

• *Academy of Management Review*, 1987, Vol. 12, No. 4, 637-647.

Toward a Behavioral Theory of Charismatic Leadership in Organizational Settings

JAY A. CONGER
RABINDRA N. KANUNGO
McGill University

Charismatic leadership has been largely overlooked by organizational theorists. In part, the problem can be attributed to the lack of a systematic conceptual framework. Drawing from political science, sociology, and social psychology, this paper addresses the problem by proposing a model linking organizational contexts to charismatic leadership. A series of research hypotheses is offered.

The term *charisma* often is used in political science and sociology to describe a subset of leaders who "by the force of their personal abilities are capable of having profound and extraordinary effects on followers" (House & Baetz, 1979, p. 399). Followers perceive the charismatic leader as one who possesses superhuman qualities and accept unconditionally the leader's mission and directives for action (Willner, 1984). These leaders represent revolutionary social forces, and they are responsible for significant societal transformations (House & Baetz, 1979).

Certain writers contend that charismatic leaders can be found in business firms and other complex formal organizations (Bass, 1985; Berlew, 1974; Berger, 1963; Conger, 1985; Dow, 1969; Etzioni, 1961; House, 1977; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Oberg, 1972; Runciman, 1963; Shils, 1965; Zaleznik & Kets de Vries, 1975). Yet while examples of charismatic business leaders such as John DeLorean and Lee Iacocca are well-documented in the press and popular journals (Baker, 1983; Nicholson, 1983; Wright, 1979), they have received little attention as a subject of serious study. For example, only 12 of 5,000 citations reported in Bass' revision of *Stodgill's Handbook of Leadership* (1981) deal with charismatic leadership.

Several reasons are possible for the topic's conspicuous absence from the research literature. First, researchers have shied away from studying charismatic leadership because of its elusive nature and the mystical connotation of the term. Second, without a systematic conceptual framework, researchers often have found it difficult to define and operationalize charisma and to identify the variables that influence its development (Willner, 1984). Third, it is difficult to obtain access to charismatic business leaders.

This paper addresses the second of these problems, and by doing so, alleviates the first. It presents a model linking organizational contexts to charismatic leadership drawing upon research and theory from political science, sociology, social psychology, and existing theories of organizational leadership.

The Literature

Charisma is a Greek word meaning gift. It is used in two letters of St. Paul—Romans, Chapter 12 and 1 Corinthians, Chapter 12—in the Christian Bible to describe the Holy Spirit. Prophecy, ruling, teaching, ministry, wisdom, and healing are among the charismatic gifts de-

scribed. However, over time the word also came to signify the basis of ecclesiastical organization for the Church itself. The various roles played by members of the Church were determined by gifts of God, rather than by a set of rules or procedures designed by man.

Influenced by this use of charisma to describe a basis for legitimacy, the sociologist Max Weber expanded the concept to include any authority that derives its legitimacy not from rules, positions, or traditions, but from a "devotion to the specific and exceptional sanctity, heroism, or exemplary character of an individual person, and of the normative patterns or order revealed or ordained by him" (Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 46). In addition, Weber ascribed a revolutionary and counternormative quality to charismatic authority: "its attitude is revolutionary and transvalues everything; it makes a sovereign break with all traditional and rational norms" (Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 24).

Weber's conceptualization of charismatic authority, however, is limited by its lack of specificity. For example, he used only generalities to describe a leader's qualities: "[they] comprise especially magical abilities, revelations of heroism, power of the mind and speech" (Etzioni, 1961, p. 12). He identified few behavioral dimensions that might distinguish these individuals from other leaders. Although he described charisma as "a certain quality of an individual personality," he also appears to acknowledge a relational basis for charisma: "It is recognition on the part of those subject to authority which is decisive for the validity of charisma" (Weber, 1947, p. 359).

Political scientists and sociologists have spent several decades examining the phenomenon. Although several have identified specific charismatic attributes such as a transcendent vision and/or ideology (Blau, 1963; Dow, 1969; Marcus, 1961; Willner, 1984), acts of heroism (Willner, 1984), an ability to inspire and build confidence (Dow, 1969; Friedrich, 1961; Marcus, 1961; Willner, 1984), the expression of revolutionary and often "hazardous" ideals (Berger, 1963; Dow, 1969; Friedland, 1961; Marcus, 1961), rhetorical

ability (Willner, 1984), and a "powerful aura" (Willner, 1984), much of their work centered on determining the locus of charismatic leadership.

