

УДК [101.9:316.46]:502/504

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30970/PPS.2025.58.2>

## THE PROGRAMME OF PHILOSOPHICAL LEADERSHIP IN THE CONTEXT OF NOOSPHERIC VALUES AND PRESENT-DAY LEADERSHIP PRACTICES

**Halyna Baluta, Andrii Abdula**

*Kryvyi Rih Pedagogical University,*

*Department of Philosophy*

*Universytetskyi Avenue, 54, 50086, Kryvyi Rih, Ukraine*

The article substantiates the relevance of the social task of forming the personality of the leader-philosopher, awareness of his or her significant social role in the context of the complex realities of today, the rapid development of science and technology. The focus of research attention is shifted to the sphere of universally oriented leadership practices as prerequisites for the maintenance of civilizational foundations. The sustainable social development is impossible beyond the outlined system of anthropological coordinates, deliberated ethical decisions because of highly organised thinking of the leader's personality. The article substantiates that social rationality cannot be reduced to its instrumental dimension and function without taking into account the universal context. Awareness of these challenges, the study says, requires rethinking the role of a social leader, the basis of major leadership qualities that will adequately respond to social challenges. The proposed considerations are an attempt of research reflection towards the understanding of the prototype of the present-day leader involved in such research programs: the concept of post-industrial leadership (J. Rost), the ethic of responsibility (H. Jonas), as well as models of leadership qualities (J. Klagge). As a result, the paradigm of present-day leadership can be supplemented by universal criteria given by the type of philosophical leadership as its actual basis, particularly in the environmental sphere. The article also provides a brief analysis of the evolution of the theory of leadership, supplemented and generalised paradigm of leadership characteristics of J. Klagge, and proposes the definition of modern leadership as leadership of a philosophical (understanding) type. The approach has been proposed that focuses on an essential understanding of leadership, its invariant characteristics, ethical criteria, which partially eliminates the effect of a simplified perception of the personality of a leader as a social manager.

*Key words:* thinking, leader, leadership paradigm, philosophical leadership.

**Philosophical discourse and the problem of leadership.** The complex and unpredictable present-day reality, the rapid development of science and technology shift the focus of research attention in the direction of the conceptual justification of current, universally oriented practices as a prerequisite for the preservation of rooted civilizational foundations. Sustainable social development is impossible outside the defined system of anthropological coordinates and balanced ethical decisions. The narrowing of the scope of ethical values, the destruction of common rules, in particular, the value of peace and universal moral unity, in favour of the values of individual ethics and “spontaneous” pragmatics lead to a destructive state of “the war of all against all”, including the uncontrolled expansion of humankind into the space and biosystems. On this background, it becomes more and more obvious that social rationality cannot be reduced only to its instrumental dimension, and it cannot function without taking into account the universal context. Awareness of these challenges requires also a rethinking of the role of the leader, the justification of such leading leadership qualities that will allow us to respond to today's challenges adequately.

The topic of leadership today is extremely valuable and multidimensional. It includes both theoretical and practical aspects, and it is actively replenished with new observations in the fields of psychology, management, sociology, pedagogy, and other branches of science.

Not surprisingly, it causes great research interest, represented, in particular, in the works by R. Stogdill, F. Fiedler, J. Burns, J. Rost, P. Drucker, J. Klagge, D. Goleman, and others. Thus, leadership began to be intensively studied at the Ohio State University in the USA in the 1940s. In the most recognised, authoritative form, the theory of leadership is represented by the research by R. Stogdill, F. Fiedler, and others, who laid the foundation of “a possible model of effective leadership” as the correspondence of the results of leadership decisions to the system of group expectations. In particular, in his study, which has acquired the status of a kind of classic leadership theory, R. Stogdill distinguishes about thirty personal factors related to leadership, which are divided into five categories (capacity, achievements, responsibility, participation, status) [19, p. 64]. At the same time, he concludes: “The qualities, characteristics, and skills required in a leader are determined to a large extent by the demands of the situation in which he is to function as a leader”, first of all, in the achievement of group goals, while leadership itself should be considered as “the interaction of variables which are in constant flux and change” [19, p. 63-64]. F. Fiedler in turn proposed a Contingency Model of leadership focused primarily on the efficiency with which the group performs the task [8, p. 2]. The effectiveness of the leader, according to this concept, will depend on the situation because the leadership style is the result of life experience, which makes it a fixed characteristic [16, p. 112]. At the same time, as the researchers themselves admit, this model and other similar theories are abstracted from other essential factors, such as personal growth or satisfaction of group members [8, p. 2]. In general, as J. Rost emphasises, during the 20th century, the majority of the leadership experts engaged in research in only one direction, mostly favouring the business environment, or, to a lesser extent, emphasizing educational or political aspects [17, p. 1].

