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ABSTRACT

Charisma, a term re-introduced by sociologist Max Weber during the mid-19th century, continues to capture the interest of scholars and laymen ever-increasingly. While Weber described charisma as a certain quality of individuals due to which they are deemed exceptional, in current usage the term has been applied rather loosely to individuals as well as inanimate objects. In so doing, charisma has lost the exceptionality that constitutes its essence. In what appears to be an extension of the trait theory of leadership, charisma has become a function of traits, skills, behaviors, situations, relationships, etc.; and there is no coherence regarding what comprises an appropriate combination of charismatic attributes. It is contended that the use of attributes in defining and measuring charisma has resulted in a male-centric approach whereby it has become common practice to designate men with charisma. Women, very rarely, have been called charismatic.

This study explored the usage of the term charisma in contemporary literature. Specifically, the goal was to determine the frequency with which men and women are termed charismatic, whether the attributes used to describe charismatic leaders are masculine, feminine, or gender-neutral and if the use of specific attributes leads to gender biases in the scholarship. A related aim was to decipher if contemporary scholarship belies Weber’s exposition of charisma. Content analysis was used to answer the questions posed in this study. The results indicate that contemporary charismatic
literature not only belies Weberian charisma but also that the use of masculine attributes and male examples leads to a gendered perception of charisma.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

But for us, we’ve never heard
About a marvel so great,
For all the heroes who have lived
In history can’t measure up
In bravery against the Maid,
Who strives to rout our enemies.
It’s God does that, who’s guiding her
Whose courage passes that of men.
(Christine de Pizan, 1994, pp. 356-357)

Few women have been extolled in words similar to those used by Christine de Pizan in 1429 to describe Joan of Arc in her poem. Often referred to as the Maid, Joan of Arc was an exemplary leader who changed the course of history in France during the mid-15th century. A review of the history of civilization shows that such leadership, as exhibited by a woman, is rare considering that world’s greatest leaders usually have been men. According to the latest census data, women comprise approximately half the human population (https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/xx.html) yet women have been and continue to be exceptions to the domain of leadership. Further, while exceptional male leaders are often also referred to as charismatic personalities, women leaders have remained bereft of the title despite their many accomplishments. This gap is evident not only in theory but also in practice. There remains a lacuna that has not been filled. These gaps and biases restrict most
studies dealing with charisma and leadership because they are often male-oriented and seldom acknowledge the existence and contributions of charismatic women leaders.

Charisma, a word transferred from religion to politics and sociology by Max Weber, implies “gift of grace” (1978). Weber reintroduced the term charisma during the early 20th century, but it was not until the mid-20th century that it gained a new found interest in the fields of sociology, psychology, public administration, political science, business administration, organization theory, leadership studies, and in mundane parlance. The increasing awareness and widespread interest in charisma brought with it inevitable changes in its definition and meaning. According to Potts (2009), the term charisma has “become increasingly elastic since attaining wide popular usage in the 1960s; further indiscriminate usages may stretch the elasticity until the concept loses recognizable shape” (p. 188). Researchers have constantly sought to operationalize charisma using both qualitative and quantitative methodologies often using various attributes (traits, skills, characteristics, qualities, behaviors, etc.) to measure charisma. These attributes are usually comprised of a combination of physical, social, and/or psychological features. Ascribing these attributes to charismatic leaders is similar to the trait theory of leadership where different traits and behaviors are used to determine if an individual qualifies as a leader (Gibson, Hannon, & Blackwell, 1998, p. 13). According to Turner (2003), “researchers tried to find measurable correlates of charisma, and reinterpreted it as a personality trait” (p. 8). Akin to leadership theories, charismatic determinants are largely based on instances of men who have achieved certain greatness and success in the course of history while excluding women from such discussions.
In her discussion of women and leadership, Karin Klenke (1996) states that leadership is generally conceived as a theory of the “man on the white horse,” in that leadership is perceived as a study of “great men” (p. 1). The gender gap in charismatic studies is evident in Lindholm’s (1990) observation that the study of charisma “is unfortunately quite male-centered. This is a consequence of the ethnographic accounts, which are almost always about male leaders, and because of a male bias in the theoretical and popular models of charisma” (p. 6). In light of the gaps noted by Klenke (1996) and Lindholm (1990), this study proposes to: (1) explore the use of charismatic leader examples in contemporary charismatic literature, (2) investigate how the use of language in contemporary charismatic literature perpetuates gender biases in the scholarship, (3) explore the frequency with which masculine and feminine attributes are used in describing charismatic leaders, and (4) explore confusion surrounding the meaning and definition of charisma in contemporary literature. The main research questions that will be addressed in this study are:

1. To what extent does contemporary literature on charisma reflect and contribute toward a gendered perception of charisma?

2. To what extent does contemporary charismatic literature belie Weber’s conceptualization of charisma?

Gender perceptions and inconsistencies in contemporary charismatic leadership literature were analyzed by means of content analysis. The data derived through the content analysis also provided necessary information to compare contemporary charisma with Weberian charisma and the tools to identify differences in the usage of charisma. The importance of this research stems from the gaps in contemporary studies on charisma:
while the role of gender has been widely studied in the field of leadership, the same
cannot be said of charismatic studies. Few studies that broach the topic of gender and
charisma (Groves, 2005; Krogstad & Storvik, 2007; Lindholm, 1990; Mitchell, 2006;
Takala & Aaltio, 2007) address the existence of gaps but do not offer approaches to fill
the gaps. This study aims at (1) bridging conceptual gaps in contemporary literature on
charisma and gender and (2) demonstrating that language about gender confounds
language about charisma.

Charisma

Tracing the history of charisma, Potts (2009) notes that the term ‘charisma’ owes
its origin to the ancient Greek term charis, which means ‘grace, beauty, charm, favor,
goodwill, free benevolence, gift, benefit, gratitude.’ The usage of the term charis can be
traced to the eighth century BC writings of Homer and Hesiod, who used the terms
Charis and Charites to describe Greek goddesses (pp. 12-13). These goddesses were
considered the personification of grace, beauty, purity, and altruism (Oakes, 1997, p. 25).
To the Greeks, the term charis did not have rigid religious connotations except that it
conveyed grace or power bestowed by God; in general usage; however, charis implied an
endowment of favor from one person to another; an acknowledgement of gifts received;
magical charm; personal charm; or an attractive inner quality based on which an
individual was deemed exceptionally attractive (Potts, 2009, p. 14).

First Century AD

It was not until first century AD that the term ‘charisma’ appeared in the writings
of St. Paul, who wrote the epistles during AD 50-62, where he referred to charisma as
“the gift of God’s grace” (Potts, 2009, p. 5). According to Oakes (1997, p. 25), the origin of the term charisma can be traced to the Greek word Charizesthai, implying favor or gift of divine origin. The Greek term pneuma chariots, implying “spirit of grace and compassion,” (Potts, 2009, p. 15) was used to define divine gifts bestowed by God. Paul used the term charismata to refer to a range of divine gifts, which include: healing, miracle working, prophecy, glossolalia, utterance of spiritual wisdom and knowledge, faith, skill of distinguishing spirits, and interpretation of glossolalia (Potts, 2009, p. 39).

Paul, organizing the church hierarchically, stated that the spiritual gifts were available to all individuals in the Christian community, with apostles and prophets possessing many charismatic powers such as healing, ecstatic speech, and prophecy among others. Teachers, who ranked third in the hierarchy, were gifted with wisdom and knowledge; while miracle workers, healers, helpers, administrators, and glossolalia comprised the remaining of the hierarchy. Though the lower occupations in the hierarchy were mundane, they were still relevant since they were considered divine appointments (Potts, 2009, p. 40). The individuals possessing charismata were urged to use the spiritual gifts not for their personal benefit but to benefit the community. Authority rested in the community as a whole rather than in individuals (Potts, 2009, pp. 46-47). In essence, Paul used the term charisma in a strictly religious context and translated it to mean spiritual and supernatural gifts bestowed by divine grace alone, which were meant to “be used responsibly for the common good” (Potts, 2009, p. 49).
Second – Third Centuries AD

Though Paul’s epistles were widely acknowledged they did not fully influence the development and organization of the church during his time. Even while Paul was aware of the ephemeral nature of charismatic gifts, a new wave of Christian ideology during the second century brought with it inevitable decline in the popularity of charisma (Potts, 2009, pp. 51-52). It was not long before the word charisma lost its prominence in the Christian community due to intellectualization of the church (Potts, 2009, pp. 5-7). By 110 AD the Christian church was delineated with formal official and hierarchical structures with the bishop assuming highest authority and the ministers assuming roles based on power derived from the institution rather than through divine grace. While Paul’s conceptualization of charisma and charismata started to wane in the second century AD, it was not until third century AD that the Christian church began to eliminate and replace charisma and charismata with mundane abilities, which had little to do with the supernatural and spiritual gifts of the divine (Potts, 2009, pp. 52-53).

Weberian Charisma

It was not until centuries later that Max Weber re-introduced the term charisma in his discussion on the types of legitimate authority. Weber (1978) classified three pure types of legitimate authority or domination: (1) legal-rational, (2) traditional, and (3) charismatic. While legal-rational authority is based on a belief in the legality of rules and obedience is owed to the impersonal order, traditional authority represents a situation where an individual is obeyed due to respect for the sanctity of traditions and customs. Charismatic authority, which is opposed to traditional and legal-rational authority,
represents a situation where the leader is obeyed because of the personal trust followers place in the exceptional qualities and heroic abilities of the leader. In his discussion on charismatic authority Weber notes that the conception of charisma is not new and that it was borrowed from early Christian terminology and credited Rudolf Sohm for clarifying the concept of charisma in his work *Kirchenrecht* (Weber, 1978, pp. 215-216). However, Weber’s exposition of charisma differed widely from that of St. Paul and Rudolf Sohm’s; to Weber charisma was not relegated to the religious realm alone rather it was a universal phenomenon (Weber, 1978, pp. 1112-1113). While Paul depicted charisma as belonging to all members of the Christian community, Weber deciphered it as an extraordinary quality that was accessible to few individuals regardless of their religious background (Potts, 2009, p. 119). According to Weber (1978):

> The term “charisma” will be applied to a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is considered extraordinary and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities. These are such as are not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as of divine origin or as exemplary, and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a “leader” (p. 241).

Charismatic leadership usually arises in times of psychic, physical, economic, ethical, religious, or political distress and depends largely on recognition of the extraordinary abilities of the leader by followers; it is a revolutionary force which defies values, traditions, and rational norms. Charismatic authority functions on the premise that “It is written . . . but I say unto you . . .” (Weber, 1978, p. 243) and wanes only when the followers fail to distinguish the extraordinariness of the leader and abandons the mission in search of a new leader. Due to its ephemeral nature, the onus is on the beholder of charisma to prove to his followers that “he himself is indeed the master willed by God”
(Weber, 1978, pp. 1114-1115). However, after the mission ends and normalcy is restored, the pure form of charisma diminishes and charismatic authority becomes routinized or institutionalized—it is either displaced by or fused with other structures. For instance, charismatic gatherings of war leader, prophet, artist, philosopher, ethical or scientific innovator may transform into a state, church, sect, academy or school, and a charismatic group that develops into a party or staff or newspapers and periodicals respectively. Pure charismatic rulership, thus, is unstable and any transformation it undergoes results from the need to change an ephemeral and unusual gift of grace into a permanent structure of everyday life (Weber, 1978, p. 1121).

**Contemporary Charisma versus Weberian Charisma**

The Western world remained unaware of Weber’s German writings until parts of his works were translated into English in the early 20th century. By the mid-20th century many translations, editions, and publications of his works appeared and gained widespread popularity. The publication of Weber’s works, especially *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, and *Economy and Society*, brought with them an immense interest and popularization of Weber’s conceptualization of charisma. In the process of being fascinated with the concept of charisma, scholars from various disciplines not only borrowed Weber’s terminology but began to modify it in ways that have denuded charisma of its originality. Several modifications have been made to the original term and with time the meaning and definition of charisma have undergone profound changes. So debased is the current usage of the term that some scholars have stated that charisma “is not only the name of a perfume and the title of a pop tune, the
name of a laundry, and a shirt brand, but also widely applied to virtually every situation in which the popularity of a political or any personality is involved” (Bensman & Givant 1986, p. 27).

While Shils (1965) expressed that the usage of the term charisma is found in “current high-and middle-brow speech, in sociological and political analyses, and in the superior ladies’ magazines” (p. 201), Wrong (1970) stated that the term charisma has “achieved the dubious fame of becoming a popular journalistic cliché” (p. 43). Lindholm (1990) further stated that the term charisma gained currency in the vocabulary of general public and

its meaning has been extended to cover not only the astonishing commitment of cultists and fanatics, not only the fervor of the mob, but also the adulation offered to glamorous movie stars, exciting sport heroes, and Kennedyesque politicians—adulation which goes far beyond mere admiration of someone with special expertise. (p. 5)

Charisma is not only a of line beauty products introduced by Avon (Toth, 1981, p. 17) but also a proper noun that is used denote names of people (e.g., actress Charisma Lee Carpenter) and objects (e.g., names of companies or products – Charisma Productions (http://www.charismaproductions.com), Charisma Magazine (http://www.charismamag.com), Charisma Bedding (http://www.charismaathome.com), and collectible dolls (http://www.charismabrands.com), among others. However, this is not in the least a comprehensive list of the many ways in which the word is used and abused. A Google search of the keyword ‘charisma’ yields over 40 million (about 41,200,000) results. Similarly, a search of Google Scholar (articles and patents) yields 98,300 results. While Toth (1981) stated that indiscriminate uses of the word charisma has diminished its power (p. 17), Riesebrodt (1999, p. 1) claimed that “charisma has
become a rather meaningless catchword” which is applied to any “politician, actor, sports hero, or musician.” He went on to state that this trivialization is also evident in the academic community where charisma has been equated with motivational force and popularity.

According to Beyer (1999a), charisma is diluted of its richness and distinctiveness due to the taming of the concept by neo-charismatic and transformational leadership paradigms (p. 308). Toth (1981) questioned if the public appropriation of an academic term like charisma and its popularization and ubiquitous application reflects a serious social need or yearning (p. 17). The answer to Toth’s question lies in the various attempts by academicians to understand, analyze, conceptualize, and incorporate charisma to fit their needs. As noted by Paul, Costley, Howell, and Dorfman (2002, p. 193), charisma has been continuously modified by “sociological (Shils, 1965, 1968), political (Burns, 1978; Willner, 1984), and organizational scholars (Bass, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Etzioni, 1975; House, 1977, 1996).” The vulgarization of charisma has led Bensman and Givant (1986) to comment that the original meaning of charisma has been altered ever since the term has gained widespread interest and this has led to violating the original literature and historical context in which Weber referred to charisma (p. 27). The Times Literary Supplement declared as early as 1959 “Max Weber would doubtless have been horrified, had he lived, to see the uses to which his doctrine of the ‘charisma’ which descends upon the born leader was to be put” (as cited in Potts, 2009, p. 106).

The variations in the usage of the term has prompted some scholars to distinguish classical charisma—the concept as introduced by Weber—from contemporary charisma
(e.g., Beyer, 1999a; House, 1999; Paul et al, 2002; Potts, 2009; Riesebrodt, 1999; Shamir, 1999; Spencer 1973). While some writers tend to refer to Weber’s ideal charismatic leader, others have deviated and introduced their conception of the term. For instance, Shils (1965) redefined charisma as an “awe-arousing centrality” a “centrality constituted by its formative power in initiating, creating, governing, transforming, maintaining or destroying what is vital in man’s life” (pp. 200-201). Similarly, Spencer (1973) concluded that charisma is neither a psychological nor sociological concept, rather it is an “affectual relationship between the leader and his followers: the one pole of this affect is awe, the other is enthusiasm” (p. 351). Elsewhere, Schiffer (1973, p. 19) noted that Weber’s conceptualization of charisma lacks in providing an understanding on the dynamics of the crowd or group and forwards his notion of charisma that relies on the importance of masses of people in whose absence charisma remains unrealized. To Bradley (1987, p. 72) Weberian charisma is posited on a normative level where the focus is on charismatic beliefs alone. He proposed a relational model of charisma where large quantities of collective energy and communion among group members are vital in sustaining charisma. According to Klein and House (1995), “charisma is the product of three elements: (1) a spark—a leader who has charismatic qualities, (2) flammable material—followers who are open or susceptible to charisma, and (3) oxygen—an environment conducive to charisma” (p. 183).

In addition to re-conceptualizing and redefining Weberian charisma academicians have persistently sought to operationalize charisma. The endowment of supernatural, superhuman, and exceptional powers or qualities in a charismatic personality as described by Weber have been modified in ways that can answer a variety of questions: what is
Charisma and how to recognize a charismatic leader (Spencer, 1973)? Whether attributes, management and influence practices of charismatic leaders differ from non-charismatic leaders in business (Conger, 1985)? Are the differences between charismatic and non-charismatic leader’s random variations around a mean or are they systematic and ordered (Pastor, Meindl, and Mayo, 2002)? In an attempt to answer these and many other questions, researchers have not only deciphered inherent attributes of charismatic personalities but have also assigned a combination of physical, social, and/or psychological attributes to explain what makes an individual charismatic. The field of organizational behavior has played the greatest role in advancing theory and research on charismatic leadership (Conger, 2011, p. 100).

Charisma remained a qualitative concept until 1976 during which time House (1977) proposed a list of characteristics—dominance, self-confidence, need for influence, strong beliefs and values—and behaviors—good role model; perceptions of leader as attractive, nurturant, successful and competent; goal articulation; communication of high expectations; confidence in follower; and ability to arouse motives—to delineate charismatic from non-charismatic leaders (pp. 194-207). House’s theory of charismatic leadership provided other researchers a framework to quantify charisma. Contemporary studies on charismatic leadership tend to rely heavily on some of the scales (e.g., Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire; Conger-Kanungo Scale; scales developed by Kouzes and Posner; Sashkin; etc.) developed by organizational researchers to measure charisma. These scales in turn use several attributes to assess charismatic presence in individuals. Adaptations of Weber’s writings on charismatic authority have been termed ‘neo-charismatic leadership paradigm,’ ‘new paradigm of charismatic leadership,’ ‘new
paradigm,’ or ‘new leadership’ theories (e.g., Bass 1999; Beyer 1999a; Fiol, Harris, & House, 1999; House 1999; Paul et al., 2002), where focus is on “traits and behaviors of leaders as measured by the reports of followers” (Beyer, 1999a, p. 308).

Discussions also revolve around whether charisma can be learned, imbibed, assimilated, or created by following certain steps (see Benton, 2003; Richardson & Thayer, 1993; Riggio, 1987, p. 4) or if individuals are born charismatic (Bryman 1992, 43). Benton (2003, p. 10) claimed there are six sacred steps to executive charisma which require one to: be the first to initiate; expect and give acceptance to maintain self-esteem; ask questions, and ask favors; stand tall, straight, and smile; be human, humorous, and hands on; and slow down, shut up, and listen. Richardson and Thayer (1993), similarly, claimed that charismatic leadership is a process rather than a function of personality and hence is highly learnable. They defined charisma as “a specialized set of communication techniques used by leaders to reach the hearts and minds of those that follow them” (p. 6). These techniques include: (i) developing a charismatic persona through optimistic language, passionate commitment, emotional expressiveness, and personal congruence; (ii) creating the bond through physical synchrony, vocal synchrony, matching skills, group alignment, and entertainment; and (iii) managing emotions through impact words, questions, word pictures, stories, universal experiences, sensory stimulating language, entraining emotions, Schwarzkopf syndrome, conditioned inspiration, physiology management, and leading through values (p. 236). Elsewhere Smith (2007) contended mystique is the force and essence of charisma. When charismatic leaders have mystique, they tend to have a high degree of personal presence and command attention through exceptional verbal or nonverbal communication styles. Charismatic leaders are attractive
because they seem larger than life in their outlook and create environments that are fun, exciting, or inspirational (pp. 38-39).

Mass media plays an equally important role in the artificial manufacture of charisma (see Bass, 1985, p. 40; Bensman & Givant, 1986, pp. 46-56; Bryman, 1992, pp. 30-32; Glassman, 1986, pp.122-128; Lindholm, 1990, pp. 47-48; Potts, 2009, pp. 159-181; Riggio, 1987, p. 106; Schiffer, 1973, p. xi; Swatos, 1986, pp. 137-146) by intensifying the role of these physical, social, and psychological qualities. Bensman and Givant (1986) state that genuine charisma as discussed by Weber involved a direct interaction between the leader and his followers but mass media has evoked charisma through rational calculation that may create the image of a warm, sincere, emotional or “genuine” personality. According to these authors, “lighting, camera angles, makeup, distance, and camera focus as well as, at times, face-lifting, and other cosmetic and illusion-producing stagecraft help to produce charisma” (p. 50). Glassman and Swatos (1986) also discussed the falsification of charisma, a result of “artificial manufacture”, wherein modern societies have come to be run by “faceless managers, impressed by media celebrities whom we know only as faces, and inhabited by individuals who retreat into private spheres of narcissist self-development” (p. 6). Loewenstein (1966) discussed the role of media—radio and television—in the disenchantment of charisma whereby media diminishes the spell of charisma instead of increasing it (p. 85).

Contemporary conceptualizations of charisma are hence vastly different from the charisma that Weber discussed. Physical qualities, social skills, and behaviors have come to occupy center stage in creating charisma. It is due to these discrepancies that a greater need arises to understand the concept and reintroduce Weberian conception of
charismatic leadership. It is true that charisma is elusive but falsifying its connotation by appending words to it does not solve the mystery surrounding the subject. The concept is further shrouded in confusion when writers, authors, and academicians alike characterize charisma with a set of masculine attributes and veer the definitions, usage, and discussions in an entirely different direction. Charisma is what the charismatic possesses not what the charismatic does. The idea that charisma equates a certain set of attributes is imprinted so firmly in the minds of people that Conger (1989) states: the term charisma in the public’s mind encompasses a broad range of human qualities (p. xii). Whether these attributes are in fact found in leaders across time is undeterminable since certain charismatic leaders may possess a set of attributes, while others may not. Under such circumstances it becomes uncertain whether or not any of these attributes are in fact indicative of charisma. It is also contended that the use of these attributes also leads to a gendered perception of charisma since charisma is closely associated with leadership theory, which in turn is steeped in gender controversies. To understand how gender biases in leadership studies have impacted the study of charisma, a brief discussion and overview of gender discrimination and its impact on leadership studies will be presented in the following sections.

