard, this study makes a novel contribution to the understanding of political leadership patterns as a subjective reality, conceived as structured views and preferences in public minds, through the use of an integrated theoretical framework, which has served as a basis for designing a Q method based research instrument.

**The Concourse**

The notion of concourse in Q methodology refers to the entire universe of existing views and opinions that relate to a particular issue or question. Concourse could be viewed as the “whole response” (Brown, 1980, p. 173) of a public to a certain question, which, as Stephenson defines as the “law of the concourse” (1983, p. 75), will tend to enlarge in size comprising, theoretically, an infinite number of statements (Stephenson 1978, p. 25). As to a real Q-based study, however, there is no need to attempt
incorporating all existing statements. There are various ways of going about selecting a fewer number of statements to create a Q sample, which will depend on different considerations such as the nature of a subject, the purpose of study, the existence of a conceptual framework, the practical limitations of a study, etc.

In essence, a concourse is comprised of the entire spectrum of the existing public discourse on a specific issue or question, which is made available through a variety of sources including broadcast and print media, books, scholarly publications, and interviews with experts, leaders, and members of the general public. Being a sum of elements of “shared communicability” that generally reflects a particular culture within which members understand these comprised statements, the concourse is an accumulation of existing views and sentiments with regard to an issue in question. On the other hand, different persons may have different understandings and interpretations of those statements so that “the statements have no normative value; they are like equal marbles in a bag and gain their saliency only in the act of Q-sorting…. Meanings are what the given situation and Q-sort instruction require” (Stephenson, 1978, p. 97). Overall, the importance of a concourse is in its being a sort of resource pool (or population) of statements out of which a reasonably representative sample can be selected to facilitate expression by respondents of their views on an issue in question.

In this study, the concourse consists of statements of actual and desirable political leadership characteristics in Kazakhstan. In this respect, the purpose of the study was to discern different factors within the concourse, i.e., distinct patterns of public views on what constitutes typical and ideal leader types for this nation. Some statements have been
extracted from the existing body of literature on leadership in general. Others have been
drawn from both national and international public media sources. Some have emerged
from interviews with Kazakh experts and scholars. Finally, some of the statements have
been generated in the course of developing the conceptual framework, i.e., were deemed
necessary to fill gaps in the structure of the Q sample. It should be noted that, except for
the GLOBE project, there appears to be a certain lack of published studies on national,
and particularly, on political leadership style based on theoretical models. This
intellectual paucity of theory-driven leadership studies applies to both Western and
developing countries and, undoubtedly, it has even higher salience for the post-
communist region, which points to the need for greater research efforts in the political
leadership area.

This study draws upon a conceptual framework combined of two leadership
models, namely by Little (1985) and Kouzes and Posner (2002), which were described in
Chapter 2. This conceptual framework is represented by the factorial design in Table 1.

The model by Little identifies three distinct psychosocial leader types, namely,
Strong, Group, and Inspiring leaders. By way of reminder, these leader types are based on
different kinds of leader-follower relations, i.e., the following three sets of expectations:

1. The Strong leader is expected to lead followers by demonstrating strong-will,
centralized decision-making, and structuring actions and ensures that
subordinates do not get out of hand by means of domination and
administrative control. This leader type is not likely to display an altruistic
commitment to a public interest, would prefer to maintain distance from the
public, and would place emphasis on conventional and transactional ways of
organizing followers.
2. The *Group* leader would lead followers by appeals to solidarity and community spirit and by addressing social justice and equality concerns. This kind of leader is expected to exhibit highly unselfish, egalitarian, and public-minded behavior and always to be ready to listen to the public, especially its disadvantaged part. The Group leader would rely heavily on informal groupings and coalitions, by emphasizing justice and community values, and by making sure that all followers are taken care of.

3. The *Inspiring* leader is expected to demonstrate an attractive personal intelligence and to project a compelling vision. The leader is to communicate his or her own ideas and gifts while being capable of recognizing the ideas and talents of followers by means of maintaining dialogue and tolerating criticism. This type of leader avoids structure-imposed controls or group-derived solidarity and justice in favor of participatory decision-making and flexible work organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Factorial Design Based on Models by Little (1985) and Kouzes and Posner (2001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader's Image</td>
<td>Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strong</strong></td>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leader's Image</strong></td>
<td>Power, domination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Style</td>
<td>Directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Status quo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leader-follower relations</strong></td>
<td>Power distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivating followers</strong></td>
<td>Transactional, coercive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Columns represent leader types as defined in the model by Little whereas rows feature five groups of practices under the model by Kouzes and Posner.

This conceptual framework was extended by incorporating the more recent theory by Kouzes and Posner (2002) on best leadership practices, which views leadership not
only as relationship, but also as a “structure of action” (Burns, 1978, p. 3), i.e., as modes of practice within all three of Little’s psychosocial leader types. Three statements were selected (or created as needed) to fill each of the 15 Practices cells in all the three psychosocial Leader Type columns in Table 1, resulting in the 45-statement Q sample shown in Appendix 2, examples of which are as follows:

**Strong Leader**

**Image: Power/Domination**
A person of power and authority, always in control

**Communication Style: Directions**
Strong-willed, imposes his viewpoint on others

**Work: Status-quo**
Sticks to conventional ways of getting things done

**Leader-follower relations: Power distance**
Maintains a distance between himself and subordinates

**Motivating followers: Transactional, coercive**
Uses administrative and economic incentives to motivate others

**Group Leader**

**Image: Concern, solidarity**
A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose

**Communication Style: Appeals**
Appeals to community spirit and solidarity

**Work: Informal structure**
Is able to build and lead informal coalitions

**Leader-follower relations: Serving people**
Strives to look ordinary, like just one of the people

**Motivating followers: Social approval**
Instills a sense of community and care among his followers
**Inspiring Leader**

**Leader’s Image: Personal Example**
Radiates a positive image, a sense of purpose, and self-confidence

**Communication style: Vision**
Expresses himself clearly and inspires others with his vision

**Work: Innovation**
Demonstrates flexibility in managing people and bringing about change

**Leader-follower relations: Delegation, sharing, enabling**
Trusts followers, delegates authority, and promotes autonomy

**Motivating followers: Encouragement**
Emphasizes a wide range of human values

Questions might arise about whether the Q sample is sufficiently representative to encompass all political leader types that might exist in Kazakhstan. The above conceptual framework hinges on Little’s psychosocial approach that distinguishes the three basic leader types, which are in turn anchored in a universally applicable “self-other dilemma buried but active wherever we look” (Little, 1985, p. 11) that claims to embrace all known patterns of leader-follower relations. That is, the Q sample can lay claim to a certain universality since the conceptual framework upon which it is based is in turn based on a set of logically exhaustive resolutions to the self-other dilemma.

Second, this study seeks to identify patterns in public perceptions, i.e., in the subjective understandings that citizens have of political leaders. This implies that their choices are largely confined by, as well as constitutive of the existing public discourses on national political leadership to which they are exposed on a daily basis and which are captured in the above concourse of statements.
Finally, it should be also emphasized that Q method principles and procedures provide latitude for practically innumerable differences in individual views on the part of respondents. Indeed, in sorting a Q sample of statements, a respondent does not simply respond to each of the 45 statements in isolation, but weighs each in conjunction with all other statements. In this regard, the resultant Q sort in the form of a sorted Q sample features the whole response, i.e., a comprehensive picture of political leader types in the mind of a respondent in which each statement is organically embedded in a particular place, so the entire mosaic of weighed responses will portray an overall picture of the person’s understandings. In statistical terms, each respondent has been instructed to compare and weigh each of \( N=45 \) statements against others, resulting in \( \frac{1}{2} N (N-1) = 990 \) different possible judgments. Moreover, the Q sorting procedure itself adds immense latitude in potential variety of responses. First, the respondent is asked to divide all statements into three piles based on their general judgments as agree, disagree, and neutral, which gives enormous variability in scope. Second, the respondent does not stop at this stage but proceeds to sort statements further by placing each of them into an array. Finally, it is even more important to emphasize that the Q-sample structure does not materially limit the Q sorter’s self-expression. Taking into account such an astounding potential for variability creates credibility for the factors emerging out a set of collected Q sorts. Indeed, if respondents have an almost infinite possibility for expressing their individual preferences and judgments, but end up grouping themselves into relatively few distinct patterns represented by factors, it is likely to demonstrate a certain congruence with a particular public perception or discourse in the country in question.
This grouping capacity features another distinguishing characteristic of Q method, which reveals commonalities that respondents share with others. This makes it possible to identify what factors with which particular high- and low-ranking statements correspond to existing groups or patterns of public perceptions on an issue. In this regard, the emerged “factors are theoretical Q sorts, like any empirically performed, as if the mind had performed them, unknown to” (Stephenson, 1978, p. 98) the respondents. It should be stressed that “operant factor structures are natural expressions, independent of the instrumentation,” the result being that “it does not matter what the size is of the Q-sample, or its constitution, or the Q-sort distribution, or the conditions of instruction” (p. 99). What is more, the indicated grouping capacity of Q method provides it with a great practical advantage of making a relatively small size population sample sufficient in terms of validity of findings. If, as shown above, an almost indefinitely large number of possible individual responses cluster into a few groups, than it is reasonable to expect a proportionately smaller size sample of respondents to represent the whole population. This is what also makes a difference between R and Q methodologies, specifically the fact that increasing the size of a sample in Q will be likely simply to add more respondents in factors, just making them look denser but leaving the same structure of patterns. In this regard, there have been studies that confirmed this trend of pattern continuity as the sample size is increased (Coke & Brown, 1976).

It is beyond the scope of this study to speculate on the psychological underpinnings of this shared communicability, which drives a potentially infinite number of idiosyncratic individual responses to fewer groups of opinions in a society.
methodology does not aspire to answer this philosophical question, but simply takes advantage of the grouping trend in subjective understandings of communal issues. Suffice it to mention here the assertion by Stephenson (1983, p. 93) of the existence of a “law of affectability,” which, by means of “confluences of feeling,” drives individual opinions into groupings. It is also apt to mention here the previously noted “open-loop nature of the limbic system, our emotional centers” (Goleman, 2002, p. 7) that render individuals highly susceptible to public moods and discourses circulating in a society. In this regard, in parallel to Goleman’s emotional intelligence concept, it could be posited that Q method reveals its own “Q intelligence” in discerning and capturing through factor-analysis those groups of public perceptions and discourses.

Thus, as Stephenson (1978) sums up, “Q offers a fundamental theory of subjectivity, beginning and ending with expressions of self-reference: we see selves in abundance, all about self-reflections upon behavioral segments” so that “the psychoanalytic unconscious is merely Q’s factorial space” (p. 104).

**The Procedures**

Below is provided a description of Q sorting procedure that the respondents in Kazakhstan have followed in order to express their individual perceptions of typical and ideal leadership style in this country. In this way their subjective understanding of this particular issue have been reflected by way of generating a Q sort that represented a pyramid-shaped array of statement cards the numbers of which were subsequently filled into a score sheet of the same shape.
When performing a Q sort, respondents rank-ordered these statements under a forced-distribution format “in a model of an individual’s subjectivity, a model reconstituted by the individual, not the researcher” (Barchak, 1979, p. 75). This modeling was thus based not on objective facts, but on the personal meanings and values of the respondent who would “model his preferences in a ‘multi-choice situation’,” which “allows us to deal with whole persons and not parts of persons” (p. 81).

Once finished, the Q sort displays a structure of subjectivity of a respondent’s perceptions of leadership style. This subjectivity is evoked from the very beginning of the described sorting procedure as a respondent, at each indicated step, places statements guided merely by subjective feeling, which provides an inner guide or, in Stephenson’s (1978) terms, a degree of “psychological significance,” or “saliency of feeling” (1987), that prompts a respondent to assign respective weight, or rank, to a particular statement. Those statements at both edges of a response pyramid would feature characteristics of highest psychological importance to a respondent as, at both positive and negative sides, they would reflect the strongest sentiments or assertions. Statements in the middle would be associated with less emotional strength; however, they could be especially revealing in expressing nuances and undertones in a respondent’s entire subjective picture of a typical or ideal leadership style in Kazakhstan.

The P Set

As emphasized earlier, Q methodology has a distinct advantage over traditional R method in drawing upon a relatively small sample of respondents (P set) to elicit existing groups of public perceptions in a larger population. In this study, the P set was comprised
of two samples, 26 respondents in each, selected from the general public in Kazakhstan that provided their Q sort based perceptions of typical and ideal leadership styles respectively. The major sampling criterion in this study was sufficient representativeness of responses, which would be achieved by ensuring an adequate diversity in the socio-professional background of respondents, which was pursued by selecting respondents based on the typology of institutions matching eight human value categories as defined by Lasswell (1948). The P-set design is shown in Table 2:

**Table 2**

*P-set Design*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Values</th>
<th>Social Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td>Business company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlightenment</td>
<td>Academia and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>Professions/writers/artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-being</td>
<td>Health care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>Social classes (wealthy, middle class, and workers/ farmers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectitude</td>
<td>Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affection</td>
<td>Family/household</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above P-set design, each of the two samples was to comprise eight socio-professional groups with 3-4 respondents in each. Participants have been offered the same Q sample and asked to provide their national leadership perceptions under the following conditions of instruction: The first sample of respondents sorted the Q sample statements guided by their perceptions of a typical leader in Kazakhstan; the second sample performed sorting based on their perceptions of an ideal leader.
In addition, a sufficient degree of sample diversity has been obtained by selecting respondents based not only on socio-professional, but also gender, geographical, and urban-rural stratification of the population in Kazakhstan.

However, to emphasize again, in Q methodology, representativeness is sought as much or more through a Q sample (set of statements) as by designing a P set (sample of respondents). Indeed, what is sampled are statements from the concourse representing public perceptions of national leadership style, not respondents from the public. In this respect, the main concern is to choose respondents who would provide for mere diversity of opinions, respondent characteristics being less important.

**The Settings**

The primary criterion in selecting respondents has been sufficient diversity in representing the general public in Kazakhstan. That implies that, in contrast to R methodologies, random sampling was not a concern. As noted above, to enhance diversity of the P set, Q sort responses have also been collected based on gender and geographic and urban-rural dimensions of respondent locations. Specifically, respondents were selected from the following localities:

1. City of Almaty, former capital and the largest metropolis, in the southeast of Kazakhstan
2. City of Atyrau, administrative center of Atyrau *oblast* (province), in the northwest of Kazakhstan
3. Village of Mahambet, county-level center in Atyrau *oblast*.

Eliciting responses from localities as different as cosmopolitan and sophisticated, Almaty, Kazakhstan’s largest city and economic and cultural center; remote and
provincial Atyrau, a modernizing city known for its oil-generated revenues; and rural and backwater Mahambet, a village based on traditional agriculture would seem to provide a great deal of diversity in retrieving national leadership perceptions from different social and geographical milieu.

Moreover, the period during which the field study took place was timely for eliciting public responses on political leadership style since it occurred on the eve and aftermath of national Parliamentary elections in September 2004, thereby taking advantage of a particularly sensitized public mood.

The research trip to the city and province of Atyrau benefited from contacts made primarily through the investigator’s family network, which facilitated identification of respondents based on the sampling approach outlined previously. Taking into account Kazakh national culture, approaching potential participants by means of local relatives knowing them personally proved a more effective way to invoke a collaborative attitude and sufficiently honest responses to a stranger. It should be noted, keeping in mind the recent Soviet authoritarian grip on citizens’ attitudes and rather low interpersonal trust, that it is generally difficult to invoke a genuine personal response, and especially to share views about political leadership with an unknown interviewer. Nevertheless, during the trips to Atyrau and the village of Mahambet, it was possible to obtain Q sorts and interviews with provincial and county-level public officials, political opposition party branch chiefs, oil production site workers, health care professionals, and Moslem community leaders.
The second major site for the field study was the city of Almaty, the largest metropolitan area of more than 1.5 million inhabitants and my home town. Here it was possible to establish numerous personal contacts so as to identify and elicit Q sorts and interviews with respondents from various socio-professional groups representing all eight institution types based on Lasswell’s (1948) classification (see Table 2). Again, having either a friend’s or relative’s reference or pre-existing personal rapport with potential respondents greatly facilitated procuring authentic responses and follow-up interviews.

As pointed out above, by way of the final field study phase, Q sortings have been followed by targeted interviews with selected respondents from each of the two samples in order to clarify their responses and gain in-depth understanding of their underlying views and perceptions. More detailed descriptions of Q sorts and interview findings are provided in the next chapter.

**Interviews**

As an attempt at methodological triangulation, Q methodology has been coupled with intensive follow-up interviews with selected respondents. Triangulation, which features combining different methods within the scope of the same study, can be viewed as way to reduce reliance on a single methodology (Patton, 1990). Besides, it seeks to validate collected data that might be subject to systematic bias inherent in a particular research method.

Four different kinds of triangulation have been identified: (1) theory triangulation employing different perspectives in data analysis, (2) methodological triangulation
implying the use of more than one method in the study of the same subject-matter, (3) data triangulation relying on different sources of data, and (4) investigator triangulation involving more than one investigator in a study (Denzin, 1978). This study has sought to draw upon methodological triangulation by complementing collected Q sorts by a number of intensive, open-ended interviews with selected respondents, which would facilitate a more in-depth understanding of subjective meanings attributed to Q sample statements as well as the logic underpinning individual Q sorts.

The collected data (Q sorts) were factor-analyzed by means of PQMethod, a software application (Schmolck & Atkinson, 1998), which features the main statistical procedures employed to reveal potential factors.

