
Book Section:
Allen, S. orcid.org/0000-0001-8706-6958 and O'Reilly, D. (2023) Leadership within 'alternatives'. In: Schedlitzki, D., Larsson, M., Carroll, B., Bligh, M.C. and Epitropaki, O., (eds.) The SAGE Handbook of Leadership. Sage Publications Limited , London , pp. 371-382. ISBN 9781529769067

Leadership within 'alternatives'

for The SAGE Handbook of Leadership – to be published November 2022

Stephen Allen, Sheffield University Management School - stephen.allen@sheffield.ac.uk ;
https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/management/staff/stephenallen
Dermot O'Reilly, Lancaster University Management School - d.oreilly@lancaster.ac.uk ;
https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/lums/people/dermot-oreilly
Both authors contributed equally, and are listed in alphabetical order.

Introduction: The meanings of alternatives and impetus for exploring leadership within them

In this chapter we examine how leadership has been conceptualised and applied in alternative forms of organizing. We develop new understanding about leadership in alternatives (e.g. co-operatives, social movements, or militant organizations) by exploring how it is understood, produced, and operates in different contexts of alternative organizing. We consider what is focal to meanings of leadership, and how leadership (whether as a form, style, process, or practice) varies within alternatives. Based on our analysis we suggest some possibilities for developing studies of leadership in alternatives, as well as posing questions about studying leadership in general.

We focus on alternatives as part of a counter to the argument, or assumption, that 'there is no alternative'. This assumption, voiced by many ideologues of the past, is that there is a teleological unity behind organizational and social evolution, and thus no point or reason to consider other possibilities. The recognition of the existence of many varieties of alternatives, however, ruptures this assertion. Consequently, we believe that by exploring the dynamics that inform or shape alternatives, the potential for, and possibilities of, alternatives is renewed.

Our affinity for considering alternatives is not a romantic attachment to 'the road less travelled', but a critical-political positioning for heterogeneity in forms of leading and organizing. Indeed, some have argued that 'alternative' forms of social organization are numerically, geographically, socially, and historically more extensive than the symbolically prominent organizational norm of the capitalist firm (Parker et al., 2014). Consequently, exploring alternatives enables the potential re-evaluation of what is considered 'normal' or mandatory.

Significantly, other than a minority interest in the solidarity economy (e.g. Parker et al., 2014; Gibson-Graham et al., 2013), organizational theory largely ignores how co-ordination works in non-profit oriented communities and forms of social organizing. The focus of organizational theorists tends to be on profit-oriented organizations, such that even authors who have noted the importance of the 'informal' organization or the forms of community within private organizations (Mayo, 1949; Barnard, 1938; Selznick, 1994; Scott and Davis, 2007), have often treated this social phenomenon as a shadow of, or complement to, market and hierarchical relations.

To make comparisons between studies of alternatives requires us to make decisions about what organizational characteristics define what is and what is not 'alternative'. These decisions involve assumptions about what is mainstream, symbolically prominent, or 'normal'. We will explain our choices in Section 1 by outlining three different, but complementary, conceptual lenses (coordination arrangements, organizational purpose, and value orientation) for identifying and contrasting 'symbolically prominent/normal', 'supporting' and 'alternative' organizational forms[i]. Section 2 presents an overview of explicit empirical studies of leadership in different types of alternatives, and identifies themes and issues across these different organizational forms and contexts. Section 3 reflects back on the extant literature on leadership within alternatives, in order to highlight questions and areas for future investigation, both for leadership in alternatives, and for leadership.

1: Sensemaking 'alternatives': Three lenses of coordination arrangements, organizational purpose, and value orientation

Various authors have offered definitions about how 'alternatives' are distinctive (e.g. Parker et al. 2014; Reedy and Learmonth, 2009). We believe, however, that there are greater conceptual possibilities to build on these existing distinctions in order to appreciate the variety and nuances of organizational forms. Such appreciations are crucial for understanding leadership in 'alternatives'. Consequently, to help to explore the varieties of 'alternatives' we identify three categorises of organization: 'symbolically prominent/normal', 'supporting', and 'alternative'. They can be appreciated to be dialectically related because they are defined and understood in relation to each other. We consider these three categories through three conceptual lenses. The purpose of considering the three lenses is not only to express the complexity of 'alternatives', but also to be broadly inclusive in the representation of 'alternatives'.

Our *first lens* for understanding and distinguishing organizational and social relations is of the predominant *coordination arrangements* identified in organizational and social theory: the idealised organizational types of the market ('symbolically prominent/normal'), which co-ordinates via price; the top-down bureaucratic hierarchy ('supporting') which co-ordinates via authority; and the clan or community ('alternative') which co-ordinates via norms, values, solidarity, or trust (Ouchi, 1980; Ouchi, 1979; Adler, 2001; Durkheim, 1933; Scott and Davis, 2007).

Our *second lens* for understanding alternatives is of *organizational purpose/s*. 'Symbolically prominent/normal' organizations foremost purpose is profit-growth (which may or may not be seen to lead to social development), pursued by market-oriented entrepreneurial organizations. 'Supporting' organizations foremost purpose is social reproduction through economic reproduction, for example in government or public service organizations where welfare goals and economic goals are considered together. 'Alternative' organizations foremost purpose is the support, development, and growth of social and cultural forms of living, for example in various forms of lifestyle development, cultural endeavours, and value-expression, or in modes of charity, mutual aid, or care which defend or preserve basic social as well as cultural reproduction.

The *third lens* for our three-way categorisation is of *value orientation*. The 'symbolically prominent/normal' value orientation in contemporary market-embedded organizations is of ego-centrism – where the individual self is presumed as, or socialised into, having a focus on self-protection, -development, and -expansion (Knights and O'Leary, 2006). The 'supporting' value orientation in contemporary society is group-centrism – where people are seen to value the group, whether for egocentric security or for more socialised motives e.g. the private family, town or city councils, or mutual welfare groups. The 'alternative' value orientation is a universalist-orientation – where the locus of values is seen as ubiquitous and unlimited within, and potentially beyond, the organizational form e.g. humanistic, religious, spiritual, or ecological communities.

