Klochko O.A., *Postgraduate Student, department of public administration, Interregional Academy of Personnel Management, 2, Frometivska Str., Kyiv, 03039, Ukraine, email: olexiy.klochko@gmail.com, ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3482-5054*

MYTHOANALYTICAL TRANSFORMATION OF LEADERSHIP IN THE MODERN WORLD: SOCIOLOGICAL APPROACH OF G. DURAND

The mythoanalytical transformation of leadership in the context of modern concepts is analysed. The development of Ukrainian society is undergoing constant changes that require new leaders who can ensure constructive change. In the field of public administration, special attention needs to be paid to the issue of leadership, which is related to the generation of innovations and their implementation, resource issues of self-organisation. The theoretical foundations of leadership are considered, considering the main archetypal theories. The typology of M. Weber's leadership is revealed based on the sense of social approval and expressed trust and reveals the following leadership legitimacy: traditional, charismatic, and rational-legal. The key differences between the concepts of "leader" and "manager" are highlighted. O. Neuberger's typology of archetypal patterns of leadership is outlined, and their timeless, structural manifestations and determinants of interactions are revealed. Possibilities of applying the basic ideas of Durand's sociology in modern concepts of leadership through the representation of symbolic structures that create meaning, structuring the basic guidelines of experience and actions, depending on individual interpretive abilities and continuous exchange between man and culture, demonstrating powerful psychoenergetic potential. The possibility of using a sociological approach to outline the determinants of leadership activity is substantiated. This approach is based on the ideas of psychoanalysis, deep psychology, structural and political anthropology, phenomenology, and ethology. It is noted that the fundamental concept of Durand's theory of imagination is the imaginary. Peculiarities in applying mythoanalysis to public administration in the context of transformational leadership are considered. Leadership's cognitive and emotional assets are considered to substantiate modern leaders' innovation and self-realisation potential. Features of the mythocritical and mythoanalytical method of G. Durand are presented.

Keywords: *myth, archetype, leadership, mythoanalysis, the sociological approach of G. Durand, public administration.*

Клочко О.А., *аспірант кафедри публічного адміністрування Міжрегіональної академії управління персоналом, вул. Фрометівська, 2, Київ, 03039, Україна, email: olexiy.klochko@gmail.com, ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3482-5054*

МІФОАНАЛІТИЧНА ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЯ ЛІДЕРСТВА У СУЧАСНОМУ СВІТІ: СОЦІОЛОГІЧНИЙ ПІДХІД Ж. ДЮРАНА

Проаналізовано міфоаналітичну трансформацію лідерства у контексті сучасних концепцій. Українське суспільство постійно розвивається, що потребує нових лідерів, які здатні забезпечити конструктивні зміни. У сфері публічного управління особливої уваги потребує питання лідерства, яке пов'язане з питаннями генерування інновацій та їх реалізації, а також з ресурсними питаннями самоорганізації. Розглянуто теоретичні основи лідерства з

урахуванням основних архетипних теорій. Охарактеризовано типологію лідерства М. Вебера, яка ґрунтується на сенсі соціального схвалення та виявленої довіри і розкриває такі типи лідерської легітимності: традиційний, харизматичний і раціонально законний. Виокремлено головні відмінності між поняттями "лідер" і "керівник". Окреслено типологію О. Нойбергер архетипових патернів лідерства, розкрито їх позачасові структурні прояви та детермінанти взаємодій. Виявлено можливості застосування основних ідей соціології Ж. Дюрана у сучасних концепціях лідерства через уявлення символічних структур, які створюють смисли, структурують базові орієнтири отриманого досвіду та дій, залежно від індивідуальних інтерпретативних здібностей і безперервного обміну між людиною та культурою, де-монструють потужний психоенергетичний потенціал. Обґрунтовано можливість викори-стання соціологічного підходу для окреслення детермінант лідерської активності. Такий підхід побудований на ідеях психоаналізу, глибинної психології, структурної та політичної антропології, феноменології, а також етології. Зазначено, що ключовим концептом теорії уяви Ж. Дюрана постає імажінер. Розглянуто особливості застосування міфоаналізу до сфери публічного управління в контексті трансформаційного лідерства. Розглянуто когнітивні та емоційні активи лідерства з метою обґрунтування джерел інноваційного та самореалі-заційного потенціалу сучасних лідерів. Представлено особливості міфокритичного та міфоаналітичного методу Ж. Дюрана.

