Leadership: The Aristotelian and the Machiavellian Leadership Attributes in "Black Swan" Periods

Argiro Trogaidou, Sotiria Triantari

Department of Management Science and Technology, University of Western Macedonia, Koila Kozanis, Greece

trogaidou@gmail.com; striantari@yahoo.gr

Abstract. Aristotle and Machiavelli were two philosophers who, with their views, tried to influence modern politicians to form an ideal political environment. As expected, much of the academic community has attempted to simulate the political environment of a state with that of a modern organization and thus to parallel the behaviors of a political leader with those of an organizational leader. The leadership literature has attempted to use their work in order to make it applicable to modern organizations. Despite the extent analysis on both philosophers there is a gap relating to the leadership attributes that can be applied in "black swan" periods. The recent economic and health crisis in the last decades have put increased value in these unstable periods since a lot of companies have lost their competitive advantage or have even closed. These periods are extremely difficult for the companies since they are out of the ordinary way of operating creating problems in both the personnel and the company's profits. This study through a bibliographical analysis of the philosophers' views in conjunction with other management and leadership theories, capturing the characteristics that are vital for the business in order to remain viable during these unstable periods. The final outcomes are not only applicable to these periods since the purpose of the company is to remain viable after the "black swan" events are over, rejecting all opportunistic and short-term characteristics that harm the company in the long term.

Keywords: Aristotle, Machiavelli, Leadership, Organization, Behavior, Black Swan

1. Introduction

A "wise man" is able to distinguish which way is more suitable for achieving the goals at the individual and collective levels. The leader should choose the most appropriate method to carry out procedures in his organization or his group (Small, 2011). This way is based on the principles and values of the society in which the leader operates. The orator's ethos provides the audience with the acceptance of the speaker that is required for his words to be believable and accepted by the audience. To perform persuasion, the orator must have principles in addition to arguments, and he must stimulate the emotions of his audience through "psychological persuasion" (Goleman, 2006). Therefore, these attributes, "logic" and "psychological persuasion" are the building blocks of enhancing the emotional intelligence of the leader, affecting positively the organization's performance.

Leaders who do not have the acceptance of their audience will face serious problems when circumstances require them to do so. Leaders should have that kind of behavior that, even if it is strict, does not become oppressive for the whole organization. This is achieved if he can inspire, communicate and convince his subordinates for the importance of the vision and convince them that all his actions should be collectively aimed at the common perceived vision (Christ, 1998).

People are easily convinced of the need for change, but it is extremely difficult to persuade them to take the necessary steps to make it a reality. "Black swan" events, like the recent pandemic of "Covid-19" in the early 20s, are the most difficult periods for leadership. The company's personnel may need a new guidance, vision and a people centric behavior is required from the leader due to the unexpected circumstances. On the other hand, the company's economy becomes unstable, urging for measures that need to be taken to sustain the company's viability. According to Parameswar et al (2021), many behaviors from the actors which affect organization performance in "black swan" events have not been approached from researchers. Therefore, the exploration of leadership under the Aristotelian and Machiavellian perspective adds to the existing leadership literature especially on times on uncertainty.

The world of business and human resource management shares many similarities, and in both cases, the leader is the one who performs the most crucial role concerning the output of the result. Company owners should invest in training leaders in order to get the most out of their staff (Christopher and Smith, 1993). Most management theories imply that when employees feel appreciated or involved in management, they perform more efficiently (Steckler and Fondas, 1995). The thin line between the modern company's profit-focused strategies according to the Machiavellian perspective in conjunction with the Aristotle's human focus will be examined especially in periods of great external environment changes.

This study aims to illustrate the characteristics of a leader according to both Aristotle's philosophy and Machiavelli's perception when the company needs to be concentrated parallelly on the target and the people's wellness. The pressure for achieving both of these elements is more evident when a "Black Swan" event occurs. This research through a bibliographical approach illustrates the characteristics of the leader in "black swan" periods based on the views of Aristotle and Machiavelli. A discreet analysis of Aristotle and Machiavelli provides the necessary inputs for the combined examination of the above characteristics.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Aristotle's Leadership Characteristics

The first intake focuses on Aristotle's writings in "Politics" and "Nicomachean Ethics," which present the attributes of a great leader while emphasis is given to the importance of rhetoric and ethics in leadership. This perspective clearly focuses on the relations and the ethical attributes within the state or the organization. The contemporary leader must have three characteristics: first, he must be loyal to the governance established by the many, second, he must be capable in the performance of his duties, and third, he must be virtuous and just.

