

TAMING AND PROMOTING CHARISMA TO CHANGE ORGANIZATIONS

Janice M. Beyer*
University of Texas

Taking a sociological perspective on the accumulated literature on charisma reveals how theories and ways of operationalizing charisma depart from Weber's original conception. These departures tend to blur the distinctiveness of the charismatic form of leadership by ignoring or downplaying integral aspects of charisma, especially the precipitating crisis, the radical vision, and subsequent systemic change.

As an apparent outsider to the “new paradigm” (House & Aditya, 1997) of leadership research discussed in this special issue, I was impressed by the diligence of the researchers who have pursued it in investigating, refining, and extending their original conceptualizations. Clearly, the work of these authors has spawned a great deal of interest and a large body of research. Also, as Conger argues in his extensive review of that literature in this issue, some researchers see a degree of convergence among the most prominent approaches subsumed as part of the new paradigm. This opinion, however, is not unanimous. Yukl (this issue), for example, argues that the two major types of leadership that have been studied so assiduously—charismatic and transformational—are not even compatible. In addition, many researchers, not necessarily represented in this issue, have offered refinements or exceptions that have not been uniformly considered by other researchers (e.g., Deluga, 1997; Erlich, Meindl, & Viellieu, 1990). Also, the convergence that has occurred is limited because it has failed to take adequate account of earlier sociological theories and various qualitative studies of charisma.

My commentary will take a more sociological stance than Yukl's and try to focus

* Direct all correspondence to: Janice M. Beyer, University of Texas, College of Business Administration, Department of Management, Room 4.202, Austin, Texas 78712; *email*: jlbeyer@mail.utexas.edu

on those issues that are particularly telling for sociologists. For example, to this outsider sociologist, the convergence that has occurred within this group of researchers seems to have reinforced commonalities rather than differences between the theories associated with new paradigm and those associated with the traditional paradigm used by organizational and social psychologists in prior decades to study leadership. In the process, the so-called neo-charismatic and transformational leadership paradigms have tamed the original conception of charisma advanced by Weber (1947) and, in the process, diluted its richness and distinctiveness.

Several influences provided impetus to the taming of charisma: the prevailing psychological paradigm and associated methods for studying leadership, the preoccupation with leadership itself in the U.S. culture (Meindl, Ehrlich, & Dukerich, 1985), the appealing description of transformational leadership offered by Burns (1978) together with the pull of prior normative views of leadership, and the widespread conviction that what leaders should do is to change their organizations (e.g., Nadler & Tushman, 1990). All of these factors also seem to have contributed to a convergence on what Yukl (this issue) accurately terms a "heroic" portrayal of leadership that largely ignores possible negative effects of charisma or of transformational leadership. Rather, the conceptions of charismatic and transformational leadership advanced in the new paradigm portray leader characteristics, behaviors, and outcomes that are loaded with social desirability. Also, writers associated with the "new paradigm" often write in a more promotional than scientifically questioning or analytical vein.

HOW DIFFERENT IS THE NEW PARADIGM?

What strikes a non-psychologist in reading these papers is how research investigating the new paradigm is still so heavily tied to the traits and behaviors of leaders as measured by the reports of followers. Willner (1984) pointed out that the most common misconception about charisma is that it is located in the quality or combination of qualities of a person. Indeed, dictionary definitions of charisma encourage this misconception in nonscientific speech and writing. But many other, more complex definitions of charisma have been advanced in the scientific literature, most notably by Weber (1947). Nevertheless, the lists of relevant traits and behaviors investigated have lengthened considerably since the line of research called the new paradigm began.

This search for relevant traits is reminiscent of what happened decades ago during the search for a universal set of traits and behaviors that would discriminate leaders from non-leaders. The only obvious difference seems to be that researchers are now trying to discriminate charismatic or transformational leaders from those who are not charismatic or transformational. Such a search makes no sense unless it is assumed that people everywhere are attracted by the same personal traits and behaviors. Indeed, as Den Hartog, House, Hanges, Dorfman, Ruiz-Quintanilla, and associates (this issue) argue, many of the researchers in the new paradigm expect that certain attributes of leaders are universally endorsed and universally effective. They acknowledge, however, that the enactment of these attributes may vary across cultures, and predict that many attributes will not be universally endorsed. Indeed,

the preliminary results presented in this issue show a longer list of attributes that are *not* universally endorsed than those that are.

Also, the traits universally endorsed by their respondents are all socially desirable, and do not depart very far from the kinds of leadership behaviors included in earlier theories, such as House and Mitchell's (1974) path-goal model or Hershey and Blanchard's (1988) situational model. After years of research on these and other contingency theories, it is rather surprising to find that a "one-best-way" approach, even in a limited form, is being used to characterize charisma and performance relationships and that this simple idea still persists and "pervades the literature" (Waldman & Yammarino, 1999, p. 271).

In addition, the basic rationale underlying the "new paradigm" is not exactly new. It amounts to the same old idea that certain kinds of leaders can change followers' attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors, and in this way, induce improved organizational performance. Models of the theories associated with the new paradigm generally include elements of performance as their ultimate dependent variable (Bass, 1985, p. 167; Bass & Avolio, 1994; Gardner & Avolio, 1998; House, 1977; Pillai & Meindl, 1998). However, when researchers test theories in this paradigm, they often focus on self-reported general psychological processes in followers or on self-reported or leader-reported general behaviors as outcomes, rather than on objective measures of specific follower behaviors related to the charismatic or transformational vision, or even better, on the general performance of organizational units or whole organizations. In their new book Conger and Kanungo (1998) argue that the outcomes of leadership can be assessed through followers' attitudes and behaviors at individual and aggregate levels.

It is important to note, in this connection, that Lowe and associates (1996) found in their meta analysis of studies using the Bass measures of transformational and charismatic leadership that correlations between leaders behaviors and effectiveness were higher when both were reported by subordinates than they were in studies that use organizational measures of effectiveness. They point out that two likely reasons for this result: mono-method bias in the self-report measures and narrower perspectives on performance in the organizational indicators of effectiveness used.

Another factor creating similarity with old approaches is that psychologists, especially those who use quantitative methods, tend to see the goal of their research as advancing and testing well-specified causal models. Because they also tend to focus on individuals and individual differences, it is not surprising that, in trying to discover the *causes* of charisma, they investigate what makes some *individuals* charismatic leaders and, in looking for the effects of charismatic leadership, they focus on how *individual* followers respond to such leaders. They have also tended to assume that such leadership rests on a foundation of *personal* sources of power (Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Howell, 1988) possessed and exercised by certain leaders.

Sociologists, on the other hand, are more inclined to collect and analyze historical and qualitative data, and to see charisma as a social structure that emerges from complex interactions of multiple factors that cannot be separated neatly into causes, moderators, and effects. A definition of structure offered by Ranson, Hinings, and Greenwood (1980, p. 3) illustrates this point: they saw structure as a "complex medium of control which is continually produced and recreated in interaction and

yet shapes that interaction: structures are constituted and constitutive.” Following Weber’s (1947) seminal conception of charismatic authority, sociologists tend to see charisma as an unusual form of normative social structure that emerges in times of crisis, when people look to charismatic individuals who are “perceived as possessing extraordinary gifts of spirit and mind” to lead them through the crisis with “radical reorganizations” (Scott, 1981, p. 33). Also, to sociologists, charisma has a normative basis in the belief systems of followers, which legitimate its power.