**Sex- Gender-based Discrimination**

Sex- and gender-based discrimination constitute the most prevalent factors that contribute toward many disadvantages that women face economically, socially, politically, and psychologically. Attempts have been made time and again to eliminate discrimination between the sexes/genders so that women have access to the rights and
opportunities that men are privileged with. These attempts have been successful on a small scale, at least in the United States, what with the enforcement of Equal Pay Act of 1963 and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. While the Equal Pay Act was aimed at prohibiting differences in wages and salaries based on sex (Gladstone, 2001), Title VII prohibited employment discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, gender, and national origin in the private sector, employment agencies, and unions with 15 or more employees (MacKinnon, 2001; Riccucci, 2002). With the passage of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act in 1972, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act was extended to the public sector (Riccucci, 2002, p. 13). Considerable time has elapsed since the enforcement of the Civil Rights Act. However, little success has been achieved in eliminating gender-based discrimination; women continue to experience biases both in their public and private lives. The glass-ceiling, glass wall, and glass cliff that were put in place centuries ago continue to exist even to this day. Oakley (1985, p. 204) equated the secondary status of women to the subordination of African Americans whereby gender differences have accorded a caste-like status to women. One of the long-felt consequences of this discrimination is the lack of leadership opportunities for women in many sectors of the economy. Leadership has always been considered a masculine field just as engineering, government, astronomy, athletics, religion, etc., are meant for men and not women. This does not imply that there never was a woman leader or that women have never been scientists or public sector employees but that they represent a very small percentage. One of the reasons for the lack of substantial advancements in eliminating gender discrimination is the failure to distinguish between the terms ‘sex’ and ‘gender.’ According to Oakley (1985, p. 16),
‘Sex’ is a word that refers to the biological difference between male and female: the visible difference in genitalia, the related difference in procreative function. ‘Gender,’ however, is a matter of culture: it refers to the social classification into ‘masculine’ and ‘feminine.’

Confusing sex with gender and using the terms interchangeably has been a longstanding practice which leads to the assumption that the sex of a person determines the primary or secondary status accorded to him/her in society. To elaborate on the commonalities and differences between the sexes requires an in-depth study of human anatomy and genetics. The sex-gender distinction is tangentially related to this study therefore it will not be elaborated further. Suffice it to say that the socially constructed term ‘gender’ and its variants will be used, instead of the term ‘sex’, since socially constructed gender perceptions have prominently influenced and impacted the way in which men and women are viewed in societies.

**Leadership Studies and Gender Perceptions**

Most leadership studies are masculine in nature and conceived as a study of “great men” (Klenke, 1996, p. 1) who define power, authority, and knowledge. Since leaders are expected to be decisive, bold, strategic, and inspirational, men are preferred over women for leadership roles since they not only fit the requirements of leadership but also because men and women expect leaders to be male (Stivers, 2002, p. 72). According to Eagly (2007), people generally prefer and expect women to portray communal traits—kindness, concern for others, warmth, and gentleness—and men to be agentic—confident, aggressive, and self-directing. However, since leader stereotypes correspond more with male than with female stereotypes, men are assigned leadership roles more easily (p. 2). While some researchers contend that gender stereotypes continue to hinder women from
becoming leaders, others contend that gender stereotypes are either non-existent or even when differences exist, they are minimal. However, perceptions of masculine and feminine traits, whether real or not, result in discrimination against both men and women (Shackleton, 1995, pp. 144-156). Agars (2004) states that gender stereotypes in organizations help maintain the glass ceiling, which in turn is responsible for differences in gender composition in high level management positions. Organizational researchers have under-examined the role of gender stereotypes because of the small and inconsistent effect sizes, which leads to the assumption that stereotypes do not account for the “skewed demographic composition of upper management” (Agars, 2004, pp. 103-104).

To Agars (2004), gender stereotypes systematically harm women and hence it is necessary to examine the cumulative effects of stereotyping and its impact on evaluations in organizations. Eagly (2007), on the other hand, contended that the “powerful Great Man model of leadership no longer holds” (p. 3) since good leadership is not about authority but has to do with the qualities of the leader. Even though gender perceptions have been changing, equality between the sexes has not yet been realized what with women continuing to encounter obstacles in organizations that disallow them from becoming leaders. These barriers can be weakened or removed through organizational changes that provide women access to and success in leadership roles (Eagly, 2007, p. 9).

Of the several types of leadership theories—trait, behavioral, contingency, charismatic, transactional, and transformational approaches—charismatic leadership has captured the interest of scholars and laymen alike during the past three decades. Leadership studies have come to rely heavily on the concept of charisma to determine whether the success of leaders can be attributed to their possession of charisma. Though
Weber did not elaborate on the nature of the qualities in his definition besides emphasizing that they are supernatural, superhuman, and exceptional, contemporary charismatic scholars extensively rely on attributes (physical and otherwise) to describe a person as charismatic. These attributes have rendered the study of charismatic leadership masculine in that examples of charismatic leaders are almost always males (see Lindholm, 1990, p. 6; Riggio, 1987, pp. 46-47; Toth, 1981, p. xiv). Since the focus of this study is to uncover gender biases in charismatic leadership literature, the full range of leadership theories was not explored in detail. Rather an analysis of leadership in public organizations was provided to decipher differences between public and private sector leadership. Such an analysis will also aid in examining similarities/differences between public and private sector charismatic leadership perceptions.

**Charismatic Leadership and Gender**

While most leadership theories have distinguished between male and female leadership styles to determine whether differences between them exist and if so what can be done to eliminate discrimination, the study of charismatic leadership has been lagging behind in this respect. Women have rarely been assigned the title ‘charismatic’ even though they fit the ‘charismatic mold’ and possess the required charismatic qualities. These gender biases in charismatic leadership literature continue to persist as attempts to find solutions in overcoming biases have been feeble at best. Both men and women can be charismatic leaders but due to societal imposed gender roles and prevalent heroic leadership definitions, the study of charismatic leadership is male-biased. As Irwin (1995) stated, research on charismatic and transformational leadership should aim at
examining whether any differences exist between male and female leaders (p. 23).

According to Riggio (1987), even though women have greater charisma potential than men, examples of men come to mind when charismatic leaders are thought of since the political systems are male-dominated. He went on to state that differences between men and women when actual charisma is considered are minimal and contended that due to changing sex roles and political and societal rules, women are not discriminated against. Owing to these changes, it is becoming easier for charismatic women to gain power and influence others (pp. 46-48). If what Riggio stated over two decades ago was indeed true, scholarship on charisma would cite and include women. This, however, is not the case. There is a need to investigate how contemporary literary scholarship on charismatic leadership contributes to gendered perceptions of charisma in academia which further perpetuates societal beliefs in such discriminatory practices.

In order to determine the factors that render charisma a masculine field, it is necessary to conduct content analysis of contemporary charismatic literature. Doing so will provide a list of terms that have been used to describe a charismatic person and determine whether the attributes used are masculine or feminine in nature. Contemporary scholars rely heavily on the use of attributes to differentiate charismatic from non-charismatic leaders. The attributes currently used are not universal in that not all charismatic leaders possess a defined set of attributes nor are their followers attracted to a certain set of attributes. This brings to fore the role played by gender in defining charismatic leaders—existing gender biases in charismatic leadership literature can be a result of attributes used in describing such leaders. According to Beyer (1999a), since leadership studies rely on the use of traits or behaviors to differentiate leaders from non-
leaders, the same approach has been applied to the field of charismatic leadership, which “makes no sense unless it is assumed that people everywhere are attracted by the same personal traits and behaviors” (p. 308). Similarly, Burns (1978) stated that the concept of charisma has fertilized the study of leadership. Its very ambiguity has enabled it to be captured by scholars in different disciplines and applied to a variety of situations. The term itself means the endowment of divine grace, but Weber did not make clear whether this gift of grace was a quality possessed by leaders independent of society or a quality dependent on its recognition by followers. The term has taken on a number of different but overlapping meanings: leaders’ magical qualities; and emotional bond between leader and led; dependence on a father figure by the masses; popular assumptions that a leader is powerful, omniscient, and virtuous; imputation of enormous supernatural power to leaders (or secular power, or both); and simply popular support for a leader that verges on love. The word has been so overburdened as to collapse under close analysis. It has also become cheapened...It is impossible to restore the word to analytic duty. (pp. 241-242)

Even though Burns sees no hope in restoring the original concept of charisma, there is an increasing awareness that contemporary charismatic studies or new paradigms of charisma should re-examine the use of the term ‘charismatic’ because they have deviated from the original conception of charisma. However, until a shift in thought occurs, efforts should be made by scholars (organizational, political, psychological, sociological, etc.) to make a clear distinction between Weberian charisma and contemporary charisma, and to introduce and conduct gender-neutral studies, so that equality between men and women can be achieved. As noted by Jermier (1993, p. 231, n. 1) charisma historically was conceived “from the domains of religious prophets and warrior kings” which eventually led to a “romancing of male privilege and male hero worship.” Recognizing that thwarting the deeply ingrained gender biases may be difficult, he recommends that the “current writers on charisma take care not to reproduce gender-biased images in their texts” (Jermier, 1993, p. 231, n.1). Efforts should be made to rid gender biases in such
studies and this can be achieved by redefining charisma to make it gender-neutral and by not using societal imposed gender perceptions in analyzing charisma. This study primarily aims at understanding how charisma and gender are interrelated. Offering gender-neutral definitions or gender-neutral conceptions of charisma are beyond the scope of this study.

There is an abundance of literature by the feminist school of thought that focuses primarily on understanding why women’s contributions have been disregarded in several areas of life and make an effort to enforce equality between the two sexes. While feminist scholars have consistently studied the role of women or the lack of it in leadership positions, there is little recognition in the scholarship on the subject of charisma and the gender biases it promotes. Again there is a gap to be filled. Several scholars address the existence of a glass-ceiling—the invisible yet impenetrable barrier—that obstructs women from climbing up the leadership ladder while others contend that the glass-ceiling is breaking, giving women access to positions that were historically reserved to men (Klenke 1996, p. 15). But in the case of charisma, there is a need first to uncover reasons as to why women are not discussed in the same vein as men and then the glass-ceiling can be re-examined to analyze if in fact it exists or not. According to Godfrey-Smith (2003), the contribution of women in science studies has been significant and

Feminism in general aims to understand rights, economic standing, and social status. This has a simple application to science: women were for many years excluded or discouraged from a life in science, as they were excluded from other high-prestige areas of work. This is a simple matter of equality of opportunity, one that raises questions about policy (such as the appropriateness of affirmative action) but does not raise issues in the philosophy of science itself (p. 137).
Though Godfrey-Smith focused on the importance of women’s contribution to the development of ideas about reason and knowledge, his analysis can be generalized to all areas of life since women have been subjugated to men in most career and non-career related roles. This dissertation focused on examining gender biases in contemporary definitions, models, and discussions of charisma and seeks to recommend measures to ‘unlearn’ gender blindness and biases in the scholarly field. Throughout this work the word “he” will be used intentionally to emphasize the fact that charismatic leaders are predominantly thought of as men. As has become customary in the contemporary world, usage of the words he/she alternately, to prove that charisma, leadership, power, and authority related studies are not biased and hence are fair to both the sexes in the population, are avoided. I will purposely not engage in such an activity as any attempt to discuss charisma, leadership, or authority by using the word “she” in the terminology could seriously undermine this study. That is, unless such terminology is used by scholars citing examples of women leaders.

**Charisma and Public Administration**

Before delving into the research themes it is important to note that while charisma has been widely explored in the field of private organizational theory, the same cannot be said of the public sector. A rudimentary search of ‘Public Policy and Administration’ disciple in the online scholarly search engine Journal Storage (JSTOR) in April 2012 for the term charisma returned only five results. Thirty-eight journals are included under the discipline of ‘Public Policy and Administration’ including public administration journals such as *Administrative Science Quarterly, Administrative Theory and Praxis, Journal of*
Public Administration Research and Theory, Public Administration Review, Public Administration Quarterly, Public Affairs Quarterly, among others. These results were somewhat broader when charisma was searched for using ‘full-text’ as the parameter, returning a total of 461 publications in over half a century (1951-2010). In comparison, a search of the journal, The Leadership Quarterly, a journal of political, social, and behavioral science, returned a total of 464 articles on charisma published over a period of two decades (1990-2012). A limited search for the keyword charisma in the article title produced 24 articles published in this journal. These numbers go on to indicate the neglect charisma suffers in public organizations and public theory.

Javidan and Waldman (2003) asserted that charismatic leadership research has been relegated to private, military, and educational organizations while the public sector has been alien to charismatic conceptions (p. 232). This disconnect may be on account of the impersonal procedures prevalent in public bureaucracies and also because of the conceptualization of charisma as a rare and anti-bureaucratic form of authority. While they affirm that Weberian charisma may be a rarity in public-sector literature, the neo-charismatic approaches -- the application of behaviors and attributes -- may still apply (p. 232). They went on to state that these gaps in the public sector warrant questioning the “extent to which charismatic leadership and its consequences are relevant in the public sector” (Javidan and Waldman, 2003, p. 229). While the results of their study supported the modern organizational view of charismatic leadership, they concluded on the note that consistent research is required to develop a better model of charismatic leadership in the public sector (pp. 238-239).
Denhardt and Campbell (2006) took a different approach to the study of transformational leadership in the public sector. To them, replicating the prevalent private sector model of transformational leadership in the public sector poses several challenges. In the private sector, distinctions are made between ‘transformation as change’ and ‘transformation as moral elevation’ (p. 558) but such a distinction is not useful in the public sector as the premise of such leadership is not organizational change alone but morals and values play an equally important role in public leadership (p. 569). The authors went on to state that by integrating change-oriented strategies and ethical and moral dimensions of transformational leadership with the “normative ideas of public administration theory, we can begin to build a model of public transformational leadership. In doing so, we should explicitly emphasize democratic values and the critical role of citizens and citizenship in the public leadership process” (Denhardt and Campbell, 2006, p. 570).

Charismatic leadership is in a nascent stage in the public sector literature, while the private sector has reliable and validated instruments and questionnaires their applicability in the public sector cannot be determined. Before public sector researchers delve on contemporary charismatic leadership paradigms, it is essential to decipher the underlying implications of the theory to avoid replication of biases.

**Research Themes**

This study proposed to (1) explore the use of charismatic leader examples in contemporary charismatic literature, (2) investigate how the use of language in contemporary charismatic literature perpetuates gender biases in the scholarship, (3)
explore the frequency with which masculine and feminine attributes are used in describing charismatic leaders and (4) explore confusion surrounding the meaning and definition of charisma in contemporary literature. The main research questions that were addressed in this study include: To what extent does contemporary literature on charisma reflect and contribute toward a gendered perception of charisma? And, to what extent does contemporary charismatic literature belie Weber’s conceptualization of charisma?

**Research Approach**

Gender perceptions and inconsistencies in contemporary charismatic leadership literature will be analyzed by means of content analysis. The data derived through the content analysis also provide necessary information to compare contemporary charisma with Weberian charisma. The importance of this research stemmed from the gaps in contemporary studies on charisma; while the role of gender has been widely studied in the field of leadership, the same cannot be said of charismatic studies. Few studies that broach the topic of gender and charisma (Groves, 2005; Krogstad & Storvik, 2007; Lindholm, 1990; Mitchell, 2006; Takala & Aaltio, 2007) address the existence of gaps but do not offer approaches to fill the gaps. This study aimed at (1) bridging conceptual gaps in contemporary literature on charisma and gender and (2) demonstrating that language about gender confounds language about charisma.

**Summary**

Charisma, the word most used since the time it was introduced, has lost its meaning and significance over time. Max Weber, the German writer, was responsible for taking the term out of the religious context and applying it to the fields of sociology,
politics, and military. His definition of charisma discussed the supernatural and superhuman qualities that an individual possesses on account of which he is termed charismatic. Weber never discussed any physical or social qualities that were necessary in defining charisma. However, contemporary definitions and explanations of charismatic leadership ever so often include attributes (physical or others) in order to categorize an individual as charismatic that the original definition has become biased and has lost the basic contention of being value-neutral. This dissertation was an effort to examine gender biases in contemporary literature on charisma and sought to recommend measures to curtail such discriminatory practices in the scholarly field.

In order to achieve this, the study is organized into chapters. Chapter I presents an introduction to the study, problem statement, significance of the study and research approaches. Chapter II entails a review of the literature relevant to the subject and focuses primarily on public sector leadership, charisma, gender and charismatic leadership. These fields are intertwined and hence towards the end of Chapter II these concepts are tied together to show gender biases in charismatic leadership studies. Research questions and the research methodology form the basis for Chapter III of the dissertation. Chapter IV presents the data and the major research findings from the study. Finally, Chapter V provides the summary and conclusion of the study.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

The fields of charisma, leadership, and gender have been widely studied and researched, however, conclusive evidence on what comprises charisma and leadership continues to evade researchers. Similarly, feminist theories and gender studies have consistently sought to address and redress inequalities between men and women with little success. Though the three fields exist separately, studies are galore on the subjects of charismatic leadership and gendered leadership. Little has however been done to examine the effect of gender on charisma. The topic of charismatic leadership has been extensively researched in the past by political scientists and sociologists, and current research is prominent in the areas of organizational behavior and psychology. The relationship between gender and leadership has also been thoroughly researched with an aim to establish whether the lack of women in leadership positions can be attributed to gender inequalities. However, there is a paucity of research on the role gender plays in explaining the lack of women in charismatic positions. As observed by Stivers (personal communication, June 8, 2006) “the two literatures, charisma and gender, are still quite separate and need to be brought into relationship with each other.” The aim of this study was to connect the literatures on charisma and gender and to examine if charisma and charismatic leadership studies are gendered just as leadership studies are and if so what
steps can be taken to de-gender charisma. To accomplish this task, four main bodies of literature were explored: public sector leadership, charisma, gender and leadership, and gender and charismatic leadership.

Public Sector Leadership

The origin of leadership is as old as humanity; however, it continues to evolve as a field of study in many disciplines such as “political science, psychology, education, history, agriculture, public administration, management, anthropology, biology, military sciences, philosophy, and sociology” (Sorenson, 2000). Not only have these fields of study learned from leadership but have also contributed to the study of leadership. The earliest writings on leadership can be traced to the Egyptian hieroglyphs, which were written 5,000 years ago (Bass, 2008, p. 5). While the terms ‘lead,’ ‘leader,’ and ‘leading’—which were derived from the Old English word leden, meaning ‘to guide’ or ‘show the way’—were used as early as 1300 AD (Rost, 1991, p. 38), the term ‘leadership’ made an appearance in English language only in the “first half of the 19th century” (Bass, 1990, p. 11). It was only in the past three decades that interest in the field exploded. While the number of published articles on leadership was at the most 3,500 in 1974, they more than doubled in 1990 (7,500 articles) and doubled again by 2007 to a whooping 15,000 publications, not including popular press books and articles (McMahon, 2010, p. ix). While Bass’s (2008, p. 6) search of Amazon.com yielded 18,299 books on leadership for a search conducted on April 14, 2005, a current search on the same website yields 33,311 (paperback only) books as of July 02, 2011, with 159 releases in the past 30 days. These astounding numbers document the ever-increasing
interest in leadership studies. In spite of the innumerable writings, research, and findings on leadership, Burns’s (1978) statement continues to hold good to this day: “leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth” (p. 2) and though a lot is known about leaders, very little is known about leadership (p. 1). Nonetheless, this ambiguity has neither deterred writers from exploring the topic nor has it slackened research and publications on leadership.

Scholars from varying backgrounds have contributed consistently to the theoretical and empirical study of leadership. The increasing interest in leadership brought with it numerous definitions, theories, and models, which have inundated the discipline. Writers have delineated time periods to denote changes in leadership theories; the end of one time period does not signify the demise of a particular theory it rather demarcates a change. Although there is no consensus on the time periods or theoretical expositions of leadership, the universality of the study of leadership defies time and space. The fluidity of leadership theories necessitates a comprehensive examination of the subject. The modern study of leadership began in the early 1900s. The focus during this stage was to create a theory of leadership by identifying different types of leadership and relating them to “functional demands of society” (Bass, 2008, p. 7). The next wave of leadership focused on empirical research and hence was not as comprehensive as its earlier phase. However, the empirical phase ended soon only to make a return to the theoretical approach to leadership. Advances in research methodologies in the past few decades directed leadership studies to adopt empirical approaches (Bass, 2008, pp. 6-7). Developments in leadership theory can be better understood by examining the evolution
of leadership theories since the beginning of the 20th century; these trends are presented in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1. Trends in Leadership Theory and Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Key Concepts</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Core Theme(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modern Approach</td>
<td>Great Man theory.</td>
<td>1840s – 1940s</td>
<td>Leadership is about authority, control, &amp; centralization of power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional and legal-rational authority, charismatic leadership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Theory/Approach</td>
<td>Individual traits and skills.</td>
<td>1930s – 1950s</td>
<td>Leadership is a function of traits/characteristics/skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Studies/Style/Functional Approach</td>
<td>Autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership styles.</td>
<td>1940s – 1960s</td>
<td>Leadership effectiveness has to do with how leaders behave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader and the Small Group</td>
<td>Situational/Contingency/Path-Goal Approach.</td>
<td>1940s – 1980s</td>
<td>It all depends; effective leadership is affected by the situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transactional Approach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Leadership Approach</td>
<td>Transforming leadership.</td>
<td>1980s – Present</td>
<td>Leaders need vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charismatic leadership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neo-charismatic leadership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Adapted from Henry (2008); Bryman (1992); & Hackman & Johnson (1991).

From this table it becomes evident that several theories/approaches to explain leadership have been put forth since the late 19th-early 20th centuries. The notions about leadership have been changing continually with no one theory providing a perfect explanation of the concept. The trends in leadership theory (see Table 2.1) sheds light on how these concepts have been used interchangeably. Interestingly, the serious study of
leadership started in the 1900s with Weber’s delineation of the three types of authority – traditional, legal-rational, and charismatic – and leadership theories and made a full circle what with Weber’s charismatic leadership theory making a comeback in current leadership theories and models (Henry, 2008, p. 103).