Table 1 summarises our three lenses in relation to the three categories of organization. The shading indicates the selected criteria for 'alternative' organizations and social relations, and of organizations that are part-alternative that will be included in our review. The two-dimensional representation of Table 1 means that it does not display all the potential combinations. For example, a hierarchical organization may have a social development purpose and be universalist in value orientation, indeed, many charities have exactly this combination of form, purpose, and value-orientation. Also, the table could imply that these distinctions are mutually exclusive. This is not necessarily the case, rather there may be combinations of each of these dimensions, and varying degrees of each of them[ii]. Although, the lenses and categories inevitably simplify organizational realities they allow us to express what we mean by 'alternatives', and so enable us to explain what is, and is not, in focus in our exploration of leadership within 'alternatives'.

Table 1: Three lenses on types of organizations and social relations in contemporary society

Categorizations of organizations and social relations Lenses	'Symbolically prominent/Normal'	'Supporting'	'Alternative'
Ideal organizational types (coordination arrangements)	Market (price) e.g. individual economic actor	Hierarchy (authority) e.g. state government	Organizational clan/community (values, norms, trust) e.g. utopian communes
Economic/ social purpose	Economic development e.g. profit-seeking private organizations	Economic / social reproduction e.g. public service organizations, professional associations, co-operatives, employee-controlled organizations, intentional communities, social enterprises	Social development e.g. social movements, developmental charities, hobby clubs, community interest companies
Value orientation	Ego-centrism e.g. profit-oriented 'platform' organizations	Group-centrism e.g. nuclear family, interest-based political parties, trade unions, indigenous movements, resistance movements, mutual welfare groups	Universalism e.g. eco-socialist-feminist collectivist movements; inclusive spiritual/religious movements

Table 1 focuses on contemporary or modern forms of organizational and social relations, but traditional forms (e.g. actual clans or hunter-gatherer groups) are also covered in Section 2. From reviewing across different fields of research we have found that there are a series of exclusions that we need to apply to make the project of overviewing leadership within alternatives manage-able[iii]. It is also important not to read any of these distinctions as logically or inherently either 'good' or 'bad'. Indeed, many community groups or organizations are significantly self-interested and some produce toxic behaviours, relations, and results, for example in some cults (see Tourish, 2011). Values that are group-centred, or universalist can shape groups and practices that are sectarian, exclusionary, or violent (including terrorist organizations - Blair et al., 2021) as well as egalitarian, pacifist, or inclusive, and are sometimes expressed in 'normal' organizations.

Table 1 thus summarises our selection criteria for identifying the types of 'alternatives' and part-alternatives within which leadership has been explicitly studied. As will become clear from our review of this literature, the types of 'alternative' organization do not correspond to pre-existing categorisations of the leadership literature. Within and across the different types of 'alternatives'

previously studied, various forms of leadership concepts and methodologies are apparent. The lenses we utilize in Table 1, however, help enable the sensebreaking and re-making of leadership through alternatives that we sketch in Section 3.

2: Sensemaking studies of leadership within 'alternatives'

In this section we review literature published in English which explicitly studies leadership through empirical research of the above-selected 'alternative' forms of organizing. This literature is not significantly clustered within some identifiable disciplinary areas or themes. Moreover, the literature is multidisciplinary and has not previously been brought together under the general framing of leadership within 'alternatives'.

From our searches we identified studies of leadership which can be associated with different framings of alternative organizations: egalitarian social organization, including studies of acephalous groups in hunter-gatherer societies (Edwards, 2015; Boehm et al., 1993; Glowacki and von Rueden, 2015; von Rueden et al., 2014; von Rueden and van Vugt, 2015) and studies of egalitarian communities in modern settings (Yngvesson, 1978); civic associations (Andrews et al., 2010; Buzzanell et al., 1997); community-based labour organizations (Fu, 2021; Rosile et al., 2021); women-centred forms of organizing (Brown and Hosking, 1986; Freeman, 2013 [1972]); co-operatives (Buzzanell et al., 1997; Goldberg, 1969); utopian communes and gatherings (Brumann, 2000; MacGill, 2014); social change/ social movement organizing[iv] (Ganz, 2010; Ospina and Su, 2009; Gerbaudo, 2012; Western, 2014; Sutherland et al., 2014; Carson, 1987; Bligh and Robinson, 2010; Tranter, 2009; Keshtiban et al., 2021; Kallman, 2022), including protest and resistance groups (Zoller and Fairhurst, 2007; Einwohner, 2007; Eslen-Ziya and Erhart, 2015), vanguard groups (Marcy, 2020), and terrorist groups (Grint, 2005).

The disciplines used to research leadership in alternatives vary widely, and are variously combined – from anthropology (Boehm et al., 1993; Brumann, 2000), to communication studies (Buzzanell et al., 1997; Moon and Kim, 2019), social psychology (Brown and Hosking, 1986), organization studies (Zoller and Fairhurst, 2007; Andrews et al., 2010), leadership studies (Edwards, 2015; Bligh and Robinson, 2010; Tranter, 2009; Zoller and Fairhurst, 2007; Western, 2014; Sutherland et al., 2014; Allen, 2019; Simsa and Totter, 2020), history and historiography (Edwards, 2015; Carson, 1987), evolutionary theory (von Rueden and van Vugt, 2015; Glowacki and von Rueden, 2015; von Rueden et al., 2014), social movement studies (Ganz, 2010; Ganz and McKenna, 2018; Andrews et al., 2010), and sociology (Andrews et al., 2010).

