An Outline of Certain Generic Values - Work Dimensions

János FEHÉR

Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary, Budapest, Hungary, feher.janos@kre.hu

Background/Purpose: Values-related issues have come into the focus of leadership thinking in the past few decades and it seems to be paradoxical why values work has not been more extensively used so far for defining and conceptualizing leadership. A reason for this can be that values-oriented research streams normally approach leadership from specific perspectives of values representation and transfer. Alternatively, this study examines values work from a generic perspective. Its goal is to suggest a generalized notion for values work and outline certain generic values-work dimensions.

Methods: Analysis in this theoretical paper is primarily based on Institutional, New Leadership, and Values-Oriented theories. Methods include argumentation and analytical framework development.

Results: This study presents a structured list of and an illustrative framework for some of the dimensions of values work as broadly defined and has research implications regarding issues of leadership influence and the demarcation of leadership from management.

Conclusion: The importance of values representation in contrast to power/influence perspectives in leadership is underlined. Our study points to the necessity for more research on generic aspects of values work. The results can also be used for leadership practice, consulting, and development.

Keywords: Leadership, Power/influence perspective, New Leadership, Representation of followers' values, Institutional Theory, Value-oriented leadership

1 Introduction

The issue of values came into the focus of leadership research and practice in the last decades of the 20th century and especially by the turn of the millennium. The attention to the issue of values was affirmed by the results of the GLOBE research identifying charismatic/value based as one of globally observable (House & Javidane, 2004) and by followers perceived as positive (Dorfman et al., 2004) leaders' behaviors.

In the leadership literature „…most definitions of leadership reflect the assumption that it involves a process whereby intentional influence is exerted over other people…" (Yukl, 2013, p. 18) As for some examples from this century, „the essence of Leadership is influence", claims

Rumsey. (2013, p. 1). In Birnbaum's (2013, p. 256) definition leadership is an „interaction that influences others through non-coercive means". The GLOBE research meant by leadership the following: „…the ability of an individual to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the organization of which they are members." (House et al., 2004, p. 15)

Alternatively, in the last decades numerous definitions offer a dual approach (influence and purpose giving etc.) in contrast to approaches to leadership with an influence emphasis. In these definitions influence is interconnected, as for example, with giving purpose, meaning, guidance (House & Aditya, 1997), structuring or restructuring of the situation and of the perceptions and expectations of the members (Bass & Bass, 2008) and showing the way, en-

visioning a desirable future, promoting a clear purpose or mission, supportive values, and intelligent strategies (Gill, 2011). The definition of leadership offered by Antonakis and Day (2018) integrates the two aspects by using the notion of goal influencing.

Despite a growing emphasis on the aspect of purpose giving etc. (giving meaning; structuring and restructuring of perceptions and expectations; showing the way; promoting a mission etc.), it can be stated as a problem that the latter aspect still seems to be undervalued in leadership conceptualizations and definitions. Given the values context of establishing goals, offering purpose, and meaning, dealing with followers' perceptions and expectations, showing the way, promoting a mission, etc., this theoretical paper is devoted to aspects of values work in leadership.

Emerging values-oriented research streams often approach leadership from specific perspectives of values representation and transfer. However, a gap can be seen in generic interpretations of the significance and overall characteristics of values work. This study approaches values work from a generic perspective. The goal of this paper is to suggest a generalized notion for values work and to outline certain generic values-work dimensions with references to underlying theories. Such dimensions include the following: characteristics of the values represented; values-profiles consistencies between leaders and followers; components of values-representation leadership behaviors; role distributions in values-representation processes; authenticity of the related leadership behaviors; and credibility implications of values representation.

In this paper a generalized concept of 'values work' is suggested on which basis generic leadership values-work dimensions are outlined and illustrated.

2 Theoretical basis

Regarding the subject of the values context of leadership, in the evolution of leadership thought, classical authors already stressed the importance of common goals and underlying generic guiding principles for organizations. Fayol's principles of management (1949) for example, entail principles like „subordination of individual interest to general interest", and „esprit de corps". Barnard (1938) emphasized the responsibility of the leaders towards their followers, and the importance of creating meaning („belief in the real existence of a common purpose", p. 87) for organizational members to establish their commitment and identification.

The idea of meaning creation is an essential element of many other leadership concepts, for example the Leadership-Followership Theory of Edwin Hollander (1954). In his approach leadership supposes an exchange between the leader and the group. The leader helps the group to define reality and reach its goals while the group offers him/her status, recognition, and „idiosyncrasy credit" for implementing changes (Hollender, 1954; Goethals et al., 2004).

Further in the evolution of leadership thought it was Selznick (1957) who put the issue of values into the focus of research specifically from an Institutional Theory perspective. Selznick described how distinct institutional characters of organizations could be developed by their leaders and argued for the necessity of value infusions for organizations to become enduring institutions (Selznick, 1957). In a recent example of institutional theory research Raffaelli and Glynn (2015) advanced a model of value infusion by leaders for organizations.

Regarding further leadership concepts, Contingency Leadership and Strategic Leadership theories highlighted the need to pay attention to competing managerial and leadership objectives and underlying competing values (Quinn et al., 1990; Kotter, 1990; Yukl, 2013). Key leadership situations (e. g. future, strategy, innovation, transformation, crises, learning, and development-related) in an ever-changing environment conveyed substantial values-related problems and dilemmas for leaders. By the last decades of the 20th century a broad concept of New Leadership appeared in response to the large-scale change requirements. New Leadership distinguished itself from Traditional Leadership by its emphasis on value-based contents like charisma, vision, and transformation (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Bryman, 1992).