Further research in this direction demonstrated that several important issues of the theory of leadership (the assessment of leaders' activities, including those that cannot be socially acceptable because of the results of leadership decisions, the problem of embodying the value principles of the leader's personality as a constructive social strategist, etc.) required the involvement of a wider discourse. However, the tendency to distinguish it emerged only at the end of the 20th century [17, p. 2-3]. Besides, as J. Rost notes that both the definitions of leadership and its models are contradictory. The emphasis on the peripheral aspects of leadership, as opposed to an understanding of its essential nature, creates interdisciplinary views, while the confusion of leadership with management raises conceptual problems [17, p. 93].

Traditional, narrowly oriented approaches to the issue of leadership as a powerful, authoritative personality as a manager gradually lost their positions as incomplete, not corresponding to present-day challenges. They were not able to provide “anthropological” samples of strategies aimed at training current leaders, in contrast to integrative, philosophical approaches that enable the shift of the research horizon with extra aspects towards an introspective and axiological analysis of leadership characteristics, in particular critical thinking, emotional intelligence, aesthetic taste, sensitivity to context, etc.

The current discourse on leadership has significantly expanded the spectrum of ideas about the essence of leadership and its value dimensions. According to D. Goleman, emotional intelligence is dominant in the structure of leadership characteristics because the leader's authority forms a system of shared values [9]. No less significant factor is aesthetic intelligence – aesthetic empathy, aesthetic taste, as P. Brown writes about it, analysing the “aesthetic” marketing strategies of successful leading companies [2]. In our opinion, the identification of certain dominant characteristics of leadership requires theoretical and methodological substantiation of its philosophical primary foundation. Such successful attempts to assess leadership as a philosophical phenomenon are the books and papers by A. Zaleznik, P. Koestenbaum, P. Case, R. French and P. Simpson, S. Spoelstra and others.

As J. Burns and J. Rost emphasise, the industrial tradition of leadership research as a management phenomenon has caused a crisis in leadership theory: researchers improperly narrow and simplify a complex set of interactions between a leader and followers. "Without a powerful philosophical tradition, without theoretical and empirical cumulation, without guiding concepts and without considerable practical experience, we lack the very foundations for knowledge of a phenomenon – leadership in the arts, the academy, science, politics, the professions, war – that touches and shapes our lives," J. Rost quotes J. Burns [17, p. 9].

As a rule, leadership is associated with success, which cannot be complete without a highly developed philosophical culture. The analysis of various elements of the "formula of success" carried out by S. Klepko points to a kind of "alphabet of success", a condensed list of "main steps to success" as a result of a philosophical understanding of reality: analysis of the situation, choice of alternatives, determination of the goal, belief in one's strength, the ability to carry through, the ability to retreat, a calculated risk, synergy, the ability to turn a problem into an opportunity, the correct allocation, personal initiative, etc. [23, p. 140-141]. The highlighted characteristics are the result of philosophical technologies of learning and education, which, unfortunately, remain underestimated. The question remains what worldview orientations and methodological contours the concept of philosophical leadership provide, which is especially significant in the social sphere and its subsystems.

The social text, its formation is a supra-biological system that ceases to function beyond the existence of nature, understanding the principles and rules of nooethics. The development of the nooethic program in its theoretical and methodological format cannot be effective without the intellectual and existential readiness of the subject to establish the limits of intervention in nature in favour of the will to "continue life", moral autonomy of a new type, justified by H. Jonas: "It was not the knowledge of a scientist or an expert, but knowledge of a kind readily available to all men of good will" [10, p. 5].

The noospheric crisis, the uncertainty of material perspectives as a result of "technological utopia" requires a focus on the systematic study of biosocial spheres in their connections and relations, as a person loses the integrity of the existential horizon. It is about a qualitatively new historical possibility of a potential planetary catastrophe, which requires awareness and understanding of the essence of leadership, the necessary revision of strategic decisions, and the fundamental role of philosophical leadership in future transformations.

Philosophical thinking overcomes the illusion of obviousness. As H. Jonas noted, interference with nature has caused an ecological crisis that threatens a human being himself because of naive belief in the picture of natural sustainability. Over time, the naive illusion was destroyed when the picture of reality became questionable because of the awareness of the vulnerability of nature and the fatality of anthropogenic pressure. "It brings to light, through the effects, that the nature of human action has *de facto* changed, and that an object of an entirely new order – no less than the whole biosphere of the planet – has been added to what we must be responsible for because of our power over it," wrote H. Jonas [10, p. 7].

The causal factor appears to be the acceleration of technological expansion in the structures of life, leaving no time for correction, which is becoming increasingly difficult. Therefore, "on a less pragmatic plane, there is the heritage of a past evolution for us to preserve," the philosopher emphasises, calling for vigilance in the matter of undertakings [10, p. 32]. As he puts it: "This raises to an ultimate pitch the old question of the power of the wise, or the force of ideas not allied to self-interest, in the body politic. What force shall represent the future in the present?" [10, p. 22].