The conceptions of leadership are also diverse – from leadership concepts that are focused more on leaders – such as charismatic leadership (Bligh and Robinson, 2010; Carson, 1987), and leaders' styles and actions (Marcy, 2020; Ganz, 2010); to more distributed conceptions of leadership such as post-heroic leadership (Eslen-Ziya and Erhart, 2015), distributed leadership (Brown and Hosking, 1986; Edwards, 2015), relational leadership (Allen, 2019), decolonial leadership (Jimenez-Luque, 2021), place leadership (Rees et al., 2021), ensemble leadership (Rosile et al., 2021), invitational and dramaturgical leadership (Buzzanell et al., 1997), and complexity leadership (MacGill, 2014). These different disciplines and conceptions of leadership similarly reflect substantially different research purposes – from functionalist approaches to leadership (Ganz, 2010; Andrews et al., 2010; von Rueden and van Vugt, 2015), and interpretive and hermeneutic approaches to leadership (Buzzanell et al., 1997; Brown and Hosking, 1986; Edwards, 2015), to critical approaches to leadership (Zoller and Fairhurst, 2007; Sutherland et al., 2014; Kallman, 2022). The following sub-sections identify some key themes across the literature.

Leaders, leadership

One of the most obvious distinctions between the various studies is how while some studies focus on individuals as leaders, others stress de-centring leadership by focussing on the distributed practices (see Chapter 2), interactions (see Chapter 3), and processes (see Chapter 23) that comprise various forms of 'plural' leadership (see Chapter 1).

Von Rueden and von Vugt (2015), for example focus on leaders in hunter-gatherer groups from an evolutionary perspective – their functions and roles; the traits and behaviours conducive to their emergence and effectiveness, and the motivations and incentives to assume leadership positions (p. 978). In contrast, Edwards (2015) distils more pluralist views of leadership processes from a review of anthropological literature, arguing that there is significant evidence for both individual-based and distributed forms of leadership. In civic associations, Andrews et al. (2010) argue that leader development is particularly important owing to their decentralized structure entailing significant numbers of leader positions. In contrast, in their study of a US quilting guild and a food cooperative Buzzanell et al. (1997) stress not the person of the leader, but the performances that enact leadership through the notion of 'dramaturgical' leadership. For some authors, leadership is something that a leader does, whereas for Buzzanell et al. leadership is understood as "the process of collective action" (p.287).

Similarly, some studies of social movements/ social change organizations focus on charismatic leadership, either to focus on particular movement leaders (Carson, 1987; Bligh and Robinson, 2010), or to explore how charisma exists in different forms after the routinisation of the social movement (Tranter, 2009). Tranter (2009) broadens the perspective from individual leaders or movements, and also explores some of the relations between different types of movement organization, and questions of leader succession in movement organizations. In contrast, other social movement studies, explicitly take a constructionist perspective of leadership to consider it as a process of how communities make meanings and take action together (e.g. Ganz and McKenna, 2018; Ospina and Su, 2009; Keshtiban et al., 2021; Sutherland et al., 2014). They sometimes focus on "identifying and exploring 'leadership practices' that set the stage for explicit collaborative work" (Ospina & Foldy, 2010, p. 295), or on how "leadership shifts amongst multiple leadership actors" through 'distributed meaning-making' and processes of role rotation (Sutherland et al., 2014, p. 772).

Leaderlessness, leadershiplessness, and dominance.

One of the most striking features of these studies is the stress on leaderlessness within many groups, and the differing interpretations as to what this means, whether it is possible, and whether it is desirable.

There is a broad consensus amongst archaeologists and anthropologists that hunter-gatherer societies both were, and are, largely acephalous (literally, 'without head'), in that there are limited formal leader roles and significant norms and practices for reproducing relative social equality (Boehm et al., 1993; von Rueden and van Vugt, 2015), and that leadership appears to be significantly influenced by the context or situation as well as the culture of the group (von Rueden et al., 2014; Edwards, 2015). For most of human existence the dominant social form was largely egalitarian in form and practice (von Rueden and van Vugt, 2015). Some anthropologists argue that in egalitarian acephalous societies group members exert a form of bottom-up 'dominance' in that they are seen to exert collective pressure on informal and temporarily formal leaders (via various forms of sanction, ostracism, or in extreme cases, killing) (Boehm et al., 1993).

Since the 1960s, a recurrent theme has been the critique of the idea that leaderlessness is possible in organization, and a concomitant focus on the tension between an ideal of leaderlessness and actual or hidden forms of social ordering. Goldberg (1969) explores tensions between egalitarianism

and autocratic organization in a small-holders' farming co-operative ('moshav') in Israel. The aims of the group involve "levelling those who are getting ahead" as well as "the sharing of wealth with those who might otherwise slip back into dire poverty" (Goldberg, 1969, p. 72). He describes how "the various households [99 families] are bound together by mutual aid as well as by common agricultural credit, supply, and marketing services" (Goldberg, 1969, p. 55). Control over decision making power is highly contested within the community, involving a complex mix of: deference to the leader ('the mazkir'); an annoyance from the community when elected committee members are not vocal in expressing their views in public; that only more wealthy community members are more willing to challenge the mazkir, and that the mazkir "should be 'quiet' and modest by conducting himself with dignity" (Goldberg, 1969, p. 71).

Yngvesson (1978) considers the nuances of leaderlessness in egalitarian group processes of Swedish fishing boats, arrangements which are also reflected within general community organization. There are role distinctions but none are understood to have more prestige than others. The boat team is suggested to function based on voluntary cooperation, with role rotation, no orders given by one member to another, and decisions reached on a consensus basis. As Yngvesson describes "team decision-making, taken at face value, is a simple operation involving a suggestion by one person, which is generally accepted (tacitly or overtly) by other members of the team, following a period of silence or informal discussion" (1978, p. 80). In this context she draws on ideas of leadership by considering how "a facade of 'leaderless unity' can be maintained while in fact the need for a leader is met" (Yngvesson, 1978, p. 74). She describes 'masking processes' whereby individuals disguise taking action in their own (and potentially team and/or communities) best interest to avoid confrontation. In particular, the masking of leaders is explored in crisis situations where immediate action must be taken. She describes how "this mask may be provided not only by a person but by a process, which instead of removing the source of a controversial decision from the group, distributes responsibility for it among the members of the group in such a way that no one person or faction can be held accountable" (Yngvesson, 1978, p. 88).