As Scott points out, Weber’s “prescient vision was pre-Lenin and Hitler, pre-Roosevelt and Gandhi, pre-Mao and Castro,” [and] . . . “seldom in the history of ideas has a theoretical formulation forecast with such accuracy, at least in general outline, the future” (1981, p. 34). When a theory provides such insights, researchers should be expected to provide strong justifications for modifying it. It is therefore rather surprising that followers of the “new paradigm” have overlooked the strong parallels between the elements of Weber’s overall conception and the parade of theories of leadership that have focused on traits, leader behaviors, follower attributions, and situational contingencies (Trice & Beyer, 1986).

It is clear that the neo-charismatic theories summarized here have paid considerable attention to the traits and behaviors as leaders. Until recently, they have devoted much less attention to the situation or the context (Shamir & Howell, this issue) and the possibility that different contexts or situations may make different personal qualities and behaviors in leaders more or less attractive, persuasive, and effective because potential followers may be more or less receptive to that type of leader. Since this was the key insight of contingency theory, such relative neglect in the new paradigm is puzzling. For example, while Conger and Kanungo (1988) early presented a model that showed the context as interacting with characteristics of both the leaders and followers, their discussion of the context was very brief. House’s research has not always been guilty of this oversight (House, Spangler, & Woycke, 1991), and the cross-national GLOBE study he has instigated may deal with this issue.

But much more needs to be done to fully incorporate a consideration of the situation in the new paradigm. It is discouraging that a recent model of the charismatic relationship advanced by Gardner and Avolio (1998, p. 35) still puts the context on the periphery of a model focused on the leader-follower relationship and does not connect it to anything else, even performance. Surely the context must be at least a constraint on performance.

More recently, however, Waldman and Yammarino (1999) proposed and discussed at length a causal model of CEO charismatic leadership that incorporates two contingency variables—close vs. distant leadership and perceived environmental volatility. The latter seems to be a watered-down version of Weber’s conception of crisis and is treated as a moderating variable. Possible differences between close and distant leadership have been discussed before (Hunt, 1991; Trice & Beyer, 1993; Yagil, 1998; Yukl, 1994), but are more thoroughly integrated and explored in the rationale behind the Waldman/Yammarino model. Their model also proposes that an “adaptive” organizational culture makes the emergence of charisma possible, but do not explicitly state that such a culture is a necessary condition for charisma.

Rather they say there is “reciprocal causation . . . between adaptive culture and charismatic leadership” (Waldman & Yammarino, 1999, p. 271).

Other researchers have considered organizational culture and structure (Pillai & Meindl, 1998), hierarchical level of the leader (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramanian, 1996; Yammarino, 1994), and sensitivity to the environment (Conger & Kanungo, 1998) as possible contingency variables. When theories in the new paradigm include such contingency factors, however, they treat them as moderating variables and not as necessary conditions or prime causal factors. It thus seems fair to say that, overall, the new paradigm of leadership research is still largely leader-centered and makes the leader or attributions of the leader the main cause of follower attitudes and behaviors.

This apparent blindness to the causal role of a crisis situation in the development of charisma may be a by-product of the general psychological paradigm or of the preferred ways in which the presumed effects of charismatic leadership or transformational leadership have been measured. Focusing on followers’ reports of and reactions to leaders’ behaviors as measures of charismatic effects readily leads to (or stems from) the assumption that what is motivating followers and causing their performance is what the leader does or how the leader treats them. Such an assumption ignores the possibility that interactions among followers and leaders or interactions among followers themselves may be important causal factors (Yukl, this issue).

Also ignored is the possibility that followers may be motivated by their desire to overcome or deal with something else in their situation—that the situation itself may have *direct* effects on follower actions and performance. But it makes no sense to assume that all or even most of people’s behaviors are caused by something some kind of leader does. Clearly this is not true. It also makes no sense to suggest that a situation can somehow magically produce a charismatic leader with radical visions that will gain acceptance of followers (Shamir & Howell, this issue). Such a leader may or may not be available and may or may not be able to command the attention required to win over the relevant group of followers. Followers can resent and reject attempts to influence them (Bryman, 1996; Kunda, 1992). In Weber’s insightful conception, the perception of crisis is only one of the interacting elements that come together in a particular social situation from which charisma emerges.

Attribution theory has been better incorporated in some of these approaches, in the sense that most of the researchers in this paradigm recognize that without favorable attributions from followers, there would be no charismatic leadership. But thoroughly considering attributions that may be present in the situation has additional implications. Some of these researchers acknowledge the possibility that the attributions of success held by followers may be what “causes” a leader to be considered charismatic. House and associates (1991) not only recognized the possibility that perceptions of performance may cause perceptions of charisma, but investigated that possibility by testing their model with assessments of U.S. Presidents in editorials published the day after their first inaugurations—prior to their time in office. Unfortunately, much of the later empirical research that is discussed here has failed to be equally careful to fully account for or to remove this possibility.

Another related possibility, addressed by Conger in his article in this volume and in Conger and Kanungo's new book (1998), is that followers' reports of leader characteristics and behaviors are heavily confounded with or amount to their implicit theories of leadership (Lord & Maher, 1991). A third possibility is that charisma remains latent until success makes it manifest (Pillai & Meindl, 1998).

A fourth and perhaps the most telling possibility that these researchers seem to miss is the general significance of the concept of leadership in this and other societies:

Social groups that highly value rationality and predictability need to be able to believe that events have discernable and controllable causes. Members of such groups will attribute to leaders many factors that they do *not* want to attribute to luck, chance, or other circumstances beyond human control or understanding. Leaders thus become an important avenue for humans to act out and continue to believe in their efficacy as a species (Trice & Beyer, 1993, p. 254).

Perhaps social groups in all human cultures conceive of leaders as those persons who claim or appear to be more in control of circumstances than they themselves feel they are. But it is also possible that other cultures do not see leaders or leadership, as we in the U.S. conceive of it, as nearly as important or central in determining the course of events in society or in business as we do. It is not clear whether the new cross-cultural studies in the GLOBE project (Den Hartog et al., this issue) are designed to investigate this possibility. The fact that this project includes focus groups, interviews, and other qualitative data should provide opportunities to seek understanding of the kinds of schemas people in different cultures use when they think about and respond to questions about leadership.

Finally, there is one aspect of the new paradigm that is quite different from the prior research on leadership: proponents of the new paradigm claim that charismatic and transformational leadership are ways to achieve change in organizations (House & Aditya, 1997)—indeed, some argue that a core element of leadership is the ability to produce change (Conger & Kanungo, 1998). Logically, it follows that tests of their theories should use some measure of *organizational* change as criterion variables. Most of their empirical work, however, tends to use self-reports of followers' inner states or behaviors as indicators of change and fails to investigate whether and how these personal factors have changed, and if so, how and whether they produce organizational-level changes. This connection is apparently assumed.

This neglect of system-wide change lies at the crux of the difference between psychological and sociological conceptions of charisma. If theories in the new paradigm want to explain how leaders bring about change—as the use of terms like charismatic and transformational implies—validating their theories requires testing them in terms of whether meaningful change has been achieved, both in follower's behaviors and at some kind of collective or system-wide level. Ideally, they would also require that both the changes in followers' psychological states (House & Aditya, 1997) and at the organizational level were stable over more than the short term.

In summary, there are many similarities between the old and new paradigms of

leadership. To qualify as a new scientific paradigm, according to Kuhn's (1964) insights, a body of research should differ in basic ways from older, accepted paradigms. It should change (1) the way that scientists see their phenomenon, (2) their preferred methodologies, (3) what findings they accept and how they interpret them, and (4) their tacit understandings over areas that are important to study (Lodahl & Gordon, 1972).