Ключові слова: *міф, архетип, лідерство, міфоаналіз, соціологічний підхід Ж. Дюрана, публічне управління.*

At the present stage of development, Ukrainian society must constantly consider changes in the social environment and adapt them to new approaches to social development. Accordingly, the role of leaders who can ensure constructive change and have such mechanisms for their regulation in the transformation periods would contribute to the development of society and public administration, in particular. For the area of public administration, in the conditions of value changes, leadership acquires special significance. It relates to the issues of generating innovations and their implementation, resource issues of self-organisation. Society needs special attention to leadership issues due to changing value priorities in a dynamically changing world characterised by uncertainty, unpredictability, and risk. Therefore, the existing leadership theories in the rapid formation of the information environment are transforming.

Priority is given to those values of leadership that enable responsible and coordinated coexistence in a safe environment, considering the many crises of humanity.

Analysis of the literature shows that the problem of mythoanalytical motives of leadership has repeatedly been the subject of research by scientists (C.G. Jung [1], G. Durand [2], M. Eliade [3], E. Neumann [4], etc.), whose works reveal the concept of archetype and mythoanalytical and archetypal methodology for the analysis of systemic factors of socio-cultural space.

An in-depth analysis of leadership, in particular, the archetypal typology of leadership, indicators of psychotypes of dominant leadership qualities, feminine and masculine features of leadership culture in the social change dynamics, revealed in M. Mark, C.S. Pearson [5], I. Myers-Briggs, M. McCaulley, N. Quenk [6], G. Hofstede [7]. Regarding the research of Ukrainian scientists, we should mention the works of E. Afonin [8], O. Donchenko [9],

S. Krymsky [10], T. Novachenko [11], etc., who studied the archetypal basis of leadership, in particular, in public administration.

At the same time, developments on archetypes and myths that contribute to understanding leadership's primary cognitive and emotional factors are insufficiently presented. This problem has no justification for innovation and self-realisation potential.

The **study aims** to reveal the mythoanalytical transformation of leadership in modern concepts, considering the sociology of the main ideas of G. Durand.

The definition of "leadership" is carried out mainly through the concepts of authority or charisma of the individual, as well as recognition of their role in a community and the ability to perform practical regulatory and organisational functions to meet specific needs of the community.

M. Weber [12] was one of the first, based on his concept of types of social action, to identify the typology of leadership in terms of social acceptance and trust. The author singled out the following leadership legitimacy types: traditional, charismatic, and rational-legal. Consider the characteristics of each of the types.

The first type – traditional – relies on the leadership authority of "forever yesterday" (the authority of traditions sanctified by eternal significance and habitual focus on their observance) and is characterised by traditional pre-reflexive domination based on unshakable and sacred faith in the sacred or patriarchal power of domination.

The second type – charismatic – involves primarily emotional solid trust in the authority of a unique personal flair, charisma. This type is characterised by personal loyalty, devotion, and admiration for the extraordinary abilities of the ruler.

Finally, the third type – rationally legitimate – arises based on conscious trust as legality, which is affirmed in legitimacy as the recognition of the legitimacy and appropriateness of established procedures, as well as a set of leadership qualities and business competence appropriate to the context.

The phenomenon of leadership reveals the specifics of the personal relationship between leader and group, where the leader is the driving force of change, reflected in his thinking are global categories, anticipates potential, creates a shared vision of the future, promotes people's abilities, delegates authority, values authenticity team approach to work, sense of partnership, welcomes change, demonstrates knowledge of new technologies, ensures people's satisfaction, succeeds in competing with competitors, demonstrates personal achievements, high level of competence, shows a willingness to joint management, acts according to specific values, but can change these values if the situation requires it.

