Oxford Handbooks Online

⊟ Abstract and Keywords

The theoretical frameworks of charismatic and transformational leadership have been at the forefront of leadership research and practice for the last several decades. This review highlights the developments that have characterized the two areas of study since their conception and attempts to create a solid foundation for leadership research to progress in the future. This review opens with an examination of charismatic leadership and provides an overview of the different viewpoints that have driven its theoretical development. Next the chapter reviews existing literature on charismatic leadership by offering a brief summary of empirical research that has been done to date and follows that with a discussion of some criticisms and limitations of charismatic leadership. A similar review and critique is then conducted on the construct of transformational leadership. Finally, it closes with avenues for future research to proceed along, with an outline of several theoretical and research questions.

Keywords: Charisma, charismatic leadership, transformational leadership

Introduction

Ever since the systematic study of leadership commenced in the early 1900s, research on leadership has evolved in a rather dramatic manner. In a sense, its evolution has mirrored our ability as a species to comprehend the intricacies and complexities associated with objective reality. As we get better at understanding the objective reality that surrounds us, so does our understanding of what constitutes effective leadership and the multitude of psychosocial processes that accompany it. Such increments in our understanding of effective leadership have paved the way for the creation of newer, better, and more comprehensive conceptualizations and theories of leadership that have provided us with an enhanced understanding of the constitution and enactment of leadership across political, social, organizational, and other domains.

One such conceptualization of leadership that has arguably been at the vanguard of leadership research over the last several decades views leadership from an emotional, symbolic, and influence perspective. According to this conceptualization, leaders use emotional appeals, symbolic gestures, and a combination of several different influence mechanisms to lead their followers to "perform beyond expectations" (Bass, 1985). This perspective on leadership—which in several ways is markedly different from most of its predecessors—has received widespread research support across several different domains, contexts, and cultures. This perspective is the family of charismatic and transformational leadership models and theories. Together, charismatic and (especially) transformational leadership have been the most-studied theories of leadership in the past 20 years (Gardner, Lowe, Moss, Mahoney, & Cogliser, 2010; Lowe & Gardner, 2000). Although charismatic leadership has been discussed for nearly a century, and theories of transformational leadership for more than three decades, there is still much that research can do to further our understanding of these complex models of effective leadership.

For decades, early research on leadership focused on leader traits (e.g., intelligence, dominance, achievement, self-confidence, drive, motivation, etc.) or other attributes of leaders (e.g., competencies) that contributed to their success (Lord, DeVader, & Alliger, 1986; Mann, 1959; Stogdill, 1948, 1974). This "trait-based" paradigm of studying leadership was followed by the behavioral approach, which involved an examination of the actual behaviors of effective leaders (Katz, Maccoby, Gurin, & Floor, 1951; Stogdill & Coons, 1957). Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, contingency or interactional models of leadership effectiveness dominated. These theories saw leadership as an interaction of leaders' behavior, followers, and situational elements (Fiedler, 1996). Although these theories were popular as research models (e.g., Fiedler, 1964, 1967; Vroom & Jago, 1988; Vroom & Yetoon, 1973) and with practitioners (Fiedler & Chemers, 1974; Hersey & Blanchard, 1969, 1977), there was dissatisfaction in some circles, and a sense of stagnation. For example, Miner (1975) suggested that leadership research was not particularly "successful in building a viable theory of organization" and that "current theories of leadership tend to exist in an organizational vacuum" (p. 295). He argued for a better paradigm to govern leadership thinking and research than what had existed in the past.

In spite of the continuing advances in the field of leadership theory and research, there were several questions that remained unanswered. For instance, why do some leaders succeed at getting their followers to go above and beyond their call of duty while others fail to accomplish similar outcomes? Why do followers of some leaders value the collective vision and mission more than they do their own individual materialistic goals and aspirations? Why do some leaders succeed in persuading followers to perform self-sacrificial behaviors for the collective benefit while others don't? What specific steps do such leaders take to elicit such self-sacrificial behaviors from their followers? Why are some leaders more effective at generating emotional arousal in their followers than others?

Existing theories, such as the interactional models, did not seem to address these processes. So, leadership researchers turned to the long-dormant concept of leader charisma (Weber, 1947), and extended it with the development of more modern versions of charismatic leadership and with

transformational theories of leadership.

The advent of charismatic and transformational theories of leadership introduced a new way of thinking about leadership. Leaders were not merely seen as "repertoires" of traits (as suggested by the Universalist paradigm). Neither were they viewed as enactors of a series of specific behaviors (like the Behavioral paradigm seemed to suggest). Leadership scholars started viewing leaders as change agents who—through the use of a combination of several different influence mechanisms—"transform" followers into highly inspired, energized, and motivated teams. Research from these theoretical perspectives began to seek answers to some of the elusive questions that in many ways inhibited the advancement of the field. This new line of inquiry and exploration thus provided a much-needed impetus to the field of leadership research and helped rejuvenate the research process that seemed to have stalled. As a result, charismatic theory, and transformational leadership theory, in particular, have been the dominant paradigm in leadership research for the past 25 years.

The current review is aimed at outlining the evolutionary trajectory of charismatic and transformational leadership. We begin this chapter by providing a comprehensive overview of the different approaches that fall under the respective categories of Charismatic and Transformational Leadership. We follow this with a brief summary of important empirical research that has helped advance the two theoretical frameworks. Next, we cite the limitations of the theories, along with some criticisms that have been voiced by the community of leadership researchers and scholars. In doing so, our goal is to aid the facilitation of a more robust transformation of these fields of study and pave the way for continued development. And finally, we offer guidelines and directions for future research on charismatic and transformational leadership to progress further.

Charismatic Leadership

Conception of Charisma

Though some of the earliest vestiges of charisma can be traced back to the writings of Aristotle (circa 4th century BC), the modern-day conception of charisma has been largely attributed to the works of Max Weber. Weber (1947) borrowed from the literal Greek meaning of the word *charisma*—which means "divine gift"—and described a breed of leaders who seem to possess certain "gifts" that allow them to lead in novel and inspiring ways that are markedly different from other traditional forms of leadership (e.g., leadership on the basis of formal authority). According to Weber, followers of charismatic leaders perceive their leaders to be gifted and to possess unique abilities that allow them to perform feats that are beyond the capacity of average individuals. Moreover, the key to success for charismatic leaders lies solely in the extent to which they are perceived to be gifted by their followers. If followers fail to recognize their leaders as having charisma, then the charismatic influence mechanism breaks down, and leaders can no longer exert their influence over followers. A quote from Weber (1968) summarizes this leadership predicament quite appropriately.

> The holder of charisma seizes the task that is adequate for him and demands obedience and a following by virtue of his mission. His success determines whether he finds them. His charismatic claim breaks down if his mission is not recognized by those to whom he feels he has been sent. If they recognize him, he is their master—so long as he knows how to maintain recognition through 'proving' himself. But he does not derive his 'right' from their will, in the manner of an election. Rather, the reverse holds: it is the duty of those to whom he addresses his mission to recognize him as their charismatically qualified leader.

(p.20)

In addition to describing the attributional nature of charisma, Weber suggested that charismatic leaders tend to arise during times of economic, social, political, and/or other forms of unrest. He argued that it is during such crisis situations that charismatic leaders get the opportunity to utilize their "divine gifts" and are able to lead effectively and successfully. These "divine gifts" often take the form of an emotional appeal to inspire and rouse followers, a radical vision to instill hope for the future, or bold steps that a leader may take to attenuate the negative effects of a crisis at hand. Once followers get a small taste of success, they tend to become more inclined to believe in the leaders' powers to perform extraordinary feats resulting in a further consolidation of the leader's influence over followers.

Weber conceptualized charisma mostly as a perception of being divinely gifted and possessing certain extraordinary capacities. This reflects the premise of the trait-based Universalist theories of leadership, which maintain that leaders are born with a certain collection of traits that make them effective/successful in their respective roles. Weber also attempted to outline (albeit not in as detailed a manner as done by some later researchers) the behavioral repertoire of charismatics that leads to follower obedience and compliance. Lastly, Weber's conception of charismatic leadership can be seen as a special case of the contingency-based theories of leadership in the sense that Weber suggested the prevalence of a crisis, or some form of a social turmoil as a precondition for charismatic leadership to emerge. Thus, it may be of interest to note that even though subsequent conceptualizations of charismatic leadership have borrowed from the groundwork that Weber laid out, Weber's own conception of charisma and charismatic leadership seems consistent with the reigning leadership paradigms of the century—thus highlighting the cumulative nature of the evolution of leadership research.

Modern Development of Charismatic Leadership Theory

Decades after Weber, House (1977) was the first to present a comprehensive theoretical framework to describe the nature of charismatic leadership, explain the psychological processes through which charismatics end up influencing their followers, and outline subsequent follower outcomes that accrue as a result. His contribution to leadership research was especially significant because it brought the concept of charisma and the process of charismatic leadership from a relatively abstract to a more concrete plane—a plane where actual leader behaviors could be observed and examined, propositions could be formulated and empirically tested, and meaningful inferences that informed leadership research and practice could be derived. If Weber was the founding father of the modern-day "charisma movement," House could arguably be described as one of the chief architects who laid the plans for a scientific and systematic study of charismatic leadership.