To this outsider, the new paradigm reviewed in this issue is somewhat stronger on the first and last of these criteria, and decidedly weak on the middle two. Distinguishing leaders from managers and transformational from transactional leaders is a somewhat new way of seeing leadership. Focusing on top level leaders and how they might stimulate change in followers is a new area of study. But the preferred methodologies have not changed very much yet—although there is beginning to be calls for a wider range of methods (e.g., Bryman, 1996; Conger, 1998; Parry, 1998)—and the old normative biases toward generally considerate, people-oriented, participative, and democratic behaviors as marks of effective leadership remain.

Also, some researchers who follow the new paradigm seem to take it for granted that charismatic and transformational leadership can be found at all levels of organizations and in all kinds of settings (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Along with such beliefs goes an underlying assumption that leadership, even of an exceptional kind, is a phenomenon with a continuous distribution of various characteristics. Leadership can be more or less transformational, transactional, inspirational, or charismatic. This tacit understanding represents no break with the thinking behind prior research that tried to determine if leaders were more or less democratic or autocratic, relationship-oriented or task-oriented, directive or supportive, participative or achievement-oriented.

The field of leadership is certainly not alone in claiming a new paradigm. The tendency to frame research as advancing a new paradigm has become quite common across scientific fields. The number of scientific papers invoking the term "new paradigm" to characterize the research reported increased from a handful in 1985 to 30 in 1991 and 124 in 1998 (Cohen, 1999). Research by the Institute of Scientific Information showed that only 32 of these papers received 10 or more citations, including citations by their authors, indicating that "90% of new paradigm papers affected the research very little indeed" (Pendlebury, as quoted in Cohen, 1999, p. 1998). These data suggest that the label of "new paradigm" is coming to be used very loosely, and in the process, losing its meaning.

TAMING CHARISMA

A key issue in theorizing about charisma is whether it is the property of a person, a relationship, or a situation. Common parlance makes it the property of a person; the new paradigm reviewed here makes it the property of a relationship; sociological theories consider charisma to be the property of a social situation with an emergent structure that involves a coming together of several elements.

In their study of two charismatic leaders, Trice and Beyer (1986, pp. 118–119) summarized Weber's theory (1947) as including five elements: "(1) an extraordi-

narily 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." They viewed charisma as a sociological phenomenon that *emerged* from the interaction of all of these elements, and argued that *all* of them must be present to some degree for charisma to occur. In assessing the new paradigm, it may be instructive to consider how this body of research conforms to their enumerative definition and Weber's ideas.

Clearly, 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. Not only does this approach assume that the qualities that define charisma are not rare, but that priming people with various descriptors will not tend to make them respond in ways that agree with these descriptors, thus making the incidence of charisma appear to be more common than it actually is.

Also, the tendency to extend and elaborate the lists of these qualities raises the question of whether there is one very restrictive set of many qualities that the charismatic leader must possess or whether there are a large set of possible personal qualities associated with charisma. If the latter is the underlying assumption, it raises the question of how many of these qualities must be present. Will any combination do? The longer and less restrictive the list, the less distinctive the whole construct of charisma becomes.

Adherents of the new paradigm differ in the degree to which they incorporate Weber's idea of a crisis in their research on charisma. This is unfortunate since the importance of crisis in the emergence of charisma has been documented in several long-term sociological studies (Clark, 1970; Roberts & Bradley, 1988; Trice & Beyer, 1986), as well as in House and associates' (1991) study of the U.S. Presidency, and in some laboratory studies (Pillai, 1996; Pillai & Meindl, 1991).¹

Furthermore, as mentioned earlier, the ideas inherent in a condition of crisis have been expanded in the new paradigm to include other sources of uncertainty, particularly the presence of significant challenges or opportunities. This addition makes the whole idea of charisma more applicable to business leaders and the current management environment, but may obscure important differences between leadership that emerges to deal with threats and that which emerges to deal with opportunities. We might expect, for example, that dealing with perceived threats is more motivating to followers than taking advantage of opportunities, unless the followers can also gain from those opportunities, as they currently do in many high tech firms.

The third element of Weber's definition, the radical vision, has also been tamed in the new paradigm. While the new paradigm makes having and advancing a vision a key element of charismatic leadership (Bryman, 1996), it does not say much about the nature of that vision.² In discussing the correspondence between traditional

approaches to leadership and Weber's conception, Trice and Beyer (1986, p. 133) remarked:

What is new and different in our enumerative definition of charisma and not easily subsumed under past approaches to leadership is the charismatic mission—the radical and novel visions and prescriptions of the charismatic leader.

Unless a leader's vision is a radical break with the past, they argue, it should not qualify as charismatic, no matter how attractive to followers. Making a radical vision a distinguishing requirement for charisma or for transformational leadership makes a sensible linkage with the presumption that charismatic and transformational leaders are those who bring about change.

Trice and Beyer (1986) provided examples of truly radical visions in their two case studies of the founders of Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) and the National Council on Alcoholism (NCA). They identified the social crisis connected with the emergence of these two leaders and their social movements as the public controversy and agitation over the prohibition of alcohol that occurred in the U.S. in the 1930s and 1940s. Despite prohibition laws, people were still becoming addicted to alcohol; this intended legal remedy had clearly not worked and brought many other, unintended negative consequences. In this setting the two founders advanced, respectively, the following radical visions:

To propose that alcoholism was a disease . . . and also that it could be treated successfully by the intervention of laypersons who were also alcoholics, was truly a radical combination of ideas that broke with traditional norms prescribing that the treatment of disease was performed by medical professionals (Trice & Beyer, 1986, p. 140).

. . . though a member of AA, she broke with the AA tradition of anonymity to publicize her own personal story of addiction and recovery. Her mission was to educate the public that alcoholism was a treatable illness and thus to remove the stigma associated with this addiction, improve the treatment of alcoholics, and perhaps even prevent alcoholism (Trice & Beyer, 1986, p. 142).

Both of these radical visions proposed other solutions to the problems connected with the use of alcohol and with alcoholism and thus made prohibition unnecessary. The organizations founded by these leaders survive and prosper today and continue to adhere to their radical visions. Also, the radical idea of lay treatment through support groups that gave birth to AA has spread throughout the world and been applied to many other social and behavioral problems. The idea of educating the public about various types of personal problems and labeling them as treatable diseases has also been extensively diffused and imitated.

The fourth element of Weber's conception has received the most attention in the new paradigm. Followers are regularly asked about the qualities they attribute to their leaders, and it is presumed that these qualities would make their leaders

somewhat different and thus an exception to the “ordinary” manager. But again the question becomes whether the qualities that they are being asked about are truly exceptional or extraordinary. How exceptional and extraordinary must the attributions of the leader’s qualities be to engender charisma? A practical answer is that they must be sufficient to induce the followers to accept and work toward the radical vision that leader advocates.

Thus we are brought back to the central role that the radical vision plays in the emergence of genuine charisma. The new paradigm dilutes this idea by assessing followers’ general motivations without regard to any particular vision of change. Also, as mentioned before, the new paradigm ignores the motivating potential of the perceived crisis, particularly when that crisis is personally experienced. Surely, for example, what motivates alcoholics to affiliate with AA and follow its prescriptions has more to do with their own drinking problems than with admiration for the AA founder or its current leaders. At the same time, there is sufficient admiration of the AA founder that his words are still quoted extensively in AA meetings and are incorporated in that movement’s equivalent of scripture—*Twelve Steps and Twelve Traditions* (Alcoholics Anonymous World Services, 1953).