The focus of leaders often depends on the type of organizations they lead. In private organizations, leaders typically “focus on market-driven needs and profits;” in public organizations the focus is usually on “publicly authorized needs and legal accountability;” and nonprofit leaders stress on “unmet public good needs and charity” (Van Wart, 2012, p. 7). Terry (1990) summarized the focus of leadership in private organizations by using three themes: (1) portrayal of leaders as “larger than life” where possession of charisma is critical in deriving power; (2) effective leaders are those that “successfully reconstruct the organization’s technical, political, and cultural systems” by taking risks, identifying opportunities, and using innovative approaches (1990, p. 398). Finally, leaders who defy traditions by using unconventional means are encouraged to lead such organizations (1990, p. 398). Terry (1990) coined the term ‘Administrative Conservatorship’ to describe a special type of leadership that is based on the concept of authority; it is a “dynamic process of strengthening and preserving an institution’s special capabilities, its proficiency, and thereby its integrity, so that it may perform a desired social function” (p. 402). Terry (1990) focused on the applicability of administrative conservatorship in government institutions and states that institutional integrity, that is, “the completeness, soundness, and persistence of administrative processes and value commitments that determine an institution’s distinctive competence” (p. 404) is critical to administrative conservatorship. Finally, administrative elites—“public officials who are
neither elected nor politically appointed, but who hold administrative positions by virtue of a merit system” (Terry, 1990, p. 406)—play an important role in administrative conservatorship. Terry (2003) noted that leadership in public bureaucracies is not widely researched (p. 4). Public administration scholars, however, have relied and borrowed leadership concepts from the private sector (Terry, 2003, p. 40), which is inappropriate as it leads to a “misplacement” (Terry, 1990, p. 400) of leadership in the public sector as it portrays public sector leaders as ‘heroes’ and ‘entrepreneurs’ (Terry, 1991, pp. 190-191).

Delving further into private-public sector leadership distinctions is outside the scope of this dissertation. Instead, the following sections provide a description of public sector leadership by using Van Wart’s analysis as the basis. Van Wart’s theory was used, firstly, because he not only provided a comprehensive review of competencies that leaders in public organizations need but also discussed public sector leadership in a comparative perspective (2011, p. ix). Secondly, Van Wart (2008) asserted that early leadership theories focused on transactional approaches while contemporary theories focus on transformational and charismatic aspects of leadership (pp. 11-13) and uses the ‘leadership action cycle’ to integrate these approaches (Van Wart, 2011, p. 12). Finally, Van Wart’s leadership action cycle provided the framework for categorizing the attributes used by contributors to the Leadership Quarterly journal in differentiating charismatic from non-charismatic leaders. The applicability of the leadership action cycle is elaborated in Chapters III and IV of the dissertation. The next section describes the leadership action cycle in detail.
Van Wart (2004) explained leadership processes in public sector by proposing the leadership action cycle. His model is comprised of five functional areas—leader assessment, characteristics, styles, behaviors, leader development and evaluation (p. 175).

**Leader Assessment**

Leader assessment includes the ability to assess the organization and the environment, internal and external constraints, and prioritize what is important (Van Wart, 2012, p. 219). Elements such as task skills, role clarity, innovation and creativity, resources and support services, subordinate effort, cohesiveness and cooperation, organization of work and performance strategies, and external coordination and adaptability are essential in assessing the organization and its environment. Organizational effectiveness is also ensured when leaders recognize and address constraints such as legal and contractual, formal and informal power, availability of resources, and personal leadership abilities. Leader prioritization has to do with goal setting which in turn includes technical performance, follower development, organizational alignment, service and ethical focus, and balance and integration of foci (Van Wart, 2012, pp. 219-238).

**Leader Characteristics – Traits**

Leader competencies include leader characteristics, which includes “innate or long-term dispositions” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 125) i.e., traits; skills (broadly applied learned characteristics); and behaviors, i.e., concrete actions. While traits and skills are indicative of leader effectiveness, leader behaviors determine if the traits and skills are/were effectively used in organizational contexts (p. 125). Van Wart (2008) focused
on six personality, two motivational, and two value-oriented traits. Personality traits include self-confidence, decisiveness, resilience, energy, flexibility, and emotional maturity. Motivational drives include willingness to assume responsibility and need for achievement. Personal integrity and service mentality are components of value orientation. Van Wart (2008) defined self-confidence as “a general (positive) sense about one’s ability to accomplish what needs to be accomplished” (p. 126). Positive aspects of self-confidence include self-esteem, self-efficacy, and courage. Negative aspects include micromanagement, arrogance, and impracticality in taking risks (p. 126).

The second trait, decisiveness is “the ability to act relatively quickly depending on circumstances without excessively damaging decision quality” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 127). Sub-elements of decisiveness include willingness to make unilateral decisions, ability to act quickly in a crisis, and ability to remain calm under crisis. Rash decision-making, authoritarianism, and unavailability of information are negative aspects of decisiveness which results in employee alienation from participation (p. 127). Resilience, “the ability to spring back into shape, position, or direction after being pressed or stretched” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 129) is determined by persistence and stress tolerance. Leaders that are resilient usually have greater energy, are able to assume responsibility, and achieve long-term goals. Resilience also boosts psychological and physical health and portrays an image that the leader is dependable. However, having too much resilience can lead to rigidity and obstinacy and conveys the message that the leader has low achievement levels (p. 129). Having the “physical and psychological ability to perform” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 130) is a determinant of the level of energy a leader has which in turn determines long-term success. Physical vitality, mental interest, and high activity levels are
components of energy. Leadership becomes dysfunctional when high levels of energy result in hasty actions devoid of contemplation (Van Wart, 2008, p. 130).

The fifth personality trait, flexibility is “the ability to bend without breaking and to be adjustable to change or capable of modification” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 135). Sub-elements of flexibility include adaptability and alertness to alternatives. In the absence of flexibility, employees have less tolerance for leaders (pp. 135-136). The last personality trait, emotional maturity is “a conglomerate of characteristics that indicate a person is well balanced in a number of psychological and behavioral dimensions” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 141). Self-awareness, self-control, responsibility for actions, and socialized power orientations comprise sub-elements of emotional maturity. Lack of self-awareness leads to inability to gauge strengths and weaknesses; absence of self-control results in interpersonal hostility; scapegoating and insensitivity to others’ needs follow when leaders do not take responsibility for actions; and leaders with personalized power orientations are sycophants, whose leadership results in organizational inefficiencies (Van Wart, 2008, pp. 141-142).

The first motivational drive, willingness to assume responsibility, implies “individuals will take positions requiring broader decision-making duties and greater authority” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 133). Sub-elements of this drive include acceptance of different responsibilities and willingness to use power in acceptable ways. Taking on different responsibilities can, however, lead to stressful situations since success is linked to training and increased accountability may result in greater chances of failure. Willingness to use power is linked to dominance and assertiveness. Leaders lacking this drive are passive to organizational problems (pp. 133-134). Leaders with a high need for
achievement usually “have a strong drive to accomplish things and generally to be recognized for doing so” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 131). Positive sub-elements of this trait include task accomplishment, competition, and striving for excellence. On the contrary, excessive need for achievement results in ignoring employees at the expense of tasks, excessive competition can lead to self-centeredness and reduced loyalty, and high drive for excellence results in micromanaging employees and/or rigid perfectionism (Van Wart, 2008, p. 132).

The first value-orientation, personal integrity, is defined as the “state of being whole and/or connected with oneself, one’s profession, and the society of which one is a member, as well as being incorruptible” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 138). Van Wart used the term ‘ethical’ to describe personal integrity, which is comprised of consistency and coherence of values, honesty, fairness, and inclusiveness in decision making. Honesty is compromised when the leader lies, cheats, and/or steals and signifies that the leader is selfish and discounts employee interests. Coherence and fairness are difficult to achieve since varying situations require differential treatments and decisions (pp. 138-140). Finally, service mentality, that is, “an ethic of considering others’ interest, perspectives, and concerns” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 136) is comprised of two sub-elements: (1) concern for others which includes service to public at large, service to clients and customers, and service to employees and (2) a behavioral element: inclusiveness in decision-making (pp. 136-138). Van Wart (2008) asserted that a combination of these personality traits, drives, and value-orientations in moderation will result in successful leadership (p. 144).
Leader Characteristics – Skills

In addition to the 10 leader traits, six leader skills comprise components of leader characteristics. The first of these, communication skills are defined as the “ability to effectively exchange information through active and passive means” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 149). Sub-elements of communication skills include oral, written, listening, and nonverbal skills. Van Wart (2008) asserted that nonverbal skills—eye movements, facial expression, posture, gestures, and body movement—are important but unappreciated forms of communication (pp. 149-150). Social skills are described as the “ability to interact effectively in social settings and to understand and productively harness one’s own and others’ personality structures” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 152). Sub-elements of social skills include personal likability (optimism, kindness, tact, and respect for others), expressiveness, and social perceptiveness. According to Van Wart, charisma, i.e., “the natural ability to inspire devotion or allegiance,” (2008, p. 152) is a special case of social skills. Influence skills imply the ability to “meld the actual use of sources of power with concrete behavioral strategies” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 153). Power is a function of position, person, or a combination of the two and can either be coercive or reward based. Influence strategies include legitimating tactics, pressure tactics, exchange tactics, rational persuasion, consultation, emotional appeals, personal appeals, and friendliness (pp. 153-154). Sub-elements of this skill include “effectiveness with which one uses influence strategies,” and “range of influence strategies that one has to use” (p. 164). Effective ethical leaders use power in combination with influence tactics to “balance organizational needs, professional standards, legal requirements, and the public goods, as well as their own needs” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 154).
Analytical skills are those that describe the leader’s memory; discrimination, i.e., the “ability to distinguish and use different conceptual dimension;” cognitive complexity, i.e., the “ability to consider and use different dimensions simultaneously or use different levels of complexity in different domains;” and ambiguity tolerance, i.e., the “ability to suspend judgment while new data are being gathered” (Van Wart, 2008, pp. 155-156). In addition to the aforementioned sub-elements, intelligence is considered a principal component of analytical skills (p. 155). The fifth skill has to do with technical work, i.e., the “basic professional and organizational knowledge and practice associated with an area of work” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 158). Sub-elements of this skill include ‘technical information and skills of the profession,’ ‘information about the organization,’ and ‘basic management knowledge/skills’ (pp. 158-159). Finally, continual learning implies “taking responsibility for acquiring new information, looking at old information in new ways, and finding ways to use new and old information creatively” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 160). Sub-elements of this skill include ability to glean and use new information and ability to expand knowledge, i.e., knowledge creation (Van Wart, 2008, p. 160).

**Leader Behaviors**

Van Wart (2008) used three behavioral categories to describe public leadership. The first, task-oriented behaviors are those that arise in eventuality of technical issues and are in turn comprised of seven types of behaviors. Monitoring and assessing work implies “gathering and critically evaluating data related to subordinate performance, service or project qualities, and overall unit or organizational performance” (pp. 191-192). The act of monitoring work is passive while assessing involves active processes.
Sub-elements of this behavior include ‘defining what is important to monitor and observe,’ ‘consistent and disciplined reviewing of the information sources,’ and ‘integrating qualitative sources’ (pp. 192-193). The second task-oriented behavior is operations planning, i.e., focusing on “coordinating tactical issues into a detailed blue-print” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 194). Sub-elements include ‘deciding on a planning model,’ ‘determining what logistical elements are necessary,’ ‘coordinating the plan with others,’ and ‘implementing the plan.’ Tools used are deployment charts, critical path analyses, increasing work efficiency, mapping techniques, task analysis, unit-cost analysis, performance measurement, and time-and-motion studies. Moderation is necessary in the planning process as excessive operations planning can be as harmful as a lack of it (Van Wart, 2008, p. 194).

Clarifying roles and objectives implies “working with subordinates to guide and direct behavior by communicating about plans, policies, and specific expectations” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 196). Sub-elements include ‘defining job responsibilities,’ ‘setting performance goals,’ and ‘providing instructions’ to employees. Excessive clarification can lead to micromanaging while a lack of it can lead to employee dissatisfaction (p. 196). The fourth task-behavior, informing, “provides business-related information to subordinates, superiors, peers, or people outside the organization” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 197). Sub-elements of informing include ‘facilitating coordination of work,’ ‘shaping the mood about work and strategies that will function best,’ and ‘serving a public relations or image function.’ Oral and written communications are used to inform employees about their tasks and also set the tone for organizational successes (p. 197). The fifth task-oriented behavior, delegating, is “a type of power sharing in which subordinates are given
substantial responsibilities and/or authority” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 198). ‘Delegating responsibility’ and ‘allocating authority’ comprise its sub-elements where responsibility implies assigning duties and authority is the amount of decision-making allowed (p. 198). The sixth type of task-oriented behavior is problem solving, i.e., “identification, analysis, and handling of work-related problems” and its sub-elements include ‘recognizing problems,’ ‘investigating problems,’ and ‘resolving problems’ (Van Wart, 2008, p. 200). The last of the task-oriented behaviors is managing technical innovation and creativity which implies “establishing an environment that encourages and provides the tools for learning, flexibility, and change, and that also provides implementation support for new or cutting-edge programs/processes” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 203). Sub-elements include ‘creating, acquiring, and transferring knowledge in an organizational context’ and ‘modifying organizational behavior to reflect new knowledge and insights’ (Van Wart, 2008, p. 207).

The second behavioral component Van Wart (2008) described is people-oriented and includes seven “soft” competencies (p. 210). The first competency, consulting implies “checking with people on work-related matters and involving people in decision-making processes,” sub-elements of which include ‘soliciting information from people’ and ‘inviting people to be involved in decision making to some degree’ (Van Wart, 2008, p. 210). Planning and organizing personnel is the second competency and implies “coordinating people and orientations, and ensuring that the competencies necessary to do the work are, or will be, available. It also involves self-planning” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 213). Sub-elements include ‘fitting people to schedules and making the appropriate changes as work and personnel needs change,’ ‘matching the talents, interests, and
preferences of people to the work,’ and ‘using personal time-management skills’ (pp. 213-214). The competency developing staff implies “improving subordinates’ effectiveness in their current positions and preparing them for their next position or step” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 215). Sub-elements of this competency include ‘supporting,’ ‘coaching,’ and ‘mentoring’ (p. 216). The fourth competency, motivating implies “enhancing the inner drives and positive intentions of subordinates (or others) to perform well through incentives, disincentives, and inspiration” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 217). Positive incentives include recognition and rewards; negative disincentives such as work and pay-related sanctions; and inspirational techniques that enhance achievement, self-actualization, and spiritual connectedness (Van Wart, 2008, p. 218) ensure leader and employee effectiveness in achieving organizational goals.

The fifth competency includes building teams, i.e., “enhancing identification with the work, intramember cooperation, and esprit de corps of both work groups and teams,” and managing teams, i.e., “creating and supporting ‘true’ teams in addition to traditional work units” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 221). Teams are important as they assure project success through creativity, synergy, and diversity. The role of the leader is to ensure that team liabilities such as lopsided representation, coordination issues, favoritism, etc. are minimized to ensure smooth project delivery (pp. 221-223). The ability to manage conflict is the sixth behavioral competency; conflict management is used as a tool to “handle various types of interpersonal disagreements, to build cooperative interpersonal relationships, and to harness the positive effects of conflict” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 224). Conflicts can be interpersonal, personality-based, or a combination of both. Reactive management implies a situation where the conflict has already arisen in which case the
leader is expected to resolve the existing conflict. When leaders assess situations and take precautionary measures ensuring that conflicts are avoided by enforcing professionalism, proactive management is in effect. Conflict management is creative when the leader delves on the positive aspect of the crisis and alters the situation by avoiding traditional means to resolve the issue (pp. 224-225). Lastly, the competency managing personnel change implies “establishing an environment that provides the emotional support and motivation to change” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 226). Sub-elements of this competency include ‘reducing the reasons to resist change,’ ‘increasing the reasons to support change,’ and ‘providing personal involvement and support for the challenges and pain of change.’ Since leading others is at the core of effective leadership, people-oriented behaviors are of prime importance to leaders (Van Wart, 2008, p. 228-230).

The third behavioral category Van Wart (2008) discussed is organization-oriented which again is comprised of seven competencies. The first competency, scanning the environment implies “gathering and critically evaluating data related to external trends, opportunities, and threats on an ongoing and relatively informal basis” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 234). Sub-elements of this competency include implementing ‘broad and informal monitoring and consulting outside the organization,’ ‘identifying external trends, opportunities, and threats,’ and ‘investigating external trends of significance in greater detail’ (pp. 234-235). Strategic planning implies “a disciplined effort to produce fundamental decisions and actions that shape and guide an organization” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 236). Sub-elements include ‘defining the mission of the overall organizational purposes and the overall vision of preferred future of the organization,’ ‘defining objectives of organizational purposes at the departmental or unit level,’ ‘defining
alternatives and selecting the best ones to accomplish objectives,’ and ‘selecting detailed
goals and their concrete measures’ (Van Wart, 2008, p. 254). The third competency,
articulating the mission and vision implies “defining and expressing an organization’s
purpose, aspirations, and values” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 239). Missions are “interpretations
of the organization’s legal mandate or central dominant theme” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 240)
and differ from visions, which imply “defining and expressing the aspirations,
overarching goals, broad strategies, and social niche or competencies that the
organization expects to excel in” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 240). In short, “while mission
statements focus on the ‘what,’ vision statements focus on the ‘how’” (Van Wart, 2008,
p. 240). Apart from organizational mission and vision, the articulation of values, which
vary by organizational philosophies, is also important.

The fourth competency is comprised of networking—developing useful contacts
outside the leader’s direct subordinate-superiors chain of command—and partnering—
developing working relationships that are voluntary but substantive outside the normal
chain of command (Van Wart, 2008, p. 242). ‘Information sharing,’ ‘provision of
support or professional “favors,”’ and ‘sharing responsibility and benefits’ are elements
of this competency (Van Wart, 2008, p. 243). Performing general management
functions, which implies “carrying out general structural responsibilities related to the
organization” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 245), is the fifth competency in this category and
includes using ‘human resource management knowledge and skills,’ ‘budgetary and
financial management knowledge and skills,’ and ‘technology management knowledge
and skills’ (p. 245). Decision-making, the sixth competency, implies “making major
organizational choices by understanding the fundamental values and factors involved and
by structuring an appropriate decision framework” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 246). Effective
decision-making involves understanding ‘factors in the decision environment—
complexity, information availability, type of decision, involvement of others,’ ‘values
involved—efficiency, effectiveness, legality, and the values implicit in the types of
change or consensus supported,’ and ‘ability to utilize the appropriate decision
framework, including the reasoned-choice, incremental, mixed scanning, and garbage-can
models’ (pp. 255-256). Finally, the last competency, managing organizational change
implies managing “large-scale change in the direction, structure, major processes, or
culture of the organization” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 250). Elements of this competency
include ‘providing a rationale for change through gathering and using information,’
‘providing a plan for change that is practical, challenging but realistic, and widely
understood,’ and ‘implementing the change, which involves the who, what, when, and
where’ (pp. 253-254). Van Wart (2008) noted that in the public sector it is more difficult
to achieve the highest levels of organizational competencies due to the legal and
administrative processes in place (p. 254).

**Leader Styles**

In addition to the leader characteristics and leader behaviors, Van Wart (2008)
described nine leader styles—demonstrable action toward followers, organization,
environment, and so forth (p. 30). The first leader style he describes is laissez-faire,
which is practically a non-style since the leader is passive and indifferent to tasks and
subordinates and is characterized by “low leader control, low leader goals and
performance expectations, and little or no motivational stimulation for followers” (Van
Wart, 2008, pp. 33-34). Such leaders usually remain inactive until faced with crises in which event they appear reactive but their failure to employ proactive behaviors lends them ineffective (pp. 34-35). Leaders are directive when they guide subordinates in task-related goals by emphasizing the importance of following rules and procedures. Subtypes of this style include instructive—telling, informing, and clarifying aspects of directing—and structuring, i.e., arranging work activities, coordinating work schedules, and contingency planning. Negative aspects of this style include authoritarianism where the leader is rigid, self-centered, commanding, and micromanages task activities (Van Wart, 2008, p. 35). Supportive styles are those where the leader is people-oriented and is concerned and considerate about subordinate needs and creates an amicable work environment. A major subtype of this style is the caring model where the leader ensures that subordinates feel interconnected to the team. Leaders employ nonverbal communication skills and motivating behaviors to demonstrate their support. This style becomes ineffective when leaders focus primarily on building interpersonal relations and fulfilling follower needs at the expense of achieving organizational goals (Van Wart, 2008, p. 36).

Participative style is one where follower feedback and inclusion in decision making and problem solving is encouraged by the leader. In addition to inclusiveness, the leader employs self-conscious approaches whereby the leader facilitates team discussions, interactive meetings, and group learning. Since such practices may be more time consuming and detail oriented, the participative style at times is inefficient (Van Wart, 2008, p. 37). The fifth leader style Van Wart (2008) discusses is the delegative style, which he defines as “one that allows subordinates relative freedom from decision
making and from daily monitoring and short-term reviews” (p. 37). Delegation can assume two forms (1) where the leader assigns additional duties but monitors performance and provides support when required, and (2) empowers subordinates by allowing the freedom to make decisions while holding them accountable to the decisions (p. 38). A leader is said to employ achievement-oriented styles when challenging goals are set, confidence is displayed in follower abilities, and excellence in follower performance is emphasized. While adopting this style enhances follower participation it also can lead to follower-dependency on leader and excessive competition among followers that may be harmful for the organization (Van Wart, 2008, pp. 39-40).

Inspirational styles are in use when leaders employ “intellectual stimulation to produce new ideas or to gain their acceptance for new approaches, and to arouse contagious enthusiasm for the achievement of group goals” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 40). Transformational (emphasis on organizational change through vision and mission articulation) and charismatic leadership (leaders possess an appealing personality in addition to “special gifts,” insights, or wisdom) theories form the crux of this style. Inspirational leadership can be harmful to subordinates and organizations when leaders mislead subordinates into accepting faulty visions by discouraging follower-input and feedback (Van Wart, 2008, p. 41). The eighth style Van Wart (2008) described is the external style where the leader “focuses attention on organizational matters and the environmental context” (p. 41). Subtypes of this style include leader as “explorer,” where the focus is on gathering information about the environment and looking for networking and partnering opportunities, and leader as “chairman,” (Van Wart, 2008, p. 42) when the primary focus is to create strategies, visions, and decisions that affect
organizational change. Internal functioning of the organization is affected when leaders focus solely on external issues (Van Wart, 2008, p. 42). Van Wart (2008) described the combined style, which is last of the nine styles, as one where two or more styles are fused into one (p. 42). He called transformational leadership the “most inclusive combined style” (Van Wart, 2008, pp. 42-43) as it represents all of the aforementioned styles, some explicitly and others implicitly.

**Leader Development and Evaluation**

The last factor in Van Wart’s leadership action cycle is leadership development and evaluation. Van Wart (2008) stated that leadership has evolved and become more challenging in the past three decades and more so in public and non-profit organizations as there is a gradual shift from bureaucratic to post-bureaucratic structures which requires effective leadership development to overcome the increasing challenges (p. 260). He recommends self-study, structured experience, and formal training and education as means of leadership development (pp. 260-261). Leadership can be evaluated through technical performance, follower performance, organizational alignment, and service mentality and ethical focus (Van Wart, 2008, p. 271).

