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Abstract

Human beings are such complex creatures who deserve to be sociologically and philosophically studied more deeply in order to understand relationships that are emerging from relations and are shaping the world and its institutions. Viewing leadership as a social construct, we want to focus on society in order to understand the way leadership is impacted. Thus, we drive our research through a general state of mind called disenchantment spreading in the postmodern times.

This thesis is looking into the imprint of disenchantment on leadership through its various attributes. With a philosophical approach, we attempt to provide a good understanding of key concepts affecting the minds of the society, extending them further to the sphere of leadership. Our research takes shape of the desk study grounded in the secondary data to which we apply actors methodological approach due to the value of interpretation in the topic in question.

Starting off with an outline of disenchantment manifestations and roots, we look at the context of postmodernity in more detail, finalizing by revisiting leadership through the prism of researched concepts. This thesis intends to inspire people to change by enlarging their knowledge about the current state of disenchanted postmodernity.
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8 HONOUR LIST I
“The snake which cannot cast its skin has to die. As well the minds which are prevented from changing their opinions; they cease to be mind.”

— Friedrich Nietzsche
1 Ready! Aim! Fire!

Change is a regular concept that occurs all the time. Sometimes people cause change, sometimes it occurs naturally. Change is necessary as it brings progress. All the improvements, discoveries, new thoughts and ideas represent positive change. Change in the society occurs often with certain emancipation. Peter Van Dam (2015, p. 293) talks about such emancipation through “depillarization” (“ontzuiling”). This term appeared in ‘Netherlands during the 1970s to proclaim the end of a society dominated by “pillarization” (“verzuiling’) (Dam 2015, p. 293). It means that now society ‘is not divided into several isolated communities’ anymore (Dam 2015, p. 293).

Emancipation is seen as a positive phenomenon of the societies, as ‘human empowerment: the emancipation of people from domination’ (Welzel 2014, p. 33). This emancipation resides in a call for freedom provoked by the human consciousness or “human agency, that is, people’s faculty to act with purpose” (Nussbaum 1993; Sen 1999 cited in Welzel 2014, p. 34). Agency, according to numerous authors, seems to be the trigger of emancipation because it ‘embodies the desire to be unrestricted in the usage of one’s potential for intentional action’ (Welzel 2014, p. 34). Plus, emancipation seems to be the path to finding a connection with the reality of life:

This adaptability in the emancipatory drive is vital: it ties subjective values to objective utilities. Without this utility-value link, human lives would be out of touch with reality and our species had probably gone extinct since long. (Welzel 2014, p. 34)

Throughout history we could observe a constant change leading to emancipation of society and thoughts. The society has gone from slavery to human rights, from social hierarchy to social equality, from absolute monarchies to democracies, from barter to free market. All the major social spheres have undergone drastic changes that surely left the mark on humans. Interests and worries shifted and the self-perception of human beings has been modified.

Following the latest social evolution, we can notice that beliefs are not ascribed from birth anymore but are the matter of personal choice and expression of the freedom of mind. At the same time such freedom makes human beings feel lost and alone. Every person has to look for his purpose that used to be generally granted through belief in God. Religion was also a mean to state the truth and no one dared to doubt this truth because of the lack of knowledge. Nowadays, truth is split in numerous pieces, which every person combines in a way he prefers, to build his own truth. This self-truth building process produced multiple meanings at the same time leading to the disappearance of one true way of thinking. Such “overproduction of meaning” makes every truth possible and this makes the definition of truth shift as well (Daudi 1990,
p. 294). Facing these numerous possibilities and at the same time no possibilities confuses people and makes them lose their way.

Our society is seen as a society of the omnipresent multiplicity, which was enlightened by numerous postmodern thinkers. Multiple meanings, multiple discourses, discourses of discourses make the loss of identity much stronger. According to Daudi (1990, p. 290) individuals are now their own recipients of their discourses which constitutes the concept of ‘discursive mirror’. ‘Foucault, Derrida, Baudrillard and Nietzsche’ say ‘that we are caught by our own discourses about ourselves’, that is why it seems impossible to critic the human being condition because it means criticizing our own behavior (Daudi 1990, p. 290).

We are blind and alone in our own room of ideology. We are blind, because we can ‘project onto the world only what we have already perceived’, which means things have a signification only in regards to our knowledge of the world and not by themselves (Daudi 1990, p. 297). The room that represents ‘our own ideology’ (Daudi 1992, p. 297) does not possess any windows or doors open to the world, but it ‘expands to envelop’ (Daudi 1992, p. 296) the world.

The signification of the text is not contained inside of it. Levinas (1972) argues that signification takes place only thanks to the idea associated to the object. The sense comes from the reader. Thus, the discourse itself means nothing, only the reader can draw the truth out from the discourse. This illustrates the fact that human beings are now alone in sensemaking, they have to make sense of what is surrounding them by themselves. Since the science and IT have erased the magic of the world, divinity is no longer an answer.

This issue of multiple discourses brings us the issue of seeking the truth. According to Daudi (1990), our society is now keen on the research of truth, which is much related to the one delivering discourses. As everyone could possess the truth, the identity of the one delivering the discourse is very important and sometimes very dangerous. The split of the truth makes some people think that they have it or at least the part of it. The terrorist attacks, which have recently happened all over the globe, are the perfect representation of the issue. One individual has delivered a discourse by claiming that he knows the truth and managed to convince many people, which led to the well-known consequences.

As Daudi (1990, p. 292) argues, the multiplicity of meaning causes disorientation and emptiness, which is symptomatic of a postmodern society. The loss of identity engendered by the loss of magic and the death of God favored these feelings. People are constantly searching for the purpose in their lives. Since we have to define these purposes by ourselves, human beings realize the loneliness in which they are living in. According to Daudi (1990) the world is lost between over explanation or no
explanation at all. A new way of thinking called deconstruction theory appeared in order to prevent texts, discourses and those who delivered them from claiming to have the truth and from serving as a 'unifying force' (Daudi 1992, p. 299). Derrida (cited in Daudi 1992, p. 299) sees deconstruction theory as 'a way of challenging any totalizing discourses which might claim to possess the truth'. This theory reinforces the fact that the truth is nowhere and the own definition of human beings comes from the individual's inner.

These ideologies and theories have an impact on organizations as well. Leadership, seen as the management of human, ideas and thoughts, is directly affected by the postmodernist thoughts. Leadership field is directly impacted by the multiplicity of discourses and meanings that creates the diversity of the concepts of leadership.

Regarding leadership in these postmodern times, we cannot help but notice the decay in this sphere. Leadership is supposed to be the guidance tool and not implementation tool. Leaders are being seen as super humans. Couple of humans are being empowered to rule the world. Their power is in the hands of people but at the same time people feel powerless. Social stability is based on the fact that everybody obeys the rules. Democracy seems to be the dictatorship which people put themselves into.

Thus, we wonder about the reasons for such a widespread feeling of powerlessness, of being lost, of having no choice among the members of the current society. Our world has no pre-defined meaning anymore and its purpose is fading little by little. People are distanced from the world, focusing on basic survival. We believe that human beings are living in the landscape of disenchantment.

In this era of disenchantment people are mentally living in imaginary reality while physically exploiting the real one. In this landscape everything is a proof of the disenchanted society. Religion does not dictate answers, people do not believe in magic, art has become a commodity (Berlant n.d. cited in Shull n.d., p. 67), science provides explanation for everything and new IT gives access to any information, the idea of which limits our minds and reduces our thinking capabilities.

We find the disenchantment of the world to be a very pressing issue, as it seems to have invaded every aspect of life, influencing the way humans operate. As the general way of thinking is being jeopardized by disenchantment tendencies, it also results in deformation of the leadership concept.

This issue takes a central place in our research. Through this thesis we will attempt to describe certain leadership attributes through the prism of disenchantment of the world. Through all postmodernist concepts we will try to explain how leadership is impacted and to what extent. This subject seems to be very exciting because it is
directly related to the study of human condition and human beings, which is interesting to the both of us.

This thesis aims to provide a better understanding of the arena leaders have to operate in and the way leader’s qualities are adapting to it. Thus, the research issue of the thesis is stipulated as an imprint of disenchantment on leadership.

1.1 Importance of the study

We both agreed at the very beginning of our process that the concept of leadership should serve to understand the society. We both were directly concerned by what was surrounding us. We did not want to focus on one company or one characteristic of leadership, but we envisioned more to talk about the surrounding world through our own definition of leadership and the concept that we got in class. We are both interested in issues we can encounter in real time, so we decided to focus on the contemporary society.

Our thesis could be seen as a quest to investigate the madness of the society. We find it urgent because people seem to be comfortable with this madness. Therefore, we wanted to raise awareness about the change that seems to be unnoticed. We wrote this thesis in order to highlight a passive behavior, certainly without pointing any guilty party, but with a well-defined purpose to gain knowledge about the problem.

This part is dedicated to justifying the chosen topic and sharing the reasons why we believe this work should be taken into consideration. We want to believe that our work could actually question our readers’ minds. Our thesis is focused on people and their behavior, it represents a genuine attempt to show another way of thinking and broaden people’s minds. As the creators of knowledge, through the process of writing the thesis we have taken on the challenge to put ourselves on the reader’s place in order to be able to assess our work from the fresh perspective. We are aware that the perception of the thesis depends on the reader. It has been very important to center the reader in the process since human beings are the centerpiece of this thesis.

From the very beginning of our process, we did believe that the world had gone mad. We could see a lot of reasons for it around us, and so many past and recent examples. Everyday something happens in the world, something that poorly affects many people, directly or indirectly. Our thesis is trying to alarm our world that it is going through a general crisis, the crisis of identity and life purpose. We did not want to narrow our focus down to one aspect in the societal issues; we wanted to go deeper in the roots of the general condition of the society. Global warming, financial crisis, poverty, hunger, war, terrorism are only on the visible part of the iceberg and represent only few consequences of the main problem. We would like to focus on the invisible part of this iceberg, on something we can more feel than see, on something deeper, that each of us
can hold – on the feeling of being. It is time now for humanity to be conscious of the impact of its actions, of the reality of the issue and of its pressing manner. We have spent so many years in our comfort zone ignoring the reality, now it is time to face it and try to make it better.

This Master Thesis is important for us personally as a self-development process. We could use our readings only in service of filling the white pages of our thesis, but it actually helped us complete our vision so we could perceive things differently. Philosophy has played a very important role in making this discussion more credible, to move it to the next level and bring the reader with us. We want to push the reader a step forward, towards critical reading of this work in order to create deeper reflections.

The topic of disenchantment has been studied for a long time. We believe that our work is different in the connections we are trying to make and analyze between the postmodern society filled with disenchantment and leadership concept. We do not say that this is the first time this issue is being subjected to a research, but we hope that as two interested in the world situation students we can offer a fresh look on the topic. Difficulties are too often being forgotten, and we hope we reflect our belief that it is time to shed the light on them with this thesis.

Any person living in our days could take interest in our research as it provides a rendering of the postmodern state of society we all live in. It could be very enlightening for people, as it could bring the realization of disenchantment manifestations and cause additional thinking process. If the society was aware of the problems it is experiencing, it would stand a chance at solving them. As the thesis describes in more detail the transformation of the leader’s traits in the disenchanted postmodern society, it could be useful for leaders, in particular.

1.2 Personal engagement

Alisa and I, we are of a different age, from different countries, with a different vision of the world, nevertheless we are both worried about the situation of the world. Probably not in the same way, of course, but we had the will to study the roots of the general state of mind. In this case the differences in our opinions represent the advantage, they create the richness of this thesis in a sense that we broaden our personal views, challenge them to make them emerge towards the same goal. We agreed on the fact that we wanted to talk about humanity in general and not to focus on a particular kind of leadership. For us, leadership is about human beings and the relation between them. It is a small picture of the society and we wanted to broaden this picture onto society. We figured that if we were able to understand how human beings act in society we would also be able to understand the leadership notion better.
I, Julien, have been personally worried for a long time now about the situation of the world. I was initially interested in the influence of the art on the world situation, especially of the street art. It has made me become aware of the power emerging from the streets. I wanted to figure out the leadership emanating from this kind of art, and the way it could help people to raise consciousness, especially about the problem of the egocentrism of the society that bothered me the most. In my country, France, I could encounter a multitude of behaviors reflecting this state of mind. I have always been worried about it without knowing what to do. The vision of the world is always a personal feeling, which is very hard to share regarding the lack of facts I possessed at that time. The frustration has increased with realization of my inability to change something. I realized then that I was actually involved and taking part in this egocentrism game. Throughout readings and conversations with our professors, especially our tutor, Philippe Daudi, I finally realized that swimming out of the aquarium to observe what is going on is impossible. We cannot extract ourselves from the structure. The best we can do is to try to understand what is occurring so we can actually analyze it. I have gone through this thesis with the will to complete my knowledge about human beings and the will to know how individuals perceive themselves in comparison to others.

I, Alisa, was initially curious about the behavior of people: the way it is being constructed, the way it shows itself, the main factors influencing it. I have been always fascinated by the differences in people's responses to various life situations. Human reactions are individual, still there are rules by which they are being built. I saw the pattern of the behavior intrinsic to the current members of society and I did not find it very appealing. In this thesis, I wanted to focus on something, which could explain the paradox of the society and hopefully give me the incentive to do things differently.

We feel that this study is important because we want to make people realize we are our own destructors and that we can stop it. By studying what makes society act and decide in a way it does, we can make it possible to change it. It is time to stop trying to find a figurehead that can take care of all the issues and it is time to face our own responsibilities in order to draw the concept of leadership on our side and not escape reality anymore.

This study can throw some light on the reasons for current leadership having the power over those who are actually making things happen. We hope that the study could be a starting point in the discussion on how to return the feeling of power to the individuals and how leadership could empower people. If this study can unravel the roots of disenchantment and the way it manifests itself in the current society, then it will help us realize what can make people change their way of thinking in order to make this world a better place.
1.3 Outline of the thesis

This thesis was grounded in secondary research, taking shape of the desk study. By conducting text-to-text dialogues and utilizing actors approach, we have tried to build the insightful theory which would provide our readers with a new improved glance into disenchantment. We wanted to emphasize how leadership concept is impacted by disenchantment in the postmodern world. Detailed methodology overlook is presented in the end of the thesis along with the description of ‘imaginary’ research that we were unable to conduct for the lack of time and resources.

For the sake of providing more beneficial experience for our readers, we have tried to systematize the thoughts in blocks logically complementing one another. Therefore, the following thesis consists of six more chapters, each dedicated to the major building block of the phenomena in question. Firstly, we indulge in describing the concept of disenchantment in more detail. We have divided this chapter in two blocks devoted to various manifestations and roots of disenchantment in order to analyze the concept from different angles. Third chapter represents a short description of the philosophy of Enlightenment and its connection to the concept of disenchantment. In the fourth chapter, we proceed with a presentation of postmodernity as a philosophical concept serving as an arena for disenchantment processes. After such a vast depiction of the social paradigm, we finally come to its implications for leadership. As our research is based on the secondary data, we present a general imprint of disenchantment on the concept of leadership through its effect on the attributes of the leader, which represents the research issue of the thesis. After drawing conclusions from our thesis, we end it with our vision of the methodological procedure of conducting empirical studies on the topic, as we would have done it if we had had the time and resources.
2 The Smoking Gun of Disenchantment

The term disenchantment was introduced by Max Weber. "Weber described the process that began in seventeenth century Europe and reached its zenith in the European Enlightenment a century later as the 'disenchanting' of the world." (Balcomb 2009, p. 81). As we believe that disenchantment is the leading force and direction of the current way of social thinking, it consequently affects the leadership concept. Aiming at understanding how those influences show themselves, we are obliged to first look at what represents disenchantment itself.

2.1 Manifestations

In order to describe the notion of disenchantment in the most beneficial way and include all the multiple perspectives, we have identified a number of manifestations, which are:

1. Loss of ideology
2. Loss of collectivism
3. Loss of connection
4. Loss of responsibility
5. Loss of tradition
6. Loss of magic
7. Loss of the power of authority

We are going to look into every manifestation in more detail.

2.1.1 Loss of ideology

To begin with, one of the first ways disenchantment seems to manifest itself is through the loss of ideology. Naturally, ideology is shaping the social world and relationships.

No doubt, a life-world is by its very nature grounded in ideology. It is from ideology that the notion of societal well being is legitimized. (Singh 1998, p. 155)

Ideology has always served as a constant and exhaustless source of life purpose, which could never ever be reached. In the modern days ideology is not governing the minds of people anymore. They freed themselves from the strict ideological dogmas to be followed day after day. However, ideologies themselves have always shifted through the process of normalization. They could have evolved to the point where no ideology is becoming an ideology. Assuming there is no ideology leading the world minds, then what is? Singh claims that:

in a modern society, not prophecy but reason, not hierarchy but equality, not vocation or calling but work, not sacred meanings but pragmatic
instrumentalities and rational-legal rules govern the day-to-day life of the people. (1998, p. 155)

Modern world follows the realistic path, as it is being called. Society is disenchanted from higher life purpose focusing on basic biological survival. Such an attitude seems to be a successor of Enlightenment thought calling for applying one's own mind in real life.

Enlightenment ideology, we may note, is the building block of Western theorising in the social sciences and constitutes the sum total of the notion of disenchantment. In the Western context, disenchantment is a process which leads to a basic secularization and rationalization of the people’s worldview and their normative perspective on the life-world. By this process humans are liberated (alienated) from the ‘great chain of being’ which bound man in a sacred-mystical relationship of hierarchy and transcendence with godhead. (Singh 1998, p. 158)

Even though disenchantment is denying ideology as a principal, it seems to be one in a sense.

2.1.2 Loss of collectivism

One of the main attributes of disenchantment ideology is the loss of collectivism, which was described by Charles Taylor (n.d. cited in Singh 1998, p. 159) as the rising feeling of individualism and anxieties resulting from it. Individualism, gaining popularity in the modern society, is absolutely self-indulgent as people are trying to claim that their personalities matter, that they are distinctive and different from everyone else, which altogether results in the ‘alienation of the individual’ (Singh 1998, p. 160). People are making big efforts just for the sake of being different and unique, however when every single person tries to oppose the mainstream, they eventually become a mainstream. We can see this notion in the rise of hipster subculture, which is based on the idea of leading an alternative life style, buying unique goods and exposing oneself to non-mainstream art and cultural products.

