

Your order details**Our Order Ref:** 00419316-001**Your Ref:****Despatched on:** 9/8/2013**Your shipping address**University of Birmingham
United Kingdom**Your item details****UIN:** BLL01012658790**Author:****Title:** Leadership, the cutting edge : a symposium held at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, October 27-28, 1976 / edited by James G. Hunt and L. Carbondale : Southern Illinois University Press ; London : Feffer and Simons, 1977.**Publisher:****ISBN:** 0809308401**Edition:****Year:** 1977**Pages:** 189-207**Author name(s):** Hunt**Chapter title words:** A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership**Comments**Visit our blog for all the latest news and find out more about our new service at <http://britishlibrary.typepad.co.uk/bldss/>**Thank you for using Document Supply Services!**University of Birmingham
United Kingdom

Copyright Statement

Unless out of copyright, the contents of the document(s) attached to or accompanying this page are protected by copyright. They are supplied on condition that, except to enable a single paper copy to be printed out by or for the individual who originally requested the document(s), you may not copy (even for internal purposes), store or retain any electronic medium, retransmit, resell, hire or dispose of for valuable consideration and of the contents (including the single paper copy referred to above).

However these rules do not apply where:

1. you have written permission of the copyright owner to do otherwise;
2. you have the permission of The Copyright Licensing Agency Ltd, or similar licensing body;
3. the Copyright Licensing Agency Ltd, or similar licensing body, has issued a licence to you;
4. the intended usage is covered by statute.

Breach of the terms of this notice is enforceable against you by the copyright owner or their representative.

This document has been supplied under our **Copyright Fee Paid** service. You are therefore agreeing to the terms of supply for our Copyright Fee Paid service, available at:

<http://www.bl.uk/reshelp/atyourdesk/docsupply/help/terms/index.html>

A 1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership

ROBERT J. HOUSE

Charisma is the term commonly used in the sociological and political science literature to describe leaders who by force of their personal abilities are capable of having profound and extraordinary effects on followers.¹ These effects include commanding loyalty and devotion to the leader and of inspiring followers to accept and execute the will of the leader without hesitation or question or regard to one's self interest. The term charisma, whose initial meaning was "gift," is usually reserved for leaders who by their influence are able to cause followers to accomplish outstanding feats. Frequently such leaders represent a break with the established order and through their leadership major social changes are accomplished.

Most writers concerned with charisma or charismatic leadership begin their discussion with Max Weber's conception of charisma. Weber describes as charismatic those leaders who "reveal a transcendent mission or course of action which may be in itself appealing to the potential followers, but which is acted on because the followers believe their leader is extraordinarily gifted" (Weber, 1947, p. 358). Transcendence is attributed implicitly to both the qualities of the leader and the content of his mission, the former being variously described as "supernatural, superhuman or exceptional" (Weber, 1947, p. 358).

Shils (1965) points out that Weber conceived of charismatic leadership as one of the processes through which routinized social processes, norms and legal rules are changed. Weber distinguished innovators and creators

¹The author is indebted to Hugh J. Arnold, Martin G. Evans, Harvey Kolodny, Stephan J. Motowidlo, John A. Dearness, and William Cooper for their helpful critiques of this chapter. The literature review on which this chapter is based was conducted while the author was visiting professor at Florida International University, April-July, 1975.

from maintainers and attributed the "gift" of charisma in part to the creative or innovative quality of the leader's goals.

Several writers contend that charismatic leadership can and does exist in formal complex organizations (Dow, 1969; Oberg, 1972; Runciman, 1963; Shils, 1965). Yet despite the profound effects that charismatic leaders are presumed to have on followers' commitment, motivation, and performance, discussions of charisma have been speculative in nature and almost exclusively theoretical. To the knowledge of this writer none of the theoretical notions in the sociological or political science literature have been subjected to empirical test, despite the fact that many of these notions are implicitly testable.

In this chapter the sociological and political science literature on charisma will be reviewed and, where possible, the major assertions in this literature will be restated as propositions in an attempt to make them testable. In addition, selected literature from the discipline of social psychology will be reviewed and propositions which the writer believes are relevant to the concept of charisma will be inferred from the literature.

The outcome of this analysis is a speculative theoretical explanation of charisma from a psychological perspective rather than from a sociological or political science perspective. Hopefully, such an explanation will help us to have greater insight into how charismatic leadership emerges and its effects in modern organizations. Further, it is hoped that such an explanation will provide testable propositions with which to further leadership research.

In the remainder of this presentation the concept of charisma will be examined under the following topics: charismatic effects, characteristics of charismatic leaders, behavior of charismatic leaders, situational factors associated with the emergence and effectiveness of charismatic leaders. While these topics will be addressed separately, they are necessarily intertwined. Thus, at times a discussion of one topic will have implications for the other topics, and reference will be made to such implications.

