



Conceptual Approach to Sovereign Leadership

Laith Ali Yousif Al-Hakim
College of Administration and Economics/University of Kufa
Amir Allawi Kazem Al-Zamili
College of Administration and Economics/University of Kufa

Abstract

The main objective of this study is to review the concept of sovereign leadership, as a type of contemporary leadership styles that have a strong impact on organizations. Therefore, it was necessary to know what are the effects of this type of leadership on organizations? how to deal with them? and what is the difference between this type of leadership and the rest of the other types of leadership, such as servant leadership?

Key Terms: Leadership, Sovereignty, and Sovereign Leadership.

DOI Number: 10.14704/nq.2022.20.8.NQ22976

NeuroQuantology 2022; 20(8): 9566-9573

9566

2019). Leadership arises from the need to direct the groups that make up organizations. Therefore, the concept of leadership has become more important with the changes that occur in the business environment, the increase in competition and the acquisition of the human element in business importance. Leadership is one of the most important concepts in the field of management and behavioral sciences, and it is one of the topics that have been searched a lot. This role comes in parallel with the changes and developments that began in the twenty-first century. When previous studies and research are surveyed, it becomes clear that leadership is the subject of many researches. It should also be noted that researchers define leadership in different ways. Leadership is the power to influence the actions and thoughts of others, and the ability to motivate and influence the group. It also helps subordinates to contribute to the goals and effectiveness of the project and the ability to build and develop a team that can outperform the competition in a competitive environment. Leadership is also defined as the power of influencing and motivating subordinates to

Introduction

The presence of destructive leaders in organizations reduces the spirit of participation and cooperation between employees and management because leaders tend to achieve their personal goals and benefits (Meyer & Meijers, 2017), where they show false sympathy with employees in order to confiscate their efforts for their personal interests, which leads to employees feeling frustrated and unwilling to work in the spirit of (Meyer & Meijers, 2006). Destructive leadership involves negative behaviors such as lack of support for employees and their work, and enforcing hostility towards employees (Kaluza et al., 2020). Researchers believe that some leaders behave in ways that harm their followers and the organization as a whole (Schyns & Schilling, 2013). It all comes down to the abuse of power by the sovereign leader (Breaky, 2017).

Sovereign Leadership Concept

Leadership has gained a lot of attention during the past decades due to the increasing responsibilities of organization managers within the context of work based on direct or indirect supervision and accountability (Daniëls et al.,



organizational goals from behaviors that have negative consequences, some previous studies and research have divided leadership into two main categories: constructive and destructive (Collins & Jackson, 2015).

Constructive leadership includes task-oriented behaviors that focus on defining job requirements and monitoring task completion, relationship-based behaviors that primarily aim to improve the quality of relationships and support workers, and that are change-oriented and aim to encourage subordinates and facilitate change. While destructive leadership includes negative behaviors that involve a lack of support and care for workers and their work, and behaviors that impose hostility towards workers (Kaluza et al., 2020).

According to the Negative Behaviors of Leaders approach, some leaders behave in ways that harm their subordinates and oftentimes the organization as a whole. As the negative influence of the leader on the subordinates is very severe, it may lead to job stress, emotional exhaustion, resistance behavior, deviant work behavior, a decrease in the level of well-being of their social life and other effects (Schyns & Schilling, 2013). As a result of the seriousness of this influence on subordinates and the organization alike, recent years have witnessed an academic interest in what is known as Sovereign Leadership, in which the leader acts in exceptional ways that are interpreted as certain ways and skills that give him the ability to distort reality and use tricks in his speeches directed to subordinates that enable him to win their sympathy with him (Smolovic et al., 2020). Moreover, Meyer & Meijers (2013) emphasize sovereign leadership as focusing on self-serving and mobilizing others to achieve special interests in the presence of formal or informal authority of the sovereign leader on which he depends to entice, motivate, inspire, influence, encourage and gain the trust of others. While Thiele (2019) sees it as the ability to self-directed change through the dissemination of ideas and knowledge in unethical ways with the purpose of manipulating, exploiting and controlling individuals rather than empowering them.

The fundamental problem of sovereign leadership is the discrediting of all notions of

achieve the goals and objectives of the organization (Cinnioğlu, 2020).