Singh goes further by saying that such individualistic self-alienation:

is further reinforced by the decline in community life and communal values, mainly due to the overwhelming growth of a mass society dependent on television, internet, telephone and other electronic instruments of communication. (1998, p. 160)

With self-indulgent individualism and the rise of technologies facilitating the social contact, relationships are starting to become more and more illusionary. Sherlock (2013) calls that kind of impersonate relationship para-social. He says that ‘today, para-social relationships have become widespread — potentially rivaling real relationships’ (Sherlock 2013, p. 168). This kind of relationship does not even demand for the existence of the real interaction with a person or even the existence of a person. ‘One can identify with someone without ever meeting them, or even if the subject is
dead, so forming a type of one-sided para-social relationship (Horton and Wohl 1956) facilitated by representations’ (Sherlock 2013, p. 168). In a traditional meaning, for relationship to emerge, there have to be two subjects present. However, para-social relationships do not need two people to exist, they need only the illusion of two subjects.

2.1.3 Loss of connection

People become more disconnected from each other and from themselves. Adding up current technological progress, the link between humans and reality becomes thinner and thinner. Current inclination of people towards their own shells and autonomic existence provided by progress signifies the loss of connection, seen as the notion of distancing. Distancing makes individuals too self-absorbed with their own good that they do not care to fulfill even those few responsibilities entrusted to them by the society.

Distancing from real life represents another manifestation of disenchantment. The main research on distancing has been done in the medical sphere, mostly connected with the psychological field. In psychology the notion of distancing was developed by Heinz Werner and Bernard Kaplan (1963). It is seen as a tool for a person to come to terms with one's individuality by separating himself from all surroundings (Werner & Kaplan 1963). Psychology also described the concept of self-distancing which means seeing things from the observer's point of view, which is used to help people get over painful past experiences (Özlem & Kross 2010). In leadership distancing has been seen as ignoring high pressure or distracting oneself from intense situations to cope with stress (Schyns & Hansbrough 2010).

From the social perspective, the notion of distancing also comprises of avoidance, passivity and susceptibility to the external influence in the matter of choice. Choices have become extremely difficult whereas people were left eye to eye with their freedom. Society was freed by the elevated sense of individualism composed with the loss of ideology, the guide book which used to show the right way and predetermine choices. Being ‘condemned to be free’ can scare us since we can choose what we want to be, so we have a multitude of choices (Gravil 2007, p. 34). Making a choice has always been difficult, given the necessity to know whether the choice is good or not. Today, when choosing a school, a university, a career path, we feel like we are choosing our future life. The pressure becomes so high that we are inclined to avoid making a decision until the very deadline or fail to do it at all. As we are free to be exactly what we want that means we are also free to make our own choices for which we have to take responsibilities. Hence, our mistakes and successes come from us. The fact that we are free to choose our own meaning of life emphasizes that we can choose our own role. Decisions are extremely complex to the extent that we do not know what to do.
Being unaware of our preferences, we become susceptible to the outer influences. This leads to making predetermined choices, which creates an illusion of making a decision.

2.1.4 Loss of responsibility

Distancing ourselves from making decisions erases the responsibility for the consequences of those decisions. This leads us to the next manifestation of the disenchantment of the society – the loss of responsibility. It signifies people’s constant intention to escape situations putting them in the responsible positions and come up with explanations excusing them from responsibility. We can see the examples of this in our everyday life: people blame weather for skipping their training, their alarm clock for being late, the oven for overcooking the dish, the alcohol for making mistakes.

The loss of responsibility is also connected with the Enlightenment perspective. Enlightenment perception of people as generally good and not naturally evil disconnects humans from their wrong doings; automatically making them not responsible (Todd 2009 cited in Brenneman & Margonis 2012, p. 231). Such pure optimism about human nature works as a perfect responsibility-lowering tool. However, when it comes to the loss of responsibility, its roots go way back past Enlightenment. We can observe ‘the loss of the notion of responsible agents’ (Gare 2001, p. 93) already in the late Roman thinking.

To generations after St Augustine the distinction between intention and outcome was completely lost. Law courts judged people solely on the outcomes of their actions, ignoring their intentions. Later, they judged them according to the correctness of their presentations to court. Finally they judged them by ordeal. (Gare 2001, p. 93)

The notion of responsibility was subjected to the black-and-white judgment. It solely became the price of the unwanted outcome. Responsibility was being challenged when the outcome did not fit the goal and nothing was taken into account when holding someone responsible besides the fact of such a discrepancy between the goal and the outcome.

2.1.5 Loss of tradition

Such attitude signifies the beginning of the decay of values. Attention is being paid only to the surface but not to what is underneath it, to what defines the surface. Modern society is going away from the core towards the surface. This represents another piece of social mentality affected by disenchantment, thus its manifestation – the loss of tradition. Tradition in this context has the meaning of the true core values present in the social life. Hence, the loss of tradition refers to the disenchantment with the true value of things. This loss of tradition is spread by the new generation brought up in the disenchanted times. We have encountered this when we met Sami people in
Lapland. One of the representatives of the older Sami generation claimed that the new generation did not support and cherish the traditions of their nation due to the lack of interest and to an inclination to use the fruits of the technological progress.

The loss of tradition occurs without anybody noticing and spreads among major social spheres. For instance, one of the things in which the disenchantment with tradition can be seen, is the largely overstated importance of politics in the current society. Weber, as well as Nietzsche, has emphasized the replacement of ethics by politics in the theorization of the modernization process (Gould 2011, p. 43). Traditional meaning of the most sacred things is being lost in the war to the more observable representation and bracketing experience such as politics.

This idiom of politics has more recently become the official ideology of development, particularly explicated by the World Summit on Development held in Copenhagen in the early 1990s. The notion of development has thus inextricably got linked with the human rights of the minorities, displaced persons, children, women and other vulnerable sections of society. (Singh 1998, p. 160)

Such bracketing is making people shift their focus from tradition to only the representation of the actual life value. Even groups claiming to be living their lives in accordance with deep moral values, to be the preachers of the true ideals are far away from the meaning of the values, maybe even the furthest. We are referring to the religious groups claiming to serve the higher purpose of their religion while neglecting the true meaning of the concept of religion. We definitely agree with Singh, when he shares his opinion on the issue:

In my opinion, religious fundamentalism and its terrorist and other activist manifestations have little to do with religion as such. Its phenomenology is rooted in politics by means of political violence. Religious fundamentalism, in this sense, is a modern phenomenon. It is totally alienated from the traditional worldview of religion and its life-world. It ethnicises religion and qualitatively disenchants from the practices and values of religion, robbing them of their traditional communitarian significance and commitment to brotherhood, which has constituted the basis of cultural and religious pluralism in societies. (1998, p. 161)

Disenchantment with tradition is a serious problem as it is situated in the core of the society. Values are supposed to be the uniting force of the society directing it towards sustainable operation. Losing connection with the core values is the beginning of the self-destructing path for the society.

2.1.6 Loss of magic

Core values of the society used to be substantially rooted in the belief in God. The loss of tradition has happened partly due to the secularization of the society. This issue
was of particular interest to Weber, who saw secularization as a religious rationalization (Goldstein 2009, p. 137).

In Weber, the process of religious rationalization occurs in the transition from mysticism to asceticism and from the other world (world fleeing or rejecting) to this world (inner worldly or world affirming). (Goldstein 2009, p. 140)

God was also the symbol that provided society with a sense of something magical and mystical existing but invisible to the eye. Therefore, secularization also resulted in the loss of magic, which is another manifestation of disenchantment.

The loss of magic can be easily observed even in children. Technologization of childhood causes an overflow of information that children are not ready for. Children and teenagers are too early exposed to adulthood. They tend to experience the attributes of an adult life in a very early age which leads to the illusion of the early maturity as well as to the loss of curiosity about the world and life and thus the loss of magic.

Weber is mostly highlighting the topic in the sphere of art and according to him, disenchantment happens due to the loss of magic, spirituality and myth in art (Grosby 2013). Art used to be the reflection of culture and civilization, the representation of religion, with the humanization of God and other spiritual characters. Before, the role of art was to represent the civilization and culture through creating myth and drawing religious icon. Art was the most powerful tool filling life with magic and myth. However, magic and myth vanished from art and gave way to trends as its primary theme. Art is not a reflection of culture anymore, but the platform for claiming trends. Furthermore, art has become its own critic, speaking about itself in never ending circles. People are no longer a part of art creation, they are being left behind wondering if art is still art.

In the discussion about the loss of magic, it is crucial to define magic. Weber has a very broad definition of the word, and he includes magic in the term of sacramentality and presupposes that science takes magic away (Sherry 2009, p. 379). Hence, Weber believes that sacramentality is also gone, as the magic is killed by science (Sherry 2009, p. 379). However, Brown and Greeley (2004, 2000 cited in Sherry 2009, p. 378) have much broader definition of sacramentality which is connected to the aesthetic. Having another understanding of sacramentality, they also believe in the enchantment of the world brought by it (Brown 2004, Greeley 2000 cited in Sherry 2009, p. 378). Regarding the relation between magic and science, Wittgenstein (1980) says that science does not necessarily have to kill all the mythical wonder of the world (Sherry 2009, p. 379). He believes that science and wonder can coexist together, because explanation of things does not take away the wonder of their existence (Wittgenstein 1980 cited in Sherry 2009, p. 379).
The Weberian point about the loss of magic and secularization occurring in the society and leading to disenchantment has been challenged by Hanegraaff (2003). He sees secularization as a transformation of religion and the shift of its role from the institution around which the society and its culture are built (Hanegraaff 2003, pp. 358-359). Hanegraaff’s (2003) opposing theory is based on the notions of participation, related to magic, and instrumental causality, related to disenchantment as an increase of intellectualization and rational processes. Hanegraaff (2003) highlights the differences of the concepts in connection to the way reality is being perceived (Hanegraaff 2003). Instrumental causality is a mindful, intellectual explanation of reality, while participation is a tendency of assigning primitive magical meaning and association (Hanegraaff 2003). From Weberian perspective magic has been lost as a result of the dominance of instrumental causality when everything has a plausible legitimate explanation. According to Hanegraaff (2003) in postmodernity the two processes coexist at the same time. Furthermore, Hanegraaff (2003) implies that magic has changed its form along with the world and has also become disenchanted. This way magic is still present as participation is instilled in the human nature, but as there is also a need to legitimize everything with the emergence of instrumental causality, magic has to undergo the process of legitimization becoming disenchanted (Hanegraaff 2003).

However, we see disenchanted magic as the loss of magic, and believe that secularization plays its role in the process of disenchantment. Gauchet (1997) is one of the first explorers of disenchantment as the loss of the power of God referring to the institution of God. Balcomb, also supports his vision, and he says:

Another way of describing the process of disenchanting the world is desacralizing the world. As space became desacralized, time became linearized and the human person became subjectivized. (2009, p. 82)

The weakening of God’s importance as institution of faith led to different realization of the human role in the environment. Having lost unseen power controlling the lives and fates of humans, they began to realize their own enacting powers. By giving up on the institution of God, people tried on the skin of creator and felt as those constituting the environment. This is how disenchantment shapes itself in the modernity.

2.1.7 Loss of the power of authority

In the postmodern world the role of God in the society was apprehended by the State. Disenchantment seems to have followed this switch of the roles. According to Lechner (1993, p. 130) ‘postmodern disenchantment usually expresses itself precisely as a loss of faith in the state’. Lechner claims that
it is not a disenchantment with politics as such but rather with a specific way of doing politics and, in particular, with a politics incapable of creating a collective identity. (1993, p. 132)

We can see the disenchantment with State on the political arena where people seem to be disenchanted with the political authorities and institutions. The saddest part is that among the whole scope of the population ‘in most European democracies, young citizens are first in line to express disenchantment with their politicians and their institutions’ (Bruter & Harrison 2009, p. 1260). Young people are increasingly reluctant to participate in the political voting procedures. They believe their vote cannot make any difference but it actually influences the results and leads to the formation of the poorly chosen government which determines the development of the country.

We can see this disenchantment even inside the political institutions. Bruter and Harrison (2009) distinguish three general types among young politicians. There are political idealists, socially oriented members interested in the interaction, and those aimed at career development (Bruter & Harrison 2009, pp. 1264-1266). Surprisingly enough, the most efficient politicians in the sphere of bringing social change are not those who are morally minded but those seeking reelection and career prospects (Bruter & Harrison 2009, p. 1266).

Orientation on career prospects seems to be invading all institutions, even when it does not correspond to the purpose of the institution. In the case of the political institution, its main mission is public service, dedicated to serve the needs of the population. The focus of politicians on their careers, rather than on values, which they are supposed to defend, interferes with the purpose of the political institution. When the actions or values of politicians are inconsistent with those of the party, it resonates in the loss of trust from the side of the followers, making the fact that people free themselves from such form of authority understandable.

Both God and State are the representatives of the leading forces of the masses from different times. First God was seen as the supreme authority, and all behaviors, actions and thoughts were guided by his authority, then State started to dictate the rules for societies to live by. Disenchantment occurred to both of those leading forces when those institutions failed to instill the feeling of collective identity into masses.

2.2 Roots

This leads us to the next part of this chapter, which goes deeper into the roots of disenchantment. We are aiming at providing a closer look at the social changes that brought disenchantment upon humanity and the way they are actually interrelated. We have identified two main fields, which seem to be at the beginning of disenchantment:
1. Capitalism
2. Rationalization & intellectualization

2.2.1 Capitalism

Having studied the disenchantment topic, we have come across the readings, which mentioned capitalism in relation to the concept of disenchantment. After identifying several manifestations of disenchantment, we have realized the existing link between the two concepts. We believe that capitalism was in fact one of the determinants of disenchantment. It drastically changed the way organizations were operating, and as organizations are the leading force of change, it led to the spread of capitalist thought among the minds of people. Grey (2006, p. 12) points out that: ‘the magic of global capitalism has succeeded in spinning an all-encompassing web, a corporate enslavement to money, sex, alcohol, drugs and shopping, or a concoction of all of these’.

With the development of economic theory and invention of mass production, organizations shifted their strategic models. They were buried under the piles of economic figures, which assessed their performance and determined their future development. Decisions were derived from the data according to the manual developed by capitalist economic theory. However, those decisions were not decisions anymore, as they were constrained to the simple choice from presented alternatives, derived from data (Derrida 1992, 1995, 1996 cited in Clegg, Kornberger & Rhodes 2007). Decision as the calling of the will was dead.

Capitalist thought has changed the way nature is perceived. Everything has become a resource in the capitalist machine of generating profit. The most dramatic change forced upon by capitalism occurred to art and its role in the society. According to Weber (Grosby 2013), there is a direct relationship between economic form and cultural form, between art and economic interest. Capitalism put the focus on bringing profit and success. Such profit orientation also succeeded in putting a price on art, making a product out of it. Lauren Berlant (n.d. cited in Shull n.d., p. 67) called such process “commodification”. “Commodification” of art is a result of capitalism that only added to disenchantment of modern society demanding for everything to have an assigned value.

2.2.2 Rationalization & intellectualization

Capitalism has been mainly enabled by scientific breakthroughs in the technological sphere. Technologization is one of the phenomena that is thought to disenchant. The role of technologies in the process of disenchantment has been broadly studied by numerous scholars. In the studies of modernity there are generally two opinions about the effect of technologies on human beings. Those opinions form in accordance with
the way modernity is seen, either as ‘massification’ or ‘technological atomization’ (Han 2015, p. 81). The matter of disagreement lies in the influence technologies have on individuality. For some scholars, individuals degrade due to technologies, for others, technologies spur individualization. The fact that everybody seems to be on board with, is that it all leads to destruction of social bonds and community effects. ‘Instead of a magical-mythical world, we have a human-technological world, magic being replaced by technoscience and myth by humanism’ (Han 2015, p. 85).

Weber also believed that the rise of technologies and science has mostly contributed to the state of mind characterized by disenchantment. Weber offers a simplified view on disenchantment, trying to put all the parts of the equation in two concepts.

Instead of focusing on the individual's estrangement (Marx), or the structural train of society-at-large (Durkheim), or the polarity between folk and urban existence (Tonnies, Vierkandt), he used the concepts intellectualization and rationalization to explain a larger process called the ‘Disenchantment of the World’ (Entzauberung der Welt). (Greisman 1976, p. 496)

Weber believes that rationalization led to the general misconception that everything can be calculated, taking mystery from the world and turning art into the island for escaping from excessive rationalism of the world (Weber 1948 cited in Sherry 2009, p. 370). Weber is supported by Cervantes in seeing the roots of disenchantment coming from systematization which led to universalism and massification (Gould 2011, p. 42). In art, this idea shows in a production of serialized popularist pieces. In literature, for instance, disenchantment is seen as “a product of nineteenth century romanticism” expressed in ‘transformations in literary forms, such as serialized novel’ (Asad 2003 cited in Gould 2011, p. 40).

Rationalization, which led to the loss of magic in art, also extends its influence to other spheres mainly due to the general transparency of the world enabled by technological development. Vast technological advancement granted general availability of any knowledge and possibility of its acquirement by anyone, which gave birth to the notion of intellectualization. Weber (1968) connects intellectualization with a loss of meaning which is primarily controversial. He says that 'as intellectualism suppresses belief in magic, the world's processes become disenchanted, lose their magical significance, and henceforth simply 'are' and 'happen' but no longer signify anything' (Weber 1968 cited in Greisman 1976, p. 497). This means that in disenchanted world the focus lies in the fact of occurrence, in simplicity of judgement, in polar alternatives like black or white, yes or no. Disenchantment erases the spiritual meaning of life, everything that is in-between, and everything that is actually important.
Even though, technologization, rationalization and intellectualization were meant to bring clarity into the ambiguous world, they do not seem to fully fulfill its purpose.

