

A Comparative Analysis of Leadership Styles in the Magical World of Harry Potter

Lena Susann Kühn

1 Introduction

“Power is never the property of an individual; it belongs to a group and remains in existence only so long as the group keeps together” (Arendt 44)

There is no doubt about the enormous influence that the Harry Potter series¹ exercises upon its readers, regardless of their age. Despite the rather obvious entertaining aspect, the books also inspire countless scholars of all areas to examine their influence on society. Cordova, for example, closely observes the gender representation that forcefully influences the books’ readers in her journal article “‘Because I’m a Girl, I Suppose!’: Gender Lines and Narrative Perspective in Harry Potter” (2015). Given that Hogwarts is the predominant place of action, others focus on the socialisation that takes place through the education within this institution, such as Dickinson in “Harry Potter Pedagogy” (2006). This work, however, focusses on the examination of different leadership styles that are exercised towards a group of followers, and that alters the reader’s perception about how power is exercised and attained. Furthermore, it needs to be noted, that this work exclusively considers the books and not the cinematographic adaptations of the series. Due to the depiction of varying leadership styles, the Harry Potter book series proves to be fruitful for

¹ See the bibliography for a list of abbreviations of the respective titles.

comparing different leaders' approaches with each other. This analysis examines on the one hand whether the above-mentioned citation of Arendt which states that power can only be achieved through groups proves to be true. On the other hand, it observes how leaders must act within their respective groups to be successful. In order to analyse these aspects, the following thesis is examined throughout this work: Leaders who place an emphasis on reciprocal communication policies within their groups are more successful in using the power that results from such group-constellations to attain their respective goals. Even though also other leaders are suited for an analysis of this aspect, this work mainly considers Albus Dumbledore, headmaster of Hogwarts, and Voldemort, the main antagonist and villain of the series. The decision to compare those two with each other results from their notable presence and clear depiction of their leadership that is exercised towards a rather clearly defined group. Whereas Harry is also considered a leader in other works (see Agar and Turk 187), this work deliberately decides against analysing him as a leader. This is because it concludes that Harry's leadership is only the result of the long-term influence of his mentor and role model Dumbledore. Considering this, Harry disqualifies for being examined as an individual leader with his own leadership style. Instead, Dumbledore's and Voldemort's leadership characteristics as well as their respective success regarding the objectives considered in the context of this work, represent the focus of this work.

To begin with, this work gives an overview of leadership style theories which appear within the leaders' groups. This chapter also introduces the concept of hegemony, which becomes important when the respective success of the two leaders is examined. Whereas chapter 3 offers a broad overview of people and institutions that display and transmit leadership, chapter 4 observes the leaders that form the centre of analysis in this work, namely Dumbledore and Voldemort. Here, the way they structure their leadership within their groups is explored, while also considering the importance of institutions when it comes to the legitimacy of their leadership. Chapter 5 then uses the results of the observation to draw conclusions about the success of the leaders in attaining their goals. Given that there are several motivations that could be considered, the chapter also shortly explains the ones chosen for this analysis before exploring them in detail. Based on the insights gained from these examinations, the thesis above will be revisited.

2 Leadership Theories: An Overview

The following chapter depicts different theories about leadership and governmental styles chosen by leaders. The focus is on their way of becoming a leader, the relation to and with their followers, and their organisation of their overall leadership. By taking a closer look at the different approaches there are, this chapter begins with the exercise of power that is characterised through downward communication. This means, that there is no exchange of opinion between leaders and followers and the

leaders do not take or value advice but decide exclusively on their own (see Said and Said 824). Then, it presents leadership styles with more intercommunicative leaders, who take their followers' opinions and ideas into consideration. Lastly, it presents leadership styles as presented by Warrick and points out their major characteristics. Throughout their presentation, the respective leadership styles also get compared to each other and similarities as well as differences are pointed out. It is important to note that this work combines leadership style theories and government theories as they both affect the respective constellation of leaders and followers. However, due to the size of the group in the Harry Potter series that is significantly smaller than the one of a whole population, this work rather considers leaders than governors. According to Kirkpatrick and Locke, there are specific traits that can be regarded as a "precondition" (49) to exercise power. However, they still need to be combined with appropriate actions in order to grant a successful leadership. These virtues have significant consequences for the respective leader's leadership style and, depending on the size of the group of followers, even the overall government resulting out of it. The general impact of the relationship between leader and followers has already been examined by Warrick in his article "Leadership Styles and Their Consequences" (1981), which serves as one of the main references in this chapter. He states that leaders have an enormous impact on their followers through their control of "both interpersonal and material rewards and punishments that often shape employee behaviour and influence [their] performance, motivation and attitude" (155). Further, he claims that leaders can affect their followers' performances through adapted treatment, such as the working atmosphere leaders create for them (see 155). Thus, the question whether leaders can affect their followers will not be looked at, but this work rather focusses on how this impact can be used to reach the leader's goals and why certain approaches are more successful than others.

2.1 Downward Communication Policy

Autocracy forms the first aspect of consideration in this chapter, as it provides one of the most clearly defined distinctions between leader and followers and thus lies the farthest away from democracy and its "rule by the people" (Bogdanor, 'Democracy' 166). All power and decision-making are centred in a single person, without any outward, public restraints (see Johnson, 'Autocracy'). Autocratic leaders enact a clear one-way communication with their followers which takes place either upward or downward but never vertically and thus does not consider the followers' opinions, concerns, and interests (see Deva and Yazdanifard 3). Therefore, Warrick states that they decide on their own about the goals that are pursued and thus organise, plan, and direct autonomously, without the interference of others as well as with minimal "employee involvement" (158). Additionally, he adds their strict use of rewards and punishments (see Warrick 160) as a characteristic feature. Even though they do not cherish a close relationship to their followers, autocratic leaders also reward desired behaviour to encourage obedience (see Warrick 160). Warrick

further points out that the autocratic leader's inherent assumption about people is that they will not work responsibly without being led and thus need a strict organisation to produce valuable outcomes (159). According to him, power and authority are crucial to uphold the given structure by the leaders and to ensure that the leaders' high productivity-goal can be achieved (see 160). Therefore, autocratic leadership is characterised through its high focus on performance and low emphasis on the people working for it (see Warrick 158). For an autocracy to persist, certain prerequisites are required such as "uneducated, backward [followers] with little or no conception of natural rights, [...] lacking any concerted political aspirations to improve their condition" (Bogdanor, 'Autocracy' 37) and a leader who aims at keeping the situation like that ('Autocracy' 37).

There is only a narrow degree between an autocracy as presented above and an oligarchy, as they both depend on the given power structures to grant them their authority and leadership. However, the main difference between the two is that an oligarchic leader does not rule alone but power is shared among a group of privileged people. This becomes visible when looking at the Greek translation of the term: "rule by the few" (Bogdanor, 'Oligarchy' 391). One possible reason for this privileged standing of individuals in society was pointed out by Greek philosopher Aristotle when he referred to the influence of wealthiness on power relations: "oligarchy is when men of property have the government in their hands [...] wherever men rule by reason of their wealth, whether they be few or many, that is an oligarchy" (Jowett 62). Despite their wealthiness, the term ascribes the susceptibility of corruption to the reigning elite, as the leaders do not have common interests in mind but are mostly focused on their individual (financial) benefit (Johnson, 'Aristocracy'). According to Mouzelis, "once in a dominant position, the primary interest of the organization elite is to maintain its power" (28). This goal is easy for them to achieve since they possess the means to "manipulate information [...] in their own interest" ('Oligarchy' 391). Just as in an autocracy, oligarchic leaders often, but not necessarily, gain their power by the means of inheritance. This is because the next generation inherits the necessary characteristics granting power in oligarchic systems from their ancestors.

Totalitarianism resembles oligarchy insofar as that it can equally rely on an elitist group to govern. However, it can also, and here the leadership styles differ from each other, be ruled by a single, autocratic leader or even take on the form of a dictatorship (see Bogdanor, 'Totalitarianism' 614). Another similarity to oligarchic leaderships is that totalitarian leaders are focused on attaining their own goals and do not take into consideration the interests of their followers. The only communication that exists takes place downwards, from top to bottom, and all opinions that contrast with those of the ruling classes are oppressed (see Bogdanor, 'Totalitarianism' 615). Furthermore, totalitarian leaders are known for their "rigorous censorship of the mass media, centralized state planning and administration of the economy, and pervasive propaganda to inculcate the principles of the obligatory official ideology" (Johnson, 'Totalitarianism'). It is in its aim for total control not

only of political power but also regarding all aspects of social life in a society that totalitarianism differs from other authoritarian leadership styles. Often, totalitarian leaders assume their position of power due to the creation of an ideology and because given ideology “penetrates into the deepest reaches of societal structure” (Pipes 243) by promising the ultimate solution to society’s worries and problems (see Bogdanor, ‘Totalitarianism’ 615). This ideology assures leaders the complete control of thoughts and actions of their followers. In order to uphold this, leaders use propaganda, such as manipulating the media, to influence people’s convictions about their abilities and to ensure their power.

2.2 Reciprocal Communication Policy

All of the above-mentioned leadership and government styles are characterised either by a group of leaders on their top or by a single person who rules over the people, oppressing them if necessary. Yet there exists a leadership style that places voting in the centre, allowing those who follow participate in electing a possible leader: democracy. It is not without reason that democracy means “rule of the people” if translated from Greek (see Bogdanor, ‘Democracy’ 166). The active participation of the people that characterises this style can either take place directly through the election of the head of government or of representatives (‘Democracy’ 167). It can also involve “decentralizing decision making to smaller associations” (‘Democracy’ 168), fostering the followers’ feeling of actively participating in the decision process. Due to the voting, democratic governments are often characterised through their absence of single force controls and the social equality the process of election (often via voting) entails (see ‘Democracy’ 186). The clear emphasis on two-way-communication highlights its reciprocal features and underlines that the focus is equally on the outcome of the group’s work as on the satisfaction of the people (see Warrick 160). Like autocratic leaders, democratic leaders also value good organisation when it comes to working processes. However, they include their followers in these processes and thus create a content atmosphere within their group, which in turn causes better results for the overall goal (see Warrick 162). Contrary to the autocratic approach of mostly punishing whenever a standard cannot be held by a follower, the democratic leader uses “performance appraisal to let employees know what they are doing right and wrong” (Warrick 162). Thereby, it promotes independent workers who ambitiously strive for the optimum success of the whole group. Overall, democratic leaders encourage a “close but objective relationship” (Warrick 161) with their followers and thus provide an excellent example of uniting interest in both, performance and people (see Warrick 158). In terms of reciprocal interactions, anarchism needs to be added since it is the style of government that does not possess any leader at all. Coercive, hierarchal forms of authority are rejected and instead, it “look[s] forward to a social order based entirely on voluntary co-operation” (Bogdanor, ‘Anarchism’ 19). There is no leader, no voting processes and there-

fore no individual goals that are followed (see ‘Anarchism’ 20). Thus, power is directed exclusively towards the interests of the group and persecuted through its force.

Besides the outlaid democratic and autocratic approaches, which are rather extreme representatives of leadership styles, there are also others showing how leaders act and interact once they have gained power. On the one hand, there are styles which are focused on the relationship between leaders and followers, such as the paternalistic, transformational and transactional styles. On the other hand, there are also ways of exerting power where the emphasis on people is rather low, like in the *laissez-faire* leadership style.

The paternalistic leadership style places leaders in a father-like position and their followers in the one of his family whom he takes care of. Whereas “the role of the superior is to provide care, protection, and guidance to the subordinate [...], the subordinate, in turn, is expected to be loyal and deferential to the superior.” (Aycan 446). Often, the position of the leader is held by a dominant authority figure (see Pellegrini and Scandura 568). However, the fatherly benevolence can be deceptive, as, after all, paternalistic leaders also demand unquestioned loyalty from their followers and aim at maintaining the hierarchy granting them their position of authority (see Ünler and Kılıç 2). In this aspect, they resemble authoritarian leaders, for which the previously presented autocratic and oligarchic leaderships serve as illustrating examples. Paternalistic leaders tend to minimise their followers’ autonomy in taking decisions and are likely to treat them “like immature children” (Demenchono qtd. in Jackson 3) – another parallel to authoritarian leaders which claim to be superior in their knowledge and status. Despite being treated like a child, followers of paternalistic leaders often grant the requested loyalty due to the close bond that exists between leader and followers and the latter’s trust in their leader (Aycan 446). Whether the emotional affection the leaders presents towards their followers is real or a means of manipulation to achieve their goals is not always evident.

Even though paternalistic leadership displays signs of interaction between leader and followers, it plays an even more important role when it comes to transactional leadership. Here, the reciprocity between leaders and followers is in the centre and they influence each other (see Khan et al. 3). The ground on which they work together is based on a series of agreements (see R. House and B. Shamir qtd. in Khan et al. 3) which assure that the individual’s interests are met in obtaining these collectively established goals. Clear definitions of common goals help the leader to pursue a consistent direction of leadership towards the groups’ goals and allows for adequate punishment in case of misbehaviour. As the followers know about the rules and have helped to set them up, they cannot argue that the punishment is arbitrary and unfair, rules are strict and transparent. Therefore, the ‘contingent-reward’ concept that is based upon “explain[ing] performance expectation to the followers and appreciat[ing] good performance” (Khan et al. 3) helps to provide a clear structure for the followers. It allows them to know what to expect from their leader and what

to do to make him/her content. Appreciating desired behaviour (Khan et al. 3) increases followers' motivation and ensures them to keep working hard to attain common goals. However, transactional leadership also provides a clear organisation when it comes to the handling of misbehaviour and mistakes. The monitoring of performance and redirecting or correcting of followers if necessary is entitled "management-by-exception" (Bono and Judge 902). It can take place actively, meaning that the progress is supervised constantly by the leader and corrected as soon as he notices any deviations or passively, "intervening only when problems become serious" (Bono and Judge 902). At the ground of this concept lays an "inherent trust" (Chan 4) the leader expresses towards his/her followers.

