

New Power through the Lenses of Leadership Studies, Psychology, and Politics

Kurt W. Jefferson

Spalding University

Robert D. Mather

Mather Professional Services, LLC

JaBani Bennett, Leslie Cairo, III, Laura Harbolt, Paul M. Ratterman, Janikaa Sherrod, Sara Story, Nathan Sturtzel, Jennifer Teater, and Christina Thomas

Spalding University

Abstract

This article will analyze Heimans and Timms' New Power (2018) via the disciplines of leadership studies and psychology with reference to power as it manifests primarily in politics and in other ways, such as in transnational space and socio-cultural and technological realms. The development of "new power communities" and the resulting proliferation of their ideas in digital time and space via social media platforms and crowdsourcing have led to both positive and negative political outcomes. The disciplines of leadership studies and psychology allow us to apply lenses that are unique and yet may overlap and yield new ideas that will help leadership studies grow and evolve as a relatively new discipline.

Keywords: leadership, new power communities, psychology, new power, old power, politics, social psychology, psychodynamics, crowdsourcing

Authors:

Kurt W. Jefferson is Dean of Graduate Education and Professor in the Doctoral Program in Leadership at Spalding University in Louisville, Kentucky.

Robert D. Mather is Associate Dean of the Jackson College of Graduate Studies and Professor of Psychology at the University of Central Oklahoma in Edmond, Oklahoma.

JaBani Bennett, Leslie Cairo III, Laura Harbolt, Paul Ratterman, Janikaa Sherrod, Sara Story, Jennifer Teater, and Nathan Sturtzel are students in the Doctoral Program (Ed.D.) in Leadership and Christina Thomas is a student in the Doctoral Program (Psy.D.) in Clinical Psychology at Spalding University in Louisville, Kentucky.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Kurt W. Jefferson, Department of Graduate Education, Spalding University, 901 South 4th Street, Louisville, KY 40203. Email: kjefferson@spalding.edu

The world around us has changed. Since 2007, we have seen the advent of the iPhone, increased connectivity, the exponential rate of change in real-time in technology, communications, and information. What once took months and years to occur now takes a matter of seconds. Australian social entrepreneurs Heimans and Timms authored a compelling work that covers a wide territory in the areas of transnational social and political developments in terms of human behavior, business, and politics. Their work also evinces the salience of leadership, psychology, and the importance of social media as a vehicle in understanding collective behavior, individual

psychological orientations, and, most importantly, how power evolves, is accessed, controlled, and shared. In their engaging book, *New power: how power works in our hyperconnected world—and how to make it work for you*, Heimans and Timms center the book on the mobilization of “new power.” They state, “the everyday people, leaders, and organizations who flourish will be those best able to channel the participatory energy of those around them” (Heimans & Timms, 2018, p. 10). This approach to the exercise of power is important at the individual and societal level. Individuals need to understand how to channel new power in creating or operating successful organizations, understand the spread of ideas or movements, and be perceptive to its beneficial or harmful purposes. New power platforms are important at a societal level because they can shape our thoughts and behaviors in the ways we react to the world around us.

In this article, we will analyze Heimans and Timms’s work via the disciplines of leadership studies and psychology with reference to power as it manifests primarily in politics and in other ways, such as in transnational space and socio-cultural and technological realms. What’s more, viewing this work through leadership models is helpful. The area of psychodynamics in leadership theory assists in understanding human behavior and its complexities according to Manfred F.R. Kets de Vries and Alicia Cheak (Northouse, 2016, p. 296.) With leadership theory and psychodynamics as theoretical constructs, this article will help those studying power in our world understand how it is applied in real-time and in variegated and complex ways. A discussion of the rich field of psychology will also help inform this commentary. In this article, we will discuss leadership theories and psychology, explain the concepts of old and new power as they relate to politics and the leadership of President Barack Obama and President Donald Trump, how theories of psychology connect to Heimans and Timms’s thesis, and make suggestions for further research and reading for those that seek to understand leadership, psychology, and new power in global political, psychological, and social contexts.

The World Changed in 2007

In 2007, the world changed with the introduction of phones that gave everyone access to the internet and a connection with others around the world at any moment in time. Heimans and Timms analyze and describe this mobile communication world evolving before our eyes from a social perspective. Thomas Friedman’s *Thank you for being late: An optimist’s guide to thriving in the age of accelerations* (2016) describes the digital evolution of virtual communication and collaboration with an emphasis on commerce and global markets. Friedman identifies the problems associated with digital accelerations and our new environment: “The world is not just rapidly changing, it is being dramatically reshaped—it is starting to operate differently” (Friedman, 2016, p. 28). We are in the midst of a new revolution that changes everything. Heimans and Timms explore the “different” from the social interaction or the crowd’s perspective. It includes the emerging power of virtual group dynamics and their effect on business, government, and, most importantly, social communities. We have entered a new paradigm of communication norms that change how the world works. A younger generation “has a new expectation: and inalienable right to participate” (Heimans & Timms, 2018, p. 19). This type of “right” is seen on campuses today, even among faculty, where the right to speak out and academic freedom are central to the shared governance ideal in running the university with administrators and governing boards. This decision-making model was somewhat unique to higher education; but, in the digital age, young people are looking for teamwork and collaboration (via formal and informal networks and channels) as much as they are looking to navigate it alone.