In the modern view of leadership, this is reflected in the view that the leader must follow the values and principles of the organization and have all the necessary qualifications to make the most appropriate decisions (Bourandas, 2005). The definition of the leader by Aristotle in his work "Politics" is quite general, but in " Nicomachean Ethics " extensive reference is made to the roles of both the leader and the rest of the citizens, in other words, the members of the organization.

According to Aristotle's perspective every person, whether is a leader or not, must have certain virtues that are certain states of the soul. Aristotle divides virtues into two types. Intellectual virtues assist in knowing the truth and can be taught, whereas moral virtues are primarily acquired by young people through their experiences. "Prudence" is one of the most important intellectual virtues as it has a catalytic effect on leadership. Aristotle described a virtuous and prudent type of leader, in whom the intellectual virtue of prudence is critical for political science understanding and practice (Triantari, 2020). This element applies in every environment and circumstance (including the "black swan" periods) and was adopted by the early modern theories of leadership, such as the "trait theory" (Stogdill, 1948).

In addition, a leader according to Aristotle should have excellent rhetoric abilities (Triantari, 2020). According to Plato, Aristotle's teacher, rhetoric as an art is primarily deceptive and condemnable because it promotes what appears believable and serves the rhetorician's interests. Additionally, Plato it offers only emotional thrills and touches the issues superficially, not in-depth (Molina & Spicer, 2004). Aristotle did not reject his teacher's views, claiming that rhetoric may be valuable if applied effectively. Aristotle does not emphasize just on the goal of rhetoric, which is persuasion, but he emphasizes the use of arguments from all possible points of view. Rhetoric, based on the "contingent model" that should distinguish each leader, should aim at the final solution based on the arguments rather than a preset conclusion. To achieve this goal, the arguments should be comprehensive and contain all possible outcomes without prejudice or expediency. Therefore, leaders must be adaptive and have increased communicative skills that persuade their audiences with logical arguments regarding the decisions that have to be made.

Regarding the selection of the arguments, the philosopher clarified that the speaker should not extract his arguments from all viewpoints, but only from those approved by the audience or from people respected by the listeners, or from an opinion shared by all or most people. Furthermore, the conclusion should be formed not just from true premises, but also from statements that prove to be true most of the time (Triantari, 2020).

In an organizational environment, each person has a unique identity based on personal perceptions and aspirations. When they coexist within an organization, they form a common identity of shared perceptions among all members of the organization. This common identity is necessary for the smooth operation of the team in order to increase its efficiency (Ackerman, 2000). Therefore, the leadership must know this common identity and communicate the messages to the rest of the organization that satisfy the common needs and aspirations, having in mind that the personal needs of each member must be met too (Burke, 1969). That is why leaders who want to have excellent communication with their subordinates make sure that the members of the organization embrace the corporate's common identity and that their personal needs do not exceed the capabilities of the organization.

Aristotle explains the unique role of the leader in Rhetoric through the personality of the orator, emphasizing among other things his multidimensional education and the moral nature of his physiognomy, which is preeminently founded on judgment and emotional intelligence. The orator and leader use judgment to promote the good and just while preventing the bad and unjust (Triantari, 2020). Therefore, from the trait theory perspective, education and fair judgement add up to the effective leader's characteristics (Locke, 1997).

In conclusion, the orator's communication methods and approaches represent the abilities of the leader, who aims to reach and convince a group of people. A significant characteristic of the leader that is also emphasized in current definitions of leadership is his ability, which comes under the ability of

the orator, to influence the thoughts, choices, and actions of a small or big group with his personality (Lord et al, 1986).

2.2 The Ethos of the Leader as A Source of Inspiration and Motivation in Modern Organizations.

Aristotle, who actually created the first communication model, believed that leaders should be able, through their rhetoric and actions, to shape people so that they are virtuous and act by following their leader's actions. The virtue of the good citizen is separated from that of the good man, as he considered that a man may not be good and virtuous but may be a good citizen. According to Aristotle, the virtue of a good citizen is a characteristic that ordinary citizens should have in order for the city to have a good policy. Similarly, leaders in organizations do not seek people who are necessarily ethical, but who are effective in their personal and collective work. Nevertheless, recent research has analyzed the importance of shaping the character and behaviors of the organization's members and the leader, as this ability is an important task that must be performed for an organization to be successful (Du Gay et al., 2018).