The logic of disenchantment which had led to the ascendance of technology, to a cyber-society or the up-coming information society, has ceased to inform. It lacks transparency. The mega-structures of the media and communication with their global speed and invisible controls tend to reduce human beings to abstractions or digital numbers and take away from the nation-state the effective power to intervene. This nurtures a diffuse feeling among the citizens, that of the loss of identity or of an authentic self. (Singh 1998, p. 163)

Media progress also resulted in the change of the way information is being served. Even though, information is supposed to be free from any influence in the liberal world claiming to have total freedom of speech, management of the information still seems to be in place. Information that is presented to the massive access is not objective, but processed and interpretative. Such processed information is feeding people with conclusions, with already developed thoughts and judgements, leaving no room for interpretation.

Han (2015) goes beyond the concepts of rationalization and intellectualization and reveals the ontological perspective on disenchantment. Han writes:

that disenchantment is not merely another term for rationalization and intellectualization, but a descriptor for a revolution in the traditional layout of the relations between humans, nature and God, or what I call ‘ontocosmology. (2015, p. 80)

Such interpretation is a step outside of the box in a way that the focus lands on the relations between people or concepts, on the interactions and in-betweens. The ontological look at disenchantment puts the human in the spotlight.

2.3 First step towards Enchantment

Overlooking the manifestations of the disenchantment phenomenon that are composed of all the losses that society has encountered because of it, we can unintentionally see a rather negative idea of disenchantment being built. Such representation of the concept of disenchantment brings up the topic of its fatality, on which different scholars have multiple opinions. Weber sees disenchantment as a logical continuation of modernity, hence inevitable world order, while Adorno believes it is just an ideology and can be prevented from spreading (Greisman 1976, pp. 495-496).

Jenkins shows at length that the disenchantment of Western societies, brought about during the Enlightenment period, was by no means homogeneous. On the contrary, enchantment has always existed, even throughout the Enlightenment. (Jenkins 2000 cited in Sherlock 2013, p. 173)
He believes that new technological development can bring back the mystery of the world, re-enchanting the society (Jenkins 2000 cited in Sherlock 2013, p. 173). There is a multitude of opinions on the issue of reversing the tendency of disenchantment and enchanting society in the discourse.

Ernst Gellner feels that the solution to the crisis of modernity in Western society will come from the evolutionary process of disenchantment itself. In other words, the social pathology of post-industrial society could be overcome by strengthening the meaningfulness of leisure time, re-scheduling work and employment, redefining the role of education in society and by increasing the empowerment of individual rights through voluntary civic institutions. Charles Taylor seeks the solution in the ‘ethic of authenticity’ and in the primacy of dialogue in human relationships, by enriching ‘the self-affirming freedom of the individuals’. Habermas anticipates that a possible solution may lie in a social and cultural agenda of legitimation which strengthens communicative interaction. All these and other similar solutions bypass the issue of moral autonomy. (Singh 1998, p. 164)

None of those suggestions, though, take into account the pluralism of moral values that combines their instrumental use, intrinsic to modernity, with tradition, comprising existential information about human beings. We cannot claim that modernity should be given up in favor of tradition. These two concepts complete each other and are not autonomous in any sense.

The crisis of disenchantment therefore cannot be resolved by a swing away from disenchantment or modernity to enchantment with tradition, but by establishing an interactive relationship between modernity and tradition within the framework of pluralism. (Singh 1998, p. 165)

We cannot just escape from the problem of disenchantment as it is deeply rooted in the contemporary society. It has to be embraced as a part of today’s reality and dealt with by overcoming its challenges through building a strong relationship of interacting concepts. We have to create a new inclusive foundation for further social development.
3 Enlightenment Bullet

We see disenchantment as the parasite of human thought. The minds of people are overtaken by the disenchantment filter disconnecting them from reality. The worst part about it is non-awareness of the existence of the problem as such. Kant (1784) in fact presented the issue of the lack of consciousness about our mental enslavement long ago in his essay “An Answer to the Question: "What is Enlightenment?"

Kant (1784, p. 1) describes a society dominated by ‘laziness and cowardice’, not able to take responsibilities and not capable to think for itself. Through his religious analysis, he explains how society can, indeed, easily abandon the will to act and think for itself (Kant 1784). Thus, Kant (1784) describes an immature society dominated by different structures. In this society people are consumed by general thinking trying to fit into the picture drawn out for the role they are occupying (Kant 1784). People share a fundamental understanding about how things work and occur on which they build their behavior (Kant 1784). From Kant’s (1784) perspective society misinterpreted the concept of obeying, spreading it onto the fields where it did not belong to. According to Kant (1784, p. 2) ‘obedience is imperative’ but in a certain condition. As he says, humans are not machines but they have the capabilities to think for themselves, so to critic, to judge what is happening in a different culture (Kant 1784). Kant (1784) supported the system in which people were obeying the rules established by legitimate authorities, however, according to him, the power of those rules and authorities could go as far as the roles taken on by people for sustaining the work of system but could not overtake their minds, opinions and expressions of those. He referred to such mindset as immaturity (Kant 1784). Kant (1784, p. 2) believes that promoting blind followership in order to ‘secure for all time a constant guardianship over each of its members’ is exactly the way to counter enlightenment.

For Kant (1784) enlightenment resides in people exercising their own reason in all spheres of life. Such constant process of reasoning involves having self-developed thoughts and opinions, stating those and holding responsibility for them. Kant’s (1784) vision of enlightened society came down to the one grown-up in its use of knowledge and free from imposed beliefs. At his time he did not seem to observe this desirable state of society, hence he referred to his time as ‘age of enlightenment’, probably implying that the process had been initiated but still in progress (Kant 1784). Kant (1784) saw enlightenment as massive and slowly occurring process. He saw revolutionary methods as the best for changing the consequences, the visible results, but not fit for changing the mindset, the unconscious, and the roots of the problem (Kant 1784).
For enlightenment to occur, it needed freedom in people’s minds (Kant 1784). People, though, can experience freedom only in comparison to slavery. This controversy plays perfectly into the structure of the society, which restrains freedom of people in their civil lives. At the same time it allows people to think freely and develop their own understanding of reality, leading to improvement of maturity in thinking. Kant (1784) goes as far as saying that the relationship between civil freedom and mind freedom works both ways, implying that society, exercising the freedom of thought, requires less control in sustaining civil freedom. Enlightenment according to Kant (1784) means dropping the faculty and thinking for thyself, it means giving civil freedoms up in order to gain freedom of mind. The general thought is that society, under any form, prevents to reach this freedom (Kant 1784). Kant (1784) denounces the ‘restriction of freedom’ (p. 3) through the concept called ‘the learning man’ (p. 2). It describes a man constantly learning and considered as someone who can only receive information as true. The learning man is not allowed to think, to judge. Kant (1784, p. 1) also says that the learning man encounters difficulties to ‘work his way out of the immaturity’, mostly because individuals are this immaturity, ‘it has become a second nature’. The fact is that the will to reach this state of freedom, to allow thyself to have a judgment on what is surrounding us, is a matter of personal choice of each individual. Freedom cannot be imposed or gained from outer sources, it can only be fostered inside the individual.

Two hundred years ago men were incapable of liberating their minds from a general behavior (Kant 1784). This emancipation explained by enlightenment has not been implemented yet. This means society is not enlightened yet and all the development throughout history could only be products from enlightenment. Individuals still define themselves as a group or ethnical affiliation. The values and assumptions, given by those groups, are taken for granted and rarely called into question.

The concept of enlightenment itself also seems to be taken for granted as there have not been many volunteers to oppose it.

The most radical criticism is undertaken by Adorno and Horkheimer in Dialectic of Enlightenment. Adorno and Horkheimer argue that twentieth-century totalitarianism should not be seen as a perversion of enlightened hopes for a rational and free society, but as the truth of a “dialectic of enlightenment,” which hides a kernel of irrationality and self-destruction. (Deligiorgi 2005, p. 173)

This criticism is only pointing out the dualism of the consequences of enlightenment, which resembles the grounds of disenchantment. Moreover, it looks like the goals of enlightenment, such as the multiplicity of reasoning, are right now in the roots of disenchantment. ‘Modernization, rationalization, industrialization, bureaucratization—all are Enlightenment products. So is Modern Man (and Woman). We are Enlightenment’s heirs’ (Hummel 2006, p. 315). Enlightenment products enumerated
by Hummel (2006) seem to represent the roots of disenchantment. Henceforth we see disenchantment as logically deriving from enlightenment, and we believe disenchantment could be the result of enlightenment or its manifestation.
4 Postmodern Magnifying Glass

After having investigated the concept of disenchantment through its manifestations and roots, we find that there is still a huge part missing necessary for building the whole picture. The missing piece is the background of disenchantment, which is represented by the shift from modernity to postmodernity where disenchantment is flourishing right now. In order to analyze postmodernity, it is crucial to understand its ancestor, which is modernity. On that account, we are going to take a look at the distinction between the two notions, built on the work of Maffesoli (1996), who analyzed the shift in the social ideologies and also organizations from modernity to postmodernity in the most comprehensive way.

4.1 Modernity VS Postmodernity

In his writing, Maffesoli (1996) characterizes the two periodic epochs by prevailing order in a number of domains such as social structure, the place of a person in it and criteria for group formation. The criterion of social structure signifies the way society organizes itself for the better functioning. On the topic of the place of the person in the society, it is essential to recognize the difference between the concepts of the social and sociality intrinsic to modernity and postmodernity respectively. The last criterion highlighted by Maffesoli (1996) is one of the main comparison points between modernity and postmodernity. Maffesoli dedicated a lot of time to studying the issue of group formations and he believed that:

> whatever name we give these groupings - kinship groups, family groups, secondary groups, peer groups - there is a process of tribalism at work that has always excited but which, according to the era, has been more or less valued. (1996, p. 69)

4.1.1 Modernity

According to Arran Gare (2001, p. 77), ‘modernity is the cultural era that began in Europe in 15th, 16th and 17th centuries with the Renaissance’. The peak of modernism occurred in the 19th with the creation of ‘global market organised through a global system’ (Gare 2001, p. 77).

Modernity was built on the mechanical structure (Maffesoli 1996). With the development of machinery and rise of democracy, politics and economy have become main social domains.

According to Arran Gare (2001, p. 77), ‘modernity has generated massive technological development that have enabled humans to dominate nature as never before’. Gare (2001) evokes the rise of capitalism, which occurred in the age of modernity and was mainly responsible for shaping it. The contradiction enlightened by the modern theory
is that modernists wanted to free society from ‘political, economical and social constraints’ by setting a ‘global community’ (Gare 2001, p. 78). The primary issue of modernity is its delusion and Gare (2001, p. 78) points that out by saying that modernity is ‘upheld more for the future it promises than [for what] it has achieved’. The global market and the rise of technology have been settled in order to offer a bright future. The fact is that this market growth and technological boost were not controlled by any forces and were mostly market oriented.

Talking about the second distinction criterion, which is the place of a person in the society, in modernity it comes from the mechanical structure based on capitalism. Individuals are defined by their function in the political-economic organizations. This means that every individual has a role in the big chain of production and is primarily identified with that role. People are seen valuable for the function they fulfill. This determines that in modernity society can be characterized by the prevalence of ‘social’, which ‘is based on the rational association of individuals having a precise identity and an autonomous existence’ (Maffesoli 1996, p. 95). Relationships are built on contractual basis which means that the contractual relationships have the primary value and are the point of reference for self- and social identification of the individual.

### 4.1.2 Postmodernity

Postmodernity shifts the focus from the mechanical structures back to nature and its organic complexity (Maffesoli 1996). People take a step back to restore their connection with nature, which results in the replacement of organizations being in the center of social structure by masses.

Postmodern society is grounded in ‘sociality’, which is ‘founded on the fundamental ambiguity of symbolic structuring’ (Maffesoli 1996, p. 95). Sociality is not individualistic; it is based on the organic social interactions of personalities (Maffesoli 1996). Maffesoli (1996) points out that sociality comes from human nature and is not imposed from above.

Relationships are not tied by contracts but form naturally in the tribes created on the ground of personal affections. Tribalism in postmodernity takes the shape of neo-tribalism, being the formation of the micro-groups of lifestyles. In the interview Maffesoli talks about the distinctive features of neo-tribalism:

> What, in contrast, is particularly specific to neo-tribalism is the feeling of belonging or simply sharing a taste or style. For my part, I consider that we are only at the beginning of this process. That is to say that, increasingly, the social mosaic will consist of multiple tribes. They will be small entities with common specific tastes that they share and hold in common: sex, music, sport, religion, consumption, etc. This spiralling return of the tribal form is marked, as I have said, by technological development. We can see this in the multiplication of community sites of
various kinds, which are found especially on the internet, in the Twitter phenomenon and other means of interactive communication. (cited in Tyldesley 2013, p. 112)

People are more and more defined by different social roles they are fulfilling; at the same time the development of personality is a key concept in person’s identification.

4.2 Behind the Curtains of Postmodernity

After drawing a line between the two social ideologies of modernity and postmodernity, we want to dive into the latter in order to highlight the way it contributes to the notion of disenchantment. We have identified a number of directions in which postmodernity reveals itself, such as:

1. Relation to time
2. Social structure
3. Multiplicity of meaning
4. Decay of intellectual life
5. Reality perception
6. Normalization
7. Power of discourse

4.2.1 Relation to time

The distinguishing features of postmodernity begin with its relation to time. In modernity the division of the world, hierarchy of power and importance, the social order of the world were built in a service towards greater future. Humanity believed in the story of the future and was operating towards achieving it. Postmodernity is the phase when this story of the future seems to not be supported by believing individuals. As the world around has been shaped for the sake of making the envisioned future come true, people are starting to question it as soon as they lose faith in this story of the future.

Postmodernity is seen as liberation from modernity (Gare 2001). As a result, postmodernity can be characterized by the loss of belief in destinies and the future (Gare 2001). Some individuals used to feel the desire to know what their future holds, so they turned to fortune tellers seeking for that knowledge. Currently, fortune telling is not popular anymore and is not considered trustworthy, furthermore it has become the subject of jokes or sci-fi movies. The concept of future disappeared, replaced by the importance to live in the present. This theory extended towards the poststructuralism and the notion of defining thyself as a human being and no longer ‘through social forces’ (Duignan 2014). It does not accept the elitism of the concepts; it encourages minorities to stand up for themselves and is almost encouraging anarchism (Gare 2001).
Gare (2001) is also wondering if postmodernism was just a small step on the way towards more radical modernism, making it just a step between two modernity periods. When the future vision lost its followers, it gave rise to postmodernism, which coincided with the emergence of neo-liberalism and globalization, which in turn only reinstated the future vision and strengthened the belief in it, simultaneously killing postmodernist thought (Gare 2001, p. 80).

In our opinion, postmodernity has also changed the value assigned to the concept of time. The recent shift of time 30 minutes forward in Venezuela for the sake of saving power has caused a discussion between us on the topic of the notion of time in a postmodern context. We both agreed that time was a concept created by humans in order to have some points of references. For Julien, the meaning of time has shifted away in a postmodern society and its importance has been forgotten. Time has become a way to serve the needs of people, accomplish goals like in Venezuela. I, Julien, believe that people show no respect to the concept itself by adjusting it every time it becomes inconvenient from economic standpoint. Alisa does not find such time use strange, as time has been primarily constituted in service to humans. We wanted to point out the differences of opinions emerging in the issue of time to give the reader the room for personal interpretations and reflections.

**4.2.2 Social structure**

Even though postmodernity freed the society from imposed beliefs and passive anticipation of the better future, it did not give the stimulus to be active in pursuing life. On the contrary, postmodernity is characterized by the increasing passivity of people (Gare 2001).

There was some, but what is astonishing was (and is) the lack of concerted opposition to transformations that have undermined or are undermining the security, income, wealth and health of the vast majority of people in these countries. There appears to be a cultural failure. The problem could be precisely those aspects of reality focussed on by postmodern theorists—the way people have been made into docile bodies, the way they now establish their identities through consumption rather than production, the way their conception of reality has been constructed by new media, and so on. However, there appears to be another dimension to the problem. The oligarchic structures of and consequent concentrations of power in social democratic states together with the subsequent atomising of human relationships, appear to have rendered people passive....My contention is that more than anything else it is this passivity that has engendered decadence, and this is the most important source of postmodernist culture. (Gare 2001, pp. 90-91)

We believe that the social state of democracy, described by Gare (2001) that promotes passive behavior in the society is disenchantment being discussed. This passivity is the reflection of Thatcher’s statement: ‘there is no society, there are only individuals’
(Gare 2001, p. 92). Individualistic orientation of the society is thought to be the beginning of an end. In this interpretation, the existence of society means that problems are being addressed by the united community, while individuals are seen as the trigger of passivity.

People could indeed change the face of the society if they would be ready to ‘transcend their egocentrism’ (Gare 2001, p. 99). To do so, Gare (2001, p. 99) says they should develop their potential and participate in rational institutions rather than escape them. Active participation can be promoted only by examples of active participation. The social democracy model is built in a convenient way for people to move their responsibilities for their lives to figureheads. Therefore, the system itself leads to the decrease in the levels of participative energy and with time to total passivity around society. That is why Gare insists that:

> a revival of social democracy will only be possible (if at all) through a struggle by people for immediate control over their lives, that is, through a struggle for direct democracy (or what Benjamin Barber (1984) called ‘strong democracy’) in society’s institutions. (2001, pp. 98-99)

Every government is blamed for not achieving the goals. Society is blaming the government that they chose themselves for all the taken decisions. Barack Obama has been blamed for the USA debt, even though he decreased it comparing to its amount before his presidency.

Direct democracy would require people to make choices. However, in front of numerous choices that society can currently provide, individuals are waiting for someone else to choose instead of them or fail to choose at all. Thus, “non-choice” seems to be the perfect response to the multiplicity of possibilities present today.