The final element in Weber’s conception—repeated success—has also been considered in the new paradigm, but perhaps not in as focused a way as his conception suggests. The real test of the charismatic leader should be whether following the radical vision is perceived by followers to deal successfully with the perceived crisis. This suggests that the ways in which success should be measured relative to either charismatic or transformational leadership is by whether some form of radical change has been achieved that corresponds to the charismatic or transformational vision, and perhaps whether followers’ perceptions of crisis have been lessened. The last point may be problematic if the charismatic leader is good at formulating new crises or at choosing a crisis that is an endless threat (e.g., the loss of heavenly salvation).

A key issue implicit in this element is that charisma is not ephemeral. Without some sustained success, charisma is potential but not realized. Thus, without some form of longitudinal inquiry, research may identify potential or failed, rather than realized, charisma. Also, of course, focusing on achieved radical change as the measure of charisma or transformational leadership turns attention away from the leader and followers to include the content of the vision and how it purports to deal with the sense of crisis among potential followers.

Because the new paradigm of leadership lacks a full incorporation of many of Weber’s seminal ideas, it seems to have tamed the whole concept of charisma to make it more common and less extraordinary. The new conceptions and especially the associated methods do not seem designed to capture such ideas as “a magnetism and power of attraction that goes beyond . . . usual experience and knowledge,” or a charismatic mission that is “explosively novel” (Shils, 1965, p. 199) and “gains acceptance because it is aimed at, relevant to, and meaningful for collective definitions of distress, trouble, and agitation arising from perceptions of an emergency or crisis” (Trice & Beyer, 1986, p. 119). Instead, proponents of the new paradigm appear to have defined and measured their concepts in ways designed to make them more ordinary and thus more generalizable to a wide range of business situations.

ROMANTICIZING BUSINESS LEADERS AND THE PURSUIT OF CHANGE

Various scholars have recognized that U.S. culture places more emphasis on personal control of events than some other cultures. For example, Weisz, Rothbaum, and Blackburn (1984) studied childhood socialization practices, religion and philosophy, work values, and the practice of psychotherapy to assess how power and control were regarded in the U.S. and Japan. They found that the U.S. culture emphasizes primary control, according to which “individuals enhance their rewards by influencing external realities” rather than accommodating to them, as is emphasized in Japanese culture. “In U.S. culture, the self is all-important, and enhancing power for self is the preoccupation” (Beyer & Trice, 1988, p. 143).

The whole concept of leadership plays into this preoccupation. If individuals succeed in becoming leaders and in exercising leadership, they have, by definition, influenced the world and persons around them. They have exercised primary control, and can expect to be rewarded more than those who have not succeeded in becoming leaders or in exercising leadership. Under such circumstances, many people will want to and strive to become “leaders”—whatever that means. The astronomical salaries of current CEO’s are ample testimony that their expectations have some realistic basis. The relatively high salaries commanded by fresh MBA’s provide additional evidence that even potential leadership is highly valued in U.S. society. The preoccupation with leadership has popularized the very term and, in the process, made it less meaningful in scientific terms. As Calder (1977, p. 183) rightly observed, to deal with a domain or phenomenon in a scientific way, we need to move away from first-degree constructs based in the “world of everyday thought and experience” toward greater abstractions.

The whole enterprise of management research and teaching is likely to be influenced by the cultural values and beliefs associated with primary control. Leadership is an inference, based either on observation of behaviors that fit expectations about how leaders typically behave (Calder, 1977), or on the presumed consequences of those behaviors (Trice & Beyer, 1991). Those who seek leadership will naturally want to learn which behaviors and consequences lead to inferences of leadership so that they can try to produce them. To satisfy such desires, management research must endorse behaviors and consequences that are achievable and that fit the *zeitgeist* of the times reasonably well.

In the U.S., and perhaps other countries as well, with the current threats and opportunities posed by global and technological hyper-competition, giving managers a chance to feel charismatic or transformational makes them romantic heroes battling against threatening forces. Perhaps more important, it gives them a sense of some degree of personal control over events. To put it bluntly, if charisma or transformational leadership is not too exceptional, many would-be leaders can have a bit of it, and thus feel more confident that they are acting appropriately and can rightly claim credit for any successes. This wishful thinking has been termed the “romance” of leadership, and research in this tradition shows that business students are more willing to credit leadership than other factors for success (Meindl, Ehrlich, & Dukerich, 1985) and will rate the same performance as more successful if it is attributed to leaders than to other factors (Meindl & Ehrlich, 1987).

Romantic conceptions of leadership are also encouraged by the trend in the new leadership paradigm to study top-level rather than middle- or first-level managers as potential leaders (with the exception of Bass, as noted by Bryman, 1996), and for the press to talk about successful top-level managers in heroic terms. Focusing on leadership at the top of organizations is a useful corrective from the emphasis on the lower levels of face-to-face managers in much of the traditional leadership research done in the past.

In our attention to the top of the hierarchy, however, we must guard against losing sight of the possibilities for the exercise of leadership at all different levels in organizations, how these various levels of leadership may differ, and how they interact and affect one another. It seems a romantic oversimplification to describe organizations as if they had only one leader as a source of leadership. As Conger (this issue) points out, hierarchical levels also matter, and need to be more fully incorporated in the new paradigm. The techniques required to reach and influence close and distant followers may differ substantially.

Also, it is possible that leaders may create public performances for their at-a-distance followers that do not match their behaviors with close subordinates, or indeed important aspects of their personalities. U.S. President Bill Clinton has certainly been criticized for this tendency. At a minimum, face-to-face subordinates may observe a wider range of behaviors of prominent leaders than do persons who never observe the same persons except in public, at-a-distance performances (Stephanopoulos, 1999). An additional issue that merits more attention than it has received (Yammarino, 1994) is how the types of leadership occurring simultaneously at various levels of organizations reinforce or undermine each other (Trice & Beyer, 1993).

Likewise important in encouraging the romanticization of leadership is the focus on pursuing change that is evident in the language used in the new paradigm. It is much more dramatic and a stronger claim to personal power to be able to change something than it is to merely keep it going, even if current courses of action are highly successful. While current competitive conditions in many industries make change desirable or necessary, it is not clear that it would be beneficial if all leaders in business at all hierarchical levels were to aim for change all of the time.

Theories of leadership should include the possibility that it also takes leadership to maintain cultures and keep beneficial lines of activity going. For example, Trice and Beyer (1990, 1993) theorized that leaders who maintain cultures are similar in some ways and differ in others from leaders whose leadership produces cultural innovations. They posit that the two types of leaders are similar in many of their behaviors, but differ in terms of some of their personal qualities, their vision and mission, the type of performance they produce, their administrative actions, the ways in which they use cultural forms and other aspects of symbolic leadership, and the ways they frame persistence and continuity. For example, they suggested that, while innovative leaders are self-confident and dominant, maintenance leaders have confidence in followers and possess facilitative skills.

Also, innovative leaders see themselves as evangelists, preaching new ideas, while maintenance leaders serve as catalysts for others' ideas. They also expect the perceived situations and visions to differ for the two types of leadership: innovative leadership is a response to crisis and advances a radical ideology, while maintenance

leadership occurs in situations where there is no perceived crisis or the crisis or problems that are present are seen as manageable. Followers' attributions also differ for these two types of leadership: innovative leaders are seen by followers as possessing extraordinary qualities needed to deal with the perceived crisis while maintenance leaders are seen as representing existing values that were successful in the past.