As far as the skills of the leader are concerned, the persuasion and inspiration of the audience are, according to the Stagirite philosopher, the most basic requirements. These attributes exist only when the orator is moral. To effectively motivate his subordinates in business, a leader must be grounded in principles in order to persuade them of the significance of the common goal. The moral principles described by Aristotle in "Nicomachean Ethics " help people act in certain situations. Ethics, however, is not based on specific rules of behavior so that it can be measured and applied. Furthermore, morality cannot be used as a baseline to generate modes of conduct as a result (Lear,1988, p. 158). The leader is the one who must have relevant experience and lead a virtuous life so that he can advise others on how they should act. According to Aristotle, ethics is not something that is taught. For example, young people can be taught morality, but this takes time because it is taught through experiences and addiction to moral actions. Therefore, in order to promote ethical principles, the leader should be a role model for others and, through example, "teach" them ethics. Of course, Aristotle suggests that ethics is addressed only to people who have a virtuous life (Lear, 1988, pp. 159-1157). For the rest who are not virtuous, moral actions have no meaning and teach them nothing (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

To inspire and motivate others, a leader must set a positive example for the rest of the company (Waldman, 1987). The employees who do not adhere to the ideals are regarded as a foreign body by the organization and are no longer considered as a member of it. Even if these employees are not removed, the leader, based on certain beliefs and values, will be unable to motivate them due to their different ways of thinking and acting. Therefore, the leader's ethics positively affect the organization and inspire others when the leader puts the collective interest above his own adjusting it accordingly if needed.

Businesses and their leaders that do not act ethically and put their interests over the common good are acting outside of Aristotelian thought. According to Aristotle, leaders should act for the "right reason," which means they should pay attention not just to the final product but also to the method by which they reach the final result. As a result, leaders should focus on ensuring that the methods they adopt are ethical and, based on this ethical correctness, pursue the results that will make their lives and the life of the company virtuous. A solution that is not founded on widely recognized principles may produce short-term benefits, but it will affect the company in the long run by lowering motivation (Boegershausen et al., 2015).

According to Aristotelian thought, morality is of essential significance since virtuous behavior enhances the relationships within a society, organization, or group. The orator's ethos, which affects the whole organization, has the effect of increasing trust inside the company and mutual respect among executives. Individual ambitions are stifled by the leader's morals, which support common aims and beliefs (Schneider & Chein, 2003). Eudemonia which is generated inside has a favorable influence on the external environment because the organization's reputation improves and the organization becomes

more appealing to both clients and potential workers.

2.3 The Machiavellian Leadership Characteristics for Effective Leadership

Machiavelli's classic work on leadership is still relevant today despite the time that has passed (Callanan, 2004). Machiavelli's work "The Prince" focuses on gaining and maintaining power with an authoritarian perspective but his teachings provide deeper insights to the modern management world (Swain, 2002). Unlike Aristotle, morality is not a leading attribute for the leader; rather, the leader's approach breaches morality norms with the ultimate goal of personal profit depending on the circumstances. This perspective is popularly known as "Machiavellianism". "Machiavellianism", although it has received criticism from time to time due to the lack of morality and the use of violence by the leader, it was not presented by Machiavelli because he was immoral himself but because this is how societies historically acted in the period of his lifetime.

Machiavelli's views were known for their application in the political field and were introduced into the field of business later, where it was found that the characteristics of political leaders also applied to leaders in the field of business (Buskirk, 1974). According to Triantari (2020), Machiavellian leaders use deceptive, manipulating and undermining methods to achieve their goals and are more evident in modern times where a crisis in ethics is observed. The research done in the previous decades analyzing state leaders can essentially be considered a natural beginning of the research on business leaders, as both the political and the business parts deal with essentially the same thing, the effective exercise of leadership (Jay, 1994).

According to Ramsey (2000), modern organizations do not follow the Aristotelian view of democratic market management but mostly act competitively with each other, seeking to obtain the largest possible share and maximize their profits. On the other hand, according to the same researcher, there are suggestions that the political leader, as analyzed by Machiavelli, cannot be paralleled with the CEO of a business since the political system is an environment with greater complexity than that of a business. Nevertheless, the globalization of trade combined with the changing conditions in the modern economic firmament give businesses the complexity that initially inspired the Italian thinker at the political level. According to Greider (1998), the balance sheets of multinational companies are now so large that in several cases they exceed the domestic gross product of several developing countries. This rise in size and complexity has made Machiavelli and other philosophers who analyzed leadership at the political level relevant in the modern business arena.

In terms of leadership efficacy, Machiavelli claimed that a successful leader can adjust to changes in the environment, but an ineffective leader cannot adapt to new scenarios and environmental changes (Machiavelli, 2014). As a result, the leader is the one who sets the amount of his efficacy by his actions. According to the Florentine writer, fortune should not be expected to come to the leader without first attempting to obtain it. The leader should be active and dynamic so that when opportunities occur, they are exploited accordingly. Therefore, the great leaders who made radical changes in their societies, like the Israelites when they were guided by Moses to exit Egypt, seized the opportunity and this action was successful mainly due their abilities (Machiavelli, 2014). This attribute of adaptivity in conjunction with the intervening role of a leader are considered basic for the Italian writer, especially in periods of great instability that are explored in this research.