Some (Blau, 1963; Chinoy, 1961; Friedland, 1964; Wolpe, 1968) argued that social and historical contexts were the critical elements in the emergence of charismatic leadership, whereas others (Dow, 1969; Marcus, 1961; Willner, 1984) argued that attributes and relational dynamics between leaders and followers were responsible for the emergence of charisma:

it involves a distinct social relationship between the leader and follower, in which the leader presents a revolutionary idea, a transcendent image or ideal which goes beyond the immediate . . . or the reasonable; while the follower accepts this course of action not because of its rational likelihood of success . . . but because of an effective belief in the extraordinary qualities of the leader (Dow, 1969, p. 315).

From in-depth case studies, Willner (1984) concluded that charismatic leadership was neither personality-based nor contextually-determined, but rather the phenomenon was largely relational and perceptual: "It is not what the leader is but what people see the leader as that counts in generating the charismatic relationship" (Willner, 1984, p. 14). Dow (1969) and Willner (1984) found that variations in individual personalities were too great to discern a single charismatic personality type and that the existence of a crisis—previously argued to be necessary for the emergence of charismatic leadership (Chinoy, 1961; Devereux, 1955; Downtown, 1973; Hummel, 1975; Schiffer, 1973)—was "neither a necessary nor a sufficient cause" (Willner, 1984, p. 60).

Among organizational theorists, the topic of charismatic leadership was largely overlooked. Only a handful of theories of charismatic leadership in organizational or business settings have been proposed (Bass, 1985; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Berlew, 1974; Conger, 1985; Etzioni, 1961; House, 1977; House & Baetz, 1979; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Zaleznik, 1977; Zaleznik & Kets de Vries, 1975). Generally these efforts have been conceptually less sophisticated than their counterparts in political science.

In addition to theoretical works, empirical studies of charismatic (and/or transformational) leadership have been reported by Avolio and Bass (1985), Bass (1985), Conger (1985), House (1985), Howell (1985), Smith (1982), Waldman, Bass, and Einstein (1985), and Yukl and Van Fleet (1982). These studies emphasized the behavioral and psychological attributes of charismatic leadership. Certain personal attributes of charismatic leaders that are identified consistently throughout this literature include vision or appealing ideological goals (Bass, 1985; Berlew, 1974; Conger, 1985; Katz & Kahn, 1978; House, 1977; Zaleznik & Kets de Vries, 1975), behavior that instills confidence (Bass, 1985; Berlew, 1974; House, 1977), an ability to inspire and/or create inspirational activities (Bass, 1985; Berlew, 1974; Conger, 1985; Zaleznik & Kets de Vries, 1975), self-confidence (Bass, 1985; House, 1977; Zaleznik & Kets de Vries, 1975), dominance (House, 1977; Zaleznik & Kets de Vries, 1975), a need for influence (House, 1977), rhetorical or articulation ability (Conger, 1985), and unconventional and/or counternormative behavior (Conger, 1985; Martin & Siehl, 1983).

In addition, House and Baetz (1979, p. 399) postulated a set of behavioral dimensions that distinguished the followers of charismatic leaders from others. These characteristics include an unquestioning acceptance of the leader by followers, followers' trust in the leader's beliefs, affection for the leader, willing obedience to the leader, emulation of and identification with the leader, similarity of followers' beliefs to those of the leader, emotional involvement of followers in the mission, heightened goals of the followers, and feelings on the part of the followers that they are able to accomplish or contribute to the leader's mission.

Unlike the political science and sociological literature, there appears to be little disagreement over the locus of charismatic leadership; a relational basis for charismatic leadership is widely accepted (Bass, 1985; Berlew, 1974; Conger, 1985; House, 1977; House & Baetz, 1979; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Zaleznik & Kets de Vries, 1975). It is be-

lieved that charisma per se is not found solely in the leader and his/her personal qualities but rather is found in the interplay between the leader's attributes and the needs, beliefs, values, and perceptions of his/her followers. Both Katz and Kahn (1978) and House and Baetz (1979) further contended that both the leader and his/her followers must share basic beliefs and values in order to validate the leader's charisma.