Trice and Beyer's approach presented other differences between the two types of leaders (see Trice & Beyer, 1993, p. 263), but the above will help to illustrate their basic conception. From the details presented, it becomes clear that many of the elements of the new paradigm of leadership represented in the articles in this issue would not discriminate innovative cultural leadership from leadership that maintains cultures. It seems that by focusing on reported leader qualities and general behaviors, what the researchers following the new paradigm of leadership are studying resembles what Trice and Beyer called cultural leadership. Whether such leadership changes organizations or groups depends on other elements being present.

Unfortunately, basic textbooks in organizational behavior have incorporated general ideas from the new paradigm to assert that dealing with and perhaps inspiring change is what discriminates a leader from a manager. As Hellriegel, Slocum and Woodman (1995, p. 342) put it:

A manager is a person who directs the work of employees and is responsible for results. An effective manager brings a degree of order and consistency to tasks. A leader, by contrast, inspires employees with a vision and helps them cope with change.

Daft and Marcic (1998, pp. 420–21) distinguish between leaders and managers in terms of their sources of power and state that “leadership power promotes vision, creativity and change in organizations.” They present a figure of “Leader versus Manager Qualities” that shows leaders as having “soul” and such personal qualities as visionary, inspiring, innovative, courageous, imaginative, and initiates change, while managers as characterized by “mind” and such qualities as rational, tough-minded, analytical, structured, deliberate, and stabilizing. Although they also take care to point out that individuals can exhibit a combination of leader and manager qualities, their portrait of leaders seems more romantic and appealing than that of managers.

It is noteworthy that most of the approaches to leadership included in the new paradigm have been heavily influenced by Burns' (1978) writing. Every one of the articles in this issue cites his work, but only four of six cite Weber's. Only two of the articles cite Trice and Beyer's (1986) extensive discussion and empirical application of Weber's ideas. It thus seems fair to conclude that Burns' conception of leadership may have been more seminal than Weber's in the development of the new paradigm (Bass, 1993). Although House (1977) based much of his 1976 theory of charisma on Weber's writing, since then the new paradigm has been more attentive to Burns' ideas than to Weber's. The work of Bass and his associates (this issue) on transformational leadership is most closely modeled on Burns' thinking,

but his ideas have also been incorporated into the conceptions of charismatic leadership discussed in this issue.

It seems likely that Burns' writing was persuasive to these researchers because it better fit the psychological paradigm with which they were most comfortable than did Weber's conceptions. The qualities enumerated in Burns' approach and those of the new paradigm, as pointed out before, are also consistent with earlier views of people-oriented leadership, especially those derived from the normative prescriptions associated with the human relations movement. The residues of that movement are most evident in Bass and Stedlmeier's paper in this issue (pp. 181–217), in which they forthrightly argue that there is a spiritual and moral core to "authentic" transformational leadership. Addressing the issue of the variance of values across cultures, they suggest that there are certain universal values and that transformational leadership may involve "forging a platform of common values and stimulating alignment and congruence of interests" and a commitment to the "searching out moral excellence." Given this continuity of what researchers and popular books say are the desirable qualities of leaders, it is conceivable that leaders behave in certain ways because of institutional pressures to do so—they do what they think is expected of them rather than what they think it is most effective (Bryman, 1996).

Such idealistic observations and suggestions do not seem to fit the world we are living in. The period since the end of the Cold War has been marked by ethnic conflicts around the world, as peoples in various societies fight over which set of values will prevail in a geographic region. Although some of these conflicts seem to be receding somewhat in intensity, notably those in the Middle East, South Africa, and Northern Ireland, others are accelerating and generating new armed conflicts, widespread repression of some groups, and even genocide. There seems to be either a great lack of authentic transformational leaders in these societies, or people in these societies are not willing to follow those that are present. It seems unlikely that the ethnic conflicts in these societies do not penetrate their business organizations in one way or another.

Working toward common values and the alignment of interests is an admirable goal, but may not always be possible. Another, perhaps more realistic possibility, is that some leaders may be able to reconcile diverse sets of beliefs and interests sufficiently to persuade people holding them to work toward specific common aims. Such leaders, called consensus (Zaleznik & Kets de Vries, 1975) or integrative leaders (Trice & Beyer, 1993), know how to negotiate and achieve workable compromises. It remains to be seen whether the qualities attributed to transformational leaders are likely to achieve such integration.

Meanwhile, the activities of top-level business leaders are increasingly being framed in war-like terms in the U.S. business press (Hannah & Beyer, 1999). They are described, in an admiring rather than critical tone, as pulling triggers, having killer instincts, defanging competitors, storming into companies, laser-beaming every aspect of the business, hitting targets, adopting battle cries, and as generally ruthless. Some of the other colorful metaphors used to characterize featured CEO's included demon slayer, expert slasher, and Rambo. Similar metaphors about their firms were: a battle of annihilation, guerilla marketing, becoming a juggernaut,

establishing a beachhead, losing a battle, outflanking the giants, shooting across the bow, and many other expressions referring to killing.

A business climate that is seen by business leaders as this conflictual seems a difficult and rather unlikely setting for the kind of leadership envisioned by Bass and Steidlmeier (this issue). If we are going to advise leaders to forge a platform of common values, we must consider what values they will advocate, to whom leaders will make these appeals, and how the target groups and sets of values will be bounded. How transformational is leadership that is successful in uniting and successfully leading a firm in a changing, competitive industry—say Bill Gates of Microsoft—if, in the process, he tries in every way he can to “kill off” the competition? Creating the perception of enemies outside a social group is one of the most effective ways to bind people together, as cult leaders such as the Reverend Jim Jones, and more recently, David Koresh, and political leaders like Hitler and Saddam Hussein have demonstrated. It is true that there are also successful leaders in business, such as Herb Kelleher of Southwest Airlines, who operate in ways that are closer to Burns’ and Bass’s conceptions of transformational leadership. The problem is that both types of leaders seem able to transform their industries and their organizations in important ways. How, then, can we say that one is transformational and the other is pseudo-transformational? At a minimum, the language becomes confusing if observed transformations do not indicate transformational leadership.

One advantage of using the concept of charisma rather than transformational for leadership that brings about change is that the original conceptions of charisma did not necessarily entail behaviors and values that corresponded to one particular value system, such as human relations. The more open-ended content of the charismatic leader’s behavior and vision, however, carries certain liabilities for followers and especially for social systems, including business and other organizations.

THE POTENTIAL DANGERS AND PRACTICAL DRAWBACKS OF CHARISMA

Many of the accounts of the new paradigm of leadership in this issue and elsewhere make charismatic and transformational leadership seem highly desirable. The possible drawbacks of these forms of leadership are sometimes discussed, but not as fully as they need to be. With some unbiased analysis, however, it seems evident that charisma, in particular, poses both dangers and practical drawbacks. The positive virtues of the new forms of leadership need to be balanced with an awareness of possible negative consequences.

The major danger of charisma for business and other organizations with practical aims is that the bases for charisma tend to be emotional, inherently irrational, and thus risky (Trice & Beyer, 1993). The perceptions of crisis or unusual opportunities may be exaggerated, especially if the aspiring leader has played a role in formulating or influencing these perceptions. The egotism of potential leaders (Deluga, 1997) may cause them to want to effect change and thus to see a need for it. Subsequent actions based on inaccurate readings of the situation may be inappropriate and lead to serious failures. In addition, the fears or enthusiasms generated by these perceptions may heighten emotions to the point where normal cautions are dis-

carded and large risks are taken without sufficient attention to possible negative consequences. The radical vision may simply be wrong, but the strong emotions present in the situation and the personal magnetism of the charismatic leader may discourage or prevent the collection of relevant information that would reveal its weaknesses, as happened with the decisions made in connection with the Cuban Bay of Pigs fiasco early in the J.F. Kennedy presidency (Janis, 1972). Finally, persons attracted to the leader and charismatic vision may be acting on the basis of strong personal needs that blind them to the possible downsides of the vision (Galanter, 1982; Lodahl, 1982). Followers thus become vulnerable to manipulation and coercion by the leader (Weierter, 1997).

