CHARISMATIC AND TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN ORGANIZATIONS: AN INSIDER'S PERSPECTIVE ON THESE DEVELOPING STREAMS OF RESEARCH

Jay A. Conger*
University of Southern California

Over the last decade and a half, the topic areas of charismatic and transformational leadership in organizational settings have undergone a significant evolution in terms of both theory development and empirical investigations. As a result, our knowledge about these leadership forms has deepened, and there are several dominant theories that are now established paradigms in the leadership field. At the same time, despite advances, there are numerous dimensions of these leadership forms about which we still know very little. Given this moment in the field's evolution, it is only appropriate that we take stock of where we have been and where we need to go into the future. We therefore provide an overview of the evolution of charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations. We examine progress along the following dimensions: 1) leader behaviors and their effects; 2) follower dispositions and dependency dynamics; 3) contextual factors; 4) institutionalization and succession forces; and 5) the liabilities of charismatic and transformational leaders.

Though it seems surprising today, only a decade and a half ago the fields of transformational and charismatic leadership in organizational settings were in their infancy. Bass (1985), Bennis and Nanus (1986), Kouzes and Posner (1987) and Tichy and Devanna (1986) had just published their books on the subject of transformational leaders—moving the field of organizational leadership towards a greater interest in senior leaders who were change agents. Their work was only the beginning of a wave of research that would soon swell in size. At the same time, if transformational leadership was the new darling of the field, charismatic leadership, on the other hand, appeared stuck in the shadows. While Berlew (1974), House (1977), and a

* Direct all correspondence to: Jay A. Conger, Bridge Hall, Marshall School of Business, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089; *email*: conger@sba.usc.edu.

Leadership Quarterly, 10(2), 145–179.

ISSN: 1048-9843

few others had published rudimentary theories on charismatic leadership in organizations the prior decade their work had sparked little interest among leadership scholars at the time. For example, a decade later, when I edited the volume *Charismatic Leadership* with Rabi Kanungo in 1988, we commented:

> The topic has actually suffered from a serious lack of attention. To put its neglect in perspective, we turn to *Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership* (Bass, 1981), which is considered the reference book on leadership studies. Combing through the more than 5,000 studies included in the handbook, only a dozen references to charismatic leadership are to be found. This is an ironic and disheartening discovery given the profound impact of charismatic leaders (p. 12).

By the late 1980s and early 1990s, however, something happened. House returned to the field as did a cast of new leadership scholars, including me. We began to build more comprehensive theories and to undertake empirical research on the topic. The neglected sibling of transformational leadership soon began to attract attention, and in a reasonably compact period of time a body of research had developed. The two leadership forms soon became twins of almost equal stature—so much so that by many they are assumed to be practically identical twins.

For all of us starting out on these topics in the 1980s, what has been most surprising is the number of empirical studies that have since appeared on both subjects. Prior to the early 1990s, most of the scholarship in charismatic leadership in organizations had been largely theoretical in nature with few empirical investigations. The study of transformational leadership in organizations, with the exception of Bass, had been largely case-based, and the typical publishing outlet was books (e.g., Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Kouzes & Posner, 1987; Tichy & Devanna, 1986).

By the late 1990s, dozens of empirical investigations on charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations have since been conducted. As Shamir and associates (1993) have pointed out, the research has involved a wide range of samples such as middle and lower level managers (Bass & Yammarino, 1988; Conger & Kanungo, 1994, 1997, 1998; Deluga, 1995; Hater & Bass, 1988; Koene et al., 1991); senior executives (Agle, 1993; Agle & Sonnenfeld, 1994; Conger, 1985, 1989; Conger & Kanungo, 1998); U.S. Presidents (Deluga 1998; House, Spangler, & Woycke, 1991); educational administrators (Koh et al., 1991; Roberts & Bradley, 1988; Sashkin, 1988); military cadets/soldiers and unit leaders (Atwater, Camobreco, Dionne, Avolio, & Lou, 1997; Curphy, 1990; Koene et al., 1991; Howell & Avolio, 1993; Shamir et al., 1998; Waldman & Ramirez, 1993); and students who were laboratory subjects (Howell & Frost, 1989; Kirkpatrick, 1992; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; Puffer, 1990; and Shamir, 1992, 1995). In addition, both leadership forms have been explored using a wide variety of research methods. For example, there have been field surveys (Conger & Kanungo, 1992, 1994, 1997; Hater & Bass, 1988; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter, 1990); laboratory experiments (Howell & Frost, 1989; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; Puffer 1990); content analyses of interviews and observation (Conger, 1985, 1989; Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Howell &

Higgins, 1990); and analyses of historical archival information (Deluga 1998; Shamir, Arthur, & House, 1994; Chen & Meindl, 1991; House, Spangler, & Woycke, 1991).

Given the recent growth of research on these topics, this article aims to take stock of our progress over the last decade and to suggest directions for the future. The goal is to identify both advances and remaining gaps in our knowledge about charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations. I will set the stage, however, by briefly describing why I believe interest in charismatic and transformational leadership "took off" in the mid to late 1980s and not sooner, despite some initial interest.

BACKGROUND FORCES DRIVING THE GROWTH OF INTEREST

As I look back over the evolution of the fields of charismatic and transformational leadership in organizational settings, it appears that a significant portion of the interest has been shaped by a small group of scholars, some of whom have been in the leadership field for several decades. These include people such as Bernard Bass and Robert House, and a small group of newer scholars to the field—individuals such as myself, Mike Arthur, Bruce Avolio, Jane Howell, Rabi Kanungo, Boas Shamir, Fran Yammarino, and others. In large part, we all appear to share a deep curiosity about exemplary forms of leadership and their influence on followers and organizational adaptation. I suspect we also share a general dissatisfaction with the earlier models of leadership which have seemed too narrow and simplistic to explain leaders in change agent roles.

At the same time, we have most likely been influenced by larger forces—the primary one being the globally competitive business environment. Here I am referring to the rise in the 1980s of the Asian economic powers such as Japan and the Little Dragons as well as European players like Germany who like a tidal wave undermined the market dominance of North American companies. This not only had a dramatic impact on American industry, but it in turn influenced research on many fronts within business schools.

From the perspective of the world of commerce, a more competitive world forced many corporations to radically reinvent themselves after enjoying several decades of what in hindsight appears to have been relative stability. As companies attempted to adapt, they discovered that the process of reinvention was extremely difficult. For example, rarely did company insiders possess the courage and change management skills needed to orchestrate large scale transformations. It appeared that the leadership talent necessary for such undertakings was essentially in short supply.

A second dilemma facing these organizations was employee commitment. In the midst of their change efforts, companies resorted to extensive downsizing as well as to new organizational arrangements such as flatter hierarchies and strategic business units. While often improving bottom-line performance, these initiatives took their toll on worker satisfaction and empowerment. In the process, the old social contract of long-term employment in return for employee loyalty was broken. The net result was disenfranchisement for many in the workforce. This occurred just at the moment when corporations were demanding ever greater performance and commitment from employees. For companies, the challenge became a question of how to orchestrate transformational change while simultaneously building employee morale and commitment—a seemingly contradictory endeavor.

I believe these important events in the business world had a direct impact on the study of leadership in organizations. For one, it turned attention towards senior leaders presumably because these individuals possessed the power and resources to more effectively implement significant organizational transformations in contrast to junior managers. Second, the majority of organizational scholars who studied leadership were housed within business schools. Therefore it was quite natural to be very alert to these twin challenges of leadership—the ability to ensure both organizational adaptation and workforce empowerment (a parallel can be drawn with the field of political science during the 1960s and 1970s when the flowering of research interest in charismatic leadership coincided with the appearance of democracies in post-colonial Africa: Many of the newly elected leaders were charismatic leaders). Simultaneously, scholars would also feel a need to explain why so many organizations had been slow to change and why turnaround efforts were often unsuccessful. To answer these issues, researchers turned to a simple dichotomy. Managers and leaders were different. We had too many of the former; too few of the latter (Kotter, 1988, 1990; Zaleznik, 1990).

Up to this point in time, leadership researchers had rarely drawn a clear distinction between the roles of leading and managing. The idea that leadership and management might stand for different phenomenon or roles or activities was a novel one. Not even in its selection of candidates for study had the leadership field discriminated between the two notions. Instead it was assumed that anyone in a position of authority was essentially in a "leadership role" (Heifetz, 1994). This problem continues to this day in the transformational leadership literature where the term "transactional *leader*"—rather than a "transactional manager or supervisor"—is used to describe all who lack or are weak in transformational ability, but who are strong on the transactional components. This terminology reinforces the old notion that formal positions of authority are always *leadership* positions.

The earliest appearance of a distinction drawn between leading and managing of which I am aware can be traced back to the mid-1970s (Zaleznik & Kets de Vries, 1975). By the 1980s, entire schools of leadership researchers, knowingly or not, had embraced Zaleznik and Kets de Vries' notions constructing their models of leadership around contrasts with the role of management—these schools were termed the New Leadership School by Bryman (1992) and the Neo-charismatic Paradigm by House (1995). They argued that the inability of North American corporations to adapt to a changing world could be traced back largely to organizations directed by too much management and too little leadership. A severe shortage of leadership talent, it was thought, was at the heart of the problem (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Kotter, 1988). While this position would be challenged by writers such as Nadler and Tushman (1990), this viewpoint continues to be popular.

Soon after Zaleznik and Kets de Vries' (1975) distinction between leading from managing was published, political scientist James McGregor Burns published his book *Leadership* (1978) proposing his now famous typology of "transformational" and "transactional" leaders. Many scholars in the organizational leadership field would in essence "translate" these terms into the roles of leadership (transformational leadership) and management (transactional leadership). For example, Bennis and Nanus (1985) commented: "Management typically consists of a set of contractual exchanges, 'you do this job for that reward,' . . . 'a bunch of agreements or contracts.' What gets exchanged is not trivial: jobs, security, money. The result, at best, is compliance; at worst, you get a spiteful obedience. The end result of the leadership we have advanced is completely different: it is empowerment. Not just higher profits and wages . . . but an organizational culture that helps employees generate a sense of meaning in their work and a desire to challenge themselves to experience success" (p. 218).

In the 1980s, Burns' ideas would naturally have great appeal to organizational theorists grappling with issues of organizational change and empowerment—especially Bass (1995). The "transformational leader" model spoke to both of these issues. After all, these were leaders concerned about transforming the existing order of things, as well as directly addressing their followers' needs for meaning and personal development. Charisma would simultaneously make its appearance. Certain researchers postulated that charisma was one of several distinguishing attributes of leaders who served in transformational roles (Bass, 1985; Weber, 1947; Zaleznik & Kets de Vries, 1975). For others, it was felt that charismatic leadership was the most exemplary form that transformational leaders could assume (Conger & Kanungo, 1987, 1998; Conger, 1989a).