While also adapting a close relationship between followers and leader, the transformational leadership style rather places inspiration and visionary thinking in the centre (see Eeden et al. 255) and entitles the leader as a role model for his followers (see Khan et al. 4). According to Eeden et. al., there are four main principles of successful transformational leadership characteristics: idealised influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and personal and individualised consideration (see 255). The latter marks a similarity to paternalistic leadership, whereas the others highlight that transformational leadership aims at creating a positive change within the followers while attaining the group's interests. Transformational leaders' authority derives from their "capability to identify the need for change, gain the agreement and commitment of others, create a vision that guides change and embed change" (McGregor qtd. in Khan et al. 3). All three, transformational, transactional, and paternalistic leaders, care about their followers and practice varying degrees of consideration².

Leaders who neither strive for high performances nor have any interest in developing a close relationship to their followers follow the principles of *laissez-faire* leadership. They do not encourage development, neither personally concerning their followers nor business-wise (see Warrick 159) and generally avoid interaction if possible. Thus, *laissez-faire* leaders leave all decisions up to the group and get involved as little as possible. In their role, it is easy to gain positions of power, since there is no regulation about the hierarchical structure within the group and followers are entitled with all delegation power there is (see 160). These leaders are mostly indifferent, and their main objective is not to make "waves" (Warrick 159). Due to this reject of taking action, Warrick lists "apathetic, disinterested and resentful" followers as a possible consequence of such leaderships (162). However, when combined with other leadership styles, *laissez-faire* leadership can also "allow [...] for the possibility of self-management" (Eeden et al. 255).

² 'Consideration' in this context is to be understood as "two-way-communication, mutual respect, and understanding" and includes "trust and warmth between the supervisor and his [...] group and emphasizes concern for group members' needs" (Warrick 156).

2.3 Other Theories Used

Despite the leadership styles that are subject to the analysis in this work, also the concept of hegemony as presented by Antonio Gramsci needs to be explained shortly. The definition primarily refers to the approach used in this paper and therefore does not claim to be complete. There certainly are more facets that would be worth mentioning in a different context. Hegemony offers an explanatory approach to the domination of a social group over opposing groups. Bates summarises it as “political leadership based on the consent of the led, a consent which is secured by the diffusion of the world view of the ruling class.” (352). This means that the followers of the leading group are convinced of their ideologies because they have been educated to accept them. To this, Gramsci adds that those outside these allied groups are dominated, “perhaps even by armed force” (57). Thereby, he hints at the aspect of coercion that comes to the fore when the leading group encounters resistances. He further claims that “a social group can, and indeed must, already exercise ‘leadership’ before winning governmental power” (Gramsci 57) in order to be able to assert it. Therefore, assuming power in smaller groups than the overall society is a prerequisite for leaders before attaining legitimate power that comes with institutions. Besides the antagonistic groups that it seeks to dominate, hegemonic leadership equally includes allied groups that it leads (Gramsci 57). Gramsci refers to these allies with Sorel’s term of a ‘historic bloc’. Sassoon explains that this concept serves as a “basis of consent” (230) assuring the ruling class’ dominance and that it aims at recreating their ideas through social institutions, such as schools. She further highlights that the allies’ consent needs to be active and genuine, and “cannot be reduced to legitimation, false consciousness, or manipulation” (231). Once the ruling class has achieved their goal of implementing their ideologies within society insofar as that the people consider it to be the norm, Sassoon speaks of cultural hegemony (see 230). Equally here, she underscores the importance of using rather an ideology to implant his ideas in the society’s mind than coercion and force (see Sassoon 230).

3 Display and Transmission of Leadership in Harry Potter

This chapter presents the different leaderships that are displayed within the Harry Potter series. It examines how these forms of leadership or government are displayed and transmitted to the respective groups of followers and hence uncovers the way leaders become leaders. Furthermore, the chapter also considers the institutions which help leaders to impose power over the people they aim to rule.

As seen in the theory chapter of this work, leadership can be imposed in different ways and means, depending on the leaders’ preferred style and on the help of possible institutions that are involved. The latter can be a useful tool as they assign a certain legitimacy to the leader that is on top of its internal hierarchy. The two major leaders serving as the subject of examination in this work may both, at least at one point of their leadership, rely on institutions granting them their authority and

power through their status in society. One such institution that appears in the Harry Potter series is the 'Hogwarts School of Witchcraft and Wizardry', the school the protagonists of the series visit and where a major part of the overall action takes place. The overall influence of subordinates such as the teachers is enormous, since they interfere with each of the different sections in school where leadership is exercised. Like in non-wizarding schools, the hierarchy of Hogwarts is clearly structured: headmasters serve as controlling supervisors who delegate their will to subordinates, the teachers, who then transmit it to the students. The immense power that Dumbledore possesses due to his position as the headmaster of Hogwarts, an "educational institution" (Marciniak 49) becomes evident when the reader learns that it is within his power to ban subjects or to influence their content (see *HBP* 466). Such an impact on the students' education allows him to shape the students according to his personal morals and virtues by causing them "to believe a certain type of magic is immoral" (Marciniak 51). His status as the headmaster allows him to decide about the rules and structures of Hogwarts, assigning him indeed "a monopoly on the conditioning of young witches and wizards to the norms and mores of society" (Marciniak 49). To this, Turner-Vorbeck adds schools' general importance for "maintain[ing] social order" (Woodson 33), further highlighting their impact on society and thus also the power their leaders have. Given that the headmaster/headmistress decides about these "norms and mores of society" (Marciniak 49) that are taught in school, they cannot be considered neutral. Forcefully, they are altered by their personal perceptions of morality. Due to this possibility to get the students used to his individual style of leadership, Dumbledore ensures that they will not easily question the decisions he makes and accept his leadership style. Thereby, he takes influence on "not only on behaviour patterns but also [on their] identity formation" (Woodson 33). As will be seen in chapter 5, it is this advantage of being able to form the entire Hogwarts community right from the start that will cause the downfall of other leaders such as Voldemort, when it is their turn to become a leader in Hogwarts.

Umbridge serves as an illustrating example for this: regardless her level of success in leading the school, she can change the values within Hogwarts and influences the curriculum according to her personal and the Ministry of Magic's standards (*OoP* 341f.) after becoming 'Hogwarts High Inquisitor'. Thus, the position of headmaster or headmistress of (educational) institutions is undoubtedly powerful, no matter who holds it, and grants legitimacy of leadership without requesting further qualification of the person. At the same time, it enables the respective leader to impose his ideals and virtues on the school. Additionally, the children grow up knowing that Hogwarts is an established institution of authority. They know that the school has strong positive connotations within the wizarding society and thus, Hogwarts earns its already institutional legitimacy, which reflects on its leader.

This institutionally granted authority is ensured through the headmaster's/headmistresses' delegates, exercising and enacting his/her rules and inevitably also their ideologies. One of the executing subordinates of the headmaster or headmistress are

the teachers, leading their students both towards their superiors' and their own values. Given that Dumbledore chooses his teachers on his own, as can be seen when he recruits Slughorn in the sixth book, he pre-selects the competences and values that are brought into the classroom. Generally, it can be stated that the leadership a group of followers is confronted with daily gets accepted and becomes the norm (see Morris 6). Thus, the headmaster further takes influence on the students and the values they learn. Heilman argues that teachers contribute to the normalisation of the status quo by stating that they are "preservationists" (114) and therefore "do not challenge or disrupt but rather reify the institution of school" (114f.). In the end, this highlights that they reproduce the ideologies they have internalised from their leader, Dumbledore, and thereby help him to transmit his leadership style to the students.

However, it is not only Dumbledore's influence that shapes the students' perceptions about right and wrong. According to Marciniak, teachers generally aim at "condition[ing] the students to perform well and act in ways deemed 'good'" (50) and thereby transfer their own understandings of good and bad to the pupils giving a personal note to their teaching and underlining their understanding of their power position (see Marciniak 50). Snape, for example, reminds of a rather autocratic leader who teaches very strictly, does not allow any interruption, and punishes severely, if not always fairly (see *PS* 153). This is only possible because the teachers' authority is rarely questioned (see Chan 423), and assured by the hierarchy of the school. The headmaster does not interfere since he allows for them to design and enact their lessons individually and without superior control (see Wolosky 292). The clear differentiation in hierarchy between students and teachers is underlined in a number of scenes, such as in the description of the students sitting in the Great Hall whereas the teachers dine spatially separated from them, at the "High Table" (Röber 43). This also highlights the unit of teachers and headmaster and their collective leadership of their followers, the students. However, also the headmaster's status as the overall leader among his subordinates is emphasised, as he sits "in the centre of the High Table, in a large gold chair" (*PS* 134).

All in all, the teachers' task can be summarised as follows: "Hogwarts professors teach the basic mechanics of magic, while at the same time conditioning students in more profound and moral ways" (Marciniak 49) – both in agreement to their superior's interests as well as according to their own perceptions about right and wrong. This shows that Dumbledore hands over a lot of power to his subordinates, which reflects *laissez-faire* leadership style tendencies that will be examined later in more detail. Nevertheless, he does not avoid problems and hopes for them to "disappear" (Warrick 160) but rather becomes active through granting support when it is needed.

The headmaster provides the necessary surveillance instruments allowing the teachers to observe whether rules are followed or not. For once, there is the house-point system, resembling a typical punishment-reward scheme. Depending on the behaviour of the students, housemaster and mistresses are allowed to "award or dock points for students' behaviour" (Chan 421). Thus, they possess instruments of

power who allow them to lead according to their own understanding, as long as they stay within the general framework determined by the headmaster. More than once throughout the book, however, it becomes clear that “there is no standard whereby certain offenses are assigned certain proportionate punishments” (Barratt 45), causing teachers to become vulnerable for abuse of said power. Arbitrary punishments cause students to identify “authority and status, not facts, process, or justice” (Barratt 46) as the ground for authority. Therefore, such treatment contradicts the clearly defined morals and virtues that are placed in the centre of Hogwarts and which are exposed right at the beginning through the Sorting Hat, listing the virtues that are most valued in the respective houses (see *PS* 130).

Snape personifies power abuse in the teacher classroom since he “enjoy[s] power, hurt[s] children, and play[s] favorites” (Birch 112) on a regular basis. This becomes particularly evident in the first book, when Harry is quick to recognise that Snape appears to like Malfoy (*PS* 152), a student of his own house, whereas he treats Gryffindor’s unfairly (see *PS* 153). Due to this kind of unprofessional behaviour on the part of the staff, students learn that personal interests play a significant role in power relations and that leaders do not always act in favour of the community.

Yet not only the teachers serve as extended arms of Dumbledore to uphold the rules. Some students that prove to be trustworthy become ‘prefects’, which means they are given certain powers, such as patrolling corridors, keeping an eye on anything that appears suspicious in school. Some of them are even empowered to administer punishments (see *OoP* 212). In case of disobedience, it is their task to report to their housemaster or housemistress who then decides about the consequences. As there is a prize at the end of each school year for the house having collected the most points, students are well aware of the possible consequences their (mis)behaviour might have for their respective house. The affiliation to a certain house and the resulting feeling of belonging encourages the majority of students to stay in line and rather aim at gaining points for them than risking losing them. Conditioning the students to monitor themselves and others in order to gain points for their own house creates a sense of collective responsibility (see Chan 421). Chan fittingly summarises the obedience caused by these surveillance mechanisms and the overall consequences resulting from it as follows: “[students] develop their obedience to rules, competitive spirits and faith in the academic system. The fear of being caught makes them police their own actions” (422).

Self-monitoring facilitates the surveillance of the teachers and thus appears to be an effective way of leading the school. Dumbledore’s way of using this values-based self-control is closely related to his individual leadership style and success and thus further explored in chapter 4 and 5. All the previously mentioned surveillance mechanisms aim at upholding the moral ideologies which Dumbledore as headmaster considers important and, at the same, time transmits his understanding of leadership as the most valuable. In the end, it is the students’ internalisation of these acquired virtues that contributes meaningfully to the success of some leaders and

the downfall of others, as chapter 5 will point out. Overall, Hogwarts enacts an enormous influence on the socialisation of its pupils and meaningfully adds to their moral values and virtues. Dumbledore's ability to define morality according to his will and to assure its compliance through his followers underscores his power in Hogwarts and strengthens his leadership position.

Apart from Hogwarts as an academic institution, leadership is also assigned to leaders through "bush-radio", meaning rumours and legends about experiences of others with the respective leader. Especially the character of Hagrid introduces both Harry and the reader to the magical world and thus also to the most relevant leadership figures in the series: Dumbledore and Voldemort. Right after learning that he is a wizard, Harry learns about Voldemort's power and recognises that he does not even dare to speak his name (see *PS* 64). Although he does not fully understand the extent of evil portrayed by someone who will turn out his biggest enemy, he learns right from the start that Voldemort is someone to fear.

As much as Hagrid fears Voldemort, he admires Dumbledore and his leadership style. He even calls him "the greatest headmaster Hogwarts ever had" (*PS* 68) and a "great man" (*PS* 69). Similar kinds of rumours and conversations about the great reputation of the headmaster and the evilness and cruelty of Voldemort occur regularly throughout the series, constantly underline the men's power and assure their position as leaders. Instead of forming his own opinions, it becomes evident that Harry is biased right from the start and appears to internalise what he learns from others. Since the reader perceives the wizarding world through Harry's eyes, he/she is induced to have the same perception about the characters as him.