Leaders need to understand this new power configuration to keep up with the behavior and expectations of their followers. Leaders must be able to expand their networks and engage followers. In today’s society, leaders must be able to interact with their followers to build a system around a higher purpose via collective conversation. Leaders must also create environments that foster inclusivity and collaboration. Heimans and Timms describe this leadership technique as “optimal distinctiveness,” in which leaders build a group where “people feel like they are a part of it and that they can stand out in it” (p. 63).

Heimans and Timms suggest that the methods of current and future opportunities for the acquisition of power are changing. As a leader in today’s world, it is not enough to simply be an expert in a field of study. *New*

Power discusses how the “old power” is not going to suffice in leadership as our world continues to be globally connected through contemporary change agents who are empowered by technological advancements.

Old Power

According to Heimans and Timms, old power values developed from norms rooted in defined boundaries between in-groups and out-groups. The authors used examples of scientists and medical doctors who wore white lab coats and who saw themselves as authorities in their fields and shared the information they learned with like-minded individuals; or they did not share information out of fear of competition and propriety. “We,” as members of society, were willing to abdicate our control to professionals without input that might question their authority. Heimans and Timms use the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) as an example of old power and how its scientists began to recognize the decay of its old power-like processes. At NASA, courageous professionals took advantage of modern communication platforms by soliciting advice from the public. NASA officials then disseminated more than a dozen research and development challenges for public analysis. They then received thousands of credible responses from private persons in eighty countries from around the world. It was stated that, on average, it would take the Research & Development (R & D) team at NASA three to five years to resolve problems. However, since using an open platform, problems were resolved with the help of those outside the NASA community. This new collaborative approach was taking three to six months. This is just one of many examples of shifts in power that took root nearly a decade ago. One way to adapt to change as a leader would be to understand as well as employ “new power” ideas. From these ideas, Heimans and Timms conceptualize the division of power using old and new models and values. Such an example was referred to as the “New Power Compass” (Heimans & Timms, 2018, p. 28) which represents four labeled quadrants effectively classifying businesses and organizations as we see them today. When analyzing the qualities each quadrant represents, Heimans and Timms provide analogies of how businesses and organizations could be categorized and essentially managed. They further explain sociological trends by demonstrating that businesses and politics are connected. Humanity is no longer isolated in gated, segmented networks; but, rather, they are inter- and hyper-connected through digital means. Inter- and hyper-connectivity occurs when people are not only connected to each other via various media platforms but when those platforms begin to guide and mold human perceptions and behaviors. Specifically, platforms begin to re-shape the flow of power away from governments, businesses, and other organizations into the hands of groups and masses who then realize their ability to influence and control issues and events has come to fruition. Thus, the movement away from a small oligarchy controlling information and power to masses having access to information and real-time social and political power has arrived. Leaders can build networks by learning new modes of communication on Twitter, Facebook, Gmail, etc. For example, the “Ice Bucket Challenge” for Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (ALS) was shared on Facebook over 10 million times (Heimans & Timms, 2018). This event was created for a good cause fighting what is colloquially called, “Lou Gehrig’s Disease.” The disease attacks the muscles and nervous system and severely impairs physical mobility. Unfortunately, the cause is not known. Named after the famous American baseball player of the 1920s and 1930s, the fight against ALS is well known, but raising funds via the Ice Bucket Challenge was a novel idea. Its fundraising was greatly enhanced when scores of young people and various groups of people took to social media to douse freezing water on each other. This also galvanized an esprit de corps among people from different backgrounds connecting a global community, where people wanted to participate in the cause. A crowd was built in virtual space and real time.