The new paradigm is rather undecided about what to do with the negative possibilities and with the irrational, emotional character of charisma and perhaps of transformational leadership. Even Conger and Kanungo's attributional model of charisma (Conger, this issue) posits a very rational-sounding set of steps to describe the unfolding of the charismatic process. Bryman (1992) has observed that the depiction of leaders as rational has been typical of the bulk of management research. The framing of these theories of leadership in rational terms is reassuring to business persons and makes them more attractive and credible within the cultures of business education and practice.

To deal with the dark side of charisma, Howell and House (1992) drew a distinction between personalized and socialized charisma (Howell, 1988). They described the personalized leader as self-aggrandizing, exploitative, and authoritarian and the socialized leader as altruistic, collectively oriented, and egalitarian. Theories in the new paradigm, however, have not incorporated this distinction. Consistent with the prevailing tendencies in research on the new paradigm, the Howell and House distinction rests in a combination of qualities and behaviors of the leader; it suggests, for example, that authoritarian leaders cannot also be charismatic or altruistic and collectively oriented. It thus fails to fit cases like Lee Kuan Yew (George, 1975), the autocratic, charismatic leader who brought Singapore from a poor, backward, politically unstable area after World War II to a socially progressive, wealthy, modern metropolis that many consider a model of what "a brilliant imperious" leader can accomplish for the benefit of all of the citizenry (Liu, 1985, p. 40; McCord, 1985). Critics see Lee's government as arrogant, over-centralized, and interfering in people's personal lives (Dr. Toh Chin Chye, as quoted in McCord, 1985). But many potential followers in some cultures may expect their leaders to be authoritarian (Williams, Whyte, & Green, 1965; Hofstede, 1980).

Another reason that charisma is dangerous to business organizations, in particular, is that its results are always somewhat unpredictable. The results achieved may not be what stockholders or members of the Board of Directors want. The charismatic leader and vision are unlikely to be easily controlled by other authorities. Also, such leaders may be sensitive to problems that can be portrayed as crises to justify change, but stimulating perceptions of crisis in followers is risky unless leaders have sure-fire solutions. If visions for solutions to the crisis do not work, the leader will lose the confidence of followers and the organization may be worse off than if the change were not attempted.

There are several other reasons to be skeptical about whether business and other

organizations with practical objectives provide a conducive setting for charisma to develop and to persist. The most basic reason is that genuine charisma is relatively rare. The presence of one or more of the elements of charisma may be relatively common, but the coming together of all of them is not.³ Particularly in business organizations facing rapidly changing environments, which is exactly where charisma might be considered most beneficial, one or more of the essential elements may disappear or change sufficiently over time to weaken or destroy charisma. In particular, it is very difficult to sustain high levels of success in highly competitive or changing environments. Steve Jobs provides an example of a business leader who was able to achieve charisma early in the life of the organization he founded. He framed his vision as both a response to the crisis of an adequate lack of communication and as an opportunity to change education (Beyer & Trice, 1987). But when Apple became less successful, Jobs was replaced by a more rational leader, John Scully, and Job's powers were gradually dissolved by a prolonged rite of degradation, in which his office was first moved across the street and he was then forced out of the firm he had founded. Although he founded another organization, Next, and took some of his followers with him, and although Apple has recently called him back as interim CEO, the charisma with which he was associated has never been fully restored.

Another reason that charisma is not easy to achieve or maintain is that the extraordinary gifts and exceptional qualities of a leader, although recognized, may fail to ignite change without the perceptions of crisis (Roberts & Bradley, 1988). Lee Iacocca was a magnetic and influential leader at Ford, but was prevented from realizing large-scale change by Henry Ford, Jr. and the lack of any evident crisis. It was only when he moved to Chrysler, then in a deep crisis, that he became a charismatic leader who successfully promoted such radical changes as borrowing money from the U.S. government and putting a representative of the union of the Board of Directors (Trice & Beyer, 1993). His charisma did not last very long, however, even though Chrysler survived, paid back its loan to the government early, and began to prosper. One possible explanation for the abbreviation of his charisma is provided by Trice and Beyer's (1986) study of the founder of NCA. Although she had exceptional personal qualities and the other elements of charisma were present, her charisma was tarnished over time by her involvement in day-to-day administration and the mundane details of management.

It seems likely that involvement with the mundane is antithetical to preserving an aura of extraordinary powers and exceptionalness. Most top executives in business may be drawn to or unable to avoid the details of managing. Also, in the process of performing their more rational, bureaucratic duties they may have to make decisions that displease followers or seem inconsistent with their vision and the exceptional qualities that have been attributed to them.

Other reasons that charisma may fail to be realized or sustained in business organizations are that (1) all visions are not successful—some may be foolish or bad ideas (Musser, 1986)—and (2) that followers may be willing but unable to realize success is pursuing the vision for reasons beyond their control. Business organizations present particular threats to charisma in both of these ways for a host of reasons: for example, general economic conditions can change, new competitors

can emerge, laws can impose new requirements, and consumer preferences may shift. Also, the vision may simply be too difficult to achieve in a reasonable business horizon with the skills and training available to followers. No matter what the reasons, unless the vision is eventually validated by what is seen as repeated success, followers will grow discouraged and cease to believe in it. In the process their attributions of charisma to the leader and the vision will fade away.

Finally, because it involves the coming together of various factors that are likely to be temporary, charisma itself is a transient phenomenon. Unless charismatic leaders stay in place for a relatively long period of time, their visions may not be fully realized and are unlikely to be routinized. Without considerable effort being devoted to the routinization (Trice & Beyer, 1986) or institutionalization (Robinson, 1988) of charisma, it will not effect lasting change. Also, in social movements, charisma often lasts only as long as the life of the charismatic leader because a suitable successor to the charismatic leader is not available or because the successor to the charismatic leader who is chosen does not represent the same values or have the same vision. The civil rights movement lost much of its force with the assassination of Martin Luther King. In business organizations, the tendency to require senior executives to retire at specified ages may remove a charismatic leader without a suitable replacement. CEO's vary widely in how well they plan for their own succession (Sonnenfeld, 1988).

The long tenure of Herb Kelleher at Southwest Airlines has clearly allowed his charisma to be routinized, but many top executives serve for terms of 3–5 years. When leadership at the top is changing so frequently, and followers know it will change, they are unlikely to invest as much emotionally in pursuing or routinizing their leaders' visions. This problem exists throughout many organizations because other executives and managers tend to be moved around from one position to another. Several authors interpret Weber as arguing that routinization attenuates charisma by dispersing it through administrative mechanisms and through those lieutenants who are interposed between the leader and mass of followers (Masden & Snow, 1983). Such concerns seem less relevant when the leader continues to speak directly to and have direct contact with followers, as Herb Kelleher has done. Trice and Beyer (1986) suggest that a key criterion for whether routinization has occurred is whether the organization or group continues to pursue the radical vision. Southwest Airlines has continued many of its unique practices and Kelleher's radical vision of how to serve customers and treat employees through times of substantial growth and phenomenal success.