Unfortunately, a more unified conceptual framework for understanding the behavioral dimensions of the phenomenon has yet to be presented by organizational theorists. Instead, the literature provides a set of overlapping attributes that identify pieces of the puzzle but lack a structure to explain their relationships. Equally important, there is little or no empirical evidence to support conclusions.

A Behavioral Framework for Studying Charisma

If a deeper understanding of charismatic leadership within organizations is to be obtained, it is important to strip the aura of mysticism from charisma and to deal with it strictly as a behavioral process. Charismatic leadership, like any other form of leadership, should be considered to be an observable behavioral process that can be described and analyzed in terms of a formal model.

The model presented here builds on the idea that charisma is an attributional phenomenon. When members of a group work together to attain group objectives, observations of the influence process within the group help them determine their status. One who exerts maximum influence over other members is perceived as a leader. This role is consensually validated when followers recognize and identify the leader on the basis of interaction with him or her. Charismatic leadership is no exception to this process. Like other kinds of leadership, charisma must be viewed as an attribution made by followers who observe certain behaviors on the part of the leader within organizational contexts. The roles

played by a person not only make the person, in the eyes of the followers, a task leader or a social leader, but they also make him or her a charismatic leader or a noncharismatic leader. The leader's observed behavior within the organization can be interpreted by his/her followers as expressions of charismatic qualities. Such dispositional attributes are inferred from the leader's observed behavior in the same way that many personal styles of leadership have been observed previously (Blake & Mouton, 1964; Fiedler, 1967; Hersey & Blanchard, 1977; House, 1971). In this sense, charisma can be considered to be an additional inferred dimension of leadership behavior. As such, it is not an attribution made about an individual because of his or her rank in the organization, but rather it is an attribution made because of the behavior he or she exhibits. Charismatic disposition or leadership style should be subjected to the same empirical and behavioral analysis as participative, task, or people dimensions of leadership have been subjected to in the past.

Behavioral Components of Charisma

If the follower's attribution of charisma depends on observed behavior of the leader, then what are the behavioral components responsible for such attributions? Can these attributions be identified and operationalized in order to develop charismatic qualities among organizational leaders? Table 1 includes a hypothesized description of what the present authors believe to be the essential and distinguishable behavioral components of charismatic leadership.

It is assumed that these components are interrelated and that they differ in presence and intensity among charismatic leaders. These ideas are represented in the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1: The behavioral components of charismatic leadership are interrelated, and as such they form a constellation of components.

Although all leadership roles involve charting a clear path for group members to achieve a common goal, attribution of charisma to leaders

is believed to depend on four variables: (a) the degree of discrepancy between the status quo and the future goal or vision advocated by the leader, (b) the use of innovative and unconventional means for achieving the desired change, (c) a realistic assessment of environmental resources and constraints for bringing about such change, and (d) the nature of articulation and impression management employed to inspire subordinates in the pursuit of the vision. The role of these variables in the development of charisma is discussed below.

Charisma and the Future Vision. Many theorists see vision as a component of charismatic leadership (Bass, 1985; Berlew, 1974; Blau, 1963; Conger, 1985; Dow, 1969; Katz & Kahn, 1978; House, 1977; Marcus, 1961; Willner, 1984; Zaleznik & Kets de Vries, 1975). Here the word *vision* refers to some idealized goal that the leader wants the organization to achieve in the future. In this paper, it is hypothesized that the nature, formulation, articulation, and means of achieving this goal can be distinguished from those advocated by other kinds of leaders.