### 4.2.3 Multiplicity of meaning

Multiplicity is thriving in postmodern times. The concept of the multiplicity of meaning is enlightened in the works of Philippe Daudi (1990) in which he has shown a connection between disenchantment and postmodernity. Describing postmodern discourses, Daudi (1990, p. 287) brings up the concepts of ‘truth, man and knowledge’. In our postmodern society, the only truth, the only meaning and the only discourse seize to exist; the role is filled with ‘the multiplicity of meanings’ (Daudi 1990, p. 287). Everything has become plausible, even the concept of truth has become blurry and the philosophical discourses have been revisited in order to fit into the new ideology. This issue reveals the fact that everything must be ‘overexplained’ (Daudi 1990, p. 293) and sometimes because of the too many explanation, the meaning itself is being lost. We can observe the phenomenon of overexplanation in the sphere of art. Multiple art pieces are meant for the personal interpretation of the person witnessing them. However, art experts feel the urge to explain what each piece means and
signifies. We believe though that without the perspective of the artist we cannot stipulate the meaning of the art piece.

4.2.4 Decay of intellectual life

The overproduction of meaning led to the decay of intellectual life. People gained access to all the knowledge in the world that prevented them from thinking. Society became stuck in already developed information, and it lost the ability to consider things intellectually. Gare develops this point through the example of classics:

Although people continued learning the classics, they lost the ability to engage in disputes and to see things from the perspective of others and, at the same time, lost the ability to manipulate concepts. (2001, p. 95)

Classical culture is considered elite even in our modern days. Its elitism seems to emerge from the traditional perspective and historical significance. Cultural items gain value with time. The more ancient the piece of culture is believed to be, the higher appreciation it earns. A lot of famous artists such as Vincent Van Gogh, Franz Kafka, Johann Sebastian Bach have been pronounced geniuses, who had created masterpieces, not during their lifetime but only after their deaths.

Education seems to only support such mode of cultural perception. All studies have historical inclination basically focusing on what has already been developed. Primarily, it was seen as building ground knowledge of how the world operates, although it appears to be the prophecy of general truths governing the world. History also is a witness of this decay of intellectual life. Talking with people having different educational backgrounds from different countries can show that history is not remembered and taught in the same way. On the subject of World War II every country has its own version of who won it. Somewhere Holocaust is being denied of ever existing. In such a manner generations have been raised memorizing what system wanted them to know without any questioning. This downsized human intellect to the level where it can only juggle the basic knowledge generated so far. Facts, theories, tools can be applied in the way they have always been but they fail to be critically observed.

No instinct to undermine in any way what is being said leads to people accepting already developed explanations. That is also applicable to the understanding of nature:

and corresponding to what appears to be an increasing level of egocentricism in culture, there is less and less interest by the general public in understanding nature as an independent reality. (Gare 2001, p. 97)

People choose the explanation which satisfies their inner values more without trying to investigate it themselves. Once the state of plausibility in explanation has been
reached, there is no more sense in looking for another variant which seems to be the case for the exploration of nature.

Nature came to be seen as a realm dominated by supernatural forces and all curiosity to understand nature itself disappeared. The quest for truth about a world independent of us, characteristic of societies in their generative stages, evaporated. Correspondingly, people lost their ability to construct narratives and to situate themselves in the world historically. (Gare 2001, p. 95)

### 4.2.5 Reality perception

The loss of the intellectual curiosity about world and nature is also the result of the reformed reality perception which represents another characteristic of postmodernity. Harman (1988 cited in Daudi 1990, p. 287) says that humans try to live “by the impossible equation of managing our lives by two mutually contradictory views of reality: the science-materialistic and the spiritual one”. Daudi (1990, p. 287) argues with Harman and says, instead, that these two concepts are ‘inseparable’.

Postmodern man is less interested in real events and in the truth that might be attached to them than in the spectacle which is produced through the representation of these events. (Baudrillard 1979 cited in Daudi 1990, p. 294)

This means that postmodern men are more focused on the form of what is happening and do not pay attention to the content anymore. We could see that happen during the Nixon-Kennedy debate on 26th of September 1960. People watching the debate on TV were convinced that Kennedy won, while those listening to it on the radio gave the victory to Nixon. Importance is assigned by the eyes and no longer by the mind. Human beings feel the need to see, but not to understand anymore, there is no longer space for questioning things surrounding us. “The representation is exaggerated...and the spectator is seduced” (Baudrillard 1979 cited in Daudi 1990, p. 294). We encounter the phenomenon in the movie industry. Contemporary movies are more focused on special effects than on the plot and the idea. The seduction is occurring because human beings lost the concept of reality. Unreal, real and hyperreal are now the same because everything has become normal.

### 4.2.6 Normalization

Hyperreality becomes real due to the social logic in modernity which follows a simple path of normalization. The error of post-Enlightenment society has been to “naturalize” Cartesian thought, i.e. to assume its universal, essential and transcendental validity’ (Kando 1996, p. 9). In social paradigm one dogma is considered to be right, suppressing all the others. Through normalization ‘this oppressive thought system “normalizes” the favored group’s behavior’ (Kando 1996, p.
However, it is unknown how the deciding process on favored group is being held. It is fascinating how the whole society manages to develop the same presuppositions about the right and normal without an intention to do so.

The process of normalization is based on dualistic thinking which assigns one of the opposite behaviouristic binaries as a typical behavior and the other one is being labeled atypical (Knights 1997, pp. 3-4). Not only the process of labeling occurs, but modernity stipulates that typical binary is the preferable, the acceptable, the right one, making an underdog from the atypical (Knights 1997, pp. 3-4). This makes every behavior outside the established social pattern seem crazy and even antisocial sometimes. 'Foucault explains that in modern society madness is “otherness”' (Kando 1996, p. 9). This can be observed through changes in different generations of women. Women wearing pants, couples divorcing or people having premarital sexual relationships were once considered to be bad, to be wrong, to be insane. Those examples illustrate the normalization phenomenon. Today, those changes are part of the society and generally accepted.

The perfect illustration of dualistic thinking that is conquering the world is a map (Coulby & Jones 1996). The Earth is always divided into North and South, East and West. While the labels were introduced for solely navigation purposes, nowadays they seem to define economic development, racial particulars, cultural features and it is not the end of the list. The most opposed pair is East and West: society versus individual, traditions versus fashion, religion versus secularism, developing versus developed. Western description is considered to be better, more progressive for the unknown reasons. After doing the same trick with the second pair on the map, we could jump to the conclusion that North-West is the best part of the world. Even though it might sound far-fetched right now, when you take a map, divide it into 4 parts, you can see that North-West actually is “the most developed” part of the world from economic, social and life quality criteria. The question here is what affects what; does formed dualistic thinking affect reality or vice versa?

In the meantime, if we take a glance at the history of the liberalization of society, atypicalities considered to be underdogs in one moment, were seen as typical in the next. The process of normalization changes the label on the exact opposite one. Madness somehow becomes normal, people are leaning to it. From a global perspective social paradigm always shifted towards atypical behavior. Nowadays, when the shift between atypical and typical is gaining speed incredibly fast, the issue of credibility of the reality and the way it is being formed and judged stands profoundly acute.

**4.2.7 Power of discourse**

Mathers & Rowland (1997, p. 177) say that ‘our perception of reality and the relationships between different concepts are important influences on our way of
knowing’. The multiplicity of meanings that we can encounter in a single discourse provides a nonsensical perception of reality. Therefore, people must build their own perception of things in order to make sense of the disorder surrounding them. Derrida points out that “the meaning of many status of any knowledge that we claim as true is true because of the process we have used to come to know it” (Derrida 1976 cited in Mathers & Rowland 1997, p. 178), which seems to mean that the process by which we attempt to reach the truth is more important than the truth itself.

Postmodernity brought the idea that the truth is no longer known for certain as a counterforce to modernists being often accused of the lack of self-criticism of their own methods and processes (Hummel 2006, p. 312). Brian Duignan (2014) says that ‘reality, knowledge and values are constructed by discourses’. It means that the sense of the concepts is strongly dependent on the discourse. If the discourse changes, then the meaning of the concepts changes too. This brings about the issue of the power of discourse. There are numerous examples of financial and investment schemes such as Ponzi schemes when due to the lack of knowledge and understanding of how the financial market operated, people believed those who fed them with the promises of the fast profit. Sometimes those discourses had such a great power that it almost brought the whole economies down.

Reality is being shaped by ideas people generate and share with the rest, it is embodied by the states of minds which are being formed by apprehended knowledge. Hence, discourses are stipulating the axes of the social development. Taking as an example the field of science, all scientific truth or evidence brought throughout history has been made by scientists. Furthermore, we can notice that the logic outrageously used in science is often a tool used to guide the thinking process towards proving the desirable scientific perspective. As Nietzsche (n.d. cited in Fichte 1845-6 cited in Tasic 2012, p. 179) said “logic (like geometry and arithmetic) only holds good for assumed existences which we have created”. According to Nietzsche (n.d. cited in Tasic 2012), scientific explanations follow the reversed path, they start with the findings and then look for the proof, thus, they start with the conclusion and then prove it with the chosen arguments that fit the conclusion, but they do not derive the conclusion from the arguments. Since the meaning of knowledge and values depends on discourses, individuals can create another meaning by setting another discourse. So the meaning does not come from divinity or text itself, which are considered to be the truth, but in the postmodern theory the meaning comes from human beings making the values, beliefs and knowledge play a crucial role in the delivering of discourse, hence, affecting the creation of the meaning.

From our viewpoint current social reality - mainly shaped by discourses - does not truly serve the best interest of society itself. One of the ways to change it is ‘discourse
intervention – an effort to change our social reality by altering the discourses that help constitute that reality’ (Karlberg 2005, p. 1). Hence, in order to alter the general societal way of thinking, knowledge creation should follow a new reformed path.

4.3 Perdurability of Life

Having looked behind the curtains of postmodernity, we have highlighted some traces of disenchantment in it. Since these two notions seem to be closely intertwined, we think studies of postmodernity could be used to address the issue of disenchantment.

In our research of disenchantment, we have come across Singh’s (1998) idea on the issue of bringing enchantment back. Singh (1998) talked about finding the balance between disenchantment and enchantment, modernity and tradition as a way of escaping from the daunting of disenchantment. We supported the idea and found it in the close resemblance to one of the issues studied by Maffesoli (1996) and probably the one in the center of his whole research which is the matter of perdurability of life.

The outline of his thoughts is ‘the existence of an equilibrium that is founded on the heterogeneous’ (Maffesoli 1996, p. 115). In other words, life is preserved by its diversity, meaning that homogeneity destructs the organic balance of the world. At the same time, heterogeneity leads to conflicts on the basis of this same heterogeneity. In the world where perdurability of life is ensured by the unity of masses characterized by their natural plurality, ‘the problem facing our societies will be to balance the opposing passions’ (Maffesoli 1996, p. 115). It might seem impossible to balance contradictions, however the structure, capable of it, is already or still in place in some parts of the world. We are talking about the notion of hierarchy that seems to contain the diversity of the groups in the united society by casting them into socially bricked blocks, making it

‘a good example of how a society can construct an equilibrium based on the coexistence of differences, codifying them with an accustomed rigour and building upon this an architectonic not lacking in solidarity’. (Maffesoli 1996, p. 115)

If we apply the notion of hierarchy being a balance creator to the context of organization, we can see that hierarchy has been used as a popular way of structuring organizational society, the same way it used to in mass societies. The masses switch from hierarchical division determined by birth to lifestyle heterogeneity promoting rights determined by choice. Organizations also seem to abandon classical structure of hierarchical division based on distributing management power and start to exploit new approach of operating by forming teams of different expertise promoting individuality that serves the common purpose.

Hence, it becomes evident that organizations and their operating modes evolve the same way as societies and masses. This implies that their future development can be
predicted by projecting societal patterns onto organizations. Thus, it is eligible to take a look at how the concept of disenchantment uncovers itself in the organizational context. More particularly, it is of great interest how leadership is affected by the disenchantment atmosphere. Furthermore, finding an antidote for disenchantment seems to be impossible, as it is the part of social construction. For this reason, the question should be reversed to how to create enchantment. Enchantment is not something that may be constructed for other people. It is self-made, enacted by every single person. Enchantment can be spread only through creating opportunities enabling enchantment emergence.
5 Leadership under Fire

When talking about leadership, we have to specify what we imply by this term. In this research we are not focused on any specific definition of leadership, but we still have an understanding of the term which represents an important point of reference for the reader. In this connection, we find it crucial to emphasize the link between leadership and power, as these concepts are often being misinterpreted.

5.1 Is power on the radar?

From our perspective, leadership should not be mixed with power, as those terms are definitely not substitutable. Some people use the power given by their hierarchical position in order to act as a leader. In this case, the leader is considered a chief, as someone giving orders to others. However, power does not automatically make a person a leader.

According to Donna M. Randall (2012) there are two different types of power existing: positional and personal. Positional power is divided by Randall (2012) into three different components which are: legitimate power provided by the position, reward power, and coercive power coming from the possibility of reward or punishment. The second, personal power can be subdivided into expert and referent power (Randall 2012). Expert power comes from the expertise and specific knowledge in some sphere (Randall 2012). Referent power relates to situations when ‘leaders can influence others if they are admired and liked by others, and if employees can identify with the leader’ (Randall 2012, p. 33). Therefore, leaders can apply the power provided by their own position in order to maintain a good climate with followers but they can also use their personal power, the one which is more natural. By using it the leader is seen as a guide, as a reference for the followers, as long as the followers could identify themselves with the leader.

The wrong perception of power in leadership comes from the one-sidedness of the discourse of power. In this sphere Western society has limited its focus to developing an image of power as a tool of oppression and domination (Karlberg 2005). It is usually being looked at in the context of conflicts and inequalities (Karlberg 2005). Giddens, Bachrach and Baratz, Dahl, Wartenberg, Lukes, Foucault (1984; 1970; 1969; 1990; 1974; 1980 cited in Karlberg 2005) all followed the same direction in their research, even though they realized the existence of other alternatives but never found them eligible for their studies. Power does not necessarily have to be oppressive; it can also be expressed in a more nurturing and enforcing way, bringing capacity over dominance into the social reality (Karlberg 2005).
Common critics of the dominant power model are feminists who claim that ‘the normalization of aggressive and competitive behaviors within Western societies has served, historically, as a structure of male privilege’ (Karlberg 2005, p. 5). The capacity power model is supported by ‘integrative theory of power’ developed by Boulding (1990 cited in Karlberg 2005, p. 8) in a framework of systems approach, and it recognizes the importance of integrative power in the foundation of the community-based, collective, relationally interdependent modern world.

Karlberg (2005) understands power as a force being constituted by two dimensions: relational and distributive. It has implications not only for understanding power but also interrelated concepts such as hierarchy, for example, that can be seen as a tool for unequal power distribution or balanced empowerment depending on the angle chosen for analysis (Karlberg 2005, p. 11). According to Karlberg (2005), wrong perception of power leads to negative social implications. Focusing on only one dimension leads to building one-sided systems that are limited which does not appear to be beneficial. In reality this shows through prevailing relationship mode, based on contest, in all the major social spheres (Karlberg 2005, pp. 13-15).

Such relationship mode can be encountered in leadership. In postmodern times, leaders are more focused on the power play than on the true values of their position. Wrong perception of power drives leaders in the wrong direction narrowing their focus to only preserving their own power and not on implementing actual change. As a result thereof we believe that constricting the leadership definitions to power undermines its true importance and role within the society.

5.2 Is the leadership vest bulletproof?

Many scholars are attempting to reach the right definition of leadership. However, the definitions change along the process of discovering leadership. Our definition of leadership, as the same of many others, is the management of the human self, ideas and “things”. Leadership is about human connections and social interactions in a constantly changing environment. Human beings are uncertain creatures with different cultures, different visions and beliefs of life. Consequently, the concept of leadership is also grounded in uncertainty and is not a science with a sure result that cannot change. High uncertainty leads to the elevated risk of failure which makes it increasingly important for leaders to understand the environment which they are operating in, in order to be able to react properly in every individual case, adjust their vision, methods and so forth.

Leaders’ mission is to empower people and align their goals in one vision. This is an incredibly challenging task and there is no one correct formula of accomplishing it.
There are no rules in the leadership game; it is based on feelings, understandings, on the components, which are determined by natural human diversity.

This challenge becomes even bigger within a postmodern arena in which faith, purpose and belief are lost, a landscape where everything is possible and plausible, where rules are being broken and schemes changed. Points of references have been demolished, forcing individuals to find their purpose on their own, favoring egocentrism - the plague of the postmodern society.

In the previous chapters we have described and explained the new arena within which leaders are operating, by pointing out some manifestations and distinctive characteristics of this new landscape. Now we want to develop the idea of the way in which leaders are being impacted by the new landscape. To that end, we are putting under the microscope the leadership attributes which are being impacted the most in the postmodern arena.

 Those attributes are:

1. Language
2. Perception of reality
3. Decision making
4. Identity
5. Integrity and Morality

The purpose of this part is to see the impact of disenchanted postmodernity on leadership attributes.

5.2.1 Language

Language is the tool through which the world is being conceptualized and, hence, realized (Standish 2016). The fact that ‘our world is in fact constituted by language’ reveals the importance of this attribute (Eleveld 2016, p. 76). People build their understanding through language. Language is the way to explain and describe what is surrounding us, to create pictures in the mind, to bridge the words and reality, language makes the world exist.

The picture of reality is built through putting it into words. For example, when people suffer a loss or a terrible event, they psychologically move into denial phase which involves neglecting the very fact of traumatic event. Stating the bad happening is always hard, because pronouncing the facts out loud makes them more real. Reality scares people, and when they are trying to express their feelings through words, it brings the feelings of vulnerability, insecurity and nervousness.

The language theory has been first studied by Ferdinand de Saussure:
According to De Saussure, the meaning of words (signs) that are made up of a combination of specific sounds (signifier) and concepts (signified) is determined by its relationship with or differences from other signs. (Eleveld 2016, p. 75)

De Saussure emphasizes that words have a meaning in relation, opposition or association to other words (Eleveld 2016, p. 75). For example, understanding the word “blue” involves knowing which things carry the characteristic of blue, like the sky, the ocean and so forth. Thus, the meaning of a word is only created through its association with the image of the word. Plus, as one word can be associated with multiple things and other words, it can have more than one meaning. This resembles the vision shared by Eleveld (2016, p. 75) who said that ‘each term leaves a “trace” in related terms’. Words impact each other, which impacts the meaning and sometimes transforms it, making the meaning diffuse (Eleveld 2016).