Machiavelli's leadership style can provide characteristics to modern leaders using Aristotle's perceptions regarding "contingencies." In today's businesses operating in an environment of intense global competition, Machiavelli's theory can be applied on a case-by-case basis. According to Peteraf et al. (2019), when the time to make the decision is limited and the knowledge inside the organization, other than the leader's, is limited, the directive style is indicated as an effective way of leading. Of course, the main differentiation of Machiavelli in comparison to Aristotle is that the Machiavelli's leadership style includes immoral actions that need to be performed in order for the leader to accomplish

his/her goals. This perspective suits many times in todays competitive and immoral world where profit is placed above morality and operates in contradiction to Aristotle's believes (Triantari, 2020).

Also, the authoritarian and directive styles can be applied in situations where the organization is going through a crisis and all the members, due to the criticality of the situation, expect from the leader to give them directions on how to act (Muczyk and Steel, 1998). In these environments, the Machiavellian leadership style may be more effective than other leadership styles. Of course, it should be taken into account that the leader who applies this leadership style will have reflected on the new social conditions prevailing in the 21st century and should have adapted the Machiavellian leadership model accordingly. The laws of today are not the same as those that existed five hundred years ago and violence is not a mean generally accepted by society. Therefore, the leader reflecting on today and its differences from the time of Machiavelli should adapt his management style while reflecting on the internal and external environment of his organization.

Of course, one leadership style may not match every situation. Leaders frequently adjust their leadership style based on the situation and apply the characteristics associated with different leadership styles each time (Fiedler and House, 1994). As for the Machiavellian model of leadership, its application in different situations, i.e., in an environment where the extraction of an innovative solution is required, will not be efficient (Peteraf et al., 2019), but some of its characteristics can be used in a crisis or a "Black swan event" by the leader.

2.4 Machiavellian Leadership Perspective Related to The Leaders' Virtues and Communication Skills

Machiavelli suggested that people do not change their character during their lifetime. He suggested that all men are born and live identically and that this human nature should be known by every leader who wishes to maintain his power. Knowing human nature allows the leader to choose how to behave. According to Machiavelli, leaders should behave mainly based on fear and not based on love and acceptance from his followers. Of course, there is also a limit to hatred, which the leader should be careful not to provoke in his subordinates. Therefore, the leader should know the limits of his strictness and, with appropriate methods, manage to become more communicative with his followers to prevent him from becoming hated.

Machiavelli was highly placed in administrative positions of the city of Florence, where he lived, and through his work "The Prince", he tried to transmit the knowledge he obtained from his tenure (Harris, 2001). Through his experiences at that time, he proposed that a leader who can rule should have two virtues: "virtue" and "fortune" (Machiavelli, 2014). The first captures the courage and mental strength that must be possessed by the leader to be able to cope with any rivalry and difficulty. It is not only a characteristic of the leader, but he should also ensure that the city he governs has the corresponding virtue on a collective level. To achieve this, the leader must have ensured that the polity does not change, that the citizens apply and respect the laws, that freedom and the prevailing religion are ensured, and that the city's army is sufficient not only to defend friendly territories but also to extend to the neighboring ones (Plamenatz et al., 1992). Therefore, the strong personality of the leader puts into practice the administration he chooses and is what essentially differentiates him from ancient philosophers who focus on ideal states, such as Plato's "Republic". The second virtue is "luck", which is necessary for the leader to recover his power from there but is not sufficient in itself to achieve his goals (House et al., 2001).

The leader, according to Machiavelli, must keep a balance between luck and virtue. Any leader who has gained and maintains his power based on luck then it is only a matter of time before he loses it. These two virtues increase the power of the leader, which results in property, positions, and troops. This view is in complete contrast to the Aristotelian philosophy, where material goods not only should concern the leader but additionally can negatively affect his ethics. The two virtues analyzed, "virtue" and "fortune", as they are understood are perfectly connected. Leaders who have the necessary mental

strength have the potential to succeed, as opposed to those who fail due to a lack of the required fortitude and luck.

Additionally, Machiavelli proposed that the ability of the leader to enforce the application of laws as a key characteristic of leadership. The application of laws according to Machiavelli can be performed in two different states. The Florentine writer was against the oligarchic polity proposed by Aristotle and suggested that cities should be governed either autocratically or democratically. The mode of governance depends on the level of corruption present in each city. In particular, absolutism fits a corrupt state, as he believed Florence was in his time. Accordingly, democracy is appropriate when there is no corruption and political stability. But democracy was an unlikely situation for him, as he believed that people always act according to their interests and seek to dominate the rest. Thus, he essentially suggested that the republican political system was practically ineffective.