The Effects of Charismatic Leadership

In the current literature the term charismatic leadership is generally defined and described in terms of the effects of the leader on followers, or in terms of the relationship between leaders and followers. For example Oberg (1972) states that "the test for charisma . . . is the degree of devotion and trust the object (charismatic leader) inspires and the degree to which it enables the individual to transcend his own finiteness and alienation and feel made whole" (p. 22). Tucker (1968) refers to both "charismatic following" and the "charismatic relationship."

Often times, the relationship of the followers to the charismatic leader is that of disciples to a master, and in any event he is revered by them. They do not follow him out of fear or monetary inducement, but out of love, passionate devotion, enthusiasm. They are not as a rule concerned with career, promotion, salary, or benefice. The charismatic following is a non-bureaucratic group [p. 735].

It appears that most, if not all, writers agree that the effects of charismatic leadership are more emotional than calculative in that the follower is inspired enthusiastically to give unquestioned obedience, loyalty, commitment and devotion to the leader and to the cause that the leader represents.

The charismatic leader is also implicitly assumed to be an object of identification by which the followers emulate the leader's values, goals, and behavior. Thus, one of the effects of the charismatic leader is to cause followers to model their behavior, feelings, and cognitions after the leader (Friedrich, 1961). Through the articulation of a transcendent goal the leader is assumed to clarify or specify a mission for the followers. By the leader's expression of self-confidence, and through the exhibition of confidence in followers the leader is also assumed to inspire self-confidence in the followers. Thus the charismatic leader is asserted to clarify followers' goals, cause them to set or accept higher goals, and have greater confidence in their ability to contribute to the attainment of such goals.

Finally, according to the political science and sociological literature on charisma, the charismatic leader is assumed to have the effect of bringing about rather radical change by virtue of beliefs and values that are different from the established order. Thus Oberg (1972) speaks of the "change agent" function of the charismatic leader.

The above review of the effects of charismatic leadership suggests several dependent variables for a theory of charisma. Some of these effects are: follower trust in the correctness of the leader's beliefs, similarity of followers' beliefs to those of the leader, unquestioning acceptance of the leader, affection for the leader, willing obedience to the leader, identification with and emulation of the leader, emotional involvement of the follower in the mission, heightened goals of the follower, and the feeling on the part of followers that they will be able to accomplish, or contribute to the accomplishment of, the mission. This large number of charismatic effects is consistent with Etzioni's definition of charisma as "the ability of an actor to exercise diffuse and intensive influence over the normative (ideological) orientations of other actors" (Etzioni, 1961, p. 203).

The charismatic effects listed above constitute an *initial* list of variables that can be used as preliminary dependent variables for a theory of charisma. While this number of variables lacks parsimony as the defining

criteria of a charismatic leader, this list of presumed "charismatic effects" provides a starting point for empiric research on charisma. If one were to identify a number of persons in a population (say military or industrial leaders in a given population) who informed observers (such as superiors or peers) could agree on as being clearly charismatic, it would be possible to identify these leaders' effects by measuring the degree to which their followers responses to them are different from responses of followers of other leaders randomly selected from the same population. The major differences in follower responses could then be clustered into primary groups and scaled. The scores of the followers on these groups could then serve as the basis for a more accurate, complete and parsimonious operational definition of charismatic effects. Leaders who have such effects on followers could be identified in subsequent samples. Such leaders could then be classified as charismatic leaders. Their personality characteristics and behaviors could be compared with those of other leaders (who do not have such effects) to identify characteristics and behaviors which differentiate the charismatic leaders from others. This process of operationally defining charismatic leadership permits one to identify leaders in a population who have the charismatic effects described in the political science and sociological literature and thereby specify an operational set of dependent variables for a theory of leadership.

Some of the above effects have also been the dependent variables in social-psychological research. Specifically, the ability of one person to arouse needs and enhance self-esteem of others, and the ability of one person to serve successfully as a behavioral model for another have been the subject of substantial empirical investigation by psychologists. Later in this chapter we will review this research in an attempt to identify and describe the specific situational factors and leader behaviors that result in such "charismatic" effects.

Defining charismatic leadership in terms of its effects permits one to identify charismatic leaders only after they have had an impact on followers. Such a definition says nothing about the personal characteristics, behaviors, or situational factors that bring about the charismatic effects. This is the scientific challenge that must be addressed if the mysterious quality of charismatic leadership is to be explained and charismatic effects are to be made predictable. We now turn to a discussion of these issues.

Definition of Charismatic Leadership

Throughout this chapter the term charismatic leadership will be used to refer to any leader who has the above "charismatic effects" on followers to an

unusually high degree.² The operational definition of a given charismatic leader awaits research which will allow one to scale the above specific "charismatic effects." While it is not likely that all charismatic leaders have all of the above "charismatic effects," there are many possibilities that can be examined. For example such effects may be present in a complex interacting manner. Alternatively it may be the sum of, or some absolute level of, selected effects that do indeed differentiate charismatic leaders from others.