The "transformational" model soon took hold and in essence has become a normative theory for the field. Perhaps in a need to villify the more instrumental side of management represented by downsizing and motivational approaches employing more extrinsic rewards and contractual arrangements, the "transactional" term has at times been applied in a somewhat derogatory way to the activity of managing. To be transformational was to be a leader. To be purely transactional was to be the calculating manager. The heroic leader had returned—reminiscent of the days of "great man" theories—with a humanistic twist given the transformational leader's strong orientation towards the development of others.

Transformational leadership had gained such momentum that it would be sometime before a greater appreciation would develop for the value of transactional behavior by itself (see Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996; Nadler & Tushman, 1990). In addition, and somewhat surprisingly, the contributions of contingency theorists (e.g. Friedler, 1967; Vroom & Yetton, 1973) to our understanding of leadership would little impact upon this body of research. Transformational leadership was applicable to most situations. Even along its individual dimensions, there was little suggestion that the need for these might vary by situation. Transformational leader's twin, charisma, on the other hand, did not fully suffer the same *coup de foudre* (French for "love at first sight"). While charisma's advocates saw it as a remarkable form of leadership, they were also aware that charisma had revealed a frightening dark side throughout history. Nonetheless, most of us focused our attention on the positive face of charisma. Contingency notions were simplistic—conditions of crisis, significant change were best suited for charismatic leadership.

With this as our backdrop, I will turn our attention to the principle streams of research that have emerged over the past decade. My aim is to provide an overview of the research contributions to date and from there to identify the areas where our knowledge still remains shallow. Interestingly, despite the dozens of research studies that have been conducted, the vast majority of these investigations examine just three models (e.g., Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1993; Conger & Kanungo, 1988, 1998; Conger, 1985, 1989; House, 1977; Shamir et al., 1993). As is often typical with research in the social sciences, new streams of theory and research are initiated by a few individuals. Whether a particular stream gains momentum and becomes an established field of study is largely dependent upon the energy and persistent of the "founding scholars" in studying their own theories. It is also dependent on their ability to recruit other scholars and doctoral students to join them in the journey. The research streams of charismatic and transformational leadership have been lucky in this regard. Their researchers have not only been persistent and productive, but they have also been good recruiters.

CONTRIBUTIONS FROM ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR: WHERE WE HAVE BEEN, WHERE WE NEED TO GO

Here I organize my discussion of the existing research within the field of organizational behavior around a framework consisting of the following leadership dimensions: (1) leader behaviors and their effects; (2) follower dispositions and dependency dynamics; (3) contextual factors; (4) institutionalization and succession forces; and (5) liabilities of charismatic and transformational leaders. I then describe how theory and research have evolved and simultaneously what has been overlooked.

Leader Behaviors and Their Effects

Both the greatest amount of theory development as well as empirical research on charismatic and transformational leadership has been in the area of leader behaviors and, to a lesser extent, on follower effects. This is due largely to the backgrounds of the most active researchers, almost all of whom have a strong behavioral orientation. While there have been a number of individuals studying either transformational or charismatic leaders (e.g., Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Kotter, 1990; Kouzes & Posner, 1987; Locke et al., 1991; Sashkin, 1988; Tichy & Devanna, 1986), I will focus on three clusters of researchers and their models in this section. My aim is not to be "encyclopedic," but rather to examine the dominant academic models in some depth.

I have chosen these three research groups based on the fact that they have undertaken the greatest amount of investigative work. The three clusters include the work of: (1) Bernard Bass, Bruce Avolio, and their colleagues; (2) Rabindra Kanungo and me, and recently Sanjay Menon; and (3) Robert House, Boas Shamir, Jane Howell, Michael Arthur, and their colleagues. I have chosen not to provide an exhaustive discussion of the individual theories assuming some reader familiarity. In-depth descriptions and overviews are provided in a number of sources (e.g., Bass 1985; Bass & Avolio 1993; Bryman, 1992; Conger & Kanungo, 1988, 1998; Shamir et al., 1993; Yukl, 1998). The basic contents of the three theories are first summarized and then compared to one another:

Bass and Avolio: transformational leadership

Bass and later his colleague Avolio essentially built upon Burns' notion of "transformational leadership" with a similar model for organizational leaders. As Bryman (1992, pp. 97–98) has pointed out, their model does go further conceptually than Burns' original model. Bass conceptualized the transactional and transformational dimensions as separate, whereas Burns had defined them as two ends of a spectrum. For Bass, therefore, a leader could be both transformational and transactional. In addition, Bass was determined to more precisely identify the actual behaviors that these leaders demonstrated along the two dimensions.

At the heart of the model is the notion that transformational leaders motivate their followers to commit to and to realize performance outcomes that exceed their expectations. Three principal leadership processes are involved (Bass, 1985) in achieving such outcomes: (1) these leaders heighten followers' awareness about the importance and value of designated goals and the means to achieve them; (2) they induce followers to transcend their self-interests for the good of the collective and its goals; and (3) they stimulate and meet their followers' higher order needs through the leadership process and the mission.

Bass was the first organizational scholar to operationalize the transformational leadership model into a measurement instrument. As a result, we see more studies employing his scale than any of the other models proposed to date. He and his colleague Bruce Avolio have also been persistent and productive researchers. By retaining Burn's original terminology and not employing the term "charismatic leadership," I believe they also broadened the appeal of their model in contrast to the two charismatic leadership models described below. The term "transformational" is less value-laden than "charismatic leadership," and the values it does convey are positive ones—especially around organizational adaptation and human development. To the business world, the term "charismatic leadership," on the other hand, is often perceived to describe an esoteric and rarer form of leadership. Few managers and executives would see charisma as a necessary quality to be effective in contrast to transformational capability.

Though the transformational leadership model's components have evolved somewhat since Bass' original 1985 publication, the changes have been relatively limited. For example, the component of inspiration which was originally treated as a subfactor within the charismatic leadership dimension is today a "stand alone" component (Bass & Avolio, 1993). As such, today four behavioral components make up the dimensions of transformational leadership: (1) charisma or idealized influence; (2) inspiration; (3) intellectual stimulation; and (4) individualized consideration. In contrast to the other theories, charisma is a separate component and is defined in terms of both the leader's behavior (such as role modeling) and the followers' reactions (such as trust, respect, and admiration for the leader's ability) (Bass & Avolio, 1993). Yukl's article in this issue lays out some of the dilemmas associated with the model and its measurement so I will not go into great depth here.

Once the model was established, Bass and his colleagues directed their efforts towards the development of their measures (the LBDQ and the MLQ) and their application in research investigations. As noted above, this is due in large part to

Bass' much earlier development of a measurement scale (Bass, 1985) and to his personal interests in quantitative measurement (Bass, 1995). Paradoxically, as Bryman (1992) has noted, while Bass's model is assumed to have important implications for business, only a small portion of the studies have been conducted in companies. From reviews by Bryman (1992) and Yukl (1997), it is clear that both of the measures have methodological shortcomings.

For example, Bass's measure of charisma itself may be a bit flawed. Vision is treated as a component of inspiration, rather than charismatic leadership. Yet the majority of the literature in the field sees vision as a component of charismatic leadership. Furthermore, Max Weber believed that the basis for charismatic leadership was a perception by followers that their leader was extraordinary. At best, only two of Bass's ten measurement items could be considered to convey this quality. Since both of the measures are based on subordinate-ratings, there are potential problems of contamination by implicit leadership theories. Bass and Avolio themselves discovered that descriptions of the transformational leader are significantly closer to subordinates' images of the ideal leader than transactional leadership. There are also issues about whether respondents' ratings of their leader's behavior are affected by their knowledge of the leader's effectiveness. In other words, perceptions of effectiveness may result in heightened attributions of leadership despite reality.

Finally, contextual variables or differences are largely overlooked—a problem to a varying extent for all three of the dominant theories. This situation reflects Bass' (1997) belief in the universality of transformational leadership which stems from his experiences using the MLQ across differing cultures and presumably different organizational levels. It is interesting to note, however, that in Bass's earliest work (1985) he speculated that the appearance of transformational leadership might be contingent upon certain organizational contexts: "We speculate that transformational leadership is most likely to appear in organic organizations where goals and structures are unclear, but where warmth and trust are high, members are highly educated and are expected to be creative. On the other hand, transactional leadership is most likely to appear in mechanistic organizations where goals and structures are clear and/or where members work under formal contracts" (p. 158).

There has also been some confusion as to the essential differences between the transformational leadership model and the two models of *charismatic* leadership described below. As Bryman (1992) points out, the Bass model is built around the leader who articulates a vision that inspires followers and who engages in behaviors that build intense loyalty and trust, empowerment, and unconventional perspectives. As we shall see, these dimensions overlap considerably with those postulated by charismatic leadership theories. This is especially true given the important role of charisma in the Bass model. For example, in their empirical studies (e.g., Avolio & Yammarino, 1990; Bass, 1985; Hater & Bass, 1988; Yammarino & Bass, 1990), the component of charisma generally has the strongest correlation of any of the model's dimensions with subordinates' ratings of leadership effectiveness and their own satisfaction. It is clearly the most influential. In the section comparing the theories, I discuss this particular issue in some depth.

Conger and Kanungo's behavioral model

The Conger/Kanungo model builds upon the idea that charismatic leadership is an attribution based on followers' perceptions of their leader's behavior. The leadership role behaviors displayed by an individual make them (in the eyes of followers) not only a task leader or a social leader but also a charismatic or non-charismatic leader. The leader's observed behavior can be interpreted by his or her own followers as expressions of charismatic qualities which are seen as part of the leader's inner disposition or personal style of interacting with followers. These dispositional attributes are inferred from the leader's observed behavior in the same way as other styles of leadership that have been identified previously (Blake & Mouton, 1964; Fiedler, 1967; Hersey & Blanchard, 1977). In this sense, charisma is considered an additional inferred dimension of leadership behavior or an additional leadership role.

In contrast to the Bass/Avolio and House/Shamir and associates' theories, we choose a stage model of charismatic leadership which involves a process of moving organizational members from an existing present state toward some future state. Given space limitations, I include only a brief synopsis of the theory here (for more details, see Conger & Kanungo, 1998).

In the initial stage, the leader critically evaluates the existing situation or status quo and the inclinations, abilities, needs and level of satisfaction experienced by followers. Such assessments, while not a distinguishing feature of charismatic leaders, are nonetheless particularly important for these leaders because they often assume high risks by advocating radical change. Thus, instead of launching a course of action as soon as a vision is formulated, a leader's environmental assessment may dictate that he or she prepare the ground and wait for an appropriate time and place, and/or for the availability of resources. It is presumed that many a time charisma has faded due to a lack of sensitivity for the environment.

In this stage, what distinguishes charismatic from non-charismatic leaders is the charismatic leaders' ability to actively search out existing or potential shortcomings in the status quo. Because of their emphasis on deficiencies or poorly exploited opportunities in marketplaces or in their organizations, charismatic leaders are always seen as organizational reformers or entrepreneurs. In other words, they act as agents of innovative and radical change.