A key study – it is heavily referenced in many of the articles we reviewed – exploring leaderlessness is by Freeman (1972) who studies the women's liberation movement in the US. Freeman's (1972) framing of 'leaderlessness' emerges from ideas of 'structurelessness' which involves considering the potential limitations of structure-less organizing (e.g. no official spokespeople nor any defined decision-making process). Freeman suggests that structurelessness, with an 'informal structure', "becomes a way of masking power", "usually most strongly advocated by those who are the most powerful" or those "who know the rules" (1972, p. 152). In the women's liberation movement, Freeman highlights the potential for "elitist and exclusive … informal communication networks of friends" (1972, p. 155) to informally exert power. Those who can be regarded as 'elites' are suggested to be identifiable by certain characteristics such as a person's background, personality, or amount of time allocated to the movement. It is these informal elites which are seen to hold power in which the leaders, and any connected notions of leadership, reside. Freeman's (1972) writing is a provocation to creating forms of 'democratic structuring' for greater political effectiveness within the women's liberation movement. Such structure is proposed to involve formalising how authority is democratically given (and taken away) via roles and task assignment, alongside equal access to resources and organizational information. Consequently, although a theory of leadership is not specifically engaged with, leaders as formal holders of (temporary) authority via roles is suggested to be an antidote to an imaginary of leaderlessness which is argued to mask who holds power.

Subsequent studies engage with Freeman's arguments against ideals of leaderlessness and structurelessness. Gerbaudo (2012) explores the difficult relations that social movements in a number of countries have with associating their ways of organizing with 'leadership' of any form. He argues that despite claims to leaderlessness there are identifiable forms of 'soft', 'emotional' and

'dialogical' leadership, which "are by and large indirect as well as invisible but nonetheless effective in giving collective action a certain degree of coherence and a sense of direction" (Gerbaudo, 2012, p. 157). In particular he considers how uses of social media by people active in social movements cannot be blindly regarded as bringing 'horizontality', as from his ethnographic research often a "handful of people control most of the communication flow" (Gerbaudo, 2012, p. 135). Similarly, Allen (2019) suggests in his study of Quakers that relations of power and associated influence within the group, can become ignored, since they are understood to be obviated by consensus based organizational processes; and that the appreciations of leadership being fluid within the group, or that any possibility for leaders(hip) is denied, can obscure how many patterns of influencing can be quite static and become ingrained.

Sutherland et al. (2014) explore social movement organizing in the UK by engaging with ideas of leaderlessness or 'anti-leadership'. They draw on critical leadership studies and earlier work about anarchism (e.g. Fyke and Sayegh, 2001) to consider how the refusal to acknowledge any kind of leadership can be detrimental to possibilities for egalitarian organizing. In particular, they explore how "leadership shifts amongst multiple leadership actors" through 'distributed meaning-making' and processes of role rotation (Sutherland et al., 2014, p. 772). In particular, they argue that even if a group is leaderless, in terms of having no formal leaders, there is nonetheless necessarily leadership. Western makes a related point by suggesting that a key reason why social movements do not develop beyond protest is because "their agency is diluted and constrained by the continued disavowal of leadership" (2014, p. 692). He develops a notion of 'autonomist leadership' which is described as an "anti-hierarchical, informal and distributed leadership that is distinctive to emancipatory social movements" (Western, 2014, p. 676). His work maintains that within social movements other forms of leadership are constructed and that it is by exploring these, and disengaging a resolute idea of leaderlessness, that there are opportunities for more effective social movement organization. Likewise, Fotaki and Foroughi (2021) engage with notions of leaderlessness by using the Lacanian concept of fantasy to explore how debates about leadership are avoided in the 'Extinction Rebellion' movement in the UK, which helps to thwart the potential for democratic politics and social change. They suggest that acknowledging psychic conflicts and tensions in relation to leaders and leadership is key for developmental governance and 'leaderfull-ness' in social movements.

While the authors involved in these studies concur with Freeman that there are dangers in an ideal of leaderlessness, and that such an ideal does not obviate power asymmetries, others take a more positive view of the ideal of leaderlessness. From the angle of postheroic leadership in their study of the Gezi Park protests in Turkey, Eslen-Ziya & Erhart (2015) see leaderlessness as offering possibilities, rather than seeing it as a barrier for the ongoing development of social movement organizing. From a prefigurative angle, Simsa and Totter (2020) explore how members of the Spanish protest movement 15M "stress the necessity of collective reflection to understand organizational dynamics, and to learn to ensure efficient organization without hierarchies" (Simsa & Totter, 2020, p. 236). They suggest that modes of reflexive organizing are in operation, such that attention is given to power, and potential hidden hierarchies are engaged with in the social movement. Such engagement is visible by members experimenting with ways of organizing and processes of doing leadership. Their study suggests that some movements take the question of asymmetric power seriously and thus try to avoid an ideal of leaderlessness detracting from dealing with the possible problems of informal hierarchy or structure.

Related to this theme of leaderlessness, there are also some salutary findings from utopian communes and temporary groups that relate back to questions of dominance identified in acephalous hunter-gatherer groups. Utopian communes are "groups that voluntarily live together and share all their property" (Brumann, 2000, p. 425). Brumann (2000) analyses historical and

contemporary utopian communes to identify the characteristics that enable some of these communes to be socially vibrant for a considerable period of time. His key findings are that individual communes where there is a leader displaying 'high' dominance, or federations of communes where a particular branch has high dominance, tend to have a limited active lifespan. In contrast, those communes which are active for longer periods are often of a federative branch structure, i.e. they are based over multiple locations without one being overly dominant, and charismatic leaders within these communes display 'mild' as opposed to 'high' dominance. MacGill's (2014) study of a 5-day co-located event experimenting in alternative lifestyles in New Zealand focuses on how it has reproduced itself for approximately 30 years without formal hierarchies, roles, or rules. While not without practical problems, MacGill argues that the longevity of 'Convergence' indicates that acephalous organization is possible for particular types of medium-scale groups, and he questions assumptions about the maximum size of egalitarian groups and the 'iron law of hierarchy' (Boulding, 1968).