Language is the witness of our evolution. Throughout history, language has been transformed, codified and used in different ways among different generations. The use of words has changed as well. New generations develop their own way of using words, sometimes by simplifying them or creating new ones. Language evolves according to the needs of society. Changing a word in a certain context directly affects its meaning.

Wittgenstein thought that:

language can be seen as an ancient city: a maze of little streets and squares, of old and new houses, and of houses with additions from various periods, and this surrounded by a multitude of new boroughs with straight regular streets and uniform houses. (1953 cited in Rømer 2003, p. 314)

This emphasizes the importance of language itself, which is ‘ready to be entered into and learned’ (Rømer 2003, p. 314). Drawing upon the metaphor of a town, we just remember the word first without going into depth of its meaning, just like we look at the map of the town to build an idea of how it looks like. Then we have to make ourselves comfortable with the streets and buildings, which gives a new feeling of the city. When we focus more on these buildings and streets we can, in fact, notice their interaction, their place and role in the whole system. The same process happens with words: we gain an understanding of the structure of the language of the way the words are interacting with each other.

Furthermore, according to Lyotard (1988 cited in Rømer 2003) language is the world where every word is explained by another word. In that sense, words have to be used in a proper way to serve the meaning, which is why Lyotard (1988 cited in Rømer 2003, p. 315) stresses the importance of putting “the right word in the right situation”. Words are associated with certain ideas, and those associations differ from one person to another, explaining the plurality of meaning which constitutes the reality of our world.
When it comes to disenchantment in language, we can identify its most apparent manifestation of the modern days which is political correctness.

By denying that in becoming subjects people can acquire the ability to use language creatively and to criticise and reform the institutions of which they are part, deconstructive post-modern theorists have provided immense comfort to unoriginal, passive conformists who have eschewed any impulse to take responsibility for their own lives or for the future of society. All that can matter in this post-modern culture is outward conformity to certain behavior patterns; that is, political correctness. (Gare 2001, p. 94)

Political correctness is a socially developed tool intended to smoothen the conversation on the problematic issues. Politically correct terminology is used to avoid putting people into allegedly negative socially constructed stereotypes by putting them into the box of acceptable terms. While the intentions are clearly good, it seems rather absurd to try to fight stereotypical thinking by simply changing the stereotypical language. Political correctness is just a façade for the reality that stands behind it. The notion was implemented out of the general willingness to sound polite, thus, out of the sheer desire to save a public face. This shows how society can be pulled towards wrong direction by the attempts of creating a positive image. The picture that society is trying to draw is just a cover-up from reality in order to self-justify non-action, which encourages passivity and gives life to disenchantment.

The perception of the world becomes real with the use of language, as it is the main tool of transferring thoughts into words, in order to make sense of what we think. Each language provides a certain way of perceiving the world. Subsequently, the ability to speak several languages could be the way of broadening our perception by having another perspective on reality. Language opens the door to a different way of thinking, so it can also be a tool to change a disenchanted way of thinking, leading to re-enchantment of the world. As disenchantment is mainly a western phenomenon, then taking into account the powers of language, discovering eastern languages can possibly hold a cure for this disease.

We have already highlighted the fact that language is an essential attribute of human existence that goes through every sphere of human lives: we share, explain, express, educate and learn with the help of language. In application to leadership, language can provide those, who know how to use it, with powerful assets of rhetoric and storytelling which we intend to explore in more detail further. Within a disenchanted landscape, it is crucial to use these assets carefully in order to empower people to do good in the world and not the opposite.
5.2.1.1 Rhetoric

Language and the particular way it is being utilized by a person can serve as an unseizable source of information. Differences in phrasing show differences in perception and assigning importance to the pieces of information. What is being said is of great value, as it is the reality frame, but meaning is also being created by the way it is being said, which is rhetoric.

The importance of rhetoric has been long ago recognized. However, people in leadership positions tend to either neglect it or narrow their leadership solely to it. None of these two variations seem to be beneficial in terms of social progress. Leaders who ignore the fact that the way they speak affects their influence in the society, are making a big mistake. First of all, their vision - no matter how good it is – might not be perceived according to its value. This decreases the chances of its implementation. Secondly, there might be less deserving candidates who can gain higher social acceptance because of the right use of rhetoric. At the same time, narrowing the whole scope of necessary leadership qualities only to mastering rhetoric is also not right, as it is only a supporting tool not the core one, though surely valuable.

Rhetoric has to be used with a purpose and understanding of its importance. It has to be taken seriously, as the scale of its possible influence is tremendous. Rhetoric shapes meaning so it would become valuable and could enchant people, inspire them, and without proper form words are just words. Leader should not speak for the sake of speaking, his role is to guide followers through darkness to better times. Ability to speak enchantingly is extremely valuable for the leader. People are naturally drawn to those who can talk.

It is speech as the performance of sound that can excite the affections of the soul and induce a willingness to be directed by the speaker to particular courses of conduct. This is the most primal form of our communicative experience, sensitivity and a sensibility that reside in our deepest nature. (Johnstone 2005, p. 10)

Although, enchanting speech is not an ability which automatically appears in the people once they occupy a leadership position, more often it is what helps them reach their position and keep it.

In a sense, the entirety of a leader’s speech to conference is a quotation: one does not only say the sorts of things said in such a speech because one is a leader; one is a leader because one says these things. That is to say, such set-piece rhetoric is both a performance and performative. (Atkins & Finlayson 2016, p. 177)

5.2.1.2 Storytelling

Rhetoric is a very valuable skill for a leader, but it cannot be independent from a leader’s speech. Therefore, most of the time leaders use rhetoric in combination with
another language tool – storytelling. Often, leaders use stories in order to share their ideas in a more comprehensive way. Since words do not impact individuals in the same way, the storytelling exercise is a challenge for leaders.

Brown and Duguid (2000 cited in Muir 2007, p. 368) state that storytelling is “social software”. Plus, there is also the opinion that storytelling is “currency of human relationship” (Boje 1991; Bruner 1991 cited in Auvinen et al. 2013, p. 417). Stories have the power to connect and unite people. As Simon (2003 cited in Muir 2007, p. 368) argues, story is “an emotional experience that feels significant for both the listener and the teller”. For leaders storytelling is a good tool to empower people and to make them aware of their capabilities, because everyone can see themselves as a character of the story, and thus identify with its message.

Yukl (2010 cited in Auvinen et al. 2013, p. 415) sees leadership as a “process of influence”. Vargish (2014) identifies two leadership qualities for influencing followers especially acute in postmodern times. He calls them persuasion and improvisation, and describes them in a following way:

Persuasion in its radically expanded postmodern form is the construction of a reality for the purpose of enticing or enforcing compliance. It amounts to selling one’s version of the way things are to someone else, someone we wish to influence. Improvisation is a sophistication of persuasion in which the improviser adapts to or takes in aspects of other persons’ versions of the way things are in order to manipulate them. (Vargish 2014, p. 18)

In the process of persuasion and improvisation, storytelling could be the very tool used by leaders. We have seen throughout history that good leaders are good storytellers with a lot of knowledge and ability to pass it in the understandable way. Fisher (1985 cited in Auvinen et al. 2013, p. 417) quoted Plato by saying that “those who tell stories rule society”. According to Auvinen et al. (2013), storytelling is a way to express leader’s intentions through a story, which is sometimes more efficient in engaging people than simply giving orders.

Storytelling integrates the narrative about the past, about the roots, which is a way to fight the lack of past knowledge in followers. Weick and Czarniawska (1995; 2004 cited in Boje & Baskin 2011, p. 416) argue that storytelling is a “retrospective narrative”. Providing retrospection in the story helps involve people in the process and achieve higher acceptance of the story.

Boje & Baskin (2011) have also emphasized the importance of storytelling in disenchantment in an organizational context. We assume, though, that it can be generalized much further than organizational context. The idea lying in the basis of their thesis is the following:
human beings do not experience events in a raw, unmediated manner. Rather they experience – that is, perceive, feel, respond to and think about – events in terms of the stories their brains are structured to create to explain those events. (Boje & Baskin 2011, p. 416)

With that being said, storytelling seems to be the very tool creating reality, thus, the tool affecting the level of enchantment. Indeed, according to Bennett (2001 cited in Boje & Baskin 2011, p. 412), enchantment “is the feeling of being connected in an affirmative way to existence”. Therefore, enchantment exists when everyone has the same vision. Storytelling helps to instill this feeling of connection by putting everyone on the same track. Storytelling creates common culture and makes people a part of the same unity, which helps avoid disenchantment and empower people so they could operate in the same way.

5.2.2 Reality perception

As language creates our world, it also builds our own reality. The gap between our own perception of reality and the perception of others is unmeasurable but still is known as a main issue in a disenchanted world.

According to Max De Pree (2004) a leader has the responsibility to set reality. In the new era of postmodern environment reality is being personalized and defined by individuals. The challenge of a leader is, then, to build a unique but collective reality for his followers in order to create the unity in the group which is a guarantee of success.

Reality perception is a complicated subject because it is influenced by various factors. Those influences also represent the limitations of reality perception. Moreover, our perception is its own limits. These limits are created by our biology, psychology, and our society. These are the factors that create that “bubble” around called perceptual field. From a biological point of view this perceptual field is extremely narrow. Our senses give us already outdated information as it takes time for all the stimuli to reach the decrypting part of the brain, even though a very short time. If we take the sense of vision, for example, the amount of actual information received when seeing something, is limited to a very small circle around the point the eyes are directed at. The illusion of having 270 degrees vision is created by our memory and cognitive abilities responsible for restoring the picture and the fact that our eyes are constantly moving.

This also explains ‘phenomenal expectation’ (Smith 2010 cited in Butterfill 2015, p. 440) which is a ‘case where perceptual experience is not neutral concerning things which are in some sense unperceived’ (Butterfill 2015, p. 440). In simpler words, when something is actually not seen, people generally assume what is unseen judging from their expectations derived from the environment (Butterfill 2015).
With this knowledge, we can say that reality is not something we perceive, it exists in our heads. Reality is like a movie, like a stream of concepts, and the role of perception is to position ourselves at a particular moment and place in the movie. Only those things that already exist in our heads can be seen. Physiologically, our brain has even developed such tool as ego defense mechanisms which are psychological structures that protect our egos - our core structural selves - from information that would hurt us.

Our perception is also limited by the general misconception that everyone sees the world as everybody else does. In reality two people - looking at exactly the same world - may take in very different information. It means any time you have to communicate you have to take into account that your experiences are different from other's. Only by testing your own knowledge can you see it for what it is.

Another limit of reality perception which probably limits it the most, is the absence of self within this reality picture. People do not perceive themselves as a part of reality, which could be as a result of the way bodies are perceived in space.

The encounter of our bodies with the world is what, for us, produces the world (including a sense of self) while at the same time this encounter itself remains outside the realm of our experience for it is this encounter that sets the stage for experience to take place. (Bleeker 2008, p. 62)

As we do not observe our bodies in the environment, they are being taken for granted in the picture of the environment and not being seen as actors influencing what is happening. This also explains the differences in the perception of the same situation among different people. Two people engaged in one situation both take into realization what is happening only outside their bodies, so they are both creating the picture of the occurrence without their own bodies in it, automatically creating two versions of the same happening. This thought is being confirmed by Massumi’s revelation of the fact that the process of orientation is largely non-visual and visualizing one’s way through space is very troubling (Bleeker 2008, p. 64). The process which helps acknowledging the body existence and the fact that its cognitive realization is unperceivable is called dys-embodiment (Bleeker 2008, p. 62). Dys-embodiment does not make our perception more realistic but raises awareness about its flaws. If we understood our cognitive limitations, we could design a better world.

**5.2.3 Decision making**

The limit of perception is affecting our lives all the time. In order to illustrate this, we can just look at how people choose from the options which are being designed by another person. Many of such decisions are actually residing from the person designing the form with the alternatives. The magic trick is that most of the decisions when faced with options are made by comparison and not by effectiveness. Thus,
design of the form is what influences this comparison process and, in the end, guides
the decision. Then decisions are not guided by the will of the decider but by his
perception of the alternatives and the best option from those alternatives.

Decision making has been studied a lot throughout history. Clegg, Kornberger and
Rhodes (2007) allow us to see how decision making in organizations has been modified
along time and how the deconstructionist and postmodernist view have contributed to
this change. According to Parker (2002 cited in Clegg, Kornberger & Rhodes 2007),
stitutions brought a certain vision of decision making. Indeed, the “post-modern
ethics” and the “machinery of judgment” (Parker 2002 cited in Clegg, Kornberger &
Rhodes 2007, p. 394) have rationalized our decision making process and bounded it
by data, numbers and probabilities for the sake of finding ‘the optimum decision’
(Clegg, Kornberger & Rhodes 2007, p. 397). Decisions are oriented on resolving
problems; they are trapped in-between different solutions, that is why the authors talk
about “bounded rationality” (Clegg, Kornberger & Rhodes 2007, p. 399). Having a
bounded vision of something is not having the right vision but a shortened one which
makes choices easier. In organization our decision making capabilities tend to be
controlled by data and results. Machines, programs and so forth “take” decisions
instead of employees, and employees’ mind become servants to these machines.

This rational vision of organization based on a ‘thorough knowledge of the facts and
the application of a calculable rationality’ is not in agreement with the Derrida’s (1992,
making process. Indeed, the philosopher does not separate choice and decision. To
person to make a decision, ‘it must involve some sort of choice’. Derrida’s (1992, 1995,
1996 cited in Clegg, Kornberger & Rhodes 2007) vision is the exact opposite of the
management vision of decision; it has nothing to do with anticipated outcomes.

According to Derrida (1994 cited in Clegg, Kornberger & Rhodes 2007), decision
making process is related to unknown future. Plus, by taking a decision individuals
admit that they cannot know the result of it, based on Derrida’s concept of
Undecidability is the state when a problem does not have any predetermined solutions
around it which provides people with an opportunity to make an actual decision,
coming directly from individuals without being influenced by a solution from the

The influence of the organization on decision making is enlightened by the concept of
the corporate mind (Clegg, Kornberger & Rhodes 2007, p. 397). The corporate mind
controls a certain behavior that employees or members of the organizations should not
have in everyday life. Organization is shaped by rules and hierarchy, forcing its
members to produce value for the organization. If we follow this idea, organization is the exact opposite of society in a democracy. It is a different world where ethic, moral and value components of decision making are completely revisited or forgotten. Both hierarchy and authority are reshaping the behavior of people enabling those in a position of power to bring change.

We would like to take the example of Adolf Eichmann described in Clegg, Kornberger and Rhodes (2007) to emphasize the danger of following the rules blindly. The authors explain the Adolf Eichmann’s story to introduce the ‘madness of rationality’ (Clegg, Kornberger & Rhodes 2007, p. 401). Adolf Eichmann was the ancient SS (Schutzstaffel) agent who took decisions on the basis of his superior’s philosophy and vision of the world without giving it a second thought (Clegg, Kornberger & Rhodes 2007, p. 401). To Eichmann his decisions seemed normal and accurate because he just followed the orders given by somebody of higher authority which we perceive as madness. For Arendt (1963, 1994 cited in Clegg, Kornberger & Rhodes 2007, p. 401), forgetting values in order to fit in the ideology of another person is the perfect example of the human weakness. Unfortunately, we can encounter this problem in organizations.

Organizations shape not only our process of decision making, but also our behavior; more specifically our senses of ethics and responsibility. Organizational system reduces the undecidability and our ethic seems to be directly altered by the organization and relations inside it. Clegg, Kornberger and Rhodes (2007, p. 402) wonder ‘what aspects of organization make obedience through unethical decision or non-decision-making feasible?’

Emmanuel Levinas (1991, 1992 cited in Clegg, Kornberger & Rhodes 2007, p. 402) said that “ethic originates in face to face interaction”. If ethics can be built when one encounters another, we can say that ethics can also be reshaped by interactions. The level of ethics and responsibility depends on the vision of the rational organization. Clegg, Kornberger and Rhodes (2007) give three examples of organizational interaction: authorized, routinized, and dehumanized. These explain how different types of organization can affect the behavior of employees or collaborators. In every example, human beings are considered a technical workforce instead of an ethical workforce. It could be wrong to think that the problem comes only from organizations. Sometimes, human beings are likely to choose to follow authority’s vision or ideology and do not see the impact of their action but just the action itself. However, ethics seems to be not in the action but rather in the continuity of the action, which means that it is not about doing right or wrong, but about wondering about the reasons of doing while doing it.
Ethics is sometimes even used as a tool of manipulation to make employees ‘do the will of management’ (Parker 2002 cited in Clegg, Kornberger & Rhodes 2007, p. 405), which implies that ethics and responsibility in decision making are ‘predetermined’ (Clegg, Kornberger & Rhodes 2007, p. 405). Management without human relationship, without considering others, leads to the loss of ethics and responsibilities, which creates a struggle for decision-making to be efficient. With an absence of ethics in the organization, people end up in a disenchanted world, where they commonly distance themselves from responsibilities. The problem is that people keep this behavior outside organizations and prevent themselves from taking any responsibilities. The solution would be rather giving up control and abandoning predetermined thoughts in order to settle a certain uncertainty in decision making and put people in front of their responsibilities. When individuals do not know the result of their choices, they pay more attention to the consequences. Every not predetermined choice or decision has positive or negative consequences, which allows people to make sense out of their actions and stay real.

5.2.3.1 Emotional Intelligence

We have already established that when it comes to decision making, the effect of reality perception and organization on it is rather significant. However, we have not covered yet the way personal traits can affect the actions of the person. The personal characteristic which has a noticeable impact on the person’s decision making as well as on his actions is emotional intelligence. By emotional intelligence we do not only imply the perception of other people’s emotions but also the influence emotions have on the decisions made by people.