The assessment stage leads to a second one: the actual formulation and conveyance of goals. We assert that charismatic leaders can be distinguished from others by the strategic visions they formulate and by the manner in which they articulate them. Here the word *vision* refers to some idealized goal that the leader wants the organization to achieve in the future. The idealized (and therefore discrepant) vision makes such leaders admirable persons deserving of respect and worthy of identification and imitation by the followers. Moreover, the greater the discrepancy of the vision from the status quo, the more likely is the attribution that the leader has extraordinary vision, not just an ordinary goal. In addition, by presenting a very discrepant and idealized goal to followers, a leader provides a sense of challenge and a motivating force for change.

In contrast to Bass and Avolio (1993), Shamir and associates (1993), and Gardner and Avolio (1998), Kanungo and Conger (1998) argued along with Locke (1998) that the vision itself may be formulated largely out of opportunities in the external environment—particularly in the case of business leaders. For example, Bill Gates of Microsoft and Sam Walton of Walmart, did not test out their visions with their employees nor was their mission framed by first determining valued aspects of their followers' self-concepts and needs. Enlisting subordinate commitment by taking into account their needs and values may instead come after the vision has been formulated, not necessarily beforehand. Moreover, the leaders themselves may not be the sole nor original source of the vision (Conger & Kanungo, 1998).

Similar to the other two theories, however, vision by itself in our model is insufficient. It must also be effectively articulated which involves two separate processes: articulation of the context and articulation of the leader's motivation to lead. The charismatic's verbal messages construct reality such that only the positive features of the future vision and only the negative features of the status quo are emphasized. The vision is therefore presented in clear specific terms as the most attractive and attainable alternative—the aim is to create among followers a disenchantment or discontentment with the status quo, a strong identification with future goals, and a compelling desire to be led in the direction of the goal in spite of environmental hurdles. In articulating their motivation to lead, the leader employs modes of action, both verbal and non-verbal, to demonstrate their convictions, self-confidence, and dedication to materialize what they advocate and to show concern for followers' needs.

Finally, in stage three, the leader builds trust in the goals and demonstrates how these goals can be achieved. This is achieved through personal example, risk taking, and unconventional expertise. These qualities are made to appear extraordinary by the leader's demonstrating a total dedication and commitment to the cause and vision and by engaging in exemplary acts that are perceived by followers as involving great personal risk, cost, and energy (Friedland, 1964).

Like Bass and Avolio, we have also tested the empirical validity of the hypothesized relationships in our model and operationalized our theoretical constructs into a measurement instrument. Through a series of empirical studies (Conger & Kanungo, 1992; Conger & Kanungo, 1994; Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur 1997; Conger & Kanungo, 1998), we established the reliability and validity of the model and of a measuring instrument, the Conger-Kanungo scale of charismatic leadership. These studies essentially found that a five-factor model (scales of strategic vision and articulation, sensitivity to the environment, personal risk, unconventional behavior, and sensitivity to member needs) best fits the theoretical notion that we had advanced.

House and Shamir: Charismatic leadership

In one of the field's earliest writings on charismatic leadership in organizations, Robert House (1977) published a book chapter entitled "A 1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership." Influenced by Berlew (1974), House outlined not only the leader behaviors that were possibly associated with charismatic leadership but also certain personal traits and situational variables. Like most models in the early stages of theory development, it had several important shortcomings (Yukl, 1998). House's description of the influence process was rudimentary especially in light of the profound influence he argued that these leaders had over their followers. Its dimensions, some would argue, were also characteristics of other leadership forms (e.g. high self-confidence, tendency to dominate, a need to influence others) and so was not highly effective in terms of discriminating between other leadership forms.

Similar to early versions of the Bass (1985) and Conger and Kanungo (1987) models, his theory was based largely around dyads—the leader and "the follower"—rather than collectives which are the basis of organizations. Finally, absent from his theory were certain components that would appear in later theories such as the notion of self-sacrifice, unconventional behavior, and the use of non-traditional strategies and tactics (Conger, 1989; Conger & Kanungo, 1988). It was, nonetheless, very important in two regards. First, he provided a framework for many later scholars to build upon. Second, his model was multi-dimensional incorporating leader behaviors and dispositional attributes, follower effects, and situational variables.

Since that time, House along with a series of colleagues (House & Howell, 1992; House & Shamir, 1993; House, Spangler, & Woycke, 1991; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993) have made revisions to his earlier theory. The most important revision was by Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993) in an article entitled "The Motivational Effects of Charismatic Leadership: A Self-Concept Based Theory." Focused on explaining the profound levels of motivation typically associated with charismatic leadership, they postulated that these motivational effects could best be explained by focusing on the self-concept of the followers. Citing supporting research (e.g., Csikszentmihalyi & Rochberg-Halton, 1981; Kinder & Sears, 1985; Snyder & Ickes, 1985; Prentice, 1987), they pointed out that as human beings we behave in ways that seek to establish and affirm a sense of identity for ourselves (known as the self-concept). What charismatic leaders do is to tie these self-concepts of followers to the goals and collective experiences associated with their missions so that they become valued aspects of the followers' self-concept.

Their theory hypothesizes that charismatic leadership transforms follower self-concepts and achieves its motivational outcomes through at least four mechanisms: (1) changing follower perceptions of the nature of work itself; (2) offering an appealing future vision; (3) developing a deep collective identity among followers; and (4) heightening both individual and collective self-efficacy.

Under the first mechanism, charismatic leaders transform the nature of work (in this case, work meant to achieve the organization's vision) by making it appear more heroic, morally correct, and meaningful. They in essence de-emphasize the extrinsic rewards of work and focus instead on the intrinsic side. Work becomes an opportunity for self- and collective-expression. The reward for individual followers as they accomplish mission tasks is one of enhanced self-expression, self-efficacy, self-worth, and self-consistency. The idea is that eventually followers will come to see their organizational tasks as inseparable from their own self-concepts. As readers can discern, there are strong parallels here with Bass & Avolio's charisma and inspirational dimensions and Conger & Kanungo's idealized vision, its formulation, and empowerment dimensions.

One of the important contributions of the theory has been the attempt to explain in greater detail the role of a strong collective identity in the leadership process. While the other two theories (Bass 1985; Conger 1989) recognized the importance of a collective identity, Shamir and associates (1993) took the process a step further. Specifically, the authors cite research (Meindl & Lerner, 1983) indicating that a shared identity among individuals increases the "heroic motive" and the probability that individual self-interests will be abandoned voluntarily for collective and altruistic undertakings. The group identification therefore strengthens the shared behavioral norms, values, and beliefs among the members and ensures a concerted and unified effort on the part of followers to achieve the mission's goals.

In the Shamir and associates' revised theory, what we see then is a shift from House's earlier conceptualization where charismatic leadership was viewed more as a dyadic process to one that is a collective process. Similarly, we also see Bass and us (Conger & Kanungo, 1998) moving increasingly away from a simple dyadic formulation to one recognizing both group and organizational levels. As Yukl (1994) has noted, the Shamir and associates' theory also places more emphasis on the reciprocal nature of the influence process where the leader chooses a vision that is congruent with the followers' own values and identities. Likewise, followers are more likely to select as their leader an individual who espouses their core values, beliefs, and aspirations.

It is important to note, however, that in a recent empirical investigation of the model examining company leaders in Israeli field military units Shamir, Zakay, Breinin, and Popper (1998) found that the self-concept theory did not receive substantial support. At the individual level of analysis, only the leader's emphasis on the unit's collective identity was related to subordinates' trust in the leader, levels of identification with the leader, heightened motivation, willingness to sacrifice for the unit, identity with the unit, and attachment to the unit. The two other categories—behaviors that reflect an ideological emphasis and exemplary behaviors—were either unrelated or negatively related to subordinate perceptions of and attitudes towards the leader and the unit. Similar results emerged from the unit-level analysis. A reverse pattern, however, emerged from the superiors' appraisals of leaders' performance. The leader's emphasis on collective identity was not related to the superior's performance appraisal while the leader's ideological emphasis and displays of exemplary behavior were positively related to the superior's appraisal.

In their interpretations of the results, Shamir and associates' (1998) concluded that since military service is mandatory in Israel and involves daily hardships, the soldiers had become somewhat alienated from the larger military system. They, in turn, may have perceived their leaders' behaviors of an ideological approach, high devotion, high motivation, and high role involvement as evidence that the leader represented the interests of the larger system rather than their own interests, and the leader's behaviors were interpreted instead as pressure for them to perform.

Comparing the Theories

If we look across the three dominant models, we see that there is considerable and growing overlap in terms of leader behaviors and activities. In many ways, they are converging towards one another. For example, the following components are shared across theories: (1) vision, (2) inspiration, (3) role modeling, (4) intellectual stimulation, (5) meaning-making, (6) appeals to higher-order needs, (7) empowerment, (8) setting of high expectations, and (9) fostering collective identity.

For example, all three models basically share similar beliefs about the role of vision in providing direction and meaning—though the Shamir and associates' model is unique in believing that the vision's content is driven by follower self-concepts. All the models describe the communication of high expectations as a central activity of the leader which aims both to empower and to produce high task accomplishment. Bass's intellectual stimulation dimension concerns itself with the leader's provision of a flow of new ideas and perspectives which challenge followers' thinking concerning organizational tasks. Under the Conger-Kanungo model, the charismatic leader similarly engages in intellectually stimulating articulation. For instance, when such leaders challenge the status quo and formulate their visions in a discrepant and idealized manner, their followers are intellectually challenged to examine their status quo supporting behavior and approaches.

All three models describe empowerment processes. For instance, the transformational leadership component of individualized consideration involves providing encouragement and support to followers, assisting their development by promoting growth opportunities, and showing trust and respect for them as individuals. Its role is to build follower self-confidence and to heighten personal development. These activities and their outcomes in essence describe empowerment processes that are also found in both the Conger and Kanungo and House and Shamir models.

Besides the overlap of specific behavior components, there is also an overlap with respect to the nature of the leadership *influence process* across the three models. For example, as noted above, all the models suggest that these leaders use empowerment rather than control strategies in order to achieve transformational influence over their followers. They in essence advocate the transformational influence of leaders where the main goal is to change followers' core attitudes, beliefs, and values rather than to induce only compliance behavior in them. Again, they all agree that these forms of leadership lead to attitude changes among followers characterized by identification with the leader and internalization of values embedded in leader's vision and ideology.

At the same time, there are important differences between the three theories in terms of the influence process. The most striking is between Conger and Kanungo and the other two theories. It is clear that the Conger and Kanungo model (1998) comes closest to Weber's original assertion (1947) that followers are influenced largely by perceptions of the leader's extraordinary qualities. The focal point of influence is therefore the leader and their character. Recent theory proposed by Gardner and Avolio (1998) shares this perspective even to the point of arguing that many charismatic leaders knowingly exaggerate their talents to ensure perceptions of an extraordinary identity. As a result, our model emphasizes personal identification with the leader as the primary source of influence followed thereafter by internalization of the values and vision professed by the leader.

