

Draft Paper

for presenting at the Central Eurasian Studies Society conference

in Ann Arbor, Sep 28-31, 2006

Panel: *Political Leadership in Eurasia*

Political Leadership Style in Kazakhstan:

Summary for Q Methodology based Study.

Almaz Tolymbek, Ph.D. Candidate, Kent State University

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Introduction and | 3 |
| 2. Research Design for Study | 4 |
| 3. Findings for Typical Leadership Styles | 6 |
| 4. Comparative Analysis of the Typical Leadership Styles | 10 |
| 4. Findings for Ideal Leadership Styles | 13 |
| 5. Conclusions | 15 |
| 6. Appendixes | 18 |
| 7 References | 22 |

Introduction

The focus of the proposed paper is *national leadership style* in Kazakhstan. In particular, the study seeks to contribute to a nation-authentic concept of leadership style, which would appear consistent and therefore effective for post-communist transition nations such as Kazakhstan, a Central Asian polity that, as of today, could still be characterized as a personalist and neo-patrimonial political system (Ishiyama, 2002). This strongman leadership pattern can be explained as a long-term impact of both a prior nomadic-age patriarchic legacy and Russian colonial and then Soviet single-minded authoritarian rule.

However, since regaining its nationhood in 1991, Kazakhstan's ruling class has been experiencing a growing domestic and international pressure for democratizing the Kazakh political system through diversifying its structure of political opportunity and leadership selection and recruitment bases. Moreover, today this nation faces a need to develop anew a critical mass of national leaders able to meet socio-political transformation needs.

With this leadership problématique in mind, the study sought to answer the following research questions: (1) What are the characteristics of *actual* political leadership style(s) in Kazakhstan? (2) What are the characteristics of *ideal* political leadership style(s) for Kazakhstan?

In reviewing existing sources on leadership style, including political leadership, a number of studies have been examined that range from situational and transformational leadership models to psychosocial approaches to leadership to comparative elite studies to post-communist political discourses to cross-national leadership field research and to personal cases of political leaders in the former Soviet Union and Kazakhstan. In this regard, it has been assumed that the following factors are relevant to the above research questions: a leader's image, communication and decision-making styles, ways of getting work done, leader-follower relations, value-based motivations, bases of power, and leadership recruitment bases and selection mechanisms.

Research Design for the Study

Existing leadership studies on Kazakhstan are few. They are mainly intellectual analyses and there have been no systematic attempts in the direction of serious culture-authentic and transformational-minded research on national leadership in Kazakhstan. One of few exceptions, which deserve mentioning, is the worldwide research project, called GLOBE (House et al., 2004), that has sought to reveal cross-cultural affinities and differences in real and desirable leadership traits in 62 countries, including Kazakhstan, in both national and organizational contexts. In this large-scope study, its authors attempted to validate an integrated theory (*Culturally Endorsed Implicit Theory of Leadership*), that focus on the relationship among culture, leadership, and societal effectiveness. In particular, national leadership traits were measured based on the nine cultural dimensions defined as follows: uncertainty avoidance, power distance, institutional collectivism, in-group collectivism, gender egalitarianism, assertiveness, future orientation, performance orientation, and humane orientation (Hofstede, 1980). In its approach, GLOBE study seems to draw primarily on pre-set uniform surveys as a research instrument, which, by its nature, would unfortunately not allow for a more in-depth and rigorous examination of a variety of subjective understandings of respondents based on their own perceptions of national leaders. In a difference from the traditional survey technique, Q methodology as the “best-developed paradigm for the investigation of human subjectivity” (Brown, 1980) and anchored in self-reference can prove to be more instrumental, as demonstrated in the proposed study having discovered and examined three distinct typical political leadership styles through exploring respective public perceptions in Kazakhstan.

Thus, this paper sought to fill this knowledge vacuum in the area of “political subjectivity” by means of Q methodology based national leadership study, which employed the conceptual framework on *leader-follower relations* developed earlier in Australia by Graham Little (1985). The crux of Little’s view of all leader-follower relations is that leaders and followers find one another if *their perceptions and expectations coincide*. Lit-

tle’s leader classification—Strong, Group, and Inspiring—has been used for developing a research tool (Q sample), reflecting actual and desirable leader traits, for purposes of exploring perceptions of Kazakhstan citizens concerning the characteristics of current and desired leadership styles.

Furthermore, this application of Q methodology to the study of leadership style has drawn upon Little’s *psychosocial leader model* in conjunction with *the best-practices leadership theory* of Kouzes and Posner (2002). This combination, as shown in Figure 1, provided a comprehensive theoretical framework for developing an appropriate research tool for collecting data from prospective respondents. In this study, 45 statements describing specific leader traits were selected based on this conceptual framework, each of 15 fields comprising by 3 traits, which thus furnished a universe of leader-related characteristics to be rank-ordered individually (on a scoring scale from -4 through +4) by every respondent based on his/her subjective understandings.