Van Wart’s (2008) assertion that public and non-profit organizations continue to adjust to post-bureaucratic structures, which are characterized by emphasis on customer service, devolution, coproduction, and competition (p. 260), brings to light the importance of understanding contemporary leadership approaches. New leadership approaches such as charismatic and transformational leadership are not fully explored in public organizations. In order to address this gap, an evaluation of these approaches in
offered in the next section which begins with a discussion of charisma. A brief discussion of the role of charisma in public administration was offered in Chapter I, the discussion in this chapter provides the basis for comparing and contrasting Weberian charisma and contemporary charismatic theories. The applicability of these approaches in the public sector is explained in Chapter V.

Charisma

The origin and development of charisma was briefly discussed in Chapter I, this section presents an overview of Weber’s theory of charisma, followed by an exploration of neo-charismatic leadership theories.

Weberian Charisma

Weber’s (1978) analysis of charisma and charismatic authority is based on the notion that certain special qualities of the leader distinguish him from ordinary individuals. The uniqueness of these qualities is due to their divine origin which renders them accessible only to a few individuals. In the past the uniqueness was attributed to exercise of magical powers as in the case of prophets, war heroes, and/or persons with therapeutic powers or legal wisdom. Weber (1978) identified the characteristics of charisma as:

(1) Personal devotion is of utmost importance since it helps the followers or disciples recognize their leader thereby validating and legitimating charisma (p. 242). The leader’s power is established upon this mutual recognition which leads to complete surrender by the followers (p. 1115).
(2) Charismatic leadership dissolves when the leader fails to provide proof of his divine/magical/heroic powers. The leader is termed unsuccessful when he “fails to benefit his followers” (p. 242). These factors render charismatic leadership highly unstable (p. 1114).

(3) Followers of the charismatic leader are organized into a charismatic community, which is unique due to its lack of structure, organization, training, economic wants, rules, laws, judiciary, rationality, and power. When competing authorities create conflict or challenges on charismatic grounds, the only resolution is to choose the winner by holding a contest. Followers are chosen on the basis of their charismatic qualifications; they are not appointed as in the case of bureaucratic organizations (p. 243).

(4) Pure charisma is antagonistic to any kind of economic gains for it is disassociated with routine worldly acts (p. 244). The charismatic mission, in order to be accomplished, requires the leader and followers to be free of any “worldly attachments and duties of occupational and family life” (p. 1113).

(5) Charisma is revolutionary by nature. Problems are addressed not by reason but by “radical alteration of central attitudes,” (p. 245) and thus bringing about “subjective or internal reorientation born out of suffering, conflicts, or enthusiasm” (p. 245). Values are transformed by breaking all traditional and rational norms by adhering to the proposition “It has been written . . . but I say unto you . . .” (p. 1115).

While traditional and bureaucratic structures fulfill routine, ordinary, and ongoing demands, charismatic leadership fulfills all extraordinary needs that “transcend” ordinary
economic routines (p. 1111). Weber used the term charisma in a “value-free,” sense which implies a lack of concern for value judgments rather than indicating a disregard for values (Bendix, 1977, p. 300). Charismatic leadership usually surfaces in times of crisis—psychic, physical, economic, ethical, religious, or political—and hence is not a continuous institution as in the case of traditional and legal authority (Weber, 1978, pp. 1112-1113). Charismatic leadership is ephemeral due to a lack of structure and stability, independence from material needs, and due to its emotional nature. Once the mission is accomplished, charismatic leadership either fades away into nonexistence or is routinized into a permanent structure (Weber, 1978).

According to Weber (1978), the transformation of charismatic leadership into a permanent institution occurs when the followers are ideally and materially motivated to continue the community they belong to and their relationships with one another, with an aim to stabilize the community. A new search is initiated to find another charismatic leader whose qualities match those of the original leader. The basis for legitimacy in this case is not the personal qualities of the leader but rules regarding the technique of selecting a new leader. In most cases, the original charismatic leader designates his successor who is then recognized by the followers. Hereditary charisma occurs when a family member of the original charismatic leader is designated the new leader; this is the easiest way to transform charismatic norms (Weber, 1978). Charisma of office implies a situation where ritual plays a role in the transference of charisma, where bureaucratization or patrimonialization of charisma occurs. Charisma in such cases becomes depersonalized and once the transformation process begins, other alterations follow: economic needs and conditions, which were heretofore not considered, are
recognized and arrangements are made to fulfill those needs (Weber, 1978). Instances of charismatic transformation include: charismatic communities of war lord, prophet, artist, philosopher, ethical or scientific innovator evolve into a state, church, sect, academy or school respectively. Weber (1978) went on to claim the transformation of charismatic leadership implies that it can also be “taught and learned” (p. 1143). This education process includes specialized training and testing to attain charismatic perfection.

Charismatic authority is based on a devotion to the exceptional qualities, heroism, or exemplary character of an individual person. Characterized by an absence of rules and tradition, obedience under this type of authority is owed to the individual on the basis of personal trust (Weber 1978, pp. 215-216). Weber (1978) defined charisma as a "certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is considered extraordinary and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities" (p. 241). Since the qualities originate from a divine source and are exemplary, and inaccessible to an ordinary person, the individual possessing such qualities is treated as a leader. Charismatic authority is characterized by lack of structure, economic wants, hierarchy, career tracks, and administrative organization. Charismatic authority is based on: recognition of authority which leads to personal devotion to the leader and an emotional relationship between the leader and the led where the led obey the leader out of a sense of duty or obligation. Authority based on charisma is differentiated from traditional and legal authority as it not only repudiates the past--and is revolutionary in this sense--but also is unstable, irrational, and is not subjected to intellectually analyzable rules. Charismatic authority requires the leader to constantly

**Neo-charismatic leadership paradigm**

Adaptations of Weber’s writings on charismatic authority have been termed the ‘neocharismatic leadership paradigm,’ ‘new paradigm of charismatic leadership,’ ‘new paradigm,’ or ‘new leadership’ theories (e.g., Bass, 1999; Beyer, 1999a; Fiol, Harris, & House 1999; House, 1999; Paul et al., 2002). According to House and Aditya (1997, p. 439) and House (1999, p. 565), the neocharismatic paradigm includes the following theories propounded by organizational behaviorists:

- the theory of transformational theory suggested by Burns (1978) and further developed and operationalized by Bass (1985, 1998),
- the attributional theory of charismatic leadership (Conger & Kanungo, 1987, 1998),
- the visionary theories advanced by Bennis and Nanus (1985), operationalized by Sashkin (1988), and extended by Nanus (1992), and Sashkin and Rosenbach (1999).

Conger (2011) similarly claimed that most significant contributions to the theoretical and empirical development of charismatic leadership can be attributed to the scholarship of
Bass, Avolio, and their colleagues; House, Shamir, and their colleagues; and Conger and Kanungo (p. 89). These theories are explained in detail in the following section.

House’s (1977) theory of charismatic leadership was one of the first explorations in the field of organizational charismatic leadership which provided an empirical analysis from a psychological perspective. The theory focused on leader traits/personal characteristics, behaviors, and situational factors in determining charismatic effects. The aim of House’s (1977) study was to provide an explanation about “how charismatic leadership emerges and its effects in modern organizations” (p. 190). Based on several testable propositions, House (1977) concluded that charismatic effects can be differentiated from non-charismatic effects through leader characteristics such as: dominance, self-confidence, need for influence, and belief in one’s own values. These characteristics are further bolstered by behaviors such as goal articulation, role modeling, personal image building, demonstration of confidence and high expectations for followers, and motive arousal, the combination of which results in effective organizational performance and accomplishment of tasks and missions. Though House’s theory made several contributions to the field of organizational charismatic leadership, it was criticized on the grounds that it failed to provide: an understanding of how leaders influence followers in accomplishing organizational goals, an explanation of how such leadership affects the collective processes or the organization, and a comprehensive understanding of charismatic behaviors such as self-sacrifices of the leader and use of nontraditional behaviors (Bryman, 1992, p. 94; Yukl, 1993, p. 368). House (1977) claimed that the title of his chapter had included the year “1976” for the very reason that it was meant to guide future research thus aiding revisions and modifications (p. 207). It
was but inevitable that House’s theory was in fact revised several times in an attempt to address shortcomings and provide rigorous methods to empirically test charismatic leadership in organizational settings.

One of the initial extensions to House’s theory was provided by Howell (1988) who distinguished between two types of charisma which are not mutually exclusive: charisma based on socialized power and charisma based on personalized power (pp. 215-216). Howell (1988) derived hypotheses to differentiate between the two types of charismatic leadership based on leader behaviors, differential exercise of power, differential use of social influence processes, and effects on followers. Socialized leaders are expected to exhibit socially constructive and egalitarian behaviors, use internalization to exert influence, formulate goals based on followers’ needs and satisfaction, create follower autonomy and empowerment, and provide means to sustain the values instilled in the followers. Personalized leaders, on the other hand, portray personally dominant and authoritarian behaviors, exert influence through affiliation, focus on personal motives, create follower dependence and conformity, and sustenance of leaders’ ideas and actions depends on maintenance of leader-follower relationship (pp. 218-229). Howell (1988) recognized the need for further theoretical developments and testing of the proposed hypotheses to identify socialized and personalized leaders in organizational settings. Conger and Kanungo (1988) criticized Howell’s analysis of socialized and personalized charismatic leaders on the grounds that power orientations are not necessarily ‘dichotomous’ and charismatic leaders are revolutionary rather than evolutionary in nature.
House and Howell (1992) further contributed to the study of organizational charismatic leadership by reviewing literature on personality traits often used in defining charismatic individuals. These traits also served as the basis for differentiating between personalized and socialized charismatic leaders thereby providing theoretical advancements to the literature of charismatic leadership. According to these authors, traditional leadership theories focused on exchange relationships between the leader and followers, where the leaders are expected to provide direction and support, and reinforce behaviors. Charismatic leadership theories, on the other hand, focus on “symbolic leader behavior, visionary and inspirational ability, nonverbal communication, appeal to ideological values, intellectual stimulation of followers by the leader, and leader expectations for follower self-sacrifice and performance beyond expectations” (House & Howell, 1992, p. 82). In the process of comprising a list of charismatic leader traits the authors recognize that Weber did not discuss the nature of the gift that distinguish a charismatic individual from ordinary individuals, personality traits or behaviors of charismatic leaders. However, their review of literature led them to conclude that charismatic leaders can be differentiated from non-charismatic leaders based on the following personality traits:

- cognitive achievement orientation; strong tendencies to be creative, innovative, visionary, and inspirational; high levels of work involvement, energy, and enthusiasm; strong propensity to take risks; self-confidence; a high need for social influence coupled with a strong concern for the moral and nonexploitive use of power in a socially desirable manner; willingness to exercise influence but not to be dominant, tough, forceful, aggressive, or critical; strong inclinations to be confident in, and encouraging toward, followers and to show a development orientation towards followers; and tendencies to be nurturant, socially sensitive, and sensitive to and considerate followers. (House & Howell, 1992, p. 90)
The authors claim that follower satisfaction is high when leaders are “more feminine and nurturant and less masculine, dominant, critical, and aggressive” (House & Howell, 1992, p. 89). The desirability for such charismatic leadership traits were in turn termed socialized leadership.

A major revision to House’s theory of charismatic leadership (1977) was also offered by Shamir, House, and Arthur in 1993. Shamir et al. (1993) specifically aimed at explaining the processes through which charismatic leaders have transformational effects on their followers by proposing a self-concept based motivational theory (p. 577). Charismatic leaders motivate followers by implicating their self-concepts, which is achieved by (1) increasing the intrinsic valence of effort, (2) increasing effort-accomplishment expectancies, (3) increasing the intrinsic valence of goal accomplishment, (4) instilling faith in a better future, and (5) creating personal commitment (Shamir et al., 1993, pp. 581-584). The self-concept theory is comprised of four main components: leader behaviors, effects on followers’ self-concept, further effects on followers, and motivational processes based on which leader behaviors produce charismatic effects on followers (p. 581). Leader behaviors include role modeling and frame alignment. Role modeling is a process where leaders exhibit behaviors such as self-sacrifice, risk-taking, engaging in unconventional ideological behaviors, demonstration of courage and conviction in the mission. Followers are encouraged to emulate these legitimate traits, values, beliefs, and behaviors (p. 585). Frame alignment represents a situation where the leaders’ activities, goals, and ideology and followers’ interests, values, and beliefs “become congruent and complementary” (Shamir et al., 1993, p. 585). Leaders use communication strategies such as linking past
events and present behaviors through historical examples thereby offering a sense of continuity, articulating an ideological vision, emphasizing the importance of collective identity, articulating high performance expectations, displaying confidence in followers which effect followers’ self-esteem and self-worth (Shamir et al., 1993, pp. 585-586).

Shamir et al. (1993) went on to describe the effects leaders’ behavior and frame alignment have on followers’ self-concept, which include psychological processes such as followers’ personal identification with the leader, social identification in terms of having a collective identity, and the process of internalizing values, which serve as guiding principles (p. 586). The linkages between followers’ self-concepts and the leader’s mission also lead to other effects such as followers’ personal commitment to the leader, personal sacrifices by followers, and performance beyond expectations (p. 587). The authors emphasize that the effects on followers are not always realized for unless the followers’ values and identities are similar to the leaders’ goals and behaviors, charismatic leadership is not recognized. Further, followers’ expressive and principled orientations to work and social relations are important factors in the extent of influence charismatic leaders have on followers (Shamir et al., 1998, p. 588).

Shamir et al. (1993) specified that certain organizational conditions are necessary for the emergence and effectiveness of charismatic leadership. These conditions include: the availability of opportunities for followers’ “moral involvement” (p. 589) in attaining the vision/mission, the existence of “weak psychological situations,” (p. 589) wherein the followers’ are easily influenced to accept the leader by adapting their self-concepts, values, and identities with those of the leader, and the existence of exceptional conditions or crises where followers’ are unconditionally committed to charismatic leaders (p. 589).
The authors’ offered several propositions based on their theory of motivational effects which remain to be tested.

House and Shamir (1993) offered a theoretical explanation that aimed at integrating the various versions of transformational, charismatic, and visionary leadership available at that time. According to them, factors that distinguish charismatic from non-charismatic personalities include leader behaviors, personality traits, follower perceptions and attributions, and effects on followers (1993, p. 86). House and Shamir (1993) defined charismatic leadership primarily in “terms of the effects of charismatic leaders on followers” (p. 86). According to them, charismatic leadership is an interaction between leaders and their followers that results in (1) making followers’ self-esteem contingent on their involvement in the vision and the mission articulated by the leader, (2) strong internalization of the leaders’ values and goals by the followers, (3) strong personal or moral (as opposed to calculative) commitment to these values and goals, and (4) a willingness on the part of followers to transcend their own self-interests for the sake of the collective (team or organization) (p. 86).

House and Shamir (1993) used the term ‘transformational’ to describe the effects that charismatic leaders have on followers. Extensions to their self-concept theory include selective arousal of follower motives (non-conscious achievement, affiliation, power motives, etc.) by the leader which results in the followers’ self-engagement in goal attainment, which leads to “increased intrinsic satisfaction from goal accomplishment because the goals become more valent when motives are aroused than when are not” (House and Shamir, 1993, p. 92). Follower behaviors become positively valent when there is progress in goal accomplishment; negative valency results from failures in attaining progress. House and Shamir (1993) ascertained that the self-concept theory integrates charismatic, visionary, and transformational theories by including criteria such
as visionary behavior, image building activities, follower empowerment, risk-taking and self-sacrifice, intellectual stimulation, supportive leader behaviors, and adaptive leader behaviors (pp. 96-103).

Burns (1978) defined leadership as “leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations—the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations—of both leaders and follower. And the genius of leadership lies in the manner in which leaders see and act on their own and their followers’ values and motivations” (p. 19). This definition of leadership provides the basis for transforming leadership which to Burns (1978) was “more potent” though it was complex. The transforming leader not only fulfills the needs of potential followers but also identifies potential motives in followers in order to satisfy higher needs by engaging the “full person of the follower” (p. 4). Dynamics other than power form the basis of this leadership for it involves factors such as mutual needs, aspirations, and values between the leaders and followers. Choice is an important aspect for followers are aware of the availability of alternate leaders and programs and have the ability to choose; and leaders uphold and fulfill their commitments of economic, political, and social change (p. 4). Leadership is legitimate only when the “ungratified needs and crushed expectations” (Burns, 1978, p. 5) of followers are met so their full potential is released. Burns (1978) distinguished between transactional and transforming leadership on the grounds that while transactional leadership is concerned with “modal values” (p. 426) honesty, responsibility, fairness, and honoring of commitments, transforming leadership deals with values of liberty, justice, and equality by raising their followers through morals. In
essence, transactional leadership is about attaining means to the ends whereas transforming leadership is about attaining end values (Burns, 1978, p. 426).

During the time that House and his colleagues offered propositions to better understand charismatic leadership processes, Bass used Burns’s theory of transforming leadership to propose a model of transformational leadership. Bass (1985) expanded Burns’s theory by not only adding a ‘followers’ portfolio of needs and wants’ (p. 20) but also by digressing from the ‘moral’ aspects that Burns emphasized in his leadership theory; to Bass (1985), “transformational leadership is not necessarily beneficial leadership” (p. 21). According to Bass’s theory, Adolph Hitler could be termed transformational despite the immorality of his leadership because his influence did not wane (1985, p. 20). Also, to Bass (1985), transformational leaders can exhibit both transformational and transactional behaviors as they are not two ends of the same continuum as described by Burns (p. 22). Bass (1985) described transformational leader as one who impacted followers by raising “their awareness about issues of consequence,” (p. 29) such leaders also shifted followers’ focus to higher-level needs, and “influenced them to transcend their own self-interests for the good of the group or organization and to work harder than they originally had expected they would” (p. 29). A pilot study of 70 senior executives was conducted to determine if any individual(s) fit part or all of the above descriptions. Results from this pilot study formed the basis for constructing survey questionnaires in order to derive transformational and transactional leader behaviors. The initial questionnaire consisted of 142 items, which was further revised to create a final leadership questionnaire that consisted of 73 items, which formed the basis for the development of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). A factor analysis
yielded three transformational factors: charismatic leadership, individualized
consideration, and intellectual stimulation, and two transactional factors: contingent
reward and management-by-exception (Bass, 1985, p. 218). Currently, 70 items
comprise the MLQ Form 5R (Bass, 1998, p. 5).

The first component, charismatic leadership or idealized influence, is descriptive
of the leader’s behaviors that result in followers’ faith and trust in the leader.
Inspirational motivation, a sub-factor of charismatic leadership, is indicative of a
situation where transformational leaders motivate and inspire followers and arouse them
to work collectively in achieving goals (Bass, 1998, p. 5). Intellectual stimulation occurs
when leaders “stimulate their followers’ efforts to be innovative and creative by
questioning assumptions, reframing problems, and approaching old situations in new
ways” (Bass, 1998, p. 5). Individualized consideration is a process where leaders
recognize individual differences in follower needs and desires and mentor them to higher
achievement. Contingent rewarding is based on transactional agreements between the
leader and followers, and management-by-exception involves active and passive
transactions between the leader and followers. Finally, laissez-faire leadership represents
inaction by the leader (Bass, 1998, pp. 6-7).

Conger and Kanungo (1987) also attempted to define and operationalize charisma
by presenting a model to link organizational contexts to charismatic leadership. They
lamented that charismatic leadership was understudied in organizations when compared
to the extensive research available in the fields of political science, sociology, and social
psychology (pp. 637-639). According to Conger and Kanungo (1987),
charisma must be viewed as an attribution made by followers who observe certain behaviors on the part of the leader within organizational contexts. The roles played by a person not only make the person, in the eyes of the followers, a task leader or a social leader, but they also make him or her a charismatic leader or a noncharismatic leader (pp. 639-640).

Thus, charisma is a behavioral component of leadership; it is a leadership style that can be operationalized. The authors provide several hypotheses to distinguish behavioral components of charismatic leadership. Variables that lead to charismatic attributions include:

(a) the degree of discrepancy between the status quo and the future goal or vision advocated by the leader, (b) the use of innovative and unconventional means for achieving the desired change, (c) a realistic assessment of environmental resources and constraints for bringing about such change, and (d) the nature of articulation and impression management employed to inspire subordinates in the pursuit of the vision (Conger & Kanungo, 1987, p. 640).

Conger and Kanungo (1987) define vision as an idealized goal formulated by the leader and communicated to followers in ways that bring about attitudinal and organizational changes. Charismatic leader attributes in attainment of the future vision include: credibility (leaders’ are likable, trustworthy, and knowledgeable), personal sacrifice, ability to take risks, and expertise (p. 642). Unconventional behaviors that lead to charismatic attribution include display of revolutionary and innovative behaviors that contradict established societal and organizational norms (Conger & Kanungo, 1987, p. 643). Another important contributor is sensitivity to environment; charismatic leaders should not only have the ability to assess environmental resources and constraints but also be sensitive to followers’ emotional needs to bring about the desired change (Conger & Kanungo, 1987, p. 643). Finally, communicating or articulating the vision is of utmost importance; leaders who use impression management techniques such as rhetorical skills
that portray the leaders’ assertiveness, confidence, expertise, and sensitivity to follower needs in addition to physical appearance and nonverbal communication skills will be viewed as charismatic (Conger & Kanungo, 1987, pp. 643-644). Charismatic leaders use referent and expert power in place of legal, coercive, and/or rewards as means of influencing followers. Further, charismatic leaders differ from administrators and managers by acting as change agents and transform not only followers but also reform organizations (p. 644). Conger and Kanungo (1987) also emphasize the importance of contextual factors (crisis and/or tranquility) as precipitating factors in the emergence of charismatic leadership. They specified that future researchers test the hypotheses in order demystify charisma so that managers with charismatic characteristics can be identified and selected in organizational settings (p. 645).