In contrast, the Bass and Avolio (1993) model focuses more on the leader's ability to make task and mission outcomes highly appealing to followers. In the process, transformational leaders are stimulating and meeting subordinates' higher-order needs (Maslow, 1968), which in turn generates commitment, effort, and ultimately greater performance. While the leader plays a crucial role in articulating and generating excitement about the mission, the goals can be as influential as the leader. As a matter of fact, if the leader were to become too much the centerpiece, it is implicitly assumed that this would undermine their ability to develop leaders below and to effectively empower followers.

In the Shamir and associates' (1993) model, the influence process is somewhat akin to that in Bass/Avolio. The theory essentially highlights the leader behaviors that increase the salience of certain values and collective identities in followers' self-concepts. The leader then frames a mission and followers' roles in terms of those values and identities. Similar to the Bass/Avolio model, it is in the framing of appealing goals and roles that the attraction and influence occurs not in the leader's extraordinary character. The leader's character serves to build confidence in the goals and in the followers' self-efficacy. As a result, value internalization, the leader's influence on follower self-efficacy, and social identification are the principal forces behind the influence process rather than personal identification (Yukl, 1998).

Beyond the influence process, there are additional differences. One of the most apparent differences between the theories is that both the Bass/Avolio and House/Shamir models do not recognize the importance of an environmental assessment stage (i.e., evaluation of status quo). House and Shamir (1993, p. 101) assert: "While these behaviors have pragmatic value in such circumstances, we see no self-implicating or motive-arousing effects on followers. . . . Thus we do not believe these attributes to be unique to charismatic leaders."

This difference between Conger/Kanungo and the other two (House/Shamir and Bass) models stems from two sources. First, the Conger/Kanungo approach is the only one to propose a stage-model analyses of charismatic leadership. In this case, stage one behaviors (status quo evaluation) are necessary for the emergence of stage two behaviors (visioning and articulation). Perhaps this is the reason why House and Shamir consider stage one behaviors to have only pragmatic value. Secondly, House and Shamir suggest that stage one behavior may not have direct motive-arousing effects on followers. But in a stage model of analyses, status quo evaluation forms the basis of vision formulation and articulation. Hence stage one behaviors affect followers in an indirect manner.

Beyond this, the articulation of status quo deficiencies which results from the status quo evaluation does indeed affect followers' attitudes and values towards change in a direct fashion. It may be noted that only through an evaluation of the status quo can the leader present the current situation as either a crisis to overcome or as an opportunity to avail if the vision is pursued.

There are three other areas of difference. First, House (1977) and ourselves (Conger & Kanungo, 1989, 1998) have emphasized to a far greater degree the leader's use of impression management and image building than Bass and Shamir and associates (1993). For example, in our theory, such activities are employed to manifest the leader's conviction, self-confidence, and dedication to materialize what they advocate. More recently, Gardner and Avolio (1998) have taken the role of these activities to an even more extreme position where they explain most of the important dynamics of identification with the leader and the garnering of follower commitment as determined by the impression management techniques of the leader. In their theory, the leader essentially seeks to construct a charismatic identity that he or she believes will be valued by those they target as followers. This identity powerfully shapes the content of their articulated vision and the personal images they wish to convey (e.g., that they are trustworthy, credible, morally worthy, innovative, esteemed, and powerful). The leader then uses impression management behaviors to secure and retain these images. In contrast to House (1977) and us, who essentially see the leader's IM behavior as more uni-directional (from the leader to the followers), the Gardner and Avolio model suggests a far more reciprocal process where the followers to a large extent shape the leader.

The next area of difference between the models concerns the fact that the Bass model is more descriptive of the nature of the leadership effects on followers. This is due largely to the fact that the transformational theories to date have concerned themselves equally with *follower outcomes* whereas the charismatic theories and research have measured leadership from the standpoint of *perceived leader behavior.* In the case of the transformational forms, this was the natural outcome of Burn's (1978) original conceptualization focusing on elevating *follower* needs and motives to the forefront of the leadership experience. As a result, Bass's component of charisma includes both leader behaviors and follower effects.

Finally, in its most recent version, the Conger/Kanungo theory (1998) emphasizes to a far greater degree the strategic side of leadership than the other theories. For example, the theory now lays out some of the processes by which charismatic leaders sense marketplace opportunities within their larger environment.

Stepping back from a discussion of the differences between the theories and looking historically across them, we could say that the three theories are becoming more sophisticated. For example, there is a growing awareness of the need to study these leadership forms beyond dyads. There is a greater sensitivity to contextual dimensions such as social distance and levels of analysis. Shamir (1995) and Shamir and associates (1998) have shown that proximity to the leader may influence the importance of certain behavioral components in attributions of charisma. For example, the components that influence follower attributions of charisma among a close circle of followers with direct contact to the leader may differ from those that influence attributions among a larger group of followers who have no direct contact with the leader. Similarly, there may be multiple collective identities within organizations, representing different, and perhaps competing values, sources of identification, and preferences (Shamir et al., 1998). As such, it is clear that these leadership forms need to be studied within a multiple constituencies framework (Tsui, 1994).

We could also say that there is continuing convergence between the theories. In other words, we are influencing each other. We (Conger & Kanungo, 1998), for example, have now more formally incorporated more of the process dimensions behind the collective identity component which were proposed by Shamir and associates (1993). Similarly, Shamir and associates (1993) now include the leadership dimensions of engaging in self-sacrifice behaviors and the use of verbal messages describing only the negative features of the status quo—dimensions that we had proposed in our earliest theory (1988).

As well, the three models have now formed a stable "paradigm" for the field in that there is fairly universal agreement concerning the importance of the behavioral dimensions they propose. As a result, I believe that our greatest challenge in the future will be whether we can significantly expand upon our own theories especially in terms of exploring overlooked dimensions and deepening our understanding of the known individual components. For example, we have barely scratched the surface of the complex processes behind a leader's vision.

Studies that identify mental representations and processes underlying the visioning activity of the leader are clearly needed. The structure and content of leadership vision are also only partially understood. As House and Aditya (1997) have pointed out, we have little understanding of the related activity of strategy formulation. Further attention needs to be directed towards examining how leaders use language to shape their visions and how they communicate their goals in general.

As Yukl argues in this issue, our conceptualizations of the influence processes are still simplistic. With few exceptions (e.g., Gardner & Avolio, 1998; House & Howell, 1992; House, Spangler, & Woycke, 1991), our insights into the self-systems and motives of these leaders are extremely limited and largely speculative. While much work remains to be done, I suspect that we may be entering a period where basic theory formulation is behind us. What we could see ahead are rather refinements on the existing theory—for example, the notion that social distance influences which behaviors will lead to attributions of charisma. As the dominant models operationalize themselves into validated measurement instruments, the models themselves will go increasingly unquestioned. Standarized measures direct researchers' attention away from reinventing and challenging their own models since such a process involves laborious revisions of measures and potential challenges to past research. Likewise, other researchers often find it easier to use the existing published measures rather than invent new models and measures.

Beyond the behavioral dimensions, an area that still provides important opportunities for both research and theory is the topic of follower and organizational outcomes. To date, attention has been directly largely at the individual follower and more recently at the group level. Most of the existing empirical research has focused on enhanced follower satisfaction and performance (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996) generally showing positive correlations. But there are a host of other possible effects and outcomes under both leadership forms that have received very limited attention. For example, Smith (1982) found that followers of charismatic leaders had more self-assurance and experienced work as more meaningful. Howell and Frost (1989) found that subordinates of charismatic leaders had less role conflict. Kirkpatrick and Locke (1996) and Conger, Kanungo and Menon (1998) have taken the analysis further to examine some of the complex casual effects of different types of leader behavior on follower effects.

For example, Kirkpatrick and Locke found that visioning had a positive effect on the quality of follower performance. Conger, Kanungo, and Menon (1998) discovered that follower feelings of reverence for their leader were derived from the leader's sensitivity to the environment, their strategic vision and its articulation, their sensitivity to member needs, and their demonstration of personal risk. In general, however, there has been little basic research which attempts to test the many networks of linkages between leader behavior and follower effects proposed to explain how transformational and charismatic leadership work (e.g., Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Morrman, & Fetter, 1990). As Yukl (1998) points out, there may be a number of different influence processes occurring under transformational leadership, all of which remain poorly understood. Research in mapping these casual links between leader behavior and follower outcomes is potentially one of the most exciting areas for future research.

In addition, there are quite a number of specific follower effects—especially at group and organizational levels that need further study. At the aggregate level, it has been hypothesized that charismatic and transformational leadership behaviors will result in followers at the group levels being characterized by high internal cohesion, high value congruence, high morale, high consensus and groupthink, and low internal conflict. Similarly, it has also been hypothesized that there will be a greater degree of sharing of the vision and a greater degree of agreement with respect to the means for achieving the vision. Meindl (1990) has also proposed that followers will influence one another in the very process of attributing charisma to their leader through a model of social contagion. With respect to the followers' relations with the task, it is hypothesized that followers will show a high degree of cohesion with the work group and a high level of feeling empowered within the organization to accomplish tasks. Recently, Klein and House (1995) have raised the possibility that group outcomes may even differ depending upon the extent to which the leader shares a charismatic relationship with a limited number of his or her subordinates versus all of them. With high homogeneity of charismatic relations across a group, it is assumed that we could expect to see high performance, high morale, and high group-think as outcomes.

In contrast, with varying levels of charismatic relations within a group of subordinates there may instead be divisive relations if subordinates perform tasks in close interactions. Such notions require further investigation. In addition, we have made few attempts to understand these forms of leadership at the larger organizational level. My feeling is that research in the areas described above will prove to be some of the most fertile areas for future investigations.

FOLLOWER DISPOSITIONS AND THE DYNAMICS OF DEPENDENCY

Issues surrounding the dispositional character of the followers of both transformational and charismatic leaders have been poorly explored. Outside of a few references, we have few studies in this area—especially in business contexts. What has been proposed is largely speculative theory. For example, recent work by Weierter (1997) proposes that the type of charismatic relationship is shaped by the clarity and stability of followers' self-concepts and their overall self-monitoring. High self monitors (Snyder, 1979) are proposed to have a greater potential for a social contagion style of charismatic relationship. In contrast, low self monitors who possess high self-concept clarity are more likely to have a socialized relationship with the charismatic leader. While low self monitors who have low self-concept clarity are more likely to have a personalized charismatic relationship. This type of theory-building followed by empirical investigations is essential at this stage of our knowledge.