Charismatic and Transformational Leadership

According to House (1977), the key to successful relationships between charismatic leaders and their followers is the ability of leaders to inspire and emotionally arouse their followers. Successful charismatics are able to energize their followers by championing an appealing and potentially radical vision for the future. Followers of charismatic leaders often end up developing strong emotional bonds with their leaders, which serve as a foundation for their willingness to be compliant and committed to their leaders' agendas. The perception of leader charisma leads to a belief that charismatic leaders are blessed with extraordinary strengths that are likely to lead to a realization of the radical vision articulated by leaders. Moreover, given that charismatic leadership is more likely to emerge in times of acute crises and/or contexts characterized by distress, the presence of a leader with extraordinary abilities serves as a source of reassurance and hope, which further strengthens the influence that charismatic leaders tend to exert on their followers.

House's (1977) theory of charismatic leadership was further developed by Shamir and colleagues (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993) to include a more elaborate articulation of the behaviors of charismatic leaders, the mediating processes through which charismatic leaders motivate and influence followers, and the outcomes that follow as a result of leaders' influence. According to this self-concept-based theory of charismatic leadership, "charismatic leaders achieve transformational effects through implicating the self-concept of followers" (p. 584). They "increase the intrinsic value of efforts and goals by linking them to valued aspects of the follower's self-concept, thus harnessing the motivational forces of self-expression, self-consistency, self-esteem, and self-worth" (p. 584). Through the use of positive evaluations and by communicating higher performance expectations to their followers, charismatic leaders express confidence in their followers' abilities to meet those higher performance expectations and end up elevating the self-efficacy and collective efficacy of their followers. Additionally, their messages to their followers often consist of references to values, morals, and ideals, and this creates a sense of a higher purpose that followers associate with their own roles and actions.

Shamir and colleagues also outlined other mediating processes that contribute to charismatic leaders' influence over their followers. Charismatic leaders use social identification, personal identification, and value internalization as sources of influence over followers. Followers of charismatic leaders define themselves in terms of the social category in which they are embedded (e.g., their group or their organization). They take pride in being a part of that social category and perceive their membership in that category to be an important part of their social identity. This high level of social identification often leads to followers going out of their way with regard to their duties, roles, and functions, and performing at levels that are often above and beyond those of average expectations.

Followers of charismatic leaders often identify personally with their leaders. Due to the perception that charismatic leaders possess "extraordinary" qualities, followers oftentimes make an attempt to be like the leader whom they admire and emulate the leader psychologically as well as behaviorally. Psychologically, they may subscribe to the same value systems, morals, and ideals that their leader is known to embody; and behaviorally, followers may end up enacting the same leadership behaviors that they observe their leader performing. Like social identification, personal identification also moves followers to go above and beyond their call of duty.

Finally, Shamir and colleagues described internalization as one more mechanism that is responsible for the influence that charismatic leaders exert on their followers. Internalization "refers to the incorporation of values within the self as guiding principles" (p. 586). When charismatic leaders use ideological explanations to communicate their vision to followers, they portray their vision as noble, heroic, and having high moral standards. When followers internalize the values, ideals, and goals inherent in their leaders' vision, those values, ideals, and goals become part of the followers themselves. They "come to view their work role as inseparably linked to their self-concept and self-worth" and "carry out the role because it is a part of their essential nature and destiny" (Yukl, 2006, p. 253).

In addition to describing leader behaviors and mediating influence processes associated with charismatic leadership, Shamir and colleagues also outlined the organizational conditions under which charismatic leadership is more likely to emerge and be effective. According to the self-concept theory of charismatic leadership, charismatic leaders are most effective when their espoused vision is congruent with the values, ideals, and identities of their followers. Such congruence allows charismatic leaders to generate higher levels of social and personal identification as well as value internalization. Charismatic leaders do not have to work extra to convince or persuade their followers to adopt new value systems, and they are able to use their charisma to elicit follower outcomes such as commitment to the leader, commitment to the leadership mission and vision, self-sacrificial behaviors, and performance beyond expectations.

Charismatic Leadership—An Attributional Perspective

Building on the theoretical groundwork established by Weber, House, Shamir, and others, Conger and Kanungo (1987, 1998) proposed an alternative theory that highlighted the attributional nature of charismatic leadership. According to this conception, the phenomenon of leader charisma was described as a function of the attributional processes that followers utilize to ascribe charismatic qualities to their leaders. Although there are several similarities between the conception and function of charisma between this new attributional perspective and the previous self-concept-based perspective, there were significant deviations as well, which makes this theory a significant step forward in the evolution of theories of charismatic leadership.

According to Conger and Kanungo (1987, 1998), the source of leader charisma lies in the attributions that followers make about their leaders. In essence, it reflects the adage, "charisma lies in the eye of the beholder." The attribution of charismatic qualities to a leader depends on how the leader behaves, the perceptions of the leader's competence and ability to handle problems and difficult situations, and the characteristics of the context/situation that the leader-followers are embedded in. The right mix of the three ingredients leads to followers attributing charismatic qualities to the leader, which marks the beginning of the influence process of charismatic leaders.

Conger and Kanungo (1987, 1998) outlined several traits and behaviors of leaders that cause followers to make charismatic attributions. Foremost among them is the portrayal of confidence by the leader. Leaders are seen as more charismatic when they exhibit a sense of self-efficacy in their beliefs and actions. When followers see their leaders taking decisive steps toward the attainment of collective goals, and acting confidently to overcome persistent problems/hurdles, they are more likely to believe that their leaders have the "divine gift," and tend to make attributions of

charisma.

Followers also tend to attribute charisma to leaders who espouse radical and ideological visions that are distinct from the status quo. The fortitude and courage that is displayed in communicating a vision that serves to challenge the status quo leads to perceptions of leader boldness and decisiveness, both seductive attributes in their own right. When followers realize and understand the positive outcomes associated with the radical vision, they are compelled to make charismatic attributions; for without the leader's foresight, the path to success would not have been possible. One caveat, however, is that if the espoused vision is perceived to be too radical or too much of a deviation from what seems possible, the leader runs the risk of being perceived as incompetent or outlandish.

Another quality that adds to the charismatic image of leaders is the ability to use emotional appeals in a strategic manner to stir and inspire followers. Through the use of symbols, slogans, and other similar means, successful charismatic leaders inject a jolt of inspiration into the thoughts and lives of their followers. They offer their followers a new purpose and meaning, and inspire them to strive hard to attain their radical vision by denouncing the status quo in favor of a better collective future. Such influx of inspiration often leads to attributions of charisma. Additionally, by acting in unconventional ways to achieve their vision and collective goals, charismatic leaders communicate a willingness to deviate from the norm for the sake of the collective good. For instance, a leader who is seen making self-sacrifices and taking personal risks for the benefit of the collective is often revered and enjoys the kind of influence and respect that is seldom afforded to noncharismatic leaders. Moreover, by conveying a sense of selflessness and making personal sacrifices for the sake of the collective, a charismatic leader manages to earn followers' trust—a very critical and influential variable in the leader-follower relationship. Followers who trust their leaders are more likely to make self-sacrifices themselves, and go above and beyond the call of duty for the attainment of the leader's vision, mission, and goals. Such behavior invites attributions of charisma and further strengthens the charismatic appeal of leaders.

The attributional theory of charismatic leadership also offered a description of the mediating influence processes through which charismatic leaders have an impact on their followers. While social identification and internalization seem to be the two key influence processes associated with the self-concept theory of charismatic leadership proposed by House and colleagues, the attribution theory of charismatic leaders views the process from a slightly different lens, in that it suggests personal identification with the leader as one of the key influence processes in the leader-follower relationship. According to Conger (1989), because followers perceive their leaders to possess extraordinary qualities, they tend to idolize them and are likely to imitate them. To be like the leader becomes a supplementary goal, and followers yearn for approval from their admired leaders. Praise and recognition from leaders have a significant impact on followers, and they seem willing to walk the extra mile in order to earn the coveted attention from their idols. Moreover, this desire to please the leader tends to act as a driving force that motivates followers to continue on the path that has been laid out in front of them.

In addition to personal identification, Conger (1989) also described internalization as one of the mediating influence processes associated with charismatic leadership. As mentioned earlier, if a vision is perceived to be too radical or unrealistic, then leaders run the risk of being labeled incompetent or outlandish. Thus, for successful leader influence to materialize, followers' internalization of the goals, values, ideals, and vision espoused by the leader becomes an imperative. Followers who internalize leaders' beliefs, values, and agenda are more likely to invest their psychological, physical, social, and other resources into the attainment of the leader's vision. Successful charismatics—through the use of their unusual gifts—are able to persuade, convince, and/or cajole their followers into buying into the collective agenda.