Figure 1: Typology of leaders based on Kouzes and Posner’s model (2002) and Little’s (1985) model of psychosocial leader types

| Leader types: | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| Practices: | Strong | Group | Inspiring |
| 1. Leader’s Image | Power, domination | Concern, solidarity | Personal example |
| 2. Communication style | Directions | Appeals | Vision |
| 3. Work | Status-quo | No formal structure | Innovation |
| 4. Leader-follower relations | Power distance | Serving people | Delegation, sharing, Enabling |
| 5. Motivating followers | Transactional, coercive | Social approval | Encouragement |

Note: This conceptual framework developed by the author can be considered a an attempt to combine the psychosocial approach pioneered by Freud with more recent management theories drawing on Max Weber's works.

These statement rank-ordering procedures (Q sorting) have been followed by targeted interviews with selected respondents from each of the sub-samples in order to clarify responses, as reflected in their individual rank-orderings of 45 statements (Q sorts), and to gain a better understanding of their underpinning views, attitudes, and preferences.

By way of summary, implementing Q study of the national leadership profile in Kazakhstan has included administering Q sorts to two groups of respondents, with 31 persons in each group (for examining their views of Typical and Ideal leaders respectively) sampled from the general public. Different segments from among the Kazakhstan citizens have been differentiated based on the typology of social institutions, which correspond to human value categories (Power, Wealth, Respect, Well-being, Enlightenment, Skill, Rectitude, and Affection), as defined by Lasswell (1948).

The following description of findings draws upon the results of correlation and factor-analytic procedures performed by means of Q methodology based software, called PQMethod (Schmolck & Atkinson, 2002), and upon subsequent interpretation of the emerging factors within each group of Q sorts, supported by intensive single-case interviews with selected respondents in order to clarify *subjective understandings* embedded in their responses.

Factor-analysis based Findings for Typical Leadership Styles

1. There have been 31 Q-sorts collected from among the general public in Kazakhstan, with each of respondents presenting his/her own perceptions of a *typical public leader* in this nation.
2. Based on Lasswell's (1948) typology of social institutions, these respondents were selected from the following socio-professional groups based on respective human value categories:
 - Power – local government elected and appointed officials

- Wealth – businessmen
 - Respect – members of well-off, middle class, and worker/farmer groups of society
 - Well-being – medical doctors
 - Enlightenment – scholars and analysts
 - Skill – professionals in a few vocational areas
 - Rectitude – religious leaders/pastors
 - Affection – housewives.
3. There have been intensive follow-up interviews conducted with selected respondents representing each of the three factors that emerged out of computer-aided factor-analysis of respective 31 Q-sorts.
 4. Specifically, PQMethod program was employed to factor-analyze correlation matrices for these Q-sorts, which drew upon Principal Components Analysis (PCA) and Varimax 3 factor-based rotation. As a result, the three factors featuring three distinct leader types have emerged that were labeled as follows:
 - *Power-wielders* (largely congruent with Strong Leader type under Little's (1985) model) – a resemblance of Machiavellian leader distinct for its self-interest driven plus power and domination based authoritarian style.
 - *Elite Leaders* (mixture of Inspiring and Strong types, under Little's typology) – a type of business-minded and autocratic leader, which appears to be represented by a newly emerged business-elite in Kazakhstan. In brief, its profile is characterized by elite-minded attitude as well as by many traits common with Power-wielders.
 - *Old Communist Guard* (a mixture of mostly Group Leader and some Inspiring and Strong Leader traits, under Little's model) – a kind of public interest-driven and egalitarian leader that seems to feature a vanishing lower-level cohort of communist idealists.

The following are groups of statements, which display leader profiles for each of the above indicated three factors; sequencing order of statements below reflects their relative rank-order among all 45 traits. Statements with highest (+) Z-scores (normalized factor scores) in Tables 1, 2, and 3 are in the strongest agreement (ranked as +4) among those respondents who described a particular leader type (Power-wielder, Elite type, or Old Com-

munist Guard); statements with lowest (-) Z-scores represent leader traits in the strongest disagreement (ranked as -4) for those respondents who presented the respective leader type (factor).