The polities according to the Machiavellian point of view, make a full circle that essentially ends up in the absolutist style of leadership that, according to Machiavelli, is preferable. The cycle of states begins with the monarch, who governs the state in an ideal way, but the next generations, who do not have the skills of the monarch lead the city to decline. In periods of decline, the few become stronger when they overthrow the government and shape it into an oligarchic one, and then the people revolt and establish a democratic government. Personal ambitions in turn erode democracy with the result that the political order is lost, and this situation is corrected by the reintroduction of the monarchy. This circular view has also been observed in companies where the founder of a large company initially manages his organization ideally. The heirs then take over the company, and after years of mismanagement, the business either goes bankrupt or is rescued by another leader who runs the business. Therefore, the leader should always keep this cycle in mind and take the necessary actions in order to avoid the decline of his organization.

Regarding the selfish approach of the citizens, Machiavelli seems to have the same opinion as the Stagerite philosopher regarding the importance of the law implementation. For the implementation of laws, Machiavelli considers that citizens' interests trump the public's, therefore the role of the authoritarian leader is necessary as no one else can enforce the law. To achieve this, the leader must act with rigor, which is applied only due the need to enforce order. Therefore, the authoritarian leader does not seek to satisfy his personal needs but, through strictness, aims for the good of the state. There are times when the leader dislikes this strict and often inhumane behavior, but it is the only solution to bring unethical people to their senses. Therefore, strictness is an attribute that can be applied in crises where the law implementation is crucial for the company.

Communication skills and attitudes are weapons of the Machiavellian leader, as apart from the impartiality and rigor required to apply the laws of the state, the power of the leader relies on the people. By extension, the Machiavellian business leader relies on his employees. According to "The Prince" leaders who have been placed in power because of their acceptance by other powerful leaders but do not have the acceptance of their audience will face serious problems when circumstances require the people or workers to support the leader. On the contrary, when the leader has the acceptance of his subordinates, the government or administration acquires stability. Leaders should have that kind of behavior that, even if it is strict, does not become oppressive for the whole organization. The first goal of every leader should be to be accepted by his subordinates. This is achieved if he can communicate his vision to all stakeholders and through his decisions and actions, show them that decisions aim at the common good (Kotter, 2012a).

For Machiavelli, the vision of every leader should be to stop being as a leader. To achieve this, all laws must be respected by the citizens, and the state must be able to acquire the corresponding mental strength in a collective context. This would result in people being able to make decisions collectively without needing the mental strength and ability of a leader to do so. Thus, the polity would be transformed into a democratic one, which is the ideal form of polity. Even in the case of a democratic

polity, people should not be inclined to seek power because it results in the re-emergence of corruption within the polity. If that occurs, the state would again look for a leader with similar virtues to be able to impose the laws on the rest of the citizens. Machiavelli, in his work "The Prince", promotes monarchy as the preferred form of government, as he believes that democracies decline over time and that a state that wants to become strong should transition to a monarchy. This view is reflected in the centralized form of leadership where decisions are made by one person, but in the modern environment, this can create delays in decision-making and efficiency (Daft, n.d.).

Regarding the parallelism of the Machiavellian perspective with modern forms of leadership, it is observed that there are many common features with McGregor's leadership theory (1960). According to the theory of X and Y, there are two dominant forms of leadership, as suggested by Machiavelli: the democratic and the autocratic. The choice of leadership style depends solely on the behavior of subordinates. Thus, subordinates who do not show interest, are not interested in the public but only in themselves and do not have critical thinking, must be managed with rigor since this is the only way the organization can be efficient. On the other hand, responsible employees, who are interested in their work and act in accordance with the laws and established principles, should operate in an environment with a democratic leadership style, as they do not require the presence of the directive leader to carry out the assigned projects.

Machiavelli claims that another quality that distinguishes a leader is his ability to promote organizational transformation. According to him, "there is nothing more difficult to manage, more dubious, and more dangerous to execute than change" (Machiavelli, 2014). Those who take on the role of a transformer are divided into those who, in order to achieve it, must convince others and bring them on his/her side and those who can make the change by themselves. For the Florentine writer, people are easily convinced of a change, but it is extremely difficult to urge them act in order to achieve it. For this reason, the leader must use all means, including violence, in order to accomplish change. The leader becomes more efficient when he eliminates all those who are not part of the change he wants to implement.