Earlier research on charismatic leaders by political scientists and psychoanalysts (e.g., Downton, 1973; Kets de Vries, 1988) had proposed that the followers of charismatic leaders were more likely to be those who were easily molded and persuaded by such dynamic leaders because of an essentially dependent character in their subordinates. Followers were drawn to the charismatic leader because he or she exuded what they lacked: self-confidence and conviction. From the psychoanalytic view point, followers were attempting to resolve a conflict between who they were as followers and what they wished to become by substituting their leader as their ego ideal.

Some psychoanalysts (e.g., Erikson, 1968; Downton, 1973) trace this type of need back to an individual's failure to mature in adolescence and young adulthood. Because of absent, oppressive, or weak parents, individuals may develop a state of identity confusion. Associating emotionally with the charismatic leader is a means of coping with this confusion and achieving maturity. Given that the leader is in essence a substitute parent and model, a powerful emotional attachment is formed by followers. Wishing to garner the leader's attention and affection, followers enthusiastically comply with his or her wishes. Followers are, in essence, fulfilling a pathological need rather than a healthy desire for role models from whom to learn and grow. There has been support for these dynamics in research on cults and certain political movements. For example, studies (e.g. Davies, 1954; Freemesser & Kaplan, 1976; Galanter, 1982; Lodahl, 1982) have found followers of charismatic political and religious leaders to have lower self-esteem, a higher intolerance for indecision and crisis, greater feelings of helplessness, and more experiences of psychological distress than others.

But these studies were almost entirely conducted on populations of individuals who voluntarily joined movements and were often disaffected by society or elsewhere in contexts of crisis where individuals are often needy by definition. In the corporate world, the situation can be quite different. For example, in a corporation, the subordinate of a charismatic or transformational leader may not have voluntarily chosen to belong to that leader's unit. More commonly, bosses are hired or promoted into positions, and the subordinates are already in place. So for subordinates, there may be little freedom to select who will lead them. Likewise, leaders may find themselves inheriting a staff of confident, assertive employees.

In the case of entrepreneurial companies founded by charismatic leaders, followers may be drawn to such contexts as much because of the challenge and opportunity as by the leader him or herself. Followers in these cases may be seekers of the risk, uncertainty, and the potential for great wealth associated with a new venture. Their dispositional character may be in sharp contrast to followers who are the dependent seekers of certainty associated with cults (Conger, 1993).

As such, there is a second school of thought which theorizes that followers are attracted to the charismatic or transformational leader because of a more constructive identification with the leader's abilities, a desire to learn from them, a quest for personal challenge and growth, and the attractiveness and rewards of the mission. With Bass (1985), for example, it is the opportunity to fulfill higher order needs. In the Shamir and associates' theory (1993), it is an opportunity to have one's self-esteem, self-worth, and self-efficacy constructively enhanced. Followers may therefore possess high self-confidence and self esteem (Conger 1989; Gardner & Avolio, 1998; Sidani, 1993).

Confirming these theoretical speculations, Conger (1989) found in field studies of charismatic business leaders that subordinates often described their strong attraction to the leader's qualities of self-confidence, a strong conviction in the mission, a willingness to undertake personal risks, and their history of prior accomplishments. As a result, subordinates could experience a sense of fulfilling their own potential as they met their leader's high expectations. In addition, as others have found (e.g., Avolio and Bass, 1987; Bass, 1985), the leader's vision offers attractive outcomes that are motivating in and of themselves. But simple identification and an attractive vision do not fully explain the commitment and motivation that followers demonstrate for their charismatic or transformational leaders. In the case of charismatic leaders, the personal approval of the leader becomes a principal measure of a subordinate's self-worth (Conger, 1989). A dependency then develops to the point that the leader increasingly defines the followers' level of performance and ability.

As Conger (1989) and Shamir and associates (1993) have also noted, the leader's expression of high expectations set standards of performance and approval while a continual sense of urgency and the capacity to make subordinates feel unique further heighten motivation. Taken together, these actions promote a sense of obligation in followers to continually live up to their leader's expectations. As the relationship deepens, this sense of obligation grows. The leader's expression of confidence in subordinates' abilities creates a sense of duty and responsibility. Subordinates can only validate the leader's trust in them through exceptional accomplishments.

Under such a scenario, a dilemma naturally occurs for many followers over the long term. As the subordinates' self-worth is increasingly defined in their relationship to the leader, a precarious dependence is built. Without the leader's affirmation, subordinates can feel that they are under-performing and even failing. In addition, there are fears of being ostracized. As one subordinate explained to Conger (1989): "There's a love/hate element [in our relationship]. You love him when you're focused on the same issues. You hate him when the contract falls apart. Either you're part of the team or not—there's a low tolerance for spectators. And over a career, you're in and out. A lot depends upon your effectiveness on the team. You have to build up a lot of credibility to regain any ground that you've lost."

Charismatic leadership may depend in part on the dynamics of exclusion to ensure both follower commitment and high performance outcomes. In essence, the leader may use exclusion from an "inner circle" to stimulate followers to greater task-efforts and in turn higher performance levels. The followers' identification with the leader so defines the follower's own self-concept that they remain in the relationship and strive to regain inclusion and the leader's approval through heightened task efforts and value congruence. These issues will be further explored under the section discussing the liabilities of these leadership forms.

In conclusion, we do have some insights into follower dispositions and the dynamics of dependency, but generally, our knowledge here is extremely limited in the sense that it is based only on selected case studies and theoretical speculation. This is particularly true about settings in the business world which are largely absent from the existing research. There are great opportunities in this domain for future research contributions.

THE ROLE OF CONTEXT

Up until very recently, investigations concerning the role of context and situational factors have been few. This is due largely to the backgrounds of those researching charismatic and transformational leadership. There have been few researchers with a "macro-organizational" or sociological perspective who have been active in studying charismatic and transformational leadership (e.g., Roberts & Bradley 1988; Trice & Beyer, 1986). In addition, I believe that the dominance of survey/quantitative methods in the research to date may be hindering our ability to discern contextual variables as well as differences between contexts. As a result, our knowledge in this area remains poor, and what does exist is largely speculative. At the same time, it is clear that contexts do vary widely. Therefore the nature and form of follower needs, for example, should vary by context. The resources and nature of opportunities available to a leader should vary widely by context. As well, there may be certain stages in organizational life cycles when charismatic and transformational leadership may be more appropriate or, for that matter, more dysfunctional.

For example, Baliga and Hunt (1988) have proposed that transformational leadership is most important during the birth, growth, and revitalization stages of an organization. Shamir and Howell pose further life cycle arguments in this issue as well as expand theory relating to other contextual variables. Beyer in her article will argue similarly. Finally, cultural variables are a crucial dimension of context. Because different cultures have different beliefs, values, modes of articulation, and so on, leadership effectiveness and attributions of charismatic and transformational leadership should vary across cultural contexts (in contrast, the findings presented by Den Hartog and associates in this issue will reinforce notions that certain aspects of charismatic and transformational leadership are universally endorsed across cultures).

The most common position to date concerning context argues that periods of stress and turbulence are the most conducive for charismatic leadership (this argument is derived originally from the work of political scientists looking at charismatic leadership in political and religious contexts: see Cell, 1974; Toth, 1981). Max Weber (1968), for example, specifically focused on times of "crisis" as facilitating environments. The basic assumption is that times of stressful change either encourage a longing among individuals for a leader who offers attractive solutions and visions of the future, or that charismatic leaders have an easier time of promoting and having accepted a transformational vision during times of uncertainty when the status quo appears to no longer function effectively (Bryman, 1992).

To date, the most important empirical study to examine situational factors in organizational contexts has been conducted by Roberts and Bradley (1988). Using a field study, they looked at a school superintendent who was perceived by her organization as a charismatic leader, yet in a latter appointment (as state commissioner of education) that perception failed to be transmitted. In Roberts and Bradley's search to explain why the individual's charisma did not transfer, they discovered several essential differences between the two contexts.

In terms of the organizational environment, the individual's first context, a school district, was one in crisis—confirming the hypothesis that crisis may indeed facilitate the emergence of charismatic leadership. In contrast, the leader's second context at the state government level was not in a similar state of distress. The public's perception was that its state schools were basically sound and simply in need of incremental improvements. The leader's authority also differed between the two situations. As a superintendent, she had much more control and autonomy. At the state level as commissioner, her number one priority was political loyalty to the governor. She no longer possessed the freedom to undertake actions she deemed necessary. Instead, her actions had to be cleared through the governor's office. Her relationships were also different between the two contexts.

Whereas the district organization had been small with limited stakeholders and localized geographically, the situation at the state level was at the opposite end of the spectrum. The agency was significantly greater in size, complexity, and bureaucracy. As a result, she had little time to build the deep, personal bonds that she had established at the district level. Her impact at the state level was no longer personal and perceptions of her as a charismatic leader did not materialize.

From the Roberts and Bradley study, we might conclude that context shapes charismatic leadership in at least two ways. One, an environment in crisis is indeed more receptive to leadership in general and is therefore more likely to be open to proposals common to charismatic and transformational leaders for radical change. Second, there are characteristics of organizations which influence an individual's latitude to take initiative and to build personal relationships which in turn shape perceptions of their leadership. More *latitude for initiative* on the job may result in simply more opportunities to demonstrate leadership. The superintendent's position allowed the leader far more autonomy to act than the commissioner's position. *Closer proximity to followers* may permit greater relationship building. The superintendent's responsibilities were more geographically concentrated and involved a more *limited number of stakeholders* which resulted in deeper working relationships at the district level and also inspired affection and trust in her leadership. These in turn heightened perceptions of her charisma.

With Roberts' and Bradley's study in mind, we can think of contributing contextual variables along the dimensions of an *outer* and an *inner* organizational context (Pettigrew, 1987)—the outer being the environment beyond the organization and the inner including the organization's culture, structure, power distribution, and so on. Using this frame-work, it is useful to divide our discussion from this point around these two contextual dimensions.

On the issue of whether crisis is the critical *external* condition, Conger (1993) hypothesized that there could actually be much more variability in terms of conducive environmental conditions. Charismatic and transformational leadership might not only be found under conditions of crisis and distress but may also in entrepreneurial environments. For example, in field research, charismatic leaders were identified who were entrepreneurs operating in environments not so much of crisis but of great opportunity, munificence, and optimism (Conger, 1989).

As such, there may instead be several types of conducive environments—for example, one demanding a major reorientation of the existing order because of a perceived state of distress and the other involving the emergence or creation of a new order based on a "munificence entrepreneurial" context. Both environments do, however, share conditions of high uncertainty. Moreover, there may be subcategories within these environments that are more conducive. For example, crisis comes in many forms. There are internal forms such as an exodus of talent or highly dysfunctional inter-group relationships and external forms due to excessive industry competition or economic downturns. The severity, duration, and possibility of a recovery vary widely across different crisis situations. Our current models employ a very coarse-grained definition of crisis. More fine-grained ones are needed to permit us to see that under the heading of "crisis" there are certain forms or subcontexts that are more conducive to charismatic and transformational leadership while others may not be at all.