The concept of Charisma in leadership came from Weber (1946, 1968) and gained new interpretation in House's theory. House's concept (1976) is built on strong values (as components of the specific personality characteristics) and trust in the leader's ideology (as one of charismatic effects on followers).

Vision-making and setting up new directions were identified as key leadership challenges of the twenty-first century by Bennis and Nanus (1985). In the concept of Visionary Leadership, it is assumed that leaders have an „insight into the followers' needs or values" and „develop a vision statement reflecting those needs or values" (Goethals et al., 2004). Vision development involving a clarification of values has become a fundamental practice in organizational strategic management and related planned change to the culture of the organization (e. g. Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Nanus, 1992; Yukl, 1998).

Transformational Leadership emerged as a broad theory including elements of Charismatic and Visionary Leadership. In Transformational Leadership leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation. (Burns, 1978) Burns (1978) underlines the procedural nature of leadership with evolving interrelationships between leader and follower aiming at an alignment between their goals, needs, values and expectations. The goal of transformation is raising the level of performance of followers and developing them to their fullest potentials (Bass & Avolio, 1990).

Representatives of the transformational approach, Kouzes and Posner (1987; 1995; 2002) contributed in unique ways to clarifying the role of values in the leadership process. The authors developed a model of five fundamental practices that enable leaders to get extraordinary things done in organizations. The first fundamental practice of admired leaders is „Model the way". It is about how leaders are clear about and believe in their own values, leadership philosophy and guiding principles. Other fundamental practices are: „Inspire a shared vision", „Challenge the process", „Enabling others to act", and „Encourage the heart" (Kouzes & Posner, 1987; Northouse, 2018). Based on their research results in leadership excellence they identified credibility as the foundation of leadership (Kouzes & Posner, 2011).

Beyond values referred to classical authors of transformational leadership like morality (Bass & Avolio, 1990), follower development (Bass & Avolio, 1990), credibility (Kouzes & Posner, 2011), on the agenda of today's transformational leadership research we find issues related to organizational values, like trust (Akter et al., 2021), employee engagement (Valldeneu et al., 2021), and social responsibility (Navia et al., 2019).

Evidence from research in Charismatic, Visionary, and Transformational leadership contributed to an understanding of the focal role values – fundamental to organizational culture – play in conceptualizing and practising leadership. As Schein (1985) wrote: „Leadership is intertwined with culture formation".

Within New Leadership some of the further trends are Ethical Leadership (Ciulla, 1998; Kanungo, 2001; Brown & Trevino, 2006), Servant Leadership (Greenleaf, 1977; Van Dierendonck, 2011, Coetzer et al., 2017), Authentic Leadership (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Maric et al., 2013; Bilgetürk & Bajkal, 2021), and Spiritual Leadership (Fry, 2003; Kriger & Seng, 2005; Korazija et al., 2016).

Through identifying ethics as the heart of leadership (Ciulla, 1998) the role leaders play in establishing and reinforcing organizational values became a key issue from ethical perspectives, as well (Gini, 1998; Carlson & Perrewe, 1995; Demirtas, 2015). Servant leadership has identified deep, values-based considerations about followers as a core element of the leadership process. Servant leader behaviors include putting followers first, helping followers grow and succeed, behaving ethically, and creating value for the community. (Liden et al., 2008). Authentic Leadership focuses on whether the leader's behaviour is genuine, "real" (Northouse, 2019), while Spiritual Leadership describes how leaders can create conditions that increase the sense of spiritual meaning of work for followers (Yukl, 2013; Palframan & Lancaster, 2019; Riasudeen & Singh, 2020).

The attention to the values context of leadership was affirmed, as mentioned above, by the GLOBE scholars. In a search for global cultural differences and relevance of leadership phenomena it was described how different cultures, view leadership. The research identified globally observable behaviors, namely charismatic/value-based, team-oriented, participative, humane-oriented, autonomous, and self-protective (House & Javidane, 2004). The GLOBE project went on investigating attributes that were universally endorsed by the respondents of a global sample as positive aspects of the leaders' behaviors. Under this category fall: high integrity, charismatic/value-based, and having interpersonal skills (Dorfman et al., 2004).

By the end of the last century, the term Values-Oriented Leadership (Lebow & Simon, 1997; Prilleltensky, 2000; Lašáková et al., 2019) appeared in leadership research. The term Values-Oriented Leadership can cover different approaches, for example it can identify leadership styles specifically built around certain values, can be used as an umbrella term for various, values-related theories (e. g. charismatic, transformational, servant, authentic, spiritual) or can refer to underlying leadership processes and methods of the transfer of values (Lašáková et al. 2019).