Peter G. Northouse (2016) refers to the work of Bennis and Nanus on transformational leaders as “social architects,” meaning that these leaders can mobilize people to accept a new group identity or movement from shared meanings between followers (Northouse, 2016, p. 173). Heimans and Timms use phrases like “flatten the path” and “made to spread” to describe movements and ideas using a new wave of power, which is much more like a current than a currency. According to Heimans and Timms, there are two conceptions of power today. First, this “new power,” according to Heimans and Timms, is the power enabled by the activity and participation of the crowd. As stated by Heimans and Timms (2018):

The future will be a battle over mobilization. The everyday people, leaders, and organizations who flourish will be those best able to channel the participatory energy of those around them—for the good, for the bad, and for the trivial. (p. 8-10)

Understanding this shift in power is vital for those who want to influence, lead, and make a difference. Second, as stated above, the “old power” is hierarchical, defined by boundaries, and ways of thinking that are less participatory, egalitarian, and horizontal in terms of communication. The “old power” model is vertical in terms of

communication, top-down in structure, and more focused on small groups of elites making decisions. Thus, the hierarchical power of old power regimes in which control is held by few over many has many examples—the doctor-patient story of a woman who believed her doctor was inattentive, so she found an online community to help solve her chronic seizures. Another example of evolving power transformation was a governor in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil deciding to bulldoze a school for development of the 2016 Summer Olympic Games. The province’s leaders adjusted course when a young student used a social app to create a movement to stop it (Heimans & Timms, 2018).

New Power

The opposite of “old power,” “new power,” sees a more collaborative approach to leadership and participation. It is an evolving mindset away from the tenets of “old power.” Heimans and Timms use an effective analogy in the famous video games Tetris (old power) and Minecraft (new power). Tetris provides gamers a limited role in the pieces they were given, and the “top-down” approach eventually overwhelms the player. Minecraft also uses blocks, but it is a “bottom-up” approach in which gamers build the world they play in; and, they do it together with other gamers participating in the fun. The dynamic Minecraft model is practically unlimited; and, strategies and ideas spread ubiquitously.

Today, according to Heimans and Timms, leaders must compete and build their brands and organizations using this new method of participation and engagement. The top organizations and social movements will be those that best channel the participatory energy available.

Heimans and Timms refer to a company called DonorsChoose, founded by entrepreneur Charles Best, which “allows teachers to take matters into their own hands and raise funds for what they see as their classroom needs” (Heimans & Timms, 2018, p. 20). The online platform is very manageable and requires teachers to send thank you notes to supply funders. The niche market for DonorsChoose are teachers in poorly funded schools; and, the “citizen donors” catch phrase works as the company’s brand. The company embraced the social problem of educational inequalities and designed a cooperative platform between teachers, education advocates, and donors. The scalability of the new power era is an important outcome that yields efficiencies and utilities that assist in broadening the net of inclusiveness, reaching a larger number of people, and including those that had no voice or the ability to participate in the past.

The New Power Communities

Shifts in the structural paradigm happened primarily because of widening access to information and the willingness of people—both professionals and non-professionals—to share it electronically. Not only are people sharing what they know, but new technological platforms encourage them to offer opinions about what they and others are disseminating. With the onset of new power transactions, individuals are changing their beliefs about how they think the world ought to work, and how they can participate in the shift from old norms to become more competent in exerting new power in cooperative and collaborative ways. Heimans and Timms warn readers about some unintended consequences of new power. New power leaders may not have considered the fact that “bad” actors used the same platforms to wreak havoc and to cause harm. They discussed the phenomenon of “fake” news, which has been propagated to influence the outcome of elections and has threatened democracy (Heimans and Timms, 2018, p. 116). They also discussed how social media platforms have been used as a recruitment tool for terrorist groups from around the world (Heimans and Timms, 2018, pp. 48-53).

Heimans and Timms described a framework for new power communities which consisted of three components: (a) platform owner or platform steward; (b) super participants; and (c) participants. The platform owner is the person that owns the brand. For example, the platform owner of the Coca-Cola Company is Coca-Cola. If a company does not have an owner, the leader or those that oversee the organization are the platform stewards; they are responsible for generating interest in the company and mobilizing the community. The super-participants are those that are most invested in the company’s platform; they will energize the participants. Reddit’s moderators are an example of super participants. The participants are the consumers of the platform. Participants can also take the form of funders or affiliates. An example of participants are customers who use Uber or Lyft services (Heimans & Timms, 2018). These key factors—platform, super-participants, and participants—were seen in the campaigns of Presidents of the United States Barack Obama and Donald Trump. The platform is the online vehicle that candidates utilize (Facebook, Reddit, Twitter, etc.) to galvanize participant support. The participant is the vast majority of people who interact with the candidates’ platforms and in turn will be influenced and will influence others. The super-participants are participants who are either paid or unpaid volunteers by the candidates’ organizations. These

groups help build the message using grassroots activism while campaigning for the election of the presidential candidates—presidents Obama and Trump—as discussed immediately below.