Other researchers find that both anxious and sad individuals aim to make choices that will make them feel better, leading those who are anxious to prefer a choice with low risk and low reward and those who are sad to prefer a choice with high risk and high reward. (Raghunathan & Pham 1999 cited in Lacasse 2015, p. 4)

Emotional intelligence is the quality that is extremely useful and necessary in the current world; and not only for leaders but also for each individual, however not so many people seem to possess it. People logically assume that if the person is outgoing and socially successful, he possesses emotional intelligence. However, it turns out that socially excluded individuals show higher emotional intelligence (Cheung & Gardner 2015). Thinking about the possible reasons, we can assume that higher emotional intelligence can be connected with a better understanding of self by socially excluded people and more experience in coping with emotions by themselves. Socially excluded people spend less time on social interaction and more time on observation and reflection. In modern world, where people are avoiding social interaction by any possible means, distancing themselves from each other with all the possible
technologies, one would logically assume that people are very emotionally intelligent. In reality we are witnessing exactly the opposite. People are likely to be more emotionally intelligent in the sense of a non-personal encounter, which means they are better at deciphering what a person feels by a voice or a tone or a phrasing on the other end of the phone or message. Even though this intelligence is rising, emotional intelligence is deteriorating. This is happening because people spend less time socially interacting and less time reflecting which is clearly the consequence of disenchantment.

5.2.4 Identity

The concept of identity has been studied by many scholars and thinkers for a long time. Defining identity has become very complicated. The issue of identity is central to postmodern thought, and can be generally expressed as an idea that ‘identity is not present to itself’, meaning that individuals cannot identify themselves as simple as saying “I am” (Tasić 2012, p. 179). The ease provided by believing in God is now gone. As Ficthe (1794 cited in Tasić 2012, p. 179) says “if the proposition A=A is certain then the proposition ‘I am’ must also be certain”. So logic has nothing to do with identity, because it ‘involves a hypothetical judgement on the part of the subject’ (Tasić 2012, p. 179). Nietzsche (n.d. cited in Tasić 2012, p. 179) went further by saying that “logic (like geometry and arithmetic) only holds good for assumed existences which we have created”. The building of the identity is massive and requires work from top to the bottom of personal development. Individuals search for a logical way which explains their role and their identity.

We find that the change that occurred in the discourse on identity from structuralism view to poststructuralist shows the best how the identity issue unfolded in postmodernity.

Structuralism view can be expressed through Poincaré’s analysis of the issue, who used the geometrical theory of Euclid’s Elements (Tasić 2012, p. 180). Euclid (n.d. cited in Tasić 2012, p. 180) stated that “figures are to be regarded as equal if one can be superimposed over the other”. The crucial term in this analysis is “superimposed”, which means that in order for two figures to coincide, one of them needs to be “displaced” (Pointcaré 1891 cited in Tasić 2012, p. 180). Since solids “are invariable” we cannot displace the figure (Pointcaré 1891 cited in Tasić 2012, p. 180). Plus, Poincaré (1891 cited in Tasić 2012, p. 182) says that “the concept of identity is construed negatively”, which means that we are first what we are not. Identity is now very difficult to define because of the multitude of negation. It means that in a structuralism theory, objects are not considered as themselves. Their role, purpose and identity are provided by the structure and the interaction with other objects in the structure.
Poststructuralism brought another view on this issue. Tasić (2012, p. 180) says that ‘identity cannot be deduced from the formal rules of the structure’. Poststructuralist thinkers began to see the object as itself, having an identity that the structure cannot define. The structure, environment should not affect the personality or any traits of someone. If the leader or the person is honest, guided by values and beliefs, if these are strong enough, then the structure should not change them.

In order to go further we need to clarify the meaning of the structure. Structure in the context of theoretical framework of structuralism and poststructuralism should not be confused with the commonly used understanding of structure applied in organizational and social studies. As Chaffee and Lemert (n.d. cited in Turner 2009, p. 125) put it, “structures” are postulates of logical or empirical work that cannot be directly observed’. Thus, the term has a different meaning in the concepts of structuralism and poststructuralism, it implies the ‘structure of existential understanding’ (Tasić 2012, pp. 181-182).

In this issue about identity, structure plays an important role. It is actually the starting point of our behavior. Structures explain partly why it is difficult to define oneself as an individual. Structures are always changing, however people do not pay enough attention to this process. All the changes are usually considered small and insignificant, when in fact they impact our behavior, therefore, our identity. The concept of identity in a certain structure depends a lot on what the structure contains. The same thought is delivered by Emmanuel Levinas (1972) when he gives an example of a green book. At the very beginning, it is only ‘cette opacité rectangulaire et solide’ (this rectangular and solid opacity) on the desk, but the signification of the book takes place with the ideas we have of it (Levinas 1972, p. 17). Projecting this example onto individuals, it shows that they are strongly dependent on the structure they act in. The loss of identity can occur because of the swop of the structure. Indeed, throughout the life, individuals are not defined by the only role, but they wear a lot of different identities. Before the death of God, characterized by Max Weber first, individuals had this point of reference to face numerous changes. Since the point of reference has disappeared, individuals have to redefine over and over when they swop structure.

What happens when the structure or the environment change is exactly the problem researched by the poststructuralist philosopher Derrida. Derrida’s (1978 cited in Tasić 2012) theory is that centered structure does not exist. Centered structures are defined as “self-regulating” (Piaget 1970 cited in Tasić 2012, p. 186). What Derrida (1978 cited in Tasić 2012) says is that the center is not in the structure, but outside of it. It is more accurate to talk about “decentered” (Tasić 2012, p. 187) structures, which do not guarantee stability, as Derrida says:
the concept of a centered structure is in fact the concept of play based on a fundamental ground, a play constituted on the basis of a fundamental immobility and a reassuring certitude, which is itself beyond the reach of play. (1978 cited in Tasić 2012, p. 187)

This is the best illustration of poststructuralism. Derrida (1978 cited in Tasić 2012) enlightens the fact that the stability of a structure is created with an assumption of having a perfect knowledge about it. According to Derrida (1978 cited in Tasić 2012), we do not know exactly the structure to which we belong. If identity was a clear concept in a structuralism philosophy, then poststructuralism led by certain thinkers makes it unclear.

The effect of the structure on one’s identity in postmodern society can be seen in the issue of self-identification for the members of European Union. European Union is definitely an incredibly complicated environment for identification. Coulby & Jones (1996) say that Europeans always put themselves in the center of the world map and they distinguish themselves from others. It promotes two opposite things at the same time: unity and nationalism. The creation of European Union signified the creation of supranational culture which extends across borders and occupies other cultures without, presumably, destroying them. For people it means the extended identification and the controversy following it. ‘A postmodern reading of the realities of citizenship in Europe would point towards an acceptance of plural identities’ (Coulby & Jones 1996, p. 177). This means that postmodernity makes it real for French and German to come from different cultures but be of the same one which is European.

As for us, it is too romantic to assume that two different things can share only definite parts of the whole without affecting those which make them different. Nevertheless, people seem to believe in the possibility of it even in the everyday life when they try to combine working and personal relationship or friendship with sexual intimacy, claiming at the same time that those parts are independent. In such a complicated system as society and relationships, there is little chance to find anything independent. Of course, it is not implied that those things cannot go along, they can and they do, as people have multiple social roles which are overlapping all over the place. However, it is ignorant to deny the fact that the change in one sphere leads to the change of the whole system, and, consequently, its other parts.

Summarizing the issue of identity in postmodern society, we can conclude that identity is vastly shaped by the structure, though, does not come from it. Structure only creates conditions for the identity to be formed.

5.2.5 Integrity & Morality

Integrity issue is especially acute in the contemporary society. Egocentrism seems to be the main state of mind nowadays. Individuals define themselves by their own image
perceived by others, no longer by what they think or do. The self-image is the central
notion that affects every field. In an organization such a behavior should not exist
because every member should work for the organization and put qualms aside in order
to look forward and give his best to the organization, but in postmodernity we can
rarely encounter this.

Postmodernist theory says that values, truth and assumptions now come from inner
self, no longer from texts, God or religion. That is why one definition of integrity would
make no sense according to this theory because anyone could have his or her own
concept of integrity. If we extend integrity to the concept of morality through the prism
of postmodernity, it would also signify the diversion of morals in every single
individual which makes the criteria of integrity blurry. Integrity seems to be very
‘challenged by postmodernism’ (Boyle 1999, p. 494).

Trying to identify what integrity is and understand the way it is being formed, we have
stumbled upon two interrelated perspectives on integrity, which describe it through
assumptions (Boyle 1999) and behaviour (Carter 1996 cited in Boyle 1999).

Carter (1996 cited in Boyle 1999) looks at integrity through the perspective of the
experience and behaviour. Boyle (1999, p. 494) argues that Carter’s concept of
integrity is based on the ‘consequences’, the rules and the ‘analysis of consequences’
and stresses the consciousness of our ethical behaviour. Carter enlightens three
important characteristics of the ethical behavior:

(1) discerning what is right and what is wrong; (2) acting on what you
have discerned, even at personal cost; and (3) saying openly that you are
acting on your understanding of right from wrong. (1996 cited in Boyle
1999, p. 494)

This theory enlightens the fact that all individuals are able to change their previous
behavior by calling it into question (Carter 1996 cited in Boyle 1999). By doing so,
they are able to create a new set of rules, which shapes a modified behavior, based on
a certain ethic previously constructed via a personal experience (Carter 1996 cited in
Boyle 1999). In a postmodern view it seems logical to build ethic through experience.
The postmodern view explains that points of references have shifted away that is why
individuals have to create new values based on personal experience. By this we want
to emphasize that ethic can be built up by questioning our behavior, and going even
further, by questioning our education which provides us with values. Those values are
being challenged through life by different both positive and negative events, happening
during life and influencing our vision of it. Thus, individuals create a certain ethic
based on their experience. Such description corresponds to the concept of self-
integrity, explained by Steele:

self-integrity subsumes self esteem (i.e., people’s needs to see themselves
as competent and good), a sense of identity (i.e., people’s desires to
maintain self-conceptions of being coherent, unitary, and stable), and a sense of control (i.e., people wanting to see themselves as capable of free choice, and as capable of influencing important outcomes). (1988 cited in Brockner, Senior & Welch 2014, p. 3)

This concept of self-integrity seems to be fully integrated by people in a postmodern world.

Boyle (1999, p. 496) has another vision of integrity, and he looks at it through assumptions and argues that assumptions are ‘constructed reasonably, but incompletely, around a binary opposition between self-interest and morality’. However, this construction of assumptions is made according to our own perception of reality and our vision of the world (Boyle 1999). The author emphasizes that assumptions are built in agreement with our experience (Boyle 1999). Moral, on the other hand, constraints individual from directly satisfying his every need. Boyle (1999, p. 495) argues that integrity should be in agreement with the ‘interpretation of the legal system, the practice of institutional politics and the moral biography of an individual life’. Further, the author talks about ‘universalizable principle’ in order to explain that integrity is made from both sides: individual and legal (Boyle 1999, p. 495). The idea that postmodernism challenges the concept of integrity could be explained by the fact the it is not perceived as a common value but more as a personal concept. According to postmodernist theory, every value which could be defined by individual itself should not be considered as granted, however called into question.

Boyle (1999) argues that integrity can protect individuals from ‘contrary desire’ (p. 510), further, the author says 'integrity is the cardinal political virtue for a world of disputed moralities’ (p. 494). The world is full of temptations: temptation of glory, power and so forth. Sometimes humanity values are completely forgotten. True integrity appears only in the postmodern society where everything has become uncertain and where everything is considered as temptation. It means that values are dependent on our moral and our vision of what is wrong or right.

Further, Boyle (1999) argues that integrity needs postmodernism. Indeed, postmodernism counters every form of totalitarianism known throughout history. This enables us to say that there is a matter of time in the integrity. Individuals can use the past mistakes done throughout history in order to make it different. Boyle (1999, p. 524) argues that integrity is the concept which gathers all together our ‘present action and our past commitment’. It enables us to judge our behavior. Postmodern theory questions mostly texts, discourses which come from individuals. That is why postmodernity helps to build moral and integrity. It raises consciousness in order to counter any ideas and dogma according to personal assumptions. The fear of being called into question forces individuals to be aware of the danger to follow blindly an idea.
Integrity is probably the most important trait a leader should have. Since the role of a leader is to guide people, to bring people all together on the same vision or goal, the message delivered by the leader must be in agreement with the leader’s moral.

Integrity also implies encountering the ‘selfishness’ (Boyle 1999, p. 510), which means leadership cannot be selfish. Being a leader means being aware of the other’s need. In order to empower people, leaders need to have interest in others. Boyle (1999) considers integrity and leadership as self-sacrifice. Leader’s interests are completely abandoned so that the general interest can shine instead. When it comes to integrity, individuals as leaders should put general well-being first even if the decision impacts the leader negatively. The will to sacrifice the personal interests is probably the mark of a good leader. Integrity is “discerning what is right and what is wrong, acting on what you have discerned even at personal cost” (Carter 1996, 2000 cited in Engho 2011, p. 524).

According to the definition of Bennis (2009, pp. xxvi), integrity means that a person has a strong moral compass that does not waver. Moral is a fragile concept that individuals should carefully cultivate. It seems like moral is built from its opposite, from realization of immoral. Individuals need to vision the “bad” side of the decision so that they can actually know their moral is correct. According to Boyle (1999) integrity is tested within the action. Being conscious of the contradiction between our actions and our values is the ‘ultimate proof of actual principles, real integrity’ (Boyle 1999, p. 510). Values such as moral and integrity could be seen differently through disenchantment. Disenchantment is characterized by the erosion of values, the pluralism of truth and discourses, all of which makes individuals struggle to define themselves.

Education, knowledge, experience and so forth help people build a reason and judgment about what is surrounding them. Obviously, created moral concepts differ from one person to another. Plus, leaders face the issue very often because they need to deal every time with different visions and different conceptions of the world and work. What is wrong and right for a leader could not be projected, transferred onto followers. The matter of balance is crucial as well. A leader should not only base his judgment on his assumptions but needs to pay attention to the meaning of decision which is highly individual.

In such world of the multitude of truths and beliefs, aligning oneself with organization can be incredibly challenging. The differences between personal and work-related values are the cause for the mental disturbance and anxiety which leads to distancing of people from the reality of both worlds. Postmodernity leaves people with no choice but to try to hold on to multiple roles and identities. However, those identities might differ in the primary constituent of the identity - morality - leaving people with the
burning feeling of uneasiness when being torn by several roles. Thompson (2004) suggests the leadership tool called moral compass which helps align personal values with organizational.

This model is applicable to individuals, groups, organizations, and communities as a tool for establishing a generic framework of moral solidarity that links diverse social identities and locations to symbols of shared meaning without distorting or encroaching upon either. (Thompson 2004, p. 33)

The key to total alignment of values lies in the pure ‘spiritual engagement’, provided by moral compass, enabling moral solidarity as well (Thompson 2004, p. 36).

5.3 Recovering from the Wounds

We have enlightened various leadership attributes from disenchantment perspective. We hope our insights could be beneficial for leaders in these complex postmodern times of uncertainty. We believe that the previous discussions could be complemented by the organizational look in order to provide more competent analysis. Therefore, we have decided to finish this chapter with the short outlook on leadership in demand shaped by disenchantment within postmodern organizational structure.

5.3.1 Complexity leadership theory

In postmodernity leadership is shaped by new organizational context. McGrath (2001 cited in Schreiber & Carley 2006, p. 61) claims that postmodern organizations stand out from traditional bureaucratic institutions for their complex functioning. The coercion of these two counteracting forces in postmodern organization represents ‘the organizational design paradox’ (Child & McGrath 2001 cited in Schreiber & Carley 2006, p. 63). Southern (2009, p. 201) also points out the ‘dialectic of postmodern organizations: [residing in their] autonomy and interdependence’.

The emergence of such organizational paradox requires a new leadership approach enabling such complex functioning, the approach named ‘complexity leadership theory’ (Schreiber & Carley 2006, p. 61). The theory suggests the necessity of three components in postmodern leadership, presented by Uhl-Bien et al. (2004 cited in Schreiber & Carley 2006, p. 63) which are ‘managerial leadership, adaptive leadership and enabling leadership’ (Schreiber & Carley 2006, p. 63). As described by Schreiber & Carley:

the heart of the complex functioning process is the co-evolution of human and social capital (Carley and Hill, 2001; McKelvey, under review) – the production of collective intelligence that occurs through an emergent collective action response. (2006, p. 64)

Schreiber & Carley (2006, p. 64) put under the microscope the influence of leadership styles on the process of enablement of complex functioning. The results show the
predominance of the participative leadership styles over directive (Schreiber & Carley 2006, p. 68). Among the reasons Schreiber and Carley (2006, pp. 69-71) enlist information flow and the level of emergent adaptive leadership in the informal network, they also point out the importance of exact conditions on the result. The importance of circumstances in the leadership sphere in postmodernity was also recognized by Leonard (2003, p. 11), who claimed that ‘a postmodern approach to leadership is necessarily situationally based’.

5.3.2 Charismatic leadership

Going on the scale larger than organizations, we can recognize that disenchantment itself is the variable determining the leadership, demanded by the public. In the time of disenchantment, theatrical performance is intrinsic to leadership and, while having nothing to do with reality, constitutes the force driving real lives. We believe that the link between disenchantment and performance can explain the boost of charismatic leadership at the same time with the development of disenchantment theory.

Disenchantment was marked with massive disinterest and distrust to political system. People were drawn to the spectacle, performance, to the flashing and screaming pictures. With disenchantment, the glitter and the hope that were intrinsic to life suddenly faded away, and in the dull world that people found themselves, they started looking for someone who would be different, optimistic, entertaining, somebody who made that picture alive again. In the leadership discourses the trait which brought to people the feeling of brighter future was called charisma. Charismatic leadership became very appealing to masses for the reason that it provided enchantment.