Characteristics of the Charismatic Leader

Both the literature concerning charismatic leadership and the opinions of laymen seem to agree that the charismatic leader can be described by a specific set of personal characteristics. According to Weber (1947), the charismatic leader is accepted by followers because both the leader and the follower perceive the leader as possessing a certain extraordinary gift. This "gift" of charisma is seldom specified and generally held to be some mysterious quality that defies definition. In actuality the "gift" is likely to be a complex interaction of personal characteristics, the behavior the leader employs, characteristics of followers, and certain situational factors prevailing at the time of the assumption of the leadership role.

The literature on charismatic leadership repeatedly attributes three personal characteristics to leaders who have charismatic effects, namely: extremely high levels of self-confidence, dominance, and a strong conviction in the moral righteousness of his/her beliefs.³ It is interesting to note that three of these characteristics are also attributed to charismatic leaders by laymen as well as by scholars. As a classroom exercise I have on three occasions asked students to form into small groups and to discuss the characteristics of some charismatic leader that they have personally known or to whom they have been exposed. These groups repeatedly described the charismatic leaders that they selected for discussion as possessing dominance, self-confidence, and a strong conviction in their beliefs and ideals.

²This definition would be tautological if the "charismatic effects" were not operationally discovered using two independent operations. However, since the discovery of the "charismatic effects" involves having charismatic leaders identified by one set of observers (peers or superiors) and specification of their effects by an independent set of observers (namely their followers), such a definition avoids the tautological problem.

³It is entirely possible that charismatic leaders present themselves as highly confident and as having a strong conviction in the moral righteousness of their beliefs but do not indeed believe in either themselves or their beliefs. Some leaders may thus have charismatic effects because of their ability to *act as though* they have such confidence and convictions. The writer is indebted to Ed Locke for pointing out this alternative hypothesis.

While the consensus of political science and sociological writers and the results of my own informal experiment are not evidence that leaders who have charismatic effects do indeed possess these characteristics, the argument is certainly subject to an empiric test with self-report measures of personality traits, beliefs, and values.

In addition to the characteristics discussed above it is hypothesized here that leaders who have charismatic effects have a high need to have influence over others. Such a need seems intuitively likely to characterize leaders who have such effects because without such a need they are unlikely to have developed the necessary persuasive skills to influence others and also are unlikely to obtain satisfaction from the leadership role. Uleman (1972) has developed a measure of the need for influence that can be used to test the above hypotheses.

The following proposition summarizes the above discussion:

Proposition 1. Characteristics that differentiate leaders who have charismatic effects on subordinates from leaders who do not have such charismatic effects are dominance and self-confidence, need for influence, and a strong conviction in the moral righteousness of their beliefs.⁴

Behavior of Charismatic Leaders

The sociological and political science literature offer some hints about the behavior of charismatic leaders.

Role Modeling

First is suggested that leaders who have charismatic effects express, by their actions, a set of values and beliefs to which they want their followers to subscribe. That is, the leader "role models" a value system for the followers. Gandhi constitutes an outstanding example of such systematic and intentional role modeling. He preached self-sacrifice, brotherly love, and nonviolent resistance to British rule. Repeatedly he engaged in self-sacrificing

⁴Sashkin, in his commentary on the present chapter, points out that earlier research has shown eminent leaders possess the traits of "intellectual fortitude and integrity of character" and speech fluency (or "capacity for ready communication"). While these traits were not specified in the earlier version of this presentation which Professor Sashkin reviewed, they are not in contradiction to the earlier literature on charismatic leadership and rather consistent with the general description of the charismatic personality advanced in this literature. Thus I would accept these characteristics, along with those in proposition 1, as possible characteristics that differentiate leaders who have charismatic effects from other leaders.

behaviors, such as giving up his lucrative law practice to live the life of a peasant, engaging in civil disobedience, fasting, and refusing to accept the ordinary conveniences offered to him by others.

The importance of the role modeling as a leadership strategy is illustrated by Gandhi's proposed leadership policies for the self-governance of India. "Most important for Gandhi was the example that leaders set for their followers . . . 'No leader of an independent India will hesitate to give an example by cleaning out his own toilet box'" (Collins & LaPierre, 1975, 234-35).

Concerning role modeling, a study by Joesting and Joesting (1972) is suggestive of the effects that a high status role model can have on the self-esteem of observers. Male and female students were asked to rate the value of being a woman. Half of the students were enrolled in the class taught by a qualified female instructor. Twenty-six percent of the women subjects in the class taught by a male thought there was nothing good about being a woman. In contrast only five percent of the women subjects in the class taught by a qualified female had similar negative attitudes toward being a woman.