As the next stage, in-depth interview participants are selected based on their representativeness. In the sample, for either typical or ideal leadership style, respondents who displayed the highest loadings on each of the factors were identified as the most attractive representatives for a particular factor (specimen) to explain more in depth their respective subjective understandings related to particular statements in the Q sample. As indicated earlier, statements of primary interest are those that received highest rankings on both sides of their Q sorts (+4, +3, -4, -3). However, as has also been stated, then they were also invited to furnish the personal meanings that they attributed to the statements in the middle of the Q sort (0, +1, -1), which was also helpful in discerning their rationale for placing those statements in the middle. The approximate scenario for conducting in-depth interviews is provided in Appendix H.
Thus, this approach has featured a standardized open-ended interview format (Patton, 1980, p. 288) complemented by a “contingency clause,” i.e., situational flexibility in terms of sequencing questions. On the one hand, this format would contribute to gaining deeper understanding of a respondent’s interpretation of statements. On the other hand, providing a chance for an impromptu open-ended question on a particular statement of interest no matter where in a Q sort could furnish unexpected insights on the whole underpinning logic or even individual political philosophy of a respondent. That is how an element of heuristic discovery was embedded in the interviewing scenario. In this regard, the actual interview experience has often confirmed credibility of “instinct” in spotting statements of most interest, which could reveal a drastic deviation between the presumed and perceived meanings of a specific statement. Overall, this approach increases the comprehensiveness of data allowing, at the same time, the bridging of potential logical gaps in the individual structure of subjectivity.

An additional naturalistic provision for picking certain statements for in-depth discussion was in terms of non-verbal or emotional expressions, which would be likely to reflect high intensity of felt sentiment toward statements. These non-verbal signals could be good clues in detecting issues of high psychological significance to respondents, and so should also be a part of guidance in choosing and sequencing interview questions.

In sum, the described interview approach contributes to cross-person comparability of responses and generalizations. Moreover, the open-ended nature of questions illuminates individual subjective understandings of statements and facilitates
further data analysis. In this regard, it was ensured through real open-ended, singular, and clear wording (Patton, 1990, p. 290).

Prior to performing data collection and interviews in Kazakhstan, permission was obtained from the Kent State University Human Subjects Review Board (HSRB). In compliance with HSRB procedures, before actual Q sorting and interviewing, all respondents were instructed about the purpose and nature of the study as well as provisions for their confidentiality and guarantee of anonymity. With their consent, only general demographic information such as gender, age, family status, education, and profession was recorded.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Overview of the Empirical Subject and Q Method

This chapter discusses results of a Q methodology based exploratory field study of political leadership styles in Kazakhstan. First, by way of reminder, the empirical subject and statistical procedures associated with the actual factor-analytic technique that Q method draws upon will be outlined. Second, the findings concerning national leadership styles in Kazakhstan will be provided, as applied to typical leader perceptions. Third, a detailed description of each of the factors will be provided based on analysis of the Q-sample statements and their factor scores as well as on follow-up interviews with selected respondents who represent each of those factors. Fourth, comparative analysis of the three factors will be performed in order to show the existing affinities and differences among them. Finally, the same descriptive sequence will be followed for the findings on ideal leader perceptions.

This field study has sought to uncover perceptions of Kazakhstan citizens with regard to typical and ideal leader types, as based on the epistemological premise congruent with Stephenson’s belief that “all subjective phenomena are reducible to operant factor structure” (1980, p. x). In this regard, the data represented by Q sorts
collected from Kazakhstan respondents were subjected to correlation and factor-analytic procedures in order to reveal factors as “categories of operant subjectivity” (Stephenson, 1973) that represent common perspectives “in terms of subjectively shared viewpoints” (Brown, 1980, p. 6).

It is from this standpoint that the earlier described conceptual framework of leader types as based on Little’s model was designed as a “launch pad” in order to discover what actually constitutes people’s views of their political leaders in Kazakhstan. In other words, the three theoretical leader types, as conceived by Little (1985) and described in Chapters 2 and 3, have been utilized as a “best initial guess” in order to uncover actual, i.e. operant, images of Kazakhstan leaders. In this respect, it is a different issue whether findings demonstrate whether actual public perceptions are consistent with the theoretical types. Thus, this chapter addresses the question of what particular combinations of statements constitute operational perspectives of Kazakhstan citizens on both existing and desirable political leadership styles in their country.

As described in the previous chapter, all respondents involved in the study have sorted the 45 statements, immediately following which most of them actively participated in a discussion of their ranking preferences and understandings of particular statements of interest. Then, their response data have been factor-analyzed by means of the PQMethod computer program (Schmolck & Atkinson, 2002). Subsequently, some of the selected
participants also agreed to follow-up interviews to share more in depth their related views of political leadership styles in Kazakhstan. Besides, an additional value to the emerged patterns of subjectivity has been secured by interviewing a few local political leaders and analysts who provided their expert opinions on the issue in question.

The factor analysis and subsequent factor rotation procedure have employed principal component factor analysis and varimax rotation. Factor rotation draws on a procedure that performs a change in perspective on the whole set of data subjected to the factor analysis, but “without altering the nature of the phenomenon in any way” (Brown, 1980, p. 166), which thus enables an analyst to look at data from another angle, providing a clearer picture of relationships between different factors and thus different clusters of views.

What follows is a detailed analysis and a comparative description of the factors, which represent salient public perceptions of both typical and ideal political leaders in Kazakhstan. The typical factors are presented first, followed by the ideal factors.

**Typical Leadership Styles**

The resultant factor arrays of three distinct factors have been obtained based on principal component analysis and varimax rotation. The factor loadings for each of the 26 sorts are presented in Table 3 below. This table indicates which respondents (marked with bold fonts) load significantly ($p<.01$) and purely on the factors, which occurs if their
### Table 3

*Typical Leadership Styles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q Sort</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-.69</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Factor loadings in excess of ±.40 are significant (*p* < .01); bold-face loadings indicate Q sorts used in the calculation of factor scores.
factor loadings exceed .39\(^2\) on one factor and less than this amount on the other factors. Specifically, 12 persons load exclusively on Factor A, 3 on Factor B, and 2 on C. Beside these “pure” cases, i.e., respondents with significant loading on only one of the factors, the table also displays 9 “mixed” cases. In this regard, 7 sorts are significantly correlated with Factors A and B, 1 sort with Factors A and C, and 1 sort with Factors B and C. Thus, the three factors present a range of subjective understandings of existing leadership styles in Kazakhstan. It should be noted that the factors may not necessarily exhaust all possible views of political leadership within the general public. However, based on the nature of Q method we could reasonably expect to have uncovered all major, i.e., salient and operant, current public perspectives on national leadership style. Moreover, in accordance with “the principle of limited independent variety … only a small number of factors are likely to be involved in any domain of discussion” (Brown, 1980, p. 247) in the public arena of which existing discourses on political leadership are a part.

As seen in Table 3, three factors have emerged and were named as follows:

- Factor A: Power-Wielder
- Factor B: Elite Leader
- Factor C: Old Communist Guard

By no means should these names be considered definitive as each scholar has discretion in conveying an impressionistic flavor in labeling a subject of interest. In this regard, the labels for the above factors carry particular sentiments associated with the author’s

\[ SE = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \]

2 The formula for the standard error of a zero-order loading is \( SE = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \) where \( N \) is equal to the number of statements (\( N = 45 \)). For this study, \( SE = .15 \) and coefficients are significant at the .01 level if they exceed \( 2.589 (SE) = .39 \).
individual impressions resulting from interviews with respondents as well as prior personal experiences as a citizen of Kazakhstan.

Classification of respondents for Q sorts on typical leadership style is shown in Table 4.

In the following sections, each of the factors will be examined based on the factor arrays and a description of factors will be furnished. Then, in each section, an attempt will be made to flesh out the factors with more substantive nuances in understanding and in-depth interpretations based on the results of follow-up and intensive single-case interviews with respondents who represent the factors.

Table 4
Classification of Respondents’ Status Based on Lasswell’s Value Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welfare</th>
<th>Deference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealth R5, R8</td>
<td>Power R3, R14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlightenment R4, R11, R17, R20, R21, R22, R24</td>
<td>Affection R12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-being R7, R19</td>
<td>Respect R10, R13, R18, R25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill R6, R9, R16, R23, R26</td>
<td>Rectitude R1, R2, R15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor A: Power-Wielder

This section depicts the perception of a typical political leader in Kazakhstan as purely defined by 12 out of the 26 respondents. Overall, as based on the composition of statements that received highest scores on this factor, this pattern is featured by traits associated with Little’s (1985) Strong leader type. Extracted from the factor array are the
following statements, which obtained the highest factor scores (shown in brackets) for Factor A:

5. Values his own personal over organizational interests. (+4)
25. Centralizes decision-making in his own hands. (+4)
14. Uses his leadership role as a way to maintain power. (+4)

Overall, this leader type could probably pass for the one described in Machiavelli’s *Prince*, due to an exclusive self-interest and power and domination based style, which makes it look highly selfish and authoritarian. As was put bluntly by one of the interviewees (R7), this leader type behaves as a predator that thinks and acts in a “dog-eat-dog” way. In this regard, R7 succinctly depicted the current situation in the government as follows: “Public leaders are greedy profit-seekers and those close to them are jackals and moochers.”

On the other hand, the following statements obtained the highest negative scores:

4. A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose. (-4)
18. Demonstrates flexibility in managing people. (-4)
20. Thinks critically and is receptive to new ideas. (-4)

In other words, respondents categorically disagreed with these statements that comprise profiles of Group (statement 4) and Inspiring leader (statements 20 and 18) types. In addition, the following statements for Factor A constituted traits of strong agreement (+3):

42. Uses others to advance himself. (+3)
34. Is willing to pressure and control others. (+3)
28. Maintains a distance between himself and followers. (+3)
38. A person of power and authority, always in control. (+3)
16. Deals with critics by intimidating or ignoring them. (+3)

Further, statements of strong disagreement (-3) were as follows:

40. Upholds his followers' sense of public interest. (-3)
7. Displays broad intellect and profound thought. (-3)
24. Is able to build and lead informal coalitions. (-3)
41. Praises followers individually for their achievements. (-3)
10. Cultivates dialog and accepts criticism. (-3)

Overall, as based on the above combination of statements with highest and lowest scores, the Power-Wielder appears to be a mix of Strong, anti-Group and anti-Inspiring leader type traits. However, to grasp the below-the-surface nature of this leader type, intensive interviews are required so as to better understand a respondent’s rationale for sorting the statements in the particular order featuring the above Power-Wielder portrait.

Nonetheless, it should be noted that this highly unattractive leadership style seems to reflect cynical views of most political leaders in the eyes of a segment of citizens in Kazakhstan. This strikingly negative image of a typical public leader evokes Havel’s (1992) earlier cited thesis of the “moral contamination” of a nation, which, as characterized by Alford (2004), results in a lowering of the national ego-ideal embodied in public leaders. How did this cynical portrait of a stereotypical public leader emerge? This question, no matter how salient, goes beyond the scope of this study. However, again drawing upon Havel’s metaphoric ideas, it seems relevant to hypothesize a
previous long-term psychosocial process of “moral erosion” of leadership in Kazakhstan as a part of the stagnating majority of the then Soviet political leadership until 1991, which Mikhail Gorbachev attempted to reenergize by calls for *perestroika* as primarily a “new thinking” approach that was to start from within the Communist Party and Soviet leadership, including Kazakhstan’s leaders (Tucker, 1987). Illustrative are self-reflections of a recent Kazakh leader, Zamanbek Nurkadilov, analyzing his own and the public’s psyches’ evolution from the mid-1960s to mid-1980s:

> Something was changing around us and within ourselves. Casting aside a fake sense of modesty, people have plunged into materialism [1996, p. 91] [the eventual outcome being that] political and daily enthusiasm have evaporated like a mist. Pragmatism and common sense took their place. When this did happen, I can not recall. Possibly, it occurred gradually as I became less and less moved by a sense of truth, as I got used to shake hands with crooks and to not feeling aversion any more. (Nurkadilov, 1996, p. 169)

Consequently, as noted by a Kazakh scholar, Masanov (personal communication, April 22, 2004), most current public leaders are still a part of the prior unreformed Soviet ruling class who exhibit the same *modus operandi* in terms of their leadership style.

These highly critical public perceptions of typical leaders also find corroboration in Lubin (1995) in which a striking difference between positive image of the top leader, President Nazarbaev, and an unattractive view of the lower-level public officials is highlighted. As will be shown in the next section, these findings appear to confirm Lubin’s results in terms of the way in which the predominant public image of Nazarbaev contrasts with that of his political appointees.

What primary motivations underpin this leader type as viewed through public perceptions? Under general premise of Burns (1978), it could be assumed that those are
“unfulfilled esteem needs” (both self-esteem and esteem by others)" and that “both power wielders and leaders have such needs” (p. 113). However, what makes a difference is “the nature of the linkage between … attempts at self-gratification” (p. 114) and gratifying the needs of others. This point seems particularly noteworthy when considering specific aspirations underpinning political leadership claims by different leaders in Kazakhstan, whose ambitions and motivational strategies can arguably be discerned through this study. Indeed, as seen through the statements with high scores on Factor A, among the three leader types in this nation, the Power-Wielder demonstrates a coercive and transactional style and also appears to be the most self-centered and self-gratifying pattern, which gives precedence to its own esteem and individual needs at the expense of others’, as revealed by the following statements:

5. Values his own personal over public/organizational interests. (+4)

34. Is willing to pressure and control others. (+3)

42. Uses others to advance himself. (+3)

Addressing the issue of leaders’ motivational strategy of targeting followers, it is pertinent to mention again Burns’s and Lasswell’s contributions in defining power and leadership as human relationships, so that leadership should be viewed in the context of human motives and resources. In particular, “power wielders draw from their power bases resources relevant to their own motives and the motives and resources of others upon whom they exercise power,” so that to acquire expected followers’ support, power resources “must be relevant to the motivations of the power recipients” (Burns, 1978, p. 17). Taking into account the basic socio-economic needs of the post-Soviet public, the
transactional (accompanied with coercive) character of the motivational strategy of the Kazakhstan leadership largely seems to match the current motives and resources of the impoverished and socially insecure citizenry.

The GLOBE project findings on “as is” leadership practices in Kazakhstan seem to resonate with many traits of the Factor A leader type. Indeed, such a societal practice as the reverence for hierarchy with a “high power distance” revealed by GLOBE is congruent with the Power-Wielder’s profile featured by the following positively scored statements:

28. Maintains a distance between himself and followers. (+3)

38. A person of power and authority, always in control. (+3)

In this regard, as noted by a local expert having worked within the President’s office, “the whole public management system, 90% consisting of former nomenklatura, is terribly stratified; on the other hand, the political counter-elite relies on the same principles of stratification” (Zhusupov, personal communication, December 10, 2004).

In sum, based on statements which received positive scores on Factor A, and using leadership practices groups from the factorial design shown in Table 1 of Chapter 3, the resultant profile of the Power-Wielder can be outlined as follows:

- Leader's Image—Power and Domination
- Communication Style—Directions
- Work—Centralism and Status Quo
- Leader-follower Relations—Power Distance
- Motivating Followers—Coercive and Transactional.
Looking at both Appendix C and Factor A scores in Appendix E, as compared with the theoretical leader types proposed by Little, the Power-Wielder appears congruent with the Strong leader type. By way of corroboration, an ANOVA of the factor scores in terms of the Q-sample factorial design (Appendix A) shows that for Factor 1 the Leader Type effect is significant, \( F(2,30) = 49.48, p < .01 \), with the Strong type statements receiving significantly higher scores than the Group and Inspiring statements (see Appendix I for the plots of the effect means). The Leadership Function effect is not significant, \( F(4,30) = 0.951 \); however, the Type \( \times \) Function interaction is close to being significant, \( F(8,30) = 2.261, p = .051 \).

Drawing on Covey’s (1991) power-base typology, the Power-Wielder seems to rely on coercive and utility power, with emphasis on the former.

**Factor A Interpretation: Respondents’ Notes and Comments at Interviews**

Factor A represents almost half of the P-set (12 respondents), thereby providing relatively more specimens whose notes will reflect particular subjective understandings associated with Power-Wielder traits. First, their comments on selected statements, which scored high on Factor A, will be furnished. Then, selected statements representing the negative pole of the factor will be given. Finally, traits toward the middle of the array will be provided along with individual interpretations. Table 5 indicates Factor A specimens and their status in the P-set based on Lasswell’s (1948) value categories as described in Chapter 3.
Table 5  
Classification of Factor A Specimens’ Status Based on Lasswell’s Value Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welfare</th>
<th>Deference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td>R5, R8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlightenment</td>
<td>R21, R24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-being</td>
<td>R19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>R6, R16, R26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>R3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectitude</td>
<td>R1, R2, R15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Respondents R7, R10, R12, R20, R22, and R23 cited in the subsection, apart from Factor A also loaded significantly on either of the other two factors.

Statement 5, “Values his own personal over organizational/public interests” (+4), was one of the most strongly agreed upon statements among the specimens, which reflects their cynical view of the motivations of leaders. Indeed, typical public leaders are widely seen as “egoists caring primarily about themselves” (R2) and “transitory benefit-seekers” (R3).

Another trait of the strongest agreement, namely statement 14, “Uses his leadership role as a way to maintain power” (+4), was also perceived as a taken-for-granted fact. In this regard, its psychological underpinnings were highlighted: “If a leader likes power, he will do everything to keep his position” (R2); and “this is just an axiom: there is a drive to stay in power permanently; power is so addictive: everybody is cajoling you; over normal people there tends to stay abnormal leader” (R10).

The third statement of strongest agreement (25), “Centralizes decision-making in his own hands” (+4), was characterized as a psychological reflection of a leader’s “unconscious fear to loosen his own authority: why was not it me who made a decision? a disposition that leads to over-centralization” (R3).
Trait 16, “Deals with critics by intimidating or ignoring them” (+3), was described as “a classical feature of our bay” (R5), a term used in Kazakhstan to refer to an autocratic snob-like person.

Statement 34, “Is willing to pressure and control others” (+3), was accounted for by a leader’s “striving to show to subordinates the law-like character of his directions by pressuring them” (R2); and “habitual pressing that tends to go off-limits” (R1) yet regarded as “a key rule of management: to make sure that subordinates have understood their tasks; in Kazakhstan, a more adequate leadership style is democratic centralism” (R5).

Trait 38, “A person of power and authority, always in control” (+3), was interpreted as “characteristic of Nazarbaev, the trait that all lower-level leaders seek to emulate; but in our conditions there is no other way” (R10). This focus on authority and power, as reinforced by the followers’ responses, is perceived to stem from a “servile attitude of many people toward a boss that thus invites autocratic habits” (R6).

Trait 28, “Maintains a distance between himself and followers” (+3), was perceived as an indispensable and “a necessary attitude: excessive familiarity with subordinates doesn’t contribute to good performance; however, the team principle should work, which implies closer distance, but for the whole team, not a particular individual” (R5).