The more idealized or utopian the goal advocated by the leader, the more discrepant it is relative to the status quo. And, the greater the discrepancy of the goal from the status quo, the more likely followers will attribute extraordinary vision to the leader. By presenting an idealized goal to followers, a leader provides a challenge and a motivating force for change. The literature on change in attitude suggests that a maximum discrepant position within the latitude of acceptance puts the greatest amount of pressure on the followers to change their attitudes (Hovland & Pritzker, 1957; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). Since the idealized goal represents a perspective shared by the followers and promises to meet their hopes and aspirations, it tends to be within the latitude of acceptance in spite of the extreme discrepancy. A leader becomes charismatic when he/she succeeds in changing his/her followers' attitudes to accept the advocated vision. In religion, charisma stems from prophecy; in organizations, charisma stems from advocacy for

Table 1
Behavioral Components of Charismatic and Noncharismatic Leaders.

	Noncharismatic Leader	Charismatic Leader
<i>Relation to Status quo</i>	Essentially agrees with status quo and strives to maintain it	Essentially opposed to status quo and strives to change it
<i>Future Goal</i>	Goal not too discrepant from status quo	Idealized vision which is highly discrepant from status quo
<i>Likableness</i>	Shared perspective makes him/her likable	Shared perspective and idealized vision makes him/her a likable and honorable hero worthy of identification and imitation
<i>Trustworthiness</i>	Disinterested advocacy in persuasion attempts	Disinterested advocacy by incurring great personal risk and cost
<i>Expertise</i>	Expert in using available means to achieve goals within the framework of the existing order	Expert in using unconventional means to transcend the existing order
<i>Behavior</i>	Conventional, conforming to existing norms	Unconventional or counternormative
<i>Environmental Sensitivity</i>	Low need for environmental sensitivity to maintain status quo	High need for environmental sensitivity for changing the status quo
<i>Articulation</i>	Weak articulation of goals and motivation to lead	Strong articulation of future vision and motivation to lead
<i>Power Base</i>	Position power and personal power (based on reward, expertise, and liking for a friend who is a similiar other)	Personal power (based on expertise, respect, and admiration for a unique hero)
<i>Leader-Follower Relationship</i>	Egalitarian, consensus seeking, or directive Nudges or orders people to share his/her views	Elitist, entrepreneur, and exemplary Transforms people to share the radical changes advocated

the future. Failure of either prophecy or advocacy may change the attribution from charisma to madness.

What attributes of charismatic leaders make them successful advocates of their discrepant vision? Research on persuasive communication suggests that in order to be a successful advocate, one needs to be a credible communicator. A leader's credibility could result from projecting an image of being likable, trustworthy, and knowledgeable (Hovland, Janis, & Kelley, 1953; Sears, Freedman, & Peplau, 1985).

It is the shared perspective of the charismatic leader's idealized vision and its potential for satisfying followers' needs that makes the leader likable. Both the perceived similarity between followers and their leader and the perceived potential of the leader to satisfy followers' needs form the basis of their interpersonal attraction (Byrne, 1977; Rubin, 1973). Through this idealized (and therefore discrepant) version of their vision, followers respect their leader and find him or her worthy of identifying with and imitating. Charismatic leaders are not just similar others who are generally liked (as one would find with popular, consensus-seeking leaders), but they are also holders of an idealized vision. Thus, the following hypothesis is advanced.

Hypothesis 2: Leaders are charismatic when their vision is highly discrepant from the status quo yet remains within a latitude of acceptance for their followers.

It is important for leaders to be trusted. Generally leaders are trusted when they advocate their position in a disinterested manner and demonstrate a concern for followers' needs rather than their own self-interest (Walster, Aronson, & Abrahams, 1966). However, charismatic leaders make these qualities appear extraordinary. They transform their concern for followers' needs into total dedication and commitment to the common cause they share with followers in a disinterested and selfless manner. They engage in exemplary acts that followers perceive as involving great personal risk, cost, and energy (Friedland, 1964). These personal risks might include:

possible loss of finances or career success; the withdrawal of organizational resources; the potential for being fired or demoted; and the loss of formal or informal status, power, authority, and credibility. Lee Iacocca's reduction of his salary to one dollar during his first year at Chrysler (Iacocca & Novak, 1984) and John DeLorean's confrontations with senior management at GM (Martin & Siehl, 1983) are examples of personal risk. The higher the personal cost or sacrifice for the common good, the greater is the trustworthiness of leaders. The more leaders demonstrate that they are prepared to take high personal risks or incur high personal costs for achieving the shared vision, the more they are charismatic in the sense of being worthy of complete trust. This leads to the next hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3: Charismatic leaders may take on high personal risks, incur high costs, and engage in self-sacrifice to achieve a shared vision.