Politics and New Power: Presidents Obama and Trump

According to Heimans and Timms, there are four categories of how people lead: co-opters, castles, cheerleaders, or crowd leaders. They described President Barack Obama’s archetype as “crowd leader.” A crowd leader combines a new power model with new power values to mobilize their community. When President Obama started his campaign, his platform was centered on “we.” He encouraged participation from the crowd. His campaign website was MyBarackObama.com (“MyBO” for short.) Several super-participants joined his campaign. These super-participants were volunteer leaders; they organized teams that gave them autonomy, and a sense that they were a part of something great. They believed they were changing history. President Obama changed from being a crowd leader to a cheerleader after he was elected. A cheerleader leads with old power, but still encourages new power values such as participation (Heimans & Timms, 2018). Some of President Barack Obama’s leadership style will be seen in President Donald Trump’s leadership style, but in different capacities.

Heimans and Timms described President Donald Trump’s archetype as a co-opter. A co-opter uses a new power model as well but does so to increase power for himself. His campaign began with the idea that Trump could fix the country. As stated above, Heimans and Timms described his platform as a strongman platform: one that is highly focused with an authoritarian style. His super-participants were those on social media as well as paid and unpaid volunteers; these individuals are those who are considered to have contributed the most to his campaign. They utilized their actions making sure they were connected and were extendable to society, which is important considering they are some of the most influential voices in the new power community. (Heimans and Timms, 2018, pp. 38-9).

Heimans and Timms argue that Presidents Obama and Trump had the capacities to create communities utilizing new power models. However, they differed in their approaches. President Obama’s campaign was about the people from inception. He focused on participation and put power in the hands of the people; however, he failed to deliver on this. President Trump’s campaign was about himself, but it allowed his supporters the freedom to express themselves in any form with no regulations. An example of this was seen at rallies where things got testy and physical altercations between pro- and anti-Trump supporters took place. President Trump was also able to maintain his leadership style, whereas President Obama, who started out in a new power model and values, eventually reverted to an old power model.

In studying Obama and Trump in more depth, a 2018 Pew Research survey found that 44% of Americans named Obama as their first or second choice for having done the best job of any president of their lifetimes, while 33% named Clinton, 32% Reagan and 19% Trump. This sample showed that of the 2,002 participants, millennials (born 1981-1996) were the most likely group to name Obama as their first or second choice. Generation X (born 1965-1980), baby boomers (1946-1964), and the silent generation (1928-1945) all had the top pick of Reagan. Two years out of office, Obama continued to be viewed as an effective president and a decent and normal human being as well (Cummings, 2018). “Barack Obama is a good person,” wrote Daniel Allott. “Obama has integrity and a strong personal character... he doesn't do or say things with the intention of hurting others. At key moments and during trying times, he has shown grace and humanity” (Allott, 2016).

Followers may not remember the political triumphs and losses that President Obama experienced in office, but they remember when he wept while speaking of the tragedy at Sandy Hook, when he sang *Amazing Grace* at the funeral of South Carolina Senator Clementa Pinckney, and when he openly showed affection for his wife, Michelle. Journalist David Brooks contends that with the election of President Trump “many of the traits of character and leadership that Obama possesses, and that maybe we have taken too much for granted, have suddenly gone missing or are in short supply” (Brooks, 2016). Brooks’ list of leadership characteristics includes integrity, a sense of basic humanity, sound decision-making, grace under pressure, and a strong sense of optimism.

In contrast, criticism of President Donald Trump’s effectiveness mounts. An ever-increasing number of books and articles describe his leadership in the White House as chaotic, dysfunctional, authoritarian, and fear-based (Woodward, 2018). Despite the criticism, Trump’s transactional, quasi-authoritarian style, solidified after years of successful leadership, negotiation, and deal-making in the business world, is familiar to and effective for his base. President Trump, however, did well with his base: mainly white people who have less than a college education. His supporters have four views in common: their dislike of Hillary Clinton, support of a ban on Muslim immigration, attitudes about illegal immigration, and a bleak view of their personal finances (Ekins, 2017). One can argue that President Trump is a successful leader precisely because he knows how to play to his base and communicate

effectively with his constituents. Heimans and Timms (2018) stated:

The Platform Strongman is a particular species of the Co-opter archetype in our leadership compass, and it is where we see such a big difference between President Trump's campaign and President Obama's. This combination of an old power, authoritarian value set and a sideways, unstructured new power model lies behind some of the most potent and dangerous leadership models in the world today. (p. 170)

To his supporters, Trump comes across as relatable, likable, and even trustworthy. His style is much like that of the man at the neighborhood bar who pontificates on everything from sports, to religion, to the state of country at large. Trump is brash but charismatic, wealthy but a champion of the working man, unscripted but to the point. Political scientist Balazs Bocskei explains that voters, "especially the ones critical of the establishment, disregard certain 'self-evident' facts while making their decision...in politics so-called 'facts' do not exist" (Bocskei, 2017).