The following understandings were expressed with regard to the statements on the negative pole of the scoring scale. Trait 4, “A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose” (-4), was characterized as just “utopian: I have not seen such leaders as the very
system imposes different rules, so leaders don’t even have such notions” (R8); or as an outcome of the condition of

… Fear that we have long lived in so that even when a new leader gains power, this fear [that he might be deprived of it] remains; and if most people seek to attain power status, they are driven by a motive, which is by no means honesty and unselfish purpose. (R3)

Strongest disagreement with statement 20, “Thinks critically and is receptive to new ideas” (-4), was accounted for by the fact that “there are tons of new ideas, but every one of them gets bogged down in talk, and their implementation doesn’t follow through nor is taken under control in lower-level leadership” (R3).

Negation of statement 18, “Demonstrates flexibility in managing people” (-4), was explained by “lack of intellect and education of leaders” (R3), which is reflected in their generally low emotional intelligence.

Strong-disagreement statements received the following comments. A negative ranking of trait 40, “Upholds his followers' sense of public interest” (-3), was supported by the stance that “it is just not the case; most leaders think like French king Louis XIV: ‘L’état, c’est moi!’” (R8).

In a similar vein, statement 19, “Is willing to take risks and address issues creatively” (-3), seemed to reflect the public’s skeptical views: “Every leader cares most of all about his own interest, but nobody wants to take risks on behalf of the public interest” (R1); “They all grew up in the Soviet past and still prefer to follow set rules” (R6); and “Most leaders are scared to lose their posts” (R3). This lack of initiative was contrasted with the private sector: “Venture-minded people work only in business” (R5)
so that “this trait is applicable to business, not to public leaders who are not ready for creativity and risk, except for the sake of their own interests” (R8).

Negative reaction to trait 10, “Cultivates dialog and accepts criticism” (-3), was explained by one respondent, a local government official, in terms of the nature of a public leader’s situation:

You are not accountable to people, no matter how strong may be the critique; as you report only to your superior; there is much talk going on about dialogue and critique, but it does not seem to impact real outcomes within the current budgetary and administrative frameworks. (R3)

The resultant inability of leaders to encourage subordinates’ contributions is reflected in statement 41, “Praises followers individually for their achievements” (-3). Trait 24, “Is able to build and lead informal coalitions” (-3), was again interpreted as a manipulating skill “that all leaders possess but use in their own interests” (R10).

In order to complement the entire picture of the Power-Wielder with substantive nuances underpinning its important traits, an interpretation of the following selected middle-block statements (with scores between +2 and -2) seems to be helpful.

By way of indicating the general pattern of career advancement, trait 11, “Takes an interest in patron-client relations” (+2), i.e., patronage, can be viewed as a principal way for the Power-Wielder. Indeed, as Masanov argues:

Leadership selection system in Kazakhstan is for 99% personified, i.e., based on patron-client relations, which is geared toward benefit-seeking by status-holders; in this personalized system, a patron seeks not letting impersonality, i.e., relations based on law or professional merit, get hold; e.g., Nazarbaev’s implicit paternalist argument is as follows: “You [appointees] owe me everything that you have because I let you gain all your power benefits.” (personal communication, April 20, 2004)
The resultant lack of public interest pursuit differs, however, within the public bureaucracy:

A distinguishing line should be drawn between senior-level leaders and lower-level leaders, the latter working within the framework of their job tasks and thus displaying more concern for the public interest; however, currently there is not even a clear notion of the public interest as was the case in the Soviet system; National Development Program 2030 proclaimed by Nazarbaev is too vague whereas most public leaders seek position-derived fringe benefits here and now. (R5)

Finally, the following overall characteristic of the Power-Wielder appears illustrative:

All our public leaders are identical as if incubator-grown; they are standardized “products” [italics added; in local political jargon, this denotes Nazarbaev’s loyalists]. Among them there are smart persons, who keenly perceive issues, but they can’t express themselves within the system; there are critical-thinking ones as Nazarbaev, but they are not given a chance. (R12)

In sum, provided interpretations of the above statements for Factor A endorse the outlined profile of the Power-Wielder as a combination of Power and Domination (leader's image), Directions (communication style), Centralism and status quo (work); Power Distance (leader-follower relations), and Coercive and transactional style (motivating followers).

**Factor B: Elite Leader**

This section describes citizens’ perceptions of a typical political leader in Kazakhstan as presented by the 3 out of the 26 respondents involved in this part of the study. Overall, as based on the composition of Q sort statements that received highest scores on factor B, this pattern is featured by characteristics which belong to both
Inspiring and Strong leader types under Little’s model. Specifically, extracted from the factor array are the following statements, which obtained the highest factor scores (shown in brackets) for factor B:

30. Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy. (+4)
12. Expresses himself clearly and inspires others. (+4)
25. Centralizes decision-making in his own hands. (+4)

Overall, this leader type, representing a mixture of Inspiring and Strong types, appears to feature the profile of the newly emerging business elite in Kazakhstan, members of which are characterized by both entrepreneurial and elite-minded attitudes as well as by certain traits common to the previously described Power-Wielder type. In this respect, Masanov’s (personal communication, April 22, 2004) view of the old and new leader types in Kazakhstan, with the latter carrying some traits of the former but also displaying distinct characteristics, seems to corroborate this finding on the two major groups of Kazakh leaders presented by Factor A and Factor B.

It is this simultaneous business-minded thinking and behavior coupled with a power-seeking style which prompted the ascription of an Elite Leader label. Indeed, Factor B seems, at least in part, congruent with Burns’s sketch of investor-like individuals who rule us based on the “investing, calculating, transacting, risk-taking quality of politics” (1978, p. 124) in the capitalist system, the model which Kazakhstan is now seeking to emulate. In fact, as illustrated by some other statements presenting Factor B in Appendix E and consistent with the Burns’s characteristic, the emerging Elite Leader type in Kazakhstan, along with persisting autocratic habits, also reflects new
individualistic, entrepreneurial-minded personalities “who bring to politics the ethics and the practices of laissez-faire capitalism—with crucial implications for policy-making and political leadership” (p. 124). By way of supporting this mixed portrait of Factor B type, the following are statements that obtained agreement in Factor B:

14. Uses his leadership role as a way to maintain power. (+3)
8. Strong-willed, imposes his viewpoint on others. (+3)
7. Displays broad intellect and profound thought. (+3)
28. Maintains a distance between himself and followers. (+3)
1. Demanding and self-imposing. (+3)

In this regard, as will be presented below, a mixture of authoritarian traits and entrepreneurial-minded attitude are displayed in the leader profile of Kazakhstan President Nazarbaev. Particularly, based on Maccoby’s (1981) terms as presented in Chapter 2 in the review of the study by Olcott (1997), it could be argued that, in psychosocial terms, Nazarbaev reflects two coexisting social characters in Kazakhstan, namely, the pre-existing Soviet autocratic-minded Communist Party elite (nomenklatura) and the new entrepreneurial class. Besides, applying the investor-like behavior of the Elite Leader to the recent political dynamic in Kazakhstan, parallels could be drawn with the ways in which different Kazakh pro-regime and opposition leaders have made coalitions and have split from the pro-regime part of the elite and joined the counter-elite.

On the other hand, the following statements constituted the negative (strong disagreement) pole of Factor B:

2. Has a strong sense of public interest. (-3)
29. Regards himself as on par with followers. (-3)
35. Seeks solutions through dialog and joint decision-making. (-3)
31. Strives to serve the public so as to gain approval. (-3)
13. Is always ready to listen to people's concerns. (-3)

4. A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose. (-4)
27. Considers justice and caring as organizing bases. (-4)
39. Strives to look ordinary, like just one of the people. (-4)

As reflected in statements 29, 31, 13, and 39, the leader who is described by this profile seems to stand aloof from the ordinary citizenry, which thus makes Factor B more of an elitist leader type.

Examining the principal motivations of the Elite Leader, as discerned through the following statements, a dominant self-interested behavior appears characteristic, which makes this leader type similar to Factor A, i.e., the Power-Wielder:

14. Uses his leadership role as a way to maintain power. (+3)
42. Uses others to advance himself. (+2)
33. Arouses interest and motivation among his followers. (-1)

6. Limits the use of his power for personal gain. (-1)
26. Regards power as a tool for serving people. (-2)
27. Considers justice and caring as organizing bases. (-4)

In this respect, the self-actualization drive of the Elite Leader, i.e., “overemphasis on self-actualization rather than mutual actualization with others” (Burns, 1978, p. 117)
seems to be predominant. Thus, Burns’s notion of requisite political skill as “the capacity to perceive needs of followers in relationship to their own, to help followers move toward fuller self-realization and self-actualization along with the leaders themselves” (p. 116) does not appear to be significantly different in the Elite leader when compared to the Power-Wielder’s self-centered behavior, although the former seems to rely more on individualized, transactional types of incentives.

By way of bolstering this thesis, an illustrative note by a political expert having close personal contacts with Kazakh opposition leaders stated that “among them, the same patron-client and domineering attitude is prevalent, so even if they come to power they will mimic Nazarbaev in their leadership style”, or will employ their transactional power as allegedly put by one of those leaders in a blunt way: “We will buy-off everybody!” (Masanov, personal communication, April 22, 2004). By way of endorsing this view, another Kazakh scholar argued,

Rules of the game within counter-elite are the same: they behave like a little Cabinet of Ministers; certain financial-industrial groups [“grey cardinals”] seek to return them to power for lobbying their interests; politics is a concentrated expression of economics; it is a political game by means of manipulating stereotypes/rules/political symbols of the international community. (Oleg Chebotarev, personal communication, December 22, 2004)

Furthermore, applying Burns’s thesis that leaders have “a central part in shaping, articulating, and targeting popular demands” (p. 119) and “help transform followers’ needs into positive hopes and aspirations” (p. 117) to the Elite Leader type in Kazakhstan, it is worthwhile to note a gap between most citizens’ demands and business elites’ use of slogans in their attempt to make publics rally in their support. Indeed, on the
one hand, currently there are evident public needs for socio-economic safety, employment security, access to decent housing, health care and education, and environmental issues. On the other hand, most opposition leaders place emphasis on democratic reforms and redistributional justice through the sharing of state oil revenues. This type of democratic rhetoric embodied in the opposition’s slogan “For a just Kazakhstan” seems to appeal more to the Western states, but fails to address adequately the issue of linking and transforming “lower” needs of ordinary citizens into “higher” ones, the latter being of less perceived salience to people. In fact, as the following statement score demonstrate, general publics do not perceive the much needed ability of the Elite Leader in terms of linking his own needs with those of the Kazakh citizenry and of transforming them:

27. Considers justice and caring as organizing bases. (-4)

Likewise, as Masanov argues,

Two essential criteria to be met by an ideal leader are being consolidated and alternative type of candidate for the public leadership role, the former showing a leader’s ability to represent the most part of political elite, and the latter dealing with his skills in connecting to the ordinary electorate. (personal communication, April 22, 2004)

In this regard, according to Masanov, none of the current Kazakhstan leaders, except for Nazarbaev, appears to meet both criteria so far, which accounts for their inability to mobilize the public and seemingly supports the above leader-follower gap premise. Thus, the above described lack of connection between the Elite Leader and citizenry of Kazakhstan becomes more understandable.
In sum, based on statements that received positive scores on Factor B, the resultant profile of the Elite Leader can be outlined as follows by using the leadership practices groups as defined in Chapter 3 and illustrated by the factorial design in Appendix A:

- Leader’s Image—Smart Authoritarianism
- Communication Style—Enlightened and Autocratic
- Work—Centralizing and Structuring
- Leader-follower Relations—Power Distance
- Motivating Followers—Transactional and Coercive.

^By way of summary, as compared with the theoretical leader types defined by Little, the Elite Leader appears to be a combination of the Strong and Inspiring leader types coupled with anti-Group traits as indicated in the Factor B scores and statements shown in Appendix E. By way of corroboration, an ANOVA of the factor scores in terms of the Q-sample factorial design (Appendix A) shows that for Factor 2 the Leader Type effect is significant, $F(2,30) = 16.650, p < .01$, with the Strong and Inspiring type statements receiving significantly higher scores than the Group type statements. The Leadership Function effect is not significant, $F(4,10) = 0.750$; and neither is the Type $\times$ Function interaction, $F(8,30) = 1.275$.

Drawing on the power base typology by Covey (1991), the Elite Leader seems to rely on utility and coercive power with emphasis on the former.
**Factor B Interpretations: Respondents’ Notes at Interviews**

In order to gain further insights into subjective understandings associated with the Elite Leader type, this section intends to convey substantive meanings that individual respondents loading highly on Factor B furnished upon completing their sorting. Particularly, notes of respondents R9, R17, and R18, who shared their interpretations of a few statements, will serve this purpose. Comments of these participants will be provided on selected statements scoring high on Factor B both at positive and negative poles. In addition, their notes, as available, will be furnished on some other statements, which either are in the middle of the Factor B sort or constitute the overall image of the Elite leader as illustrated in Appendix E. Table 6 indicates Factor B specimens and their status in the P-set based on Lasswell’s (1948) value categories as described in Chapter 3:

**Table 6**

*Classification of Factor B Specimens’ Status Based on Lasswell’s Value Categories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welfare</th>
<th>Deference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enlightenment R17</td>
<td>Respect R18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill R9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among those traits that obtained the highest score on Factor B was statement 30, “Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy” (+4), with respect to which R17 emphasized that “this is the most important leader’s ability in Kazakhstan today, which implies leading people by having a particular goal for the country and not being dependent on somebody else’s [standing higher in power hierarchy] whims and personal
agenda.” As an example, she referred to Alexander Marchenko, a high-level finance technocrat in Kazakhstan known for his independent-minded, professional stance on economic policy issues. R9 and R18 indicated that this trait would characterize President Nazarbaev. Moreover, R17 underscored the

… evidence of long-sighted plans of top leaders; I see their commitment to the country development strategy; I want to see in them positive traits; leaders see the future and they are able of leadership; what hampers government is lack of professionalism of lower-level leaders, which creates a gap between them and top leaders.

A related trait that was also ranked high is statement 7: “Displays broad intellect and profound thought” (+3). All three high-loading respondents associated it with the current president depicted by R18 as “a leader who can think profoundly and comprehensively.” In applying this feature to other leaders, R17 noted that “it is great, but not essential to display intellect, because a more important quality is a sense of purpose and respective vision whereby a leader should lead. Moreover, too much of intellect is not always good!”

The following statements are ranked as of general agreement (+2); however, it seems sensible to refer to mid-rank traits of the Elite Leader when accounting for its Strong type dimension reflected, for instance, in statement 16, “Deals with critics by intimidating or ignoring them” (+2). By way of endorsement, R9 posited that “if a leader is convinced that he is right, he can ignore or suppress a ‘cheap criticism.’” Likewise for statement 34, “Is willing to pressure and control others” (+2), he noted that “if people don’t perform their duties, then a leader can pressure them in order to avoid a chain of failures as he is responsible for results and people entrusted him with authority.” Further,
as to statement 41, “Praises followers individually for their achievements” (+2), R17 noted that “leaders have to acknowledge contributions by professionals.” Finally, recognizing trait 23, “Sticks to conventional ways of getting things done” (+2) as characteristic, she commented that “there is still little room for initiative provided by the top leadership, and lower-level public leaders are still confined by bureaucratic procedures.”

With regard to traits of strong disagreement, the following comments were elicited. Indicative is statement 4, “A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose” (-4), which may reflect an unconscious public rejection of the Soviet-age official rhetoric, including the Moral Code of Communism-Builders used to project an ideal of unselfish devotion to the public good. In fact, R17 stressed that “nowadays being just is just not possible; this notion is relative and not applicable to our times; this belongs to socialist ideals that I don’t believe.” She added, “Personally, I don’t believe in justice and honesty at work, otherwise this kind of person would look dumb.” Similarly, as if discounting this unrealistic expectation for today’s leaders, R9 noted that “a leader is a human and thus must take care of his own family [by use of his position], nobody will understand otherwise.” He added, “I don’t justify them [leaders], but don’t accuse them either because nowadays everybody needs to take care of himself as we live under a wild capitalism.”

Interpreting statement 39, “Strives to look ordinary, like just one of the people” (-4), R17 noted:
Respecting authority is culture-specific in Kazakhstan; power attributes such as leader’s appearance evokes respect for a leader, and this perception effect, also consistent with a marketing approach, may be even helpful for a leader, so it does not make sense to stay clear of it.

R9 also shared this stance saying that “since he is a leader, he must not look like a common man, e.g., worker at a factory; he must look like a leader, the one who represents an image of the country.” This hierarchy-based distinction in appearance between leaders and commoners thus appears congruent with the GLOBE findings (2003).

In commenting on statement 27, “Considers justice and caring as organizing bases” (-4), R9 noted that “people should take care of themselves; a leader does not have to care too much; otherwise everybody will degrade his authority; he must show that he is a leader.” With regard to statement 2, “Has a strong sense of public interest” (-3), he continued the same line of reasoning: “A leader takes only a part of the responsibility, his public role is limited by mere individual physical capacity and, as a mortal human, he has to take care of himself.”

In the same vein, with regard to statement 13, “Is always ready to listen to people's concerns” (-3), R17 remarked that “even a non-leader can serve as a zhiletka [Russian slang translated literally as consolation jacket],” i.e., as someone to whom everyone runs with complaints. However, it was also somewhat puzzling to hear her note in response to statement 29, “ Regards himself as on par with followers” (-3), that “in a market-economy based country it is no longer possible to remain an authoritarian leader as the economy is developing [based on liberalism principles] whereas the government is
lagging behind.” She clarified this nuance by comparing business and public leaders’ mentalities, the latter lacking the former’s entrepreneurial dynamism, so the previous contention sounded as a reproach to public leaders stuck with their inflexible power-distance habits in working with people.

Another trait of strong disagreement was statement 31, “Strives to serve the public so as to gain approval” (-3), which R17 described with one stroke: “I don’t believe in socialism’s ideals,” a contention that appears to reflect the earlier expression of public cynicism toward the official communist ideology of Soviet times that barely masked a huge gap between what public leaders proclaimed and how they de facto acted. In this regard, she also negatively referred to Group leader statement 3, “Praises followers for displaying moral virtues” (-2), on the basis of the same rationale.