Conger and Kanungo (1998) extended their attributional theory by offering a comprehensive model of charismatic leadership that incorporated three stages (evaluation of status quo, formulation and articulation of goals, and means to achieve goals), which they claim was also an improvement over other behavioral approaches including: transformational leadership theory offered by Bass and his associates, charismatic leadership theory advanced by House and associates, and Sashkin’s visionary leadership theory (pp. 65-70). Conger and Kanungo (1998, pp. 114-117) empirically tested their model by conducting six separate studies thereby developing the Conger-Kanungo Scale, which consists of 20 items classified into five subscales: strategic vision and articulation (7 items), sensitivity to environment (4 items), sensitivity to member needs (3 items), personal risk (3 items), and unconventional behavior (3 items).
Bennis and Nanus (1985) furthered the new leadership theory by describing the new leader as “one who commits people to action, who converts followers into leaders, and who may convert leaders into agents of change” (p. 3). They used Burns’ theory of transforming leadership and propose the term ‘transformative leadership,’ wherein leadership is determined by “wise use of power” (Bennis & Nanus, 1985, p. 17). Sixty leaders (corporate presidents and/or chairmen of boards) and 30 public sector leaders were interviewed to better understand leadership, which resulted in four major themes: attention through vision, meaning through communication, trust through positioning, and deployment of self through positive self-regard and Wallenda factor—leaders reaction to failures (Bennis & Nanus, 1985, pp. 19-27). Nanus (1992) sought to further clarify the importance of visionary leadership by defining a vision as a “realistic, credible, attractive” (p. 8) organizational future; in comparison a right vision refers to “an idea so energizing that it in effect jump-starts the future by calling for the skills, talents, and resources to make it happen” (p. 8).

Sashkin (1988) referred to Bennis and Nanus’ leadership theory as ‘visionary leadership’ as it “involves the creation of a vision on the part of the leader, a vision that is designed both to fit and to mold organizational conditions and requirements” (p. 123). Extending this theory further, Sashkin (1988) claims that visionary leadership is integrative in that it takes into consideration the leader, situation, and leader behaviors and includes the following elements: leaders’ employment of personality prerequisites and cognitive skills in creating the vision, ability of leaders to understand the content of organizational vision, and articulation of the vision (pp. 124-125). Personality orientation implies the leaders’ need and use of power and achievement. To Sashkin (1988),
visionary leaders use socialized power rather than personalized power in creating and articulating organizational visions (p. 127). Leaders’ cognitive skills include expressing the vision through behavior, explaining the vision to others, extending the vision, and expanding the vision (pp. 127-130). Effective visions are those whose content reveals ways for organizations to deal with change, incorporate ideal goals, and emphasize the importance of organizational members and customers in vision attainment (pp. 132-133).

Vision articulation occurs through strategic—“development of clear and concise statements of organizational philosophy” (Sashkin, 1988, p. 138), tactical, and personal actions. Visionary leader behaviors include the ability of leaders to direct follower attention to specific goals, interpersonal communication, demonstration of consistency and trustworthiness, displaying respect for self and others, and risk-taking behaviors.

Sashkin (1988) developed the Leader Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ) to measure the five leadership types and an additional scale to measure leader charisma based on follower perception (p. 147).

Several other modifications and extensions of the new leadership theories described above are currently available, which use Weber’s exposition of charisma as a starting point. However, Beyer (1999a), criticized the many theories comprised in the new paradigm by stating

> according to Weber’s conception, charisma was a rare phenomenon, and a leader must have truly exceptional personal qualities to engender charisma. The new paradigm, however, seems to assume that charisma may be a much more common phenomenon, since studies regularly ask many sets of followers about the presumed charismatic qualities of their current leaders. (p. 314)

which implies charisma is “the property of a relationship” (p. 313). She went on to argue that charisma is a “social process and emergent social structure that encompasses more
than the leadership process…mission or vision—what the leader and followers are trying to do—is integral to a conception of charisma that differentiates it from other forms of leadership” (Beyer, 1999a, p. 326). In response to Beyer, House (1999) contended that while Beyer’s views could be titled a “sociological view of charisma” or “Weberian charisma,” the new paradigm or organizational behaviorist perspectives could be termed “organizational charisma” (p. 564). According to Shamir (1999), since contemporary theories of leadership—including the new paradigm—do not include the features of Weberian charisma, the term “charisma may not even be an appropriate term for such leadership” (p. 560). Agreeing with House and Shamir, Beyer (1999b) proposed that the new paradigmers use the term “transformational” instead of “charismatic” since “the term “transformational” does not carry the implications of extraordinariness that charisma does” (p. 586).

While the debate over whether or not the term charisma should be used to describe new leadership theories continues, it should be understood that if leadership studies have been influenced by charismatic literature, they have in turn impacted the study of charismatic authority. Leadership theorists have often used several attributes in determining whether a person is capable of becoming a leader. Using these attributes in the leadership process has rendered leadership a masculine field since, stereotypically, men are assumed to possess leadership qualities. Charismatic theories similarly, rely on attributes to differentiate charismatic from non-charismatic personalities. For instance, Van Wart (2008) differentiated between charismatic and transformational leadership by stating the while transformational theories focus on leaders as triggering change, charismatic approaches focus on leader personality, traits, mystique, and cultural
expectations (pp. 68-69). According to Chin (2007a), “charismatic leadership has been a trait frequently found and associated with great men leaders; consequently, effective leadership has been associated with “masculine traits,” and characterized the leadership of men within male-dominated contexts.” (p. 5). The implications of using attributes to explain charismatic leadership can be better understood by first examining the role of gender in general leadership theories.

**Gender and Leadership**

The role of women in leadership, or the lack thereof, has been a subject of discussions and controversies for decades. The number of studies on the gender gap/inequalities may equal the number of studies on leadership what with women being subjugated to gender stereotypes and roles that restrict their progression to leadership positions. According to Burns (1978), “over the centuries femininity has been stereotyped as dependent, submissive and conforming, and hence women have been seen as lacking in leadership qualities” (p. 50). These discriminatory practices are widespread in both public and private sectors. He went on to state that discrimination against women is further enhanced because of women perceiving themselves in subordinate roles (p. 50). Further, the male bias in leadership studies is a result of the “false conception” (Burns, 1978, p. 50) of early leadership theories as a function of control and command. However, since leadership has evolved into a system of engagement by focusing on the human aspects of motivation and realizing follower needs, “women will be more readily recognized as leaders and men will change their own leadership styles” (Burns, 1978, p. 50).
There is an abundance of literature on women and leadership which can be categorized into two strands: those that examine the nature of gendered organizations thereby revealing male biases; and others that focus on identifying factors that differentiate male from female leaders thereby suggesting the uniqueness of female leadership (Fine, 2007, pp. 180-181). Not only do researchers focus on different aspects of women in leadership positions but also differentiate between male and female leadership. According to Porter and Daniel (2007), feminist leadership is “transformational in nature, seeking to empower and enhance the effectiveness of one’s team members while striving to improve the lives and social conditions of all stakeholders including those indirectly affected, such as consumers and other members of society” (p. 249). To complicate matters further, there are different approaches to deal with the topic of women and leadership. While the gender role theory focuses on how group behavior is influenced by societal gender roles, feminist leadership theories stress on creating gender-equitable environments where women do not feel the need to act like men to have access to leadership positions.

Feminist leadership is both a goal and a style (Chin, 2007b, p. 358). Despite the numerous research studies regarding gender and leadership, little has been achieved in terms of attaining gender equality. Smith (2007) was of the opinion that there may never be answers to questions like “is leadership gender neutral, or does gender matter? Are men better at leadership in practice, or do women have better leadership attributes in theory?” (p. 65) for all that matters is the necessity to understand the nature of leadership. Structural barriers such as exclusion factors and gendered organizational structures and practices; and attitudinal barriers—double standard and double bind in the exercise of
authority are the two major forms of barriers that keep women from climbing the leadership ladder (Ely & Rhode, 2010, p. 380). Coughlin (2005) similarly stated that women are impedied by several social, psychological, and organizational dynamics which increases the gender gap in public and organizational leadership (p. 9). Though these barriers have been in place for many centuries now some men and women tend to disregard them and thereby render gender differences non-existent, but this act of denial is a problem in itself (Herring, 2003, p.77) for it perpetuates gender biases. An ‘unlearning’ of gender blindness needs to be encouraged where a conscious effort is made to recognize and address gender issues (Mavin, Bryans, & Waring, 2006, p. 44).

**Gender and Charismatic Leadership**

Gender biases are also inherent in charismatic leadership studies and this is not only evident from the lack of studies on women as charismatic leaders but also from a review of contemporary literature on charisma. Not only is the field of charismatic leadership filled with barriers but also there is widespread gender blindness that further plagues the study. Most studies on charismatic leadership adopt the trait approach which only perpetuates gender biases in such scholarship. Few studies that broach the topic of gender and charisma (Groves, 2005; Krogstad & Storvik, 2007; Lindholm, 1990; Mitchell, 2006; Riggio, 1987; Takala & Aaltio, 2007; Toth, 1981, p. xiv) address the existence of gaps but do not offer approaches to fill the gaps.

This study used content analysis to review contemporary literature on charismatic leadership to determine if scholars are ‘gender blind’ in their treatment of charismatic leadership. Contents of the journal *The Leadership Quarterly* were examined to (1)
explore the use of charismatic leader examples in contemporary charismatic literature, (2) investigate how the use of language in contemporary charismatic literature perpetuates gender biases in the scholarship, (3) explore the frequency with which masculine and feminine attributes are used in describing charismatic leaders, and (4) explore confusion surrounding the meaning and definition of charisma in contemporary literature. This study aimed at bridging the gaps between charisma and gender by demonstrating that language about gender confounds language about charisma. It also contended contemporary charismatic literature belies Weber’s conceptualization of charisma. The methodological approach employed in exploring these issues is presented in Chapter III of the dissertation.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

The aim of this dissertation was to explore gender stereotypes inherent in contemporary literature on charisma. A related purpose was to investigate how the use of language in contemporary charismatic literature perpetuates gender biases in such scholarship and to determine how varied this scholarship is from Weberian analysis of charisma. The main research questions addressed in the dissertation were:

1. To what extent does contemporary literature on charisma reflect and contribute toward a gendered perception of charisma?

2. To what extent does contemporary charismatic literature belie Weber’s conceptualization of charisma?

This chapter presents an overview of the research methodology—content analysis—used in the study, data collection procedures, usability of Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI), data analysis procedures including a discussion of Van Wart’s ‘leadership action cycle,’ and the reliability and validity of the study.

Research Methodology

The qualitative research methodology, content analysis, was used to answer the questions in this study. The term ‘content analysis’ was introduced in the mid-20th century at which time its usage as a research technique gained widespread popularity in
the field of communications (Krippendorff & Bock, 2009a, p. 1). Historically, however, newspapers were analyzed as early as 18th century AD for religious purposes which encouraged scholarly discussions that eventually resulted in the quantitative analyses of documents (Dovring, 1954-1955). Max Weber (1924/2009) used the term ‘sociology of the press’ to emphasize the importance of analyzing the content of newspapers in order to “study the power inequalities that specific newspaper publicity creates” (p. 10). He recommended using ‘scissors and compasses’ to measure and analyze how the content of newspapers ‘quantitatively shifted’ during his generation and also encouraged the use of qualitative analysis to complement and enrich the quantitative results derived (Weber, 1924/2009, p. 11). The growing popularity of content analysis as a research methodology is evident by its use in various fields such as communication, journalism, sociology, psychology, business, psychiatry, history, anthropology, education, philology, literary analysis, linguistics, marketing and media studies, literature and rhetoric, ethnography and cultural studies, gender and age issues, sociology and political science, cognitive sciences, economics, and nutrition, and many other fields of inquiry (Busch et al., 2005; Nuendorf, 2002; Riffe, Lacy, & Fico, 2005; Stone, Dunphy, Smith, & Ogilvie, 1966).

**Content Analysis**

Content analysis was used to address the questions in this study because it serves as an effective tool in exploring biases inherent in contemporary charismatic leadership thereby, providing the means to decipher (1) gender-related inconsistencies and (2) confusion regarding the meaning and definitions of charisma in contemporary literature. Content analysis is particularly useful when large sets of documents and/or texts are to be

content analysis is a quantitative form of analysis that consists of an examination of what can be counted in text of any form (articles, advertisements, news items, etc.) or other media such as pictures, television or radio programs or films, and live situations such as interview, plays, concerts (Walliman, 2011, p. 86).

According to Babbie (2001), unobtrusive research methods such as content analysis provided the means to study “social behavior without affecting it” (p. 304). To Bowen and Bowen (2008):

Content analysis is a technique for analyzing a body of text. It treats the elements of the body of text as empirical entities. It establishes and documents aspects of their characteristics and the relationships between them. In doing so, it enables investigators to ask and systematically answer research questions about the manner in which the ideas and information contained in that body are conceived or expressed. The elements may be words, idioms, sentences, paragraphs, articles, papers, or similar units of text comprising a larger body (p. 689).

The advantages of using content analysis in this study were many. Since this study aimed at analyzing charismatic leadership literature, content analysis was particularly beneficial in simplifying ‘large documents into enumerative information;’ qualitative and quantitative approaches could be combined to ‘look at both numbers and the relationships between these and the context;’ ‘intentions, attitudes and emotions as well as lines of propaganda, inequality and power’ could be identified; interactions were analyzed from a distance which leads to an objective analysis of the data (Grbich, 2007, p. 122). Other strengths of content analysis (Babbie, 2001, pp. 314-315; Berg, 2004, pp. 287-288; Bryman, 2001, pp. 189-190; Riffe et al., 2005, pp. 38-39) include:
• It is an unobtrusive and nonreactive measurement technique, which allows for easy accessibility of information without having to deal with surveys, interviews, or other forms of direct communication/participation.

• It is economically time and cost effective as the materials are usually easy to find and inexpensive—a special benefit is that of safety as it is easier to repeat the study without having to go through the process of resending surveys, rescheduling interviews, or redoing the entire study.

• Longitudinal and cross-sectional studies can be conducted with ease—documented content of any form usually outlives its communicators, audiences, or events.

• It is an objective method of analysis due to its transparency—the use of coding schemes and sampling procedures render the studies feasible and replicable.

• The flexibility of content analysis ensures that it can be applied to unlimited variety of questions important to many disciplines and fields.

In essence, content analysis “provides the researcher with a structured method for quantifying the contents of a qualitative or interpretive text, and does so in a simple, clear, and easily repeatable format” (McNabb, 2002, p. 414).

**Data Collection**

According to Krippendorff (as cited in Bowen & Bowen, 2008, p. 692) every content analysis should address the following six questions: (1) which data are analyzed? (2) How are the data defined? (3) What is the population from which they are drawn?
(4) What is the context relative to which they are analyzed? (5) What are the boundaries of the analysis? and, (6) What is the target of the inferences? The next section explains the content analysis procedures followed in this study by addressing the aforementioned questions.

1. Which data were analyzed and why?

The content of scholarly articles on the subject of charisma published during the years 1990-2011 in the journal *The Leadership Quarterly* was analyzed in this study. The search string *charisma* was used to retrieve the articles. The use of the wild card ‘asterisk’ enabled searching for variants of the word ‘charisma’ thus ensuring a comprehensive and inclusive database. The following discussion offers an explanation on the reasoning for *Leadership Quarterly*’s inclusion in this study:

Firstly, ever since its inception in the year 1990, the aim of the *Leadership Quarterly* has been one of converging multi-disciplinary research on leadership by providing a single platform to scholars. The journal was started under the leadership of founding editor Bernard Bass and co-editors Bob House and Henry Tosi (Lowe & Gardner, 2000). The multi-disciplinary and international reach of *Leadership Quarterly* during its first decade (1990-2000) was minimal as the majority of authorship (67%) came from the field of business and management, with 82% of the authors residing in the United States. The second decade (2000-2009), evidenced greater representation both in terms of authorship as well as international appeal. Multi-disciplinary contributions to the journal increased from 33% to 38% and contributions from other nationalities increased from 18% to 24% by the end of this decade (Gardner, Lowe, Moss, Mahoney, & Cogliser, 2010).
Secondly, the volume of publications on the subject of leadership substantiated the use of this journal. While a total of 188 articles were published in the journal during the first decade, the number of publications at the end of second decade almost doubled to a total of 353 articles. An additional advantage was that during its first decade over one-third of the articles published dealt with neo-charismatic approaches to leadership (Gardner et al., 2010; Lowe & Gardner, 2000). This high volume of interest in charismatic leadership can be attributed to the publication of two special issues on the topic. Issues three and four of the 1993 journal publication focused on ‘Neo-Weberian Perspectives on Charismatic Leadership.’ Under the editorship of Fran Yammarino and John Jermier (guest editor) a total of 12 original research articles, three book reviews, and one film review comprised the contents of these issues. Similarly, in 1999, another two-part special issue on ‘Charismatic and Transformational Leadership’ was published under the editorship of Jerry Hunt and guest editor - Jay Conger (Hunt, 1999; Lowe & Gardner, 2000). While issues two and three of volume 10 were dedicated to the discussion of charismatic leadership, the topic generated more than the anticipated interest as the discussions flowed into subsequent issues (vol. 10, no. 4 and vol. 11, no. 1) of the Leadership Quarterly even though they were not designated special issues.

Thirdly, the Leadership Quarterly has the most publications by neo-charismatic paradigmers who claim to have made significant contributions to the theoretical and empirical development of charisma. When the search string charisma* was used, a total of 607 articles were retrieved as of October 2011 for the 1990-2011 timeframe indicating the high volume of publications on the subject of charisma in a single journal. In comparison, a search of “Public Policy and Administration” related journals (37 titles) in
the JSTOR database retrieved a total of 244 articles for the 1990-2011 timeframe. An unrestricted timeframe yielded a total of 456 articles related to charisma in six decades with articles published as early as the year 1951. The following sections discuss the inclusion criteria applied in this study.

2. How were the data defined?

Elements of analysis in this study were defined by individual articles. However, only articles containing the term ‘charisma’ and its variants (e.g., charismatic, charismatic leadership, charismatic authority, etc.) were used in deriving the data.

3. What was the population from which the data are drawn?

The population was comprised of scholarly publications on charisma within the Leadership Quarterly journal. As previously mentioned, a comprehensive search of the Leadership Quarterly yielded 607 documents spanning over 20 years (1990-2011) when the search string charisma* was used. However, in this study purposive sampling was used whereby only such articles were included which contained the term charisma* in the ‘abstract, title, keywords’ of the Leadership Quarterly journal. This constrained search yielded a total of 118 articles for the 1990-2011 timeframe; there was at least one article that contained the term charisma*, within the search parameters, in each year. All 118 articles were used for data collection and data analysis purposes. Adopting this purposive sampling approach allowed focus on the relevant subject matter by excluding those publications that refer to charisma only in the passing.

4. What was the context relative to which the data were analyzed?

The context was one of characterizing gender biases in charismatic leadership literature. The latest version of the qualitative data analysis software NVivo (9.2.81.0)
was used not only for storing the downloaded portable document format (PDF) articles but also for coding purposes. Gender biases in theoretical and popular models of charisma were determined by examining the attributes used in such studies to define and distinguish charismatic individuals from non-charismatic personalities. The manifest and latent content of the *Leadership Quarterly* articles were also examined. The manifest content involved counting the number of male and female charismatic leaders cited in *Leadership Quarterly* articles (counting), and the frequency with which masculine and feminine traits were used in describing such leaders. The Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) was used to determine if a certain attribute was masculine, feminine, or gender-neutral. A later section offers justification for using the BSRI in this study. Further, ranks were assigned to charismatic leader examples and attributes on the basis of frequency of occurrence. An examination of the latent content of the *Leadership Quarterly* articles provided the means to explore contemporary charisma.

5. What were the boundaries of the analysis?

Documents unrelated to charisma and journals other than *Leadership Quarterly* were not important for the purposes of data collection and analysis in this study.

6. What was the target of the inferences?

The target was to provide clear and explicit documentation regarding gender biases in contemporary charismatic leadership studies.

Other important steps in the content analysis process included conceptualization, operationalization, coding schemes, coding process, and data analysis (Neuendorf, 2002, pp. 50-51). These steps are discussed in relation to the research questions asked in this study and the criteria that were used in collecting and analyzing the data. The first
question – to what extent does contemporary charismatic literature reflect and contribute
toward a gendered perception of charisma – was answered by further exploring gender
stereotypes inherent in contemporary literature on charisma. Gender stereotypes were
explored by examining the manifest content of Leadership Quarterly articles, which
involved categorizing and counting the number of male and female charismatic leaders
cited in the Leadership Quarterly articles. Two categories, ‘Male’ and ‘Female,’ were
created in NVivo 9 to record the name and number of occurrences of charismatic leader
examples. The following criteria were implemented to refine the coding procedures and
to make the data relevant and useful:

1. Only when it was clear that the article author(s) referred to a certain individual
   as a charismatic personality was that example assigned to the appropriate
category.

2. If a charismatic leader’s name was used in the articles but seemed like a
   secondary reference, it was excluded from the study unless the author(s)
   claimed that the individual was indeed charismatic either through
   theoretical/empirical analysis.

3. No distinctions were made between personalized and socialized charismatic
   leaders. It was important to do this as author(s) referred to individual(s) as
   charismatic regardless of the moral implications. A comprehensive list of
   charismatic leaders also provided the necessary means to compare Weberian
   charisma and contemporary leadership theories.
4. Any ambiguous references to charismatic leaders were excluded from the study as I did not want to make any inferences about the author(s) implications based on the article text.

Gender stereotypes were also explored by categorizing attributes used by author(s) to distinguish charismatic from non-charismatic leaders. The following set of criteria was used for including/excluding charismatic attributes in this study:

1. Charismatic attributes appearing in the literature review section of the articles were not coded. Attributes were included if and only when the author(s) specifically used them empirically to prove their applicability in their study(ies).
2. No distinction was made between personalized and socialized charismatic attributes. As with the charismatic leader examples, it was important to include all charismatic attributes to compare Weberian and contemporary charismatic leadership theories.
3. Since the aim of this study was to determine the extent to which contemporary charisma belies Weberian charisma, all attributes were included in the study regardless of whether any of them were found to be statistically significant to the concept of charisma.

Another factor examined was the use of gender pronouns (he/she, himself/herself, etc.) in describing the charismatic leaders, again, only primary references were included in this study. If such gender pronouns were part of a secondary reference in the article, they were excluded from the study.
Usability of Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI)

Post data collection, the next step was to categorize coded charismatic attributes into ‘masculine,’ ‘feminine,’ and/or ‘gender-neutral’ categories using the BSRI. This was done in order to determine if gender biases in contemporary charismatic literature was perpetuated by the usage of masculine versus feminine or neutral behaviors. The BSRI was first developed by Sandra Lipsitz Bem in 1974 to “implement empirical research on psychological androgyny” (1981, p. 4). The BSRI is unique in that while most masculinity-femininity scales use a continuum, BSRI treats femininity and masculinity as two independent dimensions rather than as two ends of a single dimension, thereby enabling a person to indicate whether she or he is high on both dimensions (“androgynous”), low on both dimensions (“undifferentiated”), or high on one dimension but low on the other (either “feminine” or “masculine”) (Bem 1981, p. 4).