However, there is another institution apart from Hogwarts which undoubtedly has a leading position, namely the Ministry of Magic³. Even though the books do not reveal enough information to draw a clear image of the way the wizarding government rules, it definitely serves as the main institution responsible for creating laws and rules that maintains the order within the magical world. As Hall states: "The legislative, executive, and judicial functions within the wizard world are all concentrated in the Ministry of Magic" (149). Due to its legitimacy among the people, it is *the* desired institution granting authority for the simple reason of being established within society. Even though the MoM portrays numerous leadership styles that could be analysed, for brevity's sake, it will not be subject of a detailed discussion in this work.

Unlike the MoM and Dumbledore, Voldemort as the great antagonist cannot rely on any sort of institution to back up his authority. Very early on, in his Hogwarts days, he starts to gather a group of followers around him (see *HBP* 338) to which he transmits his ideals and thus also his leadership style. The virtues Voldemort represents and the goals he seeks to accomplish are apparently shared by his followers and the reason for their compliance. Thus he can fall back on a group of supporters who agree on his position as leader. Later in the series, he also infiltrates the MoM

³ Abbreviated from now on as "MoM".

and Hogwarts to spread his power more widely. Hence, he tries to assure himself of the legitimacy he has lacked before to be able to form the upcoming generations according to his wishes and ideologies. His perception of leadership, power, and the way he enacts it is subject of examination in chapter 4.2.

Apart from these rather obvious forms of leadership by the most influential leaders, there are also smaller appearances of exercising power throughout the series. Since the big leaders present a highly rigorous point of view, it is no surprise that minor resistance groups are formed who oppose these strong ideals and pursue their own agendas. One example of such a resistance group is the one Harry and his friends set up in book five when Umbridge starts getting involved in Hogwarts affairs. In order to practice what she prohibits, namely Defence against the Dark Arts, Harry becomes the leader of a resistance group called ‘Dumbledore’s Army’. His leadership entails teaching his peers to defend themselves, as he already has some experience through his earlier encounters with Voldemort.

Standing on the same side as the DA⁴, there is another, slightly bigger and more experienced resistance group led by Dumbledore, the ‘Order of the Phoenix’. It incorporates the direct counterpart to Voldemort’s ‘Death Eaters’ and thus has made it its purpose to resist Voldemort’s evil plans and to fight him and his supporters. These resistance groups become particularly important for the exercise of power that chapter 4 illustrates as well as the long-term consolidation of the leaders’ values that chapter 5 explores in detail.

4 Leading Characters in *Harry Potter*

The previous chapter depicts several examples of how leadership is transmitted in the HP series. For brevity’s sake, this work will focus on two leaders that fit the theories best: Dumbledore, as the headmaster of the wizarding school of Hogwarts and Voldemort, as the villain and great antagonist. This chapter focusses on the inward leadership, considering the size of the group the leaders are leading, the internal structure between leaders and followers, as well as the way power is enacted within these structures. Thereby, the respective leaders’ virtues and ideals are revealed as they become clear through the way they treat their followers. While closely examining the leader’s different ways of exerting power within their respective groups, it also takes into account the theoretical approaches of chapter 2.

4.1 Albus Dumbledore

Right from the start of the series, Albus Dumbledore’s numerous titles are listed (see *PS* 114) and the reader unequivocally learns about his hierarchical standing within the wizarding society. This superior appearance of the seemingly almighty wizard is

⁴ Abbreviation for “Dumbledore’s Army”.

further underlined when the reader learns that he even was asked to take up the position of the Minister of Magic (see *PS* 74). Even though he declined, the current Minister regularly seeks for his advice (see *PS* 74), acknowledging that Dumbledore would be more qualified for the job as him. The minister's jealousy towards him reaches its climax in book five, where Fudge "is paranoid that Dumbledore is gunning for his position" (Marciniak 30). At some point, the minister even tries to disprove the titles of his declared opponent in his fight for legitimate leadership (see *OP* 111). Thereby he proves that he still feels as if his authority is endangered by Dumbledore, although the headmaster makes no effort to take up this position.

This powerful but humble description of Albus Dumbledore is further supported when Harry encounters Ron on the Hogwarts Express. He and the reader learn that Dumbledore "can be considered the greatest wizard of modern times" (*PS* 114) and that he has contributed to numerous achievements such as beating Grindelwald, a dark wizard, as well as discovering a medical cure (see *PS* 114). Despite his general ability as a wizard and his greatness that is repeatedly evoked by his followers, one of the very first information Harry, and thus also the readers, acquire, is that Dumbledore is "the only one You-Know-Who⁵ was ever afraid of" (*PS* 64). This shows that even his enemies fear his power and are aware of his abilities.

Considering this hierarchical standing within the wizarding community and the strong convictions Dumbledore represents by openly opposing himself against Voldemort, it is not surprising that he polarises others that wish to join him in his fight against the evil. Due to his strong character and his powerful reputation, he becomes the leader of two groups throughout the series, which are the core of analysis in this chapter. For once, there is his leadership of Hogwarts as headmaster and second his role as the leader within the resistance group 'Order of the Phoenix'. Considering the size of each group, Hogwarts as a school portrays a broad field of people of different status, such as the teachers, students, and ghosts that live there. Despite the Order growing over the course of the books, it is still relatively small compared with the institution of Hogwarts.

Dumbledore's leadership within both these groups shows signs of what Hoyle and Wallace define as "temperate leadership" (187). He embodies the aspect of "reducing leadership and management" they assign to temperate leadership styles and which come to the fore due to his tendencies of *laissez-faire* leadership. Interestingly, Dumbledore reduces his own leadership and not that of his followers, as described by Hoyle and Wallace (see 188f). He willingly delegates some of his power to his subordinates so that they pay attention to the compliance of rules. Dumbledore seems to trust them enough to let them decide about minor decisions knowing that collectively they can rather focus on big strategic decisions (see Barratt 142). In his role as headmaster, this can be observed especially in the first books, where mostly Professor McGonagall and Snape are responsible for punishing or rewarding the students.

⁵ Code name for Voldemort.

Contrary to the objective of relieving teachers from managerial tasks and thereby facilitating their main objective of teaching as proposed by Hoyle and Wallace (see 188f.), this leadership reduction from the headmaster rather assigns even more responsibilities and tasks for them. However, it also permits them more freedom in their actions and grants them “free reign within their classrooms without management procedures” (Chan 425). This shows that he trusts them to act according to his will, even if he does not monitor each of their steps. However, Snape vividly exemplifies that his temperate and laissez faire leadership at some point results in ignorance when it comes to mistakes made by his followers. Snape openly bullies students he does not like (see GoF 426f.), something Dumbledore, with his strong convictions about morality and gentleness, would not tolerate if he knew about it. As Dumbledore has no control about what happens in the classrooms, he cannot do anything against it. Although this might present an enormous danger for the students, the liberty Dumbledore grants to his followers, the teachers, causes them to feel honoured. This, in turn, strengthens the relationship between leader and followers.

A similar approach towards the management of followers is apparent in the Order of the Phoenix, a “secret society” (*OoP* 79). Here, everybody feels equally responsible for attaining the objectives the group has set itself. However, Hermione’s statement that “Dumbledore’s in charge, he founded it” (*OoP* 79) leads to the assumption that he remains the agreed leader. This agreement results from the fact that his followers share the same ideals and virtues as him and thus trust him to lead them towards their common goals. Their trust goes so far that the members of the Order even place their leader’s word above the one of the actual, legitimate government by “admit[ting] that they answer solely to [their] leader [...] Dumbledore” (Marciniak 35).

As noble as their confidence in Dumbledore might be, Marciniak argues correctly that it also devalues the group’s legitimacy because they seem to accept disobedience to the government as long as their leader is convinced that it is necessary (see 35f). The ground of their resistance bases on the opposition to Voldemort’s political ideals and the need for self-preservation. For once, they would be punished by Voldemort for not sharing his ideas and second, some of their group members portray exactly the minorities the Death Eaters want to exterminate (see 33). Lupin, for example, qualifies for being such a minority. As a werewolf, he is “not a very popular dinner guest with most of the community” (*OoP* 110). Therefore they stand together in their fight against the evil that wishes to eradicate them, and those alike them, sharing the same goals and ideals. Wolosky fittingly summarises Dumbledore’s leadership within his groups as similar to the “discipline of an orchestra, where a violinist obeys the conductor because he is as keen on a good performance as the conductor is” (296). Thereby she underlines the emphasis that lays on shared interests, convictions and trust in each other.

It is because of this trust, combined with his abilities that assigns Dumbledore his leadership and that causes his followers to willingly accept him as their leader. In

this respect, one might wonder about the headmaster's true intentions. Potentially, the consideration he practices is used by Dumbledore to assure the support he needs to pursue his own goals. Another interpretation is that he genuinely wants to include his followers in the process of reaching their goals. These questions remain open for exploration and further discussion.

In any case, followers of both groups genuinely want to support him and agree with his decisions because Dumbledore as their leader places great value on "mutual assistance and cooperation of the members" (Chan 420). Therefore, his followers are content with the way he leads and feel as still having an impact on decisions. This proves that they do not confirm the assumption of Warrick that *laissez-faire* leadership results in "apathetic, disinterested, and resentful" (162) followers. Although obeying Dumbledore's instructions when he directly assigns tasks to them (see *HBP* 617), they also become active themselves and act independently if required. The reason for their willingness to contribute to the agreed goals of the group might be that Dumbledore does not fulfil the characteristic of putting a low emphasis on people that Warrick lists as typical for a *laissez-faire* leader (see Warrick 158). As mentioned earlier, he gives tasks to everyone based on their abilities and thereby assures that all of his followers can contribute as best as they possibly can to the group's well-being.

Despite assigning tasks, Dumbledore once more depicts the trust Hoyle and Wallace assign to temperate leaders (see 187) by clearly transmitting that he is convinced that they will succeed in achieving their respective tasks. Sirius, for example, is happy to do his part by providing the headquarter of the resistance group, Grimmauld Place, as he is convinced that it is "the only useful thing [he has] been able to do" (*OoP* 93) in his position as an alleged criminal wanted by the whole wizarding world. This shows that he knows well about the strengths and weaknesses of his followers and how to use them meaningfully to the group's purpose, which in turn causes the reader to assume that he maintains a close relationship to them.

This proximity between him and his followers explains not only the trust he has in them but also the willingness to accept risks in their favour, yet another trait that Hoyle and Wallace assign to temperate leaders (see Chan 426). When Umbridge tries to dismiss Professor Trelawney, Dumbledore defends her (*OoP* 656f.) and ensures that even though she is not allowed to teach any longer, she may stay at Hogwarts. By disrespecting the Undersecretary's will and by putting her back in her position, he places himself in the line of fire and becomes vulnerable, even risks his position as headmaster. Nevertheless, it proves the enormous loyalty he exercises towards his followers and that he genuinely cares about their well-being.

The headmaster's trust towards his teachers expands to the students because he relies on the education of his school that he delegates to create students that willingly embody the values and virtues transmitted to them. As long as this is the case, the headmaster looks over students breaking the rules and even encourages them to do so (see Wolosky 293). He repeatedly lets Harry and his friends get away with almost everything and even hands out the Invisible Cloak to Harry, asking him simply to

“use it well” (see *PS* 218). This underlines the beforehand explained temperate leadership characteristics: trust and willingness to accept risks for his followers.

It also highlights that, throughout the entire series, Dumbledore is presented as a man caring more about the internal values than external behaviour (see Chan 417). He makes clear that he “does not cultivate the rules as much as the values that inform the rules” (Knutsen 204). Even though this behaviour highlights the trust in his followers, it also discredits those who adhere to the rules there are, such as Argus Filch, the caretaker. Often throughout the series, Dumbledore appears to ridicule him for taking the rules seriously and asks the students “for what [the caretaker tells him] is the four-hundred-and-sixty-second time to remind [the students] that magic is not permitted in corridors, between classes, nor are a number of other things, all of which can be checked on the extensive list now fastened to Mr Filch’s office door” (*OoP* 234). He does not seem to sincerely support the enforcement of the rules he set up himself and encourages the students to do so as well. Also, by rewarding house-points rather arbitrarily for courageous or clever behaviour, Dumbledore underscores his values-based orientation and invalidates the rules’ importance (see *PS* 328f.).

Considering this way of approaching his leadership, it becomes evident that his laissez-faire behaviour grounds on educating “values-based self-governance” (Chan 426). According to Chan, this means that the students monitor themselves and act according to the way they have been educated in school (see 426). Dumbledore succeeds in underlining the enormous power he inherits through the possibility of deciding about the virtues the students acquire in Hogwarts. Nonetheless, he remains the generous headmaster by placing morality over strict structures and thus keeps his popularity among his followers. This is where his paternalistic leadership tendencies become evident. Dumbledore’s approach of values-based self-governance does not only cause the students to behave according to his ideals, it also encourages them to reflect on their own actions (see Marciniak 49) and helps them decide about their actions based on values rather than on rules they do not understand. The headmaster wants them to think for themselves and fosters agency which is accurately described by the Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy as the “exercise or manifestation of [the capacity to act]” (Schlosser). Just like a parent wants his/her child to become independent, he empowers his followers to try themselves out and he encourages them to think individually instead of simply following their leader’s orders. Harry summarises this fatherly behaviour as follows: “He’s a funny man, Dumbledore. I think he sort of wanted to give me a chance. I think he knows more or less everything that is going on here, you know. I reckon he had a pretty good idea we were going to try and instead of stopping us, he just taught us enough to help.” (*PS* 325).

This statement shows the paternalistic leadership characteristics of Dumbledore as well as his ability to be the all-seeing and all-knowing headmaster (see Reynolds 273) that decides which lapses to punish and which to let slip because they meet his understanding of morality and virtues. The relation between Harry and the headmaster could be discussed separately and thus will not be examined in further detail.