In sum, based on the above interpretations of statements for Factor B, the earlier outlined profile of the Elite Leader (Image—Smart authoritarianism; Communication Style—Enlightened and autocratic; Work—Centralizing and structuring; Leader-follower Relations—Power distance; and Ways of Motivating Followers—Transactional and coercive) appears to be largely endorsed.

**Factor C: Old Communist Guard**

This section describes citizens’ perceptions of the third type of existing political leaders in Kazakhstan as presented by the 2 out of the 26 respondents involved in this part of the study (see Table 7).
Overall, as based on the composition of Q sort statements that received highest scores on Factor C, this pattern is comprised of characteristics featuring a mix of all three leader types under Little’s model. However, in terms of a prevailing pattern, the following statements extracted from the factor array for Factor C, based on their highest scores, comprise exclusively the Group leader profile:

40. Upholds his followers' sense of public interest. (+4)
29. Regards himself as on par with followers. (+4)
39. Strives to look ordinary, like just one of the people. (+4)

**Table 7**
*Classification of Factor C Specimens’ Status Based on Lasswell’s Value Categories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welfare</th>
<th>Deference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>R14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>R25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, the following strong agreement (+3) statements display traits primarily of the Inspiring Leader (statements 36, 35, 15, 12, and 37).

36. His power rests mainly on merit, based on success. (+3)
35. Seeks solutions through dialog and joint decision-making. (+3)
15. Appeals to community spirit and solidarity. (+3)
12. Expresses himself clearly and inspires others. (+3)
37. Emphasizes a wide range of human values in motivating. (+3)
Building on this leader profile, the following statements constitute the negative pole as scored on Factor C:

23. Sticks to conventional ways of getting things done. (-4)
18. Demonstrates flexibility in managing people. (-4)
34. Is willing to pressure and control others. (-4)
  7. Displays broad intellect and profound thought. (-3)
32. Undervalues other people's ideas and strategies. (-3)
42. Uses others to advance himself. (-3)
11. Takes an interest in patron-client relations. (-3)
45. Instills a sense of community and care among followers. (-3)

Here, under Little's model, the Factor C type is complemented with anti-Strong leader traits (statements 23, 34, 32, 42, and 11). On the other hand, some other characteristics could be viewed as anti-Inspiring (statements 18 and 7) and anti-Group ones (statement 45).

Thus, the resultant variegated picture of the Factor C leader type comprises, on the positive side of the scale, Group and Inspiring type features and, on the other hand, a mix of anti-Strong, anti-Inspiring, and anti-Group traits. To make better sense of the respondents’ perceptions underpinning this leadership style, an intensive interview with Factor C specimens would have been helpful, but real-time limitations during the field study deprived the investigator of opportunities for interviews with these individuals. In this regard, the analysis of findings related to Factor C type have had to be confined to a
few notes provided by R14 and the author’s interpretations based on native background
knowledge of a Kazakhstan citizen and his personal experience of living in Kazakhstan.

By way of comment on how the label for Factor C type was chosen, drawing on a
fact of attitude inertia among the older generation, this study has found confirmation for
the author’s prior hypothesis concerning the existence of the “old good Communist
guard” leader type in Kazakhstan. In particular, this communist idealist pattern, which
apparently had real prototypes among a part of earlier public-spirited Soviet leaders,
would likely display primarily Group Leader traits. Indeed, the Factor C type, to be
labeled “Old Communist Guard,” emerged in the study findings, which, as shown in
Appendix E by statements scored positively on Factor C, present a profile of largely a
Group leader with some elements of two other types.

In this regard, an ANOVA of the factor scores in terms of the Q-sample factorial
design (Appendix A) shows that for Factor 3 the Leader Type effect, although being
close to, is not significant, $F(2,30) = 2.693, p = .084$. The Leadership Function effect is
also not significant, $F(4,30) = 0.823$; and neither is the Type × Function interaction,
$F(8,30) = 0.721$.

Applying Burns’s (1978) notions of political leadership motives/ambitions to the
Factor C type, an important distinction can be made between the Old Communist Guard
vs. both the Power-Wielder and the Elite Leader. Specifically, based on the statements
below, an argument can be advanced that the Old Communist Guard seeks to “advance
collective purposes that transcend the needs and ambitions of the individual” (1978, p.
106):
40. Upholds his followers' sense of public interest. (+4)
36. His power rests mainly on merit, based on success. (+3)
15. Appeals to community spirit and solidarity. (+3)
37. Emphasizes a wide range of human values in motivating. (+3)
27. Considers justice and caring as organizing bases. (+2)

On the other hand, there is no clear indication of where the Factor C type stands in terms of the use of power, as displayed by the following statements:

26. Regards power as a tool for serving people. (0)
6. Limits the use of his power for personal gain. (0)
14. Uses his leadership role as a way to maintain power. (+1)

Neither is it clear what principal personal motives underpin this leader type:

2. Has a strong sense of public interest. (-1)
4. A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose. (-1)
17. Is inwardly strong, seeks balanced values and growth. (+1)
9. Radiates a positive image, a sense of purpose. (0)

The only clarifying comments by respondent R14, himself a county-level public leader with a long tenure, were given with respect to statement 4, that “man is weak; persons of such virtues are rare; even the great Kazakh poet Abay cannot be said to qualify for greatness; and however people should strive for this kind of ideal.” His comment on statement 9 seemed to refer to the capital city’s high-level officials’ indulging in image-making: “This positive imagery is a temporary thing and is often a mere show-off trick in order to dupe people by nowadays leaders” (R14). To support this stance, he mentioned a
recent visit to his county by a pro-regime party candidate running for the national
Parliament who actively sought to cajole local voters by distributing gifts in the form of
T-shirts. Apparently, this kind of “political technology,” which is gaining currency
nowadays in Kazakhstan, was not to his liking and seemed to reflect a generally critical
attitude toward today’s “big boys” in the central government.

Thus, it can be inferred from the above combination of statements (26, 6, 14, 2, 3,
17) that the Old Communist Guard type is not perceived to behave always as an
unconditional altruist. Besides, some Group leader type traits do not score positively on
Factor C:

45. Instills a sense of community and care among followers. (-3)
13. Is always ready to listen to people's concerns. (-1)
3. Praises followers for displaying moral virtues. (0)

Moreover, the Old Communist Guard does not display strength in motivating his
subordinates on an individual basis:

33. Aroused interest and motivation among his followers. (+1)
41. Praises followers individually for their achievements. (-1)

As the same respondent R14 explained it, “There are few such leaders in view of the
latent fear among leaders of giving away an advantage in competition for career
advancement.”

By way of illustration, the resultant mixed profile of the Old Communist Guard
type could be well exemplified by the case of Lenin who, as Burns contends, “was a
leader, if a contradictory one, until he became a brute power wielder” and whose
Communist Party as an instrument of his ambition “has been used for purposes abhorrent to Leninism as a liberating force” (1978, p. 111).

And still, applying Burns’s premise of the importance of political skills and Lasswell’s notion of *skill struggle*, it should be noted that in “the capacity to perceive needs of followers in relationship to their own, to help followers move toward fuller self-realization and self-actualization along with the leaders themselves” (Burns, 1978, p. 116), the Old Communist Guard overall seems to fare better in connecting to and activating the mass citizenry, as reflected in the following statements:

40. Upholds his followers' sense of public interest. (+4)
12. Expresses himself clearly and inspires others. (+3)
15. Appeals to community spirit and solidarity. (+3)
20. Thinks critically and is receptive to new ideas. (+2)
43. Trusts followers, delegates authority, and promotes autonomy. (+2)

In this regard, illustrative is the stereotypical image of Lenin as an ordinary-looking man who, with a team of like-minded comrades, devoted his enormous talents and whole life to the ideals of liberating people from suppression, the profile resonant with the above set of statements. Indeed, as R14 stressed when commenting on statement 39 (+4): “One should be like Lenin!” thus referring to him as a role model for modesty, humbleness, and closeness to people. No wonder, therefore, why Lenin’s *political identity* as a leader coupled with social justice and liberation *ideology* has demonstrated such an attractive leadership pattern for general publics. In this respect, it should be underscored that themes of social justice and of devoting one’s life to the betterment of
people’s lives have always run salient in Kazakh history so these themes can thus be viewed, in terms of Mazlish (1990), as ever-important elements of the national *psychic repository*. As also uncovered by the GLOBE (2004) findings and indicated in Chapter 2, Kazakhstan, in terms of its societal practices (“as is”), was reported to rate high on group collectivism, which appears resonant with the above themes and ideals. In this regard, illustrative is a remark of a study respondent, a rural Moslem priest (*mullah*) who expressed his Islamic beliefs as follows: “The first is Allah, the second is People, the last is you” (personal communication, September 1, 2004).

In sum, based on statements, which received positive scores on Factor C, the resultant profile of the Old Communist Guard can be outlined (using leadership practices groups as defined in Chapter 3 and shown in Appendix A) as follows:

- Leader’s Image—Public-Minded Egalitarianism
- Communication Style—Solidarity and Community Spirit
- Work—Justice and Control
- Leader-follower Relations—Egalitarian Merit
- Motivating Followers—Sense of Public Interest and Diverse Human Values.

Drawing on the power-base typology by Covey (1991), the Old Communist Guard seems to rely on *principle-oriented* and *coercive* power, with emphasis on the former.

**Comparison of Factor A, Factor B, and Factor C Types**

This section provides overall results of comparative analysis of Factor 1, Factor 2, and Factor 3 leader types. For this purpose, attention will be drawn first to those findings
that provided insights into a distinguishing core of traits for each of the three leader types described above. In this regard, Tables 8, 9, and 10 feature sets of statements that represent traits that are distinguishing for each of the three factors.

Based on the above three sets of typical leader traits, affinities between all three leader profiles could be discerned. In this respect, Table 11 shows the following factor Q sort values for statements that do not distinguish between any pair of factors and could thus be viewed as *consensual* among all three factors.

**Table 8**

*Distinguishing Statements for Factor A*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5*</td>
<td>Values his own personal over organizational interests</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44*</td>
<td>Uses primarily administrative and economic motivators</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11*</td>
<td>Takes an interest in patron-client relations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32*</td>
<td>Undervalues other people's ideas and strategies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12*</td>
<td>Expresses himself clearly and inspires others</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29*</td>
<td>Regards himself as on par with followers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39*</td>
<td>Strives to look ordinary, like just one of the people</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40*</td>
<td>Upholds his followers' sense of public interest</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19*</td>
<td>Is willing to take risks and address issues creatively</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Praises followers individually for their achievements</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20*</td>
<td>Thinks critically and is receptive to new ideas</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $p < .05$; asterisk (*) indicates significance at $p < .01$; Factor Q-Sort Values (Rank) are shown.

As the above tables show, there are a few overlapping traits that constitute what can be called the *cultural archetype* as, in terms of the underpinning societal culture, these traits may be viewed as common assumptions that underlie existing public views, in
general, of national leaders of Kazakhstan. Specifically, these traits are the following:

rejecting criticism and abstaining from dialogue; strong-willed, imposes his viewpoint on

Table 9
Distinguishing Statements for Factor B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30*</td>
<td>Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7*</td>
<td>Displays broad intellect and profound thought</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Praises followers individually for their achievements</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Upholds his followers' sense of public interest</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18*</td>
<td>Demonstrates flexibility in managing people</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45*</td>
<td>Instills a sense of community and care among followers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24*</td>
<td>Is able to build and lead informal coalitions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11*</td>
<td>Takes an interest in patron-client relations</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Undervalues other people's ideas and strategies</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5*</td>
<td>Values his own personal over organizational interests</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22*</td>
<td>Relies primarily on informal groups and grassroots</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29*</td>
<td>Regards himself as on par with followers</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13*</td>
<td>Is always ready to listen to people's concerns</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27*</td>
<td>Considers justice and caring as organizing bases</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39*</td>
<td>Strives to look ordinary, like just one of the people</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. p < .05; asterisk (*) indicates significance at p < .01; Factor Q-Sort Values (Rank) are shown.

others; demanding and self-imposing; a person of power and authority, in control; and lack of strongly demonstrated sense of public interest. On the other hand, there is also a possibility for variation in meaning between the factors for these consensus statements, so this cultural archetype is subject to further examination before conclusions can be reached.

Further, comparative analysis of Factor 1, Factor 2, and Factor 3 types reveals that the statements, shown in Table 12, represent strong disagreement among all three factors.
The full factor array for Factors A, B, and C with respondent statement ranks on each factor is illustrated in Appendix D. By way of comment, it is worth pinpointing a general tendency among respondents to blame “a system” for debilitating effects on all public leaders among whom “there are smart and knowledgeable persons who think critically and keenly understand problems (such as Nazarbaev), but they can’t reveal themselves as they are not given an opportunity for it” (R12). Examining the underpinning nature of this system, it should be pointed that among principal causes of the resultant overall  

### Table 10
_Distinguishing Statements for Factor C_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Upholds his followers' sense of public interest</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29*</td>
<td>Regards himself as on par with followers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39*</td>
<td>Strives to look ordinary, like just one of the people</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36*</td>
<td>His power rests mainly on merit, based on success</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35*</td>
<td>Seeks solutions thru dialog and joint decision-making</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15*</td>
<td>Appeals to community spirit and solidarity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Emphasizes a wide range of human values in motivating</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43*</td>
<td>Trusts followers, delegates authority, and autonomy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28*</td>
<td>Maintains a distance between himself and followers</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Praises followers individually for their achievements</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25*</td>
<td>Centralizes decision-making in his own hands</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16*</td>
<td>Deals with critics by intimidating or ignoring them</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Undervalues other people's ideas and strategies</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42*</td>
<td>Uses others to advance himself</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11*</td>
<td>Takes an interest in patron-client relations</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23*</td>
<td>Sticks to conventional ways of getting things done</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34*</td>
<td>Is willing to pressure and control others</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5*</td>
<td>Values his own over organizational/public interests</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. p < .05; asterisk (*) indicates significance at p < .01; Factor Q-Sort Values (Rank) are shown.*
leader mediocrity was a premise of “Nazarbaev’s mistake in selecting his aides and other leaders based on clan relationships rather than professional merits” (R12).

Table 11
Consensus Statements for All the Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Arrays</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1* Demanding and self-imposing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Has a strong sense of public interest</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Praises followers for displaying moral virtues</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6* Limits the use of his power for personal gain</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8* Strong-willed, imposes his viewpoint on others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Radiates a positive image, a sense of purpose</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10* Cultivates dialog and accepts criticism</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Is inwardly strong, seeks balanced values</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21* Makes decisions without seeking advice of others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26* Regards power as a tool for serving people</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33* Arouses interest and motivation among followers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All listed statements are non-significant at $p > .01$, and those flagged with an * are also non-significant at $p > .05$.

Table 12
Disagreement Statements for All Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factor Arrays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Strives to look ordinary, like just one of the people</td>
<td>0  -4  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Values his own personal over organizational interests</td>
<td>4  -1  -4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Regards himself as on par with followers</td>
<td>1  -3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Upholds his followers' sense of public interest</td>
<td>-3  1  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Thinks critically and is receptive to new ideas</td>
<td>-4  -1  2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By way of comparing the three typical profiles with an ideal type, to be described in the following section, concerning a leader’s mobilizing skills, Table 13 is illustrative. It

Table 13
Comparing Mobilizing Skills of Typical and Ideal Leader Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Upholds his followers' sense of public interest</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Appeals to community spirit and solidarity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Expresses himself clearly and inspires others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Arouses interest and motivation among his followers</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Emphasizes a wide range of human values in motivating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Considers justice and caring as organizing bases</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>His power rests mainly on merit, based on success</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Praises followers individually for their achievements</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Uses primarily administrative and economic motivators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Factor Q-Sort Values are provided for these statements. can be noted that the Elite Leader and the Old Communist Guard, overall, seem to fare better than the Power-Wielder against the backdrop of the Ideal type and to present two alternative mobilizing patterns.

Ideal Leadership Styles

This final section provides a description and detailed analysis of the emerged factors, which represent salient public perceptions of an ideal political leader in Kazakhstan. The resultant factor-array of four factors, scorings of which on each particular statement are illustrated in Appendix G, features different perspectives on ideal political leadership style in Kazakhstan. Similar with typical leadership styles analysis,
this factor-array has been obtained by the principal component analysis and varimax rotation method. The respective rotated version of the factor matrix with factor loadings on each of the 26 sorts is presented in Table 14.

This table illustrates which respondents marked with “X” mark load significantly on a factor, if their respective factor loadings exceed .39, and thus constitute a particular factor, as based on the level of .01\(^3\). Specifically, all 26 persons load significantly on Factor 1 and Factors 2, 3, and 4 include 3, 2, and 2 persons, respectively, who also load significantly on those factors in addition to Factor 1. In this regard, the table displays 19 “pure” cases, i.e., respondents with significant loading exclusively on Factor 1, and 7 “mixed” cases that are also loaded significantly on one of the remaining three factors. Table 15 classifies respondents (I1, I2, etc.) with indication of their status in the P set based on Lasswell’s typology of human value categories as described in Chapter 3.

Thus, the four emerged factors present a range of subjective understandings of ideal leadership styles for Kazakhstan. It should be noted here that they may not necessarily exhaust all possible views of desirable political leader types among the general public. However, based on the nature of Q method that was described in the previous chapter, we could reasonably anticipate having discerned all major, i.e., salient and operant, current public perspectives on ideal leadership style as a reflection of existing discourses on political leadership in Kazakhstan.

\(^3\) The formula for standard error is \(SE = 1/\sqrt{N}\) where \(N\) is equal to the number of statements (\(N=45\)). For this study, \(SE=.15\) and coefficients are significant at the .01 level if they exceed 2.589 (\(SE = .39\)).
Table 14
Factor Matrix with Factor Loadings for Ideal Leader Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q Sorts*</th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (R13)</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (R2)</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (R6)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (R9)</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (R5)</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (R1)</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (R4)</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (R2)</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 (R17)</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 (R12)</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 (R11)</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 (R23)</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 (R24)</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 (R25)</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% expl.variance | 59 | 6 | 5 | 4

Note. % expl.variance denotes amount of variance, as percentage, explained respectively by each factor.
* Numbers in parentheses refer to respondent numbers in Table 4.