While role modeling often proves successful, success does not always occur. The question then is what permits a leader to be a successful role model, i.e., to be emulated by the followers.

There is substantial evidence that a person is more likely to be modeled to the extent that that person is perceived as nurturant (i.e., helpful, sympathetic, approving) and as being successful or possessing competence.

There is evidence that role modeling can have profound effects. Behavior resulting from modeling may be very specific such that the individual can be said to imitate or mimic the behavior of the model. Or, the behavior may be more general, taking the form of innovative behavior, generalized behavior orientations, and applications of principles for generating novel combinations of responses (Bandura, 1968).

Bandura (1968) reviews a substantial body of experimental evidence that shows that: (a) model's emotional responses to rewards or punishments elicit similar emotional responses in observers (p. 240); (b) stable changes in the valences (a measure of attractiveness) subjects assign to outcomes and changes in long-standing attitudes often result from the role modeling (pp. 243-44); and (c) modeling is capable of developing generalized conceptual and behavioral properties of observers such as moral judgement orientations and delay-of-gratification patterns of behavior (p. 252).

Of particular significance for the study of leadership are the diverse kinds of attitudes, feelings, and behavior and the diversity of subjects involved in prior studies. Role modeling has been shown to influence the

degree to which: (a) undergraduate females learn assertive behavior in assertiveness training program (Young, Rimm & Kennedy, 1973); (b) mentally disturbed patients assume independence in their personal life (Goldstein, Martins, Hubben, Van Belle, Schaaf, Wiersma, & Goedhart, 1973); (c) undergraduates are willing to disclose unfavorable or favorable anxiety related information to others (Sarason, Ganzer & Singer, 1972); (d) personal changes and learning outcomes result from adult *t*-groups (Peters, 1973); (e) individuals are willing to induce punishment (electric shock) to others (Baron, 1971); (f) nurses experience fear of tuberculosis (DeWolfe, 1967); (g) subjects adopt biased attitudes toward minority ethnic groups (Kelman, 1958; Stotland and Patchen, 1961).

Many of the subjects in the above studies were either college students or adults. Thus, the findings are not limited to young children but are also relevant to persons in full-time occupations. Further, the dependent variables are all of significance for effective organizational or group performance. Feelings of fear, willingness to disclose information unfavorable to self, stereotyping, willingness to administer punishment, prejudicial attitudes, learning of interpersonal skills, and learning independence are relevant to interpersonal relations within organizations. Similarly, these cognitions and behaviors are relevant to the establishment of trust, to adequacy of communication, and to experiences that are satisfying in organizational life.

Thus it is argued here that role modeling is one of the processes by which leaders bring about charismatic effects. Furthermore, it is likely that the feelings, cognitions and behavior that are modeled frequently determine subordinates' adjustment to organizational life, their job satisfaction, and their motivation to work. With respect to motivation, the above findings suggest that leaders can have an effect on the values (or valences) subordinates' attach to the outcomes of their effort as well as their expectations. And, as will be discussed below, leaders can also have an effect on subordinates' self-esteem, and their goal levels. Based on the above review of the literature concerned with role modeling, the following proposition is advanced:

Proposition 2. The more favorable the perceptions of the potential follower toward a leader the more the follower will model: (a) the valences of the leader; (b) the expectations of the leader that effective performance will result in desired or undesired outcomes for the follower; (c) the emotional responses of the leader to work related stimuli; (d) the attitudes of the leader toward work and toward the organization. Here "favorable perceptions" is defined as the perceptions of the leader as attractive, nurturant, successful, or competent.

Image Building

If proposition 2 is valid, then it can be speculated that leaders who have charismatic effects not only model the values and beliefs they want followers to adopt, but also that such leaders take actions consciously designed to be viewed favorably by followers. This speculation leads to the following proposition:

Proposition 3. Leaders who have charismatic effects are more likely to engage in behaviors designed to create the impression of competence and success than leaders who do not have such effects.

This proposition is consistent with the traditional literature on charismatic leadership. Weber (1947) speaks of the necessity of the charismatic leader to "prove" his extraordinary powers to the followers. Only as long as he can do so will he be recognized. While Weber and others have argued that such "proof" lies in actual accomplishments, the above proposition stresses the *appearance* of accomplishments and asserts that charismatic leaders engage in behaviors to gain such an appearance.

Goal Articulation

In the traditional literature on charisma it is frequently asserted that charismatic leaders articulate a "transcendent" goal which becomes the basis of a movement or a cause. Such a goal is ideological rather than pragmatic and is laden with moral overtones. Alternatively, if a movement is already in effect, one behavior of the emergent leader is the articulation of the goal of the movement with conviction and exhortation of the moral rightness of the goal (Tucker, 1968, pl 738).