In addition, I have argued that more of an interplay exists between the leader and the context (Conger, 1993). In other words, context is not the key determinant, but rather the leader and the context influence one another—the relative weight of each influence varying from situation to situation. For example, Willner (1984) found that while examining charismatic leaders in the political arena some were able to induce or create through their own actions the necessary contextual conditions of a crisis. Similarly, we might be able to find charismatic and transformational leaders who are able to foster perceptions of crisis or of munificence and great entrepreneurial opportunity.

The more conducive the existing contextual conditions, the less the magnitude or the fewer the number of charismatic attributes perhaps required for a leader to be perceived as charismatic. Likewise, the greater the intensity or the number of "charismatic attributes" present in a leader may lessen the need for the existing context to be characterized by extreme crisis or enormous entrepreneurial opportunities. Given a wealth of charismatic attributes, the leader may be able to create such interpretations of the environment through their own actions. But such hypotheses are speculative and in need of research attention. In summary, we need a great deal more attention directed towards research and theory-building around external environments and charismatic/transformational leadership.

In terms of influential contextual conditions *internal* to organizations, there has been only one major theoretical work focusing to a large extent on these (though Shamir and Howell build further the theory in this issue). Pawar and Eastman (1997) proposed four factors of organizations that might affect receptivity to charismatic and transformational leadership: (1) the organization's emphasis on efficiency versus adaptation; (2) the relative dominance of the organization's technical core versus its boundary-spanning units; (3) organizational structures; and (4) modes of governance. Using these dimensions in a series of ideal types, Pawar and Eastman differentiate between organizations that are more conducive to change and therefore to charismatic and transformational leadership and those that are not.

On the first dimension (which blends both internal and external dimensions), they hypothesize that an efficiency orientation requires goal stability and necessarily administrative management or transactional leadership to achieve its goals. During adaptation periods, on the other hand, the leader's role is to overcome resistance to change and to align the organization to a new environment through a dynamic vision, new goals and values. Therefore, they argue that organizations with adaptive goals are far more open to transformational leadership.

The authors caution, however, that while adaptive periods are more receptive to leadership there must be a *felt need* by organizational members for transformation otherwise they may accept more administrative management. Today's reality, of course, is that most business organizations are *attempting to do both simultaneously*, and this highlights one of the dilemmas with this dimension of Pawar and Eastman's theory. It is built around idealized polarities which provide a certain elegance in terms of theory building but may not reflect the complexities of reality.

The second of Pawar and Eastman's factors—the relative dominance of the technical core versus boundary-spanning units—refers to the fact that an organization's task systems are either more inwardly oriented or more externally oriented. Isolated from an ever-changing external world, the technical core develops routines and stability in how it approaches its tasks whereas the boundary-spanning functions are forced to adapt continually to environmental constraints and contingencies and can never develop highly standardized or routine approaches (Thompson, 1967). Therefore organizations where boundary-spanning units dominate over the technical core will be more open to transformational and charismatic leadership since they are more receptive to change.

Drawing upon Mintzberg's (1979) typology of organizational structures, two of his ideal types are hypothesized by Pawar and Eastman to be conducive to transformational leadership. They are the simple structure and the adhocracy, since they are felt to be more receptive to organizational change through the development and promotion of a vision. In the simple structure, the leader or entrepreneur-leader is the source of the organization's vision, and in an adhocracy structure, the vision is developed through professionals who possess the power, knowledge, and willingness to work collectively (Mintzberg 1979). It is argued that the three other forms have internal forces which mitigate against an openness to innovative leadership. For example, the machine bureaucracy is dominated by standardized tasks and work processes. Senior managers are obsessed by a control mindset, and lower level managers are intent only on implementing operational directives from above. As such, there is little concern with innovation and change that are potentially threatening to a tightly orchestrated status quo.

In the professional bureaucracy, professionals dominate to such an extent that management is simply a support function and marginalized to the role of facilitation. The divisional structure is also not conducive. Built around two layers in which a headquarters' operation governs quasi-autonomous divisions, the focus of the corporate headquarters is to specify operational goals and to monitor the divisions' accomplishment of them. While theoretically this latter argument might appear appealing, there have been instances of leaders of divisional structures who have been perceived as transformational or charismatic. Jack Welch of General Electric is certainly one of the more visible examples (Tichy & Sherman, 1993).

Pawar and Eastman's final factor concerns the mode of internal governance. They start with the assumption that membership in organizations is built around furthering individual members' self-interests (Burns & Stalker, 1961; Thompson, 1967). Yet the aim of transformational and charismatic forms of leadership is for followers to transcend their own self-interests for collective goals. Under Wilkins and Ouchi's (1983) three modes of governance (the market, the bureaucratic, and the clan), the nature of transactions between an organization and its members will differ. They argue that only under the clan mode are organizational members socialized in such a way that their own interests and the organization's are aligned as one. While employees still hold their self-interests, they believe they can fulfill them through achieving the collective's interests. The clan mode is therefore the most receptive to transformational leadership since it allows for a merging of individual self-interests with the collective's goals.

Pawar and Eastman have provided us with a good start in terms of theory-building. What remains to be done are field investigations and the further identification of additional contextual variables. Beyer's article highlights additional issues to be addressed.

In concluding this discussion on context, we can say that its role in charismatic and transformational leadership holds enormous potential as an area of future investigation. It is clear from the limited research to date that the leader and their context are intertwined in a complex and intimate fashion. Beyond simple insights and some theoretical speculation, however, we remain largely in the dark about this dimension. I believe that qualitative research will play a crucial role in helping us to discern more effectively contextual dimensions that influence both charismatic and transformational leadership and in turn to build more fine-grained theory.

ROUTINIZATION AND SUCCESSION

To date, there has been little discussion of succession issues with transformational leadership presumably because these leaders are hypothesized to develop leaders of equal ability. Rather than accept this belief blindly, it seems imperative that researchers begin to examine how effective these leaders actually are in developing successors. Moreover, it would be interesting to explore whether certain rituals and routines develop around these leaders which allow their value systems and worldviews to pass on to future generations. Succession under charismatic leadership, in contrast, is thought to be more problematic and therefore has sparked some inquiry. It is assumed that charismatic leaders often have difficulty in developing others to replace them because of their strong ego needs. The rest of this section will focus on these leaders.

Max Weber was deeply intrigued about the manner in which a leader's charisma could be transformed into routines and other institutional vehicles that in essence "lived on" beyond the leader. In this way, the vitality and positive consequences of the leader's influence might be retained long after his or her departure. Weber believed, however, that charisma was essentially an unstable force. It either faded or else was institutionalized (or, as Weber termed the process, *routinized*) as the charismatic leader's mission was accomplished (Weber, 1947). He argued there were strong incentives on the part of charismatic leaders and their followers to transform their movements into more permanent institutions (Weber, 1947). With success, the followers began to achieve positions of authority and material advantage. The desire naturally arose to institutionalize these, and so traditions and rules grew up to protect the gains of the mission.

Institutionalization is an area where little research has been conducted in the organizational behavior literature. We know almost nothing about the routinization of charismatic leadership. The only major study was conducted by Trice and Beyer in 1986. In their study, Trice and Beyer examined two charismatic leaders where in one case charisma had routinized and in another it had not. The case of successful routinization was the charismatic founder of Alcoholics Anonymous. Early in the organization's life, the leader and his initial group of followers established (1) an effective administrative apparatus independent of the founder, (2) rites that diffused charisma among the members, and (3) written and oral traditions that sustained the leader's message over time. For example, the founder's message of how he overcame alcoholism was codified into a publication entitled the *Twelve Steps and Twelve Traditions* (Alcoholics Anonymous World Services, 1953).

In contrast, the charismatic founder of the National Council on Alcoholism left behind no important oral or written traditions. No in-depth biographies of her were produced. Her philosophy was never codified into a personal testament. As a result, mention of herself and her ideas is today rare. Her charisma failed to routinize.

Trice and Beyer (1986) concluded that five key factors were largely responsible for the successful institutionalization of charisma in the one case. They were: (1) the development of an administrative apparatus separate from the charismatic leader that put into practice the leader's mission; (2) the incorporation of the leader's mission into oral and written traditions; (3) the transfer of charisma through rites and ceremonies to other members of the organization; (4) a continued identification by organizational members with the original mission; and (5) the selection of a successor who resembles the charismatic leader and is committed to the founder's mission. In the other case where charisma did not routinize, these factors were largely missing. It is important to note that both organizations had entrepreneurial founders and were non-profits so the findings may be difficult to generalize to business settings and to leaders who are not founders of organizations.

From the standpoint of the business world, it does appear that charisma is a relatively fragile phenomenon in terms of institutionalization. There are several examples from the management literature where succession dilemmas prevented the routinization of charismatic leadership (e.g., Bryman, 1992, 1993; Conger, 1989; Rose, 1989). The charismatic leaders in my 1989 study have all since departed from their original organizations due to either promotions, moves to new organizations, retirement, or in one case, death. From follow-up observation, it is clear that there is little indication of any significant routinization of their charisma in their various organizations (Conger & Kanungo, 1998). I did (Conger 1993) note that one of the group—an entrepreneur—was able to institutionalize some elements of his original mission, values, and operating procedures. But that individual has since left his organization, and a few years ago it was acquired by a much larger firm which has superimposed its own mission, values, and procedures. Today there is little evidence of the initial routinization of the leader's charisma. The leaders who were acting as change agents in large, bureaucratic organizations had practically no long term impact in terms of institutionalizing their charisma (Conger, 1993).

As Bryman (1993) argues, succession is one of the most crucial issues in routinization. When an organization has a charismatic leader, it creates what Wilson (1975) has called as "charismatic demand." The dilemma, of course, is that it is highly unlikely that a charismatic leader will be found to replace the original one. Though Bryman (1993) has found one example in a study of a transportation company, such situations appear extremely rare. Instead what often happens is that a charismatic leader is replaced by a more managerially-oriented individual. Examples of this would be Steven Jobs at Apple who was succeeded by John Sculley and Michael Spindler, the succession of Lee Iacocca at Chrysler by Robert Eaton (Bryman, 1993; Taylor, 1991), and Walt Disney's replacement by Roy Disney (Bryman, 1993; Thomas 1976). Given the enormous demands for continual adaptation due to competition and strong needs to develop rational and formalized structures, many business organizations may simply not be conducive to the long-term institutionalization of a leader's charisma.

So perhaps it is time that we consider "releasing" ourselves from the constraints of Weber's original framework concerning institutionalization. His notions may have been appropriate for more stable times which were infrequently interrupted by dramatic change. In today's world of business, for example, the rapid pace of technological change and global competitive forces suggest that we are in a period of constant change characterized by an ongoing, if not permanent, need for adaptation to change. The need to institutionalize the values, beliefs, strategies, and ideology of a single leader may actually be dysfunctional given environmental demands to constantly reinvent the organization. As such, Weber's notion that charisma must ultimately institutionalize itself may no longer be accurate.