In forms of leadership, especially those that focus on change, such as transformational leadership, communication is a key tool for each leader to be able to motivate others (Bass & Avolio, 1994). In today's age, the application of the Machiavellian approach is difficult to apply practically. Leaders to convince others and introduce a new change, usually achieve this by implementing specific motivational behaviors and, as a last resort, try to change people who resist the change (Peteraf et al., 2019). Motivation through corresponding behavior by the leader is achieved by identifying the needs and expectations of subordinates and implementing policies that satisfy them. On the other hand, following the Machiavellian approach, replacing staff is not easy to do, as leaders very often run into problems with state laws and business principles. But even to achieve this replacement of employees, the leaders should take into account the time required for the new employees to be able to assimilate the organizational culture of the organization and to help the leaders in the change that they desire. Therefore, the personnel change especially in periods of "black swan" are not recommended.

As far as the communication element is concerned, the Machiavellian approach does not advocate the establishment of alliances and collaborations with other organizations or states; the only collaborations that can be made are through mercenaries. This use of mercenaries is only useful when the city has to deal with other mercenaries (Machiavelli, 2014). In contrast to this approach, modern leadership theories suggest that communication with the external environment is a necessary characteristic of leaders operating in a changing environment, as it increases business efficiency (Yukl, 2012). Machiavelli focuses on maintaining the power exercised by the leader, which is a driving force for cutting off communications and cooperation with other armies. Characteristically in his work "The Prince" he mentions that when states rely on the help of other states then they will be called upon to face two situations. If the allied forces win, they will have a say in the power of the leader's state, while

if the war is lost, they will be in a difficult position as their choice was ineffective. According to the philosopher, alliances have a personal and selfish nature, so the absence of alliances is the optimal solution in each state.

In the field of business, the leader should have the virtue of examining the external environment, and if the competitive advantage cannot be achieved, the leader should make strategic alliances that essentially provide common benefits with the mutual contribution of the required resources (Peteraf et al., 2019). Therefore, the leaders who are the main exponents of the company's strategy should not be based on a competitive strategy with other companies, as suggested by the Machiavellian approach, but have a profit-sharing mentality so that the company invests in long-term efficiency and reduces competition in their industry.

According to Buttery and Richter (2003), the Machiavellian view of isolating the organization from alliances has some drawbacks. Partnerships and mergers offer capabilities to the organization that would be impossible to acquire otherwise, mainly due to a lack of resources. Therefore, an opportunity to gain or enhance competitive advantage may be lost if the leader follows introverted behavior. In the business world, mergers and coalitions may result in the implementation of scale strategies to reduce the operating costs of the business (Peteraf et al., 2019). Even if the organization has the resources to expand into innovative areas, partnerships offer the reduction of investment risk and the retention in the organization of capital reserves that are not available due to the participation of other organizations. Finally, alliances and good relations with a state or organization, even if it is not actively involved in a dispute the city or organization has with a rival organization, provide the security of neutrality that helps the organization focus its efforts on active competition (House et al., 2001). Therefore, even if the alliances are generally desired for an autonomous company, they are vital to handle lack of resources especially in crises.

In conclusion, the Machiavellian approach compared to the modern view of good communication and cooperation between businesses differs in terms of the strategy followed by leaders in an organization. The self-centered and opportunistic strategies proposed by Machiavelli do not suit the complex and interconnected economic environment where businesses focus on creating stable and good relationships in order to gain, but most importantly, maintain their competitive advantage.

3. Combining the Leadership Characteristics in "Black Swan" Periods

In periods of great uncertainty where the need for rapid decisions is necessary, leadership must adjust in order to maintain the efficiency of the organization. The importance of the employees and their commitment to the common cause is vital but different conceived from the Aristotle's and Machiavelli's viewpoint. Both highlight the importance of the employees' support but the way to achieve it is different. Aristotle believes in the ethical approach which requires time and training to achieve it while following the rules of the state. This approach has effect only in virtuous organizations. Individual ambitions are stifled in an environment where morality is the leading characteristic. On the other hand, Machiavelli rigorous approach has a more directive approach and is suitable in times where there is extent pressure of time. Despite the applicability of the Machiavellian leader in crisis periods with time pressure, the ethical perspective of the actions may not allow such leadership style to apply. If the company operates in a corrupted environment, the Machiavellian methods may be effective but are not ethically correct. The outcomes may promote the profit for a specific period but in the future the climate and the motivation inside the company will be degraded.