Examples of such goals are Martin Luther King's "I have a dream," Hitler's "Thousand-year Reich" and his "lebensraum," or Gandhi's vision of an India in which Hindus and Moslems would live in brotherly love, independent from British rule.

Berlew (1974, p. 269) states:

The first requirement for . . . charismatic leadership is a common or shared vision for what the future *could be*. To provide meaning and generate excitement, such a common vision must reflect goals or a future state of affairs that is valued by the organizations' members and thus important to them to bring about. . . . All inspirational speeches or writings have the common element of some vision or dream of a better existence which will inspire or excite those who share the author's values. This basic wisdom too often has been ignored by managers.

Thus the following proposition is advanced:

Proposition 4. Leaders who have charismatic effects are more likely to articulate ideological goals than leaders who do not have such effects.

Exhibiting High Expectations and Showing Confidence

Leaders who communicate high performance expectations for subordinates and exhibit confidence in their ability to meet such expectations are hypothesized to enhance subordinates' self-esteem and to affect the goals subordinates accept or set for themselves. Some examples of this kind of charismatic leader behavior are Churchill's statement that England's air defense in World War II was "England's finest hour," Hitler's claim that aryanans were "the master race," black leaders' exhortation that "Black is beautiful," and Martin Luther King's prediction that "We shall overcome." All of these statements imply high expectations and confidence in the followers.

There is substantial evidence that the expectation that one can accomplish one's goals is positively related to motivation and goal attainment. Persons with high self-esteem are more likely than persons with low self-esteem to seek higher personal rewards for performance (Pepitone, 1964), and to choose occupations that are congruent with self-perceived traits (Korman, 1966) and self-perceived ability level (Korman, 1967). Further, Korman (1968) has shown experimentally that for high self-esteem subjects there is a positive relationship between task performance and satisfaction, but that no such relationship exists for low self-esteem subjects. Raben and Klimoski (1973) have also shown experimentally that high self-esteem subjects are more likely than low self-esteem subjects to rise to the challenge of doing a task for which they believe they are not qualified. Thus, it is argued here that, to the extent the leader can affect the self-esteem of subordinates, leader behavior will have an effect on the kinds of rewards subordinates seek, their satisfaction with the rewards they obtain, and their motivation to perform effectively.

The effect of leader behavior on subordinate self-esteem has been given little attention in the leadership literature.⁵ The assertion that leaders can affect subordinates' self-esteem is derived from two lines of research: research concerning the role-modeling effects and research concerned with reality testing.

We have already argued that through role modeling leaders can have a

⁵The argument that the enhancement of subordinate self-esteem is an important charismatic effect grew out of earlier conversations between the writer and David E. Berlew. See Berlew (1974) for further elaboration of this argument.

rather profound effect on subordinates' beliefs. One of these beliefs is self-esteem which is defined by Lawler (1971, p. 107) as the belief that subordinates have with respect to their own general level of ability to cope with and control their environment. It is argued here that subordinates' self-perceptions are likely to be modeled after the leader's perceptions of the subordinates.⁶ Thus if the leader communicates high performance expectations and shows confidence in subordinates, they will in turn set or accept a higher goal for themselves and have greater confidence in themselves.⁷

The second line of research suggesting that leaders affect subordinates' self-esteem is that research concerned with "reality testing." In social situations where interpersonal evaluation is highly subjective, individuals tend to "reality test," i.e., to test their notions of reality against the opinions of others (Deutsch & Gerard, 1955; Festinger, 1950). Consequently, to the extent that the leader shows followers that he/she believes them to be competent and personally responsible, the followers are hypothesized also to perceive themselves as competent. This self-perception is hypothesized to enhance motivation, performance, and satisfaction. Some indirect evidence in support of this line of reasoning is found in the results of studies by Berlew and Hall (1966), Stedry and Kay (1966), Korman (1971), Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968), Seaver (1973), and Meichenbaum, Bowers, and Ross (1969). Berlew and Hall (1966) and Stedry and Kay (1966) in field studies both found that individual performance increased as a function of the level of expectation superiors communicated to the individuals. Similarly, Korman (1971) showed in a laboratory study that the performance of students on creative tasks was a direct positive function of the expectations that other college students had for the laboratory subjects. Korman (1971) also showed that ratings of subordinates' performance in two field settings and self-ratings of motivation in three field settings were all significantly correlated with the degree to which subordinates perceived their leaders' practices to reflect confidence in the subordinates.

These findings are consistent with those conducted in educational settings in which the expectations of teachers have been shown to be reflected in the performance of students (Meichenbaum, et al., 1969; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968; Seaver, 1973). In these studies teachers were induced to believe that certain students were more competent than

⁶Such modeling, of course, will be a function of the degree to which the subordinate holds favorable perceptions of the leader, as specified in proposition 2.