By virtue of the fact that, apart from Factor 1, no other factor comprises exclusively any sort, so that neither of the three would constitute another distinct factor, it seems justified to focus further data analysis primarily on Factor 1. Thus, in the following
subsection, examination of Factor 1 will be conducted as based on the respective part of
factor array and factor Q-sort values for statements, which will furnish a basis for general

**Table 15**

*Classification of Respondents’ Status Based on Lasswell’s Value Categories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welfare</th>
<th>Deference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td>I7, I11, I12, I14, I16, I20, I21, I22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlightenment</td>
<td>I17, I19, I18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-being</td>
<td>I1, I2, I13, I15, I23, I24, I26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>I8, I10, I12, I25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I9, I13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

description of ideal leader profile associated with Factor 1. Then, an attempt will be made
to complement the picture with more particular nuances in subjective understandings and
individual interpretations based on follow-up and intensive interview notes received from
respondents who represented this factor.

**Factor 1: Inspiring Statesman**

This subsection depicts perceptions of an ideal political leader for Kazakhstan as
presented by all respondents and, among them, exclusively by 19 out of the 26 persons
involved in this part of the study. Extracted from the factor array are the following
statements, which obtained highest factor scores (in brackets) for Factor 1:

30. Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy. (+4)

12. Expresses himself clearly and inspires others. (+4)

4. A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose. (+4)
In addition, the following statements for Factor 1 constituted traits of strong agreement (+3):

7. Displays broad intellect and profound thought. (+3)
20. Thinks critically and is receptive to new ideas. (+3)
18. Demonstrates flexibility in managing people. (+3)
2. Has a strong sense of public interest. (+3)
17. Is inwardly strong, seeks balanced values and growth. (+3)

Thus, the resultant ideal leader profile, as displayed through its positively ranked statements, appears to present a leader of a great intellectual capacity, although having a balance of different talents; a man of integrity and unselfish drives; able to create a vision that would inspire followers; apt at self-critique and at receiving others’ ideas; and a flexible manager. Overall, it seems pertinent to describe the above profile in three basic dimensions: *intellectual depth, moral strength,* and *interpersonal efficacy.*

On the other hand, the following statements obtained the lowest scores (-4):

42. Uses others to advance himself. (-4)
16. Deals with critics by intimidating or ignoring them. (-4)
5. Values his own personal over organizational interests. (-4)

In other words, respondents categorically disapproved those traits that represent a self-interested (at the expense of others) motivation and domineering attitude that, under Little’s (1985) model, are pertinent to the Strong leader type. In addition, the following statements for Factor 1 constituted traits of strong disagreement (-3), which also belong to the Strong leader type:
38. A person of power and authority, always in control. (-3)
14. Uses his leadership role as a way to maintain power. (-3)
8. Strong-willed, imposes his viewpoint on others. (-3)
21. Makes decisions without seeking advice of others. (-3)
32. Undervalues other people's ideas and strategies. (-3)

Thus, the Factor 1 Ideal Leader type can be characterized nominally as a mix of Inspiring and Group traits and, on the other hand, of anti-Strong traits. To verify this appraisal, a more in-depth examination of the respondents’ interpretations is provided in the next subsection. It should be noted, however, that the undertaken analysis of all the four factors illustrated in Appendix G has revealed a dominant and common preference by the respondents for a leader type which would combine Inspiring and Group leader traits.

By way of corroboration, an ANOVA, with the results shown in Appendix I, of the factorial design (Appendix A) shows that for Factor 1, the Leader Type effect is significant, $F(2,30) = 56.86, p < .01$, with the Inspiring type statements receiving significantly higher scores and the Strong type statements receiving significantly lower scores. The Leadership Function effect is not significant, $F(4,30) = 1.06$; however, the Type × Function interaction is significant, $F(8,30) = 2.43, p < .05$.

For the sake of clarity, in this subsection the focus will be on Factor 1, which displays most clearly this pattern of public expectations that is largely present in all three other remaining factors. This fact also provided the rationale for naming this leader type as Inspiring Statesman.
By way of a quick note and as seen in the Factor 1 profile, this testimony of a significant mismatch between ideal leader projections and the major traits of the earlier described Power-Wielder and, to a lesser extent, of the Elite Leader and the Old Communist Guard, points to a considerable gap separating, in Freud’s (1922) terms, a public ego-ideal and these actual leader types in Kazakhstan.

Furthermore, the following statements were perceived as of general agreement:

26. Regards power as a tool for serving people. (+2)
10. Cultivates dialog and accepts criticism. (+2)
35. Seeks solutions through dialog and joint decision-making. (+2)
27. Considers justice and caring as organizing bases. (+2)
43. Trusts followers, delegates authority, and provides autonomy. (+2)

Again, this combination comprises traits that pertain to either Inspiring or Group type leaders under Little’s leader typology, which reinforces the overall profile that emerged out of strongest agreement statements. As to general disagreement statements (-2), as was also reflected in traits of strongest disagreement, virtually all of them demonstrate the same anti-Strong type bias:

28. Maintains a distance between himself and followers. (-2)
34. Is willing to pressure and control others. (-2)
25. Centralizes decision-making in his own hands. (-2)
11. Takes an interest in patron-client relations. (-2)
1. Demanding and self-imposing. (-2)
Thus, the overall Inspiring Statesman profile appears, at least at its face value, to feature a mix of *Inspiring and Group* traits and, on the other hand, of *anti-Strong* traits.

Examining motivational structure for the Inspiring Statesman, the following statements appear to reflect primarily public-minded motives driving the Ideal leader:

4. A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose. (+4)

2. Has a strong sense of public interest. (+3)

17. Is inwardly strong, seeks balanced values and growth. (+3)

26. Regards power as a tool for serving people. (+2)

On the other hand, of strong disapproval would be self-interested power-holding behavior of such a leader as expressed in the following rankings:

5. Values his own personal over organizational interests. (-4)

42. Uses others to advance himself. (-4)

14. Uses his leadership role as a way to maintain power. (-3)

Regarding the Ideal leader’s ability to mobilize people, statement 12, “Expresses himself clearly and inspires others” (+4), is illustrative, which seems to reflect a strong public desire for a leader with a communicative talent of addressing salient public concerns and connecting to followers’ hearts and minds. On the other hand, of less importance would seem to be his preoccupation with populist themes as seen in statement 27, “Considers justice and caring as organizing bases” (+2). Finally, individualized, transactional, or coercive motivations used by a public leader appear of little importance for respondents:

41. Praises followers individually for their achievements. (+1)

44. Uses primarily administrative and economic motivators. (-1)
Applying these expectations to the leadership situation in Kazakhstan, it could be argued that private-public linking skills, as defined by Burns (1978), that enable a leader to realize his own motives, relate them to public issues, and mobilize followers drawing on their motives’ relatedness, are currently in high demand in this country. Indeed, when applying this concept to the leadership development process in Kazakhstan, it seems relevant to note a visible lack of this leader-follower motives linkage as especially displayed in the profile of the Power-Wielder. The earlier depicted public cynicism with regard to perceived motives of most Kazakh leaders reveals this skill gap among the local political elite. In contrast, the general public appears to seek for this missing linkage in their projected ideal leader profile.

Comparing these Ideal leader traits to the GLOBE (2004) findings on outstanding leadership traits, or values (“should be”), there appear to be parallels concerning a leader’s propensity to draw upon such Kazakhstan’s culture-specific characteristics as group and family collectivism and humane orientation.

Moreover, when looking at other region-specific traits of outstanding leadership revealed by the GLOBE studies, the following features also resonate with the Factor 1 profile: inspirational charisma, integrity, competence, team-building, and collaborative skills. Indeed, as indicated above, the Inspiring Statesman presents a combination of the Inspiring and Group leader types as defined by Little (1985). Specifically, its Inspiring leader component displays such traits as “Expresses himself clearly and inspires others” (+4), “Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy” (+4), “Displays broad intellect and profound thought” (+3), and “Thinks critically and is receptive to new ideas” (+3).
Further, its Group leader component—featured by such statements as “A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose” (+4), “Has a strong sense of public interest” (+3), and “Regards power as a tool for serving people” (+2)—seems to resonate somewhat with the general paternalist and humanistic theme, defined as caring for and serving people, which is uncovered in the GLOBE findings for the East European region that includes Kazakhstan. Thus, the GLOBE findings on outstanding leadership style as transformational-charismatic and team-oriented leadership seem congruent with the above described profile of the ideal leader type for Kazakhstan featured as a combination of Inspiring and Group types.

Factor 1 Interpretation: Respondents’ Notes and Comments at Interviews

As already indicated, Factor 1 was represented by the most part (19 out of 26 respondents) of the entire P set, which thus provided relatively more specimens whose comments and notes are furnished in this subsection. Their answers will reflect particular subjective understandings associated with the respective Ideal type traits. First, their comments on selected statements, which scored positively on Factor 1, will be furnished. Then, selected statements constituting the negative pole will be given comments. Finally, selected middle traits will be provided with individual interpretations. Table 16, classifying respondents (I1, I2, etc.) based on their status in Lasswell’s typology P set, represents a subset extracted from Table 15.
Table 16
Classification of Respondents’ Status Based on Lasswell’s Value Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welfare</th>
<th>Deference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td>I7, I11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlightenment</td>
<td>I12, I14, I16, I20,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-being</td>
<td>I1, I2, I4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>I3, I6, I23, I24, I26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* In addition to the 19 Factor 1 specimens, respondents with significant loadings on other factors are cited in the subsection.

The following comments served to support the strongest shared agreement for statement 30, “Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy” (+4): “A leader needs to be able to think broadly so as to account for changing conditions in a society, an example being State Development Program 2030” (I17); and “a leader should have a sense of future in order to know where he leads people; where does Fidel Castro lead Cuba: to the abyss?” (I18).

Statement 12, “Expresses himself clearly and inspires others” (+4), was another one of the strongest preference among respondents: “In our society there is a big deficit of people who can generate ideas and concisely formulate them” (I7); and “a person expressing himself vaguely is the one who finds himself in a hostile environment, which is either a wild competition or totalitarianism; we should part from it” (I10).

Trait 4, “A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose” (+4), also evoked the highest endorsement as an indispensable characteristic of a desirable public leader: On the other hand, there were some reservations that could be accounted for by the Soviet legacy of disbelief in the largely discredited Moral Code of Communism-Builders. In
particular, “these attributes should go without saying, it’s presumed; I just don’t like the term ‘unselfish purpose,’ the road to hell was paved by it” (I11). A more balanced and thoughtful view on these “character issues” was reflected by a church leader (I9) as follows:

Justice is an attitude of a leader toward his subordinates, so every leader should stand on it; integrity is an attitude toward one’s own consciousness and to what extent a leader listens to it. If my standpoint as a leader is in conflict with integrity and justice, I’d better not be a leader. A larger problem however is to maintain a balance in a situation when I am subject to manipulating attempts, but my conviction is in being a leader as long as I’m committed to principles; I do exercise leadership only when I’m needed and I don’t seek leadership role because I need it.

Trait 2, “Has a strong sense of public interest” (+3), was placed under the strong agreement rank. At the same time, in projecting an ideal type as “clean hands, ardent heart, and cool mind” (I2), a sense of a large actual vs. ideal gap was conveyed by realistic comments that “it would be good, but it’s unreal in current actual conditions” (I2) and “historically, we lack patriotism in contrast to the U.S.; based on Maslow’s hierarchy of needs we still have a way to go” (I8).

Statement 7, “Displays broad intellect and profound thought” (+3), was likewise perceived as an indispensable quality for a public leader:

Deficit of intellect in today’s leadership is terrible whereas public officials are greatly responsible for their actions, so they must have an intellect in order to not be narrow-minded and to be able to grasp different areas; intellect is not a sum of knowledge and foreign language proficiency: it is understanding the world from different perspectives. (I20)

Trait 17, “Is inwardly strong, seeks balanced values and growth” (+3), equally obtained strongly shared agreement: “If a leader does not develop himself, he will loose a
leadership sense” (I11); and “striving for self-development is absolutely essential for a leader” (I15). Again, a somewhat pessimistic sentiment was felt in an expressed view that “such persons are few in our society, it will not be soon for this type of leaders to emerge; in a competition-based society they are rare; even our renown scholars cannot challenge the system: what did they do to awaken the consciousness of the nation?” (I12).

In a similar vein, statement 18, “Demonstrates flexibility in managing people” (+3), was considered to be a crucial leadership skill: “any leader should demonstrate flexibility; a leader just can’t accomplish the job by himself so he must find a key to everybody” (I16).

Finally, trait 20, “Thinks critically and is receptive to new ideas” (+3), evoked a unanimous endorsement: “a leader has to be able to sort out ideas and determine their importance” (I16).

The following comments were elicited relative to traits located at the negative pole:

Trait 5, “Values his own personal over organizational interests” (-4), was perceived as a “thief mentality: a modern enemy is a self-interest that spits on moral standards” (I17) so that in a strong collectivist perspective, “if a person lives in a society, he must live for it” (I12).

Characteristic 42, “Uses others to advance himself” (-4), was likewise strongly disapproved: “This kind of person is just bad, he is for sale” (I12) so that “the only acceptable interest for a public leader is his personal career” (I17). However, a clarifying remark was also made that “generally a person is to use other people, but if it’s just for
himself than it is bad” (I11), so that “it is important not to step over a certain red line” (I8).

In the same vein, statement 16, “Deals with critics by intimidating or ignoring them” (-4), was strongly perceived as unacceptable: “in principle, critique should not be suppressed; it should be listened to” (I8).

Interestingly, trait 38, “A person of power and authority, always in control” (-3), also aroused, on the one hand, highly critical comments: “it is just a tyranny, a sort of vampirism” (I17), so that “it should not be that way: we had a dominating female leader and our staff turned over thrice; I’m for collegial decision-making” (I8). On the other hand, the same respondent I8 added that “in general, our country needs a strong-willed leader; having charisma is good, which is different from a mere strong will.” The contingency clause was introduced by some other respondents: “It depends on a type of institution; in a militarized organization it may be justified” (I12). One Kazakh political expert expressed this implicit leader reification as a cultural trend:

Authority can be maintained in different ways; in the authoritarian system power should have a certain aura (but not get idolized); a leader is to be feared and thus respected because the whole system relies on a leader, not vice versa [italics added]; it is like in traffic situations: rules are to be set either by a policeman or by a system of road rules. (Satpaev, personal communication, Nov 30, 2004)

This caveat was likewise expressed with regard to statement 14: “Uses his leadership role as a way to maintain power” (-3), to which some respondents commented in negative terms: “this is a tyrant” (I17). On the other hand, others displayed greater tolerance for a power-holding propensity: “there are other tools to retain power; I never
do it by an order-like voice; one should let subordinates know who is boss, but there have to be limits to it’’ (I8).

The power vs. personal will related ambiguity resurfaced again for trait 8, “Strong-willed, imposes his viewpoint on others” (-3), which received remarks opposing the leader’s naked power-based domination: “I don’t like imposing and pressing, which derive from positioning rather than leadership talent; a leader does not manage, he leads” (I9). However, more nuanced attitudes were simultaneously expressed: “A leader is not to impose his will, but he should be strong-willed” (I15). A management instructor (I14) articulated this implicit strong-will clause as follows:

A strong-willed leader for me is being an ultimate decision-maker [italics added] (as in a crisis management situation); even in the West, group decision-making is more a theory than a real practice; collective decision-making is more pertinent in creativity-based situations; in public service it may be harmful.

In a similar spirit, statement 21, “Makes decisions without seeking advice of others” (-3), evoked respondents’ resistance: “One should consult people” (I12). At the same time, there has been willingness shown for accommodating a leader’s “eminent domain”: “decision is to be developed jointly with subordinates, but the final word is to be reserved for a leader” (I5).

To complement the profile of the Inspiring Statesman with a more nuanced interpretation, selected middle-block (from -2 to +2) statements with respective comments are provided below. In particular, the following statements of general agreement appear illustrative.
Trait 26, “Regards power as a tool for serving people” (+2), was interpreted as follows: “Doing your public service honestly and truthfully; neither taking bribes nor expecting favors in return; however, these standards would be easier to pursue if remuneration and social security systems were properly elaborated” (I17); and “it is important to have an altruistic element; there are actual leaders who think in these terms; if a leader wants to make money he’d better go for a private business” (I20). A businessman (I7) summed it up as follows:

This attitude should be by an implicit definition: whereas among wolves the leader selection criterion is physical might, among people this criterion is serving people; otherwise what is power for: to get rich? When taking over power in Russia in 1917, Lenin did not made an order to seize banks.

However, a certain steering from a patriarchal, fatherly role of a leader was suggested by I16: “A leader is not a pastor so he should do his leader’s job, i.e., place accent on his personal and professional aptitudes.”