If defining authentic leadership as simply "what you see is what you get," then one can argue that both Presidents Obama and Trump are authentic leaders. They readily reveal their authentic, or *real* personalities and characteristics instead of pretending to be something they are not. Heiman and Timms's portrayal of President Obama as the "charismatic crowd leader" and President Trump as the "rent-a-crowd to intensity machine" is accurate. President Obama's was a "highly participatory campaign—in fact, it was a stunningly ambitious and successful use of new power tools and tactics." President Trump's campaign grew into one driven by his supporters' high-level social media engagement and content creation (Heimans & Timms, 2018, pp. 164-69).

Herein lies the lesson of old power versus new power—new power techniques can be used for old power purposes. Conversely, Trump uses new power with the old power tactics of issuing decisions and edicts without discussion. Moreover, although Obama used new power with new power values of transparency, community building, and shared decision-making, he failed to continue building on the alliances he made during his campaign. Those alliances, such as working-class voters in Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, and Michigan, would begin to end by 2016 for the Democrats as Trump used new power approaches to convince them to support him in his campaign for the presidency.

Leadership Theory and New Power

Northouse defines authentic leadership as conceptualized intra-personally, developmentally, and interpersonally. "The intrapersonal perspective focuses on the leader and the leader's knowledge, self-regulation, and self-concept. The interpersonal perspective claims that authentic leadership is a collective process created by leaders and followers together" (Northouse, 2016, p. 220). Northouse also contends that leadership is transparent and morally grounded. Richard L. Daft (2018) explains that moral leadership requires the courage to accept responsibility, push beyond the comfort zone, speak truth, and fight for what one believes. "Leaders who operate at higher stages of moral development focus on the needs of followers and universal moral principles" (Daft, 2018, p. 188).

However, leadership, in and of itself, is not an innately moral concept. Because they are human, leaders are both good and evil, prone to goodness and wickedness, benevolence and selfishness. Leaders make mistakes. One can argue mistakes may have repercussions more serious than ever. Friedman (2016) writes:

As a species, we have never before stood at this moral fork in the road—*where one of us could kill all of us and all of us could fix everything if we really decided to do so*. And that is why, properly exercising the powers that have been uniquely placed in the hands of our generation will require a degree of moral innovation that we have barely begun to explore, in America or globally, and a degree of grounding in ethics that most leaders lack. (p. 373)

Initiating change is not always easy, but moral leaders "are willing to take risks for a larger, ethical purpose, and they encourage others to do so" (Daft, 2018, p. 182). Ultimately, the leader of tomorrow must have President Trump's ability to capitalize on the momentum of new power, alongside President Obama's ethical framework. Likewise, those who participate in new communities and follow leaders they choose must be able to discern between the two.

Northouse signifies the importance of Barbara Kellerman's book (2012), *The End of Leadership*, which asserts a paradigm shift of traditional power over the last two decades. According to social psychologists John R. P. French and Bertram H. Raven, there are six bases of power that increase a leader's capacity to influence others:

referent, expert, legitimate, reward, coercive, and information. New power focuses on the last power base, information; hence, the shift in power from leader to follower. In describing the transfer, Northouse writes “access to technology has empowered followers, given them access to huge amounts of information, and made leaders more transparent; the result is a decline in respect for leaders and leaders’ legitimate power (Northouse, 2016, p.11). This reinforces Heimans and Timms’s assertion. There are leadership theories, too, that are in tandem with the concept of empowering participation, flattening hierarchies, and demonstrating transparency.

Transformational leadership (what political scientist James MacGregor Burns first called “transforming leadership” in 1978) and transactional leadership theories could be viewed in the context of old power versus new power. Research in this sub-field of leadership has revealed that employees prefer the transformational style as it encourages creativity, builds trust, and inspires a collective vision (Burns, 2010, pp. 19-20). Furthermore, the focus on relationships increases motivation and morality in both leader and follower. Transactional leadership, conversely, merely relies on the exchange between leader and follower. It involves contingency rewards, corrective transactions, and management by exception (Northouse, 2016, pp. 162-63). Uber’s founder and former CEO, Travis Kalanick, was known for expressing distaste for Uber’s super-participants and was hopeful for driver-less cars in the near future (Heimans & Timms, 2018). This type of “transactional” mindset is prevalent in most old power markets. Meanwhile, Lyft’s efforts to work across the organization to solve problems, provide individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation are all key ingredients of transformational leadership. Heimans and Timms predict that if the price margin levels out in coming years, Lyft’s leadership and culture could be a key differentiator in the rideshare battle.