However, it should be noted that especially between Dumbledore and Harry, the paternalistic features of the almighty wizard are highlighted repeatedly. Even though this relationship should not be considered as exclusively benevolent and indeed becomes difficult to grasp in the later books, there are numerous scenes where the otherwise professional Dumbledore becomes emotional when it comes to Harry and even cries at some point (see *OoP* 928) because he is worried about his well-being.

However, also the less benign side that comes with paternalistic leadership is embodied through the headmaster, as he requests relentless loyalty from his followers. Snape serves as an illustrating example, working as a double-agent and spying within Voldemort's group, making the latter think that he actually works for him and against Dumbledore. The headmaster entirely trusts him and stands in for him whenever other followers show their signs of doubt concerning his loyalty. No matter how often Harry asks him whether he really trusts Severus Snape, Dumbledore always affirms his loyalty (see *OoP* 915; *HBP* 336). By defending Snape, he also proves that once his followers have gained his trust, he returns it and also convinces others that they are trustworthy.

Also, the required characteristic of being a "strong authority" that characterises paternalistic leaders according to Pellegrini and Scandura (see 567) is met within the character of Dumbledore. His status as headmaster is not only assigned to him by the means of hierarchy but also widely accepted within the school, since most students and teachers like him and consider him a worthy leader. Harry, for example, in the second book highlights his loyalty and admiration for Dumbledore during his encounter of the young Riddle in the Chamber of Secrets and answers to his claim of being the "greatest sorcerer in the world" (231) as follows: "Sorry to disappoint you and all that but the greatest wizard in the world is Albus Dumbledore. Everyone says so." (232). Not only his personal trust towards Dumbledore's ability is shown through this statement but also the general reputation the headmaster inherits in the wizarding world, as "everyone" seems to share this point of view with Harry.

This inherent trust in the headmaster's abilities becomes ultimately evident in the fifth book, where the resistance group of Harry and his friends which rebels against the totalitarian regime of Umbridge takes on the name 'Dumbledore's Army'. Students seem to think that their headmaster shares their values, which might be because it was him imposing their morals and virtues on them by controlling their education. Here, the risk of manipulation evolving from leaders and their powers becomes clear. Even though the students appear to follow and support their headmaster out of free will, it was him determining the content of the subjects they learn in the first place. Hence, he influences their perception of right and wrong, as seen in the preceding chapter. All this proves that it is actually the other way around: students share his values, as they are faced with them on a daily basis and thus internalise them as their norm.

Despite him being a guiding figure, Dumbledore's role as a mentor is present over the course of the whole seven books and his intention of "help[ing] the hero develop into a functioning, useful man of good character" (Steege 150) is shown

numerous times. Not only for Harry but for the whole student body, he “stages learning opportunities and instils confidence” (Birch 113) to enable them to experience the feeling of success they have after triumphantly solving the riddles and tasks given to them. He embodies Bruner’s statement that “acquired knowledge is most useful to the learner [...] when it is ‘discovered’ through the learner’s own cognitive efforts” (Bruner 3 qtd. in Wolosky 294). Here, the citation from Harry of the first book depicting Dumbledore as an all-seeing guiding figure can be applied to the storyline of the last book, where Dumbledore leaves gifts for Harry, Ron and Hermione that turn out to guide them towards their goals of finding the Horcruxes. Instead of providing them with a concrete solution, he offers just enough guidance for them to figure things out on their own because he knows that one day, he might not be there to guide them anymore.

The gifts also show, once again, that he knows well about the strengths and weaknesses of his followers. Whereas Hermione is left with a riddle to solve, due to her intelligence and cleverness, he provides Ron with the opportunity to make up for the mistake of leaving his friends because of his jealousy in the seventh book. When looking for the Horcruxes after the headmaster’s death, the trio feels left alone at first and there are moments where they doubt that there was a plan at all he wanted them to follow (see *DH* 112f.). In the end, however, it turns out that their acquired agency enables them to solve the riddles. Harry even gets the chance for an explanation by Dumbledore in person when he encounters him in a dream-like state at King’s Cross and learns that he wanted to slow him down and prevent him from becoming dominated by his “hot head” (*DH* 577). Thus, it turns out that Dumbledore indeed pursued a plan and even calculated weaknesses and strengths of his followers into it.

Despite all the good Dumbledore has in mind for Harry, his paternalistic leadership is limited through the fact that he “harness[es] the boy’s potential in such a way that it will not be dangerous to the dominant/correct society” (Reynolds 277). Hence, he does not support him unconditionally but always keeps his and the society’s interests in mind when fostering Harry’s agency. In the fifth book, he avoids Harry intentionally because he fears the bond between him and Voldemort. Since he does not explain his behaviour to the protagonist, Harry feels left alone, revealing the father-like affection he has towards the headmaster (see *OoP* 137). Dumbledore’s treatment of Harry is closely aligned to his overall goal to achieve what he entitles as the “Greater Good” and what will be discussed in detail in chapter 5. However, his general approach of letting his followers find their own paths points out the enormous influence the headmaster enacts on his students. The figurative parent he is, he supports them on their way and generally “acts as a role model, as a personal paradigm for ethics, values and goals, and indeed for learning and thinking himself” (Wolosky 294). This careful consideration of his followers rounds up the headmaster’s mentoring image and highlights another crucial aspect of his character, namely his transformational leadership.

As already shown in chapter 2.3, transformational leadership characteristics include idealised influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and personal and individual consideration (see Eeden et al. 255). The character of Dumbledore embodies the first, as he is “considered extraordinary and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities” (Weber 241). Furthermore, his speeches in front of the school prove that he knows his way around words. Especially after Cedric dies in book four, the headmaster holds an encouraging speech to honour the deceased student as well as to motivate the school to stay together, as “[they] are only as strong as [they] are united, as weak as [they] are united” (*GoF* 627). What adds to this tendency towards inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation is Dumbledore’s endorsement of agency under his followers. Also, his role as a mentor and the guidance he provides, sometimes more, sometimes less visible, are proof of the support he offers to his followers. It is “under Dumbledore [...] where students come to learn and control their magic while also being encouraged to think for themselves” (Marciniak 49). He continuously inspires them to think outside their mind frames and empowers courageous behaviour, like when emphasising his values-based orientation through rewarding house-points rather arbitrarily for “outstanding courage” (*PS* 328) or clever behaviour, even though the rules have been violated (see *PS* 328f.). This kind of managing the treatment of rules highlights once again that he accepts the breaking of rules as long as it corresponds to his virtues (see Knutsen qtd. in Chan 426).

Considering the individual attention transformational leaders enact towards their followers, Dumbledore’s position as headmaster needs to be taken into consideration. Given that he rules over the whole school and needs to take major decisions, it is not easy for him to pay attention equally to all students and to develop a close emotional bond to all of them. However, he can address all of them by name, as far as portrayed in the books, and knows some of their main character traits. When it comes to Harry and his friends, he even develops a close relationship, that strengthens through the private talks in the end of the first books. There the whole storyline of the respective book is taken up once again and the headmaster explains what has happened by adding background knowledge the trio did not know about before.

Regarding his followers, in Hogwarts as well as in the Order, Dumbledore seems to know a lot about their individual character traits. It is only through his knowledge about their respective strengths and weaknesses that he can assign them fitting tasks in their groups. Snape serves as one of the most illustrating examples for this. The headmaster is well aware of the love he still feels for his teenage love Lily, Harry’s mother, and knows that he would do anything for her, even protect the son that constantly reminds him of James Potter, his biggest enemy (see *DH* 544f.). Dumbledore uses Snape’s love and the regret of losing Lily to get him to protect Harry from Voldemort (see *DH* 544f.). Thus, Dumbledore is aware of the power love can have and does not shy away from using it for his objectives.

His leadership within the group as well as his actions outside of it are strongly connected to emotions. When it comes to maintaining the position of authority

Dumbledore holds, the beforehand mentioned trust his followers have towards their leader might be the reason why none of his followers ever tries to claim the role of the leader. Dumbledore himself seems to have arbitrary convictions towards the hierarchical structure within his group of followers. Previously this paper already exposed his laissez-faire characteristics, causing him to delegate some of his exercising power to his teachers, such as letting the headmasters and mistresses decide about punishments and rewards. Another aspect shows that he “decentraliz[es] decision making to smaller associations” (‘Democracy’ 168). By doing that, he fulfils a characteristic of democratic leadership. The hints at group internal discussions, within the Order, such as the “meetings” (*OoP* 78) that take place in the headquarter of the resistance group are further evidences for his democratic tendencies. However, even in these ‘meetings’, Dumbledore is not seen as often (see *OoP* 77) and appears to leave most decisions about details to the group and only interferes in major decisions. Examples are deciding what Harry may know (see *OoP* 103) and determining that Sirius has to stay at home. Once again, these decisions are based on his knowledge of the characters; he is well aware that Sirius is known for being hot-tempered and Harry has already proved several times his “hot head” (*DH* 577). Therefore, Dumbledore’s superior position combined with his knowledge about his followers allows him to reduce possible risks that result from flaws of the individuals.

Given that Dumbledore as the leader places great value on “mutual assistance and cooperation of the members” (Chan 420), his leadership might even show anarchistic tendencies at a first glance. A closer examination, however, illustrates that in the end, Dumbledore “never relinquishes his almighty authority over students and other teachers” (Chan 421). He has the last word in all affairs, such as deciding about the contribution of house points, according to his values (see *PS* 328f.) or about who is involved in which information- and decision processes (see *OoP* 75). This behaviour rather reminds of an autocratic than a democratic or even anarchistic approach. Yet it does not harm his reputation within his group, since his followers trust him unconditionally and therefore assume a greater tactic behind his decisions they are not yet able to understand. Hermione and Ron, for example, do not question Dumbledore’s decision to withdraw all sort of information from Harry, even if they knew it would frustrate him (see *OoP* 77). Thanks to their inherit trust and loyalty, they are willing to accept Dumbledore’s choice to keep some secrets from them. This acceptance reminds one more of paternalistic leadership followers (see Aycan 446).

Despite this exclusion of his supporters concerning active decision-making processes within the Order, there are no signs of democratic decision making in Hogwarts either. Dumbledore pursues a strict line with respect to the overall goals of the group. Whenever a follower questions the path that has been determined for the group’s sake, he reminds them that they agreed to do as planned in the first place. Harry learns about such a situation when he watches Dumbledore’s memory in the Pensieve. The moment Snape learns that he has protected Harry just for him to “die at the right moment” (*DH* 551), he doubts everything he has done for Dumbledore

in the past. However, there is no evidence of Dumbledore convincing him to maintain the path they agreed on, he simply reminds Snape that he gave him his word earlier (see *DH* 550). The reader, through Harry, witnesses that the headmaster's authority is enough to push through his objectives. Thus he is once more reminded of Dumbledore's leadership abilities to pursue his interests, whether under direct agreement or after reminding his followers of the hierarchy they are located in.

Therefore, a closer examination of the way Dumbledore treats his followers shows that the headmaster portrays numerous leadership style variants. His way of leading inside his groups can generally be summarised as community-based due to his role as a guidance-figure and mentor. Additionally, he values a positive relationship to the followers he leads by taking into consideration their interests and defending them if necessary. His paternalistic and transformational leadership characteristics underline his orientation towards independent, autonomous followers who exercise agency. As his authority and leader position is rarely questioned, Dumbledore does not appear as a leader who protects his position at all costs. In the few occasions where his decisions are doubted by his followers, however, he is quick to remind them of the reasons as to why they agreed on them.

4.2 Voldemort

As Lupin states, Voldemort's group of followers mainly consists of "witches and wizards he'd bullied or bewitched into following him [and] his faithful Death Eaters, a great variety of Dark creatures" (*OoP* 108). Considering the latter, Dumbledore gives a detailed description of what kind of people belong to this closest circle and the internal group structure in the sixth book:

As he moved up the school, [Voldemort] gathered around him a group of dedicated friends; I call them that, for want of a better term, although [...] Riddle undoubtedly felt no affection for them. This group had a kind of dark glamour within the castle. They were a motley collection; a mixture of the weak seeking protection, the ambitious seeking some shared glory, and the thuggish, gravitating towards a leader who could show them more refined forms of cruelty. [...] they were the forerunners of the Death Eaters, and indeed some of them became the first Death Eaters after leaving Hogwarts (HBP 338f).

This is proof of two major characteristics that are crucial in order to analyse Voldemort's inward leadership. For once, it becomes apparent that the Dark Lord, does not rule alone but relies on a group of supporters warranting his authority. He is aware of the fact that "social change [...] can only occur with numbers" (Marciniak 33). Therefore, he knows about the tactical importance of having people to back up his authority and to help him attain his goals. Hence, he can be considered a leader of a group of followers and is thus suited for examination within parameters of this chapter.

While he “used to have huge numbers on his command” (*OoP* 108) when he first rose to power, Voldemort needs to rebuild his army after being defeated by Harry. Therefore, the size of his group is not as big as the circle Dumbledore has under command. Unlike him, Voldemort must actively recruit new members as he cannot rely on a powerful institution assigning him leadership and followers. His constant pursuit of world rule requires that he expands his power towards the whole wizarding world. In order to attain the number of followers he needs to reach this objective, he detects his enemies’ weaknesses and tries to headhunt those who are not content in their current position in society by promising them a better hierarchical standing once he is in power. Here, he appears to try creating a historic bloc that uses alliances to ensure the hegemony of the dominant class he (see Sassoon 230) leads in his ideal vision of the future. Therefore his leadership is not yet as big but appears to be growing. Dumbledore recognizes this development and advises the Minister to avoid the joining of even more powerful creatures, such as the Dementors, of which he is sure will “join [Voldemort] the instant he asks them [because he] can offer them much more scope for their powers and their pleasures as [the Ministry] can” (*HBP* 614).