As an influential factor being able to stop the trend of "anthropological defeat", the philosopher considers metaphysical philosophy as true, reliable knowledge, substantiates

the need for ethical heredity and proposes to be determined not for the sake of desire, but for the sake of duty towards humanity as such. "To stand guard over this onerous endowment of theirs is *our* cardinal duty toward the future of humanity as such (its existence presupposed), from which all specified duties toward the well-being of future humans are then derivative," he writes [10, p. 42]. Thus, the figure of a leader in its universal quality, demonstrating universal "rules of the game", acquires a topical meaning while preserving "philosophical" constants: the ability to reflect, panoramic thinking, responsibility, a high level of education, spiritual concentration, and stoic resistance to stress. Such leaders are the most valuable to society, since by virtue of their position, the leader has the right to make decisions based on moral authority. Unfortunately, in modern educational, political, and environmental practices, the potential of philosophical culture remains simplified and underestimated in situations of risks and life threats, fierce competition, public representation, environmental challenges, and acute political conflicts that require rational considerations and successful decisions [4; 21]. It is obvious that the shortage of leaders' high-quality thinking in various fields is a real practical problem.

It becomes necessary to focus on the qualitative dimensions of leadership as essential universal constants that remain outside the paradigmatic framework of leadershipology, to attempt to generalise its multi-vector approach. In the situation of social and environmental challenges, the concept of a philosophical ("understanding") integral type requires special attention, which assumes the presence of a unique leadership potential: highly developed thinking including analytics, diagnostics, forecasting, consensual sufficiency, integrated functionality. The proposed considerations are an attempt at research reflection in the direction of understanding the prototype of a present-day leader involved in the following research programs: the post-industrial paradigm of leadership (J. Rost), the ethic of responsibility (H. Jonas), and J. Klage's models of leadership descriptors. As a result, the paradigm of present-day leadership can be supplemented with the universal criteria set by the type of philosophical leadership as its actual basis, particularly in the environmental sphere.

This type of leader is personified not only by successful individuals but also by value-oriented analysts and practitioners, designers of creative solutions. In our opinion, this approach, focused on the unity of the essential understanding of leadership, its invariant characteristics, and ethical criteria, partially eliminates the stereotypical effect of the external perception of the leader's personality at the level of collective expectations, allows actualizing the essential characteristics of leadership as socially significant.

#### *The Concept of Philosophical Leadership as a Prerequisite for Leadership Practices*

As A. Yermolenko points out, the positioning of a person in the world is primary to knowledge, as it constitutes their lifeworld, their vital mode. Nature appears not as a humanised environment (Umwelt), but as a universal common world (Mitwelt) [20, p. 200]. At the same time, an important task of ecological ethics, its defining strategy is as follows: firstly, to overcome anthropocentrism, secondly, understand the phenomenological-hermeneutic principles of understanding nature. "Philosophical interest oriented towards the relationship to nature or to the ecosystem, the basis of which would be not only their explanation but also understanding or at least partial understanding," notes A. Yermolenko [20, p. 194]. The phenomenological-hermeneutic guideline of reading the world as a book, and nature as a common world or common existence, is a leitmotif of the philosophy of nature. "The interpretation of the world as a certain meaningful and semantic unity makes it possible to treat it not only as an object of explanation, mastery and instrumental domination but also as a subject of understanding with which one can find a common language by applying to it hermeneutic methods of cognition," writes A. Yermolenko [20, p. 195].

In our opinion, the potential of successful solutions and successful hermeneutic practices cannot be realised outside of diagnostic thinking as an undervalued cognitive, primarily philosophical practice, endowed with the function of sign recognition and the function of forecasting, which complements the unique qualities of analytical thinking. Cognitive models of natural phenomena may not correspond to reality without taking into account signs (symptoms) as procedural indicators of the noumenal sphere. (It is the feature of diagnostic thinking that can explain the philosophical basis of the traditional art of medicine, the inclusion of famous philosophers in the horizon of medical practice). Thus, orientation to systemic and critical-diagnostic forms of cognition and thinking are among other important tasks related to the concept of philosophical leadership, especially in the field of nooethics.

Based on this, the paradigm of “understanding” as an integral philosophical methodology for understanding the integrity of the connection between a person and the world acquires a direct practical meaning in the field of philosophical leadership with its universal criteria: the quality of thinking and the ethics of responsibility. It is clear that philosophical leadership and its criteria are necessary for overcoming not only the ecological crisis but also the crisis of civilization – social institutions and systems. As A. Yermolenko points out, the ecological crisis is not just an environmental crisis, but it causes a crisis of a personality and society in general, their value orientations and moral norms [20, p. 15].