Finally, charismatic leaders appear to be experts in their area of influence. Past success may be a condition for the attribution of charisma (Weber, 1947)—for example, Iacocca's responsibility for the Ford Mustang. The attribution of charisma generally is influenced by leaders' expertise in two areas. First, charismatic leaders demonstrate the inadequacy of the traditional technology, rules, and regulations of the status quo as a means of achieving the shared vision (Weber, 1947). Second, the leaders devise effective but unconventional strategies and plans of action (Conger, 1985). Leaders are perceived as charismatic when they demonstrate expertise in transcending the existing order through the use of unconventional means. Iacocca's use of government-backed loans, money-back guarantees on cars, union representation on the board of directors, and advertisements featuring himself are examples of unconventional strategic actions in the automobile industry. Such phenomena lead to the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 4: Charismatic leaders demonstrate expertise in transcending the existing order through the use of unconventional or extraordinary means.

Charisma and Unconventional Behavior. Attribution of charisma to leaders depends on followers' perception of their revolutionary and unconventional qualities (Berger, 1963; Conger, 1985; Dow, 1969; Friedland, 1964; Marcus, 1961). The revolutionary qualities of leaders are manifested in part in their discrepant idealized visions. More important, charismatic leaders engage in innovative behaviors that run counter to the established norms of their organizations, industries, and/or societies while leading their followers toward the realization of their visions. Martin and Siehl (1983) demonstrated this in their analysis of John DeLorean's counternormative behavior at GM. Charismatic leaders are not group facilitators like consensual leaders, but they are active innovators. Their plans and the strategies they use to achieve change, their exemplary acts of heroism involving personal risks, and their self-sacrificing behaviors must be novel, unconventional, and out of the ordinary. Such behavior, when successful, evokes surprise and admiration in followers. Such uncommon behavior also leads to an attribution of charisma in the sense of the possession of superhuman abilities. Thus the following hypothesis is advanced.

Hypothesis 5: *Charismatic leaders engage in behaviors that are novel, unconventional, and counternormative, and as such, involve high personal risk or high probability of harming their own self-interest.*

Charisma and Sensitivity to the Environment. When a leader loses sight of reality and his or her unconventional behavior fails to achieve its objective, the leader may be degraded from charismatic to ineffective (Friedland, 1964). The knowledge, experience, and expertise of the leader become critical. Charismatic leaders realistically assess environmental resources and constraints affecting their ability to bring about change within their organizations. They are sensitive to both the abilities and emotional needs of followers, and they understand the resources and constraints of the physical and social environments in which they operate. Their innovative strategies and unconventional actions are

based on realistic appraisals of environmental conditions. Instead of launching a course of action as soon as a vision is formulated, often leaders prepare the ground, or will wait for an appropriate time, place, and the availability of resources. Charisma often fades due to a lack of sensitivity for the environment. The following hypothesis captures this idea.

Hypothesis 6: *Charismatic leaders engage in realistic assessments of the environmental resources and constraints affecting the realization of their visions. They implement innovative strategies when the environmental resource-constraint ratio is favorable to them.*

Charisma and Articulation. Charismatic leaders articulate their visions and strategies for action through two processes. First, they articulate the context including: (a) the nature of the status quo; (b) the nature of the future vision; (c) the manner through which these future visions, if realized, remove sources of discontent and provide fulfillment of hopes and aspirations of the followers; and (d) plans of action for realizing the vision. In articulating the context, leaders' verbal messages paint positive pictures of the future vision and negative ones of the status quo. The status quo often is presented as intolerable, whereas the vision is presented as the most attractive and attainable alternative in clear, specific terms.