Regarding concepts of values-related leadership processes and methods a definition of values work is offered by researchers Gehman, Trevino and Garud (2013). They use the example of an institution's honor-code-related actions and processes for investigating organizational reactions to value postulations. They identify values practices and values work as organizational sociological phenomena in the following way. Values practices are „the sayings and doings in organizations that articulate and accomplish what is normatively right or wrong, good or bad, for its own sake…" (Gehman et al., 2013, p. 84). In their definition values work includes „four key interrelated processes: dealing with the pockets of concern, knotting local concerns into action networks, performing values practices, and circulating values discourse." (Gehman et al., 2013, p. 85; see also Gehman, 2021). In another, less specific definition by Wright et al. (2020, p. 1) values work is „the purposeful effort of actors to create, maintain and disrupt the values of organizations, professions and other institutions".

Concerning the practice of values-related leadership activities, authors inspired by the aforementioned Institutional Theory report on results from different segments of social and economic life. To take a societal leadership example first, Vaccario and Palazzo examined the impact of values in changing institutions that are highly change-resistant. They report on how values infused by a group of young activists were instrumental in successfully challenging institutionalized practices behind organized crime in a local culture (Vaccario & Palazzo, 2014). From the private business sector Raitis et al. (2021) report on how culture and values can be key drivers of entrepreneurship, and how value conflicts can inhibit entrepreneurial efforts. On the example of a global family firm, they identify three types of values-work, rooting, revitalizing, and spreading.

In a complex case of societal and business, and, also, of organizational, sectoral, and national relevance Raffaelli and DeJordy (2018) give an illustrative example of the leaders' involvement in establishing and maintaining institutional values, too. Studying the recent history of the Swiss watch-making industry, they report on how a balance between values of renewal and stability could be established by key stakeholders of the strategic transformation of the sector for mutual and common economic and societal benefits.

The authors found that the key players were thinking about Swiss national and sectorial historical values in terms of strategic resources. On this conceptual ground a process of social harmonization between guards of the traditions and entrepreneurs for renewal was built for a more effective use of technological resources. The urge for technological innovation provoked by the Asian competition started a „creative refinement" process among the Swiss key actors standing on different platforms. „Together, the combined interaction between entrepreneurs and guardians helped introduce several innovative structural, cultural, technological, and organizational changes to the field of Swiss watchmaking" (Raffaelli & DeJordy, 2018).

Given that values-related aspects in leadership have come into the focus of leadership thinking–as shown by number of theoretical streams referred to in this article–it seems to be paradoxical why these developments have not been more reflected in the generic theorization of leadership, and more concretely, in a more appropriate balance between different leadership definition perspectives in the literature. In other words, a question can be raised why values-related aspects and especially values work as such, have not been more extensively used so far for defining leadership, relative to anchored influence definitions.

In this context a reference can be made to Humphrey's (2014) distinction between two leadership perspectives. The distinction serves a broad categorization of Leadership definitions. As Humphrey (2014, pp. 6-7) writes: „According to a power perspective definition of leadership, leaders command, control, direct, and influence followers to achieve group, organizational, or societal goals". While „from the leaders as representatives, perspective, leaders are those who (1) best represent the values of their followers and (2) are better at solving their followers' problems and achieving their goals".

According to the latter perspective: „people emerge as leaders because they are better at articulating the values and desires of the group or are in some way seen as best representing the group." „… people are often selected for promotion based on the degree to which they represent the organization's core culture and are involved in carrying out the organization's core mission. At the national level, leaders are elected when the public perceives that the leaders share their values" (Humphrey, 2014, p. 7).

Humphrey offers at this point a generic concept of representation of followers by the leader. Specific leadership theories interpret the leader's (and h/h's values) being representative of the led group in different ways. Social Identity theory, as for one example, suggests that followers are more likely to trust leaders if they are „group prototypical" (Hogg, 2001; Hogg & van Knippenberg, 2003; Klenke, 2007).

Humphrey also does not specify here how to represent the group from values aspects (for example, what specific types of values to represent, or what concrete processes of values-work to promote). Unlike authors of certain theories in which specific types/sets of values with specifically related practices and processes are emphasized, and/or in which values-related work is only one element/part of the leaders' activities, Humphrey (2014) uses representation, and within that values representation as broad, descriptive terms for identifying a perspective of leadership as such.

To further characterize Humphrey's values representation leadership-definition perspective, it can also be stated that values representation in his–otherwise broad–interpretation is specific in a certain sense. Namely in this values-representation definition approach, he logically emphasizes the representation of the values of followers and puts less direct emphasis on the representation of the values of certain other stakeholders e. g. owners, partners, customers, society, and the leader him/herself.

In summary, the afore mentioned theories have conveyed multiple types of arguments for identifying the leaders' values-related work as a key element of leadership, moreover, offer reasons for laying more emphasis on values and their representation, when defining leadership.

The research spectrum is broad and diverse, and a gap can be seen in the research of the generic descriptions of the values-related work of the leaders in contrast to specific values-related approaches. Also, a gap can be seen in the theoretical evaluation of the balance between the interconnected leadership perspectives: values representation, and power/influence.

Regarding the above-stated need for generalizations and, following Humphrey's (2014) leadership definition approaches this study attempts to reflect on values work from a broad perspective. In this endeavour, more concretely, the aim of this paper is to suggest a generalized notion of values work and to outline certain generic dimensions of it. structure.

For obtaining the targeted results methodologically this theoretical study uses argumentation organised around the identified problems. Beyond that this paper applies methodological elements of analytical framework development. Theoretical/analytical frameworks are parts of conceptual frameworks and are informative about pre-existing theories regarding the research problem. Based on the argumentation organised around key problems identified through literature analysis in chapter 2, a proposal for a generic interpretation of the notion 'values work', as well

as a structured description and an illustrative framework of certain values-work dimensions will follow in Chapter 3.