Bem (1974) used cultural definitions of sex-typed social desirability rather than using the predominant “differential endorsement by males and females” (p. 155) to itemize behaviors into personality characteristics in the Original form. Of the 400 personality characteristics that judges rated on a 7-point scale (1 = “Not at all desirable” and 7 = “Extremely desirable”), 60 characteristics were retained in the BSRI. Bem (1974) categorized characteristics into lists if they were judged “more desirable in American society for one sex than for the other” (p. 157). A characteristic was termed masculine if it was judged more socially desirable for a man instead of a woman, feminine if the social desirability was greater for a woman than a man, and androgynous if the characteristic was not any more desirable for one sex than the other (Bem, 1974, pp. 155-157). The Original form consists of 20 stereotypically feminine characteristics (e.g., affectionate, compassionate, gentle, etc.), 20 stereotypically masculine
characteristics (e.g., aggressive, assertive, self-sufficient), and 20 (10 positive and 10 negative) filler characteristics that measure neutrality (e.g., helpful, sincere, unpredictable).

The BSRI is essentially a self-administered form where individuals and/or groups rate themselves on a 7-point scale (1 = “Never or almost never true” and 7 = “Always or almost always true”) for each of the 20 masculine and 20 feminine personality characteristics (Bem, 1981, p. 11). The individual portrays a masculine sex role when the Masculinity score differs significantly from the Femininity score, and is considered to be feminine if the Femininity score is significantly higher than the Masculinity score (Bem, 1977, p. 197). A Short Form, consisting of 30 personality items, has also been introduced, which does not include the filler or neutral items; however, the author recommends using the Original Form as it was found that this form predicts “behavior better than the short BSRI” (Bem, 1981, p. 4, n4).

The reliability and validity of the BSRI are important factors to consider in determining the usability of BSRI in this study. The reliability of the BSRI was evident from the high scores for internal consistency on the masculinity, femininity, and social desirability. To check for “test-retest” reliability the BSRI was administered a second time four-weeks later and the scores were found to be highly reliable thus confirming the reliability of BSRI (Bem, 1974, pp. 159-160). While Bem (1981, pp. 15-16) provided additional evidence validating the BSRI, subsequent researches have debated the validity of the instrument. While Holt and Ellis (1998) found the BSRI to be valid despite the “weakening of the traditional masculine and feminine gender roles” (p. 939), Hoffman and Borders (2001) reported concerns with construct and process validity of the BSRI;
however, they go on to state that the BSRI continues to be the “most widely used measure in all areas of gender research” (p. 40).

In this study, the Original BSRI, consisting of 60-items, was used to assign the coded attributes into masculine, feminine, and gender-neutral categories. Though the gender-neutral categories are considered filler items, they were relevant to this study as 10 of these items were termed positive and hence socially desirable irrespective of the sex of the individual and 10 negative personality items that were undesirable for either sex (Bem, 1974, pp. 157-159). The negative/undesirable items of the BSRI were particularly useful since this study did not differentiate between desirable and undesirable charismatic leaders or their attributes, thus allowing for some of these attributes to be assigned to the gender-neutral category. Though other current scales on femininity and masculinity are available, they were not considered in this study. For instance, the Femininity Ideology Scale (FIS) and the Male Role Norms Inventory – Revised (MRNI-R) are more recent scales that measure feminine and masculine ideologies separately. The FIS for instance, measures “the degree to which respondents endorse traditional femininity ideology (beliefs about how women should act)” (Levant, Richmond, Cook, House, & Aupont, 2007a, p. 376) using 45 normative statements on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Similarly, the MRNI-R measures traditional male role norms using normative statements that could be scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale; this scale consists of 107-items (Levant, Smalley, Aupont, House, Richmond, & Noronha, 2007, pp. 86-87). However, Levant et al. (2007b) note that the MRNI-R only measures “how men should or should not behave, and did not compare the behavior of men and women” (p. 87). Since this study aimed at categorizing charismatic leader attributes into masculine/feminine/gender-neutral
categories, the FIS or MRNI-R were not adequate instruments. The BSRI on the other hand, measures “American stereotypes of masculinity and femininity” (Bem, 1981, p. 17) and the extent to which individuals desire to possess each of the masculine, feminine, and/or gender-neutral characteristics.

Data Analysis

The qualitative software program NVivo 9 was used to create codes that were used to record examples of male and female charismatic leader examples cited in the Leadership Quarterly articles. Codes were also created to record attributes used in the Leadership Quarterly. Coding was performed by selecting the portion of relevant text in the article which was then assigned to a code. The primary researcher coded the articles by carefully reading each article and ensuring that the coding criteria explained earlier were followed. It was important to read the articles and not use in-built dictionaries or automatic search options to find charismatic leader examples or attributes because it was necessary to determine the context in which the name/attribute was used. This approach is similar to manual coding procedures; however, the use of NVivo 9 allowed for easier storage, accessibility, categorization, and coding materials. As mentioned earlier, examples and attributes appearing in the literature review sections of the articles and secondary references were not coded as they would not yield data relevant to this study. Since the purpose of this study was to examine gender inconsistencies in contemporary literature on charisma, it was necessary to determine if the article’s author(s) validated an individual or attribute as charismatic. While some articles were pertinent during the data
collection stage, others were not significant sources in offering charismatic leader examples or citing charismatic attributes.

The charismatic leader examples category comprised of Male and Female sub-categories. With respect to coding charismatic leader attributes, codes were created as they emerged from the articles. The unit of coding for each leadership attributes was either a keyword or a phrase. Post data collection, Van Wart’s (2008) ‘leadership action cycle’ was used to categorize the charismatic leadership attributes extracted from the Leadership Quarterly. The definitions, descriptions, and sub-elements used by Van Wart (2008) provided the basis for categorizing the derived attributes into three (leader styles, leader characteristics, and leader behaviors) of the five functional areas in the leadership action cycle. For instance, according to Van Wart (2008) decisiveness is one of the leader traits; when a criterion synonymous to decisiveness was found in the Leadership Quarterly, it was categorized as a trait. A similar approach was followed to categorize the attributes into styles and behaviors. Leadership Quarterly attributes that could not be assigned to Van Wart’s leadership action cycle were deemed miscellaneous.

Having categorized the charismatic leadership attributes into Van Wart’s leadership action cycle, the next step was to categorize them as masculine (M), feminine (F), or gender-neutral (N). This was done to determine if the use of gendered charismatic attributes perpetuated the gender biases in contemporary charismatic literature. While the BSRI is used to derive masculinity, femininity, and androgynous scores for individuals, it was not possible to derive scores in this study as the BSRI was used to categorize attributes used to distinguish charismatic from non-charismatic personalities. Based on the list of items provided by Bem (1974), the Leadership Quarterly attributes were
deemed masculine, feminine, or gender-neutral if they were found to be synonymous to any of the 60 items used in the BSRI. For instance, Bem (1974) described aggressive as one of the 20 masculine characteristics. When a criterion synonymous to aggressive was found in the *Leadership Quarterly*, it was deemed masculine. Similarly, if terms synonymous to affectionate and adaptable were found, they were deemed feminine and gender-neutral respectively based on the characteristics presented in the BSRI. *Leadership Quarterly* attributes that could not be assigned to either masculine or feminine categories were deemed gender-neutral. No additional coders or raters were involved in the data collection or analysis processes in this study, which brought into question the reliability and validity of content analysis methodology in this study.

Krippendorff (2009) described reliability as “the extent to which data can be trusted to represent the phenomena of interest rather than spurious ones” (p. 350). Elsewhere, Krippendorff (2004, pp. 215-216) stated that three types of reliability are relevant to content analysis: stability, reproducibility, and accuracy. Stability is ensured when the coding procedures yield consistent data/results. Since a single coder codes the same data at different points of time (test-retest) stability is ascertained. The possibility for variations in coding procedures and data obtained is reduced because multiple coders are not involved. Inconsistencies in stability result when the coding instructions are unclear, irregularities in following coding procedures, etc. Though considered weaker than other indicators of reliability, stability can be used first to measure of reliability, followed by other measures of reliability. Reproducibility is applicable when multiple coders are involved in coding the same content. Also known as “intercoder reliability, intersubjective agreement, and parallel-forms reliability,” (Krippendorff, 2004, p. 215),
reproducibility is a better indicator of reliability. Inconsistencies in this case also arise due to lack of clarity in coding instructions and intra and inter coder differences.

Accuracy is “the degree to which a process conforms to its specifications and yields what it is designed to yield” (Krippendorff, 2004, p. 215). According to Bowen and Bowen (2008) accuracy is difficult to achieve “in the field of public administration” (p. 698).

Stability was chosen in this study as the criterion to determine the consistency of coding in this study. Data collection and data analysis procedures were carefully designed and controlled to ensure the reliability of the study results. The 118 articles were initially coded using the coding rules mentioned earlier, which remained consistent over time. The content of all the articles were re-examined and re-coded, when required, at a different time, approximately four months after the initial coding phase. In order to ensure that the coding rules were applied correctly an additional step was taken to assess reliability of the content analysis procedures. A random sample from the 118 articles was drawn and two additional coders were trained to code charismatic leader examples. The two coders worked independently in deriving the results based on the coding rules provided by the researcher. After the results were compiled, the online application ReCal (Freeelon, 2010) was used to calculate the percentage of agreement among the coders. The average pairwise agreement among the two coders and the researcher was found to be 81.5% which represents a high degree of reliability. The use of computer software is supposed to reduce some concern with reliability but at the expense of compromising the validity of the study.

Validity implies the “degree to which research results are supported by evidence external to the analysis” (Krippendorff & Bock, 2009b, p. 345). To ensure validity of the
study, coding was performed during multiple phases over a period of time. The data collected covered a time range of 20 years and each article used was closely read with relevant information coded into NVivo. Qualitative content analysis, as used in this study, acted as a valuable tool to classify charismatic leadership attributes into various categories and interpret the data to provide a social reference. The next chapter presents the research findings.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS

This study aimed at exploring gender biases in contemporary literature on charisma and also investigated the extent to which such scholarship deviated from Weberian charisma. The qualitative research methodology content analysis was used to examine contents of the 118 articles (see Appendix E) used in this dissertation and the qualitative research tool NVivo 9 was used to store, access, and organize the data and to document the data collection procedures. The articles which served as data sources were retrieved from the journal *The Leadership Quarterly* for the 1990-2011 time range. This chapter presents a discussion of the results and other research findings pertinent to the research questions asked in this dissertation. Several themes emerged in the process of analyzing the data; these themes are discussed with an aim of providing answers to the research questions. The main questions addressed in this study were:

1. To what extent does contemporary literature on charisma reflect and contribute toward a gendered perception of charisma?
2. To what extent does contemporary charismatic literature belie Weber’s conceptualization of charisma?

The first question was answered by: (1) exploring the use of charismatic leader examples in contemporary charismatic literature, (2) investigating how the use of language in contemporary charismatic literature perpetuates gender biases in the scholarship, and (3)
exploring the frequency with which masculine and feminine attributes are used in
describing charismatic leaders. These questions were answered by examining the
manifest content of the *Leadership Quarterly* articles. The second question was
answered by exploring confusion surrounding the meaning and definition of charisma in
contemporary studies; this was achieved by examining the latent content of the
*Leadership Quarterly* articles.

**Data Findings and Discussion**

The first research question was answered by exploring three aspects (use of
charismatic leader examples, use of language, and use of masculine and feminine
attributes) of *Leadership Quarterly* literature. This section provides findings related to
these three aspects and the final analysis of this section answers the first research
question. In order to determine the extent to which contemporary charismatic literature
reflects and contributes toward gendered perceptions of charisma, the first aspect
examined was: use of charismatic leader examples in contemporary charismatic
literature.

**Charismatic Leader Examples**

Gender stereotypes were explored by examining the manifest content of the
*Leadership Quarterly* articles, which involved counting the number of male and female
charismatic leaders cited in the publication. As noted previously, the data source
comprised of 118 articles which were read through to extract the required information.
Fifteen (12.7%) of the 118 articles did not yield data relevant to this study. These articles
comprised book reviews, an erratum, and articles that referred to charisma only in the
passing. Charismatic leader references that indicated a secondary source were excluded from this study as were references that came across as being ambiguous. Following this approach yielded a total of 215 charismatic leader examples of which 199 references (92.6%) were to male charismatic leaders and 16 references (7.4%) to female charismatic leaders. This discrepancy may be attributed to the low representation of women in leadership roles and due to the gender biases prevalent in society which in turn are reflected in charismatic literature (Lindholm, 1990, p. 6). Figure 4.1 presents a graphic representation of the data.
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**Figure 4.1.** Charismatic leader examples by gender.

Reasons for the low representation of women charismatic leaders become evident from observations of the *Leadership Quarterly* contributors. While some contributors explicate the use of male charismatic leader examples in their studies owing to the lack of sufficient female charismatic leader biographies, others simply use predominantly male
settings or male actors as their research subjects and parameters. The following examples
depict the biases and stereotypes found in the *Leadership Quarterly*. O’Connor,
Mumford, Clifton, Gessner, and Connelly (1995) noted in their study that women were
excluded from their sample of charismatic leaders due to the “limited number of publicly
available scholarly biographies” (p. 536) on women. Their sample of 82 historical
figures comprised of 44 socialized charismatic leaders and 38 personalized charismatic
leaders belonging to political, military, business, and religious domains (O’Connor et al.,
1995).

Similarly, Strange and Mumford (2002) used a sample of 60 leaders in their study
that they categorized by leader style—charismatic, ideological, and mixed—and leader
orientation (personalized or socialized). These leaders, again, were extracted from the
fields of business, religion, politics, and military and as such were all men. Jacobsen and
House (2001) similarly attest that owing to the lack of reliable time series data on
activities and influences of outstanding women leaders, some of whom were
“undoubtedly charismatic (e.g., Joan of Arc)” (p. 98) they are not included in charismatic
discussions. As a result, their study included only one charismatic woman leader and five
male charismatic leaders (Jacobsen & House, 2001, p. 98). While it could be argued that
the nature of the sample simply precludes women, the pattern renders itself repetitive
because literature on women charismatic leaders has been scarce and will continue to
remain so if scholars continue to cite male charismatic leaders, primarily, in their studies.

While some contributors reflected on the persistence of gender biases in
charismatic literature others seemed to further perpetuate the biases against women by
using a typical male setting. For instance, Atwater, Camobreco, Dionne, Avolio, and Lau
(1997) conducted their study in a military college with no female cadets while noting that future researchers should include male and female subjects (p. 138; p. 149). Yet another study (Shea & Howell, 1999) used three male actors to portray charismatic and non-charismatic leadership styles so as to control for possible gender effects (p. 381). Again, Sosik and Dworakivsky (1998) used white males in their sample and stated that future studies should include both male and female participants from different cultures (p. 521). Interestingly, contributors to the *Leadership Quarterly* seem to avoid using women in their studies on charismatic leadership with the expectation that future researchers incorporate gender-neutrality while implementing or replicating their research.

A rudimentary analysis of the data also revealed that of the 199 male charismatic leaders, 141 (70%) male charismatic leaders were cited only once; the remaining 30% were cited more often. Adolf Hitler was the most cited charismatic leader in the *Leadership Quarterly* (cited in 14 unique articles), closely followed by John F. Kennedy (13 unique occurrences), Franklin Delano Roosevelt (12 occurrences), Mahatma Gandhi (10 occurrences), and Martin Luther King, Jr. (8 occurrences), amongst others. In the case of women charismatic leaders, only four women, Anita Roddick, Joan of Arc, Mary Kay Ash, and Mother Teresa, were cited twice as charismatic leaders and the remaining 12 were cited only once as charismatic leaders.

**Use of Gender Pronouns**

Another aspect that was examined was the usage of gendered phrases (him/her, his/her, he/she, himself/herself, etc.) in *Leadership Quarterly* literature. It was found that despite the authors’ claims that there are few women charismatic leaders, their references
to charismatic leaders were primarily gender-neutral. Of the 118 articles, 59 (50%) articles employed gender-neutral terminology. Interestingly, the remaining articles either used terms such as ‘charismatic leaders,’ ‘charismatic personalities,’ ‘leader,’ ‘they,’ etc. while referring to charismatic leaders. The use of gender-neutral language in charismatic leadership literature does not imply that the field itself is unbiased; rather it goes on to show that the authors contributing to the field are gender-blind. As observed by Jermier:

> Since the history of the idea of charisma emerged from the domains of religious prophets and warrior kings…it entails substantial romancing of male privilege and male hero worship. The undesirability of perpetuating this legacy is apparent, but it is not easy to counter biases that become as deeply ingrained in everyday ways of thinking and speaking as is the case with the concept of charisma. It seems especially important that current writers on charisma take care not to reproduce gender-biased images in their texts. This leads me to try to phrase even references to popular discourse, where sexist imagery is pervasive, in more gender-neutral terms. I do this not because people in everyday discussions think and speak about charismatic women and their accomplishments without bias, but because I think they might come to do so (1993, p. 231, n. 1).

While Jermier distinctly noted that he uses gender-neutral terms in anticipation of changing gender dynamics in the literature whereby charismatic women will be acknowledged in the same vein as men, such a change is yet to occur. Calas (1993) similarly noted the gender biases in such literature when she notes that contemporary research on charismatic leaders “maintain the patriarchal mystique of heroic leadership…he/she pronouns notwithstanding-and the implicit gender bias of leadership comparative studies, which basically wonder “if women can be as good as men”” (p. 313). These observations clearly present the gender biases inherent in contemporary charismatic literature. Another means to check for gender biases in this literature was by exploring the kinds of attributes used to describe charismatic leaders. It was contended that the use of masculine attributes not only exclude women but further perpetuate
already existing gender-biases in such literature. The following section presents the findings and discussion pertinent to charismatic attributes found in the *Leadership Quarterly*.

**Charismatic Leader Attributes**

The frequency with which masculine and feminine attributes were used in the *Leadership Quarterly* was explored to determine if contemporary charismatic literature reflects and contributes toward a gendered perception of charisma. Since contributors to *Leadership Quarterly* did not explicitly make any gender-based distinctions in their analysis, the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) was used to determine if the *Leadership Quarterly* attributes were masculine (M), feminine (F), or gender-neutral (N). Several themes emerged during the data analysis phase. Authors not only used personality-related traits but also other criteria such as effects on followers were used to distinguish charismatic from non-charismatic leaders. Van Wart’s (2008) leadership action cycle was used to categorize the attributes derived from the *Leadership Quarterly* into three categories: leader characteristics (leader traits and leader skills), leader styles, and leader behaviors. The following section presents findings derived after applying the BSRI to leader characteristics, styles, and behavioral categories.

A total of 428 attributes were identified as being used in the *Leadership Quarterly* to distinguish charismatic from non-charismatic personalities. Since some of these attributes were recurrent, they were separated to avoid duplication. To distinguish between the first occurrence of an attribute and subsequent recurrences of the same attribute the terms ‘distinct’ and ‘recurring’ are used henceforth. Using this approach
yielded a total of 160 (37.4%) distinct attributes of which, 26 (16.3%) were categorized under leader behaviors, 41 (25.6%) under leader style, and 84 (52.5%) under leadership characteristics (42 leader traits and 42 leader skills), and 9 attributes (5.6%) could not be assigned to categories in the leadership action cycle and hence were termed miscellaneous. The bar graph (Figure 4.2) represents these data.
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Figure 4.2. Charismatic leader attributes.

The remaining 268 (of 428) attributes (62.6%) were listed separately as recurring attributes.

After aggregating the attributes into the leadership action cycle categories, the BSRI was used to determine if the attributes used were masculine, feminine, or gender-neutral. The results are as follows:

**Leader Traits**

A total of 42 attributes were deemed distinct leader traits. Table 4.1 presents the attributes derived from *Leadership Quarterly* that were deemed ‘traits’ based on Van
Wart’s framework. The column ‘gender’ was derived by applying characteristics described in the BSRI to the traits. Trait recurrences are not included in this table; however, a brief discussion of the findings is presented in a later section.

Table 4.1. Leader Traits and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Leader Traits</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Displays emotional stability and selflessness</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>His communications evidence an eloquent appeal to followers' emotions</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Emphasis on ideas and attractiveness of the vision, rather than the leader</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>More references to the collective and to collective identity, and fewer references to individual self-interest</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Self-sacrificial</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The leader may change his vision to meet the needs and wants of the followers and the organization</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nonauthoritarian</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Independent Thinker</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Makes me proud to be associated with him/her</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Demonstrate their enthusiasm and energy through their dynamic presence</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Passionate or driven</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Need for achievement</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Charismatic leaders tend to take credit for contributions and engage in highly visible leadership activities</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Talks about his/her most important values and beliefs</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strong convictions about the correctness of his or her actions</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Seeks change for the purpose of furthering a personal agenda</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Determination</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Self-confidence</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Adventurous</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>High self-esteem</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>High need for power</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Acts in ways that builds your respect</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Self-effacing</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Honorable</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Narcissistic behaviors</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.1. Leader Traits and Gender (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Leader Traits</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Flexibility and adaptability to different circumstances</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Willful</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Involving people in developing shared vision based on socially-responsible values</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Strong sense of moral mission</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Machiavellian behavior</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Cynicism</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty (47.6%) of the 42 traits were found to be masculine, eight (19.0%) were feminine, and the remaining 14 (33.3%) were determined to be gender-neutral (see Figure 4.3). The masculine inclination in leader traits can be explained by using Van Wart’s classification, which includes descriptors such as self-confidence, courage, determination, energy, willingness to assume responsibility, etc. which have generally been associated with the masculine gender. Of the remaining 22 traits, 14 (33.3%) were found to be gender-neutral, descriptors of which were included under personal integrity and emotional maturity. Traits that were deemed feminine included descriptors related to service mentality such as self-sacrifice, altruism, and selflessness (see Appendix A).
Figure 4.3. Leader traits and gender.

**Recurring Traits**

An analysis of the *Leadership Quarterly* revealed that some of the traits were used more frequently than others. Based on the frequency of occurrence it was found that traits related to leader’s emotional maturity and personal integrity were used often in the *Leadership Quarterly* to describe charismatic leaders. Self-confidence-related descriptors comprised the second most recurring trait. Table 4.2 lists the traits based on their recurrence.