Second, charismatic leaders also communicate their own motivation to lead their followers. Through expressive modes of action, both verbal and nonverbal, the leaders communicate their convictions, self-confidence, and dedication in order to give credibility to what they advocate. Expression of high energy and persistence, unconventional and risky behavior, heroic deeds and personal sacrifices, all communicate the leaders' high motivation and enthusiasm, which then become contagious with their followers. In articulating their motivation to lead, charismatic leaders use a number of impression management techniques. For instance, they use rhetoric by selecting words to reflect assertive-

ness, confidence, expertise, and concern for followers' needs. These same qualities are also expressed through their dress, appearance, and other forms of body language. Unconventionality in the use of rhetoric and nonverbal forms of communication creates conditions for a dispositional attribution of charisma. These ideas about charismatic leaders' articulation of context and motivation are contained in the following two hypotheses.

Hypothesis 7: *Charismatic leaders portray the status quo as negative or intolerable and the future vision as the most attractive and attainable alternative.*

Hypothesis 8: *Charismatic leaders articulate their motivation to lead through assertive behavior and expression of self-confidence, expertise, unconventionality, and concern for followers' needs.*

Charisma and the Use of Personal Power. Influence over followers can stem from different bases of power (French & Raven, 1968). Charismatic influence, however, stems from leaders' personal ideosyncratic power (referent and expert powers) rather than their position power (legal, coercive, and reward powers) legitimated by organizational rules and regulations. Participative consensual leaders also use personal power through consensus seeking. Some non-participative organizational leaders also use personal power through their benevolent but directive behavior. However, charismatic leaders differ from both consensual and directive leaders in the use of their personal power. Charismatic personal power stems from the elitist idealized vision, the entrepreneurial advocacy of radical changes, and the depth of knowledge and expertise to help achieve desired objectives. All these personal qualities appear extraordinary to their followers, and they form the basis of charisma. The following two hypotheses state this aspect of charismatic leadership.

Hypothesis 9: *Charismatic leaders' influence on their followers stems from the use of their personal ideosyncratic power (expert and referent) rather*

than the use of their position power (legal, coercive, and reward) within the organization.

Hypothesis 10: *Charismatic leaders exert ideosyncratic personal power over their followers through elitist, entrepreneurial, and exemplary behavior rather than through consensus-seeking or directive behavior.*

Charisma and the Reformer Role. A charismatic leader is seen as an organizational reformer. As Weber (1947) pointed out, charismatic authority is essentially unstable and transitory. Once a new order is institutionalized, charisma fades (Eisenstadt, 1968). Thus charisma is seen in leaders only when they act as agents bringing about radical changes. The attribution is made simply on the basis of actions taken to bring about change or reform. It is not a post facto attribution made after the outcomes of changes are known. Outcomes may, however, reinforce or diminish existing attributions.

From the perspective of change management, leaders should be distinguished from administrators (Zaleznik, 1977). Administrators act as caretakers responsible for the maintenance of the status quo. They influence others through their position power as legitimated by the organization. Leaders, as opposed to administrators, direct or nudge their followers in the direction of an established goal. Charismatic leaders, however, transform their followers (instead of nudging them) and seek radical reforms in them in order to achieve the idealized goal. Thus, charisma can never be perceived either in an administrator (caretaker) role or in a leadership role designed only to nudge the system. This idea is contained in the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 11: *Charismatic leaders act as reformers or agents of radical changes, and their charisma fades when they act as administrators (caretaker role) or managers (nudging role).*

The Context for Emergence of Charisma. The preceding discussion implies that a need for major transition or change triggers the emergence

of a charismatic leader. Sometimes contextual factors are so overwhelmingly in favor of a change that leaders take advantage of them. For instance, when a system is dysfunctional or when it faces a crisis, leaders find it to their advantage to advocate radical change, thereby creating a charismatic image for themselves. In periods of relative tranquility, leaders play a major role in creating the need for change in their followers. They anticipate future change and induce supportive conditions. In any case, context must be viewed as a precipitating factor, sometimes facilitating the emergence of certain behavior in leaders that forms the basis of charisma. As Willner (1984) pointed out regarding political leadership, "preconditions of exogeneous social crisis and psychic distress are conducive to the emergence of charismatic political leadership, but they are not necessary" (p. 52). From the point of view of the leader, however, sensitivity to contextual factors is important if he or she is to develop appropriate strategies for change. The following two hypotheses deal with the role of context in the emergence of charisma.