3 Results

On the theoretical basis laid down in Chapter 2, parts, for a broad definition of values work can be suggested one that would build on both the two sub-perspectives (values-representation and problem-solving/goals achievement) of Humphrey's (2014) leaders as representatives, perspective. Thus, in a broad sense Leadership as Values Work (LaVW) is suggested to mean: Conceptualizing and making personal strategic choices about values and acting as a mover within the dynamic (organizational) processes of (1) identifying/constructing, further elaborating, sharing values, and (2) using them as guiding principles in solving problems and achieving goals.

As can be seen values-related work in the definition proposed in this paper goes beyond the representation of the values of followers, a sub-perspective by Humphrey (2014). Namely it implies the leader's concern on h/h own and other stakeholders' values, as well, including ones that are competing with or controversial to followers' values.

Regarding possible dimensions of Leadership as Values-Work the literature covered in this paper reflects on different topics in leaders' values-related preferences, roles, and activities.

As to the content of the values to be represented or infused by the leader different types of values can be distinguished based on the theories referred to. Certain of these theories (for example Ethical, Servant, Authentic, Transformational) show commonalities in describing how leadership works through partly or wholly given, of external origin, generic, ethically and/or functionally pre-determined sets of societal and organizational values.

Other approaches, like Contingency and Strategic leadership are more open to values urged by instrumental, functional (e. g. actual societal, business-) needs, and, also, ones more open to ways of identifying values through own, internal, customized search. Some theories typically refer to human values in a generic sense (e. g. Ethical Leadership), while some other (e. g. Servant Leadership, Spiritual Leadership) are concerned with more specific types of values.

Regarding the generic components of values work they can be logically grouped as follows: inner (intra-personal) values work, fundamental values work and applied values work. Inner values work can be identified as an intra-personal work on conceptualization, harmonization, and operationalization of own, owners'/governors', and other stakeholders' and generic social values. Fundamental values work can be defined as moving (or participating in the moving of) dynamic group/organizational processes of identifying/constructing, further elaborating, and shar-

ing values. Applied values work is meant to use values as guiding principles in solving problems and achieving goals within the organization/led entity.

Besides the types of values on the agenda and the basic values-work components significant parameters of values work can be historical and present similarities or differences in the values profiles between leaders and followers, peer members, and different organizational groups/units (for example intercultural or other, individual, group or broader level, inherited differences, or similarities). Regarding the values consistency between leaders and followers, for example, we can talk about a high or low values-consistency.

In case of a high consistency the leaders' role can be characterized by a representation of the values of followers, while in case of a low consistency by an infusion of alternative values. As to an opportunity of the leader to infuse alternative values, a reference can be made to the Leadership-Followership Theory of Hollender who described the phenomenon of the so-called „idiosyncrasy credit" offered by followers to the leader as a reciprocation for the leaders' help in defining reality and contributing to the achievement of the group's goals (Hollender, 1954; Goethals et al., 2004).

Different degrees of involvement of leaders, individuals, and groups in initiating and performing formal and informal values-related activities can also be important characteristics. This question is related to strategic choices: representing follower's values vs. influencing followers from a power perspective of leadership; trying to dominate values work vs. setting up a dynamic process of mutual involvement of followers/stakeholders in creating and maintaining values.

As referred to before, authenticity (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Maric et al., 2013; see also: Northouse, 2019) and credibility (Kouzes & Posner, 2011) are also essential elements of leadership influence.

To summarize, a draft list of basic dimensions of leaders' values work, primarily based on the leadership approaches referred to in this paper, entails the following (see also Table Chart 1):

1. Content characteristics of values – ethical, spiritual, functional, and other values.

2. Level of generality of values to be represented – universal values rooted in societal/(sub)cultural moral consensus vs. specific/local values urged by more instrumental, functional organizational needs.

3. Multiplicity and diversity of values – multiple values of a broad (or indefinite) scope/array vs. less numerous / a narrow, special segment of values (for example: ethical values in a generic sense or related to certain ethical/spiritual concepts, like service, responsibility, specific religion).

4. Origin of values to be represented – imported vs. intra-organizationally generated.

5. Prevalence of values – historical vs emerging or actual created values.

6. Generic components of values work: inner (intra-personal) values work, fundamental values work and applied values work. For working definitions for these overlapping values work components the following are suggested. Inner values work is suggested to mean an intra-personal work of the leader on conceptualization, harmonization, and operationalization of own, owners'/governors', and other stakeholders' and generic social values. Fundamental values work is proposed to be the following: moving / participating in the moving of dynamic group / organizational processes of identifying / constructing, further elaborating, and sharing values. Applied values work can be interpreted as using values as guiding principles in solving problems and achieving goals.

7. Consistency between the values profiles of leaders and followers – high or low consistency.

8. Differences in role distributions / levels of involvement between leaders and followers and other stakeholders in identifying and cultivating values – leader's initiatives and involvement vs. followers' or other parties' dominance in values work vs. multiple initiatives and involvements. Regarding values consistency between leader and followers the leader's role options can be a representation of followers' values or an infusion of alternative values. Infusion of alternative values is enabled by idiosyncrasy credit gained by the leader from the group (Hollender, 1958).