Leadership: for and against

There are significant elements of the literature on leadership within alternatives, similar to much of the leadership literature, that points to how leadership is aimed towards, or *for*, some goal or purpose. This is seen in the studies where leadership is identified as occurring in the accomplishment of various tasks – for example, in hunting, fishing, or in conflict-mediation in hunter-gatherer groups (Edwards, 2015) or egalitarian community relationships (Yngvesson, 1978), and in co-ordinating civic associations (Andrews et al., 2010; Buzzanell et al., 1997) or social movements (Sutherland et al., 2014; Western, 2014; Kallman, 2022).

There are also significant indications of leadership as operating *against* something, as oppositional. This feature of opposition is most evident in particular types of social change/movement organizations such as protest or resistance organizing, vanguard groups, or revolutionary/terrorist groups. Leadership in resistance has been theorised in terms of 'resistance leadership' (Zoller and Fairhurst, 2007), which they specify as being oriented towards changing structural arrangements rather than involving simply individual, covert, or discrete acts of resistance. Zoller and Fairhurst (2007) consider how leadership relationships develop among resisters, which variously involves perceived injustice or 'hidden transcripts' of injustice, the handling of shared emotions, the use of instrumental arguments, relational attributes, attributions, charisma and 'crucibles' of experience.

Einwohner's (2007) study of resistance in Jewish Ghettos in WWII, for example, highlights the importance of resistance leaders establishing and maintaining their credibility and legitimacy as leaders. Zoller and Fairhurst (2007) also note the instrumentalization of this oppositional consciousness into the mobilisation of collective action. Such processes are identified via symbolic actions and material practices such as 'massing' which involves bringing people together to both facilitate and display collective power (Scott, 1990). In turn, Zoller and Fairhurst (2007) address the issue of how resistance leadership involves 'continued redrafting of an emerging story' (Weick et al., 2005) in order to make the discourse of change 'stick', and embedding it into material codes, forms, or practices. Zoller and Fairhurst's (2007) analysis of resistance leadership points to the dialectical tensions and processes evident in resistance leadership as it shifts between being 'against' a status quo, prominent symbol, or structural arrangement, and 'for' an alternative vision, symbol, or structure.

A particular type of oppositional social change organization are socio-political 'vanguards' (Marcy, 2020) – groups or organizations that aim at disrupting accepted social consciousness and that attempt to insert, or at least enable, alternative meanings or social ordering. Marcy (2020) locates both overlaps and distinctions between vanguard organizations and social movement and revolutionary organizations. Social movements seek to actively organize and mobilise people and

revolutionary groups seek to overthrow the status quo. In contrast, vanguard groups seek to disrupt thought and habit. Marcy (2020) identifies various vanguard organizations that lie on both the political 'right' (e.g. alt-Right) and political 'left' (e.g. the Situationist International). By focusing particularly on their traits, skills and outcomes he studies what vanguard leaders do – as individuals, within their groups, and in relation to the wider society that they seek to influence. There is relatively little on leadership in revolutionary or terrorist forms of social change organizations, but Grint (2005) notes the 'Hydra-like' (as in multi-headed) organizational and leadership structure of Al-Qaeda. He notes that the distributed leadership evident in such a structure can be positive in terms of inhibiting authoritarian leaders; but that it also potentially enables unrepresentative or undemocratic groups to destabilise liberal democratic societies, potentially resulting in a type of 'leaderless authoritarianism'.

3: Sensebreaking and re-making leadership through alternatives

Questions about leadership in alternatives

Our review of leadership within alternatives raises a variety of questions. We start with the obvious task of 'gap-spotting'. Firstly, there appears to be a serious dearth of studies of leadership in co-operatives, in intentional communities (those which are not utopian communes), mutual aid groups, or common interest groups (where the interests are non-economic). There is potential to examine extant studies of these types of organizations and social relationships for implicit accounts of leadership in these contexts in order to lay the ground for more explicit studies of leadership. Secondly, as noted above, most of the studies reviewed tend to be of single cases, with only a small number of comparative analyses undertaken. The comparative studies reported (e.g. Brumann, 2000; Buzzanell et al., 1997; Ospina and Su, 2009), though, are particularly informative about some key features of the type of alternative that they examined, suggesting that there is much greater scope for comparative analysis across alternatives of the same and different types. However, for comparative analysis it is important that a recognition of the different sociocultural contexts and worldviews that animate different alternatives is retained. This is because these empirical features, which can be highly significant, can become obscured in cross-cultural analysis (Edwards, 2015). Significantly, our searching was in English which means that studies in all other languages were excluded, this is a potentially very significant 'gap' that can be addressed.

There are also questions about leadership in alternatives that are generated by reflecting on the lenses noted in Section 1. For example, the organizational theory literature on co-ordination arrangements seems strongly focused on the 'positive' modes of co-ordination through provisioning or accumulation. For example, markets are seen as providing positive economic incentives, hierarchies are seen as allocating positive resources or rewards, and clans or communities are seen as expressing or actualising positive joint values. However, the empirical literature on leadership in alternatives, implies that co-ordinating arrangements are composed of both accumulative modes, and punitive modes. While the punitive mode of the market is economic deprivation, and the punitive modes of the hierarchy are, variously, punishment, resource deprivation, or marginalisation; the punitive modes of the clan/community are exclusion or marginalisation (evident in Freeman's, 1972) account of the negative sides of structurelessness and leaderlessness), or denigration, or occasionally, killing which is evident in anthropological accounts of acephalous communities (Boehm et al., 1993). There is significant scope for the future exploration of the interplay between 'accumulative' and 'punitive' modes of co-ordination.