From a contextual perspective, the attribution theory of charismatic leadership is distinct from the self-concept theory of charismatic leadership in the sense that the prevalence of a crisis is not deemed to be a necessary precondition for the emergence of charismatic leadership. Whereas House and colleagues considered crises to be a relatively necessary condition for charismatic leadership to emerge, Conger and Kanungo (1998) proposed that charismatic leadership can emerge even in the absence of a crisis. They suggested that leaders often are motivated to create a discord with the status quo and use that as a foundation to further their visionary ideas for a better future. Reframing the situation as a crisis (when in fact it might not qualify as one) and presenting unconventional ways to overcome it was not considered to be beyond the behavioral repertoire of charismatic leaders according to the attributional theory of charismatic leadership.

Competing Conceptions of Charisma

In addition to the two theoretical frameworks proposed by Shamir and colleagues (1993) and Conger and Kanungo (1998), the period between 1976 and 2000 saw several alternative perspectives and conceptualizations of charisma and charismatic leadership. A majority of those perspectives were instituted with the objective of filling the gaps in the explanatory and predictive potential of existing frameworks. Their addition to the domain of research on charismatic leadership served two main purposes. First, by perpetuating theorizing and research efforts in the field, they made the domain of charismatic leadership popular among emerging leadership researchers and scholars as well as practitioners, thus facilitating a more thorough examination of leadership, in general, and charismatic leadership, in particular. Second, it fueled research designed to empirically test these theoretical frameworks, and explore this new paradigm further.

Kets de Vries (1988) and Lindholm (1988) utilized a Freudian lens and looked at charisma from a psychoanalytic perspective. They sought to explain the reasons behind followers' personal identification with their leaders and the subsequent effect that it has on followers. According to this perspective, followers can derive a sense of empowerment and positive energy by merging their identity with that of the charismatic leader whom they admire and cherish. Through the process of transference (i.e., unconscious redirection of feelings from one person to another), followers often seek to compensate for fractured self-identities, inchoate value systems and morals, and unfulfilled needs/desires by identifying with a charismatic leader who is seen as a walking example of what they seem to want or lack. They derive a sense of vicarious fulfillment of their needs and desires by associating with their leader, and the leader often becomes a source of continual motivation and inspiration. This view of how followers come to identify and "worship" charismatic leaders sheds light on the influence processes associated with cult leadership and leaders with compromised moral standards who nevertheless are able to command strong support and devotion from their followers.

Around this same time, Riggio and colleagues (Friedman, Riggio, & Casella, 1988; Riggio, 1987) argued that the charismatic qualities that cause a leader to be labeled "charismatic" were highly developed interpersonal and social skills, particularly skills in emotional and nonverbal communication (e.g., "emotional expressiveness"; Riggio, 1998). Emphasis was placed on the emotional contagion processes between charismatic leaders and followers, a topic of research that has continued up to the present time (Bono & Ilies, 2006; Johnson, 2009).

In an attempt to explain why certain followers make attributions of charisma toward leaders with whom they have never had close contact or personal interactions, Meindl (1990) proposed an alternate conceptualization of the process by which attributions of charisma emerge and are perpetuated among followers. Dubbing the process as "social contagion," Meindl (1990) suggested that followers often look for means or reasons to act on their desires to fight for a just or righteous cause that would allow them the opportunity to make self-sacrifices for the greater good. Such desires are often in a state of repression due to inhibiting social norms and/or conflicting social identities. However, when a leader (especially in the context of a crisis) challenges existing social norms and behaves in unconventional ways, he or she sparks a chain reaction or a "social contagion" that provides followers with an outlet to vent their repressed desires and emotions and allows them to pursue a just and righteous cause. Followers try to imitate the unconventional behavior displayed by their leader and indulge in activities that support and further their newly realized purpose. To understand, justify, and rationalize this change, followers often tend to attribute charisma to their leader, and such attributions often become exaggerated as they channel across multitudes of followers.

To distinguish between a charismatic relationship in which leaders are in close contact with their followers and one in which leaders are physically distant from their followers, Shamir (1995) and Yagil (1998) conducted exploratory studies to determine how followers make attributions of charisma when they are in close contact with their leaders and when they are distant from them. Shamir (1995) found that attributions of charisma for distant leaders stem from the achievements that the leader is known for; and attributions of charisma for close leaders originate on the basis of leader identification, the leader's interpersonal skills, and the leader's ability to motivate and inspire followers. These were interesting results and helped to uncover an interesting dynamic associated with how charisma works across different situations and contexts. However, subsequent studies did not fully support these results, which left the door open for future studies to address the topics of charisma and leader distance.

Several organizational researchers and leadership scholars (e.g., Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Conger, 1989; Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Hogan, Raskin, & Fazzini, 1990; House & Howell, 1992; Mumford, Gessner, Connelly, O'Connor, & Clifton, 1993) suggested the existence of a negative aspect to the influence of charisma and charismatic leadership. Referring to it as "the dark side of charisma," it was proposed that because followers are in awe of their "gifted" leaders, they might be less likely to speak up against the ideas and the propositions of their leader, and refrain from offering criticism regarding certain actions or practices. The "awe" might result in a perception that their leader is infallible and can potentially create a context that is divorced from objective reality. Given that charismatic leaders often challenge the status quo and partake in risky decisions, a less-than-optimal strategy to see their radical vision to fruition may result in serious failures and/or catastrophic and irrecoverable losses; and this does not augur well for any leadership situation. Moreover, such failures can potentially result in forces of opposition that may work toward removing the charismatic leader from his/her leadership position.

House and Howell (1992) offered a distinction between two different kinds of charismatic leaders, viz., personalized charismatic leaders and socialized charismatic leaders. Personalized charismatic leaders were described as self-aggrandizing, non-egalitarian, and exploitative leaders whose primary goal is to act in the interest of their own selves. Socialized charismatic leaders, on the other hand, were described as collectively oriented, egalitarian, and nonexploitative and whose primary goal is to act in the interest of others. Furthermore, personality traits such as need for power, authoritarianism, Machiavellianism, locus of control, etc., were the moderating factors that contributed to the distinction between personalized and socialized charismatic leaders.

Charismatic leadership, thus, is not without its own set of pitfalls, and efforts to further understand this "dark side of charisma" should continue if we are to acquire a better understanding of the overall process of leadership, both "positive" and productive, and "negative" and (potentially) destructive.

Charismatic Leadership—Brief Summary of Empirical Research

The different theoretical frameworks and conceptualizations of charismatic leadership have received varying degrees of empirical support over the years—some more so than others. Leadership researchers and organizational scholars have conducted numerous laboratory and field studies to test the propositions associated with the multiple conceptions of charisma and those of charismatic leadership. In the following section, we organize empirical research in this field into four main categories: (1) empirical research validating the relationships between charismatic leadership and common follower/organizational outcomes, (2) empirical research exploring and validating the factors that aid or impede perceptions/attributions of leader charisma, (3) empirical research validating and/or supporting the mediating mechanisms associated with the influence of charismatic leaders, and (4) research outlining other factors that exert an impact on perceptions/attributions of leader charisma. Additionally, it needs to be noted that the following section is more a summary of empirical research on charismatic leadership than a comprehensive overview, and space limitations prohibit us from listing all the studies that have contributed toward the validation and establishment of research on charismatic leadership.

Charismatic leadership and follower/organizational outcomes. Howell and Frost (1989) found that charismatic leadership was associated with high task performance, task adjustment, and adjustment to leader and group. Additionally, group productivity norms (i.e., high and low group productivity norms) did not have an impact on the relationship between charismatic leadership and the above-mentioned outcomes. Kirkpatrick and Locke (1996) examined the effects of visioning, highly expressive communication style, and providing advice to followers and found that visioning was associated with followers' perceptions of their task as more interesting, challenging, and important. Additionally, leader visioning led followers to set higher performance goals, display higher trust in the leader, and perceive the leader to be more charismatic, inspirational, and intellectually stimulating. In an attempt to explore the effects of charismatic leadership on negative organizational outcomes such as workplace aggression, Hepworth and Towler (2004) explored the relationship of charismatic leadership and workplace aggression and found that the effect of charismatic leadership on workplace aggression was small but significant. In a similar effort, Brown and Trevino (2006) investigated the relationship between socialized charismatic leadership and deviance in work groups and found that work groups managed by socialized charismatic leaders (i.e., charismatic leaders

who motivate followers to achieve collective organizational goals without regard to their personal needs or agendas) exhibited less workplace deviance.