9. Authenticity of the leader's behaviour in representing values (high/low).

10. Credibility implications of the values work (positive/negative).

For integrating the dimensions, a conceptual framework is outlined (see Table 1.). The first five dimensions are included into one column named „Types of values to be represented/infused". (For values infusion see primarily Hollender, 1958). Dimension 6 is illustrated in the next column, and Dimensions 7, 8, 9, 10 are shown in further columns, respectively.

4   Discussion

For leadership influence traditional (legitimate power, traditional rewards and punishments, expert power, information, etc.) and non-traditional (New Leadership, i.e., ethical, neo-charismatic, transformational, etc.) power sources can be used. The use of traditional (e. g. transactional leadership) sources is highly limited in certain situations. Certain contingencies not only allow but enforce the use of non-conventional means of influence. Behind non-conventional means of influence clear and shared values, authenticity and credibility are immanent in the New Leadership paradigm. Leadership influence and values work have never been separable but the need for non-conventional means has made the role of values work more visible and central in leadership influence.

The nature of the relationship between leadership and values can vary according to sectoral, organizational, and other contingencies. In societal leadership, for example, values work is more evident than, for example, in business organizations. Nevertheless, a certain a shift from influence perspective to values work perspective is urged in business leadership, too. Especially in the last decades certain contingencies have made leaders move towards non-conventional means of influence to be effective in business organizations, as well. Consequently, the problem of influence in organizations, including business organizations, boils down in a good part to values-related issues of leadership. Values-related work deserves more emphasis in defining the phenomenon of Leadership, because credibility and authentic leadership behaviors are key conditions for Leadership success, and they certainly are in close connection with the level of values consistency between leader and followers. Values work is specifically defined by different authors. The Leadership as Values Work (LaVW) framework presented in this paper offers a broad interpretation of values-related leadership considerations and activities.

Some ethical, values-oriented leadership approaches are criticized for being normative and self-explanatory in literature (see, for example, Antonakis & Day, 2018). The LaVW framework is descriptive and not normative. For example, it does not exclude, that in bad cases, the content of different, espoused and lived, values might – unfortunately – be unethical, or dysfunctional (under the list item 'Other'). Moreover, if the negative values would in given bad cases meet the will, acceptance and support of followers, leadership might – unfortunately, and paradoxically – be 'authentic' and 'credible' in doing bad. Consequently, there is a danger of potential misuse of leadership tools (see, for example the problem of pseudo-transformational leadership, Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999, and narcissistic leadership, Alhasnawi & Abbas, 2021). I personally share the view that the danger of potential misuse should only multiply the efforts of scholars, administrators, and others related to present and report on concepts and examples of ethical and functional uses, and to fight against the danger and realities of misuse.

Values perspectives in Leadership are essential in further studies and clarifications of the (theoretical and practical) line between Management and Leadership, because Management is often associated with conventional tools of administration and cognitive/rational excellence in solving organizational problems and achieving goals, while Leadership is often linked with the use of non-conventional means of influence and, consequently, the representation/infusion of values behind rational solutions and factual results.

Table 1: An illustrative framework of certain dimensions of Leadership as Values Work (LaVW)

Types of values to be represented/infused (Dimensions 1-5)	Generic components of leaders' *values work* (Dimension 6)	Given level of consistency of values between leader and followers/group (Dimension 7)	Role options of the leader in value representation (Dimension 8)	*Authenticity* of the leader's behavior as perceived by the followers (Dimension 9)	Impact on the *credibility* of the leader (Dimension 10)
Content characteristics: • Ethical, e. g. values of *Ethical Leadership* and related values of *Servant, Transformational Leadership* • Spiritual, e. g. values of *Spiritual Leadership* • Functional, e. g. related values of *Contingency and Strategic Leadership* (including values supporting specific strategic directions like lean-orientation, change resilience, customer orientation, etc.) • Other Universality: • universal • local Multiplicity and diversity: • numerous, diverse • less numerous, less diverse Origin: • imported • intra-organizational Prevalence: • historical • emerging, actual	Inner values work: Intra-personal work of the leader on conceptualization, harmonization, and operationalization of own, owners'/governors', and other stakeholders' and generic social values.				
	Fundamental values work: Moving / participating in the moving of dynamic group / organizational processes of identifying / constructing, further elaborating, and sharing values.	High consistency Low consistency	*Values work* dominated by a *representation of followers' values.* *Values work* dominated by an i*nfusion of (*alternative*) values.*	High / Low	Positive / Negative
	Applied values work: Using values as guiding principles in solving problems and achieving goals.		*Idiosyncrasy credit* gained by the leader from the group, allowing the leader to infuse alternative values.		

5 Conclusion

The primary goal of this study was to outline certain generic dimensions of values work. For identifying generic dimensions, a broad definition of leadership as values work (LaVW) was used, and an illustrative framework showing the dimensions in a logical structure was created. The targeted results have been obtained through a historical review and analysis of several underlying theoretical concepts and generalizations from values-related leadership approaches.