One of the rare similarities between him and his opponent Dumbledore is that they both are leaders of resistance groups, fighting against the status quo, although for completely different causes. The Death Eaters under Voldemort are a resistance group insofar as that they fight against the status quo where mudbloods⁶ are mostly accepted, yet not appreciated, in society. Their main goal is to “fight for an authoritarian state, increasing the role of Blood Status in defining people and giving Voldemort absolute power over everyone” (Marciniak 33). According to them, the wizarding world should “cut away the canker that infects us until only those of pure blood remain” (*DH* 179). The pureblood ideology values wizards and witches who exclusively have wizarding ancestors and therefore is reminiscent of Hitler’s Nazi-ideology during the Second World War. This subject will not be examined in this work but others, such as Sarah Wente and Nancy R. Reagin have discussed the parallel between Voldemort and Hitler in more detail (see Wente; Reagin).

Voldemort seems to seek these goals his followers share and is therefore accepted as their leader. Within these structures, he qualifies for being considered an autocratic leader, for he personifies a clear distinction between leader and followers. As Dumbledore’s quote about Voldemort’s followers points out, there is an entirely functional and clearly defined relation within their group. Being the dictator, Voldemort’s hierarchy is never questioned and his authority never touched. As pointed out by Deva and Yazdanifard, an autocratic leader with totalitarian features generally does not care about the well-being of his followers and thus does not consider their interests while leading (3). Interestingly, Voldemort’s lack of interest towards his followers does not hinder them to be emotionally involved with their leader. Bellatrix Lestrange embodies this, since she appears to even be in love with her master.

⁶ Wizards and witches who are not “pure” wizards but have muggle-born parents or relatives.

She repeatedly reveals her emotions, such as when speaking to him “as if to a lover” (*DH* 580). Rowling never goes into detail about whether Bellatrix’s intense behaviour results from pure admiration for her leader or whether she feels an actual emotional bond between them. Either way, she illustrates that, in contrast to him, some of Voldemort’s followers do not consider their relation in exclusively functional terms. These strong feelings, even though he does not share them, suit him well as they cause Bellatrix to be the most loyal towards him and loyalty is what is most important to him. Her commitment even extends to the point of willingly going into prison because she is convinced the Dark Lord will reward her loyalty once he has regained his power (see *GoF* 517).

Voldemort despises love but is clever enough to use the energy resulting out of it for his proper uses. Instead of returning these emotions, he rather pursues his individual goals without interference or advice of others. He assigns tasks to his followers, without asking them for their opinions. Neither are there signs of “employee involvement” (Warrick 158) nor of meaningful vertical communication among the group members which further characterise Voldemort’s leadership as an autocracy. Additionally, he fulfils the autocratic characteristic of being only interested in his personal goal of wanting to live forever. Nonetheless, within his group, he is clever enough to adapt additional goals that assure him of his followers’ endorsement (such as aiming for blood purity in the wizarding world).

When examining the structure of his group of followers, the Death Eaters, a closer look reveals the cellular structure that reminds of terrorist groups (see Barratt 95). In these structures, mostly leaders with authoritarian tendencies are presented and determine the procedures (Hogg and Adelman 447). Marciniak has already stated that Voldemort can be considered as such (33) and thereby explains the Death Eaters’ obedience towards him. Especially the masks worn by them (see *GoF* 561) reveal that, just like terrorists, Voldemort’s followers hide their true identity from the other group members. Karkarov, one of the Death Eaters, admits that “He Who Must Not Be Named operated always in the greatest secrecy [...] we never knew the names of every one of our fellows – he alone knew alone who all were” (*GoF* 511). Moody concludes correctly that this is a reasonable way for Voldemort to organise his fellowship given that it prevents his followers from betraying each other in case of being trapped (see *GoF* 511).

Despite minimising the risk of betrayal, Barratt fittingly points out that the cellular organisation of his followers allows Voldemort to reduce the risk of them plotting against him (98). Generally, it is not easy to determine whether the assumption that followers of autocratic leaders do not question the hierarchy of their group (‘Autocracy’ 37) fits the Dark Lord’s group of followers. For once, this results from their lack of communication with one another. Secondly, Voldemort does not reveal anything about their identities. Thus, they stay anonymous and do not know much about their respective group members. The reader does not learn whether the Death Eaters are uneducated. What he/she learns, however, is that none of them tries to

revolt openly against the hierarchical structure within the group. Therefore, they appear to be content with the status quo and do not intend to alter anything about it and so willingly assign Voldemort his status as leader.

Rather than practise an open-communication policy and trying to please his followers, Voldemort places an enormous emphasis on loyalty to assure his leadership and power within his group as the beforehand mentioned example of Bellatrix shows. Obedience and unquestioned trust of his followers are his greatest weapons, since he needs his followers as instruments, who exercise power where he cannot be present. As Barratt states, the Dark Lord “expects complete loyalty from his followers” (24). It appears as if a lack of loyalty is the only thing that evokes an emotion in him. Although he usually does not appear to have any feelings at all, this scene shows him confessing his disappointment in his followers’ lack of loyalty (see *GoF* 562). Normally utterly convinced of himself, Voldemort wonders who will be loyal enough to come back and who will be “foolish enough to stay away” (*GoF* 560). This exposes, on the one hand, his insecurity about his followers’ loyalty and on the other hand, that he will punish those who are not loyal enough to come back to him in this moment of need.

Interestingly, Voldemort “has few followers who obey him out of loyalty rather than fear” (Barratt 141). This is not contradictory when looking at the fact that Voldemort merely demands loyalty and does not care for which reasons it is granted. He willingly manipulates people in order to get what he wants, as can be seen when he tries to interrogate Slughorn on the creation of Horcruxes. Despite not wanting to tell him anything about it, Slughorn cannot resist young Riddle’s charm (see *HBP* 464f.). Voldemort does not care whether this loyalty is genuine or based on fear or false hope, as long as he can use this knowledge strategically. He openly admits that he knows about the true reasons for his followers’ obedience when he addresses Peter Pettigrew at the graveyard in book four, claiming that “[he] came back to me, not out of loyalty, but out of fear of [his] old friends” (*GoF* 563). The old “friends” he speaks of are Lupin and Sirius, who now work for the Order of the Phoenix and are thus his declared enemies. Neill fittingly summarises Voldemort’s treatment of his followers by comparing it with an army that “is ruled mostly by fear, and the soldier knows that if he disobeys he will be punished” (105). Indeed, the books portray multiple occasions where Voldemort penalises those not loyal towards him and thereby underscores his autocratic leadership style.

Nonetheless and contrary to Warrick’s perception of autocratic leadership (see 160), Voldemort also honours desired behaviour. Hence, he reveals his transactional style tendencies by following the contingent-reward system (see Khan et al. 3). He rewards Wormtail’s loyalty and obedience with a silver hand after he has cut his own off to enable his master to return (see *GoF* 556). Interestingly, Voldemort and the circle he leads exhibit the characteristic of agreeing on common goals (see Khan et al. 3). Voldemort also appears to consider the approach of “appealing to the wants and needs” (Bass and Avolio qtd. in Khan et al. 4) because he pursues their ‘common’ goal to enforce the pureblood ideology. Otherwise, the Death Eaters and their

leader do not practise the reciprocity that House and Shamir consider as crucial in transactional leadership constellations (see Khan et al. 3). He does not have an “inherent trust” (Khan et al. 4) towards his followers to achieve their tasks satisfactorily. Therefore he closely supervises them and does not allow for any individual performances.

Given that he is aware that “if you have assumed power by force, [...] you must hold onto it by force as well” (Barratt 142), he can neither be considered a passive management-by-exception leader that “waits for things to go wrong before taking action” (Bass and Avolio qtd. in Khan et al. 4). Rather, he micromanages to avoid the smallest mistakes and thus no action happens without his final agreement. This behaviour further qualifies him for being an autocratic leader that never relinquishes his decision-making abilities and holds on to his autonomous management of actions. Although rewarding his followers at times, Voldemort is rather known for his strict exercise of discipline that does not allow for things to go wrong under his leadership than for his generous treatment of followers. Whenever mistakes are made, he severely punishes those responsible, as typical for autocratic leaders (see Warrick 160). One example is when he punishes the whole Malfoy family after Lucius fails to obtain the prophecy he tells him to get for him in the *OoP*. He even goes so far as to claim his wand, symbolically taking the very last bit of authority Lucius had. By setting such illustrative examples, Voldemort ensures that his followers grant him unconditional authority, even if it does not arise out of free will but of coercion.

The reason for the necessity of this behaviour is best summarised by the following statement by Barratt: “Those who base their claim to rule in possession of power must of necessity rely heavily on tactics of coercion” (11). This is what Voldemort does within his group: through emphasising loyalty and punishing those not willing or able to grant it as he expects them to, he assures that they all will constantly strive to please him, even if only to avoid punishment. Despite the fear his followers have towards their leader, they stick to him and his group because they “have no real life on the outside to which to return, [...] further cementing their loyalty to the terrorist organization.” (Barratt 98). The group is like their family that Voldemort surveillances and protects from the enemies they have gained through their collective actions. There is no way back for them, as the side they have chosen does not permit a change of mind.

Therefore, and when looking at the kind of inward leadership Voldemort creates within his group, Sirius’ statement highlights that serving Voldemort is either “a lifetime service or death” (*OoP* 129) appears to be well suited. Due to the lack of emotional affection and consideration of his followers, Voldemort, at first glance, does not appear like a paternalistic leader that cares about his followers. When closer examining his emphasis on loyalty, however, certain paternalistic features of his leadership style can indeed be found. As pointed out by Aycan, this style is often employed in groups with clearly differentiated hierarchical structures (see 446) where the leader aims at maintaining the hierarchy and his position of authority (see Ünler and Kılıç 2). The previous analysis exemplifies that this is the case for the Death

Eaters. Also, the relation between leaders and followers suits Aycan's definition of paternalistic leadership, as Voldemort provides "care, protection, and guidance" (446), given that the group is like the followers' family and he as leader inherits the role of the father at the top who receives absolute loyalty in return (see Aycan 446). One example for him taking care of his followers is when he enables their escape from the wizarding prison Azkaban by getting the Dementors on his side of the combat by promising them "more scope for their powers and their pleasures" (*GoF* 614) than the Ministry could. As highlighted previously, his followers are likely to grant him the requested loyalty. Some, like Bellatrix, genuinely admire him and his abilities, which fit the paternalistic feature of accepting the hierarchy because of emotional affection and trust towards their leaders (Aycan 446). Others, like Wormtail and Lucius, are afraid of his power or want to have a share of it. Although they do not genuinely trust him, they profit from being protected and supported.

Within his group of followers, Voldemort also uses the aspect of manipulation that characterises paternalistic leadership styles. It takes place through the pureblood ideology that makes the Death Eaters believe in a common goal they are willing to work for. Despite uniting his group, the ideology equally serves as a means of differentiation between them and others. The ideology's segregation of people into two separate spheres creates a clearly defined hierarchy. On the one hand, there are those worthier and of higher status (the 'purebloods') and on their opposite those considered as of lower virtue for society ('mudbloods' and 'muggle-borns'). As stated earlier, one of the reasons for the Death Eaters to follow Voldemort is their urge for power that is satisfied in being considered worthier of status and blood than others. This emphasis on status resembles the system of oligarchy, as it also favours leadership of privileged people (see Jowett 62), whose privilege equally results on an ideology.

However, as for Voldemort and his followers, their oligarchic leadership is only theoretical since they have not yet gained enough power to rule legitimately over the whole wizarding society. Mouzelis' claim of the ruling élite that does not want to relinquish its power once it has been gained (28) is not entirely fulfilled by the Death Eaters, given that they are not yet in a reigning position but only striving for it. The inheritance of status that characterises oligarchic leaderships, however, is illustrated by the Malfoy family. Draco is born into his position, firstly because he has literally inherited the "right" blood and secondly, because he inherits the ideology of Voldemort and his group and thus considers it as the right one – at least for a long time. Whereas his followers are genuinely committed to their ideology, the Dark Lord mainly focusses on his individual quest of eternal living. Also, Voldemort meets the requisite of only focussing on individual benefits instead of the common good, further corresponding to oligarchic leaders (see Bogdanor 'Oligarchy' 391). The pureblood ideology rather appears to be a 'side-quest' for him that allow for the creation of a common goal and thus obedience of his adherents. Therefore, they are convinced that they are indeed working to attain what they consider beneficial for the community. Apart from the power he has within his group of followers, he even

impacts those outside of it with his dominant character. This becomes particularly evident through the fact that most wizards and witches do not dare to say his name (see *PS* 64). Thus, one of his major powers is the fear he evokes in them because of all the cruel crimes he has committed in the past and the ones he is willing to commit in order to attain his goals. In a way, his reputation about his enormous power turns out to be a self-fulfilling prophecy. Just as Dumbledore's reputation relies on his titles, so does Voldemort's renown depend on fear.

Overall, Voldemort's leadership is characterised by his strive for authoritarian control over the wizarding world, his pursuit of the pureblood ideology that assures him the loyalty of his followers and the use of coercion and fear. By organising his group of followers cellularly, he ensures that they will grant him the requested loyalty that is necessary for him to become more powerful, as he cannot yet rule as he wishes and requires support. Generally, the relation between him and the Death Eaters is purely strategical from his side and he appears to consider them rather as instruments than as human supporters and thus interchangeable at the first mistake. His followers are aware of Voldemort's refusal "to contain his power and wrath in anything beyond his own whims and interest" (Barratt 46) and it is this self-centeredness that causes them to assign him the power to rule. At first sight, it appears as if his followers are content with their leader's ideals and willing to follow him blindly wherever he goes. The potential success of the way illustrated beforehand of exercising power within his group is closely examined in chapter 5.