Statement 10, “Cultivates dialog and accepts criticism” (+2), was likewise assessed favorably, yet in moderation, as expressed by a journalist who alluded to a lack of political sophistication among Kazakhstan citizens easily swayed by irresponsible rhetoric:

Dialogue and criticism are important, but in public service they are not to be always accepted; people need a leader in order to make a decision; it is not a matter of style; without a leader chaos will start; as Kazakhstan has skipped a normal capitalism phase in its development in contrast to Europe, our people are not ready yet for a large number of leaders. (I20)

This realistic sense of balance was further conveyed with regard to statement 35, “Seeks solutions through dialog and joint decision-making” (+2), which, along with
supportive comments—e.g., “A leader manages both people and problems; he can’t know all the details so he should look for solutions through dialogue with subordinates” (I10)—evoked a certain reservation. Indeed, as the above businessman stressed, “This is to an extent the democratic centralism principle, which along with participating presumes accountability of subordinates, the result being a balance of theory and practice that matches participation and responsibility” (I7). A christian church leader summed up this attitude as follows:

    Sometimes I make my own mind; it’s not always possible to live by compromises; it is a matter of balance; there is a good time for each way of decision-making; a good leader neither centralizes nor gives out decision-making in others’ hands; he *senses* a delimiting line between the strong will and being subject to manipulation; it is the greatest problem for nowadays leaders—solving dilemma of two extremes (tyrant vs. puppet-marionette): how to *combine* a leader’s strong will and his openness, honesty, and having sympathies of others. (I9)

    Again, the theme of balance in caring versus enabling in a leader’s role was voiced in comments accompanying statement 27, “Considers justice and caring as organizing bases” (+2): “Leader’s actions should display justice and care, but in a way; people are not children and should take care of themselves; primary way for it is to stimulate them” (I6). A certain weariness of former Soviet overuse of public interest rhetoric was reflected upon by an instructor in management:

    In real life, it is not possible to take care of everyone; this maximalist statement sounds like populism. In fact, this attribute tends to look cynical because it can be used in one’s own public relations campaign; extremes converge; a leader should take care of an issue in question and not be preoccupied with justice. (I14)

    Recognition of the imminent power distance was perceived in respondents’ reactions to Trait 28, “Maintains a distance between himself and followers” (-2). Whereas
assessed as generally undesirable, it was complemented with a substantial caveat: “I’m a
democrat in my soul, so a power distance should be less, not like a Great Wall of China;
however we’ll never have it as in the US; there should be a distance, but a transparent
one” (I8). Others accounted for it by either local mentality or work imperatives: “It
relates to a high power distance in our society in general and it might be risky to attempt
changing this mentality; should we change it at all? (the South Korean case attests to it),”
(I14) so that “there should be a balance between equality and subordination” (I9).

Likewise, a dual sentiment was felt in comments on statement 34, “Is willing to
pressure and control others” (-2), which was interpreted mostly as a necessary evil: “I
don’t like pressuring people, but pressure is inevitable as a result of previous faults; it is
not an advantage, but rather a necessity; if I’m a good leader I can do without pressuring”
(I9). Others viewed it as a procedural way to ensure compliance with performance
expectations: “A leader needs some periodic control, but moderate one; pressure could be
exerted differently: no to yelling, yes to reminding; control should be objective” (I8).

Furthermore, alongside the face rejection of autocratic style, willingness to justify
an imminent centralizing need was perceived in comments on trait 25, “Centralizes
decision-making in his own hands” (-2): “A leader is to be in charge of decisions, but he
should remain accessible to others’ opinions; an ultimate responsibility lies on a leader”
(I9); and “Kazakhstan resembles Russia in a way that Russia now returns to centralism; a
presidential system suits us better” (I8).

Statement 40, “Upholds his followers’ sense of public interest” (+1), was
accompanied by generally acquiescent remarks yet reflected weariness of Soviet
propaganda overuse: “It sounds emotionally as Soviet-era slogans; anyway, a good leader is to raise a sense of community” (I20); and, “Patriotism is the last resort of crooks; it should not be a way of motivating; it should be naturally present in a leader as the salt in a soup” (I11).

Generally lenient attitudes toward a potential mixing of public and private interests was reflected in comments on statement 6, “Limits the use of his power for personal gain” (+1): “It’s very difficult to draw a line; as an example it’s hard to say something about Nazarbaev” (I9); “Today this notion is absolutely missing; ideally it’s a normal condition for a leader, but it’s not a major one” (I7); and “A leader will use power for his own purpose, no matter whether he wants it or not; he has to feed his ‘dogs’ around; so a leader should undertake both good and bad schools of life” (I11).

Attribute 9, “Radiates a positive image, a sense of purpose” (0) was accompanied with detached assessments seemingly watchful for a mere public relations technique: “It’s a nice quality but a good leader can do without it; more important are his professional skills” (I8); and “It could be used either for good or for bad; it is image-making; every high-level official is self-confident” (I20).

Similarly, statement 39, “Strives to look ordinary, like just one of the people” (-1), evoked perceptions weary of the former Soviet comradeship stereotypes: “We’ve been through this [communist] phase; it’s just an appearance; a leader’s work will be a better indicator of his attitude to people” (I3) so that “it’s an absolutely neutral trait; one can’t lead by means of his appearance; everyone can have it; it doesn’t make a
difference” (I11). In this respect, the above christian church leader drew a clarifying delimitating line:

I am supportive of looking ordinary; however, there should be a balance between snobbishness and familiarity; it’s a *balance* between hierarchy and equality; any ordinary person can become a leader while remaining accessible. It is like with our pastor John: I need him as a leader and at the same time I don’t feel myself inferior to him. (I9)

Finally, acknowledgement of a necessity for a leader’s reliance on motivations beyond a mere stick-and-carrot was reflected in comments on statement 44, “Uses primarily administrative and economic motivators” (-1): “Public praising and commending suit our national mentality; it is inherent in our people and leaders sense it; in our collectivist society this motivation works better than in individualistic Western countries” (I14); “A leader can appeal to a sense of professional commitment; monetary incentives may not always work; one should also rely on people’s consciousness and personal relationships” (I16) so that “there should be not only material incentives but also moral ones such as a sense of satisfaction” (I10).

In sum, based on the statements with highest scores on Factor 1 and interpretations related to the above range of traits, the resultant profile of the Inspiring Statesman can be outlined, using the leadership practices defined in Chapter 3 and shown in Appendix A, as follows:

- Leader’s Image—Public-Spirited Thinker
- Communication Style—Clear Vision and Articulation
- Work—Innovation and Flexibility
- Leader-follower Relations—Democratic Centralism
• Motivating Followers—Balancing Public Interest and Individual Initiative. Drawing on power base typology by Covey (1991), the Inspiring Statesman seems to rely on principle-oriented and utility power with emphasis on the former.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This final chapter presents the summary of findings and the implications of this research project. First, by way of recounting the study’s problematique, the underpinning theoretical premises, and the methodology, the main points as outlined in the prior chapters will be summarized. Second, an outline of the study findings on typical vs. ideal leadership styles in Kazakhstan will be provided. Next, the practical implications of the study findings for leaders and policy-makers, both in the USA and Kazakhstan, concerning culture-specific leadership patterns as setters of authentic democratization paths will be furnished. Finally, the usefulness of the psychosocial approach employed and of Q methodology to the study of political leadership will be evaluated.

Main Points on Theory and Methodology

The research questions to be answered in the study were about the characteristics of typical and ideal leadership styles in Kazakhstan. To develop a conceptually solid and productive approach, the author chose the psychosocial perspective on leadership phenomenon in general and reviewed the respective contributions by Freud (1922), Lasswell (1948), and Burns (1978) who examined leadership in terms of leader-follower relations, value-based motivations, mutual psychological needs and expectations, and
leaders’ ability to connect their own motives with those of their followers. In particular, this project started off with Freud’s (1922) concept of libidinal structure or “emotional ties” that “… constitute the essence of the group mind” (p. 31) and the identification mechanism for developing leader-follower relations by which followers “put one and the same object [a group leader] in the place of their ego ideal and have consequently identified themselves with one another in their ego” (p. 61). In a similar vein, the fundamental formula by Lasswell (1948) on the imminent psychological needs of *homo politicus* in its quest for leadership and power and the premise that “power is an interpersonal situation” to be viewed as “cue-giving and cue-taking in a continual spiral of interaction” (p. 10) were drawn upon. Likewise, this project sought to rely on leadership insights furnished by Burns (1978) who viewed power and leadership as human relationships and defined transformational leadership as “a structure of action” (p. 3) and as “a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents” (p. 4). In this regard, it attempted tapping into Burns’s premise on the crucial “nature of the linkage between … attempts at self-gratification” (p. 114) of a leader and gratifying the needs of followers as reflected in the leaders’ “capacity to perceive needs of followers in relationship to their own …” (p. 116). Finally, by way of conceptualizing all these ideas into a coherent approach to examining leadership in Kazakhstan, this project directly built on the psychosocial leader model by Little (1985), which is founded on the view that leaders and followers find one another if their expectations coincide. Little’s typology of leaders, as based on their way of resolving a fundamental self-other dilemma and of matching three distinct leader-
follower relationship patterns, thus served as a basis for defining the Strong leader as the one who “will act and get things done,” the Group leader who “does care and is one of us,” and the Inspiring leader who “has a vision and knows how to express himself” (p. 139). As a result, Little’s typology together with Kouzes and Posner’s (2002) leadership best-practices model provided a foundation for a comprehensive and logically neat theoretical framework for this study.

Thus, the leadership premises of Freud, Lasswell, Burns, and Little, as anchored in leader-follower relations, were incorporated in the study approach through its conceptual framework (factorial design) to be further operationalized in the Q sample of statements, which reflected different leader types and aspects of leader-follower relations. The research tool (Q sample) for this exploratory study thus drew upon the factorial design by way of selecting a number of leadership style characteristics (statements) that would match the respective leadership practices cells in each of the three leader type columns in Table 2 of chapter 3.

This project sought to identify major characteristics of typical and ideal leadership styles by procuring first-hand data on genuine perceptions, views, and attitudes of Kazakhstan citizens about their political leaders in general. As mentioned in chapter 3, so far there appear to be few cross-country scholarly studies of public perceptions of national leadership styles, of which the GLOBE research project (House, 2004) is an exception. However, there is a difference from the GLOBE approach, which employs traditional R methodology and is premised on the Culturally Implicit Theory of Leadership (CLT) anticipating the existence of a single, rather a static, and self-contained
national leadership style. By way of contrast, this study embarked on exploring public perceptions of the national leadership with a different set of assumptions. In fact, the distinguishing approach of this study, as reflected in its theoretical framework and methodology, is its anchor in “self-referent subjectivity.” In other words, the author examined national leadership style(s), as seen through the eyes of the Kazakh citizenry, for uncovering diverse and dynamic patterns of leadership in their country. Thus, members of the ordinary public served as the primary source of knowledge as to what constitutes actual and desirable leader-follower relationship patterns in Kazakhstan. As demonstrated by the findings, looking at the leadership style phenomena from this angle proved to be productive in terms of revealing more than one distinct group of views and opinions that have previously gone undetected by other serious studies in Kazakhstan, including GLOBE. Thus, this project seems to furnish an important contribution to the nation-specific leadership studies both in terms of the unique conceptual framework resulting in an effective research tool and its findings bearing implications for leadership development in Kazakhstan.

In a nutshell, the novelty of the developed research framework is in applying a psychosocial approach to understanding culture-specific leadership as originally premised in leader-follower relations by Freud (1922) and formulated in the psychosocial leader model by Little (1985), who viewed leadership as a fundamental expression of “the self-other dilemma buried but active wherever we look” (p. 11). Little defined the three distinct leader types (Strong, Group, and Inspiring) and these were combined with the five best-practices groups (Leader’s Image, Communication Style, Work, Leader-
follower Relations, Motivating Followers) under the leadership theory by Kouzes and Posner (2002) and served as a basis for the conceptual framework for this study. The factorial design in Table 2 (Chapter 3) sought to capture in a logically comprehensive way a universe of possible leader-follower relation patterns as based on the self-other dilemma.

In order to examine citizens’ perceptions, 45 statements were selected from the concourse of communicability on Kazakh leadership, using the factorial structure shown in Table 2 (chapter 3) as a device for providing a Q sample that was representative of the volume of public views and opinions concerning both typical and ideal political leadership styles in Kazakhstan. Participants sorted the 45 statements so as to show their typical and ideal leader leadership style perceptions, and the resultant Q sorts were correlated and factor-analyzed, resulting in three statistically significant typical (Power-Wielder, Elite Leader, Old Communist Guard) and one ideal leader type (Inspiring Statesman). These factors were examined more in depth by means of subsequent intensive, open-ended interviews with selected respondents (specimens) who provided their individual interpretations of the statements, and this helped clarify common views, opinions, and attitudes that they shared with other respondents within the same factor. This methodological triangulation was intended to overcome over-reliance on one method and to verify the interpretations. A representative P set of 26 respondents, selected based on the typology of social institutions matching Lasswell’s (1948) eight human value categories, provided Q sorts of their perceptions of both typical and ideal leadership styles. The 26 Q sorts for each of the two conditions of instruction were
subjected to principal components factor analysis and varimax rotation, resulting in three different factors and one major factor for typical and ideal leaders, respectively.

**Summary of the Findings on Typical vs. Ideal Leaders**

Based on the pattern of statements with highest positive and negative factor scores, Factor A for typical leaders (Power-Wielder) turned out to be a combination of Strong, anti-Group and anti-Inspiring leader type traits, as described by Little (1985). In fact, among the strongest agreement (+4) statements for the Power-Wielder were such traits as the following: Values his own personal over organizational interests; Centralizes decision-making in his own hands; and Uses his leadership role as a way to maintain power. On the other hand, strongest disagreement (-4) was registered with respect to statements such as the following: A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose; Demonstrates flexibility in managing people; and Thinks critically and is receptive to new ideas. Furthermore, discussions with Factor A specimens during intensive interviews revealed endorsement by the Power-Wielder of Power and Domination (leader's image), Directions (communication style), Centralism and status quo (work), Power Distance (leader-follower relations), and Coercive and transactional style (motivating followers). This leader type seems to display the profile of the majority of the former Soviet ruling class who still demonstrate the dominant leader-follower relationship pattern in Kazakhstan.

The Factor B leader type, representing a mixture of Little’s (1985) Inspiring and Strong types, was featured by the following strongest agreement (+4) statements: Sees
the big picture and envisions broad strategy; Expresses himself clearly and inspires others; and Centralizes decision-making in his own hands. On the other hand, the Elite Leader displayed anti-Group attributes as seen in the choice of strongest disagreement (-4): A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose; Considers justice and caring as organizing bases; and Strives to look ordinary, like just one of the people. The interpretations furnished by specimens for Factor B provided the following profile of the Elite Leader: Smart authoritarianism (Image); Enlightened and autocratic communication style; Centralizing and structuring work style; Power distance (Leader-follower Relations); and Transactional and coercive ways of motivating followers. In terms of social character, the Elite Leader appears to reflect the portrait of the newly emerging business elite in Kazakhstan, members of which are characterized by both entrepreneurial and elite-minded attitudes as well as by certain traits shared with the Power-Wielder.

The Factor C leader type was comprised of characteristics featuring mainly the Group leader profile as based on the following statements with highest positive scores (+4): Upholds his followers' sense of public interest; Regards himself as on par with followers; and Strives to look ordinary, like just one of the people. On the other hand, no clear pattern was displayed by the strongest disagreement statements (-4): Sticks to conventional ways of getting things done; Demonstrates flexibility in managing people; and Is willing to pressure and control others. Overall, the resultant picture of the Old Communist Guard is comprised mostly of Group and Inspiring type features blended with a mix of anti-Strong and anti-Inspiring traits. Respondents’ comments helped complete the following profile for Factor C type: Public-minded egalitarianism (Leader’s image);
Solidarity and community spirit (Communication style); Justice and control (Work); Egalitarian merit (Leader-follower relations); and Sense of public interest and diverse human values (Motivating followers). By way of matching the Old Communist Guard with social characters in Kazakhstan, this leader type seems to reflect a vanishing cohort of lower-level public-spirited former Soviet leaders characterized primarily by Group leader traits.

Of the four factors that emerged for the ideal leadership style, Factor 1 overwhelmingly represented the most prominent ideal leader type. Based on the combination of strongest agreement and disagreement statements, it features a composite of Inspiring and Group type traits under Little’s model. The following were characteristics at the positive pole (+4): Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy; Expresses himself clearly and inspires others; and A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose. On the other hand, an anti-Strong bias was displayed by the statements on the negative pole (-4): Uses others to advance himself; Deals with critics by intimidating or ignoring them; and Values his own personal over organizational interests. This profile of the Inspiring Statesman featuring a strong mix of Inspiring, Group, and anti-Strong traits was corroborated by Factor 1 specimens’ interpretations, which also facilitated drawing the following profile for this ideal leader type: Public-spirited thinker (Leader’s image); Clear vision and articulation (Communication style); Innovation and responsibility (work); Democratic centralism (Leader-follower relations); and Balancing public interest and individual initiative (Motivating followers). This profile appears to match the GLOBE findings on outstanding (“should be”) leadership style as
transformational-charismatic and team-oriented leadership for Kazakhstan and can be summarized in three main aspects: intellectual depth, moral strength, and interpersonal efficacy.

As revealed in the study findings provided in Chapter 4 (as also shown in Appendix D), there is currently a considerable gap in Kazakhstan between public perceptions of each of the three typical leadership styles (Power-Wielder, Elite Leader, and Old Communist Guard) and the ideal style (Inspiring Statesman). Indeed, whereas, under Little’s (1985) model, the Power-Wielder features primarily the Strong type, the Elite Leader comprises a mix of Strong and Inspiring type traits, and the Old Communist Guard displays largely Group and some Inspiring type features, the Inspiring Statesman presents an exclusive combination of Inspiring and Group type characteristics. In this regard, as the interpretations of study respondents uncover, the Inspiring Statesman shares some Inspiring type traits in its profile with the Elite Leader and certain Group type traits with the Old Communist Guard. This overlap of typical and ideal types places actual representatives of these two typical styles in a position of candidates who, in their public mobilization efforts, might attempt to narrow the gap between their own style and the public ego-ideal as featured by the Ideal leader type. This typical vs. ideal leader gap appears to reflect the resultant split in the national psyche between a newly unleashed materialistic striving for achievement and individual success and the traditional Soviet (and patriarchic) urge to care about one’s fellow citizens and the society at large. In this regard, the Ideal leader profile combining these two (individualist and collectivist) dimensions can be viewed as essentially an attempt to bridge this split in the public
psyche by merging new and old dominant public values into a single pattern. That is why it is argued that to the extent an actual political leader will come to demonstrate this *Inspiring and Group* pattern of public ego-ideal, he will be able to marshal the same magnitude of resonance and public mobilization among citizens of Kazakhstan.

Another noteworthy finding is the demonstrated functional utility of Little’s (1985) psychosocial leader typology as applied to public perceptions of political leaders in Kazakhstan. The three theoretical leader types, as operationalized through particular combinations of Q statements and shown in Appendix C, have emerged either in their almost pure form (Power-Holder) or as two-type combinations (Elite Leader, Old Communist Guard, and Inspiring Statesman). This successful practical test of Little’s model might thus warrant its further use in other leadership studies. On the other hand, the leadership best-practices theory of Kouzes and Posner (2002) has not displayed the same level of functionality, at least in this particular study; i.e., in none of the ANOVAs reported in Chapter 4 did any of the five practices—leader image, communication style, work, leader-follower relations, and motivational style—demonstrate statistical significance. Only in the case of the Ideal factor did Kouzes and Posner’s practice levels interact with Little’s leadership styles.