Leadership is traditionally defined from perspectives of power/influence, while values representation can be conceived as another definition perspective (Humphrey, 2014). As noted earlier the two aspects are highly interrelated. This paper emphasizes the – by the literature –relatively neglected values-representation perspective and approaches leadership as values work (LaVW). The description of LaVW offered by this paper is based on an extended and generalized interpretation of the 'values representation' leadership definition perspective by Humphrey (2014). Furthermore, the present study contributes to the literature by outlining certain generic values-work dimensions with references to underlying theories, as well as by offering a structure and an illustrative framework for these dimensions. Such dimensions include the following: characteristics of the values represented; values-profiles consistencies between leaders and followers; components of values-representation leadership behaviors; role distributions in values-representation processes; authenticity of related leadership behaviors; and credibility implications of values-representation.

A conclusion from this study is that generic problems of leadership values and values related work deserve more attention in future research. There is a need for more generalizations that go beyond analyses of the relationship between specific types/sets of values with specifically related values-oriented practices and leadership influence. Such generalizations are needed for a better understanding of the leadership phenomenon, moreover, for further developing the definition(s) of leadership from a values/values-work perspective.

A practical conclusion of this paper is for leaders for whom it is necessary to find a balance and synergies between values representation and power/influence perspectives while pursuing their different political, economic, social etc. goals in practice.

Literature

Akter, K. M., Tang, S. M., & Adnan, Z. (2021). Transformational leadership and quality of work life: A mediation model of trust climate. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, *19*(4), 161-174. http://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.19(4).2021.14

Alhasnawi, H. H., & Abbas, A. A. (2021). Narcissistic Leadership and Workplace Deviance: A Moderated Mediation Model of Organizational Aggression and Workplace Hostility. *Organizacija*, *54*(4). https://doi.org/10.2478/orga-2021-0023

Antonakis, J., & Day, D. D. (2018). *The Nature of Leadership*. Thousand Oaks (California): Sage Publications.

Avolio, Bruce, J., & Yammarino, Francis, J (2013). *Transformational and charismatic leadership: the road ahead*. Bingley (UK): Emerald.

Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 315-338. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.001

Bachmann, B. (2016). *Ethical Leadership in Organizations. Concepts and Implementation*. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.

Barnard, Ch. (1938). *The functions of the executive.* Cambridge. MA, Harvard University Press.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. *Research in Organizational Change and Development,* 4, 231-272.

Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008). *Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research and Managerial Applications.* New York, London, Toronto, Sydney: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational Leadership.* Mahwah, New Jersey, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bass B. M. & Steidlmeier P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership. *Leadership Quarterly,* 10(2), 181-217. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00016-8

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders. The Strategies for Taking Charge*. Harper Perennial. A Division of HarperCollins Publishers.

Bilgetürk, M. & Baykal, E. (2021). How does Perceived Organizational Support Affect Psychological Capital? The Mediating Role of Authentic Leadership. *Organizacija*, 54(1), 82-95. https://doi.org/10.2478/orga-2021-0006

Birnbaum, R. (2013). Genes, Memes, and the Evolution of Human Leadership. In Rumsey, M. G. (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership* (pp. 243-266). Oxford, UK, New York, etc:. Oxford University Press.

Brown M. E., & Trevino, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 595-616. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004

Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and Leadership in Organizations*. London: Sage.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Carlson, D. S., & Perrewe, P. L. (1995). Institutionalization of organizational ethics through transformational leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 14(10), 829-838. https://www.academia.edu/2367196/Institutionalization_of_organizational_ethics_through_transformational_leadership?from=cover_page

Ciulla, J. B. (1998). *Ethics, the heart of leadership*. Westport CT: Greenwood.

Coetzer, M. F., Bussin, M., & Geldenhuys, M. (2017). The functions of a servant leader. *Administrative Sciences*, 7 1 5. http://doi.org/10.3390/admsci7010005

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). Charismatic Leadership in Organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Demirtas, O. (2015). Ethical leadership influence at organizations. Evidence from the field. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 126(2), 273-284. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1950-5

Dorfman, P. W., Hanges, P. J., & Brodbeck, F. C. (2004). Leadership and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed leadership profiles. In House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., Gupta, V., & Associates (Eds.), *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies* (pp. 669-722). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fayol, H. (1949). *General and Industrial Management*. Pitman.

Freund, L. (2017). *Transformational Leadership and Ethical Values. A Philosophical Approach*. München: GRIN Verlag.

Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14(6), 693-727. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.09.001

Gardner, J. W. (1990). *On Leadership*. New York: The Free Press.

Gehman, J. (2021). Searching for values in practice-driven institutionalism: practice theory, institutional logics, and values work, *Research in the Sociology of Organizations,* 70, 139–159. https://doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X20200000070004

Gehman, J., Trevino, L. K., & Garud, R. (2013). Values work: a process study of the emergence and performance of organizational values practices. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(1), 84-112. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.0628

Gill, R. (2011). *Theory and Practice of Leadership*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Gini, A. (1998). Moral leadership and business ethics. In Ciulla, J. B. *Ethics, the Heart of Leadership* (pp. 27-46). Westport CT: Greenwood

Goethals, G. R., Sorenson, G. J., & Burns, J. M. (2004). *Encyclopedia of Leadership*. Thousand Oaks (California): Sage Publications.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness.* New York, NY: Paulist Press.