The leader especially in crisis periods must exhibit communication skills and have rhetoric abilities. The arguments must be carefully selected in order to persuade the audience having in mind the common identity of the audience. Leading by example can be performed before the crisis to create the necessary connection and trust with the subordinates. Both, Aristotle and Machiavelli, emphasize the adaptivity of the leader which is crucial in "black swan periods". These two perspectives in terms of organizational

change and leadership can be parallelized with the transformational and the transactional leadership styles (Bass and Riggio, 2006). The Aristotle's leader characteristics are similar to the transformational leader's and Machiavelli's approach is closer to the transactional leadership.

Additionally, the followers from the Aristotle's and Machiavelli's approach seem to have triggered Mc Gregor's (1960) "X and Y" leadership theory. In times of instability, the leader must have in mind the type of personnel he/she is leading and use the characteristics that fit in every circumstance. The ethical perspective should not be neglected in any case, even if a more rigorous leadership style is selected, since it will have negative long-term effects on the company.

The leader in time of crisis must have the ability to perform all necessary alliances in order to maintain the efficiency and the viability of the organization. The Machiavellian perspective opposes to this suggestion since it considers alliances as a weakness. Alliances if they can be avoided without degrading organizational performance is positive, but in unstable periods the companies try to limit their expenses and are unavoidable. Therefore, the leader must pursue alliances that enhance the organizational performance and increase the viability of the company.

Finally, the leader must keep a balance and not disregard the ethics of the organization or the material profit of the company. Aristotle's perspective focuses on the ethics and the Machiavellian perspective on the material goods. An effective leader must make sure, especially in "black swan" periods where the organization is more unstable, to promote the ethics inside the company which keep a good and fair climate inside the organization but not disregard the profit side because the viability of the company will be at stake.

4. Conclusion

Aristotle emphasized the leader's moral leadership character through the use of three parameters; ethos, passion, and rhetoric, intending to demonstrate that how the leader presents and formulates his opinions establishes his reliability (Triantari, 2020). On the other hand, ethos is absent in the Machiavellian approach which focuses in the results despite the means that this will be achieved.

One of the most serious problems facing leaders today is their volatility and instability while in leadership. This implies that only a dynamic leader personality can maintain stability and consistency especially during periods of great instability. Even if we regard the shift in the leader's conduct to be a typical phenomenon, there are fundamental parts of his character that, if he exercises by indulging himself regularly and cultivating, he may have self-control. The leader even in times of great instability must show characteristics that are part of the emotional intelligence. His cognitive and emotional abilities, in particular, make him charismatic and effective because he can be distinguished for his self-management and self-awareness through the harmony of words and actions, which is reflected in the way he communicatively manages any changes and crises that arise in the work environment. Self-management and self-awareness are crucial communicative skills in the orator, who emerges as a dominating distributive active entity in almost every aspect of life, including family, work, politics, society, and education.

In today's modern complex society, which is governed by constantly changing situations and is increasingly experiencing a deep economic, moral, and social crisis, the leader's model brings together a wide range of elements that reconcile practice with theory, ethics with realism, and work-centered management with human-centered management. Today, the dynamic personality of the leader is evaluated by his effective response to work changes and communication crises that he must manage, so that he remains democratic, negotiating, and transformative, keeping his presence visible and important, rather than simply becoming a viewer of developments and changes, fearing the effects of his movements and unexpected changes (Anderson, 1998).

References

Ackerman, L.D., (2000), *Identity is Destiny: Leadership and the Roots of Value Creation*, Berrett-Koehler.

Anderson, T.D. (1998), *Transforming Leadership: Equipping Yourself and Others to Build the Leadership Organization*, 2nd ed., Boca Raton, Florida: St. Lucie Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving Organizational Effectiveness Through Transformational Leadership*. SAGE Publications.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational Leadership*. Taylor & Francis.

Boegershausen, J., Aquino, K., & Reed, A. (2015). Moral identity. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *6*, 162–166. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.07.017

Bourandas, D. (2005). *Ηγεσία: Ο δρόμος της διαρκούς επιτυχίας*. KRITIKI.

Burke, K. (1969). *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Amsterdam University Press.

Buskirk, R.H. (1974), *Modern Management and Machiavelli*, Mentor Books, New York, NY.

Buskirk, R.H. (1974), *Modern Management and Machiavelli*, Mentor Books, New York, NY.

Buttery, E. A., & Richter, E. M. (2003). On Machiavellian management. *Leadership &Amp; Organization Development Journal*, *24*(8), 426–435. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730310505858

Callanan, G. A. (2004). What would Machiavelli think? An overview of the leadership challenges in team-based structures. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, *10*(3/4), 77–83. https://doi.org/10.1108/13527590410545072

Christ, W.G., (1998), *Leadership in Times of Change: A Handbook for Communication and Media Administrators*, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Christopher, E.M., and Smith, L.E., (1993), *Leadership Training: A Sourcebook of Activities*, London: Kogan Page.