**Practical Implications of the Findings**

The national self-identifying process in post-Soviet Kazakhstan as “essentially a psychological conception” in “a continuous growth … of … a single continuously evolving organism” (McDougall, 1920, p. 105) has been expressed as a reflection of *ego-
ideal changes, in newly evolving public ideals, which in turn shape public attitudes and preferences toward political leaders. This largely unexplored area certainly deserves more attention, both in theoretical and practical terms, if we are to better understand what is really inspiring to citizens of the former “Second World” and whether the current democratic crusade of the “First World” is likely to win hearts and minds of those peoples. In fact, as the cross-country study of post-communist discourses revealed (Dryzek & Holmes, 2002), there is a great diversity of attitudes toward democratization, both within and across those nations. This implies that a unanimous conversion of those publics into a heavily promoted “democratic orthodoxy” should not be viewed as a taken-for-granted reality. One could similarly expect a variety in citizens’ perceptions of actual public leaders and in their ego-ideal preferences as expressed in ideal leader projections, which may or may not necessarily embrace a new “democratic religion.” Indeed, as the previously very popular but then badly tarnished image of ostensibly democratic Russian President Yeltsin vs. widely-endorsed but authoritarian style of the current leader Vladimir Putin indicate, Western states’ efforts to quickly democratize the post-communist world may not encounter unquestionable support of their publics let alone political leaders. Another, this time a “Third World” case, is provided by recent political dynamics in the Middle East with surprising outcomes of democratic elections in Palestine that have brought a landslide victory to a former terrorist organization HAMAS (Aburaiya, 2006). No wonder, therefore, as demonstrated in this study, that “smart authoritarianism” may still feature a preferred public option over “all-thumbs democrats” who may enjoy higher favors from the West than autocratic incumbents, but fail to
connect better to their own publics. This implies an unacknowledged, yet potent, demand for studies of imminent “structures of subjectivity” within the public minds of those nations.

Unfortunately, the paucity of studies of nation-specific leadership style deprives Western policy-makers of a chance to grasp the importance of issues of “national character” remaining unexamined, with salience attributed to democratic institution-building whereas the problem of democratic character-building rests largely unaddressed as such. On the other hand, as indicated previously, over a century ago Le Bon (1895) stressed that “peoples are governed by their character, and all institutions which are not intimately modeled on that character merely represent a borrowed garment, a transitory disguise” (p. 89). In a similar vein, Dryzek and Holmes (2002) argue that “institutions have little or no exposure to the habits, traditions, and dispositions necessary to make these particular institutions function” (p. 4). Finally, Lasswell’s thesis on worldwide democratization that is to rely on “the development of democratic personality and … decision-making process” (1948, p. 149) serves as a reminder to today’s political leaders of the West who, in pursuit of democracy-building in both Middle Eastern and post-communist societies, fail to account for the importance of formulating and striving for a democratic personality formation goal. It is this personality type of leaders who would help “evoke and crystallize moral sentiment in favor of democracy,” a public mind disposition that “undoubtedly depends upon the formation of characters capable of respecting the basic humanity of all men” (p. 149). Indeed, Lasswell reminds us that “power, though taken seriously, is subordinated to the value
goals of human dignity….” so that the public interest is to be embodied, first of all, in “democratic leaders who share the basic personality structure appropriate to the elite of a society where power is subordinated to respect and to identification with humanity” (p. 152).

As could be inferred from this project, publics of post-Soviet countries may not care much whether their political leaders espouse any particular “operating philosophy”—be it scientific communism, neo-liberalism currently in vogue with their political elites, or just another dominant “ideological orthodoxy.” What seems to matter more to most citizens is whether in their actual performance public leaders demonstrate: (a) An ability to think comprehensively and critically, to express themselves clearly, and to manage people effectively (Inspiring type), and (b) a genuine sense of public interest and concern for common people, personal integrity and unselfishness, and accessibility and responsiveness (Group type). Thus, as discovered in this study, the profile of the Ideal leader is largely ideology-neutral. Indeed, as the two currently dominant leadership styles in Kazakhstan have revealed, neither the Power-Wielder (i.e. self-perpetuating Soviet ruling elite) nor the Elite Leader, representing a “new bourgeoisie,” with their seemingly opposite ideological stances, appear to enjoy enthusiastic and overwhelming sympathies and support by most general publics. As indicated in Chapters 3 and 4, these two types are perceived primarily either as self-serving patrons who strive to remain in power for the sake of large indulgences or as young ambitious wolves (leading opposition leaders) seeking power in order to promote their business interests, although Nazarbaev
appears to be an exceptional case. By way of corroboration, Masanov’s following note is illuminating:

There are two opposition leader types in Kazakhstan, the first type, holding principled positions based on true political commitment to democratic ideas, but they do not seek power and therefore do not aspire at leadership roles. The second type is those who, behind their democratic façade, really do not have any firmly held political convictions, and in their quest for power they are driven by their economic interests. (personal communication, April 22, 2004)

The third leader type, namely the Old Communist Guard, with its genuine Soviet-era convictions, does not seem to constitute a real alternative in view of its public place disappearing as its representatives grow old and are likely to leave the public arena altogether in the not so distant future.

Thus, in the age of dwindling ideologies, other leadership factors seem to assume a crucial role in determining Kazakhstan citizens’ preferences in choosing their public leaders. Among these factors maintaining Nazarbaev’s stable leadership status are the situational match of his task-oriented managerial style and the coexistence, in Maccoby’s (1981) terms, of two social characters in Kazakhstan, with a resultant political culture that reflects features of both. Indeed, the thesis of democratic centralism, i.e., an accent on the implicit primacy of a leader, articulated in Chapter 4 by one of the respondents (17), seems to fit the traditional social character in Kazakhstan with its high power distance and reverence for hierarchy, cultural traits also noted by Nurkadilov (1996). At the same time, Nazarbaev appears to embody a new dynamic, business-minded leader supportive of an entrepreneurial spirit and resourcefulness, traits of the new ascending social character in Kazakhstan.
By way of illustrating Nazarbaev’s sense of the local political culture, his March 2006 State of the Nation speech expresses his call for “taking into account general principles of democratic and prosperous state-building as well as important cultural and historical traits and traditions of our society…. Lack of solid democratic culture traditions, perceptions of freedom as everything-is-allowed attitude can destabilize the country, cross out our plans for future, and set us far back” (Nomad, 2006, March 2). This absence of *democratic culture*, which requires nurturing in order to secure its greater consistency with political institutions, is also resonant with Lasswell’s (1948) premise of democratic personality formation (character-building) as an indispensable pillar of a truly democratic polity.

That is why the largely uncharted area of political culture and leadership and, in particular, relationships between national character and leadership styles, appears to offer more insightful clues to Western scholars and policy-makers in navigating their approaches to democratization in post-communist and developing countries. By way of illustration, it seems appropriate to note the doctrine of national communism for Central Asia and Caucasus by a 1920s Tatar leader, Mir-Said Sultan Galiev, who developed the concept of "proletarian nations" as applied to Muslim peoples of the Russian empire, an ideological innovation as opposed to Marx’s traditional notion of a working class. As Bennigsen and Wimbush (1979) argue, Sultan Galiev and other Central Asian leaders of the early Soviet Union were thus able to reconcile Marxist doctrine and Islam and to devise a "Moslem Communism" theory to *match* national and cultural contexts in the Central Eurasian region. From the psychosocial perspective, it could be viewed as an
attempt by those national leaders to adapt a foreign (European), yet attractive, ideology to the specifics of the social characters and minds of Central Asian peoples including Kazakhs. Analyzing current Central Asian polities in terms of their democratization outcome, Gleason (2001) notes that whereas

…the governments of Central Asia have indeed succeeded in adopting many of the structures of western style democracy … they have not succeeded in the subtler yet more significant transition to the spirit and processes [italics added] of true democracy…. None of the countries … have truly succeeded in making the transition from democratic structure to democratic function. As a consequence, many of the formal institutions have acquired a showcase quality … it is the informal institutions that actually guide the processes of policy decision-making. (p. 2)

Furthermore, in pondering the question: “What do the features of Central Asian culture spell for attempts to promote democracy?”, Gleason (2001) argues that

…The structures and procedures of democracy do not constitute democracy itself. If democracy is to grow in Central Asia, it will grow from roots that already exist there…. The failed transplantation of western structures and institutions should lead … to the conclusion that efforts to recreate the developing world in the image of Europe and North America are not likely to succeed, and may provoke counterproductive repercussions…. There is growing recognition that democratic universalism is possible without institutional uniformity…. Investment in democracy is not an investment in a form of government at all. It is an investment in good governance [italics added]. (p. 9)

Thus, the search for culture-authentic good governance anchors in, using MacDougall’s (1920) terms, the national mind and character, instead of formal ideological frameworks, would arguably promise potentially greater yields in the worldwide democratic quest by the West.

To accomplish this good governance-driven and national culture-based analysis, Lasswell (1971) underscores the necessity for new
Techniques for making assumptions explicit and for testing their validity in terms of both the basic values which policy seeks to realize and the actualities of human relations to which policy must be applied…. For example, the formulation of policy toward Asia can proceed more intelligently when the decision-maker knows with some precision how and by whom power is wielded in each country, what are the characteristics and backgrounds of controlling elites, and what are the prevailing aspirations and habits of thinking of each Asian people. With such insight into national characteristics the statesman is also better prepared to determine what combination of methods is preferable for implementing a given policy. (p. x)

In this regard, this project can be viewed as a Q-technique equipped study of the modern Kazakh elite in terms of patterns of perceiving, thinking and relating by the people of Kazakhstan toward their political leaders.

By way of suggesting policy implications, leadership development programs in Kazakhstan, including those supported by American and international institutions, could utilize the reported study findings for purposes of educating and training both existing and emerging national leaders in the spirit displayed by the Ideal leader type (Inspiring Statesman). In particular, leadership selection and training activities targeting actual office-holders and new public aspirants seeking leadership roles in legislative and executive power branches at the national, provincial, and local levels should be more culturally attuned. Specifically, these efforts could provide a high return were they more in sync with the public ego-ideal as featured by the profile of the Inspiring Statesman. In this way, ascending leaders would be more likely to bridge the identified typical vs. ideal leader gap and to produce greater resonance and higher levels of public mobilization in their political projects for Kazakhstan.
Reflecting further on the need for better grounding of democratization policies, Lasswell points to “the methods of social and psychological inquiry” as well as to the demand for “the improving of the concrete content of the information and the interpretations available to policy-makers,” the latter seeking to grasp better “the basic conflicts in our civilization … disclosed by … the study of personality and culture” (Lasswell, 1971, p. 8). Identifying then available methods, Lasswell refers to “the conceptions put forward by Freud of the oral, anal, and genital types of personality; or the types of leaders and power relations described by Max Weber, who wrote at some length on the methodological role of ‘ideal types’” (p. 9). However, refining policy objectives within the framework of today’s democratization policies would call for new perspectives and methods with greater explanatory power in the realm of political subjectivity. In this regard, the tandem use of the leadership models by Little (1985) and Kouzes and Posner (2002) coupled with Q methodology, as demonstrated in this study, appears to be instrumental in procuring authentic, first-hand knowledge of public perceptions of the political elite in a nation in question. On the other hand, as also shown in the study of leadership in Kazakhstan, by way of methodological triangulation, other methods should complement a main research tool in order to reinforce the procured findings of Q method.

Usefulness of the Psychosocial Approach and Q Methodology

Contemplating the potential of a psychosocial perspective for studying political leadership, it should be remarked that its capacity to “dig deeper” into the public mind and to look beyond ideology-imposed frameworks can render it valuable as a scholarly
and policy-analytic and design approach. Indeed, invoking again Lasswell’s premise of
democratic personality formation to be pursued in conjunction with democratic
institution-building in a particular nation, its existing national character is to be
understood deeply enough in order to know where to start, that is, which particular social
character traits to deal with and account for in designing nation-specific representative,
executive, and judicial institutions and practices of democratic governance.

As demonstrated in the previous chapter, the psychosocial approach can offer a
better grasp of public expectations of the political leadership pattern, which might be
reflected in terms of preference for a strong presidential republic, a system with a more
balanced executive power, a parliamentary system, or even something else. In particular,
this project has uncovered a transitional match of the acquiescent, though increasingly
sophisticated, citizenry with the super-presidential system in Kazakhstan. On the other
hand, it also discovered an inherent gap between actual and ideal leaders in the public
mind of this nation, the resultant dissatisfaction being able to lead to potential leadership
legitimacy crisis unless this gap is understood and addressed properly by Kazakh national
leaders. Moreover, psychosocial approaches might furnish valuable insights into the
sequence, tempo, and substance of democratization steps, including decentralization in a
particular country.

Besides, the psychosocial framework coupled with Q technique could prove to be
an indispensable research tool to be used in tandem with other approaches to the study of
national leadership style such as the one employed in the GLOBE project (House, 2004).
In fact, an approach similar with the one used for this Q based study in Kazakhstan would
help offset an imminent weakness of the Culturally Endorsed Implicit Theory of Leadership (used in GLOBE), namely its premise that “the attributes that differentiate a specified culture are predictive of … leader attributes and behaviors that are most frequently enacted and effective in that culture” (House et al., 2004, p. 17). However, GLOBE is based on a theoretical framework that would not allow capturing the dynamic nature of a national culture in question, thus viewing it as something rather stable in its constituent elements. As demonstrated in this Q study, however, this is not the case, particularly in post-communist nations such as Kazakhstan, which is undergoing drastic changes in both its societal practices and values, so the emerged three typical leadership styles have captured the internal dynamic of national leadership as a process: its recent past (Old Communist Guard), present (Power-Wielder), and near future-as-unfolding-present (Elite Leader). In this regard, conducting a large-scale R based research project on leadership in a specific country based on prior Q based findings on potentially more than one culture-based leadership style would give researchers an advantage in making credible assessments as to the relative extent of use of each distinct leadership style in this nation. Thus, both R and Q anchored approaches used in tandem would gain considerable surplus value as exploratory research methods.

Consequently, if the psychosocial perspective renders such a multi-dimensional phenomenon as leadership more understandable, then it might offer new angles of viewing both national and international political processes, with leader-follower relations being at the focus of attention. In this case, institutionalism, currently a dominant perspective on what constitutes the basis for national polities, could benefit considerably
from collaborating with the psychosocial approach. Such a collaboration would facilitate exploration, in terms of Mazlish (1990), of a national psychic repository with a range of submerged themes and memories of national pride or shame, and with suppressed collective sentiments. In fact, psychosocial models can demonstrate their promising potential in understanding, in Lasswell’s (1971) words, “the importance of the irrational in human behavior” (p. viii), e.g., motivations underpinning actual, often surprising and seemingly unexplainable, choices and support by citizens of particular leaders preferred over others, no matter what ideological stance they might espouse. In this regard, it could be argued that if a psychosocial perspective into policy-making takes hold as a legitimate policy framework, it could open completely new vistas of interpreting policy process and avenues of policy design and implementation.

To what extent each new public leader’s character would match public expectations of an ideal leader type would be another issue worthy studying more in depth. In this respect, again the psychosocial perspective and Q method might be of utility. Suffice it to note that, as already emphasized, the more this leader character will comprise, under Little’s (1985) model, those Inspiring and Group leader traits, present in the Inspiring Statesman profile, the greater public resonance and mobilization it will likely engender in Kazakhstan. Indeed, newly emerging public leaders would arguably be able to tap into a genuine public support if, in accordance with Alford (1994), they embody a higher public ego-ideal representing high expectations for both a leader’s and citizens’ standards of thinking and acting. In this regard, illuminating is a public image of John F. Kennedy who, in his appeal to the fellow citizens, was able to capture a long-
running theme within the American psyche, namely an entrepreneurial, yet self-sacrificial, spirit driven by the belief that “the pioneers of old gave up their safety, their comfort and sometimes their lives to build a new world here in the West…. Their motto was not ‘every man for himself’ – but ‘all for the common cause’” (Kennedy, 1960). One could draw a striking parallel between JFK’s reference to American pioneers and an earlier generation of communist idealists in the former Soviet Union whose image, reflected in the Old Communist Guard, is exemplified by such leaders as Lenin depicted in Chapter 4. By way of corroboration, Tucker (1987) views “Lenin’s Bolshevism as a revolutionary culture that grew by accretion from its early beginnings around the turn of the century to Lenin’s last period of activity under the NEP” (p. 53), based on which “Lenin was a believing Marxist yet … a culture-conscious revolutionary” (p. 57). This may imply the first Soviet leader’s inherent drive of revolutionary idealism balanced, however, with his post-revolutionary “fundamental orientation on the Marxist party’s educative mission [italics added], to the notion of politics as pedagogy and persuasion in relation to the party’s worker and peasant constituency” (p. 56). In other words, on the one hand, Lenin projected an ideal of a self-sacrificial revolutionary devoted to the ultimate goal-value of social liberation by means of overthrowing the tsarist regime in a backward Russia, a long-standing Group leader type leitmotif and perpetuating cultural pattern within the national psychic repository, which was resonant with earlier Russian free thinkers and political activists. On the other hand, his keen awareness of the then Russian social character made Lenin advocate before his party comrades an imperative for demonstrating an Inspiring leader style to the public in order to ensure a post-
revolutionary leadership “as a pedagogical process of overcoming habitual ways of individualistic thinking and living on the part of the vast peasant majority” (p. 57).