Cicero and Pierro (2007) found that charismatic leadership was positively related to work effort, job involvement, job satisfaction, performance, and negatively related to turnover intention. Erez, Misangyi, Johnson, LePine, and Halverson (2008) reported leader charisma to be positively related to followers' positive affect and negatively related to followers' negative affect. De Hoogh and Den Hartog (2009) found that charisma was associated with lower burnout, and that relationship was especially salient for individuals who were low in internal locus of control. Michaelis and Stegmaier (2009) found that charismatic leadership was positively related to innovation implementation behavior. Rowold and Laukamp (2009) found that charismatic leadership was negatively related to follower absenteeism and was positively related to follower training and development activity. Additionally, charismatic leadership was reported to be positively associated with profit, thus confirming the hypothesis that charismatic leadership might be related to objective and organizationally relevant indicators. Such (and other) research efforts helped corroborate the theoretical propositions of several charismatic leadership models and paved the way for a better understanding of the impact that charismatic leadership has on follower and organizational outcomes.

Research identifying/validating precursors of charismatic perceptions/attributions. In addition to examining the relationship between charismatic leadership and several individual/group level outcomes, several researchers explored the factors that are responsible for followers perceiving leaders as charismatic and attributing charisma to them. In one of the first attempts at understanding the effects of leaders' vision content, delivery, and organizational performance on perceptions of leader charisma and effectiveness, Awamleh and Gardner (1999) conducted an experiment and found that strength of delivery played a key role in determining whether a leader was perceived as charismatic and effective. Choi and Mai-Dalton (1999) conducted two studies to explore the impact of self-sacrificial behaviors on attributions of leader charisma and found that followers tend to attribute charisma to leaders who exhibit self-sacrificial behaviors. Additionally, they found that followers of self-sacrificial leaders intend to reciprocate such leader behaviors, and these effects are stronger when leaders are perceived to be competent. House, Spangler, and Woycke (1991) conducted a comparative study on charismatic leadership of U.S. presidents and found that presidents with a socialized power orientation (i.e., concern with others' welfare instead of their own) exhibited more behaviors that were characteristic of charismatic leadership. Additionally, such presidents were more likely to be perceived as charismatic, and their performance was rated higher than those of noncharismatic presidents. Halverson, Murphy, and Riggio (2004) examined the effects of evaluation stress and situational crisis on ratings of charismatic leadership and found that perceptions of leader charisma were more likely when the context was characterized by stress.

In an attempt to explore whether individuals could be taught how to be more charismatic, Antonakis, Fenley, and Liechti (2011) tested the efficacy of a theoretically designed intervention aimed at making "individuals appear more charismatic to independent observers." Using a field and lab study, the researchers manipulated individuals' charisma ad measured its impact on observer perceptions of charisma. They found that charisma training led to an increase in perceptions of charisma, leader prototypicality, and leader emergence (i.e., trained individuals were perceived as more prototypical leaders and more leader like). These are only but a few studies that have identified the precursors or antecedents of charismatic attributions/perceptions, and research on charismatic leadership continues to grow.

Research on mediating processes associated with charismatic leadership. Several researchers have contributed to the body of research on charismatic leadership by identifying the mediating processes through which charismatic leadership influences follower/organizational outcomes. Erez et al. (2008) reported that the relationships between leader charisma and followers' positive and negative affect were mediated by leaders' positive affect, positive expression, and aroused behavior. Cicero and Pierro (2007) found that the relationships between charismatic leadership and work effort, job involvement, job satisfaction, performance, and turnover intention were mediated by follower work-group identification. Michaelis and Stegmaier (2009) found that the relationship between charismatic leadership and innovation implementation behavior was mediated by followers' affective commitment to change.

Other factors impacting perceptions of charisma. Groves (2005) examined the role of gender in attributions of charisma and found that female leaders were perceived to be higher on social and emotional skills as well as on followers' ratings of charismatic leadership. Den Hartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, and Dorfman (1999) explored leader attributes reflecting charismatic (and transformational) leadership across 62 cultures around the world and found that leader attributes such as motive arouser, foresight, encouraging, communicative, trustworthy, dynamic, positive, confidence builder, and motivational were universally endorsed. This seems to suggest that although the vast majority of theoretical frameworks and conceptualizations of charismatic leadership are products of Western cultures, their relevance, pertinence, and applicability tends to cross-cultural barriers and might not be limited to Western cultures. In a related study, Van De Vliert (2006) conducted secondary analysis of managerial survey data from 61 countries and found that charismatic organizational leadership is endorsed more in countries with higher income and more demanding climates.

Thus, it is evident that the theoretical framework of charismatic leadership has received ample empirical support from numerous research efforts and as the number of studies to test the various propositions and mechanisms associated with charismatic leadership continues to grow, so does our understanding of the antecedents, mediators, and outcomes associated with this branch of leadership.

Criticism and Limitations of Charismatic Leadership Theory

The accumulation of theoretical and empirical research on charismatic leadership was met with several criticisms by numerous leadership scholars. Turner (1993) argued that the secular view of charisma that was introduced by Weber (1947) was unable to explain how leaders impact followers' expectations and internalization of attitude and behavioral changes. Beyer (1999) and House (1999) argued that a majority of the emphasis of charismatic leadership is skewed toward an examination of the influence of charismatic leaders on individual followers and fails to account for the influence that charismatic leaders may have on groups, teams, and organizations.

Yukl (1999) cited concerns regarding the ambiguity associated with the multiple conceptions and definitions of charisma. According to him, the

differences between the leading construct definitions of charisma (viz., Conger & Kanungo's (1988, 1998) attributional view of charisma and House (1977) and Shamir et al.'s (1993) behavioral and follower influence-oriented view of charisma) created a "need for more clarity and consistency in how the term charismatic is defined and used" (p. 294).

Yukl (1999) also cited concerns with the ambiguity associated with the underlying influence processes in charismatic leadership. While the attributional theory of charismatic leadership (Conger & Kanungo, 1987, 1998) described personal identification and internalization as the primary influence processes of charismatic leaders, the self-concept theory of leadership (House, 1977; Shamir et al., 1993) identified internalization and collective identification as the key influence processes. This is a cause for concern because the identification of dominant influence processes in leader-follower relationships is critical for understanding and predicting leadership effectiveness (Howell, 1988; Shamir, 1991).

Some other concerns with charismatic leadership cited by Yukl (1999) were differences in behavioral repertoires associated with different theories of charismatic leadership, confusion regarding necessary conditions for attributions of charisma to surface (e.g., essential characteristics of followers in a charismatic leader-follower relationship, contextual variables such as the presence/absence of uncertainty or crises, etc.), and ambiguity regarding the reasons for the loss of charisma.

Charismatic leadership is not without its own set of limitations. The use of impression management, information restriction, unconventional behavior, and personal risk taking by charismatic leaders leads to the perception that such leaders are extraordinarily competent (Yukl, 2006). In the process, they might pay less attention to follower empowerment, appropriate delegation of authority, development of follower skills and self-efficacy, and the development of a strong empowering culture (Yukl, 2006). This implies that followers of charismatic leaders are more likely to be dependent on the "extraordinariness" of the charismatic leader and in the event that the leader is absent, followers might be unable to meet the challenges associated with their work task/roles. Thus, charismatic leadership seems to foster an unhealthy dependence on leaders that may lead to undesirable consequences in the long run.

Another limitation of charismatic leadership is that its emergence seems to depend on the existence of certain favorable contextual variables (Bass, 1985; Shamir & Howell, 1999). Although it may not be a necessary condition for charismatic leadership to emerge, the presence of some form of uncertainty or crisis creates a fertile ground for the emergence of charismatic leadership. This implies that the applications of charismatic leadership in everyday life may be of a restrictive nature.

While research on charismatic leadership reemerged in the late 1970s and 1980s to reenergize research on leadership, it was the theory of transformational leadership that led to explosive growth in leadership research. Transformational leadership theory, which incorporated aspects of charisma, but went beyond charisma, captured the attention of students of leadership, and the development of instruments to measure transformational leadership, facilitated scholars' research.

Transformational Leadership

It was in part the criticisms of and limitations to charismatic leadership theories that spurred the development of conceptualizations of transformational leadership. In some ways, transformational leadership theory, as developed by Bass and colleagues (Bass, 1985, 1998; Bass & Avolio, 1994), includes the notion of charisma, but goes well beyond in terms of its scope. As a result, transformational leadership has been the most-studied theory of leadership over the past two decades (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Gardner, Lowe, Moss, Mahoney, & Cogliser, 2010).

The origin of transformational leadership theory can be traced to the book, *Leadership*, by political scientist and presidential historian James MacGregor Burns. Burns (1978) laid down the foundation for transformational leadership by describing leadership from a transactional and a transformational perspective, the latter of which he labeled "transforming leadership." According to Burns (1978), transactional leadership is based on the principle of exchange.

> Such leadership occurs when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of exchange of valued things. The exchange could be economic or political or psychological in nature: a swap of goods or of one good for money; a trading of votes between candidate and citizen or between legislators; hospitality to another person in exchange for willingness to listen to one's troubles.
>
> (p. 19)

Transactional leadership does not go beyond the exchange. There is nothing holding the leader and follower together except for the mutual benefits each receives.