5 Successful Leadership

After having exposed the different approaches to exerting power within the different leadership groups, this chapter explores the degree of success the respective leader experiences by exercising it. A major focus is on the question whether the leader can achieve a long-term success that ensures his power over time or whether it is only of short duration. The results of this analysis are backed up by theories about relations of power. They further explain the reasons for the success or the ineffectiveness of a certain leadership style and why it does not lead to the expected outcome. Before being able to analyse their success, the individual objectives of Dumbledore and Voldemort as leaders need to be assessed. Then, this chapter inspects whether the chosen leadership style is suited to achieve said goals and the reasons leading to the corresponding results. Lastly, the focus is on the consolidation of leadership and how, if this is the case, the leaders assure that their power remains consistent as well as what they do to expand it.

As for Dumbledore, it can be said that his overall leadership is oriented towards "the Greater Good" that he explains in a letter to his childhood friend Grindelwald, with whom he once fought for dominance of the wizards over the muggles. Even though he eventually turns away from this objective, he expresses his understanding of how power should be handled within a group in this letter:

Yes, we have been given power and, yes, that power gives us the right to rule, but it also gives us responsibilities over the ruled. We must stress this point, it will be the foundation stone upon which we build. Where we are opposed, as we surely we will be, this must be the basis of all our counter-arguments. We seize control FOR THE GREATER GOOD. And from this it follows that where we meet resistance, we must only use the force that is necessary and no more (DH 291).

It is not easy to clearly illustrate the “Greater Good” the headmaster refers to in this quote given that there is no general definition of it. The “Greater Good” depends on the individuals’ virtues and on what he/she considers as ‘good’. However, the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* defines it as “a general advantage that you can only gain by losing or harming something that is considered less important”. It highlights that the outcome is beneficial for the overall society and at the same time harmful for a part of it. This quote vividly demonstrates several traits of Dumbledore that are crucial in the examination of his leadership success. The individual definition he assigns to the “Greater Good” can be depicted when closely looking at his actions throughout the series and the way he chooses to attain this objective. There is no doubt that his major interest is to fight Voldemort and the group he has assembled around him. Interestingly, the reader never explicitly learns about his motivation to do so. The headmaster is presented as a man of high ethics and neither supports the cruelty personified by the Dark Lord nor his pureblood ideology.

However, this was not always the case. As mentioned earlier, there was a time when Dumbledore also had ambitions to become a “glorious young leader [...] of the revolution” (DH 573), assuaging the scruples he had by telling himself that it was for “a greater good” (DH 573). His change of mind mainly evokes from the painful recognition of the possible consequences the desire for power can cause and which he experiences himself when a fight between Grindelwald and his brother eventually caused his sisters’ death. The remorse he feels because it was him who brought the young Tom Riddle, who would later turn into Lord Voldemort, to Hogwarts might be his motivation to fight the latter. One might argue that Dumbledore’s actions are aimed at redeeming his mistakes. He is eager to achieve his individual “Greater Good” by eliminating the bad he brought upon the wizarding world by fighting Voldemort and everything he stands for. Even though the reasons for this objective may result from personal interests (redeeming his soul), the overall wizarding community would benefit from his success.

Voldemort, in contrast, does not pursue a goal that benefits the majority of the wizarding society. Rather the opposite is the case, given that his oligarchic leadership aims for the rule of the few that are of pure blood. His ideology openly excludes those that do not fit into the desired blood status and therefore creates a clearly defined concept of the enemy his supporters fight against. Interestingly, the Dark Lord’s followers consider the beforehand-mentioned pureblood ideology equally as the ‘Greater Good’. They are convinced that they make the wizarding a world a better place by “cut[ting] away the canker that infects [them] until only those of pure

blood remain” (*DH* 17). This approach underlines once more their totalitarian characteristics as they consider their ideology an ultimate solution to society’s problems (see Bogdanor, ‘Totalitarianism’ 615). Dumbledore himself evokes the designation of this ideology as the Greater Good in his letter to Grindelwald and even refers to the exact same meaning: the purification of the wizarding world from pureblood interferences (*DH* 291).

Although Voldemort indeed pursues this objective, it cannot be considered his major interest. Like explained in chapter 4, his focus is on eternal life, a goal that is entirely egoistic and which he tries to achieve through the creation of Horcruxes. When talking to Slughorn about their creation, the otherwise so emotionless Voldemort cannot hide his “hunger” (*DH* 465) and his “longing” (*DH* 465) that the imagination of being able to beat death evokes in him. Thus the goal the Dark Lord aims at further underlines his autocratic leadership style, causing him to act exclusively for his own benefit.

Upon close inspection of Dumbledore’s and Voldemort’s respective goals, one can see that the two leaders have a very different understanding of what power should be used for. Nonetheless, there is one conviction they both share and that causes them to be suited for a comparative analysis in their leadership. It is directed towards the achievement of their individual goals. Both men have understood that “social change [...] can only occur with numbers” (Marciniak 33). Thus, both leaders recognise the potential of alliances that is also crucial for the creation of hegemony (see Sassoon 230). As they aim for cultural hegemony that assures their respective ideologies through implanting it within society, they begin to recognise that it might be crucial for them to gain power over institutions. Arendt’s quote that introduces this thesis points out their recognition about groups in leadership structures as follows: “Power is never the property of an individual; it belongs to a group and remains in existence only so long as the group keeps together. When we say of somebody that he is ‘in power’, we actually refer to his being empowered by a certain number of people to act in their name” (44).

Chapter 4 closely inspected the leadership of both Dumbledore and Voldemort within their groups of followers that substantiates their authority with the help of theoretical propositions of leadership styles. I concluded that, even though both men can be considered leaders of a group, their leadership and perception of power is different. Now I will also critically assess leader’s respective success in leading these groups which they need to achieve the power necessary to accomplish their goals. Dumbledore’s numerous titles and his general hierarchical standing within the wizarding community (see Marciniak 29) make it easier for him to gain followers which help him to achieve his objectives. As pointed out in chapter 4, the institution of Hogwarts further grants his authority, transmits legitimacy to him as a leader and helps him to enforce his values and to transmit the virtues he considers important. Voldemort cannot rely on this kind of legitimate leadership that is granted through institutions and therefore needs to regain followers to be able to start pursuing his

goals. Therefore, with regards to the overall range of their leadership, Dumbledore starts with an advantage.

Although he does not yet lead an institution, Voldemort recognises the potential institutions may have for leads early on and thus tries to infiltrate the two major centres of power in the wizarding world. The reasons for his desire of controlling legitimate institutions within the wizarding world can be explained through the concept of hegemony. It is based upon using “the prestige (and consequent confidence) which the dominant group enjoys because of its position and function” (Gramsci 12). Marciniak fittingly describes that “Voldemort and his Death Eaters do not destroy the Ministry; instead they infiltrate and usurp its already established authority” (37). Given that the people do not easily question the decisions of the MoM, he is granted the legitimacy he lacked before. As assumed by force through the Death Eaters and their master, this power is not legitimate in the long run due to their coercive methods (see Marciniak 36). Nonetheless, it allows Voldemort to legally enforce laws. He succeeds in causing a social and political change (see Marciniak 37) by using the trust the people have towards their government to legitimate his enactment of rules. An example for that is the mudblood hunt in book 7 and the “Muggle Born Registration Commission” (*DH* 206f.).

After successfully infiltrating the MoM, Voldemort also aims at seizing control through the institution of Hogwarts, since he recognises the potential of forming young students according to his ideology and virtues right from the start (see Marciniak 50). Through the replacement of teachers with his followers, he tries to enable a radical change of values within the school and aims for creating a young generation of adherents. In spite of his enormous power within the school, he fails in transforming the students because they have already internalised Dumbledore’s ethics. Morris points out that “ethical action produces a form of strength grounded in trust that nothing else can duplicate” (64). Whether Dumbledore’s actions might be ethically correct or not, they appear to be for the students and teachers. Therefore, they willingly reproduce them (see Birch 115). Due to this enormous impact of Dumbledore on his followers in Hogwarts, Voldemort fails at embedding the ideology of totalitarian leaders into “the deepest reaches of societal structure” (Pipes 243) and does not attain the complete control of his followers’ thoughts and actions. Although having mastered the first aspect of the “historic bloc” (Sassoon 230) by creating a basis of consent among his followers, his failure in transmitting his ideologies via the institutions prevents him from successfully re-producing the hegemony of his ‘class’.

Ironically, it is his failure to gain control of Hogwarts that highlights the degree of Dumbledore’s success in this very objective. In contrast to Voldemort, he fulfils both prerequisites of a successful historic bloc. Firstly, his group of disciples provides him the required basis of consent (see Sassoon 230). Secondly, as long-time headmaster, he succeeds in implanting his ideology so far that it becomes ‘common sense’, a characteristic of successful hegemonic leadership according to Hopf (see 318). Due to this failure, Voldemort needs to develop another strategy that helps

him gain followers to use the beforehand mentioned power that only occurs in groups. Quickly it becomes evident that his approach to reach that goal is coercion out of which his autocratic leadership arises. Even though he despises affection towards others, “shrewd strategist” (Barratt 136) he is, Voldemort promises those who are discontent in their current situation in society to satisfy their needs under his reign (Barratt 30). As explained in chapter 4.2, this strategy of requiring followers is successful.

This chapter has equally highlighted that Voldemort’s strategy of creating a clear differentiation between the two groups (‘mudbloods’ and ‘purebloods’) applies to his followers’ need of differentiating themselves from their enemies. Barratt argues that “such bodies often appeal to individuals who lack other sources of identity or power” (104). Since Voldemort is aware of their urge to share a part of his power, he is strategically capable of taking advantages of these desires. One example for such is their longing for attachment to a certain group which the Dark Lord provides through his ideology of races that have different value (see chapter 4). Thereby, he proves to inherit one of the crucial prerequisites for successful leadership as proposed by Adair and Thomas, “a thorough knowledge of his employees” (118). In book 5, it becomes clear that this knowledge about others equally allows him to lure his enemies into a trap, especially when he uses occlumency to make Harry believe that Sirius is in danger. These indications show that during his leadership he proves an “eerie skill for discerning and destroying or perverting the things closest to the hearts of his enemies” (Barratt 140).

Despite using emotions of both his followers and his enemies for tactical warfare, he practises neither consideration nor compassion. In none of the books does he show genuine interest in his followers’ well-being. In the beginning, this is what his adherents admire their leader for, namely his lack of emotions since it makes him appear even more powerful. However, his high emphasis on attaining his goals and the low emphasis on the people, as typical for autocratic leaders (see Warrick 158), fire back against him. Despite this failure in considering his followers’ needs, there is also another aspect that eventually causes the downfall of the Dark Lord and his failure in achieving his goals. In the end, it is Dumbledore’s influence on Draco Malfoy combined with the latter’s family’s love for him that results in the betrayal of Voldemort. Although the Malfoys are repeatedly shown as strongly connected to Voldemort’s ideology and thus appear as faithful servants at first glance, they eventually turn against their former master to protect themselves. Starting after Lucius’ failure to obtain the prophecy, the Dark Lord treats them more and more as dispensable, taking away their authority, at last by taking Lucius’ wand (see *DH* 373). It is due to this miserable treatment, which even expands to their son, that causes the Malfoy family to eventually turn against their former master. As unlikely as it seems at first sight, Voldemort’s consideration of Lucius as a “slippery friend” (*GoF* 564) appears to be a prophecy that comes true. At first, the Malfoys try to restore their reputation within the Death Eaters but, no matter what they do, nothing seems to be enough (*DH* 371). Eventually, Narcissa betrays Voldemort when he commands

her to check whether Harry is still alive after the Dark Lord has tried to kill him in the final book, knowing this is the only opportunity to find her son (see *DH* 582). Harry correctly recognises that “she no longer cared whether Voldemort won” (*DH* 582) because she is more concerned with the well-being of her son than with her leader’s victory.

Although Barratt argues that there is no clear hierarchical structure within this group (99), Lucius’ standing appeared to be higher than the ones of others, as he is repeatedly represented as one of his closest servants. Together with the common motivations to follow Voldemort, fear and the lure for a share of his power, it was this standing within the group that motivated him to restore his position. When Narcissa recognises that he will not be able to rebuild this hierarchical position, she notices that there is nothing more to gain from her family’s obedience to the Dark Lord. Barratt expresses this thought fittingly, he claims that “by failing to forgive, and by punishing those who have returned to him, [Voldemort] guarantees that his power over his followers is entirely dependent upon his ability to punish” (46). As he had punished them to the extent that they have nothing more to lose but themselves as a family, Narcissa decides to save those she loves with all means at her disposal. Later, during the battle of Hogwarts, Draco’s parents are described as “running through the crowd, not even attempting to fight, screaming for their son.” (*DH* 589).

This scene vividly portrays that even though Voldemort always put the loyalty of his followers in the centre, he fails in attaining it to the extent he wishes for. Their loyalty is not strong enough to withstand the emotional attachment to one’s own family and the love parents feel for their child. Here, it becomes evident that in the end, Voldemort’s followers mirror his egoistic behaviour and pursue their personal goals. As long as they follow their common goal of reaching power through fighting for an oligarchic system with pureblood families at the top, Voldemort’s leadership is successful. Once his followers learn, however, that “Voldemort shows just as little mercy to his followers as to his enemies” (*PS* 126), their loyalty fades, and they willingly betray him. It is not without irony that the reason for his followers’ betrayal results once again out of a mother’s love for her son. Like Lily once did for Harry, Narcissa proves that she is willing to endure any consequences to assure that her son is in safety. Never having experienced love himself, Voldemort is unable of feeling and truly understanding it, which causes him, in turn, to underestimate its inherent power.