Even if routinization were to be successful, it is no guarantee of continued performance success. Part of the dilemma is that successors may not possess the strategic skills nor other abilities crucial to ensure the firm's future leadership (Conger, 1993). For example, while the retailer Walmart has apparently institutionalized Sam Walton's values and operating beliefs, a critical issue is whether it can institutionalize his visionary insights into the world of retailing. Just as importantly, Walton's vision was most likely time-bound. It was built around an era of retailing where the internet did not exist. So even if his strategic competence were to be institutionalized, it is the product of a specific era in retailing and therefore may be unsuitable for anticipating the industry's next paradigm shift. The original mission of a charismatic leader is highly unlikely to be forever adaptive.

Institutionalization of the leader's charisma in rites and routines may also not necessarily produce positive outcomes (Conger, 1993). Elements as simple as institutionalized rituals of the charismatic leader may themselves become counterproductive over time. Even simple traditions could lose their original meaning and transform themselves into bureaucratic norms. For example, IBM's traditional corporate dress code of dark suits and white shirts is illustrative. This requirement was intended by Watson to make salespeople feel like executives: "If you dressed like an executive, you would feel like one," was Watson's belief. Indeed the dress code did build pride in the early days of IBM. Many decades later, however, this norm would transform into a symbol of rigidity and conformity. It bureaucratized itself as Weber would have guessed.

In conclusion, we need to challenge our thinking about this crucial area. A limited number of case studies have offered us at best tantalizing tidbits of insight. There is a strong need for systematic longitudinal and qualitative research to answer questions about the potential problems of institutionalization and whether positive aspects of charisma may routinize to the point they become meaningless or simply bureaucratic procedures.

LIABILITIES

Liabilities of the transformational leader have been largely overlooked. Because these leaders are seen as such positive forces, the liabilities they might possess or cause have gone unnoticed. Yet it would seem that they might not be appropriate in all contexts and therefore could possess certain liabilities.

In contrast, there has been interest in the negative outcomes associated with charismatic leadership. Jane Howell has proposed a dichotomous model of socialized and personalized charisma which attempts to address this issue. In conjunction with Robert House (Howell, 1988; House & Howell, 1992; Howell & House, 1993), the theory has been refined to propose a set of personality characteristics, behaviors, and effects that distinguished two forms of charismatic leadership. There has been some support for the theory in a recent analysis using assessments of historical profiles of charismatic leaders (O'Connor, Mumford, Clifton, Gessner, & Connelly, 1995).

Specifically, socialized charismatics are described as articulating visions that serve the interests of the collective. They govern in an egalitarian, non self-aggrandizing manner, and actively empower and develop their followers. They also work through legitimate, established channels of authority to accomplish their goals. On the other hand, personalized charismatic leaders are authoritarian and narcissistic. They have high needs for power driven in part by low self-esteem. Their goals reflect the leader's own self-interests, and followers' needs are played upon as a means to achieve the leader's interests. At the same time, they demand unquestioning obedience and dependence in their followers.

While portraying these two forms as dichotomous, Howell and House do acknowledge that a charismatic leader might in reality exhibit some aspects of both the socialized and the personalized characteristics. This latter view is probably closer to reality than their ideal model. As such, two parallel scales (of varying degrees of intensity) of each might be more accurate. A leader might therefore embody degrees of both.

Drawing upon actual examples of charismatic leaders, Conger (1989a, 1990) examined those who had produced negative outcomes for themselves and their organizations. He found that problems could arise with a charismatic leader around (1) their visions, (2) their impression management, (3) their management practices, and (4) succession planning. On the dimension of vision, typical problems occurred when the leader possessed an exaggerated sense of the market-place opportunities for their vision or when they grossly underestimated the resources necessary for its accomplishment. In addition, visions often failed when they reflected largely the leader's own needs rather than those of constituents or the marketplace or when leaders were unable to recognize fundamental shifts in the environment demanding a redirection of their vision.

In terms of impression management, charismatic leaders appear prone to exaggerated self-descriptions and claims for their visions which can mislead their followers (Conger, 1990; Gardner & Avolio, 1998). For example, they may present information that makes their visions appear more feasible or appealing than they are in reality. They may screen out looming problems or else foster an illusion of control when things are actually out of control. Gardner and Avolio's (1998) recent model takes these dimensions to a further extreme where charismatic leaders are essentially portrayed as actors who are extremely clever in manipulating images of themselves to secure perceptions of their leadership and commitment to their goals: "they use their superior acting abilities to orchestrate nonverbal and expressive behaviors that followers see as highly fluid, outwardly directed, and animated. . . . Whereas many such behaviors involve spontaneous displays of genuine emotions, others are scripted in advance, or through improvisation to maximize their impact" (p. 43).

If Gardner and Avolio are correct, the liabilities of such leaders are that they are so atuned to crafting images of themselves based on perceptions of their followers that the leader's own personal identity and convictions may in turn be lost. In the quest for an attribution of charismatic leadership, their own internal sense of identity is undermined. They become actors seeking the next round of applause.

From the standpoint of management practices that become liabilities, there are examples of overly self-confident and unconventional charismatic leaders who create antagonistic relations with peers and superiors. Some such as Steven Jobs of Apple Computer are known to create "in" and "out" groups within their organizations that promote dysfunctional rivalries. Others create excessive dependence on themselves and then alternate between idealizing and devaluing dependent subordinates. Many are ineffective adminstrators preferring "big picture" activities to routine work. Finally, charismatic leaders often have a difficult time developing successors. They enjoy the "center stage" too much to share it. To find a replacement who is a peer may be too threatening for leaders who tend to be so narcissistic.

Daniel Sankowsky (1994) has written about the dilemmas of charismatic leaders who are prone to a pathology of narcissism. Specifically, he has proposed a stage model showing how pathological charismatics implicate their followers into a cycle of exploitation. First, these leaders offer a grandiose vision and confidently encourage followers to accomplish it. Followers, however, soon find themselves in an untenable position. Because of their leader's optimism, they have underestimated the constraints facing the mission as well as the resources they need but currently lack. As a result, performance inevitably falls short of the leader's high expectations. Wishing to comply with their leader's wishes, however, followers continue to strive. Soon their performance appears substandard to themselves and the leader as they fall behind.

While initially the leader will blame the outside world for undermining the mission, his or her attention will eventually turn towards the followers. Conditioned to accept their leader's viewpoint and not to challenge it, followers willingly receive the blame themselves from their leader. The reverse of the many benefits ascribed to charismatic leaders then occurs. Instead of building their followers' self-worth and self-efficacy, they gradually destroy it and create highly dependent individuals.

In general, the liabilities of charismatic and transformational leadership remain a seriously neglected area of study. There is a great need for longitudinal studies and in-depth case analysis to better understand whether some of the manipulative dynamics found in political and cult settings can also occur in business contexts. As we noted earlier, "followers" in corporations are often not in a position to freely chose or self-select their leader. Their leader may be appointed by the organization or else employees themselves may be promoted or moved into the leader's work unit - not necessarily by choice. As such, we cannot be certain that the degree or intensity of psychological dependence on the leader is the same as in political or cult movements. It is most likely to be different. Finally, transformational leadership remains largely untouched by the debate about leadership liabilities. Given that such leaders may not be appropriate for all contexts (Baliga & Hunt, 1988), and that it is rare to find a single leader who possesses a balanced complement of leadership capabilities, it seems timely to challenge our assumptions and to more closely look at the issue of the liabilities with transformational leaders.

CONCLUSIONS

In this article, I have taken a broad sweep through the fields of charismatic and transformational leadership as they stand today. Both fields have undergone dramatic growth in terms of research over the last ten years. We have identified a number of areas where explorations have truly deepened our understanding of very complex phenomena. This is particularly true in the domain of leader behaviors. At the same time, the field in this arena appears to have settled into a dominant paradigm where the leading theories are increasingly converging and stabilizing as standardized measures are developed and interest turns to investigations with measures. In other words, we are moving away from theory-building. My personal belief is that this is a mistake. Our knowledge is still formative in terms of leader behavior and follower effects. Both theory-building and continued exploratory research are necessary. At same time, there are numerous domains of knowledge about the phenomena where we remain largely in the dark. For example, we have only scratched the surface in our understanding of contextual issues, liabilities, and succession. In many ways, one might say we are in the Iron Age in terms of our understanding of both charismatic and transformational leadership. The Information Age is still a long ways off. In conclusion, our work has only begun. From my vantage point, the opportunities are boundless.

Acknowledgments: The author wishes to thank three anonymous reviewers for their helpful insights and suggestions. Selected portions of this article are adapted from Conger, J. A. and Kanungo, R. N., *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations* (Sage Publishers, 1998).

REFERENCES

Agle, B. R., & Sonnenfeld, J. A. (1994). Charismatic chief executive officers: Are they more effective? An empirical test of charismatic leadership theory. In *Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings.*

Agle, B. R. (1993). *Charismatic chief executive officers: Are they more effective? An empirical* *test of charismatic leadership.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington.

Atwater, L. E., Camobreco, J. F., Dionne, S. D., Avolio, B. J., & Lau, A. (1997). Effects of rewards and punishments on leader charisma, leader effectiveness and follower reactions. *Leadership Quarterly, 8*, 133–152.

Avolio, B., & Yammarino, F. J. (1990). Operationalizing charismatic leadership using a levels-of-analysis framework. *Leadership Quarterly, 1*, 193–208.

Avolio, B., & Bass, B. M. (1988). Transformational leadership, charisma and beyond. In J. G. Hunt, B. R. Baliga, H. P. Dachler, & C. A. Schriesheim, (Eds.), *Emerging leadership vistas* (pp. 267–308). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath–Jossey-Bass.

Avolio, B., & Gibbons. (1988). Developing transformational leaders: A lifespan approach. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 267–308). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1985). *Charisma and beyond.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, San Diego, CA.

Baglia, B. R., & Hunt, J. G. (1988) An organizational life cycle approach to leadership. In J. G. Hunt, B. R. Baliga, H. P. Dachler, & C. A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Emerging leadership vistas* (pp. 129–149). Lexington, MA: Heath.

Bass, B. M. (1995). Theory of transformational leadership redux. *Leadership Quarterly, 6*, 463–478.

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

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. (1993). Transformational leadership: a response to critiques . In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 49–80). New York: Academic Press.

Bass, B. M., & Yammarino, F. J. (1988). Leadership: Dispositional and situational, (ONR Tech Rep No 1). Binghamton, NY: State University of New York, Center for Leadership Studies.

Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge.* New York: Harper & Row.

Berlew, D. E. (1974). Leadership and organizational excitement. *California Management Review, 17*, 21–30.

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid.* Houston: Gulf Publishing.

Bradley, R. T. (1987). *Charisma and social structure: A study of love and power, wholeness and transformation.* New York: Paragon House.