New power communities rely on owners being in touch with the values of the organization and the participants who contribute to its value. Similarly, many leadership theories focus closely on the relationship between leader and follower. For example, Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory notes that the quality of leader-member exchanges relates to positive outcomes for leaders, followers, groups, and the organization in general (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995, pp. 225-26). Heimans and Timms provide the example of the collapse of Reddit as a cautionary tale. A Reddit user by the name of “qgyh2” began the revolt by complaining about Reddit’s prioritizing corporate interests rather than user interests. The company appeared to shift the focus from the users and community as the main asset to the website itself being their main asset. From there more users joined in the “mutiny,” and the feed became nothing but topics about Reddit’s credibility (e.g. #RedditRevolt and “AMAgeddon”), led by its moderators. Owners lost sight and lost touch with their most frequent participants, ultimately leading to a revolt and an end in followership. To be successful, LMX theory emphasizes that leaders must treat each follower as if they were a part of the in-group. The more an individual feels part of the in-group, the more likely they are to conform and comply with group standards, beliefs, and behavior.

Two other noteworthy leadership theories to consider in this new power community discussion are authentic leadership and servant leadership. Authentic leadership is all about the genuine nature of the leader and the organization. The five key questions from Heimans and Timms’s interplay here, as an organization walks the line of making a profit while motivating and encouraging its participants (customers) and followers (employees). The identity of the organization is also significant in new power communities and the concept of authentic leadership. Ideals are very important to the brand and the participants. Examples include compassion, connectedness, passion, consistency, and behavior (Northouse, 2016, p. 198). Finally, servant leadership began with the 1977 work of business executive and ethicist Robert Greenleaf (who died in 1990) and states that leaders should put the needs of their followers first by empowering them and developing them into their fullest capabilities (Greenleaf, 1991; Northouse, 2016). Heimans and Timms provide many examples of new power communities in which owners find success when they consider how their actions will affect their participants. Furthermore, the ability of a new power community to empower others provides participants with purpose and support their self-actualization. These two concepts are key in servant leadership theory (George, 2003).

Psychology, the Psychodynamic Approach to Leadership, and New Power

Interestingly, the dyadic relationships of leaders and people, both individually and collectively, are a foundational context for multiple disciplines. Northouse (2016) discusses the strengths of the psychodynamic approach to leadership which includes studying organizational evolution through interpersonal education, organizational growth and decline, and the idea that humans within organizations can reflect on and learn from “their own behavior.” The systemic study of leadership that connects community, groups, individuals, etc. is another strength of this approach. The study of the “leader-follower” relationship is important as well. On the negative side, the psychodynamic approach to leadership focuses on the early clinical study of mental dysfunctions and pathologies based on the works of seminal thinker and psychiatrist Sigmund Freud. Other issues focused on

individual psychological dispositions and personality traits tend to overshadow the nature of organizational life and leadership. These can cause concern from analytical and prescriptive standpoints (Northouse, 2016, p. 306-07.) Thus, the fuzziness of the role of the crowd in the broadening of new power and how leaders not only lead in this evolving context but develop organizational coherence will be aided in part by the psychodynamic approach to leadership. However, it may also hinder the new power concept as a heuristic for conceptualizing and analyzing power and social inter-relationships versus old power dynamics and empirical outcomes.

The leader-follower relationship is vital in the grand scheme of organization. The duo works together towards a common goal. The key component to the relationship is the willingness of the leaders to lead and the followers to follow. Without this relationship, the leader would hold no power and would be unable to exert any control over constituents. The relationship is not meant to be an individualistic dynamic, but rather two positions that serve to enrich one another.

Sigmund Freud's psychodynamic approach has been refuted in the literature given the overemphasis on maladaptive personality patterns and speculation on the underlying causes of behaviors. His theory purports that individuals develop their patterns in childhood, which follow them to adulthood. His theory leaves no room for growth and does not account for the complex interplay of leadership, interpersonal relationships, and organizations. The focus is on the internal psyche rather than interpersonal relationships; the problems lie within the individual and not within the organization. Compared with the leader-follower theory, Freud's psychodynamic theory focuses more on dysfunction rather than function. The focus lies in the problems with relationships rather than the manners in which individuals work together towards common goals. Yet, in leadership studies, the psychodynamic approach is still valued as an appropriate framework for research and decision-making.