A leader is someone who has the ability to mobilize others to comply, not because they have to, but because they want to. Just as the leader may also have the formal power to demand obedience, the informal power to motivate, persuade, pressure, seduce, inspire, influence and encourage subordinates makes subordinates want to comply with him. Because driving is a license to be obtained, not a position. Someone may be assigned to a managerial position, with a number of responsibilities to fulfill and an associated set of formal powers to ensure compliance by subordinates. But to get a driver's license, a person needs to gain the trust of individuals and the ability to influence them to follow voluntarily. Hence, the leader is not necessarily the boss or the manager. Not all managers have the personal power that allows them to strongly influence others. Not all leaders should be sought from among the top management levels. Some workers can also have a great influence over other individuals in the organization. Nor are leaders necessarily heroes, which is another misconception frequently promoted. Leaders in general are not superheroes able to save organizations on their own. They work through subordinates, using their power to mobilize support and build effective teams, making them more organizers than champions (Meyer & Meijers, 2013).

So leadership is a continuous process that includes achieving the goals of the organization by influencing the behavior of individuals in the organization. Leadership is the art of motivating a group of people to work towards a common goal, and the leader is the inspiration and manager of the business. He possesses a combination of personality and leadership skills to make others want to follow his lead. Given these definitions of leadership, it can be said that leadership is a political-cultural concept that does not depend on formal positions, and leadership consists largely of acquired knowledge, attitudes, and skills (Akkaya & Üstgörül, 2020).

According to the common classifications of leadership behaviors that distinguish behaviors that reflect positively on subordinates and



establish regulatory procedures that help them be who they want to be. In this context, the exact opposite of sovereign leadership appears as servant leadership, which tends to do what is required for the benefit of others. Servant leadership focuses on organizational interests by mobilizing all stakeholders to pursue a common goal, and table (1) shows a comparison between sovereign leadership and servant leadership (Meyer & Meijers, 2008)).

mobilizing interests and organizational identities that are permitted by independent political expression (Huysmans, 2008). The sovereign leadership style emphasizes the importance of self-realization, by focusing on self-interest first. Leaders who adopt this style in their organizations tend to act in a manner consistent with their personalities, beliefs, and values, regardless of the circumstances surrounding their organizations and their goals. They serve their own interests by working to

Table 1: Comparison between Sovereign Leadership and Servant Leadership

Servant Leadership Behaviors	Sovereign Leadership Behaviors	Details
Self-realization service	Self-fulfillment on service	Focus on
common cause service	Pursuing the dream of a leader	motivate people
collective good	one's dream	Primary interests
Prioritizing the needs of the group	Meet the individual's needs first	head towards
What's in it	what's in it for me	basic position
Humility and determination	Pride and charisma	basic quality
Follow our vision - do as I do	Follow my dream - do what I want	intended effect
What is best for everyone, is best for me	What is best for me is best for everyone	latent conviction
I am behind you!	Follow me!	Guideline/logo
Intense dialogue	compelling offers	Favorite Tools
self-sacrifice	narcissism	common predicament

9568

Source: Meyer, R. & Meijers, R. (2013). Sovereign or servant? : cross fertilizing 20 approaches to develop a robust leadership style. 4th edition, Krauthammer International Strategy Academy.

2. **Positivity:**It is the sovereign leader’s possession of a set of personal characteristics or positive personal traits that place the sovereign leader among good leaders, which may be necessary traits such as determination, courage, and seeking to attract the sympathy of the listener when appreciating the difficulties faced by the sovereign leader.
3. **Vulnerability:**Some may explain the weakness of the sovereign leader in the moments when he makes false sympathy in his speeches. It is a form of manipulation through which he seeks to soften the humanity of his ugly face, as he is willing to sacrifice

According to the Smolovic et al. (2020) opinion, there are three axes through which sovereign leadership can be understood, which are (emergency, positive, and weak situations), as follows:

1. **Emergency:**The sovereign leader responds to emergencies and deals with them in exceptional ways, and acting in these situations is a way to shut down the opposition. His actions are decisive, such as restricting the freedom of expression of others or acting towards acts of violence against individuals, groups or other countries. In these cases, he acts with (force and decisiveness), which is evidence of the importance of sovereign leadership.



Dimensions of Sovereign Leadership

Due to the novelty of the topic of sovereign leadership and the scarcity and limitations of the study that focused on its study, and after reviewing a group of previous studies and research, the researchers can put the dimensions of this variable as follows:

1. False Sympathy:

Appropriate expressions of sympathy are vital in forming a relationship and bringing comfort. However, truisms and false expressions of sympathy often underestimate feelings and should be avoided (Velez et al., 2022). Therefore, the researcher believes that sympathy in general is a pro-social behavior, as it is a very useful method in dealing with social relations, but there are many cases in which their sympathy does not match the actual feeling of others, which is known as false sympathy.