⁷It is possible that such leader behavior will have a positive effect on subordinates' task-related self-esteem only (i.e., on the subordinates' confidence in their ability to accomplish task goals). It is also possible that such leader behavior will result in enhanced chronic and generalized self-esteem of subordinates. Whether leaders can indeed have such a powerful effect on subordinates' self-perceptions is of course a question that requires empiric investigation.

others. This belief, or expectancy, on the part of the teacher was shown to be associated with higher student performance. However, there are also studies conducted in educational settings which have failed to demonstrate an effect of teachers' expectancies of students' performance (Anderson & Rosenthal, 1968; Collins, 1969; Conn, Edwards, Rosenthal, & Crowne, 1968); Evans & Rosenthal, 1969; Fiedler, Cohen & Finney, 1971). Seaver (1973) points out that in all of these disconfirming studies and also in the Rosenthal and Jacobson study which is the subject of much controversy, the means of inducing teacher expectations were weak and thus "failure to find expectancy effects may be attributable solely to their failure to induce the desired expectancy in teachers" (p. 341).

If it is assumed that the leader's expectation of subordinates affects the subordinates' self-esteem and their self-esteem in turn affects their performance, then the above studies all provide indirect support for the assertion that leader's expectations affect subordinates' performance.

The *combination* of leader's confidence and high expectations, rather than high expectations alone, should be emphasized here. It is possible that leaders might set high performance standards, thus implying high expectations of subordinates, while at the same time showing low confidence in the subordinates' ability to meet such expectations. An example of this would be the leader who scores high on such questionnaire items as "he needles foremen for production."⁸ While such leader behavior may motivate subordinates to strive for high performance in order to avoid punishment, it is also likely to induce fear of failure. Such a state in turn will likely be accompanied by efforts to avoid accountability on the part of the subordinates, strong feelings of dissatisfaction, low acceptance of the leader, and resistance to the leader's influence attempts in the long run.

Thus, while leader expectations are considered to have a significant effect on the reactions of subordinates, high expectations are hypothesized to have a positive effect *only* when subordinates' perceive the superior to also have confidence in their (the subordinates') ability to meet such expectations.

Effect on Followers' Goals

In addition to affecting the self-esteem of subordinates, leader expectations and confidence are also hypothesized to affect several important characteristics of the subordinates' goals. In the following paragraphs we review the research concerned with goal characteristics.

⁸Fleishman, E. A. *Manual For the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire*. Washington, D.C.: American Institutes for Research, 1972.

In a series of laboratory studies, Locke and his associates (Bryan & Locke, 1967a, 1967b; Locke & Bryan, 1966a, 1966b) have demonstrated that when subjects are given specific goals by the experimenter they perform at significantly higher levels than those given the instruction to "do your best." Two field studies (Mace, 1935; Mendleson, 1971) also offer support for the generalizability of these laboratory findings to natural field settings. Thus, it is argued here that, if laboratory experimenters can influence the goal characteristics of experimental subjects, it seems reasonable that leaders can have similar influence on the goal characteristics of subordinates.

Specific and high expectations of leaders are hypothesized to clarify subordinates' performance goals. Further, it is hypothesized that the more the leader shows confidence in the subordinates' ability to meet goals, the more subordinates are likely to accept them as realistic and attainable.

Specific and high leader expectations are likely to provide a standard against which subordinates can evaluate their own performance. Accordingly, it is hypothesized here that leaders' expectations also serve as a basis on which subordinates may derive feedback. Finally, it is hypothesized that, when the leader's expectations are both high and clear to the subordinate and when the leader shows confidence in the subordinate's ability to meet such expectations, the subordinates will set and/or accept higher goals for themselves than would otherwise be the case, and will have more confidence that they will be able to meet the goals.

The above hypotheses concerning the leaders' effect on followers self-esteem and goals can be summarized in the following proposition:

Proposition 5. Leaders who simultaneously communicate high expectations of, and confidence in followers are more likely to have followers who accept the goals of the leader and believe that they can contribute to goal accomplishment and are more likely to have followers who strive to meet specific and challenging performance standards.

Motive Arousal Leader Behavior

One explanation for the emotional appeal of the charismatic leader may be the specific content of the messages he communicates to followers. It is speculated here that charismatic leaders communicate messages that arouse motives that are especially relevant to mission accomplishment. For example Gandhi's exhortations of love and acceptance of one's fellow man likely aroused the need for affiliation, a need (or motive) especially relevant to the goal of uniting Hindus, Moslems, and Christians.

Military leaders often employ symbols of authoritarianism and evoke the image of the enemy, thus arousing the power motive, a motive especially relevant to effective combat performance. For example Patton, when

addressing infantry recruits, would do so against the background of a large American flag, dressed with medals of his accomplishments, and wearing a shining helmet displaying the four stars indicating the status of general.