Leadership qualities require a skilful combination of personal and collective interests in their work. Encouraging employees to improve their attitude to work requires various incentives, penalties, and sanctions for labour and industrial discipline. Therefore, leadership is one of the processes of organising and managing a small social group, which contributes to achieving group goals in the optimal time and with the optimal result [2]. The leader's crucial role is to integrate team members and regulate relationships within it.

J. Adair [13] characterises the innovation leader by his ability to support and implement innovative change.

D. Gliddon [14] argues that for innovative leaders, creating new ideas is not a necessary component. It is more critical for them to understand the value of creative subordinates. They should encourage new ideas, seeking and collecting active input from employees, thus developing an innovation culture in the organisation, because the development of such a culture is the second necessary component of innovation leadership.

The key differences between the concepts of "leader" and "manager" are that the manager is an administrator who relies on the system, works for the goals of others, and uses arguments, evidence, and control. A leader is an innovator who motivates colleagues, works with the goals of the group they lead, inspires, trusts, gives impetus to the movement, is enthusiastic, and has the most important personal qualities for the group. The manager's responsibility is to ensure that employees perform the tasks assigned to them effectively, and the leader is responsible for developing the innovative ideas needed to solve the most critical problems successfully.

According to O. Morozov [15], the top quality of a leader is a clear vision of the goal, which for others is outlined completely "vaguely" or not visible at all. The main quality of the manager is the ability to realise the set goal with minor losses. According to the author, the difference between leaders and leaders in non-standard, force majeure or critical situations is also significant. As a rule, managers (administrators) try to use procedures and relevant rules and do so effectively. On the other hand, leaders receive credit for others and create their own rules, taking responsibility for achieving the result.

J. Newstrom, K. Davis [16], analysing the differences between manager and leader, note that the manager directs the actions of others to achieve "normal" goals, while for the leader, it is critical to set high goals to inspire subordinates for their achievement.

Another typology of leadership is the typology of O. Neuberger [17] archetypal patterns of leadership (hero, father, saviour, and ruler), which represents the psycho-energetic sources of leadership, revealing their timeless, structural manifestations and determinants of interactions. Such leaders are characterised by a corresponding predominant charisma such as heroic, paternalistic, saving, and majestic.

M. Mark, C.S. Pearson [5] combining the ideas of C.G. Jung [1] on archetypes as prototypes that have a mighty structuring power according to a particular mythological form, and A. Maslow's basic needs [18], distinguish archetypes of leadership according to critical needs. The authors highlight such vital needs as 1) stability and control (corresponds to the archetypes of the creator, caring, ruler); 2) belonging and possession (compared with the archetypes of a clown, lover, her boyfriend); 3) risk and skill (causes the emergence of archetypes of the hero, rebel, magician); 4) independence and self-realisation (the archetype of the simple-minded, seeker, sage).

M. Wheatley [19], the author of the synergetic paradigm of leadership, proposes to consider the deep sources of self-organisation structures, which, even in a chaotic state, keep within certain limits the internal order, which is manifested in values and archetypes that define common semantic and identity structures provide internal order and self-attribution.

In such a paradigm, leadership is viewed primarily as a model of behaviour rather than a role, actualising the context of movement from vertical chains of subordination to horizontal networks of interactions. At the same time, one of the critical tasks of leadership in the

modern world is the destruction of balance, which stimulates the processes of self-organisation of systems. Potential interactions, the energy of change, intense emotions, resource potential, deep desires, value fields, etc., become essential, which become descriptors of change without direct influence.

G. Durand's idea [20] of the conceptual foundations of leadership and outlining the determinants of leadership activity is justified by the expression of the constructivist potential of symbolic representation and a robust transdisciplinary basis. G. Durand's sociological approach is based on the ideas of psychoanalysis, deep psychology, structural and political anthropology, phenomenology, and ethology. Imaginary, as a key concept of G. Durand's theory of imagination, appears both as a function of imagination, the content of imagination, and the source of imagination and the common that unites them and precedes them.