Table 4.2. Recurring Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Traits</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Integrity</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Maturity</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-confidence</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Mentality</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determined</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy/Mental Interest</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2. Recurring Traits (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Traits</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to assume responsibility</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty-eight of the recurring traits were found to be masculine, 18 were found to be gender neutral, and 10 were feminine traits. Personal integrity and emotional maturity-related traits were found to be predominantly gender-neutral and a few were deemed masculine. Consistent with gender stereotypes, self-confidence, courage, determination, energy/mental interest, and willingness to assume responsibility were found to be a masculine. The only feminine traits were descriptors related to service mentality. This reveals that predominantly masculine traits were used to describe charismatic leaders.

The findings from the leader traits can be summed up in words of Calas (1993), who claimed that charismatic leadership:

> is articulated as if it were gender-neutral. However, most of the research has been based on personal characteristics elicited from those labelled as charismatic in the public arena (e.g., presidents and other heads of states; military leaders; CEOs), and who are more likely to be male. Thus, laboratory studies that trained women to perform as “charismatic leaders” actually trained them to perform as “male charismatic leaders.” (p. 313)

**Leader Skills**

A total of 42 attributes were deemed distinct leader skills. Table 4.3 presents the attributes derived from *Leadership Quarterly* that were deemed ‘skills’ based on Van Wart’s framework. The column ‘gender’ was derived by applying characteristics described in the BSRI to the skills. Skill recurrences are not included in this table; however, a brief discussion of the findings is presented in a later section.
Table 4.3. Leader Skills and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Leader Skills</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Emotional expressiveness</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regulating or controlling their emotional Communications</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>More positive references to followers' worth and efficacy as individuals and as a collective</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Are...skilled at reading the emotions of others</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Followers are directly influenced by the leader and their personal relationship with him</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The leader will try to persuade those who disagree with his vision to agree with it</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Stimulates others to put forth efforts above and beyond the call of duty and make personal sacrifices</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Inspires loyalty to the organization</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Emphasis on, attraction to, and reverence for the leader, more than the vision</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Talks optimistically about the future</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Communicative</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Eloquent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Clarity of message</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Strong delivery style</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Variation/speed of delivery</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Exhibit vocal fluency</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Foreign accent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Rhetorical skills</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Visionary message content</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Abstraction</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Nonverbal expressiveness</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Personal presence</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Use facial expressions (e.g., smiles)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Maintaining direct eye contact when speaking</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Having a relaxed posture</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Engage in dynamic hand and body gestures</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Alternate between pacing and sitting on the edge of the desk</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Lean towards the participants</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Dramatic and expressive</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>She is involved in a social exchange relationship with her staff</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Makes me feel good to be around him/her</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Impressive physical appearance</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Admirable</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Devotion and loyalty leaders enjoy from their followers</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Inspires loyalty to him/her</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3. Leader Skills and Gender (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Leader Skills</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Has a special gift of seeing what it is that is really important for me to consider</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Brilliant scientist</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 42 primary skills identified, six (14.3%) were found to be masculine, four (9.5%) feminine, and 32 (76.2%) were categorized as gender-neutral (see Figure 4.4). A majority of leader skills (76.2%) were categorized as gender-neutral because these were related to communication and technical skills which are not necessarily masculine or feminine (See Appendix B).

![Figure 4.4. Leader skills and gender.](image)

Even while communication, analytical, technical skills were found to be gender neutral, Leadership Quarterly scholars have set out to explore the gender-inclination of such skills. Bligh and Robinson (2010), for instance, examined if charismatic rhetoric was consistent across cultures and found that culture shapes expectations of charisma and that certain kinds of rhetoric (active, aggressive, dramatic, and dominant) may be “more or
less appropriate in some cultural contexts, as this type of influence may be viewed as inappropriate for women in highly masculine cultures or too individualistic in more collectivistic cultures…” (p. 853).

Den Hartog (1997) similarly reflected on the importance of considering gender differences in communication skills by ascertaining that it is likely for gender differences to exist not only in the use of rhetorical devices but also in the effect it has on audiences (p. 382). Bligh and Robinson (2010) claimed that contemporary literature largely neglects the role of gender in the relationship between visionary rhetoric and charismatic attributions. It may well be that certain expectations of communication patterns become attached to male and female leaders, and expectations may be different for male and female followers as well (p. 853).

They recommend that future researchers should examine the relationship between gender and leader rhetoric (see Bligh & Robinson, 2010; Den Hartog, 1997).

**Recurring Skills**

Table 4.4 lists the skills based on their frequency of occurrence. Communication skills were used more frequently than others to distinguish charismatic from non-charismatic leaders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Skills</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social skills</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical skills</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence skills</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical Skills</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
56 of the recurring skills were found to be gender-neutral, eight were deemed masculine, and four feminine skills were found. An analysis of communication skills revealed that contemporary scholars use oral communication frequently, followed by non-verbal and written communication. As observed by Shamir, Arthur, and House (1994), “leader rhetoric is commonly believed to play an important role not only in generating attributions of charisma among observers but also in recruiting followers and increasing their identifications with the leader and the mission” (p. 26). Though communication skills were categorized as gender-neutral in this study, Leadership Quarterly contributors are increasingly interested in uncovering gender differences in rhetorical skills (see Bligh & Robinson, 2010; Den Hartog, 1997). Given the importance given to charismatic leader rhetoric, it is not surprising that the remaining skills were used less frequently by Leadership Quarterly scholars.

All communication-oriented skills were deemed gender-neutral. Technical and analytical skills were also deemed gender-neutral. Influence skills were deemed masculine and social skills were found to be masculine, feminine, and gender-neutral. This reveals that predominantly gender-neutral skills were used to describe charismatic leaders.

**Leader Behaviors**

A total of 26 attributes were identified as distinct leader behaviors. Table 4.5 presents the attributes derived from Leadership Quarterly that were deemed ‘behaviors’ based on Van Wart’s framework. The column gender was derived by applying
characteristics described in the BSRI to behaviors. Behavior recurrences are not included in this table; however, a brief discussion of the findings is presented in a later section.

Table 4.5. Leader Behaviors and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Leader Behaviors</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The leader will take into account the needs of the organization in his decision making</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Is a model for me to follow</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Maintained positive interaction among group members</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sense of purpose</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Being original or unconventional</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Proactive behavior</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Has a sense of mission which he/she transmits to me</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>To be entrepreneurial and able to recognize new opportunities</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Clarified the group's goal</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Motivating</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>He had inspired an elite of Peace Corps volunteers to personal commitment</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Identify with the leader and the mission of the leader</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The leader will use positive rewards and reinforcement with his followers</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Contingent rewarding and punishing</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Vision and farsightedness</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>With an important mission</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Articulates a compelling vision of the future</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Unconventional actions are linked to the enhancement of the broader organization and the vision</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Encouraged each group to engage in task conflict</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Seeks change for the purpose of moving the organization forward in a mutually beneficial manner</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Encouraging</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>The leader will excel in persuading people to agree with him</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>More references to hope and faith</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 26 distinct behaviors identified, 21 (80.8%) were deemed masculine, one (3.8%) feminine, and four (15.4%) were found to be gender-neutral (see Figure 4.5). Again, a majority of the behaviors (80.8%) were found to be masculine. This may be because many of the behaviors were related to Van Wart’s classification of building and
managing organizations, teams, and tasks, which are stereotypically masculine preoccupations (refer to Appendix C).

According to Yukl (1999), charismatic and transformational theories, in accordance with earlier leadership theories, are based on the premise of heroic leadership which in turn determines leader effectiveness as a function of skills and actions of the leader (p. 301). This masculinity is predominant across cultures, as determined in comparative study on commonalities and differences in effective leadership in Western and Asian countries (Dorfman, Howell, Hibino, Lee, Tate, & Bautista, 1997). Dorfman et al. found that while Mexican history has many revolutionary charismatic leaders, they are usually “strongly masculine and possess a high degree of power” (1997, p. 242).

Sosik and Dinger (2007) claimed that while men stereotypically display agentic organizational behaviors (competent, rational, and unemotional), women express
communal behaviors (intuitive, empathic, and emotional expressiveness); however, results from their study indicated that “men may be more effective than women in formulating inspirational vision statements, whereas women may be more effective at articulating inspirational visions because of their expressiveness…” and suggest that “trainers could build upon men's strengths in formulating inspirational visions by training them to deliver their message more effectively” (p. 150). In their study, Kotlyar, Karakowsky, and Ng (2011) trained male actors to display pragmatic, charismatic-oriented, and shared leader behaviors; female actors were excluded because followers perceive women leaders differently than male leaders owing largely to behavioral differentials based on sex (p. 4).

Recurring Behaviors

Organization-oriented behaviors were used frequently in the *Leadership Quarterly* to describe charismatic leaders, followed by people and task-oriented behaviors (see Table 4.6)

Table 4.6. Recurring Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Behaviors</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization-Oriented Behaviors</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People-Oriented Behaviors</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-Oriented Behaviors</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All 58 (100.0%) behaviors were deemed masculine (see Figure 4.6). Thirty-one of the organization-oriented behaviors were related to the leader’s vision or mission and articulation of the vision. These findings emphasize the importance given to visionary
behaviors in contemporary charismatic literature. In this study, all vision and mission-related behaviors were categorized as masculine as they entail leadership abilities. However, contemporary charismatic scholars have found that while men may be more effective than women in formulating a vision, women seem to be more effective in articulating the vision (Sosik & Dinger, 2007, p. 150). People-oriented behaviors, such as developing and motivating/inspiring staff and conflict management were categorized as masculine in nature. Task-oriented behaviors such as innovation and unconventionality were also deemed masculine.

**Leader Styles**

A total of 41 attributes were identified as distinct leader styles. Table 4.7 presents the attributes derived from *Leadership Quarterly* that were deemed ‘styles’ based on Van Wart’s framework. The column ‘gender’ was derived by applying characteristics described in the BSRI to leader styles. Style recurrences are not included in this table; however, a brief discussion of the findings is presented in a later section. Of the 41 distinct leaders styles identified, 24 (58.5%) styles were deemed to be masculine, three (7.3%) feminine, and 14 (34.1%) were found to be gender-neutral (see Figure 4.6). Majority of the leader styles were masculine (58.5%); this may be because these styles were specific to the achievement-oriented, delegative, and directive categories of the

Table 4.7. Leader Styles and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Leader Style</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Considerate</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The leader will take an interest in all current and potential followers</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.No</td>
<td>Leader Style</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>In my mind, he/she is a symbol of success and accomplishment</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Knowledge and information sharing for the purpose of developing individuals and the organization</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The leader will express high performance expectations of followers</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Assessment of environmental resources and constraints for bringing about change</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The leader will allow followers the autonomy to make their own decisions, but will influence them to make decisions in line with his vision</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The leader will back up orders with justification based on the goodness of his vision</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Stressing the righteousness of the leader's own vision</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Communication of confidence in others' ability to accomplish tasks</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Empowering followers</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Douglas's efforts to change the hearts and minds of Americans are indicative of his belief that people are fundamental to problem solution</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sharing information selectively</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Generates follower enthusiasm by presenting novel ideas or solutions</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The leader will demonstrate behaviors that selectively arouse unconscious achievement, power, and affiliative motives of followers when these motives are specifically relevant to the attainment of the vision</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The leader cares about his image and plays to the desires of followers</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The leader will negotiate his ideas when it benefits his image or his vision</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Personal projection of the leader's ideas and less concern for diversity of opinions</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Visions of charismatic leaders portray a model for the future that is markedly different from the status quo</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Hero</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The leader is motivated by the accomplishment of his vision</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Increases my optimism for the future</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Emphasizes the importance of being committed to our values and beliefs</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Personal risk</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Hero</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>More references to the leader's similarity to followers and identification with followers</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sociability – Openness</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>He was unable to delegate authority</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Low self-esteem</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I am ready to trust his/her capacity to overcome any obstacles</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>I have complete faith in him/her</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Encourages understanding of points of view of other members</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Extraordinary</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Unique</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Magnetic personality</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>People will have an extreme reaction to the leader</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
leadership action cycle (refer to Appendix D). The descriptors used by Van Wart to explain these leader styles indicate why women may be excluded from leadership contexts. In the words of Calas (1993),

Throughout my discussion, I notice how the reductive readings of Weber in the organizational text help to exclude from the organizational definition of "leadership" social phenomena better represented in certain groups of people, such as women and blacks. This exclusion, which appears in several different forms within the literature, produces an "effect of legitimation" for traditional organizational concepts, which further marginalizes the excluded groups. (p.313)

![Bar chart showing leader styles and gender]

Figure 4.6. Leader styles and gender.

**Recurring Styles**

Leaders styles frequently used in the *Leadership Quarterly* include inspirational, achievement-oriented, and supportive (see Table 4.8). Of the 76 recurring styles identified, 37 were deemed masculine, 25 gender-neutral, and 14 feminine styles were found.
Table 4.8. Recurring Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Behaviors</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement oriented/performance expectations</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive/authoritative</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegative/empowering</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty-one of the styles were identified were deemed inspirational and include descriptors such as charisma, intellectual stimulation, heroic, trustworthy—which were deemed gender-neutral—and risk taking abilities (deemed masculine). All of the descriptors categorized under delegative, achievement-oriented, directive, and external leader styles were also deemed masculine. Majority of the supportive styles were deemed feminine. These findings substantiate the premise of this study – charisma is devoid of gender classifications. However, scholars have recorded the deep seated biases in contemporary charismatic literature, where charisma is applied frequently to men (see Calas, 1993; Jacobsen & House, 2001; Jermier, 1993; O’Connor et al., 1995; Strange & Mumford, 2002; Turner, 1993).

Miscellaneous

Of the 428 attributes found in the Leadership Quarterly, nine (2.1 %) were categorized as miscellaneous as they could not be assigned to leader behaviors, styles, traits, or skills. These nine attributes include: ‘in order for the leader to be effective,
there must be some catalyst to make the followers open to the leader and his vision,’
‘fun-loving,’ ‘having a sense of humor,’ ‘lucky,’ ‘external beliefs,’ internal beliefs,’ ‘had
little need for affiliation,’ ‘cruelty,’ and ‘rudeness.’ These attributes were categorized as
gender-neutral since they could apply to both men and women. None of these nine
attributes had recurrences.

To summarize, the findings to the first question posed in this study, the extent to
which contemporary literature on charisma reflects and contributes toward a gendered
perception of charisma, the data presented thus far reveals a masculine bias (examples
and attributes) in the Leadership Quarterly literature while gender-neutral language was
frequently used in describing charismatic leaders. Though gender norms and stereotypes
have been changing with time, no patterns were found in the Leadership Quarterly
reflecting the changing definitions of masculinity and femininity. Despite the on-going
social changes, the themes found in the Leadership Quarterly have been frustratingly
stable. A subsidiary finding from this study revealed that several scales were used
frequently in measuring charisma, some of which include the Multifactor Leadership
Questionnaire (MLQ), the Conger-Kanungo Scale (CKS), a scale developed by
Podsakoff, among other scales. While some authors listed a breakdown of the scale items
used in their research, others did not elaborate on them; only the number of items used
was mentioned in some studies while others offered sample items. Overall, it was found
that approximately 60% of the articles used some kind of a measure for charisma. A
critical analysis of these findings and their implications are discussed in Chapter V of the
dissertation. The following section will address the second question posed in this study:
**Contemporary Charisma**

The second question addressed in this study was the extent to which contemporary charismatic literature belie Weber’s conceptualization of charisma. This question is answered by exploring confusion surrounding the meaning and definitions of charisma in contemporary charismatic literature. It was expected that the Leadership Quarterly scholars would cite definitions specific to charisma and charismatic leadership; however, no clear-cut definitions were offered in majority of the articles. It was also anticipated that the Leadership Quarterly articles could be separated into Weberian and contemporary charismatic categories but clear distinctions did not emerge during the coding process. Few authors offered definitions but in most cases, general references to both Weber and contemporary charismatic definitions were found. Weber’s definition of charisma was presented in Chapter II. Trice and Beyer (1986), in keeping with Weber’s definition, used five elements to summarize his theory of charismatic leadership. These elements include:

- (1) an extraordinarily gifted person, (2) a social crisis or situation of desperation, (3) a set of ideas providing a radical solution to the crisis, (4) a set of followers who are attracted to the exceptional person and come to believe that he or she is directly linked to transcendent powers, and (5) the validation of that person’s extraordinary gifts and transcendence by repeated successes (pp. 118-119).

The authors emphasized that all five elements are necessary for the emergence of charisma.

Contemporary scholars, however, have deviated from the basic premise offered by Weber. For instance, according to the neo-charismatic theorists, House and Shamir (1993, p. 86) charismatic leadership can be defined as
an interaction between leaders and followers that results in (1) making the follower’s self-esteem contingent on the vision and mission articulated by the leader, (2) strong internalization of the leader’s values and goals by the followers, (3) strong personal or moral (as opposed to calculative) commitment to these values and goals, and (4) a willingness on the part of followers to transcend their self-interests for the sake of the collective (team or organization).

Shamir and Howell (1999) extend this definition to include charismatic leadership effectiveness, which they define as the “degree of its influence on followers’ self-concepts, values, and motivations” (p. 259). Waldman, Javidan, and Varella (2004) defined charisma as a “relationship between an individual (leader) and one or more followers based on leader behaviors combined with favorable attributions on the part of followers” (p. 358). Elsewhere, Waldman and Javidan (2009), specified that their use of the term relationship includes “both physically proximal and distant, or even nonexistent, interactions” (p. 132).

Other definitions that were extracted during the coding process were specific to differentiating socialized and personalized charisma. House and Howell (1992) defined socialized charismatic leadership as one which “[a] is based on egalitarian behavior, (b) serves collective interests and is not driven by the self-interest of the leader and (c) develops and empowers others” (p. 84). Personalized charismatic leadership on the other hand is one which “[a] is based on personal dominance and authoritarian behavior, (b) serves the self-interest of the leader and is self-aggrandizing and (c) is exploitive of others” (p. 84). Bryman, Stephens, and Campo (1996) summed up neo-charismatic leadership as a situation where charisma “denotes a leader with vision, who is seen as exceptional, and whose subordinates are highly committed to him/her” (p. 358).
Given that majority of the contributors to *Leadership Quarterly* were neo-charismatic scholars (with a few exceptions including Hunt, Yukl, Beyer, amongst others), the deviation from Weber’s description of charisma is not surprising. The major distinctions between Weberian and contemporary charisma have been noted by many scholars; while Weber’s definition primarily focuses on the possession of a special gift that is supernatural in nature, contemporary definitions focus on traits, behaviors, and effects on followers (see Avolio, 1990; Bass, 1999; Beyer, 1999; Bligh & Kholes, 2009; Deluga, 1998; House & Howell, 1992; Wooford, 1999; Yagil, 1998). Since Weber’s definition proved difficult to operationalize, contemporary scholars amended the definition in an effort to operationalize it. However, there is no consistency in the criteria used to measure charisma (Avolio & Yammarino, 1990; House & Howell, 1992; Shamir, 1995). In their study, O’Connor et al. (1995) defined and operationalized charisma as the “attainment of an identifiable pinnacle position of responsibility where the ability to effect profound change in organizations and organizational members was exhibited” (p. 536). Campbell, Ward, Sonnenfeld, and Agle (2008) provided a description of the evolution of neo-charismatic research by stating:

Early research focused on the traits and behaviors of the leader (e.g. House, 1977) or the situation in which the leader performs (e.g. Schneider, 1937). Later researchers began to consider the importance of the follower (Avolio & Yammarino, 1990; Bass, 1988; Klein & House, 1995; Meindl, 1995), arguing that charismatic leadership did not exist separate from the perceptions of followers. As a result, the focus shifted towards the active role of the follower and how traits and behaviors of the follower influenced the perception of charisma in leaders. Today however, the emerging consensus on charismatic leadership is that the focus should be on the dyadic nature of the charismatic relationship (e.g. Klein & House, 1995; Lord & Maher, 1991; Weierter, 1997) rather than just the individual characteristics of the leader or the follower. There is agreement among researchers that rather than being a “gift from the gods” of extraordinary powers,
charismatic leadership is located in the relationship between the leader and follower (p. 556).

The definitions and conceptualizations of charisma offered by contemporary scholars have been criticized on the grounds that while Weberian charisma was a rare phenomenon, contemporary scholars have tamed it such that it has become commonplace (Beyer, 1999a; Wofford, 1999). In response to these criticisms, Bass (1999) and Shamir (1999) agree that contemporary scholars should substitute the word charisma for a new term that reflects its current usage. Similarly, House (1999) noted that Beyer’s typology of charisma should be termed as a “sociological view of charisma or, more succinctly, Weberian charisma and definitions offered by organizational behaviorists as organizational charisma” (p. 564). In the words of Calas (1993), the current usage of charismatic leadership in organization literature is equivalent to stating:

Charisma, that is, individual performances allocated to functionaries who have specialized charismatic leadership training and who are capable of attaining an objective discharge of business, according to calculable rules and without regard for persons…as long as they are American white males, middle class, heterosexuals. (p. 325)

This description not only divulges how far removed contemporary conceptualizations are from Weberian charisma but also reflects the gender biases inherent in such literature. In conclusion, many of the definitions and descriptions of charisma and charismatic leadership are reflective of the neo-charismatic literature presented in Chapter II.

Subsidiary findings from the Leadership Quarterly also revealed that contemporary scholars use the terms charisma and transformational leadership interchangeably. While House and Howell (1992) referred to transformational, visionary, and inspirational theories also as charismatic since “charisma is a central concept in all of
them, either explicitly or implicitly” (p. 81), others state that charismatic leadership is not as broadly defined as transformational leadership (Ehrlich, Meindl, & Viellieu, 1990, p. 231). Other scholars, however, assert that charismatic and transformational leadership are separate concepts and should not be used interchangeably (see Beyer, 1999b; Yukl, 1999). However, such distinctions were limited in the *Leadership Quarterly*. Using the terms charismatic and transformational leadership interchangeably and including other leadership theories such as visionary and inspirational theories within charismatic leadership further confounds the confusion surrounding the definition and meaning of charisma. Findings from this study also indicated that some authors differentiate between moral (socialized) and immoral (personalized) charismatic leaders (House & Howell, 1992, p. 83) while others (see Graham, 1991) state that charismatic and transformational leadership are devoid of moral implications. Such distinctions further indicate that contemporary charismatic literature belies Weberian charisma.

In conclusion, findings from this study support the contention that contemporary charismatic literature not only reflects and contributes toward a gendered perception of charisma but also misrepresents Weber’s definition of charisma. This chapter provided an overview of the findings, tables, figures, and a brief discussion of the findings. The implications of these findings are presented in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

Introduction
The purpose of this study was to examine the differences between Weberian and contemporary charisma and to investigate the nature of relationship between charisma and gender. To achieve this, Weber’s analysis of charisma was taken as the starting point because he offered the first sociological explanation of charisma. Thereafter, contemporary charismatic literature was reviewed to examine its impact on current understanding of charisma. Finally, since gender and charisma are separate, an effort was made to connect the two literatures.