As well as using more comparative analysis to understand alternatives and leadership within them, there would also be value in taking a more 'cultural-ecological' approach (which would include a historical sensibility, see Chapter 26) to understanding alternative organizations, their contexts and values, and the roles and forms of leadership within them. Taking such a cultural-ecological approach might suggest that accumulative modes of co-ordination are ascendant in periods of growth,

whereas punitive modes of co-ordination may predominate in periods of stagnation or decline. There is also circumstantial evidence that the mix of co-ordinating arrangements may fluctuate according to social conditions – with the suggestions of community being strong in times of stress or crisis, such as depressions, pandemics, or wars (e.g. Solnit, 2010). Indeed, it has long been hypothesised that economic recessions and other forms of societal crises give an impetus to the generation of 'alternative' modes of organization and social relationships. There is thus, a rich series of potential studies into the cultural-ecology of the rise and fall of 'alternatives', and of the differing roles and processes of leadership within this cultural-ecology.

Another question posed to leadership in alternatives from our review relates to the dynamics of leadership in alternatives. As noted above, a key theme in the literature on leadership in 'alternatives' relates to processes of working through tensions and oppositions that are seen to be inevitable within (alternative) organizing (Brumann, 2000; Buzzanell et al., 1997). In particular, it has been argued that the particularities of leadership in 'alternatives' requires different ways of conceptualising how leadership and collective action emerges in connection with certain people and at certain moments (Buzzanell et al., 1997). It is clear from our review that leadership within 'alternatives' is variously in tension with values about leaderlessness, formal and informal practices and structures of authority, and is bound up in questions of, and tensions between, instrumental efficacy and valued ways of being. Sutherland et al. (2014) and Western (2014) suggest that what is perhaps most important in 'alternatives' is not so much whether there are or are not leaders or leadership, but the types of roles and processes of leaders and leadership that there are, and the types of effects that they have in their particular cultural-ecological location and time. This suggests that the study of leadership in 'alternatives' needs to continue focussing ever more closely on the variety within different modes of leadership and different modes of 'alternatives' and the dialectics of their modes, roles, processes, practices, and their effects in their cultural and material contexts over time.

A final question posed relates to the broad themes and issues associated with gender and race, and how these relate to leadership in 'alternatives'. There are very few studies which specifically address these themes, on race there is one study (Ospina and Su, 2009), and also only one which specifically considers gender constructions and dynamics (Moon and Kim, 2019), despite feminist organizing being a prominent focus of some of these studies. Indeed, we notice in some historical accounts of 'egalitarian' groups and communities that they appear to be patriarchal is taken-for-granted (e.g. Goldberg, 1969; Yngvesson, 1978). Consequently, how leadership in 'alternatives' can be (counter) productive in relation to these themes is ripe for investigation. Also, although ecological sustainability is engaged with as an agenda, particularly in the social movement contexts (e.g. Fotaki and Foroughi, 2021), how 'alternatives' show forms of leadership on, for example (non) consumption practices, and the influence dynamics involved in the creation of these organizational practices has not yet been explored.

Questions from alternatives to leadership research

There are also a few deeper questions that this exploration of research on leadership within alternatives asks of leadership studies. The first question is perhaps the simplest and also the most complex – how, and in what ways, does sociocultural context lead? The majority of studies reviewed tended to oscillate between viewing leadership as an individual or as a collective phenomenon, but there were instances where the sociocultural context was apparent as a perceived force. Sahlins (2017) argues that even egalitarian acephalous societies operate within a hierarchical cosmology of various divinities or spirits, similarly, Allen (2019) notes that in Quaker organizing the ultimate authority is 'the will of God'. Abélès (2017), disputes what Sahlins infers from this, arguing that even if people in these groups see themselves as existing within these cosmological hierarchies, it is another thing altogether to suggest that these cosmological hierarchies actually act upon them. That

is, Abélès appears to be arguing that cosmological hierarchies lack agency, and so cannot be said to be actually exercising leadership or authority upon their believers, even if their believers fervently believe that they do, and these beliefs impact on what they do.

These contexts may seem like purely animistic, spiritual, or religious circumstances, but consider how resistance leaders react to feelings of injustice, or vanguard leaders react to what they consider to be misbegotten in 'mainstream' society – they are led by their beliefs, and their beliefs are necessarily socially, culturally, historically, and situationally shaped. In some manner, therefore, all the various protagonists of leaders, and all the various processes of leadership, are led, given a form of direction, by their sociocultural context. Our review suggests that leadership scholars could usefully inquire into how it does so (Chapter 32 likewise investigates leadership in relation to culture and symbolism).

The second question is raised by the observation of the oppositional thrust of much of the leadership in alternatives – many of the social movements mentioned – 15M in Spain, the Gezi Park protests in Turkey, Extinction Rebellion in the UK, women's movements in South Korea, are explicitly premised against economic, social, and political processes and orderings. The very concept of resistance leadership is founded on the observation of the oppositional mobilisation of injustice against social arrangements, and many utopian communes are predicated as a way to live differently to what is considered 'normal', mainstream, or lacking in their surrounding society. Yet, the mainstream of leadership research is founded on a unitary assumption – that leadership is functional to achieving some common goal or objective, for example, in their discussion of leadership in egalitarian small-scale societies, von Rueden and von Vugt (2015) define leadership thus:

> "Leadership is a primary mechanism by which groups resolve coordination and motivation problems. We define leaders as individuals who have differential influence within a group over the establishment of goals, logistics of coordination, monitoring of effort, and reward or punishment strategies" (Bass, B. M., 1990, Day, D. and Antonakis, J., 2012 cited in von Rueden and von Vugt 2015: 978).

These unitary assumptions are undercut, or at least problematised, when one considers the oppositional nature of resistance indicated in many forms of 'alternatives'. The mainstream literature appears to assume that leadership is concertive direction *towards* something, whether that something is a goal, a community, a purpose, a value, or an identity. But leadership can also be *against* a goal, community, identity and so on. Nor does being against something even entail or necessarily require organized concertive co-ordination of those opposing or resisting (such a conception would 'smuggle in' a unitary moment into resistance or protest). The idea of 'massing', noted by Zoller and Fairhurst (2007), suggests there are moments of uncoordinated and spontaneous synchronous interaction of individuals and collectives where direction is emergent rather than given or taken, and any perceived unity is imposed on empirical plurality. In these instances, such self-coordinated emergent direction is a product of an intersubjective or extra-individual awareness, attention, or presence. And it may not even be that rare – surely it is just such a phenomenon that animates most collective endeavours – for example in sports teams, and has been previously termed 'collective mind' or 'heedful interrelating' (Weick and Roberts, 1993). However, there is no need to romanticise or over-valorise such a phenomenon which is suggested by Sutherland et al's (2014) and Western's (2014) accounts of the desire for leaderlessness in social movement and anarchist organizing.