False empathy is understood as an individual's tendency to think, believe, and act as if he or she has more empathy than can be personally confirmed or validated by: (a) the beneficiaries of an emotional response, or (b) the positive outcomes of an individual's application of empathy in relationships Social. Empathy requires that the individual be able to distinguish between his feelings and experience, his understanding of the circumstance of feelings and experience, and the understanding of the same circumstance by those who are on the receiving end of the application of empathy. False sympathy is worse than indifference as it leads to mistrust. False sympathy lends itself to false consciousness. False awareness makes the leader feel that he knows more about the desires of other individuals than they know themselves. So a leader who practices false empathy is actually a selfish leader because the actions that are taken to help someone are simply for personal benefit (Warren & Hotchkins, 2015).

himself in exchange for his sovereign power, or it may be interpreted on the other hand as the expression of the sovereign leader's real annoyance, contradiction and uncertainty about what he is doing and what It can offer it materially and emotionally in times of emergency.

Negative Effects of Sovereign Leadership

I touched a study' Meyer & Meijers (2008) refers to a set of negative effects resulting from the behavior of sovereign leadership, which can be put as follows:

- Conflict of interest:Wrong policies create an unstable and unsafe work environment. As the sovereign leadership works on the basis of achieving personal interests at the expense of the interests of subordinates and the organization. This difference leads to making the organization's environment a chaotic environment a ruined environment because the leadership and workers do not agree on a specific goal and there is no organizational alignment.
- Loyalty Struggle: The sovereign leader practices arbitrary politics and tries to deceive others in order to achieve personal or other organizational interests. That is, his loyalty is personal or to an organization other than the organization in which he works, which may cause conflicts within the organization between subordinates and the leader in order to get rid of him as he poses a great danger to the organization and threatens its interests.
- Trustless:There is a lack of trust between individuals when coercive power is exercised or individual decisions are questioned by the leader. This leads to making subordinates feel insecure and mistrustful of their leadership as it is a leadership that works to confiscate the efforts of others to achieve its goal.



subordinates by virtue of their weakness and domination and confiscation of their efforts for the purpose of achieving personal interests (Lovett, 2012). Many researches have indicated that negative (destructive) leadership may often reduce the level of cooperation between working individuals and try to weaken them and eliminate the voice of employees, which leads to preventing the organization from keeping pace with development (Starratt & Grandy, 2010).

3. Focus on Self-Interest:

It represents the tendency of the sovereign leader to adopt political behavior or political skills to achieve his self-interests away from achieving the interests of his subordinates, even if his self-interest conflicts with their interests. As he practices a narcissistic style that relies on pride and charisma in his dealings with subordinates, and believes that achieving his personal interests is more important than the interests of the organization and the individuals working in it (Meyer & Meijers, 2008).

Self-interest is referred to as the goal of satisfying personal desires. The leader is still concerned with himself with this loose feeling in pursuit of a personally satisfactory goal. The leader is motivated by self-desires because what drives him to act is always her own desires. An extended definition states that self-interest is when actions are intended to achieve any desire or goal that a person has, while self-interest is understood in terms of what the person was trying to achieve. As for the concept of sovereign leadership, it is sufficient to have a personal desire only to make an act serve self-interest, even if self-interest conflicts with the interests of the organization or the interests of the individuals working in it (Cropanzano et al., 2005). Self-interested behavior may have positive consequences for individual group members, but it also negatively affects group outcomes when the group level and individual interests are inconsistent. When individual and group interests are

2. Abuse of Disciplinary Power:

Abuse of authority means any use of authority outside the authorized use, including activities, limitations and purposes set forth by those entrusted with authority. Abuse of disciplinary power can be defined as corruption that is intentionally conducted to take advantage of the funds, resources, freedoms, entitlements, opportunities and interests of any person outside the authorized beneficiaries for improper gain (Breakey, 2017).