Table 1

Factor 1: **Power-Wielder** type:

| <i>Highest (+) Normalized Factor Scores</i> | | | |
|---|--|------|---------|
| No | Statement | Rank | Z-score |
| 5 | Values his own personal over organizational interests | +4 | 1.705 |
| 25 | Centralizes decision-making in his own hands | +4 | 1.640 |
| 14 | Uses his leadership role as a way to maintain power | +4 | 1.569 |
| 34 | Is willing to pressure and control others | +3 | 1.552 |
| 28 | Maintains a distance between himself and followers | +3 | 1.450 |
| 38 | A person of power and authority, always in control | +3 | 1.418 |
| 16 | Deals with critics by intimidating or ignoring them | +3 | 1.408 |
| 42 | Uses others to advance himself | +3 | 1.391 |
| 11 | Takes an interest in patron-client relations | +2 | 1.122 |
| 32 | Undervalues other people's ideas and strategies | +2 | 1.075 |
| 44 | Uses primarily administrative and economic motivators | +2 | 1.067 |
| 1 | Demanding and self-imposing | +2 | 1.025 |
| 8 | Strong-willed, imposes his viewpoint on others | +2 | 0.969 |
| <i>Lowest (-) Normalized Factor Scores for Factor 1</i> | | | |
| 35 | Seeks solutions thru dialog and joint decision-making | -2 | -0.756 |
| 2 | Has a strong sense of public interest | -2 | -0.865 |
| 43 | Trusts followers, delegates authority, and autonomy | -2 | -0.867 |
| 45 | Instills a sense of community and care among followers | -2 | -0.841 |
| 30 | Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy | -2 | -0.846 |
| 40 | Upholds his followers' sense of public interest | -3 | -0.881 |
| 19 | Is willing to take risks and address issues creatively | -3 | -0.927 |
| 24 | Is able to build and lead informal coalitions | -3 | -1.002 |
| 41 | Praises followers individually for their achievements | -3 | -1.146 |
| 10 | Cultivates dialog and accepts criticism | -3 | -1.213 |
| 20 | Thinks critically and is receptive to new ideas | -4 | -1.530 |
| 18 | Demonstrates flexibility in managing people | -4 | -1.542 |
| 4 | A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose | -4 | -1.578 |

Overall, as compared with Little's theoretical leader types (Strong, Group, and Inspiring), the *Power-Wielder* can be characterized as primarily a *Strong* type combined with *anti-Group* and *anti-Inspiring* traits.

Table 2**Factor 2: Elite Leader type**

| | | Rank | Z-score |
|--|---|-------------|----------------|
| <i>Highest (+) Normalized Factor Scores</i> | | | |
| No | Statement | | |
| 30 | Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy | +4 | 1.725 |
| 12 | Expresses himself clearly and inspires others | +4 | 1.667 |
| 25 | Centralizes decision-making in his own hands | +4 | 1.291 |
| 14 | Uses his leadership role as a way to maintain power | +3 | 1.265 |
| 8 | Strong-willed, imposes his viewpoint on others | +3 | 1.223 |
| 7 | Displays broad intellect and profound thought | +3 | 1.206 |
| 28 | Maintains a distance between himself and followers | +3 | 1.197 |
| 1 | Demanding and self-imposing | +3 | 1.021 |
| 16 | Deals with critics by intimidating or ignoring them | +2 | 0.989 |
| 34 | Is willing to pressure and control others | +2 | 0.863 |
| 23 | Sticks to conventional ways of getting things done | +2 | 0.830 |
| 42 | Uses others to advance himself | +2 | 0.820 |
| 41 | Praises followers individually for achievements | +2 | 0.746 |
| <i>Lowest (-) Normalized Factor Scores for Factor 2:</i> | | | |
| 15 | Appeals to community spirit and solidarity | -2 | -0.645 |
| 26 | Regards power as a tool for serving people | -2 | -0.746 |
| 22 | Relies primarily on informal groups and grassroots | -2 | -0.947 |
| 3 | Praises followers for displaying moral virtues | -2 | -0.963 |
| 10 | Cultivates dialog and accepts criticism | -2 | -1.106 |
| 2 | Has a strong sense of public interest | -3 | -1.248 |
| 29 | Regards himself as on par with followers | -3 | -1.323 |
| 35 | Seeks solutions thru dialog and joint decision-making | -3 | -1.407 |
| 31 | Strives to serve the public so as to gain approval | -3 | -1.508 |
| 13 | Is always ready to listen to people's concerns | -3 | -1.550 |
| 4 | A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose | -4 | -1.625 |
| 27 | Considers justice and caring as organizing bases | -4 | -1.767 |
| 39 | Strives to look ordinary, like just one of the people | -4 | -2.011 |

Overall, the *Elite Leader* type can be characterized as a *mix of Strong and Inspiring traits* combined with *anti-Group traits*.