Finally, from our review of leadership within alternatives, we notice how conceptualisations of leadership overlap with, and are distinct from, other related concepts, including in terms of its (and their) formal, informal, material, and ideational forms. For example, if our review had considered

explicit accounts of authority, or of power, as well as explicit accounts of leadership in alternatives, the number of studies to review would have multiplied significantly. Interestingly, a number of studies encountered in the review equated leadership with authority. More interestingly, a number of studies encountered did not distinguish either between formal and informal leadership, or between formal and informal authority. It has to be acknowledged that these distinctions are both tricky and fluid. When informal authority becomes recognised as such, it can either take on a degree of formality, or have its legitimacy questioned. When informal leadership is recognised as such, it too can be either buttressed or eroded. The dynamics and inter-relations of these different phenomena would bear much greater conceptual enquiry from leadership scholars, suggesting that the future study of leadership needs to return to more fully considering the relations between leadership (formal, informal, material, and ideational) with authority, power, legitimacy, culture and symbolism (see Chapter 32) and social and organizational forms and processes, and the different alternative concepts available for theorizing and studying them (see Chapters 39 and 41 for complementary discussions).

References

Abélès M. (2017) The virtues of cosmopolitics. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 7: 129-132.

Adler PS. (2001) Market, Hierarchy, and Trust: The Knowledge Economy and the Future of Capitalism. *Organization Science* 12: 215-234.

Allen S. (2019) Exploring Quaker organising to consider the possibilities for relational leadership. *Quaker Studies* 24: 249-269.

Andrews KT, Ganz M, Baggetta M, et al. (2010) Leadership, Membership, and Voice: Civic Associations That Work. *American Journal Of Sociology* 115: 1191-1242.

Barnard C. (1938) *The Functions of the Executive*: Harvard University Press.

Blair CW, Chenoweth E, Horowitz MC, et al. (2021) Honor Among Thieves: Understanding Rhetorical and Material Cooperation Among Violent Nonstate Actors. *International Organization*: 1-40.

Bligh MC and Robinson JL. (2010) Was Gandhi “charismatic”? Exploring the rhetorical leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. *The Leadership Quarterly* 21: 844-855.

Boehm C, Barclay HB, Dentan RK, et al. (1993) Egalitarian Behavior and Reverse Dominance Hierarchy [and Comments and Reply]. *Current Anthropology* 34: 227-254.

Boulding KE. (1968) *The organizational revolution: A study in the ethics of economic organization,* Chicago: Quadrangle Books Inc.

Brown MH and Hosking DM. (1986) Distributed Leadership and Skilled Performance as Successful Organization in Social Movements. *Human Relations* 39: 65-79.

Brumann C. (2000) The Dominance of One and Its Perils: Charismatic Leadership and Branch Structures in Utopian Communes. *Journal Of Anthropological Research* 56: 425-451.

Buzzanell PM, Ellingson L, Silvio C, et al. (1997) Leadership processes in alternative organizations: Invitational and dramaturgical leadership. *Communication Studies* 48: 285-310.

Carson C. (1987) Martin Luther King, Jr.: Charismatic Leadership in a Mass Struggle. *Journal of American History* 74: 448-454.

Durkheim E. (1933) *The Division of Labor in Society,* New York: Free Press.

Edwards G. (2015) Anthropological accounts of leadership: Historical and geographical interpretations from indigenous cultures. *Leadership* 11: 335-350.

Einwohner RL. (2007) Leadership, Authority, and Collective Action:Jewish Resistance in the Ghettos of Warsaw and Vilna. *American Behavioral Scientist* 50: 1306-1326.

Eslen-Ziya H and Erhart I. (2015) Toward postheroic leadership: A case study of Gezi's collaborating multiple leaders. *Leadership* 11: 471-488.

Fotaki M and Foroughi H. (2021) Extinction Rebellion: Green activism and the fantasy of leaderlessness in a decentralized movement. *Leadership.*
Freeman J. (2013 [1972]) The tyranny of structurelessness. *Women's Studies Quarterly* 41: 231-246.
Fu H. (2021) Social action as 'a total social phenomenon': Comparing leadership challenges facing community-based labour organizations in China and Japan. *Human Relations* 74: 1396-1420.
Fyke K and Sayegh G. (2001) Anarchism and the Struggle to Move Forward. *Perspectives on Anarchist Theory* 5: 30-38.
Ganz M. (2010) Leading Change: Leadership, Organization, and Social Movements. In: Nohria N and Khurana R (eds) *Handbook of leadership theory and practice: An HBS centennial colloquium on advancing leadership* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Review Press, 527-568.
Ganz M. and McKenna E. (2018) Bringing Leadership Back In. In D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, H. Kriesi, & H. J. McCammon (Eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (pp. 185–205). John Wiley & Sons.
Gerbaudo P. (2012) *Tweets and the Streets: Social Media and Contemporary Activism.*: Pluto Press.
Gibson-Graham J, Cameron J and Healy S. (2013) *Take back the economy: an ethical guide for transforming our communities*.
Glowacki L and von Rueden C. (2015) Leadership solves collective action problems in small-scale societies. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 370: 20150010.
Goldberg HE. (1969) Egalitarianism in an Autocratic Village in Israel. *Ethnology* 8: 54-75.
Grint K. (2005) *Leadership: limits and possibilities,* Basingstoke: Palgrave.
Jimenez-Luque A. (2021) Decolonial leadership for cultural resistance and social change: Challenging the social order through the struggle of identity. *Leadership* 17: 154-172.
Kallman M. (2022) Autonomist Leadership and Organizational Practices in Leaderless Street Bands. In M. Godwyn (Ed.), *Research Handbook on the Sociology of Organizations*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
Keshtiban AE, Callahan JL and Harris M. (2021) Leaderlessness in social movements: Advancing space, symbols, and spectacle as modes of "Leadership". *Human Resource Development Quarterly* n/a.
Knights D and O'Leary M. (2006) Leadership, Ethics and Responsibility to the Other. *Journal of Business Ethics* 67: 125-137.
MacGill V. (2014) Convergence Gathering as an Example of a Medium-Scale Acephalous Group. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science* 31: 606-613.
Marcy RT. (2020) Leadership of socio-political vanguards: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly* 31: 101372.
Mayo E. (1949) *The social problems of an industrial civilization*: Routledge.
Moon YE and Kim HH. (2019) Unnie 1 comes out 2: Conceptualizing egalitarian leadership among South Korean women. In: Chao C-C and Ha L (eds) *Asian Women Leadership: A Cross-National and Cross-Sector Comparison.* London: Routledge.
Ospina S and Su C. (2009) Weaving Color Lines: Race, Ethnicity, and the Work of Leadership in Social Change Organizations. *Leadership* 5: 131-170.
Ouchi WG. (1979) A Conceptual Framework for the Design of Organizational Control Mechanisms. *Management Science* 25: 833-848.
Ouchi WG. (1980) Markets, Bureaucracies, and Clans. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 25: 129-141.
Parker M, Cheney G, Fournier V, et al. (2014) *The Routledge companion to alternative organization,* Abingdon: Routledge.
Rees J, Sancino A, Jacklin-Jarvis C, et al. (2021) 'You can't Google everything': the voluntary sector and the leadership of communities of place. *Leadership*.
Rosile GA, Boje DM, Herder RA, et al. (2021) The Coalition of Immokalee Workers Uses Ensemble Storytelling Processes to Overcome Enslavement in Corporate Supply Chains. *Business & Society* 60: 376-414.