Instead of "subject" and "object", the scientist introduces the concept of anthropological trajectory, which organises the inner and outer worlds. In G. Durand's conceptual sense, the anthropological trajectory is a kind of intermediate mode of the scheme, a route that unfolds between subject and object, future and past, nature and culture. In the search for forms of social harmony, presented in symbolic modes of values, meanings, needs, etc., identity is formed not as a constant characteristic but because of anthropological trajectory. Reflecting typical embodiments of ferries, myth as a set of archetypes and symbols structures the idea and reflects its deep properties. At the same time, archetypes in the concept of G. Durand are the organising core for myths, in the plastic symbolism of which are hidden means of protection from the objective world of death.

According to G. Durand [20], archetypes are understood as deep, genotypic images that interpretively model their phenotypic semantic content. These archetypal constants determine the essential understanding of humans. In his concept, the myth appears as a dynamic system of symbols, archetypes, and schemes of thinking, which from the impulse of one of the schemes of thinking turns into a narrative [2]. Various mythological symbols in striking combinations constitute a particular mode of the imaginary, finding reflection in the corresponding sides of representations. Imaginer G. Durand endows the ability of a kind of implicit order, through which passes all the necessary understanding of individual and collective behaviour, carrying out essentially "progressive rationalisation of the mythical". Exploring the place of symbolic and imaginary, G. Durand attaches particular importance to symbolic structures, which gave rise to the development of ideas of Apollonian and Dionysian principles of culture in the modes of diurnal nocturne [21].

Numerous invariants of mythological plots have profound messages, and the task of mythoanalysis is to understand during mythocriticism this mythical message, which is the core of the whole mythical narrative and can be applied in other contexts [22].

According to G. Durand, any myth is a bunch of "differences", and these differences are not subject to cancellation by any other system of logos. Thus, the myth is an exceptional discourse where antagonistic tension is formed, which is the basis for any discourse, i.e., for any "development" of meaning [22]. G. Durand notes the separateness of M. Weber's thesis [12] on the "polytheism of values", hence the "paradoxical" determinism, which leads to the logic of not ambiguity but at least three ambiguities. G. Durand proposed a global division of

the "imaginary" into several structural regimes [2], which in his description contain the time and hence the pace of the narrative and demonstrate the "invariable and generative plurality" of myth. Myth as a narrative is not only a component of this complex of structures. It "invariably" and "generatively" unites three structural regimes [22] while maintaining its inherent logic of contradictions.

The researcher argues that myth, as a diachronic scattering of narrative elements and symbols, as a unique system aimed at the embodiment of confrontation, is an exceptional discourse which ultimately embodies the so-called "War of the Deities". By "War of the Deities", they meant the confrontation between Mars and Venus, Apollo and Dionysus, and even Cain and Abel, between the principle of pleasure and reality. Deities are special forces that are part of man. These are compelling self-sufficient symbolic elements. Deities, particularly the "War of the Deities", are the frontier of human destiny, including humanism. That is why the myth is an exceptional field of anthropology. Deities are at war with humans. They are at war inside man. The "War of the Deities" thesis applies to both pantheism and monotheism (for example, in the biblical tradition, this war is conveyed through the archetypes of nostalgia, fall, sin, resistance, exile, and the concept of penance).

Due to the narrative and imaginary nature of the myth, which expresses the fixation of recurring constants in the human psyche, fully or partially sets the structures of perception of the political, forming paradigms of positioning and interpretation of values and meanings. Myth can manifest itself in symbolic constructs of power, archetypes of leaders, representations of communities and rituals of the political. Moments of political life can be represented in one of the three temporal manifestations of myth: the myth that disappears dominates, or the one that is just emerging, is emerging. According to the changes in the representations of mythological plots in the diurnal and nocturne modes, there are also changes in the archetypes of leaders – in heroic, dramatic and mystical formats.

The type of leader-hero belongs to the classical type, which challenges, destroys balance and habit, essentially corresponds to the archetype of growth and expressiveness, which is vividly embodied in the pastoral dominant, which is based on basic vertical reflexes (raise your back, sit, stand) and means diurnal, solar, Apollonian organisation of the imaginer, represented mainly by a group of heroic myths. This type is characterised by a markedly masculine, categorical, and power-oriented, which becomes the leading dominant of leading social practices in many cultures. The leader-hero is often the image of a child who, growing up, acquires new qualities, becomes more robust, forms a set of necessary traits, and eventually succeeds, overcoming several obstacles and solving problems.