Arbitrary authority is a type of authority that has emerged today as an attempt by the leader to control the behavior of others through discipline and training mechanisms. Certain ways, develop their ability to self-control, enhance their abilities to act in concert, make them amenable to direction, and shape their personalities in other ways. Many researchers believe that the abuse of disciplinary power leads to a decrease in organizational alignment among working individuals, and the abuse of this power may include rudeness, humiliation, public criticism and anger, which leads to a high rate of work turnover and a decrease in job satisfaction among workers. According to the transactional theory, individuals who are subjected to the arbitrary use of power will be afraid and of little will (Raza et al., 2019).

That arbitrary power is somewhat discriminatory; It is the power that can be exercised "with the will or consent" of the owner of the authority, and it is the power that the owner of the authority can deploy, or cannot exercise, as he sees it. On the contrary, it is with non-discretionary power - power whose exercise is not entirely up to the power-holder, power whose diffusion is somehow restricted or controlled by something outside the power-holder (Arnold & Harris, 2017). Depending on the specifics of the account in question - to characterize a person or group as being under control is that the leader has the ability to exercise arbitrary power over



ability to influence the feelings and behaviors of others for self-interest or benefit. So emotional exploitation is a personal tactic used to advance an individual's agenda by influencing the emotions of others, either positively or negatively. Manipulative individuals may seek to exploit others in order to gain or maintain power (Hyde, 2021).

Emotional exploitation is the darker side of emotional intelligence. Emotional exploitation is the ability of individuals to manipulate the feelings of others in the context of self-serving (Austin et al., 2008). Th Grieve & Mahar (2010) extend current concepts of emotional intelligence, arguing that the ability to use and manage emotions can also be used in negative and malignant contexts. Moreover, Grieve & Mahar (2010) argue that emotional exploitation has factors: emotional exploitation, perceived emotional skills, and emotional concealment. Psychopathy, as a comprehensive structure, is associated with manipulative and deceptive behaviour.

Emotional intelligence is often viewed in a positive light. That Austin et al. (2008) have suggested that some individuals may use their emotional skills in a negative way by manipulating the emotions of others for their own good. That is, emotional exploitation is the ability to influence the feelings and behaviors of other individuals for their own benefit or benefit (Greeve & Panebianco, 2013).

Conclusions

The emergence of a modern administrative style represented by the sovereign leadership that works to weaken the organization in order to achieve personal gains and benefits for the leader. Sovereign leadership works to create an isolated work environment among working individuals that does not encourage cooperation and teamwork and prevents communication between management and subordinates. The sovereign leader works to subordinate the skills and experience of subordinates to

out of alignment, individuals subject to a promotional focus will be more likely than individuals subject to a prevention focus to pursue individual success at the expense of their group (Zaal et al., 2015). Self-interest is a powerful driver of human behavior and is closely related to the negative qualities of sovereign leadership, unlike servant leadership, in which self-interest is a positive feature as it is in the interest of all working individuals (Wu et al., 2021). They are defined as the tangible, relatively immediate, personal or family benefits of a policy. The advantage of this narrow conception of self-interest is that it by definition excludes the possibility of pursuing self-interest through expressive or other actions or through long-term calculations. A narrow concept of self-interest is also useful in reducing the correlation between indicators of self-interest and measures of values such as ideology, partisanship, and equality, so that the relative effects of interests and values on policy preferences can be very clear (Chonget al., 2001). Culture and attitudes influence the actions and opinions of leaders as well as the accounts they make of their actions. The accounts refer to explanations given by leaders of their behavior that appear to be inimical to organizational standards. Considering the negative reactions elicited by actions or situations based on self-interest (Miller, 2001).

4. Emotional Abuse:

The sovereign leader manipulates by exploiting emotional intelligence to appear as if he is in the service and care of subordinates and that he is in a state of deep listening to them, in order to form relationships between him and his subordinates on the basis of which trust is built between them, which is an artificial trust that is built on the deep pain and trauma that subordinates face and directing shocks in places More vulnerable in subordinates and not true confidence because in fact it treats them as content, sales and numbers rather than as human beings, and is defined as the