Miner's research is relevant to defining some of the conditions under which the arousal of the need for power is associated with successful performance. Miner found that individuals who were high on a projective (sentence completion) measure of the power need were more likely to be successful in hierarchical bureaucratic organizations than individuals low on the power need. These findings did not hold true in egalitarian non-bureaucratic organizations however (Miner, 1965).

Industrial leaders and leaders of scientists frequently stress excellence of performance as a measure of one's worth, thus arousing the need for achievement, a motive especially relevant to the assumption of personal responsibility, persistence, and pride in high-quality work performance. Varga (1975) has shown that the need for achievement is positively associated with economic and technical performance among research and development project leaders. He has also shown that the need for power is a strong factor contributing to such success when in conjunction with the need for achievement, but a factor making for failure when possessed by leaders low on the need for achievement.

There is some evidence that formally appointed leaders in a laboratory situation are capable of arousing subordinates' need for achievement (Litwin & Stringer, 1968). There is also a substantial amount of evidence that the achievement, affiliation, and power needs can be aroused from experimental inductions. For example the need for achievement has been aroused for males by suggesting to subjects that the experimental task is a measure of personal competence, or that the task is a standard against which one can measure his general level of ability (Heckhausen, 1967; McClelland, 1953; McClelland, Clarke, Roby, & Atkinson, 1958; Raynor, 1974).

The need for affiliation has been aroused by having fraternity members rate one another, while all were present, on a sociometric friendship index (Shipley & Veroff, 1952) while at the same time requiring each brother to stand and be rated by the other members of the fraternity on a list of trait adjectives.

The power need has been aroused experimentally by (a) evoking the image of, or reminding one of, an enemy, (b) having subjects observe the exercise of power by one person over another, or (c) allowing subjects to exercise power over another (Winter, 1973). Thus it is hypothesized that needs can be, and often are, similarly aroused by leaders in natural settings. By stressing the challenging aspects of tasks, making group members' acceptance of each other salient to performance appraisal, or talking about competition from others, it is hypothesized that leaders can and frequently

do arouse the needs for achievement, affiliation, and power. Further it is hypothesized that, to the extent that such motives are associated with task-required performance, the arousal of these motives will result in increased effectiveness on the part of subordinates. Thus the performance consequence of motive arousal is contingent on the task contingencies. For example, when task demands of subordinates require assumption of calculated risks, achievement oriented initiative, assumption of personal responsibility, and persistence toward challenging goals, the arousal of the need for achievement will facilitate task accomplishment. Further, there is evidence that when subordinates' need for achievement is high, task accomplishment will lead to satisfaction. When subordinates' need for achievement is low, task accomplishment will not be related to satisfaction (Steers, 1975).

When the task demands of subordinates require them to be persuasive, assert influence over or exercise control of others, or be highly competitive or combative, the arousal of the power motive is hypothesized to be related to effective performance and satisfaction. For example, on competitive tasks, or tasks requiring persuasion or aggression, the arousal of the power motive is hypothesized to lead to effective performance.

Finally, when task demands require affiliative behavior, as in the case of tasks requiring cohesiveness, team work, and peer support, the arousal of the affiliative motive becomes highly relevant to performance and satisfaction. An example of such tasks would be tasks that are enriched by assignment of major work goals to groups rather than individuals (Trist & Bamforth, 1951).

These speculations are summarized with the following proposition:

Proposition 6. Leaders who have charismatic effects are more likely to engage in behaviors that arouse motives relevant to the accomplishment of the mission than are leaders who do not have charismatic effects.⁹

Social Determinants of Charismatic Leadership

The sociological literature (Weber, 1947) stresses that charismatic leadership is born out of stressful situations. It is argued that such leaders express sentiments deeply held by followers. These sentiments are different from the established order and thus their expression is likely to be hazardous to the leader (Friedland, 1964). Since their expression is hazardous, the

⁹The ability of the leader to arouse motives of subordinates is hypothesized to be a function of the degree to which subordinates hold favorable perceptions of the leader, as specified in proposition 2.

leader is perceived as courageous. Because of other "gifts" attributed to the leader, such as extraordinary competence, the followers believe that the leader will bring about social change and will thus deliver them from their plight.

Thus it can be hypothesized that a strong feeling of distress on the part of followers is one situational factor that interacts with the characteristics and behavior of leaders to result in charismatic effects.

However Shils (1965) argues that charisma need not be born out of distress. Rather, according to Shils, charisma is dispersed throughout the formal institutions of society. Accordingly, persons holding positions of great power will be perceived as charismatic because of the "awe-inspiring" quality of power. Shils' only requirement is that the expression of power must appear to be integrated with a transcendent goal.