CONCLUSIONS

Twenty-two years have passed since House's 1976 theory of charismatic leadership was published—fifty two, since a translation of Weber's seminal writings on charisma became widely available in the U.S. Scholars studying leadership apparently feel that they have learned a great deal about leadership over these years (House & Aditya, 1997; Conger, this issue). As Hunt (this issue) points out, other organizational and management scholars are not so sure. Hunt is optimistic, however, that the shift to

the “new leadership” paradigm substantially expanded the field of study and has both revitalized the research of established scholars and attracted bright new ones.

Being an outsider to this paradigm, I share the uncertainty of many other scholars who do not yet see a clear pattern of explanations or findings in the many sets of theories and empirical results that are accumulating in this new tradition. It seems as if each new article I read sets forth a new set of possible moderating variables or a new twist on the definition of this new form of leadership. As a result, the study of leadership never gets beyond Stage two in the Reichers/Schneider framework (1990) to some sort of consolidation. Perhaps this sort of slow and back-sliding development is inevitable or normal in our field of science, but I wonder. Perhaps changing *the way* we study leadership would yield more progress in less time. It is possible that the phenomenon of leadership is too situation-specific to yield the kinds of generalizations that researchers are seeking.

Leadership researchers have approached the study of charisma and transformational leadership with the aim of better understanding *leadership* and predicting its results. Their methods and general approach have been largely drawn from the psychological paradigm. The generalizability valued by the psychological paradigm has discouraged researchers in the new paradigm from attending to matters that cannot be measured with quantitative data from instruments that can be used across many settings. Thus, they have largely ignored the *unique* circumstances that are crucial in each instance of the emergence of charisma: the nature and severity of the particular threat, the content of the radical vision and how it deals with that threat, and the magnitude and persistence of particular changes that are accomplished through charisma. In his 1998 book, *Three Seductive Ideas*, Jerome Kagan “speaks out against psychological abstractions” and the search for law-like, general causes of behavior. He suggests that if researchers observe behavior, specify the context, and pay attention to local cultural and historical meanings, they will be less tempted to make “unwarranted claims about abstract traits or universal psychological processes” (Shweder, 1999, p. 798).

From my reading of recent publications addressing the new paradigm, it seems as if more attention is now being paid to the situation in which leadership occurs than was true at earlier stages of research. It seems, however, that the likely role of the situation in the process of leadership is still being underplayed in many studies and models in the sense that it is not treated as a possible causal factor. There is, rather, convergence among the authors working within the paradigm that the best way to think about and define leadership is as a *relationship* between a leader and some followers—with the setting or situation acting as a modifier of that relationship. There is, of course, no verifiably right or wrong way to define a concept. But there are better and worse ways, in the sense that some definitions turn out to be more useful than others.

If we adopt usefulness as a criterion for the worth of a concept or definition, we must then consider for whom it is useful. There are two main sets of candidates: potential users in the practitioner community and those in the scientific community. Adopting definitions that are generalizable enough to apply in many settings and situations may make our research appear to have wider applicability and thus more usefulness in the practitioner community—including for our applied students. Such

definitions also lend themselves to methods that allow relatively easy collection of data across many settings. The question is whether such definitions are equally useful in the scientific community, especially if they do not go very far beyond the way practitioners think and talk about a phenomenon.

A possible scientific criterion for the usefulness of a definition is whether it encompasses all of the distinctive features of the phenomenon we are seeking to understand. Such definitions, it could also be argued, are also more practically useful than those that may miss some parts of the phenomenon. Incomplete theories and ideas can be misleading, and often are unconvincing to those practitioners immersed in the phenomenon itself. How then do we learn how to think and do research in more encompassing ways? My recommendation is not a new one—it is to do more observing, asking, and examining of the artifacts over a substantial period of time before developing our theories and models. Calls for qualitative and multi-method research have already been issued by followers of the new paradigm, and good exemplars of such research exist. I hope that the calls will be answered with greater frequency in the future, and that those working in the field will try to learn from and build on one another's observations. This will not be easy, because detailed, rich, qualitative observations tend to turn up many specifics that vary from one setting to another. Such studies will therefore, rather paradoxically, call for greater rather than less abstraction before their results can be compared and made cumulative. They will also tend to expose the difficulties of looking at variables as discrete from one another. For example, are the qualities of a leader separable in the followers' eyes from the vision he or she espouses and symbolizes with behavior (Willner, 1984)?

Throughout this commentary I have often used the term *charisma* rather than *charismatic leadership*. The reason I do this is because I want to define *charisma* as a social process and emergent social structure that encompasses more than the leadership process. In particular, I believe that the 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. Charismatic visions usually incorporate radical means to radical ends. For example, Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King advocated nonviolence as a means to fight British rule and racial discrimination. Thus, to evaluate the realization of potential *charisma* requires assessing whether the means espoused by the leader are adopted and enacted by the followers. In addition, to evaluate the outcomes of *charisma* requires assessing both the degree to which the espoused, radical means were actually implemented (Beyer & Trice, 1978) and whether the desired changes were attained and persisted for some period of time. Without this kind of detail, *charisma* is tamed into just another form of leadership and much of the distinctiveness of the construct and the phenomenon is lost.

Researchers in the new paradigm can respond to such criticisms by continuing to incrementally build these complications into their existing models and methods. I'm not sure that such an approach will succeed. I hope that more of the researchers studying the so-called new paradigm of leadership will take the plunge and spend more time observing their phenomenon for the insights and complications that such observation can yield. That would really be a departure from the traditions of this

area of study—a departure that I hope to encourage. Meanwhile, I congratulate those who have already moved beyond the shore and stepped into unknown waters by carrying out qualitative studies.

Acknowledgments: Many thanks to James G. Hunt for his kind support and encouragement of an outsider.

NOTES

1. Although a more recent laboratory study (Pillai & Meindl, 1998) found a negative relationship between perceptions of “crisis” and the emergence of charisma, the authors of this study point out a variety of reasons why they may have obtained this unexpected result. It should be noted that their measure of crisis was rather weak and seemed to measure uncertainty rather than the threat present in a crisis.
2. An exception is Weieter (1997), who discussed the charismatic message as consisting of beliefs, values, and moral justifications.
3. Using a somewhat different set of arguments, Klein and House (1998, p. 18) acknowledge that “true, group-level charisma is a rare event in organizations and likely to remain so.” They suggest that “charisma rages” . . . “when leader, followers, and environmental characteristics foster both charisma and homogeneity.”

REFERENCES

- Alcoholics Anonymous World Services (1953). *Twelve steps and twelve traditions*. New York: Alcoholics Anonymous Publishing.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1993). A seminal shift: The impact of James Burns' *Leadership*. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 4, 375–377.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Introduction. In B. M. Bass & B. J. Avolio (Eds.), *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership* (pp. 1–9). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Beyer, J. M., & Trice, H. M. (1978). *Implementing change*. New York: The Free Press.
- Beyer, J. M., & Trice, H. M. (1987). How an organization's rites reveal its culture. *Organizational Dynamics*, (Spring), 5–24.
- Beyer, J. M., & Trice, H. M. (1988). The communication of power relations in organizations through cultural rites. In M. O. Jones, M. D. Moore, & R. C. Snyder (Eds.), *Inside organizations: Understanding the human dimension* (pp. 141–157). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. London: Sage Publications.
- Bryman, A. (1996). Leadership in organizations. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. R. Nord, *Handbook of Organization Studies* (pp. 276–292). London: Sage Publications.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Calder, B. J. (1977). An attribution theory of leadership. In B. M. Staw & G. R. Salancik (Eds.), *New directions in organizational behavior* (pp. 179–204). Chicago, Ill: St. Clair Press.
- Clark, B. R. (1970). *The distinctive college: Antioch, Reed, and Swarthmore*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Cohen, J. (1999). The march of paradigms. *Science*, 283, 1,998–1,999.
- Conger, J. A. (1998). Qualitative research as the cornerstone methodology for understanding leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 9, 107–121.

- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). Conclusion: Patterns and trends in studying charismatic leadership. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 324–336). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Daft, R. L., & Marcic, D. (1998). *Understanding Management* (2nd ed.). Fort Worth: The Dryden Press, Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Deluga, R. J. (1997). Relationship among American Presidential charismatic leadership, narcissism, and rated performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8, 49–65.
- Ehrlich, S. B., Meindl, J. R., & Viellieu, B. (1990). The charismatic appeal of a transformational leader: An empirical case study of a small, high-technology contractor. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 229–248.
- Galanter, M. (1982). Charismatic religious sects and psychiatry: An overview. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 139, 1,539–1,548.
- Gardner, W. L., & Avolio, B. J. (1998). The charismatic relationship: A dramaturgical perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 32–58.
- George, T. J. S. (1973). *Lee Kuan's Yew's Singapore*. London: André Deutsch Limited.
- Hannah, D. R., & Beyer, J.M. (1999). From “prophets” to “mercenaries”: A comparison of 1978 portrayals of leaders in the American business press with 1998 portrayals. Paper presented at the Academy of Management meetings, Chicago, Ill.
- Hellriegel, D., Slocum, J. W., Jr., & Woodman, R. W. (1995). *Organizational behavior* (7th ed.). Minneapolis/St. Paul: West Publishing.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1988). *Management of organizational behavior* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge* (pp. 189–207). Carbondale, Ill: Southern Illinois University Press.
- House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23, 409–473.
- House, R. J., & Mitchell, T. R. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership. *Journal of Contemporary Business*, 3, 81–97.
- House, R. J., Spangler, W. D., & Woycke, J. (1991). Personality and charisma in the U.S. Presidency: A psychological theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 364–396.
- Howell, J. M. (1988). Two faces of charisma: Socialized and personalized leadership in organizations. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 213–236). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Howell, J. M., & House, R. J. (1992). *Socialized and personalized charisma: An essay on the bright and dark sides of leadership*. Unpublished manuscript, School of Business Administration, The University of Western Ontario.
- Hunt, J. G. (1991). *Leadership: A new synthesis*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Janis, I. (1972). *Victims of group think: A study of foreign policy decisions and fiascoes*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Klein, K. J., & House, R. J. (1998). On fire: Charismatic leadership and levels of analysis. In F. Dansereau & F. J. Yammarino (Eds.), *Leadership: The multiple-level approaches* (pp. 3–52). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1964). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Kunda, G. (1992). *Engineering culture: Control and commitment in a high technology organization*. Philadelphia, Temple University Press.
- Liu, M. (1985). His brave new world. *Newsweek* (February 4) 40.
- Lodahl, A. (1982). *Crisis in values and the success of the Unification Church*. Unpublished honors thesis, Department of Sociology, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.
- Lodahl, J. B., & Gordon, G. (1972). The structure of scientific fields and the functioning of university graduate departments. *American Sociological Review*, 37, 57–72.
- Lord, R. D., & Maher, K. J. (1991). *Leadership and information processing: Linking perception and performance*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- Lowe, K. B., Kroek, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 385–425.
- Masden, D., & Snow, P. G. (1983). The dispersion of charisma. *Comparative Political Studies*, 16, 337–362.
- McCord, W., & McCord, A. (1985). Singapore's success story. *American Labor Conference on International Affairs: The New Leader*, 68, 8.
- Meindl, J. R., & Ehrlich, S. B. (1987). The romance of leadership and the evaluation of organizational performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 30, 91–109.
- Meindl, J. R., Ehrlich, S. B., & Dukerich, J. M. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30, 78–102.
- Musser, S. J. (1986). *The determination of positive and negative charismatic leadership*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management meetings, Chicago.
- Nadler, D. A., & Tushman, M. L. (1990). Beyond the charismatic leader: Leadership and organizational change. *California Management Review*, 32, (Winter), 77–97.
- Parry, K. W. (1998). Grounded theory and social process: A new direction for leadership research. *Leadership Quarterly*, 9, 85–105.
- Pillai, R. (1996). Crisis and the emergence of charismatic leadership in groups: An experimental investigation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 26, 543–562.
- Pillai, R., & Meindl, J. R. (1991). The effect of crisis on the emergence of charismatic leadership: A laboratory study. *Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings*, 235–239.
- Pillai, R., & Meindl, J. R. (1998). Context and charisma: A “meso” level examination of the relationship of organic structure, collectivism, and crisis to charismatic leadership. *Journal of Management*, 24, 643–671.
- Ranson, S., Hinings, B., & Greenwood, R. (1980). The structuring of organizational structures. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25, 1–17.
- Roberts, N., & Bradley, R. T. (1988). Limits of charisma. In J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo et al. (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 253–275). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Robinson, J. C. (1988). Mao after death: Charisma and political legitimacy. *Asian Survey*, 28, 353–368.
- Scott, W. R. (1981). *Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Shweder, R. A. (1999). Humans really are different. In Books: Psychology. *Science*, 283 (5 February), 798–799.
- Shils, E. (1965). Charisma, order, and status. *American Sociological Review*, 30, 199–213.
- Sonnenfeld, J. (1988). *The hero's farewell: What happens when CEOs retire*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stephanopoulos, G. (1999). *All too human: A political education*. New York, NY: Little, Brown.

- Trice, H. M., & Beyer, J. M. (1986). Charisma and its routinization in two social movement organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 8, 113–164.
- Trice, H. M., & Beyer, J. M. (1991). Cultural leadership in organizations. *Organization Science*, 2, 149–169.
- Trice, H. M., & Beyer, J. M. (1993). *The cultures of work organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Waldman, D. A., & Yammarino, F. J. (1999). CEO charismatic leadership: Levels-of-management and levels-of-analysis effects. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 266–285.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization* (A.M. Henderson & T. Parsons, Eds. and Trans.). Glencoe: Ill: The Free Press.
- Weierter, S. J. M. (1997). Who wants to play “follow the leader?” A theory of charismatic relationships based on routinized charisma and follower characteristics. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8, 171–193.
- Weisz, J. R., Rothbaum, F. M., & Blackburn, T. C. (1984). Standing out and standing in: The psychology of control in American and Japan. *American Psychologist*, 39(September), 955–967.
- Williams, L. K., Whyte, W. F., & Green, C. S. (1965). Do cultural attitudes affect workers’ attitudes? *Industrial Relations*, 5, 105–117.
- Willner, A. R. (1984). *The spell-binders: Charismatic political leadership*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Yagil, D. (1998). Charismatic leadership and organizational hierarchy: Attribution of charisma to close and distant leaders. *Leadership Quarterly*, 9, 161–176.
- Yammarino, F. J. (1994). Indirect leadership: Transformational leadership at a distance. In B. M. Bass & B. J. Avolio (Eds.), *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership* (pp. 26–47). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Yukl, G. (1994). *Leadership in organizations* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Zaleznick, A., & Kets de Vries, M. R.. (1975). *Power and the corporate mind*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.