This example shows the weakness that can result from a purely autocratic leadership that is characterised through lack of interest in and consideration of one’s followers. Voldemort, as a counter-intuitive example, highlights that qualities such as “warmth”, “humility” and “fairness” towards one’s followers are crucial to lead successfully (Adair and Thomas 121). His character further underlines that tactical knowledge about warfare and the role emotions can play is not enough to succeed. As pointed out above, Voldemort can use emotions to manipulate his opponents to

act as he wants them to. Nonetheless, he eventually fails since he underestimates the enemies' strongest power he has never experienced himself: love.

Concerning his followers, similar mistakes can be recognised. At first sight, Voldemort succeeds in controlling his followers' obedience through the cellular structure he chooses within his group. However, he does not foresee the betrayal due to love that causes his second downfall. Despite constantly underestimating the power of love, equally the all-embracing control of his followers' actions prevents Voldemort from asserting his leadership in the long run. By controlling all of the Death Eaters actions, he discourages them to become independent. Thus, they entirely depend on their master and are unable to pursue the group's goals without him. In the end, "[Voldemort's] army suffers from the same weakness as any other autocrats': when the leader shows signs of weakness, the troops have little incentive to persevere." (Barratt 142). This statement holds true for his first as well as for his second downfall, where his "weakness" consists of being disempowered from his body, not being able to assert his power physically, e.g., through his wand. The moment he cannot use violence to assure his domination, such as punishing disobedience directly, he loses his group of supporters which enable him to make the social change he aims for (see Marciniak 33). Thus, Marciniak as well as Arendt (see 44) have correctly predicted that his success depends entirely on the ability to keep his group of followers together. By failing in this attempt, Voldemort causes his downfall.

Even though he also has his limits, Dumbledore can generally be considered a leader who fulfils Adair's and Thomas' prerequisites and indeed practices "warmth", "humility" and "fairness" (121) within his group. As opposed to Voldemort's failing autocratic leadership, his transformational approach is successful in the long run as it includes consideration, an important aspect of such leaderships (see Eeden et. al 255). The knowledge of his followers which results from this consideration becomes visible, inter alia, through the gifts the headmaster leaves for Harry, Ron and Hermione. Although he is dead and thus cannot help them to figure out the respective reasons for each gift, his role as a mentor enables them to "mak[e] interferences on the basis of incomplete knowledge" (Brown 407). Thanks to the acquired agency and independence, they are capable of solving the riddles themselves, even if it takes some time. Bruner's assumption that "acquired knowledge is most useful to a learner, when it's discovered through [...] own cognitive efforts" (Bruner qtd. in Wolosky 294) thus proves to be suited for the trio. Dumbledore's Army, which can be considered an extension of Dumbledore's leadership since it is led by "Dumbledore's man through and through" (*HBP* 326), namely Harry, personifies the same structure. Interestingly, Harry overcomes his mentor's mistakes and succeeds in establishing a democratic leadership within his group and includes voting processes (see Barratt 21). After all, Dumbledore's transmission of virtues onto his group of followers might not be as openly manipulative and coercive as Voldemort's ap-

proach. However, the reader cannot be sure whether those who are under Dumbledore's leadership, would also share his convictions if they had not been confronted with them daily and from a very early age on.

Previous chapters have shown that the institutional power Dumbledore inherits due to his position as headmaster contributes enormously to his long-term success. His values have even been internalised to the extent that Draco Malfoy cannot kill Dumbledore, even if he knows that he must to restore his family's reputation. Torn between the values cherished by his family and the ones he has learned in school, the reader experiences a weighing between the different educations Draco has witnessed – and in the end, Dumbledore's education beats Voldemort's. Draco cannot kill his headmaster and his longstanding mentor and influencer of his socialisation (see *HBP* 553ff.). It is reasonable to assume that Draco would have acted differently if he had grown up under Voldemort's education.

Like elaborated above, this successful internalisation of the headmaster's values presents the second major cause for the Dark Lord's downfall. Draco's behaviour serves as a particularly evident example of Dumbledore's leadership success caused by his rule of Hogwarts. Interestingly, it leads to the assumption that also others might act in Dumbledore's interest due to the presence of his values and virtues. This perspective allows for the imagination of a different Hogwarts under a different leader. Another example for the enormous success the headmaster in transmitting his ideas to his followers can be depicted when Harry willingly sacrifices himself for Dumbledore's 'Greater Good', the common goal they agreed on. This can be considered the peak of Dumbledore's leadership success since it personifies that he manages to implement his individual goal into others to the extent that they even willingly sacrifice themselves for it. It is only due to the unconditional trust and loyalty of his followers that the headmaster's values and objectives are carried on. As he provides plausible goals he strives for, his followers genuinely support him in their attainment.

Dumbledore's own death is equally an interesting aspect to look at when it comes to the depiction of his leadership towards his followers. At one point, he admits that he asks Snape to kill him instead of letting Malfoy or others do it because he does not want to suffer more than necessary (*DH* 548). Despite that, he knows that the wound the destruction of the Horcrux has caused is slowly killing him (*DH* 548). His followers do not know about these tactical influences which shape his decisions. Thus, Dumbledore suffers a martyr's death which appears to underline that he is dedicated to the "Greater Good" during life as well as in death. Due to this way of deceasing, Dumbledore assures that his transformational leadership continues even after his death. For his followers, he sets an example of selflessness that inspires them to seek after the goal they once tried to attain together. The basis for this long-term transmission of Dumbledore's values is the "agreement-oriented communication" proposed by Hannah Arendt (see Habermas and McCarthy 5f.). Per definition, the power that results from agreement cannot be instrumentalised because if it were, it would lose its power (see Habermas and McCarthy 5). Even

though it is questionable whether the headmaster's leadership would be equally successful under different circumstances, his way of exercising power is accepted and indeed "rests on conviction", as requested by Habermas (5f.) This approach makes up for his lack of democracy within his group since it underscores that his followers agree with their leaders' decisions. Even without voting processes, Dumbledore succeeds in working for the collective goals the group agreed upon and thus fulfils the democratic criteria of focusing on the outcome of the whole group (see Warrick 160). The headmaster's personal interest, to redeem that he brought the vilest wizard into the magical world, rather vanishes behind his effort for attaining the group's goals. Therefore, Dumbledore's followers consider him working for the group's interest and attribute him an interest in the satisfaction of his followers, another criterion for democratic leadership (see Warrick 160).

Even though all this presents him as a caring leader, the headmaster needs to be regarded critically. As stated above, his interest in the group's goals is not as genuine as they might appear and often there is a tactic behind his actions. There are even signs of manipulation of his followers since he repeatedly highlights the importance of alliances (see *GoF* 627), a prerequisite for him to rule successfully (see Arendt 44). The willingly granted obedience and acceptance of his rules and ideals ultimately facilitate the headmaster's leadership. It naturally minimises the need for punishments, which in turn helps to uphold the good relationship between him and his followers. It is also crucial for allowing *laissez-faire* tendencies under his leadership. These are only successful because Dumbledore's followers are capable of self-management (see Eeden et al. 255).

Due to this way of handling his followers, Chan ascribes anarchistic tendencies to Dumbledore which explain his success in leading his followers. Chan states that such leaders "believe that harmony can be better achieved in a society regulated not through the government but through mutual assistance and cooperation of the members" (420). Even though we rejected the idea of Dumbledore as an anarchistic leader earlier, Chan might be right in this assumption. Indeed, mutual assistance and cooperation become particularly evident when looking at the close bond between Dumbledore and his followers. One example that shows that the entire group works together for a common goal is when Mr Weasley is attacked in the Ministry. Dumbledore, without hesitation, initiates the necessary processes to save him. Nonetheless, it is only due to the common and genuine interest to save their member that everyone contributes his/her best to succeed. Both his agreement-orientated communication as well as his values-based orientation fit into Neill's understanding of the "discipline of an orchestra, where a violinist obeys the conductor because he is as keen on a good performance as the conductor is" (156). Thus, Dumbledore shows repeatedly that he does not make the same mistake as Voldemort, who micromanages everything. Instead, he relies on the libertarian assumption "that government is best which governs least" (Thoreau 244), trusts upon self-reliance, respect of individual rights (see Barton 1537) and the together-defined virtues and goals the group agreed upon. After all, the headmaster succeeds in his aim of educating his followers

to become independent, autonomous adults that think before acting – a goal he shares with most parents, underscoring the paternalistic leadership he inherits. As his adherents learn to understand the rules brought upon them by internalising the values that induce them, they are more likely to behave accordingly. Even if they do not, the headmaster trusts them and accepts that “there are no power relations without resistances” (Foucault 142). Thus, he ensures that even in case of breaking the rules as they will anyway, his pupils have at least the morals in mind that he has chosen for them to acquire. This way of reacting to resistances occurring in his leadership demonstrates that he fulfils the successful-leadership-quality of “not [to] become engrossed in detail” (Adair and Thomas 120).

Voldemort, on the contrary, relies entirely on his coercive leadership, his cellular organization and downward communication. Therefore, he does not expect any resistances and fails in managing them once they occur. Generally, the Dark Lord does not rely on agreement-oriented communication but rather refers to the teleological concept of power suggested by Max Weber. This approach of enacting leadership opposes the one of Hannah Arendt as it “only provides for actors who are oriented to their own success and not to reaching agreement” (Habermas and McCarthy 4). Thus, it implies the aspect of manipulation and can be considered rather “instrumental” (Habermas and McCarthy 4) than genuinely agreement-oriented like Arendt’s approach. It can be applied to Voldemort’s leadership insofar as that the Death Eaters neither appear to know about the creation of their master’s Horcruxes nor are they generally involved in decision-making. They support their leader since they are part of the group of society he seeks to entitle as the elite but are not allowed to decide autonomously. In this respect, his oligarchic leadership style representing a clearly defined “ingroup/outgroup distinction” (Barratt 104) is successful. It motivates those belonging to the beneficial group to support his objectives and to grant Voldemort the authority he requests.

The teleological model, however, does not provide long-term success, as Voldemort vividly exemplifies. Given that their followership is not genuine, they are quick to change their minds and to pursue their own individual goals. This does not come as a surprise, given that they have learned this behaviour from their leader, Voldemort, who does the same by reigning autocratically. What holds true for both leaders, however, is William’s assumption about the leading-by-example style: “In leading by example [...] leaders provide a continual living demonstration of the values which represent the core culture of the team or group” (36). Adair and Thomas likewise list the ability to “set a good example” as necessary for a person in command (see 118).

Ironically, just like Dumbledore, Voldemort succeeds in getting his followers to mirror his behaviour. Their major difference is that the personification of the virtues Dumbledore hallows benefits his respective objectives, causing his followers to imitate him and entirely commit to reach their “together-defined goals” (Wolosky 295). His follower’s commitment even extends to them sacrificing their lives for the greater good, just like he (seemingly) does. Voldemort, in contrast, teaches his followers ignorance and self-centeredness and thereby signs his downfall, as it is exactly

the self-centeredness of the Malfoy family that eventually causes his failure. Whereas Dumbledore relies on his followers to carry on his morals because of the trust towards them, Voldemort's analysis underscores that he does not trust anybody but himself. Therefore, it is only logical that he entrusts objects and animals instead of people to maintain parts of him, namely the Horcruxes he creates. The creation of the latter, however, only aims at fulfilling his personal goal of eternal life and does not contribute to his group's objectives. It might be due to this egoistic example he sets that he prevents himself from obtaining long-term leadership.

Taking all of the previously mentioned aspects into consideration, it can be concluded that the respective leader's success indeed depends on the success of leading within their groups (see Marciniak 33). Dumbledore achieves long-term success due to the passing on of his virtues through his followers. There is even a new resistance group evolving that bases on the same virtues the headmaster stands for, led by his most loyal follower, Harry Potter, who assures that his morals are lived on without him. By educating his group towards consideration, independence and cooperation, he assures their genuine conviction of the virtues they stand for. Especially through emphasising values-based self-governance, the headmaster causes his followers to internalise the educated values to the extent that they aim for 'Greater Good'.

Voldemort, however, might succeed in his "leadership-by-example" (Williams 36) as he transmits his virtues onto his followers but ultimately, it is because of them that his leadership fails. By educating his followers the virtues that are characteristic for his autocratic leadership, that is egoism and self-centeredness, he causes them to mirror these traits. Due to the total absence of consideration and warmth towards his followers, they soon recognise that they are indeed interchangeable for their master. In the end, the Malfoys place the benefit of their family above their obedience towards their leader, thus underlining the two major mistakes of the Dark Lord: Failing to create an atmosphere of contentment among his followers and underestimating once more the power of love. Due to the lack of reciprocal communication and recognition, Voldemort's followers realise that he is the only one who benefits from their fellowship.

Generally, this analysis depicts that whereas Dumbledore meets numerous of the proposed requirements Adair and Thomas set up for successful leaders, Voldemort fails in meeting them. In the end, it is "believing in the common good, in love, in friendship, in [genuine] loyalty, and in justice" (Barratt 160) that assures a long-term leadership, whereas "seeking power for power's sake, and self-preservation above all else" (Barratt 160) only allows for a short-term leadership.

6 Conclusion

The present thesis has treated extensively the leadership styles Albus Dumbledore and Voldemort portray within their respective groups of followers. I have further examined the treatment of the latter and eventually analysed their success in attaining

the goals the two leaders pursue with their leaderships. The results of the examination about the influence of behaviour towards one's group on their leadership success have confirmed the original hypothesis. Indeed, reciprocal leadership structures with an emphasis on consideration prove to be more successful, as depicted through Dumbledore's long-term success in transmitting his virtues onto his followers who even promulgate them after his death. Voldemort's failure that results from his mostly autocratic, one-way communication within his group further supports this hypothesis by providing a negative counterexample. It underlines that it is due to his lack of consideration and reciprocal communication policies that he does not achieve the goals he aimed for.