- matters. *Political Psychology*, 22(3), 541-570.
8. Cinnioğlu, H. (2020). A Review of Modern Leadership Styles in Perspective of Industry 4.0.1. *Agile Business Leadership Methods for Industry 4.0*.
 9. Collins, MD, & Jackson, CJ (2015). A process model of self-regulation and leadership: How attentional resource capacity and negative emotional influence constructive and destructive leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26(3), 386-401
 10. Cropanzano, R., Goldman, B., & Folger, R. (2005). Self-interest: Defining and understanding a human motive. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 26(8), 985-991.
 11. Daniëls, E., Hondeghem, A., & Dochy, F. (2019). A review on leadership and leadership development in educational settings. *Educational research review*, 27, 110-125.
 12. Grieve, R., & Mahar, D. (2010). The emotional manipulation–psychopathy nexus: Relationships with emotional intelligence, alexithymia and ethical position. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48(8), 945-950.
 13. Grieve, R., & Panebianco, L. (2013). Assessing the role of aggression, empathy, and self-serving cognitive distortions in emotional manipulation. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 65(2), 79-88.
 14. Huysmans, J. (2008). The jargon of exception—on Schmitt, Agamben and the absence of political society. *International political sociology*, 2(2), 165-183.
 15. Kaluza, AJ, Boer, D., Buengeler, C., & van Dick, R. (2020). Leadership

achieve his goals and objectives at the expense of the subordinates and the organization. The sovereign leader uses coercive methods, cunning and deception in dealing with subordinates in order to deceive the subordinates that the leader is working for the benefit of the organization and the individuals working in it, and in reality it is the opposite. The sovereign leader works on decision-making alone and does not involve subordinates in the decision-making process, which leads to the deviation of the organization from its right track because the sovereign leader looks from one point of view, which is the personal benefit.

References

1. Adelberger, KE (2000). Semi-sovereign leadership? The state's role in German biotechnology and venture capital growth. *German Politics*, 9(1), 103-122.
2. Akkaya, B., & Üstgörül, S. (2020). Leadership Styles and Female Managers in Perspective of Agile Leadership. In *Agile Business Leadership Methods for Industry 4.0*. Emerald Publishing Limited.
3. Arnold, S., & Harris, JR (2017). What is arbitrary power?. *Journal of Political Power*, 10(1), 55-70.
4. Austin, EJ, Parker, JD, Petrides, KV, & Saklofske, DH (2008). emotional intelligence.
5. Brännström, L. (2015). Carl Schmitt's definition of sovereignty as authorized leadership. In *The Contemporary Relevance of Carl Schmitt* (pp. 19–33). Routledge.
6. Breakey, H. (2017). Arbitrary power, arbitrary interference and the abuse of power: corruption, natural rights and human rights. In *Responsible leadership and decision-making*. Emerald Publishing Limited.
7. Chong, D., Citrin, J., & Conley, P. (2001). When self-interest



23. Schoel, C., Bluemke, M., Mueller, P., & Stahlberg, D. (2011). When autocratic leaders become an option—Uncertainty and self-esteem predict implicit leadership preferences. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 101(3), 521.
24. Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2013). How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 138-158
25. Starratt, A., & Grandy, G. (2010). Young workers' experiences of abusive leadership. *Leadership & organization development journal*.
26. Warren, CA, & Hotchkins, BK (2015). Teacher education and the enduring significance of "false empathy". *The Urban Review*, 47(2), 266-292.
27. Wu, J., Liden, RC, Liao, C., & Wayne, SJ (2021). Does manager servant leadership lead to follower serving behaviors? It depends on self-interest follower. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 106(1), 152.
28. Zaal, MP, Van Laar, C., Ståhl, T., Ellemers, N., & Derks, B. (2015). "Self-promotion": How regulatory focus affects the pursuit of self-interest at the expense of the group. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 45(5), 587-598.
16. Lovett, F. (2012). What counts as arbitrary power?. *Journal of Political Power*, 5(1), 137-152.
17. Mencl, J., Wefald, AJ, & van Ittersum, KW (2016). Transformational leader attributes: interpersonal skills, engagement, and well-being. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*.
18. Meyer, R. & Meijers, R. (2006). Sovereign or servant? : cross fertilizing 20 approaches to develop a robust leadership style. SISI: Krauthammer International Strategy Academy.
19. Meyer, R., & Meijers, R. (2017). Leadership agility: Developing your repertoire of leadership styles. Routledge.
20. Meyer, R., Meijers, R. (2008). Sovereign or servant? Cross Fertilizing 24 Approaches To Develop A Robust Leadership Style: Krauthammer & Strategy Academy.
21. Miller, D.T. (2001). The norm of self-interest. The next phase of business ethics: Integrating psychology and ethics.
22. Rast III, DE, Hogg, MA, & Giessner, SR (2013). Self-uncertainty and support for an autocratic leadership. *Self and Identity*, 12(6), 635-649.