At first glance, leadership is a completely understandable phenomenon that implies dominance, extraordinary anthropological potential as a system of advantages. S. Spoelstra draws attention to the etymology of the concept, which developed from Old English and other languages, e.g. from Greek (*hēgemonia*), Latin (*ducere*), German (*leiten*), Dutch (*leiden*), and he notes its complexity and multiplicity of its meanings: to lead, to encourage, to force to go, to suffer, etc. The dominant etymological meaning is to lead – “to guide”, “to go”, and “to travel”. Therefore, the leader acts as a guide, and that also involves followers. In the 19th century, leadership was associated with office, administration, but such use of the term is inaccurate regarding its etymological roots. You can think about management (Italian: *maneggiare* means to manage, train horses) as a certain analogue of the concept. A brief review of the etymology of leadership and management reminds us that their meanings are not set in stone and that their relationship can be viewed in many ways. Both the leader and the manager have a tinge of direction, i.e. they “cause others to go” or “guide towards a different place” [18, p. 15-16].

A critical assessment of the phenomenon also represents its ambiguity. The phenomenon of leadership has been described in anthropological, psychological, cross-cultural, and historical studies close to the formation of an interdisciplinary discourse – leadershipology on the basis of “leadership psychology” mainly in the field of management, which is dominant among other approaches. Within the framework of psychological assessments, leadership is analysed as a set of personal and behavioural aspects, the result of the multifactorial influence, i.e. individual aspects that, due to their specificity, cannot fully cover the existential-reflective, valuable, personal dimensions of leadership potential.

The research in this field is mostly descriptive, local, and beyond the universal meaning, which can be explained by the lack of a theoretical and methodological basis of the leadership discourse, which claims to be separate. The interdisciplinary peculiarity of leadership studies creates different interpretations of the concept itself, various aspects of the research perspective – “organizational leadership”, “political leadership”, “gender”, “formal” and “informal”, “charismatic”, and others. The research horizon, the categorical apparatus of the problem is constantly enriched due to the synergy of the research process and socio-cultural dynamics. Let us note that the paradigmatic typology of leadership research is ambiguous and multivariate, which takes into account various criteria.

Constructive assessment of leadership qualities is also quite difficult because the external features of a candidate for a leader, for example: status, charisma, ingratiation, and self-confidence, sometimes do not coincide with the actual qualities of a formed leader: experience, intelligence, thinking style, moral maturity, criticality. The effect of such inconsistency as a metacognitive distortion that creates the illusion of competence was described by D. Dunning and J. Kruger [13]. No matter how attractive or magical the image of a leader constructed by collective intentions is, the leader's mental projection retains an imprint reflected in the social field: in energies and social outcomes.

The explicit theory of leadership discourse was formed in the 20s of the 20th century, initiated by the theories of "leadership qualities" within the framework of the human-centred paradigm, focused on the direct analysis of the leader's personality. In general, within the framework of the explicit theory of leadership, one distinguishes the following traditional approaches: theories of "leadership qualities", "educational leadership", "leadership styles", "situational", "probabilistic", and others [22].

The theory of leadership qualities turned out to be widespread and stable, but ambiguous in its results, since a set of specific leadership manifestations was never defined, which gave reason to doubt such a possibility. As S. Klepko notes, researchers have singled out basic leadership qualities that can be observed with some degree of probability: extraversion, benevolence, awareness, openness, etc. [22, p. 50]. In recent years, there have been some attempts to revive the theory, for example, within the paradigm of a charismatic leader as a paradigmatic example of a special style of thinking [18]. As it is known, the concept of a charismatic leader was introduced by M. Weber.

Situational models, in their turn, are focused on determining the characteristics of leadership in situational variables. A leader, from this point of view, is a function of a certain situation, leadership qualities are relative and situationally determined. Modern situational concepts proclaim the existence of a leadership crisis [22, p. 53]. In the system theory described by the researcher, the leader reproduces the function of the group; two types of leaders are also distinguished: instrumental, result-oriented, and emotional, focused on cooperation, group integration [22, p. 54]. The important concept of classical leadership theory was "a leadership style", substantiated by K. Levin [14].

It should be noted that the main drawback of these approaches was a narrowed, local perspective of observation, the reduction of the sphere of leadership pragmatics as the horizon of the goal, expectations and consequences of leadership decisions, the putting aside biological and social systems as direct spheres of anthropogenic influence. A significant disadvantage of the understanding of leadership is its interpretation exclusively in the economic plane through the prism of profit maximization, benefit and rationality, which is based on "irrefutable facts" and quantitative calculations [5]. Over time, the human-centred paradigm of leadership, i.e. centred on the personality of the leader as the bearer of leadership traits, was replaced by models of "transformational leadership" with an emphasis on socio-pragmatic, systemic, intersubjective dimensions of the phenomenon. It should also be noted that this paradigm rejects the criteria of power and influence as the main criteria of leadership.