According to Northouse, the empirical research on the psychodynamic approach is rooted in the "Clinical Paradigm." The four main assumptions of this model include: 1) there is "a rationale behind every human act;" 2) the psychological life of a human being "lies outside of conscious awareness;" 3) the most central component of an individual is the way "he or she regulates and expresses emotions;" and 4) human development is a process through which we develop based on "products of our past experiences" (Northouse, 2016, pp. 296-7). Thus, various scholars and researchers applied the framework of the Clinical Paradigm and the psychodynamic approach to understanding the psychology of leaders in various settings from the general work world to the corporate context to more specific behavioral assumptions of organizations. Abraham Zaleznik found in 1989 that businesspersons did not focus as much on ideas and emotions but on "process and structure" in the organization. Zaleznik and Manfred F.R. Kets de Vries studied the "unconscious motivations" of chief executive officers in the organization and linked together management theory, political science theory, and psychoanalysis in creating a fresh explanatory analysis in 1975. More recently, in 2007, Jean Benjamin Stors found that the applications of psychoanalytic conceptualizations assisted in understanding the "fantasies, projections, and identifications" manifesting in groups as levers of "repressions, suppression, and idealization" in organizations (Northouse, 2016, pp. 296-300). Thus, a growing body of interdisciplinary research and literature, rooted in the Clinical Paradigm and the psychodynamic approach, has assisted in helping link leadership, as a lens for analysis, to psychology. Several important conclusions for understanding power and behavioral dynamics have followed as a result.

Certainly, individual academic, clinical, and research psychologists—who point to Freud or fellow psychiatrist, Carl Gustav Jung—connect deeply to the psychodynamic approach to leadership and discuss important concepts from hysteria to neurotics. Both hysteria (as seen today on social media outlets like Twitter and Facebook) and neurotics (which both leaders and followers may exhibit or find themselves dealing with in terms of followership) provide ample empirical examples to link to the transformation of old power giving way to new power (Jung, 2011). The ideas of clinical psychologist Jordan B. Peterson (2018) may help us understand the core practical function of Heimans and Timms's thesis. Specifically, trying to clarify an emerging epoch of new power is realized coming from "the hundred-of-millions-of-years-old hierarchy of place, position and authority . . . Order is the place where the behavior of the world matches our expectations and our desires . . . But order is sometimes tyranny and stultification, as well, when the demand for certainty and uniformity and purity becomes too one-sided" (Peterson, 2018, p. 36). Thus, to see a new order evolve, either out of new power (as Heimans and Timms conceptualize it) or as an a posteriori fact, means that new power appears to be part of a broader evolution of leadership and political power. Anne-Marie Slaughter (2004) argues in *New World Order* that the world is collapsing into greater centralization and integration. Slaughter, whose work was written 14 years before Heimans and Timms, argued that as the world centralized in many social, political, and economic areas, a supranational government of evolving international and transnational institutions was coming. This argument is incorrect. In fact, she argues that the world is collapsing into greater order through decentralized networks whether business alliances, shared legal edicts or parliamentary cooperation. (Slaughter, 2004). The liberal western model where the individual holds primacy is understood, and this is one area that is difficult in reconciling the new power thesis of Heimans and Timms. Not just

given the fact that over seven billion people exist on the earth, but that hyper-connectivity leads to hyper-individualism, which means harnessing people, whether individually or in groups, is no small task even via social media. C.S. Lewis referred to the modern world as a world of “post-humanity” where some are conscious and some unconscious in terms of general production of things material and ideational (Lewis 2001, p. 75).

These existential dilemmas refer back to the problems of our day in the twenty-first century where Friedman reminds us that we are the most connected generation ever, and we are also the loneliest generation. The paradox is difficult to accept, but it does connect somewhat to Nobel literature laureate Albert Camus’s concern that revolution will lead to tyranny. Camus (2001) states:

The contradiction of rebellion, then, is reflected in an apparently insoluble contradiction, of which the two counterparts in politics are on the one hand the opposition between violence and non-violence, and on the other hand the opposition between justice and freedom. (p. 286)

The advent of new power may, as Heimans and Timms admit, lead to this revolutionary and destabilizing direction given the use of social media and crowdsourcing for nefarious means by heinous actors. Theoretically, an interdisciplinary approach helps us understand the new power thesis of Heimans and Timms and helps us conceptualize broader questions of its merits as a heuristic, a concept, a theory, and as an understood empirical phenomenon.

Much of the old power versus new power discussion can be seen in the organizational theories of classical versus neoclassical (Muchinsky & Culbertson, 2016). Classical focuses on structural principles, while neoclassical acknowledges that those structures exist within the contextual realities of less formal human relations. Similarly, the Trump campaign was built to appeal to new power. The “drain the swamp” slogan is fundamentally about removing old power structure from the federal government and replacing it with new power and new power communities that reflect the times in which we live.