Table 3**Factor 3: Old Communist Guard type**

| <i>Highest (+) Normalized Factor Scores</i> | | |
|--|--|----|
| No | Statement | |
| 40 | Upholds his followers' sense of public interest | +4 |
| 29 | Regards himself as on par with followers | +4 |
| 39 | Strives to look ordinary, like just one of the people | +4 |
| 36 | His power rests mainly on merit, based on success | +3 |
| 35 | Seeks solutions thru dialog and joint decision-making | +3 |
| 15 | Appeals to community spirit and solidarity | +3 |
| 12 | Expresses himself clearly and inspires others | +3 |
| 37 | Emphasizes a wide range of human values in motivating | +3 |
| 38 | A person of power and authority, always in control | +2 |
| 8 | Strong-willed, imposes his viewpoint on others | +2 |
| <i>Lowest (-) Normalized Factor Scores for Factor 3:</i> | | |
| 31 | Strives to serve the public so as to gain approval | -2 |
| 24 | Is able to build and lead informal coalitions | -2 |
| 7 | Displays broad intellect and profound thought | -2 |
| 32 | Undervalues other people's ideas and strategies | -2 |
| 42 | Uses others to advance himself | -3 |
| 11 | Takes an interest in patron-client relations | -3 |
| 45 | Instills a sense of community and care among followers | -3 |
| 23 | Sticks to conventional ways of getting things done | -3 |
| 18 | Demonstrates flexibility in managing people | -3 |
| 34 | Is willing to pressure and control others | -4 |
| 5 | Values his own personal over organizational interests | -4 |
| 10 | Cultivates dialog and accepts criticism | -4 |

Overall, the *Old Communist Guard type* can be characterized as largely a *Group leader type* coupled with some *Inspiring and Strong traits* and, on the other hand, displaying *anti-Strong and anti-Inspiring traits*.

Comparative Analysis of the Typical Leadership Styles

Comparative analysis of the above leader types is presented through the following *Factor Q-Sort Values* for the below statements viewed as **Consensus** between all respondents, which feature leader traits **common** for all the three leader types (factors):

Factor Arrays

| No. | Statement | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|------------------------------|--|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| | | Power- Wielder | Elite Type | Old Communist Guard |
| Factor Q-Sort Values: | | | | |
| 8. | Strong-willed, imposes his viewpoint on others | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 1. | Demanding and self-imposing | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| 38. | A person of power and authority, in control | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 6. | Limits the use of his power for personal gain | -1 | -1 | 0 |
| 10. | Cultivates dialog and accepts criticism | -3 | -2 | -4 |

Comparative analysis of *Factor 1*, *Factor 2*, and *Factor 3* types is reflected through the following Factor Q-Sort Values for Statements viewed as **Disagreement** between all respondents, which feature leader traits **common** for all the three leader types (factors):

| Statement No. | Factor Arrays | | | |
|------------------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------------------------|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| | Power- Wielder | Elite Type | Old Communist Guard | |
| Factor Q-Sort Values: | | | | |
| 39 | Strives to look ordinary, like just one of the people | 0 | -4 | 4 |
| 5 | Values his own personal over organizational interests | 4 | -1 | -4 |

In sum, the revealed common characteristics reflect certain *national character traits*, which tend to demonstrate the above mentioned patriarchal-autocratic legacy imprint in Kazakhstan. On the other hand, the three leader types differ very significantly with regard to *egalitarianism* and *public v. private interest-orientation* preferences.

By way of summarizing leader type profiles, Table 4 represent list of traits as **distinguishing** for each of the three leader types:

Table 4

| No. Distinguishing Statements for Factor 1: <i>Power-Wielder</i> | Rank | Z-SCORE |
|---|-------------|----------------|
| 5 Values his own personal over organizational interests | 4 | 1.87* |
| 44 Uses primarily administrative and economic motivators | 2 | 1.05* |
| 11 Takes an interest in patron-client relations | 2 | 1.02* |
| 32 Undervalues other people's ideas and strategies | 2 | 0.87* |
| 12 Expresses himself clearly and inspires others | 1 | -0.04* |
| 29 Regards himself as on par with followers | 1 | -0.04* |
| 39 Strives to look ordinary, like just one of the people | 0 | -0.15* |
| 30 Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy | -2 | -0.85 |
| 19 Is willing to take risks and address issues creatively | -3 | -0.93* |
| 41 Praises followers individually for their achievements | -3 | -1.15 |
| 40 Upholds his followers' sense of public interest | -3 | -0.92* |
| 20 Thinks critically and is receptive to new ideas | -4 | -1.40* |
| No. Distinguishing Statements for Factor 2: <i>Elite Leader</i> | | |
| | Rank | Z-SCORE |
| 30 Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy | 4 | 1.73* |
| 7 Displays broad intellect and profound thought | 3 | 1.21* |
| 41 Praises followers individually for their achievements | 2 | 0.75 |
| 40 Upholds his followers' sense of public interest | 1 | 0.66 |
| 18 Demonstrates flexibility in managing people | 1 | 0.63* |
| 45 Instills a sense of community and care among followers | 1 | 0.27* |
| 24 Is able to build and lead informal coalitions | 0 | 0.14* |
| 11 Takes an interest in patron-client relations | 0 | 0.02* |
| 32 Undervalues other people's ideas and strategies | -1 | -0.10 |
| 22 Relies primarily on informal groups and grassroots | -2 | -0.95* |
| 29 Regards himself as on par with followers | -3 | -1.32* |
| Is always ready to listen to people's concerns | -3 | -1.55* |
| Considers justice and caring as organizing bases | -4 | -1.77* |
| Strives to look ordinary, like just one of the people | -4 | -2.01* |
| No. Distinguishing Statements for Factor 3: <i>Old Communist Guard</i> | | |
| | Rank | Z-SCORE |
| 40 Upholds his followers' sense of public interest | 4 | 1.64 |
| 29 Regards himself as on par with followers | 4 | 1.60* |
| 39 Strives to look ordinary, like just one of the people | 4 | 1.57* |

| | | |
|--|----|--------|
| 36 His power rests mainly on merit, based on success | 3 | 1.36* |
| 35 Seeks solutions thru dialog and joint decision-making | 3 | 1.32* |
| 15 Appeals to community spirit and solidarity | 3 | 1.28* |
| 37 Emphasizes a wide range of human values in motivating | 3 | 1.11 |
| 43 Trusts followers, delegates authority, and autonomy | 2 | 0.90* |
| 30 Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy | 0 | 0.04 |
| 28 Maintains a distance between himself and followers | 0 | -0.08* |
| 4 A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose | -1 | -0.29* |
| 41 Praises followers individually for their achievements | -1 | -0.29 |
| 25 Centralizes decision-making in his own hands | -1 | -0.36* |
| 16 Deals with critics by intimidating or ignoring them | -2 | -0.50* |
| 32 Undervalues other people's ideas and strategies | -3 | -1.07 |
| 42 Uses others to advance himself | -3 | -1.07* |
| 23 Sticks to conventional ways of getting things done | -3 | -1.32* |
| 11 Takes an interest in patron-client relations | -3 | -1.11* |
| 34 Is willing to pressure and control others | -4 | -1.85* |
| 5 Values his own personal over organizational interests | -4 | -1.85* |

Note: Values are indicated for P < .05; asterisk (*) indicates significance at P < .01

Factor-analysis based Findings for Ideal Leadership Styles

1. There have been 31 Q-sorts collected from among the general public in Kazakhstan who presented their own perceptions of an *ideal public leader* in this nation.
2. Based on Lasswell's typology of social institutions, these respondents were selected from the same socio-professional groups as those who performed Q-sorts to present their own perceptions of a typical political leader in Kazakhstan.
3. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and Varimax rotation based analysis of 31 Q-sorts has been performed by means of PQMethod program. As a result, four factors emerged out of which a major Factor 1 stands out (all 31 Q-sorts loaded significantly on Factor 1 that accounted for 59 percent of the total explained variance). In view of complementary character of Factors 2, 3, and 4, they were not examined in detail. There have been intensive follow-up interviews conducted with selected respondents belonging to Factor 1. The resultant profile of an Ideal Leader as featured by Factor 1 is shown in Table 5:

Table 5 *Factor 1: Inspiring Statesman type*

| No. | Statement | Rank | Z-SCORES |
|---|---|------|----------|
| <i>Highest (+) Normalized Factor Scores</i> | | | |
| 30 | Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy | +4 | 1.634 |
| 4 | A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose | +4 | 1.375 |
| 12 | Expresses himself clearly and inspires others | +4 | 1.219 |
| 20 | Thinks critically and is receptive to new ideas | +3 | 1.218 |
| 18 | Demonstrates flexibility in managing people | +3 | 1.174 |
| 2 | Has a strong sense of public interest | +3 | 1.163 |
| 17 | Is inwardly strong, seeks balanced values and growth | +3 | 0.991 |
| 7 | Displays broad intellect and profound thought | +3 | 0.923 |
| 26 | Regards power as a tool for serving people | +2 | 0.907 |
| 10 | Cultivates dialog and accepts criticism | +2 | 0.878 |
| 35 | Seeks solutions thru dialog and joint decision-making | +2 | 0.865 |
| 27 | Considers justice and caring as organizing bases | +2 | 0.764 |
| 43 | Trusts followers, delegates authority, and autonomy | +2 | 0.747 |
| <i>Lowest (-) Normalized Factor Scores:</i> | | | |
| 28 | Maintains a distance between himself and followers | -2 | -0.693 |
| 34 | Is willing to pressure and control others | -2 | -0.774 |
| 25 | Centralizes decision-making in his own hands | -2 | -0.975 |
| 11 | Takes an interest in patron-client relations | -2 | -1.135 |
| 1 | Demanding and self-imposing | -2 | -1.237 |
| 38 | A person of power and authority, always in control | -3 | -1.299 |
| 14 | Uses his leadership role as a way to maintain power | -3 | -1.349 |
| 8 | Strong-willed, imposes his viewpoint on others | -3 | -1.382 |
| 21 | Makes decisions without seeking advice of others | -3 | -1.459 |
| 32 | Undervalues other people's ideas and strategies | -3 | -1.531 |
| 42 | Uses others to advance himself | -4 | -1.655 |
| 16 | Deals with critics by intimidating or ignoring them | -4 | -1.769 |
| 5 | Values his own personal over organizational interests | -4 | -1.988 |

4. The following **Table 6** displays ranking of statements as **Distinguishing** traits for Factor 1:

| No. | Statement | No. | Factor 1: Rank | Z-score |
|-----|---|-----|-------------------|---------|
| 30 | Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy | 30 | 4 | 1.63* |
| 4 | A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose | 4 | 4 | 1.37 |
| 20 | Thinks critically and is receptive to new ideas | 20 | 3 | 1.22* |
| 18 | Demonstrates flexibility in managing people | 18 | 3 | 1.17 |
| 2 | Has a strong sense of public interest | 2 | 3 | 1.16 |
| 17 | Is inwardly strong, seeks balanced values and growth | 17 | 3 | 0.99* |

| | | | | |
|----|--|----|----|--------|
| 26 | Regards power as a tool for serving people | 26 | 2 | 0.91* |
| 35 | Seeks solutions thru dialog and joint decision-making | 35 | 2 | 0.87* |
| 43 | Trusts followers, delegates authority, and autonomy | 43 | 2 | 0.75* |
| 41 | Praises followers individually for their achievements | 41 | 1 | 0.71 |
| 40 | Upholds his followers' sense of public interest | 40 | 1 | 0.67* |
| 13 | Is always ready to listen to people's concerns | 13 | 1 | 0.63* |
| 6 | Limits the use of his power for personal gain | 6 | 1 | 0.57* |
| 45 | Instills a sense of community and care among followers | 45 | 1 | 0.54 |
| 9 | Radiates a positive image, a sense of purpose | 9 | 0 | 0.26* |
| 36 | His power rests mainly on merit, based on success | 36 | 0 | 0.14* |
| 24 | Is able to build and lead informal coalitions | 24 | 0 | -0.05 |
| 22 | Relies primarily on informal groups and grassroots | 22 | -1 | -0.50* |
| 44 | Uses primarily administrative and economic motivators | 44 | -1 | -0.69 |
| 34 | Is willing to pressure and control others | 34 | -2 | -0.77 |
| 25 | Centralizes decision-making in his own hands | 25 | -2 | -0.97* |
| 11 | Takes an interest in patron-client relations | 11 | -2 | -1.14* |
| 1 | Demanding and self-imposing | 1 | -2 | -1.24* |
| 38 | A person of power and authority, always in control | 38 | -3 | -1.30* |
| 8 | Strong-willed, imposes his viewpoint on others | 8 | -3 | -1.38* |
| 21 | Makes decisions without seeking advice of others | 21 | -3 | -1.46* |
| 32 | Undervalues other people's ideas and strategies | 32 | -3 | -1.53* |
| 42 | Uses others to advance himself | 42 | -4 | -1.65* |
| 16 | Deals with critics by intimidating or ignoring them | 16 | -4 | -1.77* |
| 5 | Values his own personal over organizational interests | 5 | -4 | -1.99* |

Note: Rank Values, ranging from -4 to +4, and Z-scores (normalized factor scores) are indicated for $P < .05$; asterisk (*) indicates significance at $P < .01$

Overall, the major (**Factor 1**) *Ideal Leader type* is characterized as a *mix of Inspiring and Group* traits combined with *anti-Strong* traits, which provided for the ground to label it as **Inspiring Statesman**.