Such an appeal of charismatic leadership can represent a huge danger to society. Current political race in the USA is a perfect example of the influence of charisma on the masses. We think that political campaigns are mainly spectacles produced for the sake of seducing as many people as possible. Charisma can serve as a very good tool for this purpose. We believe that current disenchantment can be seen in the example of postmodern leader Donald Trump. To begin with, Trump is a very rich businessman which makes him independent from anyone’s influence. This candidate has no political background, nevertheless believes that the power of money he holds makes him legitimate for changing things. Donald Trump always goes directly to the point, he is spontaneous, and he does not respect any political traditions, conventions or language, which all together makes him more real in the eyes of the masses. His charismatic appeal might be very enchanting, however if you pay attention to his radical position on several political issues, his candidacy does not seem to be that appealing anymore. This highlights the value assigned to charisma in postmodern society.
The word “charisma” comes from the ancient Greek and means “divinely inspired gift” (Yukl 1993 cited in Nisbett & Walmsley 2016, p. 3). The notion of gift or “extraordinaries” (Weber n.d. cited in Nisbett & Walmsley 2016, p.3) brings some magic into leadership and provides a certain enchantment.

The Weberian view is focused on a ‘personality traits and behavior’ (Nisbett & Walmsley 2016, p. 4). Trice and Beyer sum it up in five points:

1. an extraordinarily gifted person.
2. a social crisis or situation of desperation,
3. a set of ideas providing a radical solution to the crisis.
4. a set of followers who are attracted to the exceptional person and come to believe that he or she is directly linked to transcendent powers,
5. the validation of that person’s extraordinary gifts and transcendence by repeated successes. (1986 cited in House 1999, p. 563)

While Weber believes that charisma is a gift, Meindl (1990 cited in Nisbett & Walmsley 2016, p. 6) says “charisma is a social construct of followers”. Further, Keyes (2002 cited in Nisbett & Walmsley 2016, p. 6) argues that “followers endow leaders with charisma”. This relationship emphasizes the fact that charisma is fragile in a sense that subordination can make it collapse.

The main idea that comes up in those studies is that ‘charisma lies in the relationship between leaders and followers, or merely resides in the minds of followers’ (Nisbett & Walmsley 2016, p. 6). Such opinion challenges the Weberian view of charisma as a gift, or more precisely it emphasizes that this gift is given by followers.

In this connection, we find the description of charismatic leadership, provided by Ladkin (2006), very relevant. He describes it through the context of sublime and his main idea is that charismatic leadership, as well as the experience of sublime, is co-created by both sides involved (Ladkin 2006). In the case of charismatic leadership, not only charisma has to be present but also identified by the followers as something of use to them (Ladkin 2006). One more time the importance of followers in the leadership is highlighted.

Beyer quotes Scott’s view (1981 cited in House 1999, p. 563) and emphasizes the importance of the crisis in the emergence of charisma. Ladkin (2006) also points out that charismatic leadership is increasingly appealing at the certain times.

Leaders such as John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, or Nelson Mandela were pivotal in leading their nations through times of huge societal upheaval when significant cultural meanings were dying and being transformed into new social forms. Such contexts, rife with uncertainty and potentially overwhelmingly chaotic can evoke the experience of the sublime. They also provide the perfect ground for the experience of charismatic leadership. (Ladkin 2006, p. 174)

Putting it into simpler words, dark, pessimistic, hopeless times of social deterioration call for charismatic personas on the leadership position. During crises followers need
a guide who seems to know how to act in such an environment of change. According to Davis and Gardner (2011, p. 919) crisis reassures followers in the leader’s vision. Indeed, crisis “produces desired motivational effects on followers, such that followers will pursue the leader’s vision and objectives” (Beyer & Browning, 1999; Shamir, 1995; Shamir, Arthur, & House, 1994; Shamir et al., 1993; Shamir, Zakay, Breinin, & Popper, 1998 cited in Davis & Gardner 2011, p. 919). As we can notice, crisis seems to be the perfect context to reinforce the relationship between leaders and followers as House and Shamir emphasized it:

an interaction between leaders and followers [during or after a crisis situation] that results in 1) making the followers' self-esteem contingent on the vision and mission articulated by the leader, 2) a strong internalization of the leader’s values and goals by the followers, 3) a strong personal or moral...commitment to these values and goals, and 4) a willingness on the part of followers to transcend their self-interests for the sake of the collective. (1993 cited in Davis & Gardner 2011, p. 919)

In a crisis time, leaders must reassure followers in having faith in leaders. Crisis or change is often a psychological trauma that a leader has to handle. In times of crisis leaders can use ‘charismatic communication style’ to instill hope and inspiration back into their followers (Davis & Gardner 2011, p. 919). In this case, such leadership attributes as rhetoric and storytelling, explained above, play a crucial role. Indeed, ‘charismatic relationship between leaders and followers involves the leader’s communications to the followers’ (Davis & Gardner 2011, p. 919). Moreover, this relationship has been proved to be “related to follower perceptions of leader charisma” (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999; Holladay & Coombs, 1993, 1994; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996 cited in Davis & Gardner 2011, p. 919).

5.3.3 Transformational leadership

While charisma is something that provides people with the feeling of enchantment, it is the external characteristic of a leader. With the loss of ideology present in postmodern disenchanted times people are looking for someone who is able to provide them with the feeling of belonging and aim. People are biologically designed for evolution and they are always looking for possible improvements to be made in their natural habitat. That is why postmodernity calls for transformational leadership able to provide people with the goal to look ahead. Berry (n.d. cited in Southern 2009) presented President Obama as one of the latest examples of a transformational leader. He also ‘identified three key characteristics of transformation leadership in President Obama: (a) a clearly articulated vision; (b) statements that inspire people to connect; and (c) a detailed plan to execute’ (Berry n.d. cited in Southern 2009, p. 202). In order to pass on the transformational vision, the leader can ‘use proven transforming techniques such as developing a vision, enlisting others, fostering collaboration, strengthening others, planning small wins, linking rewards to performance, and
celebrating accomplishments’ (Kouzes & Posner 1995 cited in Whetstone 2002, p. 391). On top of that, the essential component of transformational leader is execution plan for the presented vision, as it does actually have to transform the reality.

Transforming reality in conformity with the leader’s vision should not overlook the moral implications of doing so. History has proved the importance of morality in the leadership which is why it is crucial to implement it into the theory. Thus, increasing morality should be one of the aims of the transformational leader. After studying the topic, Whetstone (2002, p. 391) comes to the conclusion that ‘a theoretically superior approach is a combination in which a morally tough servant leader adopts certain behaviors of Bass’s altruistic transformational leader’. Whetstone describes the way it would look like:

The leader and the follower would focus on the vision jointly formulated and refined, avoiding manipulation by any party through a mutual commitment to participation, solidarity of community, and respect for each person grounded in the philosophy of personalism. (2002, p. 391)

We also believe that putting people at the center of leadership activities could have a positive effect on the way society operates and develops.
6 Weapons Down

“If your actions inspire others to dream more, learn more, do more and become more, you are a leader”


This thesis was born out of our desire to enlighten the distancing process occurring in society. We were personally upset by the way people were dealing with the issues of our time. Society is avoiding its own wrong doings and is trying to blame figureheads for its own responsibilities. Smiling leaders might make people feel better, but they cannot bring the necessary change in order to actually make things better. Society is focused on the non-important things, trying to just cover up the consequences of its actions but not tackle the problems in roots. In this context leadership is playing a representative role, not using the power it is entrusted with to its full potential.

Our vision was based on the fact that leadership is the notion inseparable from the society. Two phenomena are interrelated, that is why we thought we could gain a better understanding of leadership field through studying social issues. The aim of this thesis was to understand the angst of the society in order to be able to expand this understanding into leadership.

We are not trying to present a framed answer to all the issues of the society. This thesis is attempting to bring a clearer understanding of the problems and show the bigger picture of what society is living in. We hope our thesis provides readers with the food for thought and gives them the chance to reflect more deeply on the social issues and enlightened philosophical concepts. From our perspective the situation cannot be improved only by actions, as they will only cover up the consequences once again. For sustainable long term effect the change of human minds is highly needed in the postmodern society.

The notions outlined in this thesis are observed in the postmodern times. Postmodernity serves as a landscape to our study and is of a huge importance. The main characteristics of postmodernity lie within meaning creation and reality perception. Due to the multiplicity of meaning produced in the postmodern society, torn apart by different views of the reality, people fall victims of seduction process and distance themselves towards hyper reality.

We have used the concept of postmodernity to help us understand the notion of disenchantment. We believe that disenchantment is one of the major social
phenomena affecting the general way of thinking nowadays. Disenchantment has led to the deformation of the society and the way individuals operate.

We have found out that the start of disenchantment was first seen in the secularization of the society. Historically, the notion could be seen in the loss of power first of the God, then of the Church, then of the State. This led us to the idea that disenchantment is a consequence of the failure of the social institutions, required to instill the feeling of collective identity into masses, to do their job.

Looking into disenchantment we have found a lot of ideas correlating with the philosophy of Enlightenment. Enlightenment’s goal was to reach the freedom of minds and thoughts that right now seems to be in the roots of disenchantment. This finding made us wonder whether disenchantment is just the way Enlightenment manifests itself in postmodern times.

We have followed disenchantment through different social spheres and came across a number of its manifestations. Disenchantment seems to show itself through the losses happening in the social mentality among which we could enlist the losses of ideology, tradition, responsibility, magic, power of authority resulting in the general distancing of people from reality.

We have tried to identify the sources of disenchantment hoping to draw the full picture of the phenomenon. Among the tangible roots of disenchantment we have uncovered capitalism which globalized the commodification process, and also vast technological advancement, which led to massive technologization of all spheres of life which in turn spurred rationalization, changing the availability of information and process of its use, causing intellectualization. Technological and scientific breakthroughs took away mechanically the magic and mystery from the world, which resulted in the loss of social glue of the community. Technological process has caused pervasive forgery of relationships, which led to the shift of the social mentality.

The main outcome of disenchantment could be seen in the passivity of society. We believe that current social structure plays a significant role in the creation of such passivity. We reckon that the structure which is based on the idea of people handing their responsibilities over to a couple of individuals can promote nothing but passivity. Thus, we believe that social structure of democracy promotes passivity that creates decadence, leading to disenchantment lying in the basics of postmodernity. Passive society has a very good chance of destroying the very idea of leadership and the benefits it could produce.

Thus, disenchantment seems to hold a big threat to the concept of leadership. As a social notion, leadership is present in everyday life of the society and consequently is
affected by it. We cannot make a clear division between society and leadership, what is occurring in one of the spheres inevitably affects the other.

The purpose of our analysis was to emphasize all the causes and consequences of disenchantment, so we could measure its impact on leadership. We discovered that disenchantment has major implications on leadership in postmodern society. The uncertainty of such concepts as morality, values, identity, brought by disenchantment, is threatening leadership. Followers put their responsibilities away. The avoidance of responsibility has a bad influence on decision making. People are unable to make independent decisions. We were surprised to realize that organizations have been in the roots of establishment of decision making derived solely from data, which deteriorated the abilities of people to make choices. Such undecidedness only increases the passivity of the society, which makes us wonder whether organizations could be standing at the very beginning of the disenchantment of the world.

The reality perception, characterized by the rise of seduction process, led to the spread of the charismatic leadership. It has also spurred the importance of such tools as rhetorics and storytelling among leader’s attributes. Disenchantment with tradition underlines the essentiality of strong integrity and moral core in the leader. Integrity development has become one of the biggest challenges in the disenchanted society.

From the organizational perspective, leaders should take into account the complexity of the organizational design highly widespread in the postmodern society. All those findings point us to the most relevant type of leader needed in the disenchanted postmodernity, which, as for us, represents a combination of transformational and servant leaders. We believe this world has a chance for a better future with morally strong leaders having a clear transformational vision and its implementation plan.

All in all, human beings, nowadays, seem to be independent from society. Identities, reality, truth, in a postmodern landscape are now personally constructed. The mass has been split in pieces destroying the feeling of unity capable of leading the society towards a brighter future. We believe that studying disenchantment could make people realize the huge impact they have on their own life. Thus, it can positively implement the idea that human beings are now their own leaders, they are making their own choices and they are deciding on their future.
7 The Rules of the Battlefield

This part aims to emphasize how this research has been conducted. Moreover, we want to share our method so it can provide a better understanding about our outcomes along this study. The reader has to understand how the research has been set in order to read this thesis in a proper way. The methodological approach is the reflection of our thoughts and capabilities to construct consistent insights.

We, the reader and the researchers, have to be aware of the fact that research is personal, and the way we conduct it has everything to do with our own perception of the topic and the world. Our thesis is a personal perception of the world and some societal issues, in which we tried to draw our own understanding based on our own vision. Our philosophical, interpretative skills have been used along the whole writing process. Our methodology reflects this way of thinking.

It seemed very important to develop a certain theory about what the society is experiencing. Even though many studies have enlightened the phenomena, we wanted to connect several concerns all together. We have decided to focus on the disenchantment of the world and look into the ways it is connected to the leadership field in order to gain an understanding of its impact on people in general and in organizational context.

7.1 Leadership view

The study is conducted from the particular understanding of leadership. The core background idea of this study is that leadership is not an individual and isolated phenomenon but exists only together with followership. It is wrong to focus only on the leadership phenomenon when we study leadership field.

Both leadership and followership have been widely studied in the literature with followership being given less attention than leadership. The majority of the work in the field looks at followership as a passive recipient of leadership or with recent shifts in focus from leadership to followership as an influential variable of the leadership. All research seems to still underline leadership as a prior phenomenon and the most important. This study claims that followership is the prerequisite of leadership.

Thus, leadership does not only go one way from leaders to followers, but followers are an important part of leadership. Once we start talking about followers as well, leadership may become a social construct. Leadership begins with followers supporting the vision and ends when there are no followers empowering the leader. The idea is that leadership is not self-independent, it derives from followership. Therefore, we must combine both leadership and followership in our research.
Recognizing that bond between the two concepts of leadership and followership calls for the necessity of taking into account the influence that followers could have on the behavior of leaders. It looks like these days followers see leadership as the best way to escape from responsibilities by putting them on the shoulders of others, which results in the total absence of actual leadership.

However, the behavior of followers is certainly in a way a reflection of leadership. “If leadership involves actively influencing others, then followership involves allowing oneself to be influenced” (Uhl-Bien & Pillai 2007 cited in Uhl-Bien et al. 2014, p. 83). This means that inefficient leadership cannot be explained by malfunctions of solely neither leaders nor followers. There must be something wrong in the interaction, the relationship between them. We realize that both notions are grounded in the human mentality which is why we subject it to our research. This is where disenchantment can be relevant as a state of postmodern relationship style.

7.2 Turning pages

We were first driven by a general assessment of our modern society. We built up our own basic understandings prior to researching the topics in depth, which is seen by Arnbor and Bjerke (2009, p. 37) as 'clichés'. Sometimes, those prejudices are seen as bad concepts because they, somehow, frame our vision of the world. In our case, clichés helped us to conduct our research. They allowed us to build up criticism, and criticism provided a new theory. As Arnbor and Bjerke (2009, p. 37) argue: 'they are in fact a prerequisite for us to be able to handle our environment and ourselves, and to conduct studies creating knowledge'.

The aim of this paper was to generate a better understanding of disenchantment and philosophical concepts related to the issues of society. Researcher is defined as a 'creator of knowledge', which gives a certain freedom in the way we understand and reflect on our topic (Arnbor & Bjerke 2009, p. 47).

Revisiting leadership through philosophical concepts has been done through qualitative research. ‘Qualitative research employs an inductive approach and a fundamentally different role of the researcher and interpretation of findings’ (Creswell 2007 cited in Johnson 2015, p. 262). We have opted for the qualitative approach because it 'provide[s] greater researcher flexibility and subjective interpretation, which may be necessary for understanding highly complex phenomena' (Creswell 2007 cited in Johnson 2015, p. 262). Through books and articles we collected more and more data in order to set up theories regarding our research and this data provided us with more powerful insights for the development of consistent thoughts.
7.2.1 Philosophical field

Our luck was the wideness of our thesis, in a sense that we first focused on philosophical aspects of it in order to possess a larger knowledge about the human state of mind. Philosophy prevents us from narrowing our minds and being caught in the ‘established wheel’ described by Arbnor and Bjerke (2009, p. 214). Authors describe the danger of reading previous studies about the topic under research and being biased by the thoughts of others as a result (Arbnor & Bjerke 2009, p. 214). Philosophical approach is very suitable for researching human condition as it teaches us to perceive the world, human interactions and to understand the place of individual in the society.

Studying philosophy allowed us to understand our ‘own inner drive for doing research’, and thus reinforce our tenets about the direction of our research (Arbnor & Bjerke 2009, p. 214). As the study is written with an aim of opening minds, it surely deserves to be conducted by the open-minded researchers. As researchers, we did not want to narrow neither our field of studies nor our capabilities in the process. Reading philosophy helped us with those concerns, first because it allowed us to broaden our vision about human beings and, second, because it synced both of our visions into our thesis’ vision. By enlarging our philosophical knowledge we were able to “create knowledge by interactive development of understanding in the study area” (Wild cited in Arbnor & Bjerke 2009, p. 214).

Studying the past landscape of philosophy makes us more qualified for analyzing the present. By landscape we mean a sort of legacy, a saved legacy, on which everything is based, as an old house which has been untouched for a while. This house is still a part of the present, but nothing has changed inside of it since the time people lived in it. Everything left a trace from the past with a story to tell. Paying attention to these little details allows us to build a whole story about what happened in that house. The dust has had time to settle but foundations are still solid. Those foundations are strong enough to build something around.

Philosophy, for us, has played the role of this old house. We blew the dust off and discovered the whole unexpected world full of questions, answers, thoughts and problems, the world that brings a new vision of things, a new way to approach life. Just like we can see ourselves stepping in this house, surprised at the very beginning, perhaps afraid a little, but very curious to know what kind of treasure the house could hold inside, we stepped forward to gain more knowledge. We can easily imagine walls talking via pictures hanging on them, telling us more about its story. Every new room represented a new road toward the philosophical knowledge we could use to build our theory. This backward journey is essential in our process because our whole thesis is based on a good understanding of this landscape. We, as individuals, live in this
landscape but too often ignore the change occurring in it. We are blindly moving forwards, which is ironic, because in order to see the path into tomorrow, we need to open our eyes to the past journey.

7.2.2 Leadership field

Our philosophical knowledge provided the outline for our thesis, it is like a box that we can fill up with different knowledge dedicated to a more specific topic, such as revisiting leadership.