An important principle of this type of leadership, first substantiated by J. Burns, was the understanding of leadership as a process focused on the realization of collective expectations. According to him, transformational leadership as the cultivation of stable productive collective relationships, situations of success, is opposed to transactional leadership, which is based on operations of the formal exchange, directive influence between the leader and subordinates: "The transforming leader recognises and exploits an existing need or demand of a potential follower.

But, beyond that, the transforming leader looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower. The result of transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agent" [3].

J. Burns's ideas are reinterpreted by J. Rost, who points to the insufficiency of a holistic understanding of the phenomenon under study. J. Rost distinguishes industrial and post-industrial leadership paradigms. As the author notes, in the industrial paradigm, leadership is rational, management-oriented, "masculine", technocratic, quantitative, determined, taking into account costs and benefits, personalistic, hierarchical, short-term, pragmatic, and materialistic [17]. According to J. Rost, the ethical values of the industrial paradigm are reduced to therapeutic, expressive individualism, that is, they are limited individualistic principles of industrial culture [17, p. 94]. Leadership of the current post-industrial type is characterised by J. Rost as "an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes" [17, p. 102].

J. Burns's transformational theory and J. Rost's theory of post-industrial leadership are considered fundamental to modern human-oriented leadership and its variants: transformational leadership, agile leadership and servant leadership (in the context of the development and practical application of these approaches, the "Father of the Modern Management" P. Drucker [7]. These concepts were supplemented by attempts to substantiate the concept of "authentic leadership", to offer an updated image of a charismatic leader, and other trends focused on responsibility, ethics, and moral values [18, p. 77]. The attention is drawn to the implementation of leadership models in the educational environment with an emphasis on the critical function of the mind, which, in turn, concerns values [1; 6].

Therefore, it is noteworthy that modern approaches analyse leadership as an intersubjective meaning, as opposed to a personal construct. They are mostly value-orientated, which allows us to think about the possibility of forming an implicit philosophical basis of the paradigm of present-day leadership. At the same time, one need to take into account the unity of leadership qualities, situational and behavioural aspects, and that corresponds to the constructive discourse, which is still quite complicated. Such unity of these three aspects of leadership can be seen in J. Klagge's research.

According to J. Klagge, the leader's personality includes 10 metaphors that characterise the spheres and aspects of leadership activity: "time" – the leader is a predecessor (the idea of primacy in time); "place" – a pioneer (the idea of primacy in space); "route" – (the idea of the right way); "skills" – an expert (the idea of the highest qualification); "knowledge" – authority (the idea of possessing knowledge), "ability" – a master (the idea of the highest abilities); "power" – a supervisor (the idea of the greatest influence); "experience" – senior (the idea of the value of experience); "learning" – a scholar (the idea of the greatest competence); "technology" – an inventor (the idea of a better technology); "paradigm" is an innovator (the idea of an innovative plan). According to the researcher, it is precisely such leaders, who are most in demand in the realities of modern life [11, p. 39]. In our opinion, the suggested approach, despite the unconditional value and specificity of the theoretical construct, is incomplete. Firstly, it excludes a qualitative characteristic of leadership – philosophical thinking (systemic, divergent, diagnostic, etc.) as a necessary prerequisite for leadership strategies; secondly, it does not take into account the situation of ethical choice, which imposes responsibility on the personality of the leader and his followers; thirdly, excludes the understanding of leadership as a transformation of reality based on mutual goals, considers the leader as a subject isolated from the social field.

We believe that “J. Klagge’s matrix” can be supplemented with the metaphor of a leader-philosopher. The sphere of activity of such a leader is the “system” – a universe that encompasses other spheres as subsystems. This type of philosopher presupposes the idea of the highest level of systemic, divergent thinking and the “ethics of transformations”: responsibility and the common good.

In contrast to psychological approaches and management theory, philosophical leadership discourse is tangential to anthropology, social philosophy, and philosophy of history, ethics, and politics. An important step in leadership theory is the philosophical problem of the value basis of leadership competence, since “most leadership books stop when they get to a philosophical rearrangement” [18, p. 7]. As S. Spoelstra observes, trying to approach the topic from the perspective of new views on leadership by reconfiguring relations between concepts through work on these concepts, current discussions about leadership have a strong normative component because “the question of how to lead?” is ethical. It is one of the main ways, in which leadership is usually distinguished from management: a good manager is good at his job, while a leader is good as a person. It is ethical values that distinguish leaders from managers [18]. In addition, P. Koestenbaum studies the moral dimension of leadership, emphasising its importance: “Developing the leadership mind means transforming it. By expanding its creativity and deepening its character it can go through a metamorphosis to authenticity. Authenticity means a new integrity, a new level of power and influence, a new height of vision, and more ethical courage” [12, p. xiii].