Daft, R. L. (n.d.). *Management, Sixth Edition: Transparency Acetates*.

Du Gay, P., Lopdrup-Hjorth, T., Pedersen, K. Z., & Roelsgaard, A. O. (2018). Character and organization. *Journal of Cultural Economy*, *12*(1), 36–53. https://doi.org/10.1080/17530350.2018.1481879

Fiedler, F.E., and House, R.J., (1994), "Leadership Theory and Research: A Report of Progress," in Cooper, C.L., and Robertson, I.T., (Eds.), *Key Reviews in Managerial Psychology*, Chichester: Wiley, pp.97-116.

Greider, W. (1998). *One World, Ready Or Not: The Manic Logic of Global Capitalism*. Simon & Schuster.

Goleman D. (2006) *Social Intelligence*. New York: Bantam.

Harris, P. (2001). Commentary - Machiavelli, political marketing and reinventing government. *European Journal of Marketing*, *35*(9/10), 1136–1154. https://doi.org/10.1108/eum0000000005962

House, R., Javidan, M., & Dorfman, P. (2001). Project GLOBE: An Introduction. *Applied Psychology*, *50*(4), 489–505. https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00070

Jay, A. (1994). *Management and Machiavelli: Discovering a New Science of Management in the Timeless Principles of Statecraft*. Pfeiffer.

Kotter, J (2012a) "Accelerate!" *Harvard Business Review*, 90(11), pp 45-48.

Lear, J. (1988). *Aristotle: The Desire to Understand*. Cambridge University Press.

Locke, E.A., (1997), "PrimeMovers: The Traits of Great Business Leaders," in Cooper, C.L., and Jackson, S., (Eds.), *Creating Tomorrow's Organizations*, Chichester: Wiley, pp.75-83.

Lord, R.G., De Vader, C.L., and Alliger, G.M., (1986), "A Meta-analysis of the Relation Between Personality Traits and Leadership Perceptions: An Application of Validity Generalization Procedures," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 71, No. 3, pp.402-409.

Machiavelli, N. (2014). *The Prince*. Van Haren Publishing.

McGregor, D. & Business Library Johnson Foundation Collection. (1960). *The Human Side of Enterprise*. McGraw-Hill Education.

Molina, A. D., & Spicer, M. W. (2004). Aristotelian Rhetoric, Pluralism, and Public Administration. *Administration &Amp; Society*, *36*(3), 282–305. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399704265293

Muczyk J.P. and Steel P.P. (1998) "Leadership Style and the Turnaround Executive, Business Horizons, March-April 1998, pp 39-46.

Parameswar, N., Chaubey, A. and Dhir, S. (2021), "Black swan: bibliometric analysis and development of research agenda", *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, Vol. 28 No. 7, pp. 2259-2279. https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-08-2020-0443

Peteraf, M., Thompson, A. A., Jr, Gamble, J. E., & Strickland, A. J., III. (2019). *ISE Crafting & Executing Strategy: Concepts and Cases*. McGraw-Hill Education.

Plamenatz, J., Plamenatz, M. E., & Wokler, R. (1992). *Man and Society : Political and Social Theories from Machiavelli to Marx : From the Middle Ages to Locke* (Revised, Subsequent). Addison-Wesley Longman Ltd.

Ramsey, M. (2000) "Are Machiavellian tactics still appropriate or defensible in politics?" in Reeve, D., D., C. (1995) *Practices of Reason: Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*, Charendon Press, Oxford.

Schneider, W., & Chein, J. M. (2003). Controlled & automatic processing: behavior, theory, and biological mechanisms. *Cognitive Science*, *27*(3), 525–559. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog2703_8

Small, M.W. (2011), "Developing wisdom and moral duty in management", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 30 No. 9, pp. 836-846. https://doi.org/10.1108/02621711111164321

Stogdill R (1948) Personal factors associated with leadership. A survey of the literature, *Journal of Psychology*, Vol 25, pg 35-72.

Steckler, N., and Fondas, N., (1995), "Building Team Leader Effectiveness:A Diagnostic Tool," *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp.20-35.

Swain, J.W. (2002), "Machiavelli and modern management", *Management Decision*, Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. 281-287. https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740210420237

Triantari, S. (2020). *LEADERSHIP -LEADERSHIP THEORIES* (1st ed.). K & M STAMOYLI.

Waldman, D.A., (1987), "Managing by Example: Developing Transformational Leaders," *Business*, Vol. 37, No. 3, pp.23-28.

Yukl, G. (2012). Effective Leadership Behavior: What We Know and What Questions Need More Attention. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *26*(4), 66–85. https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2012.0088