Back to the American case, in the same Group and Inspiring leader spirit, JFK evoked earlier elements, in Mazlish’s (1990) terms, of the American psychic repository:

New Frontier is not a set of promises—it is a set of challenges. It sums up not what I intend to offer the American people, but what I intend to ask of them. It appeals to their pride, not to their pocketbook—it holds out the promise of more sacrifice instead of more security…. For courage—not complacency—is our need today—leadership—not salesmanship. (Kennedy, 1960)

This high benchmark set by the American leader for himself and the citizenry seems to parallel that of former Czech President Vaclav Havel with his rigorous standards established for himself and his people, both leaders thus exemplifying a higher public ego-ideal. Applying this leadership pattern to Kazakhstan, it can be argued that, similarly with American and Czech cases, its citizens currently hold expectations of a leader able to conceive of and project a similar inspiring, yet demanding, vision both for himself and his nation. Indeed, the Ideal Leader type, with its broad-minded, inspiring, and public-spirited profile, seems to feature high moral standards of unselfishly serving others and self-sacrifice for the common good. Thus, this public longing for leaders demonstrating and setting high standards for themselves and their people is reflected partly in the Old Communist Guard but primarily in the Inspiring Statesman as shown in Appendixes C and F. However, a more focused examination of both public leaders’ and citizens’ mutual expectations would furnish deeper insights, and this is how the psychosocial approach and Q method could again be instrumental.
By way of parallels, in appealing to the American sense of excellence and pride, JFK refers to the Soviets’ displayed self-sacrifice as he challenges his own public by asking, “Are we up to the task—are we equal to the challenge? Are we willing to match the Russian sacrifice of the present for the future—or must we sacrifice our future in order to enjoy the present?” (Kennedy, 1960). Finally, he appeals to a sense of a larger American responsibility vis-à-vis the entire world:

For the harsh facts of the matter are that we stand on this frontier at a turning-point in history. We must prove all over again whether this nation … with its freedom of choice, its breadth of opportunity, its range of alternatives—can compete with the single-minded advance of the Communist system…. That is the question of the New Frontier. That is the choice our nation must make—a choice … between the public interest and private comfort … between determined dedication and creeping mediocrity. All mankind waits upon our decision…. We cannot fail their trust, we cannot fail to try. (Kennedy, 1960).

The same sense of responsibility before other Central Asian, former Soviet, and Eurasian nations would be probably expressed by an ideal Kazakh leader in his projecting a larger mission of Kazakhstan as a new multi-ethnic nation exposed to a host of socio-economic, political, and regional challenges in the age of globalization on the threshold of the 21st century. However, illuminating the respective positions by actual and ideal leaders would again require a more directed study of national leadership, the task that would well be accomplished by the tandem of a psychosocial model and Q method.

Finally, this novel approach, applied to Kazakhstan, could be later extended “to investigate the nature of national mind and character and to examine the conditions that render” (McDougall, 1920, p. 100) widely varying leadership patterns in other countries and regions. This would enrich understanding of diverse democratization processes as
conditioned by “specificities of national character” shaped by particular socio-cultural and historical contexts. In this regard, applying both psychosocial approaches and Q methodology to investigating important differences in potentially numerous national leadership styles across the globe, could prove their exploratory strengths and practical value for policy-making. Thus, this would be a potentially fruitful avenue for “providing the knowledge needed to improve the practice of democracy” in both advanced, developing, and transition nations while keeping in mind that “the ultimate goal is the realization of human dignity in theory and fact” (Lasswell, 1971, p. 15).
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APPENDIX A

Factorial Design for Typology of Leaders
Factorial Design for Typology of Leaders Based on Little’s Psychosocial Leader Types Model and Kouzes and Posner’s Leadership Best-practices Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader type</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Inspiring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader’s Image</td>
<td>Power, domination</td>
<td>Concern, solidarity</td>
<td>Personal example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Style</td>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>Appeals</td>
<td>Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Status quo</td>
<td>No formal structure</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-follower relations</td>
<td>Power distance</td>
<td>Serving people</td>
<td>Delegation, sharing, Enabling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating followers</td>
<td>Transactional, coercive</td>
<td>Social approval</td>
<td>Encouragement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Q Sample Statements
**Q Sample Statements**

1. Demanding and self-imposing  
2. Has a strong sense of public interest  
3. Praises followers for displaying moral virtues  
4. A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose  
5. Values his own personal over public/organizational interests  
6. Limits the use of his power for personal gain  
7. Displays broad intellect and profound thought  
8. Strong-willed, imposes his viewpoint on others  
9. Radiates a positive image, a sense of purpose  
10. Cultivates dialog and accepts criticism  
11. Takes an interest in patron-client relations  
12. Expresses himself clearly and inspires others  
13. Is always ready to listen to people's concerns  
14. Uses his leadership role as a way to maintain power  
15. Appeals to community spirit and solidarity  
16. Deals with critics by intimidating or ignoring them  
17. Is inwardly strong, seeks balanced values and growth  
18. Demonstrates flexibility in managing people  
19. Is willing to take risks and address issues creatively  
20. Thinks critically and is receptive to new ideas  
21. Makes decisions without seeking advice of others  
22. Relies primarily on informal groups and grassroots  
23. Sticks to conventional ways of getting things done  
24. Is able to build and lead informal coalitions  
25. Centralizes decision-making in his own hands  
26. Regards power as a tool for serving people  
27. Considers justice and caring as organizing bases  
28. Maintains a distance between himself and followers  
29. Regards himself as on par with followers  
30. Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy  
31. Strives to serve the public so as to gain approval  
32. Undervalues other people's ideas and strategies  
33. Aroused interest and motivation among his followers  
34. Is willing to pressure and control others  
35. Seeks solutions thru dialog and joint decision-making  
36. His power rests mainly on merit, based on success  
37. Emphasizes a wide range of human values in motivating  
38. A person of power and authority, always in control  
39. Strives to look ordinary, like just one of the people  
40. Upholds his followers' sense of public interest
41. Praises followers individually for their achievements
42. Uses others to advance himself
43. Trusts followers, delegates authority, and autonomy
44. Uses primarily administrative and economic motivators
45. Instills a sense of community and care among followers.
APPENDIX C

Profiles for Theoretical Leader Types
Profiles for Theoretical Leader Types under Little’s Model

**Strong Leader**

**Image: Power/Domination**
1: Demanding and self-imposing
5: Values his own personal over organizational interests
4: A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose

**Communication Style: Directions**
21: Makes decisions without seeking advice of others
2: Strong-willed, imposes his viewpoint on others
16: Deals with critics by intimidating or ignoring them

**Work: Status-quo**
3: Sticks to conventional ways of getting things done
32: Undervalues other people's ideas and strategies
25: Centralizes decision-making in his own hands

**Leader-follower relations: Power distance**
4: Maintains a distance between himself and subordinates
44: Uses primarily administrative and economic motivators
11: Takes an interest in patron-client relations

**Motivating followers: Transactional, coercive**
5: Uses administrative and economic incentives to motivate others
42: Uses others to advance himself
34: Is willing to pressure and control others.

**Group Leader**

**Image: Concern, solidarity**
4: A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose
2: Has a strong sense of public interest
6: Limits the use of his power for personal gain

**Communication Style: Appeals**
15: Appeals to community spirit and solidarity
29: Regards himself as on par with followers
13: Is always ready to listen to people's concerns

**Work: Informal structure**
24: Is able to build and lead informal coalitions
27: Considers justice and caring as organizing bases
22: Relies primarily on informal groups and grassroots

**Leader-follower relations: Serving people**
39: Strives to look ordinary, like just one of the people
26: Regards power as a tool for serving people
31: Strives to serve the public so as to gain approval

**Motivating followers: Social approval**
45: Instills a sense of community and care among followers
3: Praises followers for displaying moral virtues
40: Upholds his followers' sense of public interest

**Inspiring Leader**

**Leader’s Image: Personal Example**
7: Displays broad intellect and profound thought
17: Is inwardly strong, seeks balanced values and personal growth
9: Radiates a positive image, a sense of purpose, and self-confidence

**Communication style: Vision**
12: Expresses himself clearly and inspires others with his vision
30: Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy
10: Cultivates dialog and accepts criticism as a constructive process

**Work: Innovation**
18: Demonstrates flexibility in managing people and bringing about change
20: Thinks critically and is receptive to new ideas
19: Is willing to take risks and to address issues creatively

**Leader-follower relations: Delegation, sharing, enabling**
43: Trusts followers, delegates authority, and promotes autonomy
35: Seeks solutions through dialog and joint decision-making
36: His power rests mainly on merit, based on successful leadership

**Motivating followers: Encouragement**
33: Arouses interest and motivation among his followers

41: Praises followers individually for their achievements and growth

37: Emphasizes a wide range of human values.
APPENDIX D

Typical Leadership Styles: Factor Q-Sort Values for Each Statement
## Typical Leadership Styles: Factor Q-Sort Values for Each Statement

**Factor Arrays:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demanding and self-imposing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Has a strong sense of public interest</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Praises followers for displaying moral virtues</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Values his own personal over organizational interests</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Limits the use of his power for personal gain</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Displays broad intellect and profound thought</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Strong-willed, imposes his viewpoint on others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Radiates a positive image, a sense of purpose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cultivates dialog and accepts criticism</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Takes an interest in patron-client relations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Expresses himself clearly and inspires others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Is always ready to listen to people's concerns</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Uses his leadership role as a way to maintain power</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Appeals to community spirit and solidarity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Deals with critics by intimidating or ignoring them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Is inwardly strong, seeks balanced values and growth</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Demonstrates flexibility in managing people</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Is willing to take risks and address issues creatively</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Thinks critically and is receptive to new ideas</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Makes decisions without seeking advice of others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Relies primarily on informal groups and grassroots</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sticks to conventional ways of getting things done</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Is able to build and lead informal coalitions</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Centralizes decision-making in his own hands</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Regards power as a tool for serving people</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Considers justice and caring as organizing bases</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Maintains a distance between himself and followers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Regards himself as on par with followers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Strives to serve the public so as to gain approval</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Undervalues other people's ideas and strategies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Aroused interest and motivation among his followers</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Is willing to pressure and control others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Seeks solutions thru dialog and joint decision-making</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Value Diff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>His power rests mainly on merit, based on success</td>
<td>0 0 3 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Emphasizes a wide range of human values in motivating</td>
<td>0 0 3 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>A person of power and authority, always in control</td>
<td>3 1 2 -3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Strives to look ordinary, like just one of the people</td>
<td>0 -4 4 -1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Upholds his followers' sense of public interest</td>
<td>-3 1 4 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Praises followers individually for their achievements</td>
<td>-3 2 -1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Uses others to advance himself</td>
<td>3 2 -3 -4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Trusts followers, delegates authority, and autonomy</td>
<td>-2 -1 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Uses primarily administrative and economic motivators</td>
<td>2 0 -1 -1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Instills a sense of community and care among followers</td>
<td>-2 1 -3 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

Factor Scores for Typical Leader Profiles
Factor Scores for the Emerged Typical Leader Profiles

Factor A: Power-Wielder

A-1: Leader's image—Power and domination

1. Demanding and self-imposing. (+2)
5. Values personal over organizational interests. (+4)
38. A person of power and authority, always in control. (+3)

A-2: Communication style—Directions

8. Strong-willed, imposes his viewpoint on others. (+2).
16. Deals with critics by intimidating or ignoring them. (+3).

A-3: Work—Centralism and status-quo

32. Undervalues other people’s ideas and strategies. (+2).
25. Centralizes decision-making in his own hands. (+4).

A-4: Leader-follower relations—Power distance

28. Maintains a distance between himself and subordinates. (+3)
14. Uses his leadership role as a way to maintain his power. (+4)
11. Takes an interest in establishing selective patron-client relations. (+2)

A-5: Motivating followers—Coercive and transactional

42. Uses others to advance himself. (+3)
44. Uses administrative steps and economic incentives to motivate others. (+2)
34. Is willing to pressure and control others to get things done. (+3)
Factor B: Elite Leader

B-1: Leader’s image—Smart authoritarianism

1. Demanding and self-imposing. (+2)
7. Displays broad intellect and profound thought. (+3)

B-2: Communication style—Enlightened and autocratic

8. Strong-willed, imposes his viewpoint on others. (+2).
16. Deals with critics by intimidating or ignoring them. (+2)
12. Expresses himself clearly and inspires others. (+4)
30. Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy. (+4)

B-3: Work—Centralizing and structuring

23. Sticks to conventional ways of getting things done. (+2)
25. Centralizes decision-making in his own hands. (+4).

B-4: Leader-follower relations—Power distance

28. Maintains a distance between himself and subordinates. (+3)
14. Uses his leadership role as a way to maintain his power. (+3)

B-5: Motivating followers—Transactional and coercive

42. Uses others to advance himself. (+2)
34. Is willing to pressure and control others to get things done. (+3)
41. Praises followers individually for their achievements. (+2)

**Factor C: Old Communist Guard type**

*C-1: Leader’s image*—Public-minded egalitarianism

29. Regards himself as on par with followers. (+4)

39. Strives to look ordinary, like just one of the people. (+4)

*C-2: Communication style*—Solidarity and community spirit

12. Expresses himself clearly and inspires others with his vision. (+3)

15. Appeals to community spirit and solidarity. (+3)

*C-3: Work*—Justice and Control

27. Considers justice and caring as organizing bases. (+2)

38. A person of power and authority, always in control. (+2)

*C-4: Leader-follower relations*—Egalitarian merit

43. Trusts followers, delegates authority, and promotes autonomy. (+2)

35. Seeks solutions through dialog and joint decision-making. (+3)

36. His power rests mainly on merit, based on successful leadership. (+3)

39. Strives to look ordinary, like just one of the people. (+4)

*C-5: Motivating followers*—Sense of public interest and diverse human values

40. Upholds his followers' sense of public interest. (+4)

37. Emphasizes a wide range of human values. (+3)
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Factor Scores for the Ideal Leader Profile
Factor Scores for the Ideal Leader Profile

Factor 1: Inspiring Statesman

I-1: *Leader's Image*—Public-Spirited Thinker

4: A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose. (+4)
7: Displays broad intellect and profound thought. (+3)
17: Is inwardly strong, seeks balanced values and growth. (+3)
2: Has a strong sense of public interest. (+3)

I-2: *Communication Style*—Clear Vision and Articulation

30: Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy. (+4)
12: Expresses himself clearly and inspires others. (+4)
10: Cultivates dialog and accepts criticism. (+2)

I-3: *Work*—Innovation and Flexibility

20: Thinks critically and is receptive to new ideas. (+3)
18: Demonstrates flexibility in managing people. (+3)
19: Is willing to take risks and address issues creatively. (+1)

I-4: *Leader-follower relations*—Democratic Centralism

26: Regards power as a tool for serving people. (+2)
35: Seeks solutions thru dialog and joint decision-making. (+2)
43: Trusts followers, delegates authority, and autonomy. (+2)

I-5: *Motivating followers*—Balancing Public Interest and Individual Initiative

27: Considers justice and caring as organizing bases. (+2)
40: Upholds his followers' sense of public interest. (+1)

45: Instills a sense of community and care among followers. (+1)

41: Praises followers individually for their achievements. (+1)
APPENDIX G

Ideal Leadership Styles: Factor Q-Sort Values for Each Statement
## Ideal Leadership Styles: Factor Q-Sort Values for Each Statement

### Factor Arrays:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demanding and self-imposing</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Has a strong sense of public interest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Praises followers for displaying moral virtues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Values his own personal over organizational interests</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Limits the use of his power for personal gain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Displays broad intellect and profound thought</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Strong-willed, imposes his viewpoint on others</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Radiates a positive image, a sense of purpose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cultivates dialog and accepts criticism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Takes an interest in patron-client relations</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Expresses himself clearly and inspires others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Is always ready to listen to people's concerns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Uses his leadership role as a way to maintain power</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Appeals to community spirit and solidarity</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Deals with critics by intimidating or ignoring them</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Is inwardly strong, seeks balanced values and growth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Demonstrates flexibility in managing people</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Is willing to take risks and address issues creatively</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Thinks critically and is receptive to new ideas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Makes decisions without seeking advice of others</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Relies primarily on informal groups and grassroots</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sticks to conventional ways of getting things done</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Is able to build and lead informal coalitions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Centralizes decision-making in his own hands</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Regards power as a tool for serving people</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Considers justice and caring as organizing bases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Maintains a distance between himself and followers</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Regards himself as on par with followers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Strives to serve the public so as to gain approval</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Undervalues other people's ideas and strategies</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Aroused interest and motivation among his followers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Is willing to pressure and control others</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Seeks solutions thru dialog and joint decision-making</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>His power rests mainly on merit, based on success</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Emphasizes a wide range of human values in motivating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>A person of power and authority, always in control</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Strives to look ordinary, like just one of the people</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Upholds his followers' sense of public interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Praises followers individually for their achievements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Uses others to advance himself</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Trusts followers, delegates authority, and autonomy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Uses primarily administrative and economic motivators</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Instills a sense of community and care among followers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Sequence of Questions for Interviews
Sequence of Questions for In-depth Standardized Open-ended Interviews on Typical and Ideal Leadership Styles in Kazakhstan

After a respondent’s Q-sort has been completed and/or factor-analyzed, the following questions are to be asked:

1. Can you please explain why you ranked statement # … as +4, i.e., placed it under the most agreeable rank? Can you describe more in-depth what it means to you? The same questions are to be asked for the other two statements ranked as +4.

2. Can you please explain why you ranked statement # … as +3, i.e., placed it in the “strongly agree” column? Can you describe more in-depth what it means to you? The same questions are to be asked for the other four statements ranked as +3.

3. Can you please explain why you ranked statement # … as -4, i.e., placed it under the most disagreeable rank? Can you describe more in-depth what it means to you? The same questions are to be asked for the other two statements ranked as -4.

4. Can you please explain why you ranked statement # … as -3, i.e., placed it in the “strongly disagree” column? Can you describe more in-depth what it means to you? The same questions are to be asked for the other four statements ranked as -3.

5. Can you please explain why you ranked statement # … as 0, -1, or +1, i.e., placed it in the “neutral” column? Can you describe more in-depth what it means to you? The same questions are to be asked for the other statements ranked as 0, -1, or +1.
6. Would you like to comment on any particular statement that drew your attention? Why do you think this statement is important in terms of typical or ideal leaders as related to Kazakhstan?

7. How would you summarize your views of typical or ideal leaders for Kazakhstan?

8. What particular characteristics are the most important that would make for an effective public leader in Kazakhstan?
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Profile Plots for Estimated Marginal Means of Typical and Ideal Factors
Profile Plots for Estimated Marginal Means of Typical and Ideal Factors

Estimated Marginal Means of Typical Factor 1

Estimated Marginal Means of Typical Factor 2