As an argument in favour of the idea of the expediency of considering ethical issues in the theory of leadership, there are considerations on the pages of Aristotle’s “Politics” about what form of government is the best and what the ruler should be. In other words, that is the question of “whether it is more advantageous to be ruled by the best man or by the best laws” [18, p. 3]. As J. Rost notes, at first glance, leadership does not have a moral basis, the issue of ethical criteria in leadership theory is ambiguous, in many situations, there is no consensus on what the highest ethical basis is. However, the very practice of leadership as a positive transformation involves the moral improvement of the leader and his followers. J. Rost appeals to J. Burns, who writes, “Leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” [17, p. 125]. “Transforming leadership is elevating. It is moral but not moralistic. Leaders engage with followers, but from higher levels of morality; in the enmeshing of goals and values both leaders and followers are raised to more principled levels of judgment” [17, p. 125]. Real changes as a result of transformational leadership should be those that raise leaders and followers to higher levels of morality [17, p. 125].

J. Rost analyses leading ethical concepts (utilitarianism, ethics of rules, social contract theory, relativistic ethics) as irrelevant to the nature of leadership, but relevant to leadership practice. An ethical system that integrates individual and mutual good is considered the most optimal [17]. Different areas of leadership involve transformations and shared intentions. According to J. Rost, leadership is a philosophy of transformation of reality on the basis of mutual purposes. Positive transformations are impossible without people who share the intention of real change. “When real, substantive changes are intended, transformation is possible and even likely. When pseudochanges are intended, transformation is quite unlikely,” writes J. Rost [17, p. 124]. Therefore, transformation occurs in groups and societies when people develop common goals.

“The changes that leaders and followers intend must reflect their mutual purposes. Mutual purposes are common purposes, not only because they are forged from the influence relationship, which is inherently noncoercive, not only because they develop over time from the multidirectional nature of the relationship, but because the followers and leaders together do leadership,” writes



the scholar [17, p. 122]. In other words, leadership in its essence cannot be considered outside the boundaries of modern social, especially communicative, ethics, which implies a high degree of philosophical reflection of both the leaders themselves and their followers.

In our opinion, leadership ethics is a significant aspect in the justification and formation of philosophical leadership, which is also written by P. Case, R. French, and P. Simpson. Researchers note that ethics is essential to understanding the essence of leadership; they analyse the ancient tradition of virtue as relevant for leaders of our time, and they make arguments for leadership as an effective lifestyle practice. The scholars emphasise the inadequacy of instrumental, scientific thinking in understanding the essence of leadership qualities, suggesting that a leadership philosophy based on virtue ethics has much to offer. A challenge related to this perspective will be the integration of “leadership philosophy as a way of life” into the business and management curriculum [5].

Indeed, the understanding of the leader’s personality through the prism of virtue inherent in antiquity is a stable invariant that stands the test of time. Virtue ethics actualises “perfection” in the context of the classical interpretation of the good, as thought by the Greeks, in particular, Socrates, as well as Plato, who directed (albeit in a slightly different way) their efforts to the search for intellectual and moral perfection. “Such an engagement with the Good involved the more mystical, contemplative knowledge, understanding and wisdom arising from, and being embodied in, lived experience (intellectus) rather than purely cognitive understanding” [5, p. 249]. It is about reason, as opposed to instrumental rationality. Equally valuable is Aristotle’s *phronesis* as a way of reasoning for a leader that will enable one to respond to unpredictable, difficult circumstances. “The primary function of *phronesis* is to discern “what matters” in a given situation, something which can only be accomplished through the collective deliberation of those whose shared concern is the welfare of the polity” [5, p. 250].

Stoical ethics declares as the truth that the way to happiness lies in not wishing things to be other than they are, and it has a practical and gentle approach to the art of living offering much to those individuals, who occupy current positions of leaders [5, p. 251]. Stoical ethics provides advice on “how to develop mental attitudes, such as fortitude and equanimity, which enable individuals to discriminate more clearly between what they can and cannot influence in the world” [5, p. 251]. We share the opinion that the classical understanding of leadership, rooted in the ancient tradition, is extremely useful for the practical philosophy of leadership as a way of life, the consequences of which in the formation of a leader would be more far-reaching than any form of cognitive modelling [5, p. 252]. The study of Stoical philosophy reveals that the natural philosophical and epistemological aspects cannot be separated from ethics as a reasonable practice of awareness and preservation of the harmony of the cosmos.

The outlined considerations are a conceptual generalization of a long discussion about the essence of leadership as a social phenomenon, which includes convincing arguments in favour of the system-philosophical basis of leadership as such.

If J. Rost characterises post-industrial leadership as such a relationship involving leaders and followers who pursue their mutual purposes [17, p. 102], we should note that the type of philosophical leadership deepens J. Rost’s definition with the following characteristics: *the leader is a person of the highest degree of systemic and divergent thinking, oriented to the nooethics of joint responsibility*.