Conclusion

Heimans and Timms’s work is important. It not only resonates with people as it is attempting to create a new set of conceptual frameworks related to old power, new power, socio-cultural understanding, politics, and the technological tools that characterize and delimit our age. For these alone, the book and thesis have merit. However, scientifically, it is a bit superficial in terms of its understanding of transnational forces, sociological trends related to the evolution of new power, and its assumptions of human behavior (psychologically, socially, and politically). For example, the work of social psychologist Jonathan Haidt, an expert in political and psychological disgust, helps us see that the characterization of both President Trump and Obama’s supporters in dichotomous and simplified terms is not accurate given the complexity of the brains and psychological behaviors of both Democrats and Republicans (Haidt, 2013). Also, an extension of context for understanding voter behavior and political culture and values in the United States under President Trump, with reference to comparative European political contexts, might help the new power thesis in its explanatory power (Mather & Jefferson, 2016). Heimans and Timms’s work resonates given its attempt to challenge the old power order and give expression and hope to a new power order. Like other geo-political orders before from kingdoms and empires to longstanding orders based on real and perceived conflicts (world wars, the Cold War, and in the twentieth century to the Global War on Terror), the attempt to conceptualize how technological tools, media, socio-political movements, and other machinery and phenomena not only spread globally, but impact the individual at the local level is both laudatory and helpful. Going forward, this work should be read in context with leadership studies, psychology, political science, and other academic and applied literature. Future research on leadership will continue to connect the ideas of new power, leadership theory, and psychology as demonstrated in new approaches and concepts that are evolving such as “3D thinking and contextual intelligence” (Kutz, 2017, pp. 16-18), the distribution of leadership in flattening contexts (Johansen, 2017, pp. 8-14), and the importance of understanding neuroscience in “practical ways” (Johansen, 2017, p. 132). For students in doctoral programs in leadership and clinical psychology Heimans and Timms’s work helped contextualize abstract theories of work and organizational life into a broad holistic discussion about leading in the world around them.

References

Aldisert, L. M. (2018, January 9). Five must-have traits of successful leaders. *Success*. (www.success.com).

- Allott, D. (2016, November 16). Why is President Obama still so popular? *Washington Examiner*. (www.washingtonexaminer.com).
- Bocskai, B. (2017). "Post-truth politics" as the normal state of politics. *Tamara: Journal for Critical Organization Inquiry* 3-4(15). (https://tamarajournal.com).
- Brooks, D. (2016, February 9). "I miss Barack Obama." *New York Times*. (www.nytimes.com).
- Burns, J. M. (2010). *Leadership*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- Camus, A. (1991). *The rebel*. New York: Vintage International.
- Cummings, W. (2018, July 11). Barack Obama is the greatest president of our lifetime, 44% say in Pew survey. *USA Today*. (www.usatoday.com).
- Daft, R. L. (2018). *The leadership experience*. Boston: Cengage Learning.
- Haidt, J. (2013). *The righteous mind: why good people are divided by politics and religion*, rpr. New York: Vintage Books.
- Ekins, E. (2017, June). The five types of Trump voters: who they are and what they believe. Democracy Fund Voter Study Group. (www.voterstudygroup.org).
- Friedman, T. L. (2016). *Thank you for being late: an optimist's guide to thriving in the age of accelerations*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- George, B. (2003). *From authentic leadership: Rediscovering the secrets of creating lasting value*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Graen, G. B. & M. Uhl-Bien. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level, multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly* 6(2), 219-47.
- Greenleaf, Robert K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Heimans, J. and H. Timms. (2018). *New Power: How power works in our hyperconnected world—and how to make it work for you*. New York: Doubleday.
- Jung, C. G. (2011). *The Undiscovered Self with Symbols and The Interpretation of Dreams*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Johansen, Bob (2017). *The new leadership literacies: Thriving in a future of extreme disruption and distributed everything*. Oakland, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Kellerman, B. (2012). *The end of leadership*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Kutz, M. (2017). *Contextual intelligence: How thinking in 3D can help resolve complexity, uncertainty and ambiguity*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lewis, C.S. (2001). *The abolition of man*, pbk ed. New York: HarperCollins.
- Mather, R. D. & K. W. Jefferson. (2016). The authoritarian voter? The psychology and values of Donald Trump and Bernie Sanders support. *Journal of Scientific Psychology* May (11), 1-8.
- Muchinsky, P., & Culbertson, S. (2016). *Psychology applied to work: An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology* (11th ed). Summerfield, NC: Hypergraphic.Northouse,
- Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership: theory and practice*, 7th ed. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Peterson, J. B. (2018). *Twelve rules for life: An antidote to chaos*. Toronto: Random House Canada.
- Raven, B. H. (2004). Power, six bases of. *Encyclopedia of Leadership*, Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, *SAGE Reference Online*, 1242-49.
- Slaughter, A. (2004). *New world order*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Woodward, B. (2018). *Fear: Trump in the White House*. New York: Simon and Schuster.