Hypothesis 12: *Contextual factors that cause potential followers to be disenchanted with the prevailing social order, or that cause followers to experience psychological distress, although not a necessary condition for the emergence of charismatic leaders, facilitate such emergence.*

Hypothesis 13: *Under conditions of relative social tranquility and lack of psychological distress among followers, the actions by a leader that foster or support an attribution of charisma facilitate the emergence of that leader as a charismatic leader.*

Implications

In order to demystify charisma, these tentative hypotheses for future testing have been presented. Existing evidence forms the basis of the model, but the specific predictions should be tested.

In the model, charisma is viewed both as a set of dispositional attributions by followers and as a set of leaders' manifest behaviors. The two are linked in the sense that the leaders' behaviors form the basis of followers' attributions. To validate such a framework, two steps are necessary. First, the behavioral and dispositional attributes of charismatic leaders suggested in this framework require independent empirical confirmation. To determine if convergent and discriminant validity exist, a behavioral attribute checklist or questionnaire could be developed including the attributes believed to characterize charismatic leaders as well as those cited in the literature for other forms of leadership. A group of test subjects could identify leaders they perceive as charismatic and as noncharismatic. Respondents then could describe the distinguishing attributes of charismatic and noncharismatic leaders using the checklist. With this format, it would be possible to test whether an attribution of charisma is associated with the attributes described. Second, the discriminant validity of the charismatic leadership construct as described in this paper could be tested by demonstrating that a dependent variable (e.g., followers' trust) is related to charisma in a different way than other leadership constructs.

The model also has direct implications for management. Specifically, if the behavioral components of charismatic leadership can be isolated, it may be possible to develop these attributes in managers. Assuming that charismatic leadership is important for organizational reforms, organizations may wish to select managers on the basis of charismatic characteristics that have been identified. Certain tests such as those already developed to test sensitivity to the environment (Kenny & Zaccaro, 1983) could be administered to potential managerial candidates. The need for such selection procedures may be particularly important for developing countries, where greater levels of organizational change would be necessary in order to adopt new technologies and to transform traditional ways of operating.

References

- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1985) *Charisma and beyond*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, San Diego.
- Baker, R. (1983, March 27) Peripatetic pitchman. *New York Times Magazine*, p. 26.
- Bass, B. M. (1981) *Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1985) *Leadership performance beyond expectations*. New York: Academic Press.
- Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, G. (1985) *Leaders*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Berger, P. L. (1963) Charisma and religious innovation: The social location of Israelite prophecy. *American Sociological Review*, 28, 940-950.
- Berlew, D. E. (1974) Leadership and organizational excitement. *California Management Review*, 17(2), 21-30.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964) *The managerial grid*. Houston: Gulf.
- Blau, P. (1963) Critical remarks on Weber's theory of authority. *American Political Science Review*, 57, 305-315.
- Byrne, D. (1977) *The attraction paradigm*. New York: Academic Press.
- Chinoy, E. (1961) *Society*. New York: Random House.
- Conger, J. (1985) *Charismatic leadership in business: An exploratory study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard Business School, Boston.
- Devereux, G. (1955) Charismatic leadership and crisis. In W. Muensterberger & S. Axelrod (Eds.), *Psychoanalysis and the social sciences* (Vol. 4, pp. 145-157). New York: International University Press.
- Dow, T. E., Jr. (1969) The theory of charisma. *Sociological Quarterly*, 10, 306-318.
- Downtown, J. V., Jr. (1973) *Rebel leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. (1968) *Max Weber: On charisma and institution building*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Etzioni, A. (1961) *A comparative analysis of complex organizations*. New York: Free Press.
- Fiedler, F. F. (1967) *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- French, J. R., Jr., & Raven, B. H. (1968) The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds.), *Group dynamics* (pp. 259-269). New York: Harper & Row.
- Friedland, W. H. (1964) For a sociological concept of charisma. *Social Forces*, 43, 18-26.
- Friedrich, C. J. (1961) Political leadership and the problem of the charismatic power. *Journal of Politics*, 23, 3-24.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1977) *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- House, R. J. (1971) A path-goal theory of leadership effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 321-332.
- 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, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- House, R. J. (1985) *Research contrasting the behavior and effects of reputed charismatic versus reputed noncharismatic*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Administrative Science Association, Montreal.
- House, R. J., & Baetz, M. L. (1979) Leadership: Some empirical generalizations and new research directions. In B. M. Staw (Ed.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 1, pp. 399-401). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Hovland, C. I., Janis, I. L., & Kelley, H. H. (1953) *Communication and persuasion*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hovland, C. I., & Pritzker, H. A. (1957) Extent of opinion change as a function of amount of change advocated. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 54, 257-261.
- Howell, J. M. (1985) *A laboratory study of charismatic leadership*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, San Diego.
- Hummel, R. P. (1975) Psychology of charismatic followers. *Psychological Reports*, 37, 759-770.
- Iacocca, L., & Novak, W. (1984) *Iacocca*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978) *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Kenny, D. A., & Zaccaro, S. J. (1983) An estimate of variance due to traits in leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 678-685.
- Marcus, J. T. (1961, March) Transcendence and charisma. *Western Political Quarterly*, 14, 236-241.
- Martin, J., & Siehl, C. (1983) Organizational culture and counterculture: An uneasy symbiosis. *Organizational Dynamics*, 12(2), 52-64.
- Nicholson, T. (1983, February 14) Iacocca shifts into high. *Newsweek*, pp. 101, 64.
- Oberg, W. (1972) Charisma, commitment, and contemporary organization theory. *Business Topics*, 20(2), 18-32.

- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1981) *Attitudes and persuasion: Classic and contemporary approaches*. Dubuque, IA: Brown.
- Rubin, Z. (1973) *Liking and loving: An invitation to social psychology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Runciman, W. G. (1963) Charismatic legitimacy and one-party rule in Ghana. *Archives Europeenes de Sociologie*, 4, 148-165.
- Schiffer, I. (1973) *Charisma: A psychoanalytic look at mass society*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Sears, D. O., Freedman, L., & Peplau, L. A. (1985) *Social psychology* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Shils, E. A. (1965) Charisma, order, and status. *American Sociological Review*, 30, 199-213.
- Smith, B. J. (1982) *An initial test of a theory of charismatic leadership based on responses of subordinates*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.
- Tucker, R. C. (1968) The theory of charismatic leadership. *Daedalus*, 97, 731-756.
- Waldman, D. A., Bass, B. M., & Einstein, W. O. (1985) *Effort, performance and transformational leadership in industrial and military settings*. (Working Paper 85-80). State University of New York at Binghamton, School of Management.
- Walster, E., Aronson, D., & Abrahams, D. (1966) On increasing the persuasiveness of a low prestige communicator. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, 325-342.
- Weber, M. (1947) *The theory of social and economic organization*. (A. M. Henderson & T. Parsons, Trans.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Willner, A. R. (1968) *Charismatic political leadership: A theory*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University, Center of International Studies.
- Willner, A. R. (1984) *The spellbinders: Charismatic political leadership*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Wolpe, H. (1968) A critical analysis of some aspects of charisma. *Sociological Review*, 16, 305-318.
- Wright, P. J. (1979) *On a clear day you can see General Motors*. New York: Avon Books.
- Yukl, G. A. (1981) *Leadership in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Yukl, G. A., & Van Fleet, D. D. (1982) Cross-situational multi-method research on military leader effectiveness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 30, 87-108.
- Zaleznik, A. (1977) Managers and leaders: Are they different? *Harvard Business Review*, 55(3), 67-78.
- Zaleznik, A., & Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (1975) *Power and the corporate mind*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Jay A. Conger (D.B.A., Harvard University) is Assistant Professor of Organizational Behavior, Faculty of Management, McGill University. Correspondence regarding this article can be sent to him at: McGill University, Faculty of Management, 1001 Sherbrooke Street West, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, H3A 1G5.

Rabindra N. Kanungo (Ph.D., McGill University) is Professor of Organizational Behavior, Faculty of Management, McGill University.