Transforming leadership on the other hand is based on the principle of raising the consciousness of followers to a higher moral plane and encouraging them to aspire to high ethical standards. The following paragraph taken from Burns's (1978) *Leadership* summarizes the concept of transforming leadership quite effectively.

> Such leadership occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality. Their purposes, which might have started out as separate but related, as in the case of transactional leadership, become fused … But transforming leadership ultimately becomes moral in that it raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both leader and led, and thus it has a transforming effect on both."
>
> (p. 20)

By describing leadership along a continuum ranging from "transactional" to "transforming," Burns laid down the foundation for what would be later conceptualized as the Transactional-Transformational model of leadership.

Charismatic and Transformational Leadership

The term "transformational leadership" was first introduced by Downton (1973) to describe a model of transactional, charismatic, and inspirational leadership. Bass (1985) proposed a different model of transformational leadership in which he further extended the theoretical frameworks earlier proposed by Burns (1978) and the charismatic leadership theory of House (1977). Central to Bass's model was the concept that different leadership styles and behaviors exist along a continuum. On the one end of the continuum was transformational leadership that consisted of four different factors. Following that was transactional leadership that consisted of two discrete factors, and it was followed by a single factor denoting the absence of leadership, or what Bass labeled "laissez-faire" leadership. Taken together, this continuum became known as the Full Range of Leadership model (Avolio & Bass, 2002).

The four factors that composed transformational leadership were termed *idealized influence*, *inspirational motivation*, *intellectual stimulation*, and *individualized consideration*. These components of transformational leadership are briefly described in Table 1.

Table 1: The Four Components of Transformational Leadership (Bass, 1998; Bass & Riggio, 2006)
Idealized Influence (II)—is the leader's ability to serve as a positive role model for followers. Transformational leaders convey an ideological vision to their followers and give followers a higher sense of purpose—persuading followers to let go of self-interests for the benefit of collective goals. By setting high moral standards and establishing ethical codes of conduct, such leaders garner respect and trust from followers.
Idealized influence was initially considered a single factor, yet it was later divided into idealized influence-attributed—charisma attributed to leaders from followers—and idealized influence-behavioral, which refers to observable leader behaviors that constitute a leader's charismatic appeal.
Inspirational Motivation (IM)—is the ability of transformational leaders to inspire and motivate followers. Leaders communicate high-performance expectations and convey a sense of confidence that followers can meet those expectations.
Taken together, idealized influence and inspirational motivation best represent the notion of a leader's *charisma* (Bass & Riggio, 2006).
Intellectual Stimulation (IS)—is the ability to spur innovative and creative thinking through challenging followers to solve problems and think "outside the box." Because transformational leaders encourage followers to approach problems in novel and perhaps unconventional ways, leaders convey to followers that they are trusted and empowered.
Individualized Consideration (IC)—is the leader's ability to provide for the needs, and be responsive to, each individual follower. The leader provides support, guidance, and mentorship with the result of improving followers' performance, potential, and leadership capacity.

The four transformational leadership factors, along with the three forms of transactional leadership (labeled Contingent Reward, Active Management-by-Exception, and Passive Management-by-Exception), and Laissez-Faire leadership are all measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). Perhaps more than any other single element, the MLQ spurred the increase in research on transformational leadership in the 1990s and beyond (see Antonakis, 2012).

Interestingly, there seems to be a significant amount of overlap between the influence processes associated with charismatic leadership and those associated with transformational leadership. Given that transformational leadership had charisma as an integral part of its factor structure, personal and social identification with the leader were common to both theoretical frameworks. Moreover, given that transformational leaders take active efforts to link tasks to followers' value systems and beliefs, followers are likely to perceive their tasks as a part of their own and thus experience the process of internalization.

Other Models of Transformational Leadership

Bennis and Nanus (1985) presented a model of transforming leadership that outlined four common strategies used by leaders in transforming organizations. They described transforming leaders as (1) having a clear vision of the future state of their organization, (2) social architects capable of mobilizing followers to accept a new group identity or philosophy for their organizations, (3) creators of trust within their organizations, and (4) leaders capable of using creative deployment of self through positive self-regard.

Kouzes and Posner (1987, 2002) interviewed several middle and senior managers and used content analysis to come up with their model of leadership. According to this model, there are five fundamental practices that allow leaders to accomplish extraordinary things. These practices are (1) modeling the way, (2) inspiring a shared vision, (3) challenging the process, (4) enabling others to act, and (5) encouraging the heart. There is a great deal of similarity between these factors and the components of transformational leadership in Bass's model (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) presented another model of transformational leadership that was conceptually similar to the one presented by Bass (1985). It contained six transformational leadership factors that were (1) articulating a vision, (2) providing an appropriate model, (3) fostering the acceptance of group goals, (4) high-performance expectations, (5) providing individualized support, and (6) individualized consideration.

Kouzes and Posner (1988) produced the *Leadership Practices Inventory*, which is widely used in their work in developing leaders, but rarely used as a research tool. Podsakoff et al. (1990) also produced a measure of transformational leadership that has been used in research, but research using the MLQ predominates in the literature.

Transformational Leadership—Summary of Empirical Research

Charismatic and Transformational Leadership

The theory of transformational leadership arguably has been the most researched of all leadership theories. Since its conception circa 1980, many researchers have devoted a great deal of effort toward testing and validating the various aspects of this popular theoretical framework. Given that there is quite a bit of overlap between charismatic leadership and transformational leadership (e.g., idealized influence or charisma is an integral element of transformational leadership), much empirical research aimed at testing the propositions of charismatic leadership inadvertently ends up testing some theoretical propositions associated with transformational leadership, and vice versa. While a comprehensive overview of all the research associated with transformational leadership is beyond the scope of this chapter, the following sections outline some of the research findings associated with this theory of leadership.

Transformational leadership and follower/organizational outcomes. There has been a great deal of research devoted to exploring the relationships between transformational leadership (usually using the MLQ) and follower, team, and organizational outcomes, that several meta-analyses have been conducted. The results suggest that transformational leadership has had a major impact on key variables such as individual and team performance, satisfaction with the leader, and positive workplace attitudes and behaviors.

Meta-analytic results show that all of the components of transformational leadership (e.g., idealized influence, inspirational motivation, etc.) and total score on the transformational leadership components of the MLQ are associated with higher ratings of unit performance (mean rs in the .4–.6 range) and objective measures of positive unit performance (mean rs .2–.3). Interestingly, transactional leadership, as represented by the contingent reward scale of the MLQ, has an estimated r of .45 with rated performance, but only .07 with objective performance. More recently, Wang, Oh, and Colbert (2011) found that transformational leadership was positively related to individual, team, and organizational level performance. The authors also reported that transformational leadership had an augmentation effect over transactional leadership in predicting individual-level contextual performance and team-level performance. These results suggest, in line with the title of Bass's 1985 book that transformational leadership does indeed lead to "performance beyond expectations." (Dumdum, Lowe, & Avolio, 2002; Lowe, Kroek, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996).

The effects of transformational leadership on follower attitudes are even stronger, (although this is partly due to common method bias as followers rate their leaders on the MLQ and also complete the attitude measures). Followers of transformational leaders tend to be more satisfied and show stronger organizational commitment than followers of non-transformational leaders (DeGroot, Kiker, & Cross, 2000; Dumdum et al., 2002). There is also a negative relationship between transformational leadership and turnover intentions (e.g., Martin & Epitropaki, 2001).

In addition to the effects of transformational leadership on employee attitudes and job performance, followers of transformational leaders engage in more organizational citizenship behaviors (i.e., employee behaviors that go beyond the required duties of followers' jobs; Cho & Dansereau, 2010; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, & Bommer, 1996; Purvanova, Bono, & Dzieweczynski, 2006). Transformational leadership also seems to have positive effects on followers' well-being and resistance to stress and burnout. For example, Seltzer, Numerof, and Bass (1989) show that followers of transformational leaders report lower levels of stress and burnout.

An important element of transformational leadership theory is the concept that transformational leaders develop followers' leadership capacity. In other words, followers of transformational leaders should themselves be more effective when put in a leadership role than followers of non-transformational leaders. As a result, there is an expectation that transformational leaders should have a positive developmental impact on followers. Dvir, Eden, Avolio, and Shamir (2002) used a longitudinal randomized field experiment to test the impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance. They found that leaders receiving transformational leadership training had a more positive impact on direct followers' leader development, as defined by a group of measures including internalized moral values, an orientation toward the collective, and a sense of self-efficacy, than did leaders in the comparison group (which received eclectic leadership training). Moreover, these followers, once in leadership positions, led higher performing groups than did leaders receiving eclectic leadership training. Sosik and colleagues (Sosik & Godshalk, 2000; Sosik, Godshalk, & Yammarino, 2004) have suggested that transformational leaders develop followers through effective mentoring processes, including providing career guidance, enhancing self-esteem/efficacy, and providing networking opportunities.