Leadership is about relations between people. More precisely, it is the study about individuals having an impact on a group of people, their behaviors, thoughts and so forth. Leaders have to deal with human behavior which is a very complex subject. Throughout times, we could encounter many leaders and followers, who had an important impact on history. Many scholars have been studying leadership, even though this field is quite new. For us, as researchers, it was really important to study a certain vision of leadership from other researchers in order to complete our knowledge about it.

Our philosophical background research helped us to elaborate on theories upon information sorted out from many readings; moreover, it allowed us to build criticism and not to follow only one thought, by going through more readings in order to develop a larger theory connected to our vision.

7.3 Empirical study

In this last part of our thesis, we would like to present our vision of the methodological procedure of conducting empirical studies on the topic to the reader, as we would have done it if we had had the time and resources. Let us call it our ‘imaginary’ research.

With our thesis we have already conducted a substantial primary research of secondary data in all the relevant fields of study. We have gained a wide knowledge and understanding of theoretical framework of the issue in question. Additional research could be made only after having some results from collected empirical data.

In search for the methodological approach in collecting and analyzing empirical data, we have decided upon the combination of grounded theory and actor’s approach. We believe that in our topic it would be best to use some knowledge contained in grounded theory while utilizing the methods of actor’s approach which would allow us to draw more interpretative conclusions, thus, be more insightful.

7.4 Actors View

The approach mainly utilized in our research is the actor’s approach. In our case, the actors view seems to be the perfect method since it provides a certain ‘understanding
of the complexity of the human society’ (Arbnor & Bjerke 2009, p. 134). Actors view allows the researchers to collect data from its roots which are the people. Our study is focused on societal issues that directly involve people, making them the source of the needed knowledge.

Facing the wideness of our thesis topic, we could not only bind our thoughts into leaders and followers in an organizational sphere. Actors view allows us to follow the flow of the society. Indeed, society is changing, and is doing so very fast. Being involved, being an actor in our research provides us with a better understanding of this change. As Arbnor and Bjerke (2009, p. 134) argue ‘as creator of knowledge we are always co-creator in a constant flow of the development of the reality’.

As Arbnor and Bjerke (2009, p. 132) argue ‘in the actors view we must therefore never stand outside’. The main principle of the actors view lies in the effective behavior in the process of data collection, which allows to be very active in the research, as enlightened by the authors ‘the conception of knowledge of the actors view is therefore procreative with a clearly expressed ambition to be present and to act – not to stand outside as an observer’ (Arbnor & Bjerke 2009, p. 134).

In this approach, the theory is built up by a researcher but is based on other actors. However, when we talk about leadership, we talk about human relationships. We can first collect insights so we can understand the complexity of human beings, but we cannot avoid the crucial role of human in this research. Indeed, we cannot only talk about the situation of the society without asking people about their feelings, it would be wrong to state facts concerning people without paying attention to them. As we explained earlier through Arbnor and Bjerke’s (2009) thoughts, the truth cannot emanate only from observing the society; it requires having a direct contact with it.

The idea of using the actors approach resides in bringing out the dialectically constructed knowledge about socially constructed reality. Starting out from the idea of socially constructed reality, we acknowledge the fact of being active reflexive agents of this reality. Therefore, the reality takes shape ‘of a number of finite provinces of meaning’ (Arbnor & Bjerke 2009, p. 75). ‘The provinces of meaning’ represent ‘the thesis’, while the interpretations provided by actors are seen as ‘the antithesis’ (Arbnor & Bjerke 2009, p. 76). The contradiction of those results in the development of ‘synthesis’, which represents the new social reality expressed through language development (Arbnor & Bjerke 2009, p. 76).

**7.4.1 Researcher in actors approach**

There are a number of requirements to the researchers in using the actors approach. They represent the founding principles of researcher’s behavior when exploiting actors view. These requirements include reflexivity, language development and pre-
understanding. Coming together they help the researcher to create a reality, a new socially constructed truth.

7.4.1.1 Reflexivity

Reflexivity is strongly interrelated with the idea of the objectivity of the research. It is crucial for the researcher to realize his own participation in the reality. Reflexivity engages the personality of a researcher in a sense that his personal background is implicated in a process of conducting a research.

This is accomplished by the researcher reflecting on their: cultural background; thoughts; actions; emotions; assumptions; and unconscious responses, and how these factors may influence the research process and findings. (Finlay, 1998; Rolfe, 2006 cited in Darawsheh 2014, p. 563).

The concept of reflexivity explains that research is actually biased by the researcher’s feelings directly involved in the meaning creation process. In other words, it allows the researcher to ‘situate [himself] in relation to [his] research idea and study” (Darawsheh 2014, p. 563). Furthermore, reflexivity provides more and more subjectivity which “is inherent in the thought process of any researcher and can affect data collection, analysis, and interpretation” (Finlay, 1998; Finlay and Ballinger, 2006 cited in Darawsheh 2014, p.561). In order to increase the level of the study, the researcher must challenge his subjectivity to encounter other person’s reality framed by his or her own subjectivity. In other words, the researcher has to confront his thesis with somebody else’s antithesis in order to build together a synthesis:

This means that qualitative research findings are a result of the synthesis of the perspectives of the researcher and participants. (Finlay, 1998; McCabe and Holmes, 2009; Lambert et al, 2010 cited in Darawsheh 2014, p.562)

The researcher cannot escape from the reflexive process because it constitutes the main part of the meaning creation process. “Through reflexivity, researchers reflect on their thoughts, actions, assumptions, and expectations”, bringing their personal engagement in research process (Finlay, 1998; Lambert et al, 2010 cited in Darawsheh 2014, p. 562). Thus, conducting a consistent study requires a good knowledge of oneself.

Reflexivity is an individual concept that allows creator of knowledge to situate himself in his study. However, when trying to interact with other actors of the reality, researchers have to find the most suitable way of transferring the knowledge between actors, which brings us to the matter of language development.
7.4.1.2 Language development

The purpose of language development in actors view perspective, is to find the proper ‘road’ to communicate with other actors (Arbnor and Bjerke 2009, p. 140). It is not only to use language, as words, but it is to find ‘all the instruments that creators of knowledge can use, antithetical to the everyday language, to express their experiences and understanding’ (Arbnor and Bjerke 2009, p. 140).

In order to increase efficiency in communication with actors, creators of knowledge should not force the process of language but they should create a working interpretation system, instead:

Creators of knowledge can use new well-connotated word combinations, analogous concepts, contradictory terms, new concepts and terms, metaphors, analogies, simplifications, newly constructed words, and illustrations and drawings to advantage. (Arbnor and Bjerke 2009, p. 140)

Language development is essential in the construction of social reality that is why considering all possibilities of communication is important. Language development could be also seen as a way to create a certain intimacy with actors. We, as producer of meaning, could gain a lot by doing so. The more confident and comfortable with the environment people are, the more they are willing to share.

7.4.1.3 Pre-understanding

When conducting research, researchers are trying to build an understanding of social reality, and language serves as a tool for optimizing communication. Language is the source of the truth exchanged in the communication between the researcher and the actors. However, in order to understand the actors, researcher has to, first, build an understanding of the way actors build their own reality. This is called pre-understanding or ‘first understanding’ (Arbnor and Bjerke 2009, p. 77). Pre-understanding implies that knowledge creators have to detect what guides the actors, before trying to ‘understand [their] actions in the social world’ (Arbnor and Bjerke 2009, p. 77). Pre-understanding represents the starting point of the research.

7.4.2 Building of truth

The central assumption of the actors view is the existence of a social reality’, which stresses the fact that reality is being built through social interactions (Arbnor & Bjerke 2009, p. 142). Authors develop an idea based on four processes that enlighten the building of common truth (Arbnor & Bjerke 2009).

The truth emanating from those interactions is first to think individually. It urges individuals to create their own truth which would come from their personal experiences. Such personal process through which individuals create their own
perception of what is surrounding them is called ‘subjectification’ (Arbnor & Bjerke 2009, p. 142). That is why, authors say that ‘humans are a subjective reality’ (Arbnor & Bjerke 2009, p. 143). When it comes to making ‘these subjective experiences externally available’, language plays an important role (Arbnor & Bjerke 2009, p. 142). By sharing their experiences, what Arbnor and Bjerke (2009, p. 142) call ‘externalization’, individuals create a common knowledge. They modify their thoughts and their vision in order to create an objective truth, through the process of ‘objectification’ that can be seen as the co-creating process of building truth (Arbnor & Bjerke 2009, p. 142). Objectification process is essential for making connections between individuals, as it creates a social ‘objective reality’ (Arbnor & Bjerke 2009, p. 143). Finally, the last process is the ‘internalization’ by which individuals integrate previously created common knowledge and compare it to their personal thoughts (Arbnor & Bjerke 2009, p. 142). Internalization is the process through which a human is socially shaped (Arbnor & Bjerke 2009, p. 142). Our thesis is mainly based on ‘internalization’ process, occurring between our understanding and the knowledge presented by all the texts.

These four elements: ‘subjectification’, ‘externalization’, ‘objectification’ and ‘internalization’, which are the four dialectical processes behind the social construction of reality according to phenomenology, emphasize the importance of actors view (Arbnor & Bjerke 2009, p. 142). Indeed, for us, as researchers, talking about social issue, it is crucial not to fall victims to one way of thinking taken for absolute truth. We have first built a theory based on our readings, personal vision and common ideas, which is now ready to be confronted by reality. Discussing this idea with people will power our thesis with reality check. As this approach sees reality as a subjective social construction, the only objectified reality is located on the crossroads of everybody's personal perceptions (Arbnor & Bjerke 2009). This is why it cannot be a subject to explanation, only to understanding (Arbnor & Bjerke 2009).

7.4.3 Language use

Another argument that explains why we decided to opt for actors view is its approach to the use of the language. The approach looks at interpretation of relationships through language used. According to Arbnor and Bjerke:

We experience the world in language. We act in, and reflect on, the world through language. We hold conversations, exchange thoughts, express feelings, create technology and cooperate. (2009, p. 152)

In other words, language is a mean to ‘catch what Max Weber called “the subjective logic of actors”‘ (Arbnor & Bjerke 2009, p. 152) and broaden our vision as well. As Wild said:
Before you started school you had 100 languages. By the time you arrived here your schooling had done away with ninety of them. If you aren’t careful, your further studies will take away a few more. (cited in Arbnor and Bjerke 2009, p. 214)

We could easily compare this quote to the process of writing a thesis. First, 100 languages are the ideas in the researcher’s head. Then he diminishes them with multiple incomes in order to narrow the topic. At the end of the process, researcher builds up one theory seen as one language. The actors view will prevent us from speaking only one language through this work. This method will provide us with multiple languages, multiple views to reinforce the theory, to broaden it up so we could have better outcomes.

7.5 Grounded theory

Along with the actor’s approach, we strongly believe that using some of the procedures of grounded theory could help us reach our goal. However, we do not accept the analytical philosophy on which grounded theory is based. Grounded theory approach focuses on both explanation and understanding. The main purpose of grounded theory is to generate knowledge representing new alternatives in empirical reality. Therefore, it takes the shape of the constant analysis of existent empirical data that goes all the way to theoretical labeling and then results in the formulation of new concepts and consequently new data to analyze.

Though it seems that there is a strict path of steps to be taken in the grounded theory approach, it is not linear at all, which is very convenient for our topic (Strauss & Corbin 1997). Grounded theory tools allow us to go back-and-forth in our research which improves efficiency. Data collection and analysis are highly intertwined, as well as analysis and conceptualization, theorizing and researching. Plus, it is quite personal in the sense that we could write and think in our way and then use the theory to complement our thoughts. We believe it would balance objectification in analysis with subjectification in interpretation which could add value to our research.

7.6 Data collection

Analyzing the disenchantment issue with actors approach, our ‘imaginary’ research would take shape of communication with people to find out their view on the topic. The results would be interpreted from the way we understand them with careful attention to the language of people. This approach is not centered on scientific measurement of validity; it looks more on the authenticity of the researchers’ study that is why it mainly uses methods of direct observations and dialogues (Arbnor & Bjerke 2009).
Conducting our primary research we made use of the dialogue technique, but applied it to the way we approached our readings. Our own province of meaning represented the thesis, while the texts subjected to our analysis provided us with the antithesis. The constant interrelation between the thesis of our understanding and multiple representations of antithesis in the literature discourse on the issues shaped the reality, which resulted in the synthesis expressed in our work.

Applying text-to-text dialogue requires an explanation of the way the text is analyzed. We believe that deconstruction theory could be relevant in this connection. Deconstruction theory was largely developed by Jacques Derrida. The theory was derived from the understanding of the language provided by Ferdinand de Saussure who ‘saw language as a closed, stable system of signs’ (Marts 2015). The approach of deconstruction to reading texts is based on the ideas of, first, the infinite plurality of meaning of the language, and secondly, the necessity of critical analysis of the binary logic of opposition in the text (Marts 2015). The plurality of meaning is the result of the fact that the author is the only person who can determine the exact meaning of the words written, while for the reader everything that is left is interpretation (Benson 2005, p. 30). The binary logic explains the tendency to signify things through their opposites (Marts 2015). Deconstruction of the text implies careful consideration of each such signification to the extent of disproving its opposition (Marts 2015).

For our empirical data collection we would also use dialogues, but face-to-face instead of text-to-text that we have done so far, in order to obtain a realistic grasp on the issue of disenchantment of the society and its effect on follower-leader relationship. Leading such dialogues with actors could generate new knowledge regarding the effect of the disenchantment on the everyday human life. The philosophical side of our study is favorable to dialogue defined as ‘the interplay between “talking” and “listening” that takes place on equal terms for the participants’ (Arbnor & Bjerke 2009, p. 135). Indeed, dialogue can be perceived as the best way to first present a certain theory, then go through it and present insightful thoughts, and end up with a reinforced theory. Having a conversation with people prevents to set boundaries around the exchange of information. In comparison with text-to-text dialogues, face-to-face dialogues allow us to gain a better understanding of the content created in the process. During a real conversation, we have the possibility to direct it in a beneficial way, to focus on more interesting points, to inquire into a better explanation of the implied meaning. In text-to-text dialogues we do not have the luxury of clarifying with the author what exactly hides behind the words on paper. Dialogue allows conversation, and conversation is the form of interaction which promoted the freedom of the mind, hence, improves the outcome. Focusing on a social issue requires social means in order to build up knowledge. The dialogue is seen as ‘a necessity in the social world of reflection and action between people’ (Arbnor & Bjerke 2009, p. 136).
Furthermore, ‘carrying out a dialogue is the basis of the act of creating knowledge and the participation of the creator of knowledge in the world’ (Arnbor & Bjerke 2009, p. 136).

In order to start collecting empirical data, we would have to find relevant candidates, who have to be consistent for us to be able to draw up some conclusions. However, our topic concerns society in general, which we extend onto narrower subject of leadership. Furthermore, as any individual is engaged in some kind of a follower-leader relationship, this would imply that when collecting data, almost any member of the society would have his own view on the topic, hence be eligible to be in our research. However, there would still be limitations in the research, as the concept of disenchantment is mainly seen in a Western society; we cannot extrapolate it to the whole world for the apparent reason of the existence of the differences in culture, social mentality and so forth.

We would divide the collection of the empirical data in two stages. First of all, we would like to talk to several people to gather as many dispersed ideas as possible. The diversity of the people on this stage is the key as it would allow us to cover more aspects of disenchantment issue in the society. Dialogues would be mainly built around the feelings people experience in relation to the main disenchantment components as identified in the relevant chapter of this thesis. By addressing such topics as feeling of responsibility, presence of ideology, attitude towards magic, effect of economic and technological development on the relationships, current state of leader-follower relationship, we would be able to identify the scale of the disenchantment issue in the society, its impact on leadership concept and the extent to which it is connected to the concepts we have described. The purpose of talking to the crowd is composing a general idea of the way society shapes itself through disenchantment. The freedom of the face-to-face dialogues might also help us to find other interrelated topics which have not been covered by secondary data analysis.

After talking to a variety of people, we would continue by having conversations with experts in the field. Among those experts would be sociologists, philosophers, postmodernists, scholars studying the evolution of leadership. These conversations would be held on the basis of the analysed insights from talking to the crowd, thus, would be much more theoretically grounded.

Once collected the dialogues, we would start line-by-line analysis or microanalysis (Strauss & Corbin 1998). This tool would help us to make sense out of the data and look at everything in detail. To begin with, we would have to analyze words, phrases and sentences. Microanalysis of the data helps to categorize it and see topics arising from it, to build primary blocks prompting further research and data collection.
When microanalysis is done, we would move towards the theory building procedures. In theory building we would use coding techniques. The purpose of the coding procedures is to extract main research groups to be covered. To continue with conceptualizing, we would implement abstracting and labeling along with microanalysis (Strauss & Corbin 1998). This would result in defining and naming categories which would simplify interpretation process. Categorizing and dimensionalizing of the categories would lead to formation of subcategories. This would allow us to conduct our research more thoroughly and have more extensive results.

When dealing with subcategories, grounded theory offers the tool of axial coding. First of all, it helps to analyze the category along its axis making the whole research more extensive. Secondly, it allows us to do the analysis at two levels: at the level of respondent and our conceptualization of their responses (Strauss & Corbin 1998). By doing such a vast analysis we would be able to define or explain a paradigm which consists of structure and processes (Strauss & Corbin 1998). Structure is conditions in which the problem exists and process stands for the interactions and connections between actors (Strauss & Corbin 1998).

At the point when no subcategories seem to be developing, we would proceed with the interpretation and final theorizing. When building up a theory we would first have to describe the essence of the research, and then conceptualize a theory, which involves naming central category and linking all subcategories to it (Strauss & Corbin 1998). There would be some cases, which do not fit into the general scenario; they would propose an alternative view on the issue. After that we would have to validate if the research makes sense or find gaps which we would have to fill. After final refining of the research, the theory should be in place giving insights on the problem and guiding to action, also appearing as the base for the future research. Hopefully, in the end of this study we would obtain an empirical proof of theoretical findings or maybe some new insights.
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