Bryman, A. (1993). Charismatic leadership in business organizations: some neglected issues. *Leadership Quarterly, 4*, 289–304.

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

Burns, T., & Stalker, G. M. (1961). *The management of innovation.* London: Tavistock.

Calder, B. J. (1977). An attribution theory of leadership. In B. M. Staw, & G. R. Salancik (Eds.), *New directions in organizational behavior* (pp. 179–204). Chicago: St. Clair.

Carroll, L. (1987). A study of narcissism, affiliation, intimacy, and power motives among students in business. *Psychological Reports, 61*, 355–358.

Cell, C. P. (1974). Charismatic heads of state: The social context. *Behavioral Science Research, 4*, 255–305.

Chemers, M. M., & Ayman, R., (Eds.) (1993). *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions.* New York: Academic Press.

Chen, C. C., & Meindl, J. R. (1991). The construction of leadership images in the popular press: The case of Donald Burr and People Express. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36*, 521–551.

Conger, J. A. (1993). Max Weber's conceptualization of charismatic authority: Its influence on organizational research. *Leadership Quarterly, 4*, 277–288.

Conger, J. A. (1991) Inspiring others: The language of leadership. *Academy of Management Executive, 5*, 31–45.

Conger, J. A. (1989). *The charismatic leader: Behind the mystique of exceptional leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Conger, J. A. (1988). Theoretical foundations of charismatic leadership. In J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, & Associates (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 12–39). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Conger, J. A. (1985). *Charismatic leadership in business: An exploration study.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, School of Business Administration, Harvard University.

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

Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., & Menon, S. T. (1998). *Charismatic leadership and follower outcome effects.* Paper presented at the Academy of Management, San Diego, August.

Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., Menon, S. T., & Mathur, P. (1997). Measuring charisma: dimensionality and validity of the Conger-Kanungo scale of charismatic leadership. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 14*, 290–302.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. (1994). Charismatic leadership in organizations: Perceived behavioral attributes and their measurement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15*, 439–452.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1992). Perceived behavioral attributes of charismatic leadership. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 24*, 86–102.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N., (Eds.). (1988). *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review, 13*, 471–482.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review, 12*, 637–647.

Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Rochberg-Halton, E. (1981). *The Meaning of things: Domestic symbols and self.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Curphy, G. J. (1990). *An empirical study of Bass' (1985) theory of transformational and transactional leadership.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Deluga, R. J. (1998) American presidential proactivity, charismatic leadership and rated performance. *Leadership Quarterly, 9*, 265–292.

Deluga, R. J. (1995). The relationship between attributional charismatic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 25*(1), 652–1,669.

Downton, J. V., Jr. (1973). *Rebel leadership.* New York: Free Press.

Erikson, E. (1968). *Identity, youth, and crisis.* New York: Norton.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Freemesser, G. F., & Kaplan, H. B. (1976). Self-attitudes and deviant behavior: The case of the charismatic religious movement. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 5*, 1–9.

Galanter, M. (1982). Charismatic religious sects and psychiatry: An overview. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 139*, 1539–1548.

Gardner, W. L., & Avolio, B. J. (1998) The charismatic relationship: A dramaturgical perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 23*, 32–58.

Hater, J. J., & Bass, B. M. (1988). Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73*, 695–702.

Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist, 49*, 493–504.

House, R. J. (1995). Leadership in the twenty-first century: A speculative inquiry. In A. Howard (Ed.), *The changing nature of work* (pp. 411–450). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge* (pp. 189–207). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997) The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management, 23*, 409–473.

House, R., & Shamir, B. (1993). Toward the intergration of transformational, charismatic, and visionary theories. In M. Chemmers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research perspectives and directions* (pp. 577–594). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

House, R., & Howell, J. M. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 3*, 81–108.

House, R. J., Spangler, W. D., & Woycke, J. (1991). Personality and charisma in the U.S. presidency: A psychological theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36*, 364–96.

Howell, J. (1996). *Organization contexts, charismatic and exchange leadership.* Working paper, London, Ontario: University of Western Ontario.

Howell, J. M. (1988). Two faces of charisma: Socialized and personalized leadership in organizations. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 213–236). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, lows of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated business unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 891–902.

Howell, J. M., & Higgins, C. A. (1990). Champions of technological innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 35*, 317–341.

Howell, J. M., & House, R. (1993). *Specialized and personalized charisma: A theory of the bright and dark sides of leadership.* Working paper. London, Ontario: University of Western Ontario.

Howell, J. M., & Frost, P. (1989). A laboratory study of charismatic leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 43*, 243–269.

Kanter, R. M. (1968). Commitment and social organizations: A study of commitment mechanisms in utopian communities. *American Sociological Review, 33*, 499–518.

Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (1994). The leadership mystique. *Academy of Management Executive, 8*, 73–92.

Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (1988). Origins of charisma: Ties that bind the leader and the led. In J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, & Associates (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: the elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 237–252). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kinder, P. R., & Sears, P. O. (1985). Public opinion and political action. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology*. New York: Random House.

Kirkpatrick, S. A. (1992). *Decomposing charismatic leadership: The effects of leader content and procession follower performance, attitudes, and perceptions.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 36–51.

Klein, K. J., & House, R. J. (1995) On fire. Charismatic leadership and levels of analysis. *Leadership Quarterly, 6*, 183–198.

Koene, H., Pennings, H., & Schrender, M. (1991). *Leadership, culture, and organizational effectiveness.* Boulder, CO: Center for Creative Leadership.

Koh, W. L., Terborg, J. R., & Steers, R. M. (1991). *The impact of transformational leaders on organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, teacher satisfaction and student performance in Singapore.* Miami, FL: Academy of Management Meetings.

Kotter, J. P. (1988). *The leadership factor.* New York: Free Press.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1987). *The leadership challenge.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Locke. E. A. (1998). The role of individual consideration, vision, and egoism in effective leadership. In F. Dansereau & F. Yammarino (Eds.), *Leadership: The multiple level analysis* (pp. 85–92). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Lodahl, A. (1982). *Crisis in values and the success of the unification church.* Unpublished undergraduate honors thesis, Cornell University.

Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996) Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly, 7*, 385–425.

Maslow, A. H. (1968). *Towards a psychology of being*, (2nd ed.) Princeton: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Meindl, J., & Lerner, M. J. (1983). The heroic motive: Some experimental demonstrations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 19*, 1–20.

Meindl, J. R. (1990). On leadership: An alternative to the conventional wisdom. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (vol. 12; pp. 159–203). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The structuring of organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Musser, S. J. (1987) *The determination of positive and negative charismatic leaders.* Working paper. Grantham, PA: Messiah College.

Nadler, D. A., & Tushman, M. L. (1990). Beyond the charismatic leader: Leadership and organizational change. *California Management Review, 32*, 77–97.

O'Connor, J., Mumford, M. D., Clifton, T. C., Gessner, T. L., & Connelly, M. S. (1995) Charismatic leaders and destructiveness: An historiometric study. *Leadership Quarterly, 6*, 529–555.

Pawar, B. S., & Eastman, K. K. (1997). The nature and implications of contextual influences on transformational leadership: A conceptual examination. *Academy of Management Review, 22*, 80–109.

Pettigrew, A. M. (1987). Context and action in the transformation of the firm. *Journal of Management Studies, 24*, 649–670.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly, 1*, 107–142.

Prentice, D. A. (1987). Psychological correspondence of possessions, attitudes and values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 993–1003.

Puffer, S. M. (1990). Attributions of charismatic leadership: The impact of decision style, outcome, and observer characteristics. *Leadership Quarterly, 1*, 177–192.

Roberts, N. C. (1985). Transforming leadership: a process of collective action. *Human Relations, 38*, 1,023–1,046.

Roberts, N. C., & Bradley, R. T. (1988). Limits of charisma. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 253–275). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rose, R. (1989). *West of Eden: The end of innocence at Apple Computer.* London: Business Books.

Sankowsky, D. (1995). The charismatic leader as narcissist: Understanding the abuse of power. *Organizational Dynamics 23*(4), 57–71.

Sashkin, M. (1988). The visionary leader. In J. A. Conger and R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 122–160). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shamir, B. (1995). Social distance and charisma: Theoretical notes and an exploratory study. *Leadership Quarterly, 6*(1), 19–47.

Shamir, B. (1992). Attribution of influence and charisma to the leader: The romance of leadership revisited. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22*, 386–407.

Shamir, B., Zakay, E., Breinin, E., & Popper, M. (1998) Correlates of Charismatic Leader Behavior in Military Units: Subordinates' Attitudes, Unit Characteristics, and Superiors' Appraisals of Leader Performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 41*, 387–409.

Shamir, B., House, R., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivation effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science, 4*, 584.

Sidani, Y. (1993). *Perceptions of charisma: The influence of leader attributes, leader speech, and follower self-esteem.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi.

Synder, M., & Ickes, W. (1985). Personality and social behavior. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp. 883–947). New York: Random House.

Taylor, A. (1991). Can Iacocca fix Chrysler—again? *Fortune, 8*(April), 40–44.

Thomas, K. (1976). Conflict and conflict management. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 889–935). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Thompson, J. D. (1967). *Organizations in Action.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Tichy, N., & Devanna, M. A. (1986). *The transformational leader.* New York: Wiley.

Tichy, N., & Sherman, S. (1993). *Control your destiny, or someone else will.* New York: Currency Doubleday.

Toth, M. A. (1981). *The theory of the two charisma.* Washington, DC: University Press of America.

Trice, H. M., & Beyer, J. M. (1986). Charisma and its routinization in two social movement organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 8*, 113–164.

Tsui, A. S. (1994) Reputational effectiveness: Toward a mutual responsiveness framework. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (vol. 16; pp. 257–307). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, P. W. (1973). *Leadership and Decision-Making.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Waldman, D. A., & Ramirez. (1992). CEO leadership and organizational performance: The moderating effect of environmental uncertainty, (working paper 92, 10-37). Montreal: Concordia University.

Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organizations* (A. M. Henderson & T. Parsons, trans.; T. Parsons, ed.). New York: Free Press.

Weierter, S. J. M. (1997). Who wants to play "follow the leader?": A theory of charismatic relationships based on routinized charisma and follower characteristics. *Leadership Quarterly, 8*, 171–194.

Wilkins, A. L., & Ouchi, W. G. (1983). Efficient cultures. Exploring the relationships between culture and organizational performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 28*, 468–481.

Willner, A. R. (1984). *The spellbinders: Charismatic political leadership.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Yammarino, F. J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). Transformational leadership and multiple levels of analysis. *Human Relations, 43*, 975–995.

Yammarino, F. J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). Long-term forecasting of transformational leadership

and its effects among naval officers. In K. E Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 151–170). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations*, (4th ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Zaleznik, A. (1990). The leadership gap. *The Executive, 4*, 7–22.
Zaleznik, A., & Kets de Vries, M. (1975). *Power and the corporate mind.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.