Sahlins M. (2017) The original political society. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 7: 91-128.
Solnit R. (2010) *A Paradise Built in Hell: The Extraordinary Communities that Arise in Disaster,* London: Penguin Books.
Scott JC. (1990) *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: hidden transcripts,* New Haven: Yale University Press.
Scott WR and Davis GF. (2007) *Organizations and organizing: rational, natural, and open systems perspectives*: Pearson Prentice Hall.
Selznick P. (1994) *The moral commonwealth: social theory and the promise of community,* Berkley: University of California Press.
Simsa R and Totter M. (2020) The struggle for good leadership in social movement organizations: Collective reflection and rules as basis for autonomy. *Ephemera* 20: 223-249.
Sutherland N, Land C and Böhm S. (2014) Anti-leaders(hip) in Social Movement Organizations: The case of autonomous grassroots groups. *Organization* 21: 759-781.
Tourish D. (2011) Leadership and cults. In: Bryman A, Collinson D, Grint K, et al. (eds) *The SAGE Handbook of Leadership.* London: Sage, 215-229.
Tranter B. (2009) Leadership and change in the Tasmanian environment movement. *The Leadership Quarterly* 20: 708-724.
von Rueden C, Gurven M, Kaplan H, et al. (2014) Leadership in an Egalitarian Society. *Human Nature* 25: 538-566.
von Rueden C and van Vugt M. (2015) Leadership in small-scale societies: Some implications for theory, research, and practice. *The Leadership Quarterly* 26: 978-990.
Weick KE and Roberts KH. (1993) Collective Mind in Organizations: Heedful Interrelating on Flight Decks. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 38: 357-381.
Weick KE, Sutcliffe KM and Obstfeld D. (2005) Organizing and the Process of Sensemaking. *Organization Science* 16: 409-421.
Western S. (2014) Autonomist leadership in leaderless movements: anarchists leading the way*. *Ephemera* 14: 673-698.
Yngvesson B. (1978) Leadership and consensus: Decision-making in an egalitarian community. *Ethnos* 43: 73-90.
Zoller HM and Fairhurst GT. (2007) Resistance leadership: The overlooked potential in critical organization and leadership studies. *Human Relations* 60: 1331-1360.

[i] The 'scare quotes' are deliberate in order to highlight the contested and contestable nature of these labels, and the dialectical relations between what might be considered 'symbolically prominent/normal', 'supporting', and 'alternative' (see Chapter 41 for more on dialectics).

[ii] Within theorizing on alternative organization, autonomy and solidarity, i.e. allowing individuals' freedom and acting collectively, have been suggested to be in tension or even contradictory (Parker et al., 2014), whereas Adler (2001) argues that egocentric and universal motives are not necessarily opposed to each other.

[iii] Intentional exclusions from the review: Public service organizations [for example, see chapter 36], mainstream political parties, (because there are significant literatures on leadership in these types of organizations already); Professional associations, the nuclear family (because of their primarily group-centred reproduction character); The 'platform economy' (because such organizations are primarily economically focused); Informal groups in experiments (since this is experimental research, and the value-orientation is potentially skewed towards self- or group-centricity owing to this feature); Formal labour organizing or trade unions (Ganz 2000, Kirton and Healy 2012) (since there is a sizeable literature on these); (Economic) interest groups (since by definition these groups are economically group- or self-oriented); Non-profit organizations (since there is a very large literature on this in the journal 'Nonprofit management and leadership'; Cults (since these are a particular form of intentional community or commune, and are examined in depth in Tourish Tourish D. (2011) Leadership and cults. In: Bryman A, Collinson D, Grint K, et al. (eds) *The SAGE Handbook of Leadership.* London: Sage, 215-229.); Alternative philosophies, ideas, or fictions (although the consideration of alternative philosophies, ideas, and fictional worlds is of importance in its own right, see Chapter 28, we focus on empirically-based studies of alternatives); Indigenous communities (there is a recent and growing literature on leadership in various indigenous communities that are at least part-embedded in modern society and that often resist particular processes and effects of modern society, see Chapter 25).

[iv] In different geographical and disciplinary contexts these organizations are sometimes referred to as 'social change' organizations, or as 'social movement organizations' or 'social movements'.