Greenleaf, R. K., & Spears, L. C. (1996). *The Power of Servant Leadership: Essays*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Grint, K.; Jones, O. S., & Holt, C. (2017). What is Leadership: Person, Result, position, Purpose or Process or All or None of These? In: Storey, J., Hartley, J., Denis, J-L., „t Hart, P., & Ulrich, D. (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Leadership* (pp 3-20). New York and London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Hogg, M. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5, 184-200.

Hogg. M., & van Knippenberg, D. (2003). Social identity and leadership processes in groups. In: Zanna, M. (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology,* 35, 1-52. San Diego (California): Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1207%2FS15327957PSPR0503_1

Hollander, E. P. (1958). Conformity, status, and idiosyncrasy credit. *Psychological Review*, 65, 117-127. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/h0042501

House, R. J. (1976). A 1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership. In: Hunt, J. G., & Larson, L. L. (Eds.), *Leadership: The Cutting Edge* (pp. 189-207). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

House, R. J., & Aditya, R. M. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo Vadis? *Journal of Management,* 23, 409-473. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(97)90037-4

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, Leadership and Organizations. The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies.* Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

House, R. J. & Javidane, M. (2004). Overview of GLOBE. In House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., Gupta, V., & Associates (Eds.), *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies* (pp. 9-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. p. 15.

Humphrey, R. H. (2014). *Effective Leadership. Theory, Cases and Applications*. Los Angeles etc.: Sage.

Hunt, J. G., & Larson, L. L. (Eds.) (1976). *Leadership: The Cutting Edge*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Kanungo, R. N. (2001). Ethical values of transactional and transformational leaders. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 18(4), 257-265. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1936-4490.2001.tb00261.x

Klenke, K. (2007). Authentic Leadership: A Self, Leader, and Spiritual Identity Perspective. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 3(1), 68-97. School of Leadership Studies, Regent University. https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/ijls/new/vol3iss1/klenke/Klenke_IJLS_V3Is1.pdf

Korazija, M., Zizek, S., & Mumel, D. (2016). The Relationship between Spiritual Intelligence and Work Satisfaction among Leaders and Employees. *Naše gospodarstvo/Our economy,* 62 (2), http://doi.org/10.1515/ngoe-2016-0012

Kotter, J. (1990). What Leaders Really Do. *Harvard Business Review*, May-June 1990, 103-111.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1987). *The Leadership Challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1995). *The Leadership Challenge: How to keep getting extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The Leadership Practices Inventory: Theory and evidence behind the five practices of exemplary leaders*, Wiley.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2011). *Credibility. How leaders gain and lose it. Why people demand it.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kraatz, M. S. (Ed.). (2015). *Institutions and Ideals: Philip Selznick's Legacy for Organizational Studies (Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Vol. 44)*. Bingley (UK), Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Kriger, M. & Seng, Y. (2005). Leadership with inner meaning: A contingency theory of leadership based on the worldviews of five religions, *Leadership Quarterly*, 16(5), 771-806. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.07.007

Lašáková, A., Bajzíková, L., & Blahunková, I. (2019). Values oriented leadership – Conceptualization and preliminary results in Slovakia, *Verslas: Teorija ir Praktika / Business: Theory and Practice*, 20, 259-269. https://doi.org/10.3846/btp.2019.25

Lebow, R., & Simon W. L. (1997). *Lasting change: the shared values process that makes companies great*. Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 161-177. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.006

Marič, M., Gerdej, T., Penger, S., Jereb, E., Žnidaršič, J., & Đurica, N. (2013). Human Resources Annual Interview as a Part of Authentic Leadership. *Organizacija*, 46(2), 55-63. https://doi.org/10.2478/orga-2013-0005

Nanus, B. (1992). *Visionary Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Navia, J. M. A., Plazas, E. R., & Diaz, Y. C. (2019). Leadership and social responsibility from the perspective of gender. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, *17*(2), 303-312. http://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.17(2).2019.23

Northouse, P. G. (2018). *Leadership: Theory and Practice.* Thousand Oaks (California): SAGE Publications.

Northouse, P. G. (2019). *Leadership: Theory and Practice.* Thousand Oaks (California): SAGE Publications.

Palframan, J. T., Lancaster, B. L. (2019). Workplace Spirituality and Person–Organization Fit Theory: Development of a Theoretical Model. *Journal of Human Values*, 25(3), 133-149. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0971685819861216

Prilleltensky, I. (2000). Value-based leadership in organizations: balancing values, interests, and power among citizens, workers, and leaders. *Ethics & Behavior,* 10(2), 139-158. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327019EB1002_03

Quinn, R. E., Faerman, S. R., Thompson, M. P., & McGrath, M. R. (1990). *Becoming a master manager – A competency framework*. New York etc.: John Wiley and Sons.

Raffaelli, R., & Glynn, A. (2015). What's so institutional about leadership? Leadership mechanisms of value infusion. In: Kraatz, M. S. (Ed.), *Institutions and Ideals: Philip Selznick's Legacy for Organizational Studies (Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Vol. 44)* (pp. 283-316). Bingley (UK): Emerald Group Publishing https://scholar.google.hu/scholar?hl=hu&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=raffaelli+glynn+2015&btnG=

Raffaelli, R. & DeJordy, R. **(2018):** *Institutional resilience and the complementarity of entrepreneurship and guardianship in the Swiss watchmaking industry*. Working Paper. Boston, Harvard Business School.