Understanding the transformational leadership process. Much of the process by which transformational leaders affect followers and individual, group, and organizational outcomes has been touched on in our discussion of charismatic leadership given that charisma is a component of transformational leadership. For example, Shamir, et al. (1993) noted how charismatic leaders enhance the self-concept and esteem of followers, and this leads them to greater commitment and performance. It has also been suggested that transformational leaders enhance a collective sense of self-efficacy that facilitates group performance (Hoyt, Murphy, Halverson, & Watson, 2003; Sosik, Avolio, Kahai, & Jung, 1998).

In addition to developing a sense of self-efficacy in followers, transformational leaders also tend to empower followers; and consistent with the intellectual stimulation component, transformational leaders delegate important tasks to challenge followers. This allows followers to "stretch" and grow in their positions, and develop their own leadership potential (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Another aspect of the dynamics of transformational leadership is that followers tend to identify with the leader and develop a sense of trust in him or her. Pillai, Schriesheim, and Williams (1999) suggest that it is trust in the leader and perceptions of leader fairness that are partially responsible for the positive impact transformational leaders have on followers. Deluga (1995) and Podsakoff et al. (1990) found that trust in the leader mediated the relationship between transformational leadership and follower engagement in organizational citizenship behaviors.

As far as an explanation for the finding that transformational leadership is negatively associated with follower stress and burnout goes, it has been suggested that transformational leaders are able to cognitively reframe potentially stressful situations as challenges (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Through enhancing followers' collective sense of efficacy and motivating them to rise to the challenge, followers are buffered against the negative aspects of difficult and taxing situations.

Additional research on transformational leadership. As noted, there has been a huge number of studies and scholarly papers on transformational and charismatic leadership. For example, Wang et al., (2011) found 113 separate studies that looked at the relationship between transformational leadership and follower performance. Antonakis (2012) found 200 papers published on charismatic and transformational leadership

in 2009 alone. Therefore, it would be impossible to review all of the categories and subcategories of research and the multitude of variables that have been explored. What follows is a sampling of additional research topics that have been studied.

One area of research has explored the antecedents to transformational leadership, with the greatest emphasis on the relationship between personality and transformational leadership. Bono and Judge (2004) conducted a meta-analysis to determine the nature of the relationship between personality variables and ratings of transformational and transactional leader behaviors and found that the personality variables of extraversion and neuroticism showed a positive and negative association, respectively, particularly with the charisma-related dimensions of transformational leadership (i.e., idealized influence and inspirational motivation). Self-confidence/self-esteem, dominance, openness to experience, and resiliency/hardiness have also been associated with transformational leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Another important concern is whether transformational leadership theory is U.S.- or Western-centric, or whether it applies to other countries and cultures. Bass (1997) suggests that transformational leadership is more or less universal in its applicability across cultures, and the GLOBE studies suggest that charisma (although it may take different forms in different nations and cultures) is universally valued (House et al., 2004).

Another well-researched topic concerns gender differences in transformational leadership. In their meta-analysis, Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and van Engen (2003) explored gender differences across transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles and found that female leaders were more transformational, engaged in more contingent reward behaviors, and were less likely to manifest aspects of transactional leadership (viz. active and passive management-by-exception) and laissez-faire leadership than male leaders.

Criticisms and Limitations of Transformational Leadership Theory

Similar to charismatic leadership, transformational leadership too has its own set of problems and pitfalls, and numerous researchers have voiced their concerns and criticisms about this theoretical framework (Antonakis, 2012; Antonakis & House, 2002; Yukl, 1999). For example, the original concept of transformational/transactional leadership, emanating from Burns (1978), suggests that transformational leadership is, in many, or perhaps all, ways, superior to transactional leadership. Yet, evidence suggests that transactional leadership, at least as represented by the Contingent Reward subscale of the MLQ, does a good job of predicting positive group and follower outcomes (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Perhaps a better conceptualization has been suggested (Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Bass & Riggio, 2006) that transformational leadership augments the positive effects of transactional leadership.

Another criticism of transformational (as well as of charismatic) leadership is that it tends to be leader-centric and only marginally accounts for the role of followers in the leadership process. House (1999) suggested that charismatic/transformational models place too much emphasis on the effects that leaders have on followers while simultaneously neglecting leaders' effects on group and organizational performance. This criticism has been addressed—to a certain extent—since House (1999) first voiced his concern, however, much needs to be done to fully understand the macrolevel impact that transformational leadership has on group and organizational level outcomes.

Yukl (2006) suggested that "most theories of transformational and charismatic leadership lack sufficient specification of underlying influence processes" (p. 272). For example, the self-concept theory of charismatic leadership seems to lack a detailed description of how the different types of leader influence processes interact and the extent to which they are compatible with each other. Another concern voiced by Yukl (2006) is that most of the theories emphasize leadership from a dyadic perspective and neglect to appropriately explain how leaders build high performing teams. In order to overcome this potential problem, Yukl (2006) suggested that "the theories could be strengthened by a better explanation of how leaders enhance mutual trust and cooperation, empowerment, collective identification, collective efficacy, and collective learning" (p. 273).

Yet another concern expressed by Yukl (2006) is that the theories of charismatic and transformational leadership are unable to appropriately explain the external roles that leaders have to play (e.g., monitoring the environment for opportunities and threats, boundary spanning activities, acting as spokespersons for their organizations, seeking political support, building networks, negotiating, etc.). Such roles are of significant importance for organizational success, and the theories of charismatic and transformational leadership do not offer details regarding leaders' roles and responsibilities in this arena.

Brown and Lord (1999) argued that transformational leadership as a field of leadership research tends to exhibit an overdependence on survey and field studies. According to them, more experimental research needs to be done in order to be able to fully understand the underlying mediating processes associated with how transformational leaders influence their followers—and, in turn, their organizations.

Transformational (as well as charismatic) leadership theories have been accused of overemphasizing universal leader attributes that are relevant across all contexts and situation. This "one size fits all" approach to leadership seems to forgo the significance and impact of contextual variables that might play a role in critical leader-follower processes. Accordingly researchers have called for more attention to situational variables in order to determine the extent to which charismatic and transformational leadership will be effective across different situations (Beyer, 1999; Bryman, 1992). Even though research on the effect of situational factors is emerging (e.g., Antonakis & Atwater, 2002), much more work still needs to be done to accurately decipher the true nature and impact of charismatic and transformational leadership.

Another line of criticism has been leveled at the means for measuring transformational leadership. Criticisms of the MLQ have led to the development of alternative measures (e.g., Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe, 2001; Podsakoff, et al., 1990), and the factor structure of the MLQ has been criticized. For example, some researchers (e.g. Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997; Tejeda, Scandura, & Pillai, 2001; Tracey & Hinkin, 1998) have reported a significant overlap between the four components of transformational leadership, and an inability to replicate the factor structure of the Full Range of Leadership model. However, Antonakis and colleagues (Antonakis, 2012; Antonakis et al., 2003), have suggested that the factor structure of transformational leadership, as measured by the MLQ, does indeed support the four factors outlined above. However, a legitimate criticism is the overreliance on rated, questionnaire measures for assessing transformational leadership, an issue we will discuss in the next section that will deal with future directions needed to increase our understanding of charismatic and transformational leadership.

Directions for Future Theory and Research on Charismatic and Transformational Leadership

Future Theoretical Direction: Charismatic leadership theory still suffers from a lack of consensus regarding the definition of "charisma." This is also a problem for the charisma elements of transformational leadership theory.

Because of its magical and mystical overtones, any attempt to define charisma is met with skepticism (as in "I don't know exactly how to define it, but I know it when I see it, and your definition isn't it."). It may very well be that during the 1990s and early 2000s, research on transformational leadership flourished, while research on leader charisma floundered, simply because of transformational leadership's four well-defined components, and accepted measurement tool (i.e., the MLQ). Yet, the lack of an agreed-upon definition of charisma is still a problem. Researchers have been trying to determine both the elements that seem to contribute to charismatic behavior (e.g., emotional expressiveness, the type and quality of rhetoric, use of metaphor, etc.), and there has been research that has tried to capture aspects of the charisma process (e.g., emotional contagion between leaders and followers, perceptions of leader charisma, etc.). This search for a better understanding of charisma may reinvigorate theorizing and research on charismatic leadership (and on the role of charisma in transformational leadership).

Future Theoretical Direction: Neither charismatic nor transformational leadership theories have dealt adequately with "dark side" leaders.

There is an underlying assumption that charismatic and transformational leadership represent ideals of effective leadership, yet there are many examples of charismatic leaders who were/are horrible dictators, despots, and heads of dangerous and deadly cults. Transformational leadership theory has also been concerned with "pseudo-transformational" leaders (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Indeed, it is this issue that has driven research on authentic leadership (e.g., Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Gardner, Avolio, Walumbwa, 2005) in an effort to focus only on the positive or "authentic" forms of leadership. It is clear that future theory and research on both charismatic and transformational leadership need to clearly define and distinguish the "light" and "dark" forms.

Future Research Direction: The need for additional measures of charismatic and transformational leadership.