Conclusions:

Thus, the above findings provide the following summary picture of three *typical* political leadership styles as perceived by citizens of Kazakhstan. The most part of respondents who performed Q-sorts on their perceptions of a public typical leader, comprised *Factor 1* associated with the leader type called **Power-Wielder**. Subsequent interviews have helped clarify respective subjective understandings of respondents for this leader

type characterized, in general, as a leader who: views his leadership role as power-holding; pursues primarily his own interest; demonstrates complete domination and power attitude; maintains high power distance; prefers centralized decision-making; exerts pressure and control; prefers coercive and transactional motivation of subordinates; and is not receptive to critics. Overall, under Little's model (1985), this leader type features **Strong** type traits coupled with **anti-Group, and anti-Inspiring** traits.

Factor 2 associated with the second type named **Elite Leader** displays the following distinct features: ability to see the big picture and to envision a broad strategy; capacity to express himself clearly and to inspire others; and displaying broad intellect and profound thought. At the same time, it retains some major traits of the Power-Wielder, namely, using his leadership role as a way to maintain power; strong-willed approach and imposing his viewpoint on others; centralizing decision-making in his own hands; maintaining a distance between himself and followers; and being demanding and self-imposing. Under Little's typology, this leader type combines **Strong and Inspiring traits** coupled with **anti-Group** traits.

Factor 3 associated with the third leader type labeled **Old Communist Guard** features the following, mainly *Group* type, distinguishing traits that make it stand apart from the two previous types: upholding his followers' sense of public interest; regarding himself as on par with followers; striving to look ordinary, like just one of the people; his power rests mainly on merit, based on success; appealing to community spirit and solidarity, etc. On the other hand, it reveals Strong Leader attributes such as exhibiting power and authority, being always in control; and showing strong-willed approach and imposing his viewpoint on others. Under Little's model, this leader type features a mix of **Group** and some **Strong and Inspiring**, traits coupled, on the other hand, with **anti-Strong and anti-Inspiring** traits.

As comparative analysis of all the three leader types reveals, there are some overlapping traits that constitute what can be called the *cultural archetype* inherent in the existing leadership styles in Kazakhstan. In other words, these traits may be viewed as basic characteristics underlying the generalized typical leader's profile thus reflecting some major *national character traits* in today's Kazakhstan. As shown above, these traits are the

following: strong-willed; imposes his viewpoint on others; demanding and self-imposing; a person of power and authority, in control; a tendency not to limit the use of his power for personal gain; and rejecting dialog and criticism. The largest difference between the three typical leader types lies in the following traits: striving to look ordinary, like just one of the people; and valuing his own personal over organizational interests.

By way of contrast, the analysis of *ideal* leadership styles has discovered an overwhelming preference of the general public for a leader type, which would combine *Inspiring and Group leader type* traits. For the sake of clarity, in this paper the focus is on the first of the four emerged factors, which displays most clearly this pattern of public expectations and, moreover, is largely present in all the four factors. Particularly, under Little's model, this factor comprises the following *Inspiring type* traits: Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy; Expresses himself clearly and inspires others; Thinks critically and is receptive to new ideas; Demonstrates flexibility in managing people; Is inwardly strong, seeks balanced values and growth; and Displays broad intellect and profound thought. The respective *Group type* traits are as follows: A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose; Has a strong sense of public interest; and Regards power as a tool for serving people. Among the *least appreciated traits* for the ideal leadership style, the respondents named the following ones: Values his own personal over organizational interests; Deals with critics by intimidating or ignoring them; Uses others to advance himself; Undervalues other people's ideas and strategies; Makes decisions without seeking advice of others; Strong-willed, imposes his viewpoint on others; and Uses his leadership role as a way to maintain power.

The undertaken comparison of the typical and ideal leadership styles in Kazakhstan appears to attest to public disapproval of typical leadership styles currently in presence in Kazakhstan, especially, of Power Wielder, the profile of which, in Freud's (1922) terms, is likely to signify a *low public ego-ideal* as embodied in this leader type. However, none of the uncovered typical leaders seems to offer an attractive leadership pattern to most citizens, as seen through comparing typical leader profiles and public projections of an ideal type, which may imply an inherent gap between most existing political leaders and general citizenry in Kazakhstan.

Overall, the *Ideal Leader (Inspiring Statesman)* type can be characterized as a **mix of Inspiring and Group** traits and, on the other hand, of **anti-Strong** traits. It should be noted that one of the typical leaders, namely Elite Leader, comprises some Inspiring leader traits such as “Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy;” “Expresses himself clearly and inspires others;” and “Displays broad intellect and profound thought,” which indicates that this leader type is somewhat closer to public expectations. On the other hand, Old Communist Guard, as a mix of Group and some Inspiring traits, which overlap with the Ideal leader profile (e.g. Upholds his followers' sense of public interest; His power rests mainly on merit, based on success; Seeks solutions thru dialog and joint decision-making) also appears, at least partially, to qualify as a style, which would find a greater public endorsement. These findings can suggest paying further attention to those political leaders in Kazakhstan who, in their public appearance, approximate the style of Inspiring Statesman and can thus be seen as representatives of a leadership style closer to the desirable *pattern of public expectations*. More detailed interpretation of the factor analysis findings is underway, which can later be reported as a part of the author’s doctoral thesis.