Raitis, J., Sasaki, I., & Kotlar, J. (2021). System-Spanning Values Work and Entrepreneurial Growth in Family Firms. *Journal of Management Studies,* 58(1), http://doi.org/10.1111/joms.1265

Riasudeen S., Singh P. (2021). Leadership Effectiveness and Psychological Well-being: The Role of Workplace Spirituality. *Journal of Human Values*. 27(2), 109-125. http://doi.org/10.1177/0971685820947334

Rumsey, M. G. (2013). Introduction: Leadership in five parts. In Rumsey, M. G. (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership* (pp. 1-10). Oxford, New York, etc.: Oxford University Press.

Rumsey, M. G. (Ed.) (2013). *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership.* Oxford, New York, etc.: Oxford University Press.

Schein, E. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in administration: a sociological interpretation*. Evanston, (Illinois): RowPeterson.

Stogdill, R. M. (1950): Leadership, membership, and organization. *Psychological Bulletin*, 47(1), 1-14. http://doi.org/10.1037/h0053857

Storey, J., Hartley, J., Denis, J-L., 't Hart, P., & Ulrich, D. (eds.) (2017). *The Routledge Companion to Leadership*. New York and London: Routledge, Taylor &

Francis Group.

Tichy, N. M., & Devanna, M. A. (1990). *The transformational leader*. New York: John Wiley

Vaccario, A., & Palazzo, G. (2014). Values against violence: institutional change in societies dominated by organized crime. *Academy of Management Journal*, 2014, July. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.0865

Valldeneu, M., Ferràs, X., & Tarrats-Pons, E. (2021). Transformational behaviors: Increasing work engagement in multinational environments. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, *19*(2), 519-527. http://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.19(2).2021.41

Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis *Journal of Management,* 37(4), 1228-1261. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0149206310380462

Van Dierendonck, D., & Patterson, K. (Eds.) (2018). *Practicing Servant Leadership. Developments in Implementation*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Weber, M. (1968). *Economy and Society*. Edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich, New York: Bedminster Press.

Weber, M. (1946). Politics as a Vocation, In *Essays in Sociology* (pp. 77-128). New York: Oxford University Press.

Winston, B. E., & Patterson, K. (2006): An Integrative Definition of Leadership. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 1 (2), 6-66. School of Leadership Studies, Regent University. http://www.rodrigoselback.com.br/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/An-Integrative-Definition-of-Leadership.pdf

Wright, A. L., Irving, G., & Thevatas, K. S. (2020). Professional Values and Managerialist Practices: Values work by nurses in the emergency department, *Organization Studies*, 2020-09-09. http://doi.org/10.1177/0170840620950079

Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in Organizations*. Upper Saddle River (New Jersey): Prentice Hall, 564 p.

Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in Organizations*. Global Edition. Edinburgh Gate, Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

János Fehér, Dr. habil. (PhD) is Honorary Professor of Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary, Budapest where he teaches Management and HRM related subjects. He earned his doctoral degree in Business Administration and Organisation from Szent István University, a legal predecessor of Hungarian University of Agriculture and Life Sciences (MATE) where he holds an Affiliated Professor position. He served as Associate Professor and Program Director at IMC/International Management Center (the first Graduate School of Business in the CEE region, in affiliation with the University of Pittsburgh PA); and Visiting Associate Professor at Temple University Philadelphia PA, CWRU Cleveland OH, and Budapest Corvinus University. He has been a Consultant/MD Program Director/Trainer for leading Hungarian and international companies.

Oris določenih generičnih vrednosti – dimenzij dela

Ozadje/namen: Vprašanja, povezana z vrednotami, so zadnjih nekaj desetletjih prišla v središče razmišljanja o vodenju. Zdi se pa paradoksalno, zakaj wrednote dela doslej niso bile v večji meri uporabljene za definiranje in konceptualizacijo vodenja. Razlog za to je lahko, da vrednotno usmerjeni raziskovalni tokovi običajno pristopajo k vodenju s specifičnih vidikov predstavljanja in prenosa vrednot. Druga možnost je, da ta študija preučuje delo vrednot z splošnega vidika; njen cilj je predlagati posplošeno pojmovanje vrednotnega dela in orisati nekatere generične vrednotno-delovne dimenzije.

Metode: Analiza v tem teoretičnem prispevku temelji predvsem na institucionalnih teorijah, teorijah novega vodenja in teorijah vrednot. Metode vključujejo argumentacijo in razvoj analitičnega okvira.

Rezultati: V študiji smo opredelili strukturiran seznam in ilustrativni okvir za nekatere razsežnosti delovanja vrednot, kot so široko opredeljene. Zato ima ta študija raziskovalne implikacije glede vprašanj vpliva vodenja in razmejitve vodenja od upravljanja.

Zaključek: Poudarjen je pomen zastopanja vrednot v nasprotju s perspektivami moči/vpliva pri vodenju. Naša študija kaže na potrebo po več raziskavah o generičnih vidikih delovanja vrednot. Rezultati se lahko uporabijo tudi za vodenje, svetovanje in razvoj.

Ključne besede: *Vodenje, Perspektiva moči/vpliva, Novo vodenje, Zastopanje vrednot sledilcev, Institucionalna teorija, Vrednotno usmerjeno vodenje*