The leader-hero has characteristic manifestations in the mythological narratives of the successes of triumphant victories. The hero challenges death and makes a breakthrough in a clash with others, in general, embodying one that divides, a competitive, oppositional, dual strategy of the ferry. The heroic myth is structured by the idea of antitheses, struggle, and the desire to succeed and overcome obstacles, actualising in the appropriate situation traits of the leader-hero (strength, courage, endurance, activity, ingenuity, toughness, wisdom, aggression, etc.). Particular attention should be paid to the unique mythological language, which G. Durand describes as rhetoric associated with specific groups of rhetorical figures.

Heroic rhetoric is based on figures of repetition and exaggeration, illustrating the potential for the deployment, especially of masculine verbalism.

Instead, another leadership image of Hermes (Mercury) shows the tangible features of the diachronic facets of a new type of hero-leader, who emphasises the mediating nature of the imaginary, appearing as a synthesis of myth and logo, diurna and nocturne, actualising the logic of new feminine and masculine, prospects for rising and fall. Role interpretations of the leader as a mediator, therapist, organiser, etc. are emerging, revealing the invariants of leadership alternatives, including gender, in the new environment.

Thus, the era of postmodernism endows Hermes (Mercury) with new leadership qualities – inventive, giving new attributes to imaginary structures of this cultural type. According to the change of epoch, context, and situation, the heroes' main attributes change, simultaneously leaving the formative meanings of mythological plots constant. It should be noted that in the modern political space, the original embodiment of new leadership qualities is increasingly politicians who represent mental models of archetypes of a trickster, clown, Hermes (Mercury), etc., illustrating the existing mythoranial.

Revealing the universal principles of worship and deep archaic sources of leadership, G. Durand draws attention to the specifics of linguistic and mythological symbols of leadership archetypes [2], associated primarily with several images of the head, which is essential in the symbolic fixation of higher, vertical, key, the main thing, etc., becoming a centre of spiritual and physical strength, with a tangible axiological dominant. The diurnal symbolism of leadership mascots and totems has a noticeable masculinisation of strength as male aggression and the ability to curb natural elements.

Analysing the mythological pictures of the world in different cultures and the results of research by political scientists, the scientist draws appropriate parallels between micro and macrocosm in the symbolic conceptualisation of leadership [2]: 1) microcosm of personal anatomical (head as part of the body, in particular, or its parts); 2) social macrocosm (vertical scheme led by the head of state, expressed in the monarchical archetype); 3) natural macrocosm (as the celestial sphere and its luminaries, mountains, world axis, etc.).

The general leadership content of the vertical dominant is concretised in the symbolic contexts of the head and high frontal lobes as signs of wisdom, symbols of pride and exaltation, and separation from the general mass, illustrating the different logic of the imaginative in the direction of the microcosm.

It should be noted that the actual conceptual reformatting of the archetypes of leadership discourse in the philosophical reflection of the unique can be traced to the communicative foundations of moral action. The expression of the archetype of tsilerational action, with its inherent subject-object relations, is a shared archetype of hunting in mythological narratives. This type is characterised by motives for mastering the object (victory, overcoming, mastery, etc.), which determines its strategic nature and directs the implementation of leadership principles such as "submission – obedience", and "order – obedience". This helps to define the archetype of hunting (as the implementation of strategic action) by the type of masculine rationality. At the same time, the paradigm of subject-subject relation represented in communicative action is a type of feminine rationality based not on mastering the object but

on the attitude to another as a subject, realising the existential need for care, which is a prerequisite reciprocity relation. There is a shift of leadership emphasis from the dominance of vertical control to horizontal interactions of joint participation.