Chapter I of the dissertation presented an overview of Weberian and contemporary charisma, discussed briefly the relationship between gender and leadership and how it affects charisma, introduced the significance of charisma, or lack of it, in the field of public administration, and presented the research questions. Chapter II offered an overview of four main bodies of literature: public sector leadership, charisma (Weberian and neo-charismatic), gender and leadership, and women and charismatic leadership. Chapter III offered a discussion of the qualitative methodology, content analysis, used in this study, a brief explanation of the Bem-Sex Role Inventory (BSRI), a description of Van Wart’s leadership action cycle, and data analysis procedures. Chapter IV presented
the research findings and a discussion of the results supplemented with tabular and graphic representation of the results. The focus of this chapter is to present a summary of the results, implications of the research findings, discuss limitations of the study, and offer recommendations.

**Summary of Findings**

Max Weber offered a sociological explanation of charisma, wherein charisma represents a condition where the leader is gifted with supernatural and superhuman abilities which deem the individual exceptional. Contemporary scholars, in an attempt to understand and operationalize charisma, re-conceptualized Weber’s definition. While Weber did not describe any attributes that can be used distinguish charismatic from ordinary individuals, contemporary scholars have relied heavily on psychological, social, and interpersonal explanations to differentiate charismatic from non-charismatic personalities. This study proposed that the use of attributes is misleading as it contributes to and exacerbates gender biases and stereotypes in charismatic literature. This proposition was supported by the data findings in this study, which are summarized below.

Contemporary charismatic literature has been found to be replete with gendered references and descriptions of charismatic leaders. A majority of the characteristics, behaviors, and styles of charismatic leaders were found to be masculine and gender-neutral but only a little over 10% of these attributes could be categorized as feminine. Gender-biases in contemporary charismatic literature cannot be denied also because majority of the charismatic leader examples cited in the Leadership Quarterly were found
to be male; less than 10% of the examples cited were female. The findings also reveal that despite citing predominantly male examples and using masculine attributes, contemporary scholars have been consistently employing gender-neutral terminology in their publications. Surprisingly, the results of this study also indicate that though contemporary charismatic researchers differentiate between personalized and socialized charismatic leaders, their analysis seems to present a view of charisma that is devoid of moral connotations. This was clearly evident in that a personalized leader, Adolf Hitler, was cited more frequently as charismatic. Contemporary charismatic scholars also seem to assert that individuals can be trained to exhibit charismatic attributes. Charisma has been equated to a skill or ability and scholars have made it a common place phenomenon, amenable to laboratory settings (Wofford, 1999), thereby indicating that charisma is replicable. Contemporary definitions and understandings of charisma are based increasingly on the use of psychological, physical, social, behavioral, situational, and many such ambiguous constructs that lead to misleading interpretations of who can be charismatic and what factors are required for charisma to ensue.

In recent times, contemporary scholars have been using communicational skills frequently to distinguish charismatic from non-charismatic personalities. Speeches (written and oral) are being analyzed for their content to determine if they contain elements that explain how and why an individual is more charismatic than others. Also, nonverbal skills such as facial expressions, body movements, physical appearance, etc., are being used to train actors in laboratory settings to portray charismatic personalities and also to distinguish charismatic and non-charismatic personalities. The use of such attributes adds to the confusion surrounding charisma as contemporary scholars
continually attempt to decipher gender differences in communication patterns and how these can be used in attributing charisma to individuals. Further, contemporary researchers claim that women stand a better chance of being charismatic and/or transformational owing to feminine characteristics such as being considerate, having compassion, nurturing abilities, etc. However, a review of the *Leadership Quarterly* literature has demonstrated that this is not the norm. Women are far from being recognized as charismatic/transformational leaders. It was also found that contemporary charismatic literature belies Weberian charisma to a great extent; contributors to the *Leadership Quarterly* increasingly use several contemporary scales to determine charismatic attributes and their effects on followers in order to differentiate charismatic from non-charismatic personalities. Further, the research subjects usually include undergraduate students, military personnel, organizational employees, managers, actors etc., (some studies are conducted in male-only settings) who in some instances are not provided a definition of charisma but are given questionnaires such as the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), Conger-Kanungo Scale (C-K Scale), House’s model of charismatic leadership, etc., to measure charisma. The attributes used in these scales have been found to be primarily masculine. Finally, in the process of offering ways to operationalize charisma contemporary scholars have parted ways with Weber’s analysis but have invoked Weber time and again implying that few differences exist between the two theories. Due to the muddied distinctions between Weberian and contemporary charismatic descriptions, confusion abounds regarding the actual meaning and definition of charisma. This presents a difficult situation as contemporary scholars recognize that their conceptualization of charisma varies significantly from Weberian charisma and go
on to assert that organizational theorists use a different term to distinguish between Weberian and organizational charisma. However, these distinctions are superficial at best.

**Implications**

The findings of this study have several theoretical and practical implications for the field of charismatic leadership:

Firstly, the implication of using predominantly male charismatic leader examples is that women will continue to be underrepresented in charismatic literature. Contemporary scholars recognize the lack of biographies on charismatic women and state this as a reason for excluding women from their research but recommend that future researchers should incorporate gender-equality by including women. This presents a double bind where one can have little hope for change as contemporary scholars perpetuate gender biases by citing primarily male examples but offer no measures to include women, thereby making few efforts to bridge the existing gender gaps, which eventually leads to perpetuation of the biases.

Secondly, the implication of using personalized examples is that leaders such as Adolph Hitler will be increasingly used and exemplified as a charismatic personality. Further, the implications of citing personalized and socialized leaders in the same breath impacts general perceptions of charismatic leadership since it portrays a view that it is acceptable for charismatic leaders to be devoid of morals and ethics. It also presents a view that negative behaviors such as cruelty, cynicism, rudeness, etc., are characteristic of charismatic leaders thereby promoting a misleading perspective of charisma.
Thirdly, the implications of using gender-neutral pronouns, such as he/she, himself/herself, etc., is misleading as contemporary scholars portray gender fairness in their use of language but not in their use of charismatic leader examples and/or attributes. The implications of such contradictions are far-reaching as the use of gender-neutral terminology not only influences future researchers and scholars to continue using gender equitable language but also urges students and society at large to read and decipher charisma as devoid of gender biases when this is not true. Further, using gender-neutral language in spite of citing predominantly male examples reinforces the impression that contemporary scholars are gender-blind and even while the use of gender-neutral language is reflective of editorial decisions, using gender-neutral pronouns does not address the problems associated with already existing gender stereotypes and biases in the scholarship.

Fourthly, the implications of using predominantly masculine attributes in describing charismatic leaders is that women will continue to be underrepresented in charismatic literature. Charisma is portrayed in contemporary literature as an exclusively male attribute. Specifically, the use of masculine traits (e.g., self-confidence, courage, determination, etc.); behaviors (vision and mission related); and styles (e.g., achievement-oriented, delegative, directive, etc.) ensure that women will be excluded from discussions about charisma. It is unlikely that women will emerge as charismatic leaders when the attributes used to describe such leaders are primarily masculine.

Fifthly, the implication of using gender-neutral attributes but applying them only to men is that women will continue to be excluded from such scholarship. Contemporary scholars perpetuate gender biases by attempting to decipher gender differences in
communication skills (e.g., leader rhetoric, speech delivery, non-verbal gestures, etc.).
Even though men and women can possess equally effective communication skills the
male-centric approach of contemporary scholars ensures that women will be left out of
discussions about charisma. Use of gender-neutral traits (e.g., honesty, fairness,
enthusiasm, respect, etc.) does not ensure that women will be included in these
discussions. Though charisma is free of gender stereotypes, contemporary scholars
exclude women even while claiming that such leadership is conducive to women, thereby
presenting a polarized view of charisma which in turn deepens gender-biases.

Sixthly, the implication of rarely using feminine attributes is that gender biases
will be perpetuated in charismatic scholarship since the focus is primarily on masculine
attributes. The idea that charismatic leadership is conducive to women is called into
question as feminine leadership cannot be borne out as long as male examples and
masculine attributes are used on a continual basis. Further, stressing that feminine
attributes such as self-sacrifice, altruism, etc., make it easier for women to be charismatic
leaders implies that such attributes will be increasingly warranted of women further
deepening gender stereotypes.

Seventhly, the implication of using contemporary definitions and scales to
measure charisma is that gender biases and stereotypes will be perpetuated because of the
current understanding of charisma as a trait, or a leader-follower relationship. This
implies that masculine attributes will continually be used, thereby reinforcing
discriminatory practices. Further, charisma will continue to be understood in male-
centric and mundane terms if incomplete descriptions are used. Also, the use of
operationized instruments such as Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire, Conger-
Kanungo Scale, etc. ensures that gender stereotypes are maintained in such literature. The pattern lends itself repetitive as no efforts are being made to correct the gender imbalances. This implies, both theoretically and practically, that men will be increasingly found to be charismatic while women will continue to remain unrecognized.

Finally, presenting the notion that individuals’ can be trained to be charismatic by portraying certain attributes is misleading. According to Weber’s description, charisma is an extraordinary quality that is not accessible to everyone. The implication of treating charisma as amenable to laboratory settings is that due to the already existing gender biases, the stereotypes will be replicated ad-infinitem. It also ensures that charisma will continue to be understood as a common phenomenon that can be inculcated in any individual through training, thus providing a misleading perspective of charisma.

In addition to the implications based on findings from this study, some broader implications include:

1. The processes involved in deciphering charismatic attributes and considering them a function of gender roles implies that women should simultaneously be included in charismatic discussions due to changing societal norms. Even while this is a desirable outcome, contemporary explanations of charisma rule out such an undertaking. The current use of language, examples, and attributes in charismatic literature is male-biased and these perceptions are widespread as there are no determined efforts to expand the meaning of charisma to allow space for feminist and other conceptions of charisma. The changing perceptions of gender roles offer fertile ground for incorporating advanced conceptualizations of gender where attributes are not described as
masculine, feminine, and/or gender-neutral but rather as human characteristics. In so doing, it becomes possible to seek plurality in defining and understanding charisma.

2. Contemporary charismatic definitions are widely dispersed which deepens the confusion and mystery surrounding charisma. Before it becomes impossible to close the widening gaps, there is a need to refer to the roots of charisma and to incorporate and promote the exceptionality that Weber introduced in ways that are relevant in the twenty-first century.

Implications for the Scholarship

In light of the previous discussion, it is recommended that contemporary scholars be more sensitive:

- To using gender-specific examples and offer gender equitable understanding of charisma.
- To biases and messages implicit in the use of gender-neutral pronouns in order to avoid gender-blindness.
- To using masculine attributes so that women are not excluded.
- In defining and operationalizing charisma so as to allow for gender-equality.
- To deviations from Weberian charisma by explicating that their interpretations vary from Weber.

Limitations of the Study and Recommendations for Research

One of the limitations of this study is the use of the Bem-Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) in assigning gender roles to charismatic criteria derived from the Leadership
Quarterly. The BSRI was developed approximately four decades ago and represents the gender stereotypes prevalent during that time. Also, the BSRI was created using perceptions of undergraduate students which limits the representativeness of the population. It is recommended that future studies use alternative instruments that not only present societal gender interpretations but also are related to charismatic leadership. Some of the current gender inventories include Femininity Ideology Scale (FIS) and the Male Role Norms Inventory – Revised (MRNI-R); researchers can review these scales and determine their applicability in similar studies.

Another limitation is that data were derived from only one journal, *The Leadership Quarterly*, which represents a small selection of contemporary literature on charisma. Also, this dissertation did not examine hypotheses and propositions presented in the *Leadership Quarterly*, which may limit the comprehensiveness of the data collection processes. While this study relied solely on the *Leadership Quarterly* journal, future researchers can expand their sample by examining other sources, which may include journals, books, media, etc., which may yield more comprehensive results.

In addition, it was anticipated that the use of the qualitative software program, NVivo, would allow for deriving the charismatic leader examples and behaviors by the use of in-built dictionaries or through the use of conditional statements. However, NVivo does not support such automation, which resulted in the researcher manually coding and interpreting the information in Leadership Quarterly. Other qualitative programs should be explored to examine the extent to which charisma is gendered. Automated search capabilities and dictionaries should be explored in order to handle vast amounts of literature.
Also, another area for future researchers is to examine which translation of Weberian writings is used by contemporary scholars. It is known that Talcott Parsons was the first author to translate some of Weberian writings from German to English and in the process offered his personal interpretation of charisma. Parson’s translation and interpretations have been brought into question by contemporary scholars. It will be interesting to note if contemporary scholars use Parson’s translations and if so, how they differ from other translations of Weber. Some of these biases and misinterpretations of charisma may be uncovered by examining the sources used by contemporary charismatic researchers. Charisma has been widely studied in the fields of political science and private organizations; however, its applicability to the field of public administration is a recent development. A search for the term charisma in some of the leading public administration journals yielded limited results and the few articles that were found used neo-charismatic literature as the basis for their studies. This is troublesome as the study of charisma in public organizations will reiterate the gender stereotypes prevalent in contemporary charismatic literature. Further, a more refined search for charisma in public administration theories may help provide new directions for understanding the role of charisma in public organizations.

Conclusion

This study proposed to examine whether contemporary charismatic literature reflects and contributes to a gendered perception of charisma and to what extent it belies Weberian charisma. Findings of this study supported the proposed contention that contemporary charismatic literature reflects and contributes to gendered perceptions of
charisma by using predominantly male examples and masculine attributes in charismatic leader descriptions. It was also found that contemporary literature belies Weberian charisma. The findings of this study extend our current understanding of charisma by examining it from a gendered lens. While the role of gender has been widely studied in the field of leadership, gender and charisma have been fairly separate till date. This study analyzes the role of gender in contemporary charisma and in doing so affects the way in which we read and understand charisma.

It is of paramount importance that future researchers re-examine how they define and describe charisma and to ensure that gender biases are not repeated; in absence of such conscious efforts, women will continue to be a minority in such research. As a starting point this study, using Weber’s definition as its basis, conceptualizes charisma as an inherent extraordinary quality of an individual that results in morally uplifting consequences for society.
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APPENDICES
## APPENDIX A
### LEADER TRAITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Traits</th>
<th>Traits Sub-elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decisiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Thinker</td>
<td>Make unilateral decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional Maturity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts in ways that builds your respect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays emotional stability and selflessness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes me proud to be associated with him/her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-effacing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissistic behaviors</td>
<td>Lack of self-control (-ve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate their enthusiasm and energy through their dynamic presence</td>
<td>Mental interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>Mental interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished</td>
<td>Mental interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passionate or driven</td>
<td>Mental interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Physical vitality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flexibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility and adaptability to different circumstances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willful</td>
<td>Rigidity (-ve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Need for Achievement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>Excellence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Charismatic leaders tend to take credit for contributions and engage in highly visible leadership activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Personal Integrity</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong convictions about the correctness of his or her actions</td>
<td>Consistency/coherence of values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talks about his/her most important values and beliefs</td>
<td>Consistency/coherence of values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving people in developing shared vision based on socially-responsible values</td>
<td>Consistency/coherence of values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions</td>
<td>Consistency/coherence of values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong sense of moral mission</td>
<td>Consistency/coherence of values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>Honesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellian behavior</td>
<td>Lying, cheating (-ve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks change for the purpose of furthering a personal agenda</td>
<td>Selfish purposes (-ve)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resilience**

- Determination

**Self-confidence**

- Self-confidence
- Cynicism | Arrogance(-ve)
- Adventurous | Courage
- Courage | Courage
- High self-esteem | Self-esteem

**Service Mentality**

- Self-sacrificial

The leader may change his vision to meet the needs and wants of the followers and the organization.

- His communications evidence an eloquent appeal to followers' emotions | Concern for others
- Emphasis on ideas and attractiveness of the vision, rather than the leader | Concern for others
- More references to the collective and to collective identity, and fewer references to individual self-interest | Concern for others
- Non-authoritarian | Concern for others
- Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group | Concern for others

**Willingness to Assume Responsibility**

- High need for power | Power
- Assertive | Power/assertive
## APPENDIX B

### LEADER SKILLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Skills</th>
<th>Skill Sub-elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analytical skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eloquent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of message</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal expressiveness</td>
<td>Nonverbal skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal presence</td>
<td>Nonverbal skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use facial expressions (e.g., smiles)</td>
<td>Nonverbal skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining direct eye contact when speaking</td>
<td>Nonverbal skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a relaxed posture</td>
<td>Nonverbal skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in dynamic hand and body gestures</td>
<td>Nonverbal skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate between pacing and sitting on the edge of the desk</td>
<td>Nonverbal skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lean towards the participants</td>
<td>Nonverbal skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic and expressive</td>
<td>Nonverbal skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong delivery style</td>
<td>Oral skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation/speed of delivery</td>
<td>Oral skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit vocal fluency</td>
<td>Oral skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign accent</td>
<td>Oral skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical skills</td>
<td>Oral skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Oral-written skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary message content</td>
<td>Oral-written skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstraction</td>
<td>Oral-written skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Influence skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Followers are directly influenced by the leader and their personal relationship with him

| The leader will try to persuade those who disagree with his vision to agree with it | Pressure tactics |
| She is involved in a social exchange relationship with her staff | Exchange tactics |
| Makes me feel good to be around him/her | Friendliness |
| Inspires loyalty to the organization | Personal appeals |
| Stimulates others to put forth efforts above and beyond the call of duty and make personal sacrifices | Emotional appeals |
| Emphasis on, attraction to, and reverence for the leader, more than the vision | Manipulative (-ve) |

**Social skills**

| Emotional expressiveness | Expressiveness |
| Regulating or controlling their emotional communications | Expressiveness |
| More positive references to followers’ worth and efficacy as individuals and as a collective | Expressiveness |
| Inspires loyalty to him/her | Personal likability |
| Admirable | Personal likability |
| Impressive physical appearance | Personal likability |
| Devotion and loyalty leaders enjoy from their followers | Personal likability |
| Talks optimistically about the future | Optimism |
| Are...skilled at reading the emotions of others | Social perceptiveness |
| Has a special gift of seeing what it is that is really important for me to consider | Social perceptiveness |

**Technical skills**

| Expertise |
| Competent |
| Brilliant scientist | Profession |
### Leader Behaviors

#### Organization oriented behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Behaviors</th>
<th>Behavior Sub-elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articulates a compelling vision of the future</td>
<td>Articulating mission and vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leader will take into account the needs of</td>
<td>Decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the organization in his decision making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks change for the purpose of moving the</td>
<td>Managing organizational change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization forward in a mutually beneficial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be entrepreneurial and able to recognize new</td>
<td>Scanning the environment/identifying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities</td>
<td>opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision and farsightedness</td>
<td>Strategic planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a sense of mission which he/she transmits</td>
<td>Strategic planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With an important mission</td>
<td>Strategic planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconventional actions are linked to the enhancement</td>
<td>Strategic planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the broader organization and the vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of purpose</td>
<td>Strategic planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### People oriented behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Behaviors</th>
<th>Behavior Sub-elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintained positive interaction among group members</td>
<td>Building and managing teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a model for me to follow</td>
<td>Developing staff/mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More references to hope and faith</td>
<td>Developing staff/supporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating</td>
<td>Motivating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He had inspired an elite of Peace Corps volunteers to</td>
<td>Motivating/inspiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive behavior</td>
<td>Managing conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged each group to engage in task</td>
<td>Managing conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td>Motivating/inspiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leader will excel in persuading people to</td>
<td>Motivating/inspiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree with him</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify with the leader and the mission of the</td>
<td>Motivating/inspiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging</td>
<td>Motivating/inspiring-encouraging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leader will use positive rewards and</td>
<td>Motivating/positive incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reinforcement with his followers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent rewarding and punishing</td>
<td>Motivating/positive, negative incentives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Task oriented behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task oriented behavior</th>
<th>Clarifying roles and objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarified the group's goal</td>
<td>Clarifying roles and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>Managing technical innovation and creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being original or unconventional</td>
<td>Managing technical innovation and creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>Managing technical innovation and creativity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

LEADER STYLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Styles</th>
<th>Style Sub-elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement-oriented</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication of confidence in others' ability to accomplish tasks</td>
<td>Confidence in followers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leader will express high performance expectations of followers</td>
<td>Performance expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leader cares about his image and plays to the desires of followers</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delegative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leader will allow followers the autonomy to make their own decisions, but will influence them to make decisions in line with his vision</td>
<td>Supervisory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering followers</td>
<td>True delegation/empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas's efforts to change the hearts and minds of Americans are indicative of his belief that people are fundamental to problem solution</td>
<td>True delegation/empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directive</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Authoritarian (-ve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leader will negotiate his ideas when it benefits his image or his vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal projection of the leader's ideas and less concern for diversity of opinions</td>
<td>Authoritarian (-ve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>Authoritarian (-ve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leader will back up orders with justification based on the goodness of his vision</td>
<td>Follow rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing information selectively</td>
<td>Instructive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stressing the righteousness of the leader's own vision</td>
<td>Instructive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of environmental resources and constraints for bringing about change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspirational</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnetic personality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
People will have an extreme reaction to the leader. The leader is motivated by the accomplishment of his vision. Visions of charismatic leaders portray a model for the future that is markedly different from the status quo.

In my mind, he/she is a symbol of success and accomplishment. Acceptance of leader’s wisdom.

The leader will demonstrate behaviors that selectively arouse unconscious achievement, power, and affiliative motives of followers when these motives are specifically relevant to the attainment of the vision. Attitudinal changes in followers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charismatic</th>
<th>Charisma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generates follower enthusiasm by presenting novel ideas or solutions</td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More references to the leader's similarity to followers and identification with followers</td>
<td>Oneness with group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal risk</td>
<td>Produce new ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am ready to trust his/her capacity to overcome any obstacles</td>
<td>Trust of leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have complete faith in him/her</td>
<td>Trust of leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Laissez-faire**
He was unable to delegate authority.

**Participative**
Low self-esteem

The leader will take an interest in all current and potential followers.

Knowledge and information sharing for the purpose of developing individuals and the organization.

Encourages understanding of points of view of other members.

Emphasizes the importance of being committed to our values and beliefs. Creating work environment.

**Supportive**
Increases my optimism for the future.

Compassionate

Considerate

Sociability – Openness
APPENDIX E

LIST OF 118 LEADERSHIP QUARTERLY ARTICLES