In our opinion, within the outlined approach, the problem of philosophical leadership as a universal basis that integrates the qualities of the leader’s thinking and leadership responsibility for the biosocial consequences of leadership decisions is revealed to the greatest extent. Among the definitions of the leader, there are also quite close approaches corresponding to the outlined

prototype. According to A. Meneghetti, the attribute of a leader is integral functionality – the ability to synthesise the context of relations as an “operational centre of a set of relations and functions”. A. Meneghetti’s metaphor represents the leader as a functional hierarchy, whose essential characteristic is the ability to bring a set of needs, abilities and means to the unity of functions [15].

Therefore, the sphere of application of leadership qualities requires an understanding of the principles of organizing the system as a whole and a hermeneutic assessment of the manifestations of the system, a comprehensive justification of constructive creative decisions, and awareness of the ethics of responsibility as a key principle of leadership.

**Conclusions.** In the social sciences, in particular, the philosophy of education and leadershipology, the clarification and interpretation of the essence of leadership as a complex interdisciplinary phenomenon remains relevant. As the researchers note, for a long time, the literature in the field of leadership was contradictory, disorganised, and disintegrated. The fact that there is no single school of leadership was also noted. The dominance of the psychological interpretation of leadership and its reduction to the sphere of management beyond its deep manifestations led to an established, stereotypical understanding of the essence of this philosophical phenomenon.

The problem of leadership is relevant in various social contexts, but the most in-demand one, in our opinion, is “philosophical leadership” as a prototype of a systemic style of thinking and ethical practices. The global crisis prompts a rethinking of anthropological values in the context of leadership philosophy. In contrast to the psychology of leadership and management, which for a long time studied leadership as ethically neutral, the philosophy of leadership integrates the personal characteristics of the leader, value guidelines, horizon of thinking, and ethical strategies.

Thus, there is a need to substantiate the ethical basis of leadership activity, to understand the essence of a leader as a philosophical (“understanding”) type of personality, who possesses several relevant leadership competencies, such as an understanding of the deep cause-and-effect relationships of biosocial transformations, experience of observations and successful hermeneutic practices, integrated thinking, which combines systemic, divergent, diagnostic, critical, and other types of thinking.

Being traditional for the 20th century, the interpretation of the leader is based on the assessment of the leader as a successful manager, an effective executor of tasks, in contrast to a strategist focused on higher goals, in particular nooethics. The post-industrial concept of a leader reflects a higher quality of personal maturity. Accordingly, the formation of leadership skills should go beyond purely utilitarian goals that provide an impulse to success and ensure the achievement of a higher quality of leadership functionality due to high-quality thinking and personal virtues inherent in a philosopher.

Modern transformational leadership is justified as a process focused on the realization of collective expectations, in contrast to transactional leadership as management and exchange. The difference between leadership and management can be explained in such a way. A notable principle of this type of leadership was its understanding as a process of realizing collective productive relations and mutual cultivation of a situation of success. Thus, transformational leadership and ethics can be understood as transforming reality based on mutual goals for the common good.

The typology of leadership is ambiguous because the unsolved problem is to isolate the essence of leadership, provided that leadership qualities, situational, and behavioural aspects are preserved. In this sense, the “leadership types” substantiated by J. Klagge are quite indicative as they can be supplemented with the metaphor of a leader-philosopher, and this type is especially

relevant in the conditions of the noospheric crisis. The type of philosophical leadership deepens J. Rost's definition with the following characteristics: the leader is a person possessing the highest degree of systemic and divergent thinking oriented to the nooethics of joint responsibility. The sphere of activity of such a leader is the "system" – a universe that encompasses other spheres as subsystems. This type of philosopher presupposes the idea of the unity of integrated thinking, the ethics of responsibility and the common good.