The archetype of care also specifies the gender context of temporal consciousness. There is a confrontation of monochrome time (corresponds to the masculine principle), which prevails in society with the realisation of the fullness of care and attention to relationships, and polychrome time (corresponds to the feminine principle). The leadership approach adopted in this context allows the interpretation of feminine motives of communicative action as the basis of generalised ethical attitude to people in general, which is extremely important in the conflict of today's world with priorities of caring for the ethos and expanding trust practices.

Conclusions and prospects for further research in this direction. The existence of man and society in the concept of G. Durand is shown through the representation of symbolic structures that create meaning, structuring the basic guidelines of experience and action, depending on individual interpretive abilities and continuous exchange between man and culture, demonstrating powerful psychoenergetic potential. Leadership archetypes interchange in the regimes of heroic, dramatic and mystical narratives, finding constant representations and semantic incarnations in different cultural traditions.

In the mythoanalytical interpretation of G. Durand, archetypes appear as universal dominant images, repetitive configurations of which contribute to a particular positioning following the modes of diurnal nocturne and demonstration of the current anthropological structures of identity.

The study results provide grounds for further references to the works of G. Durand to find ways of functioning and developing of the collective imagination of leadership archetypes and identify patterns of development of value-semantic principles of politics.

References

1. Jung, C.G. (2016). Archetypal symbol. Moscow: Kanon [in Russian]

2. Durand, G. (1984). The Anthropological Structures of the Imaginary. Paris: Dunod [in French]

3. Eliade, M. (1998). The myth of the eternal return. Archetypes and repetition. Saint-Petersburg: Aleteyya [in Russian]

4. Neumann, E. (1991). The Great Mother: An Analysis of the Archetype. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

5. Mark, M., Pearson, C.S. (2001). The Hero and the Outlaw: Building Extraordinary Brands Through the Power of Archetypes. New York: McGraw-Hill.

6. Myers-Briggs, I., McCaulley, M., Quenk, N. (1998). MBTI Manual (A guide to the development and use of the MyersBriggs type indicator). Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.

7. Hofstede, G. (1991). Cultures and Organisations: Software of the Mind. London: McGraw-Hill.

8. Afonin, E.A., Martynov, A.Yu. (2019). Archetype as a source of the innovation process. *Public Management,* 3, 28-42. https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-2224-2019-18-3-28-42

9. Donchenko, O., Romanenko, Yu. (2001). Archetypes of social life and politics (deep regulations of psychopolitical everyday life): monograph. Kyiv: Lybid [in Ukrainian]

10. Krymskyi, S.B. (2000). Philosophy as a way of humanity and hope. Kyiv: Course [in Ukrainian]

11. Novachenko, T.V. (2013). The archetypal paradigm of the authority of the head in public administration: monograph. Nizhyn-Kyiv: Lysenko M.M. [in Ukrainian]

12. Weber, M. (1998). Sociology. General historical analysis. Policy. Kyiv: Osnovy [in Ukrainian]

13. Adair, J. (2007). Leadership for Innovation: How to Organise Team Creativity and Harvest Ideas. Philadelphia: Kogan Page Publishers.

14. Gliddon, D.G. (2006). Forecasting a competency model for innovation leaders using a modified delphi technique. URL: https://etda.libraries.psu.edu/catalog/6994

15. Morozova, E.N. (2008). Balance of administrative and leadership skills. Saint-Petersburg: Rech [in Russian]

16. Newstrom, J., Devis, K. (2000). Leadership and empowerment. Organisational behaviour. Saint-Petersburg: Piter [in Russian]

17. Neuberger, O. (2002). To lead and to let lead: Approaches, findings and critique of leadership research. Stuttgart: UTB [in German]

18. Maslow, A.H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review,* 50, 4, 370-396. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346

19. Wheatley, M. (1992). Leader shipand the New Science: Learning about Organization from an Orderly Universe. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

20. Durand, G. (1993). The Implication of the Imaginary and Societies. *Current Sociology*, 41, 2, 17-32. https://doi.org/10.1177/001139293041002004

21. Durand, G. (1973). The Symbolic Imagination. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France [in French]

22. Durand, G. (1979). Mythical figures and faces of the work: from mythocriticism to mythanalysis. Paris: Berg international [in French]