In addition to the need for clearer definitions within these leadership theories, there is a need for additional attention given to the measurement of charismatic and transformational leadership. Aside from the authors' own work, few researchers have adopted the Conger and Kanungo (1988, 1998) measure of charismatic leadership. More typically, researchers interested in charismatic leadership have used the charisma subscales from the MLQ, or they use the terms "charismatic" and "transformational" interchangeably. However, the MLQ is not without its critics (e.g., Tejeda, Scandura, & Pillai, 2001; Yukl, 1999), although the instrument has received strong support (e.g., Antonakis. Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003) and usage. Still there are limitations to the MLQ. It has been suggested, however, that other methods and approaches for assessing transformational leadership should be developed. Specifically, Bass and Riggio (2006) suggest the need for a diary-based measurement of transformational leadership behaviors, as well as observational coding.

Future Research Direction: Greater emphasis on the multilevel phenomenon of charismatic and transformational leadership, which involves leaders, followers, and situational elements.

Both charismatic and transformational leadership are very leader-centric theories, focusing primarily on the leader's role in influencing followers. In reality, leadership is a multilevel phenomenon, with leaders and followers collaboratively creating leadership in groups and organizations. Moreover, the role of the situation is theoretically implicated in both charismatic (e.g., crisis situations) and transformational (e.g., stagnant groups and organizations needing change strategies) leadership. Leadership research in general has been moving toward multilevel analyses of leadership (Yammarino & Dansereau, 2008), and research on charismatic and transformational leadership needs to move in this direction.

Future Research Direction: There is a need for evidence that transformational leaders actually "transform" followers (as well as organizations).

A critical and defining element of transformational leadership is the idea of leader "transformation" of followers—the idea that transformational leaders encourage and catalyze the development of leadership potential/capacity in those they lead (see also Antonakis, 2012). However, there has been virtually no evidence, in terms of solid longitudinal investigations, that have demonstrated that transformational leadership actually leads to increases in follower leadership capacity. This research needs to be done. Indeed, leadership research in general suffers from a lack of longitudinal studies of both leader development and leadership processes over time (Day, 2011; Riggio & Mumford, 2011).

Future Research Direction: A clearer articulation of the successful influence tactics that enhance the effectiveness of Charismatic and Transformational leadership.

Research on influence tactics has come a long way since they were introduced into leadership/organizational contexts by Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson (1980) and Jones and Pittman (1982). Multiple efforts have been directed at identifying the effectiveness of specific influence tactics across a plethora of agents, targets, and situations (see Higgins, Judge, & Ferris (2003) for a meta-analytic review of influence tactics' impact on work related outcomes). Although most current models of Charismatic and Transformational leadership outline several influence processes that mediate the impact of Charismatic and Transformational leadership, efforts to associate specific influence tactics with models of Charismatic and Transformational leadership have been relatively scant (Charbonneau, 2004; Clarke & Ward, 2006; Howell & Higgins, 1990). More research needs to be done to identify and validate the specific influence tactics that charismatic and transformational leaders use to effect leadership outcomes. Furthermore, exploring the impact of several different combinations of influence tactics across different situations, cultures, as well as followers of varying demographics can yield a better understanding of the how the current models work and can potentially pave the way for more refined theories.

Future Research Direction: More comprehensive descriptive as well as normative models of Charismatic and Transformational leadership need to be developed for leading in multi- and cross-cultural environments.

Although research on Charismatic and Transformational leadership is transcending the typical Western contexts (Den Hartog et al., 1999; Leong & Fischer, 2011; Lian, Brown, Tanzer, Che, 2011; Van De Vliert, 2006), more work needs to go into the development of theoretically and empirically validated models of Charismatic and Transformational leadership that are best suited for specific cultures around the world. Most cross-cultural research on Charismatic and Transformational leadership seems to be aimed at empirically testing the efficacy of current models across different cultures. Although this has significantly added to our understanding of the different processes and outcomes associated with these theories, a necessary next step is to adapt and refine current models so that they are more culturally specific and accurate. Such efforts at theory revision should focus more on introducing necessary increments/decrements to current models to suit particular cultures—rather than a revolutionary upheaval of established theory. Adopting this route will have tremendous implications for not only the theoretical advancement of the field, but also have implications for the practice of charismatic and transformational leadership across the globe.

Conclusion

Charismatic and transformational leadership are popular theories with research scholars and with the general public. Both involve the elusive, but fascinating, construct of charisma—that special "gift" discussed by Weber more than a century ago. Yet, there is still some disagreement over the definition and proper assessment of charisma. These theories are also appealing because they represent superior, and perhaps even ideal, forms of leadership. In the case of transformational leadership, there is substantial evidence that transformational leaders do indeed lead better than their non-transformational counterparts. Moreover, because of the availability of reasonably well-validated measurement instruments, particularly the MLQ, research efforts to further understand the intermediary processes and outcomes associated with transformational leadership have flourished, and will likely continue into the foreseeable future. Several challenges to such efforts, however, loom on the horizon. Given the porous nature of organizational, cultural, political, and social boundaries, coupled with the ever-evolving role played by rapid technological innovation, the form and function of charismatic, as well as transformational leadership, as we understand them today might change. Followers today have the means to witness and minutely scrutinize each and every action of leaders. Social media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, etc., have made contemporary leaders more visible. Due to such widespread visibility, a relatively minor mistake or a faux pas on the part of leaders has the potential to cause their downfall. This calls for greater transparency between leaders and followers—a component of a relatively new model of leadership, viz. Authentic leadership (but also hinted at in discussions of "authentic" transformational leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006). We speculate that with passing time and changing contexts, newer prerequisites, antecedents, and moderators will be introduced to the present conceptualizations of charismatic and transformational leadership thus prolonging their applicability and deferring their *potentially impending* obsolescence. Whether models of charismatic and transformational leadership become obsolete or not will be a question that will be answered in due course of time, however, following Thomas Kuhn's (1962) suggestion, their place in the history and progression of the field of leadership will remain irreplaceable as we stand in the face of new frontiers of leadership science and thought.

References

Antonakis, J. (2012). Transformational and charismatic leadership. In D. V. Day & J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (2nd ed., pp. 256–288). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Antonakis, J., & Atwater, L. (2002). Leader distance: A review and a proposed theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, *13*(6), 673–704.

Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14*(3), 261–295.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (Eds.). (2002). *Developing potential across a full range of leadership: Cases on transactional and transformational leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, *16*, 315–338.

Awamleh, R., & Gardner, W. L. (1999). Perceptions of leader charisma and effectiveness: The effects of vision content, delivery, and organizational performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(3), 345.

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

Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional/transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American psychologist*, *52*, 130–139.

Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*, 207–218.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational Leadership* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*, 181–217.

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

Beyer, J. M. (1999). Taming and promoting charisma to change organizations. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*, 307–330.

Bono, J. E., & Ilies, R. (2006). Charisma, positive emotions, and mood contagion. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*, 317–334.

Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*, 901–910.

Brown, D. S., & Lord, R. G. (1999). The utility of experimental research in the study of transformational/charismatic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*, 531–539.

Brown, M. E., & Trevino, L. K. (2006). Socialized charismatic leadership, values congruence, and deviance in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(4), 954–962.

Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. London: Sage.

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

Charbonneau, D. (2004). Influence tactics and perceptions of transformational leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *25*(7), 565–576.

Cho, J., & Dansereau, F. (2010). Are transformational leaders fair? A multi-level study of transformational leadership, justice perceptions, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, *21*(3), 409–421.

Choi, Y., & Mai-Dalton, R. R. (1999). The model of followers' responses to self-sacrificial leadership: An empirical test. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(3), 397–421.

Cicero, L., & Pierro, A. (2007). Charismatic leadership and organizational outcomes: The mediating role of employees' work-group identification. *International Journal of Psychology*, *42*(5), 297–306.

Clarke, S., & Ward, K. (2006). The role of leader influence tactics and safety climate in engaging employees' safety participation. *Risk Analysis: An International Journal*, *26*(5), 1175–1185.

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

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

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Day, D. V. (2011). Integrative perspectives on longitudinal investigations of leader development: From childhood through adulthood. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *22*, 561–571.

DeGroot, T., Kiker, D. S., & Cross, T. C. (2000). A meta-analysis to review organizational outcomes related to charismatic leadership. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, *17*, 356–371.

Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., & Dorfman, P. W. (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(2), p. 219.

De Hoogh, A.H.B., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2009). Neuroticism and locus of control as moderators of the relationships of charismatic and autocratic leadership with burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(4), 1058–1067.

Deluga, R. J. (1995). The relationship between trust in the supervisor and subordinate organizational citizenship behavior. *Military Psychology*, *3*, 25–39.

Downton, J. V. (1973). *Rebel leadership: Commitment and charisma in the revolutionary process*. New York: Free Press.