### References

1. Abdula A. I. Educational guidelines in the process of implementation of rational principles and the value preconditions of the open society. *Philosophy of education*. 2020. Vol. 26, № 1. P. 84–98. DOI: 10.31874/2309-1606-2020-26-1-5
2. Brown P. *Aesthetic Intelligence: How to Boost It and Use It in Business and Beyond*. Harper Business, 2019.
3. Burns J. *Leadership*. New York : Harper & Row, 1978.
4. Baluta H., Abdula A., Olifer O. The competence of risk assessment in the structure of educational content. *Challenges and opportunities of the modern risk society: socio-cultural, economic and legal aspects*: monograph / eds N. Varha, B. Hvozdetzka. Praha : Oktan print, 2021. P.132–143. DOI: 10.46489/CAOTM-21042601
5. Case P., French R., Simpson P. *Philosophy of leadership. SAGE Handbook of Leadership* / eds. A. Bryman, D. Collinson, K. Grint, B. Jackson and M. Uhl-Bien. London : Sage, 2011. P. 242–255.
6. Chitpin S. Leading school improvement: using Popper's theory of learning. *Open Review of Educational Research*. 2016. Vol. 3:1. P. 190–203. DOI: 10.1080/23265507.2016.1217742
7. Drucker P. *Classic Drucker: Wisdom from Peter Drucker from the Pages of Harvard Business Review*, Harvard Business Press, 2006.
8. Fiedler, F. E., Garcia, J. E. *New Approaches to Effective Leadership, Cognitive Resources and Organizational Performance*. New York : John Wiley and Sons, 1987.
9. Goleman D. *Emotional Intelligence*. New York : Bantam Books, 2006.
10. Jonas H. *The Imperative Responsibility. In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age*. Chicago & London : The University of Chicago Press, 1984.
11. Klagge J. Defining, discovering and developing personal leadership in organizations. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*. 1996. Vol. 17/5. P. 38–45.
12. Koestenbaum P. *The Heart of Business: Ethics, Power, and Philosophy*. New York : Saybrook Publishing Company, 1987.
13. Kruger J., Dunning D. Unskilled and unaware of it: How difficulties in recognizing one's own incompetence lead to inflated self-assessments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1999. Volume 77(6). P. 1121-1134. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.77.6.1121
14. Lewin K., Gold M. *The complete social scientist: A Kurt Lewin reader*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 1999. DOI: 10.1037/10319-000
15. Meneghetti A. *The Psychology of the Leader*. Ontopsicologia Editrice, 2011.
16. Reams L. Fred Fiedler's contingency model revisited: 30 years later. *Filosofiya osvity. Philosophy of Education*. 2023. Vol. 29(1). P. 111–124. DOI: 10.31874/2309-1606-2023-29-1-6
17. Rost J. *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Westport : Praeger, 1993.
18. Spoelstra S. *Leadership and Organization. A Philosophical Introduction*. London & New York : Routledge, 2018.
19. Stogdill R. Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature. *The Journal of Psychology*. 1948. Vol. 25:1. P. 35–71. DOI: 10.1080/00223980.1948.9917362
20. Єрмоленко А.М. Соціальна етика та екологія. Гідність людини-шанування природи : монографія. Київ : Лібра, 2010.

21. Балута Г.А. До проблеми формування теоретико-методологічної платформи інвайронментальної освіти. *Актуальні проблеми духовності*. 2022. Вип. 23. С. 287–299. DOI: 10.31812/apm.7633
22. Клепко С., Литвинюк Л. Формування лідерської компетентності в школі. Полтава : ПОППО, 2012.
23. Клепко С. Філософія освіти в європейському контексті. Полтава : ПОППО, 2006.

## **ПРОГРАМА ФІЛОСОФСЬКОГО ЛІДЕРСТВА В КОНТЕКСТІ НООСФЕРНИХ ЦІННОСТЕЙ ТА СУЧАСНИХ ЛІДЕРСЬКИХ ПРАКТИК**

**Галина Балута, Андрій Абдула**

*Криворізький державний педагогічний університет,  
кафедра філософії,*

*проспект Університетський, 54, 50086, м. Кривий Ріг, Україна*

У статті обґрунтовано актуальність соціального завдання формування особистості лідера-філософа, усвідомлення його значущої соціальної ролі в контексті складних реалій сьогодення, стрімкого розвитку науки і техніки. Фокус дослідницької уваги зміщено у сферу універсально-орієнтованих лідерських практик як передумови збереження цивілізаційних засад. Стійкий соціальний розвиток є неможливим за межами окресленої системи антропологічних координат, зважених етичних рішень як результату високоорганізованого мислення особистості лідера. Обґрунтовано, що соціальна раціональність не може бути зведена до її інструментального виміру і функціонувати без урахування універсального контексту. Усвідомлення цих викликів, – йдеться у дослідженні, – вимагає переосмислення ролі соціального лідера, обґрунтування провідних лідерських якостей, які дозволять гідно реагувати на соціальні виклики. Пропоновані міркування є спробою дослідницької рефлексії у напрямку осмислення прототипу сучасного лідера, задіяного у таких дослідницьких програмах: концепції постіндустріального лідерства (J. Rost), етики відповідальності (H. Jonas), а також моделі лідерських якостей (J. Klagge). У результаті парадигма сучасного лідерства може бути доповнена універсальними критеріями, заданими типом філософського лідерства як його актуальної основи, зокрема у інвайронментальній сфері. Також у статті здійснено короткий аналіз еволюції теорії лідерства, доповнено та узагальнено парадигму лідерських характеристик, запропоновано означення сучасного лідерства як лідерства філософського (розуміючого) типу. Запропонований підхід, орієнтований на сутнісне розуміння лідерства, його інваріантних характеристик, етичних критеріїв, що частково елімінує ефект спрощеного сприйняття особистості лідера як соціального менеджера.

*Ключові слова:* мислення, лідер, парадигма лідерства, філософське лідерство.