Appendixes:

Appendix A. Factorial Design for the Research Tool developed for the Field Study of Leadership Styles in Kazakhstan

| Main Effects | Levels | | | | | N |
|----------------|------------|-------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|----------------|---|
| A. Leader type | (a) strong | | (b) group | | (c) inspiring | 3 |
| B. Practices | (d) image | (e) communication | (f) work | (g) leader-follower relations | (h) motivation | 5 |

$m = 3$ replications, $mAB = (3)(3)(5) = 45$ statements

Note: This factorial design for the Q method based research tool draws upon A. Little's (1985) psychosocial leader types model and B. Kouzes and Posner's (2002) leadership best-practices model.

Appendix B. Statements used for the Research Tool (Q sample)

Strong Leader type related Statements:

(ad) power, domination

Demanding and self-imposing
 Values personal over organizational interests
 A person of power and authority, always in control

(ae) directions

Makes decisions without seeking advice of others, makes up his own mind
 Strong-willed, imposes his viewpoint on others
 Deals with critics by intimidating or ignoring them

(af) status quo

Sticks to conventional ways of getting things done
Undervalues other people's ideas and strategies
Centralizes decision-making in his own hands

(ag) power distance

Maintains a distance between himself and subordinates
Uses his leadership role as a way to maintain his power
Takes an interest in managing every detail

(ah) transactional, coercive

Uses others to advance himself
Uses political and economic incentives to motivate others
Is willing to pressure and control others to get things done

Group Leader type related Statements:

(bd) concern, solidarity

A person of justice, integrity, and unselfish purpose
Has a strong sense of public interest
Limits the use of power for personal gain

(be) appeals

Appeals to community spirit and solidarity
Regards himself as on par with followers
Is always ready to listen to people's concerns and problems

(bf) no formal structure

Is able to build and lead informal coalitions
Considers justice and caring as bases for organizing followers
Relies primarily on informal groups and grassroots networks to initiate change

(bg) serving people

Strives to serve the public so as to gain their approval

Regards power as a tool for serving people

Strives to look ordinary, like just one of the people

(bh) social approval

Instills a sense of community and care among his followers

Praises followers for displaying moral virtues, such as justice and unselfish assistance

Upholds his followers' sense of community, patriotism, and public interest

Inspiring Leader type related Statements:

(cd) personal example

Displays broad intellect and profound thought

Is inwardly strong, seeks balanced values and personal growth

Radiates a positive image, a sense of purpose, and self-confidence

(ce) vision

Expresses himself clearly and inspires others with his vision

Sees the big picture and envisions broad strategy

Cultivates dialog and accepts criticism as a constructive process

(cf) innovation

Demonstrates flexibility in managing people and bringing about change

Thinks critically and is receptive to new ideas

Is willing to take risks and to address issues creatively

(cg) delegation, sharing, enabling

Trusts followers, delegates authority, and promotes autonomy

Seeks solutions through dialog and joint decision-making

His power rests mainly on merit, based on successful leadership

(ch) encouragement

Arouses interest and motivation among his followers
Praises followers individually for their achievements and growth
Emphasizes a wide range of human values.

References

1. Brown, S. (1980). *Political subjectivity: Applications of Q-methodology in political science*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
2. Freud, S. (1955). Group psychology and the analysis of the ego. *Standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 18, pp. 65-143). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1922)
3. Ishiyama, J. (2002). Neo-patrimonialism and the prospects for democratization in the Central Asian republics. In S. Cummings (Ed.), *Power and change in Central Asia* (pp. 42-58). London: Routledge.
4. Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work related values*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
5. House, R., Hanges, P., Javidan, M., Dorfman P., and Gupta, V. (Eds.) (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organization: the GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
6. Kouzes, J. & Posner, B. (2002). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
7. Lasswell, H. (1948). *Power and personality*. New York: W. W. Norton.
8. Little, G. (1985). *Political ensembles: A psychosocial approach to politics and leadership*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
9. Schmolck, P. & Atkinson J. (2002). *PQMethod* (version 2.11). [Computer Software]. Available from: <http://www.qmethod.org/Tutorials/pqmethod.htm>