Dumdum, U. R., Lowe, K. B. & Avolio, B. J. (2002). A meta-analysis of transformational and transactional leadership correlates of effectiveness and satisfaction: An update and extension. In B. J. Avolio & F. J. Yammarino (Eds.), *Transformational and charismatic leadership: The road ahead* (pp. 35–66). Oxford: JAI/Elsevier.

Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, *45*, 735–744.

Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing men and women. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*, 569–591.

Erez, A., Misangyi, V. F., Johnson, D. E., LePine, M. A., & Halverson, K. C. (2008). Stirring the hearts of followers: Charismatic leadership as the transferal of affect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(3), 602–616.

Fiedler, F. E. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (vol. 1, pp. 149–190). New York: Academic Press.

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

Fiedler, F. E., & Chemers, M. M. (1974). *Leadership and effective management*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Friedman, H. S., Riggio, R. E., & Casella, D. (1988). Nonverbal skill, personal charisma, and initial attraction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *14*, 203–211.

Gardner, W. L., Avolio, B. J., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Emergent trends and future directions. In W. L. Gardner, B. J. Avolio, & F. O. Walumbwa (Eds.), *Authentic leadership theory and practice: Origins, effects, and development* (pp. 387–406). Oxford: Elsevier Science.

Gardner, W. L., Lowe, K. B., Moss, T. W., Mahoney, K. T., & Cogliser, C. C. (2010). Scholarly leadership of the study of leadership: A review of the Leadership Quarterly's second decade, 2000–2009. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *21*(6), 922–958.

Groves, K. S. (2005). Gender differences in social and emotional skills and charismatic leadership. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, *11*(3), 30–46.

Halverson, S. K., Murphy, S. E., & Riggio, R. E. (2004). Charismatic leadership in crisis situations: A laboratory investigation of stress and crisis. *Small Group Research*, *35*(5), 495–514.

Hepworth, W., & Towler, A. (2004). The effects of individual differences and charismatic leadership on workplace aggression. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *9*(2), 176–185.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Higgins, C. A., Judge, T. A., & Ferris, G. R. (2003). Influence tactics and work outcomes: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, *24*, 89–106.

Hogan, R. J., Raskin, R., & Fazzini, D. (1990). The dark side of charisma. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 343–354). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

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

House, R. J. (1999). Weber and the neo-charismatic paradigm: A response to Beyer. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*, 563–574.

House, R. J., & Howell, J. M. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, *3*, (2), 81–108.

House, R. J., Spangler, W. D., & Woycke, J. (1991). Personality and charisma in U.S. presidency: A psychological theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *36*(3), 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., & Frost, P. J. (1989). A laboratory stud of charismatic leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *43*(2), pp. 243–269.

Howell, J. M., & Higgins, C. A. (1990). Leadership behaviors, influence tactics, and career experiences of champions of technological innovation. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *1*(4), 249–264.

Hoyt, C. L., Murphy, S. E., Halverson, S. K., & Watson, C. B. (2003). Group leadership: Efficacy and effectiveness. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, *7*, 259–274.

Johnson, S. K. (2009). Do you feel what I feel? Mood contagion and leadership outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *20*(5), 814–827.

Jones, E. E., & Pittman, T. S. (1982). Toward a general theory of strategic self presentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives on the self* (pp. 231–262). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Katz, D., Maccoby, N., Gurin, G., & Floor, L. G. (1951). *Productivity, supervision and morale among railroad workers*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Kets de Vries, M.F.R. (1988). Prisoners of leadership. *Human Relations*, *41*(3), 261–280.

Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S.M., & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics: Exploration in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *65*(4), 440–452.

Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes.

Journal of Applied Psychology, *81*(1), 36–51.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1987). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Leong, L., & Fischer, R. (2011). Is transformational leadership universal? A meta-analytical investigation of multifactor leadership questionnaire means across cultures. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *18*(2), 164–174.

Lian, H., Brown, D., Tanzer, N., & Che, H. (2011). Distal charismatic leadership and follower effects: An examination of Conger and Kanungo's conceptualization of charisma in China. *Leadership*, *7*(3), 251–273.

Lindholm, C. (1988). Lovers and leaders: comparative models of romance and charisma. *Social Science Information*, *27*(1), 3–45.

Lord, R. G., DeVader, C. L., & Alliger, G. M. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *71*, 402–410.

Lowe, K. B., & Gardner, W. L. (2000). Ten years of *The Leadership Quarterly*: Contributions and challenges for the future. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *11*, 459–514.

Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *7*(3), 385–425.

Mann, R. D. (1959). A review of the relationship between personality and performance in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, *56*, 241–270.

Martin, R., & Epitropaki, O. (2001). Role of organizational identification on implicit leadership theories (ILTs), transformational leadership and work attitudes. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *4*, 247–262.

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

Michaelis, B., Stegmaier, R., & Sonntag, K. (2009). Affective commitment to change and innovation implementation of behavior: The role of charismatic leadership and employees' trust in top management. *Journal of Change Management*, *9*(4), 399–417.

Miner, J. B. (1975). The uncertain future of the leadership concept. An overview. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership frontiers* (pp. 197–208). Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.

Mumford, M. D., Gessner, T. L., Connelly, M. S., O'Connor, J. A., & Clifton, T. C. (1993). Leadership and destructive acts: Individual and situational influences. *Leadership Quarterly*, *4*, 115–147.

Pillai, R., Schriesheim, C. A., & Williams, S. E. (1999). Fairness perceptions and trust as mediators for transformational and transactional leadership: A two-sample study. *Journal of Management*, *25*, 897–933.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational, citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, *22*, 259–298.

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

Purvanova, R. K., Bono, J. E., & Dzieweczynski, J. (2006). Transformational leadership, job characteristics, and organizational citizenship performance. *Human Performance*, *19*(1), 1–22.

Riggio, R. E. (1987). *The charisma quotient*. New York: Dodd-Mead.

Riggio, R. E. (1998). Charisma. In H. S. Friedman (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of mental health*. (pp. 387–396). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Riggio, R. E., & Mumford, M. D. (2011). Introduction to the special issue: Longitudinal studies of leadership development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *22*, 453–456.

Rowold, J., & Laukamp, L. (2009). Charismatic leadership and objective performance. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *58*(4), 602–621.

Seltzer, J., Numerof, R. E., & Bass, B. M. (1989). Transformational leadership: Is it a source of more or less burnout or stress? *Journal of Health and Human Resources Administration*, *12*, 174–185.

Shamir, B. (1991). The charismatic relationship: Alternative explanations and predictions. *Leadership Quarterly*, *2*, 81–104.

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

Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organizational Science*, *4*, 1–17.

Shamir, B., & Howell, J. M. (1999). Organizational and contextual influences on the emergence and effectiveness of charismatic leadership. *Leadership*

Quarterly, *10*, 257–283.

Sosik, J. J., Avolio, B. J., Kahai, S. S., & Jung, D. I. (1998). Computer-supported work group potency and effectiveness: The role of transformational leadership, anonymity, and task interdependence. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *14*, 491–511.

Sosik, J. J., & Godshalk, V. M. (2000). Leadership styles, mentoring functions received and job-related stress: A conceptual model and preliminary study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *21*, 365–390.

Sosik, J. J., Godshalk, V. M., & Yammarino, F. J. (2004). Transformational leadership, learning goal orientation, and expectations for career success in mentor-protégé relationships: A multiple levels of analysis perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*, 241–261.

Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology*, *25*, 35–71.

Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research* New York: Free Press.

Stogdill, R. M., & Coons, A. E. (Eds.). (1957). *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.

Tejeda, M. J., Scandura, T. A., & Pillai, R. (2001). The MLQ revisited: Psychometric properties and recommendations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *12*, 31–52.

Tracey, J. B., & Hinkin, T. R. (1998). Transformational leadership or effective managerial practices? *Group & Organization Management*, *23*(3), 220–236.

Turner, S. (1993). Charisma and obedience: A risk cognition approach. *Leadership Quarterly*, *4*(3–4), 235–256.

Van De Vliert, E. (2006). Climatic ecology of charismatic leadership ideals. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *15*(4), 385–403.

Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (1988). *The new leadership: Managing participation in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

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

Wang, G., Oh, I., & Colbert, A. E. (2011). Transformational leadership and performance across criteria and levels: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of research. *Group & Organization Management*, *36*(2), 223–270.

Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization* (T. Parsons, Trans.). New York: Free Press.

Weber, M. (1968). *Max Weber on charisma and institutional building* (S. N. Eisenstadt, Ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago 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., & Dansereau, F. (2008). Multi-level nature and multi-level approaches to leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *19*(2), 135–141.

Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership potential. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*, 285–305.

Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in Organizations*. NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Ketan H. Mhatre

Ketan H. Mhatre is a member of the Kravis Leadership Institute at Claremont McKenna College in Claremont, CA.

Ronald E. Riggio

Ronald E. Riggio, Ph.D., is the Henry R. Kravis Professor of Leadership and Organizational Psychology and former director of the Kravis Leadership Institute at Claremont McKenna College.