Additionally, the analysis of the different leadership styles used by Dumbledore supports the idea that a mixture of different styles is more successful than restricting oneself to only one approach. However, the leader's success depends not entirely on the leaders but is enormously influenced by their followers' perception of the style that is exercised towards them, as can be seen through the Malfoys' example.

Although this thesis has examined the leadership of the two chosen leaders and their respective success in-depth, there are still several aspects that remain open for exploration. For once, this work seized down the leader's motivation to consciously selected aspects that, at one point, are more or less explicitly stated by them as their goals. Further research could be done about the Dumbledore's success in fulfilling his position as headmaster. One might explore his approach to transmit the curricular knowledge to his students as well as his general success in educating them. Given that the acquired knowledge which forms the centre of this work is acquired mostly outside the classroom, the success concerning the transmission of technical magic knowledge is not treated.

Also, the limits of Dumbledore's success have not yet been regarded. Although the headmaster succeeds in achieving his personal goal of redeeming the evil he released into the magical world through his transformational and motivating leadership, he only fights the symptoms, not the 'disease' itself that is the pureblood-ideology. Indeed, his pursuit of personal interests contributes to society's well-being to the point of freeing the wizarding world from Voldemort and causing his followers to scatter. Nonetheless, Dumbledore's leadership does not aim for changing society's perspective about these outcasts and is thus unable to cause a significant social change. The only hint at an actual, altruistic social change is the promising transmission of his leadership to Harry, who might have the potential to overcome his mentor by aiming for greater causes and not his interests.

Generally, the way the leaders have attained their success needs to be put into relation to the respective goals that have been set by them. This thesis only considers those presented at the beginning of chapter 5. However, given that the definition of success depends on the goals set by a leader, also the leader's eventual success varies when considering other criteria than the one selected for this paper. Also, the present thesis seized down the applied theories to their use for the chosen focal point. Different works might place other aspects in the centre and thus provide an additional

perspective to the one provided within this work. Taking into consideration the aspect of hegemony as presented in the Harry Potter world would be for itself a possible emphasis of continuing scientific work. Therefore, this thesis serves as a basis for further research that provides an overview of the used leadership styles of Dumbledore and Voldemort. It considers their success resulting from their respective choices as well as the associated consequences. Despite the deliberately chosen limits of this work, there are also the limits given through the way J.K. Rowling decided to display the world she created. Given that the reader only gets to know Hogwarts under the long-term reign of Dumbledore as headmaster, it remains open whether Voldemort would have been more successful had he been granted the same preconditions as Dumbledore. The same question can be raised concerning another headmaster that might have imposed different virtues onto the pupils. Thus, it might be of interest to examine the general influence of headmasters towards their students and compare these findings with the display of Dumbledore as headmaster.

Bibliography

For brevity's sake, the following thesis deviates from the originally used MLA citation style considering the primary source (The Harry Potter book series by J.K. Rowling, Bloomsbury edition). Instead, the following abbreviations are used to refer to the respective books:

PS Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone
CoS Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets
PoA Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban
GoF Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire
OoP Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix
HBP Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince
DH Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows

Adair, John, and Neil Thomas. *The John Adair Handbook of Management and Leadership*. Thorogood Ltd, 2004.

Agar, Courtney, and Julia Terk. "Harry Potter and the Wizard's Game: A Genetic Analysis of Potterworld." *A Wizard of Their Age: Critical Essays from the Harry Potter Generation*, State University of New York, 2015.

Arendt, Hannah. *On Revolution*. Viking Press, 1963.

Aycan, Zeynep. "Paternalism: Towards Conceptual Refinement and Operationalization." *Indigenous and Cultural Psychology*, 2006, pp. 445-66.

Barratt, Bethany. *The Politics of Harry Potter*. Palgrave Macmillan US, 2012.

- Barton, Benjamin H. "Harry Potter and the Half-Crazed Bureaucracy." *Michigan Law Review*, vol. 104, no. 6, 2006.
- Bates, Thomas R. "Gramsci and the Theory of Hegemony." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 36, no. 2, Apr. 1975, p. 351, doi:10.2307/2708933.
- Birch, Megan L. "Schooling Harry Potter: Teachers and Learning, Power and Knowledge." *Critical Perspectives on Harry Potter*, edited by Routledge Elizabeth E. Heilman, 2nd ed., 2009, pp. 103-20.
- Bogdanor, Vernon. "Anarchism." *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Political Institutions*, 1987.
- . "Autocracy." *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Political Institutions*, Basil Blackwell, 1987.
- . "Democracy." *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Political Institutions*, Basil Blackwell, 1987, pp. 166-68.
- . "Oligarchy." *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Political Institutions*, 1987, p. 391.
- . "Totalitarianism." *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Political Institutions*, 1987, pp. 614-16.
- Bono, Joyce E., and Timothy A. Judge. "Personality and Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 89, no. 5, 2004, pp. 901-10, doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.901.
- Brown, Ann L. "Transforming Schools into Communities of Thinking and Learning about Serious Matters." *American Psychologist*, vol. 52, no. 4, 1997, pp. 399-413, doi:10.1037/0003-066X.52.4.399.
- Bruner, Jerome. *The Culture of Education*. Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Chan, Aaron Yu Kwan. "Surveillance in Hogwarts: Dumbledore's Balancing Act Between Managerialism and Anarchism." *Children's Literature in Education*, vol. 50, no. 4, Springer Netherlands, 2019, pp. 417-30, doi:10.1007/s10583-017-9333-7.
- Cordova, Melanie J. "'Because I'm a Girl, I Suppose!': Gender Lines and Narrative Perspective in Harry Potter." *Mythlore: A Journal of J.R.R. Tolkien, C.S. Lewis, Charles Williams, and Mythopoeic Literature*, vol. 33, no. 2, 2015.
- Demenchono, E. "The Universal Concept of Human Rights as a Regulative Principle: Freedom Versus Paternalism." *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 273-301.
- Deva, TT Haswiny, and Rashad Yazdanifard. *The Review of Communication Methods Used by Leaders Employing Various Basic Leadership Styles*. no. May 2014, 2013, pp. 1-7.

- Dickinson, Renée. "Harry Potter Pedagogy: What We Learn about Teaching and Learning from J. K. Rowling." *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, vol. 79, no. 6, July 2006, pp. 240-44, doi:10.3200/TCHS.79.6.240-244.
- Eeden, René van, et al. "Leadership Styles and Associated Personality Traits: Support for the Conceptualisation of Transactional and Transformational Leadership." *South African Journal of Psychology*, vol. 38, no. 2, 2008, pp. 253-67.
- Elizabeth E. Heilman. *Critical Perspectives on Harry Potter*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2008, doi:10.4324/9780203892817.
- Foucault, Michel. *Power/Knowledge*. Prentice Hall, 1980.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebook*. Quentin Hoare, Geoffrey Nowell Smith, 1971, <https://archive.org/details/AntonioGramsciSelectionsFromThePrisonNotebooks/page/n1/mode/2up>.
- Habermas, Jürgen, and Thomas McCarthy. "Hannah Arendt's Communications Concepts of Power." *Social Research*, vol. 44, no. 1, 1977, pp. 3-24.
- Hall, Susan. "Harry Potter and the Rule of Law: The Central Weakness of Legal Concepts in the Wizard World." *Reading Harry Potter: Critical Essays*, edited by Giselle Liza Anatol, 78th ed., Praeger, 2003., 2003, pp. 147-62.
- Hogg, Michael A., and Janice Adelman. "Uncertainty-Identity Theory: Extreme Groups, Radical Behavior, and Authoritarian Leadership." *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 69, 2013, pp. 436-454, doi:10.1111/josi.12023.
- Hopf, Ted. "Common-Sense Constructivism and Hegemony in World Politics." *International Organization Foundation*, vol. 67, no. 2, 2013, pp. 317-54.
- Hoyle, Eric, and Mike Wallace. *Educational Leadership: Ambiguity, Professionals and Managerialism*. Sage Publication Ltd., 2005.
- Jackson, Terence. "Paternalistic Leadership: The Missing Link in Cross-Cultural Leadership Studies?" *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, vol. 16, no. 1, 2016, pp. 3-7.
- Johnson, Paul M. "Aristocracy." *A Glossary of Political Economy Terms*, <http://webhome.auburn.edu/~johnspm/gloss/aristocracy.phtml>.
- . "Autocracy." *A Glossary of Political Economy Terms*, <http://webhome.auburn.edu/~johnspm/gloss/autocracy.phtml>. Accessed 7 Oct. 2020.
- . "Totalitarianism." *A Glossary of Political Economy Terms*, <http://webhome.auburn.edu/~johnspm/gloss/totalitarianism.phtml>.
- Jowett, Benjamin. "Part VIII." *Politics. Aristotle*, Batoche Books, 1999, p. 62.

- Khan, Zakeer Ahmed, et al. "Leadership Theories and Styles: A Literature Review." *Journal of Resources Development and Management*, vol. 16, 2016, pp. 1-7.
- Kirkpatrick, Shelley A., and Edwin A. Locke. "Leadership: Do Traits Matter?" *Academy of Management Perspectives*, vol. 5, no. 2, 1991, pp. 48-60.
- Knutsen, Torbjorn L. "Dumbledore's Pedagogy: Knowledge and Virtue at Hogwarts." *Harry Potter and International Relations*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. Inc., 2006, pp. 197-213.
- Marciniak, Aaron D. "There Is Only Power": *Surveying the Structures and Operations of Power in the Magical World of Harry Potter*. Hamline University, 2016, <https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/dhp/42>.
- McGregor, Douglas. *The Human Side of Enterprise*. 1960.
- Morris, Tom. *If Harry Potter Ran General Electric Leadership Wisdom from the World of the Wizards*. Doubleday, 2006.
- Mouzelis, Nicos P. *Organisation and Bureaucracy: An Analysis of Modern Theories*. Aldine Transaction, 2009.
- Neill, Alexander Sutherland. *Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Child Rearing*. Hard Publishing Company, 1960.
- Pellegrini, Ekin K., and Terri A. Scandura. "Paternalistic Leadership: A Review and Agenda for Future Research." *Journal of Management*, vol. 34, no. 3, 2008, pp. 566-93.
- Pipes, Richard. *Russia Under the Bolshevik Regime*. New York: Vintage Books, Random House, 1995.
- R. House, and B. Shamir. "Toward the Integration of Transformational, Charismatic, and Visionary Theories." *Leadership Theory and Research: Perspectives and Directions*, edited by M.M. Chemers and R. Ayman, Academic Press, 1993, pp. 81-107.
- Reagin, Nancy R. "Was Voldemort a Nazi? Death Eater Ideology and National Socialism." *Harry Potter and History*, Wiley, 2011, pp. 127-52.
- Reynolds, Susan. "Dumbledore in the Watchtower: Harry Potter as a Neo-Victorian Narrative." *Harry Potter's World Wide Influence*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009, pp. 271-90.
- Röber, Franziska. *Hogwarts isn't Safe Anymore. Surveillance and Power in Harry Potter*. Technische Universität Dresden, 2014.
- Rowling, J. K. *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*. 1998.
- . *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*. Bloomsbury Publishing PLC, 2007.

- . *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire*. Bloomsbury Publishing PLC, 2000.
- . *Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince*. Bloomsbury Publishing PLC, 2005.
- . *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*. Bloomsbury Publishing PLC, 2003.
- . *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*. Bloomsbury Publishing PLC, 1997.
- Said, Meldasari, and Laila Refiana Said. "Differences in Employee Perceptions on Downward and Upward Communications." *Conference: Academy for Global Business Advancement's 15th World Congress*, 2018, pp. 822-30.
- Sassoon, Anne Showstack. "Hegemony." *A Dictionary of Marxist Thoughts*, edited by Tom Bottomore et al., 2nd ed., Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 1983, p. 230.
- Schlosser, Markus E. "Agency." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2015, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/agency/>.
- Steege, David L. "Harry Potter, Tom Brown and the British School Story. Lost in Transit." *The Ivory Tower*, Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2002.
- Thoreau, Henry David. *Civil Disobedience*. Edited by Owen Thomas, Walden, 1966.
- Ünlü, Ela, and Bülent Kılıç. "Paternalistic Leadership and Employee Organizational Attitudes: The Role of Positive/Negative Affectivity." *SAGE Open*, vol. 9, no. 3, 2019, doi:10.1177/2158244019862665.
- Warrick, D. D. "Leadership Styles and Their Consequences Importance of Leadership Style." *Journal of Experiential Learning and Simulation*, vol. 172, 1981, pp. 155-72.
- Weber, Max. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. University of California Press, 1978.
- Wente, Sarah. "The Making of a New World: Nazi Ideology and Its Influence on Harry Potter." *A Wizard of Their Age: Critical Essays from the Harry Potter Generation*, edited by Cecilis Koncha Farr, SUNY Press, 2015, pp. 89-112.
- Williams, Michael. *Leadership for Leaders*. Thorogood Publishing Ltd., 2005.
- Wolosky, Shira. "Foucault at School: Discipline, Education and Agency in Harry Potter." *Children's Literature in Education*, vol. 45, no. 4, Dec. 2014, pp. 285-97.
- Woodson, Stephani Etheridge. "Mapping the Cultural Geography of Childhood or, Performing Monstrous Children." *The Journal of American Culture*, vol. 22, no. 4, Dec. 1999, pp. 31-43.