The above controversy suggests the hypothesis that leaders are more likely to have charismatic effects in situations stressful for followers than in non-stressful situations. Further it can be hypothesized that persons with the characteristics of dominance, self-confidence, need for influence, and strong convictions will be more likely to emerge as leaders under stressful conditions. Whether or not follower distress is a necessary condition for leaders to have charismatic effects or for persons with such characteristics to emerge as leaders is an empirical question that remains to be tested.

While there is lack of agreement as to whether or not leaders can have charismatic effects under nonstressful situations, all writers do seem to agree that charisma must be based on the articulation of an ideological goal. Opportunity to articulate such a goal, whether in stressful or nonstressful situations, thus can be hypothesized as one of the situational requirements for a person to have charismatic effects. This hypothesis suggests that, whenever the roles of followers can be defined as contributing to ideological values held by the follower, a leader can have some degree of charismatic effect by stressing such values and engaging in the specific behaviors described in the above propositions.

The question then is under what circumstances are roles definable in terms of ideological values. Clearly the roles of followers in political or religious movements can be defined in terms of ideological values. In addition, Berlew (1974) argues that since man seeks meaning in work there are many such ideological values to be stressed in modern formal organizations. Specifically he argues that any of the value-related opportunities listed in Table 22 can have a charismatic effect.

There are some work roles in society which do not lend themselves to ideological value orientation. These are generally the roles requiring highly routine, nonthinking effort in institutions directed exclusively to economic ends. It is hard to conceive of clerks or assembly-line workers in profit-

TABLE 22
*Sources of Meaning in Organizations:
 Opportunities and Related Values**

| Type of Opportunity | Related Need or Value |
|--|--|
| 1. A chance to be tested; to make it on one's own | Self-reliance Self-actualization |
| 2. A social experiment, to combine work, family, and play in some new way | Community integration of life |
| 3. A chance to do something <i>well</i> —e.g., return to real craftsmanship; to be really creative | Excellence Unique accomplishment |
| 4. A chance to do something <i>good</i> —e.g., run an honest, no rip-off business, or a youth counselling center | Consideration Service |
| 5. A chance to change the way things are—e.g., from Republican to Democrat or Socialist, from war to peace, from unjust to just. | Activism Social responsibility Citizenship |

*Source.—Berlew, 1974, with permission by Prentice-Hall.

making firms as perceiving their roles as ideologically oriented. However the same work when directed toward an ideological goal could lend itself to charismatic leadership. For example in World War II, "Rosie the Riveter" expressed the ideological contribution of an assembly-line worker. And such menial efforts as stuffing envelopes frequently are directed toward ideological goals in political or religious organizations. The following proposition summarizes the above argument:

Proposition 8. A necessary condition for a leader to have charismatic effects is that the role of followers be definable in ideological terms that appeal to the follower.

Summary and Overview

Figure 11 presents a diagrammatic overview of the theory presented above. It is hypothesized that leaders who have charismatic effects are differentiated from others by some combination (possibly additive and possibly interactive) of the four personal characteristics shown in the upper right box: dominance, self-confidence, need for influence, and a strong conviction in the moral righteousness of his or her beliefs. Charismatic leaders are hypothesized to employ these characteristics with the following specific behaviors: goal articulation, role modeling, personal image-




Fig. 11. A model of charismatic leadership. (Dotted lines indicate that favorable perceptions moderate the relationship between leader and follower responses)

building, demonstration of confidence and high expectations for followers, and motive arousal behaviors. Goal articulation and personal image-building are hypothesized to result in favorable perceptions of the leader by followers. These favorable perceptions are asserted to enhance followers' trust, loyalty, and obedience to the leader and also to moderate the relationships between the remaining leader behaviors and the follower responses to the leader. The follower responses are hypothesized to result in effective performance if the aroused behavior is appropriate for their task demands.

Conclusion — Why A 1976 Theory

This chapter presents a "1976" theory of charismatic leadership. The date, 1976, is attached to the title to reflect the philosophy of science of the writer. The theory is advanced for the purpose of guiding future research and not as a conclusive explanation of the charismatic phenomenon. As such it includes a set of propositions that are hopefully testable. Admittedly tests of the theory will require the development and validation of several new scales. However it is hoped that the propositions are at least presently testable in principle. "A theory that can not be mortally endangered cannot be alive" (cited in Platt, 1964, from personal communication by W. A. H. Rustin).

The results of empiric tests of the theory will undoubtedly require revision of the theory. It is believed by the writer that theories, no matter how good at explaining a set of phenomena, are ultimately incorrect and consequently will undergo modification over time. Thus as MacKenzie and House (1975) have stated "the fate of the better theories is to become explanations that hold for some phenomena in some limited condition." Or, as Hebb (1969, p. 21) asserts, "A good theory is one that holds together long enough to get you to a better theory."

Hopefully at some future date this theory will have led to a better theory.