
Charisma and the Archetypes of Leadership

Johannes Steyrer

Abstract

The following contribution attempts to develop a charisma model in the context of business organizations, based on a social-cognitive information processing approach in the perception of leadership. It tries to operationalize charisma, departing from prototypical attributes that are inherent in the cognitive category of leadership. In contrast to the 'New Leadership Approach', we depart from a 'polymorphous phenotype' of charisma. This position is derived from the concept of charisma as Max Weber understands it. Based on the concept of 'archetypes' of leadership, four different phenotypes are then defined: the hero ('heroic charisma'), the father ('paternalistic charisma'), the saviour ('missionary charisma') and the king ('majestic charisma'). The main idea of this model is the correlation that is brought out clearly between charisma and stigma, and thus also the idea that both 'hyper-representativity' and 'anti-representativity' as well as 'social dramatization' and 'social reversion' can occasion the allocation of charisma.

Descriptors: charisma, leadership, information processing, impression management, organizational symbolism

Introduction

In leadership research considerable efforts have been made during the last 15 years to analyze exceptional leaders who have extraordinary effects on their followers both from a theoretical and an empirical point of view. In this connection Bryman (1992) talks about a 'New Leadership Approach'. This approach can basically be subdivided into three different research perspectives: a distinction between management and leadership (e.g. Bennis and Nanus 1985; Kouzes and Posner 1987; Kotter 1988), a distinction between transformational and transactional leadership (e.g. Burns 1978; Bass 1985) and an analysis of the charisma phenomenon (e.g. House 1977; Conger and Kanungo 1987; Kets de Vries 1988; Conger 1989; Howell and Frost 1989; House et al. 1991; Howell and Avolio 1992; House and Howell 1992; Shamir et al. 1993; Shamir et al. 1994; O'Conner et al. 1995; Steyrer 1995; Kirkpatrick and Locke 1996; Deluga 1997). The common core of these frequently overlapping approaches lies in their viewing leadership as the conveyance of values and meaning by means of exemplary action, as well as in the articulation of an inspiring vision. The basic assumption is that this kind of leadership transforms the needs, values, preferences, desires and aspirations of followers from their individual interests to collective

Johannes Steyrer
University of
Economics
and Business
Administration,
Vienna, Austria

Organization
Studies
1998, 19/5
807-828
© 1998 EGOS
0170-8406/98
0019-0031 \$3.00

interests, so that followers become highly committed to the mission of the leader and are prepared to make sacrifices in the interest of the mission.

Weber's Charisma Concept and Theory

Charisma is a term from ancient Greek. 'Charis' can be translated by 'favour'. The suffix 'ma', which is added to the root, forms a term the original sense of which is 'gift of favour' (Sullivan 1984: 17). Weber, who introduced this concept into sociology, indicates that he took it over from Christian theology (Weber 1976: 124). In his work *Economy and Society*, Weber gives a definition of the concept according to which the carrier of charisma is:

'set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least (...) exceptional powers and qualities (...) which are not accessible to the ordinary person, (...) and on the basis of which the individual concerned is treated as a leader. (...) How the quality in question would be ultimately judged from any ethical, aesthetic, or other such point of view is naturally entirely indifferent for purposes of definition. What is alone important is how the individual is actually regarded by those subject to charismatic authority, by his "followers" or "disciples".' (Weber 1974: 358–359)

This definition shows clearly that in Weber's understanding of the concept, on the one hand, the elements of the exceptional and the exemplary on the part of the leader are of central importance, and that, on the other hand, it is important how these qualities are 'evaluated by the followers', i.e. that charisma clearly lies in the eyes of the beholders.

At least two conclusions can be drawn: on the one hand, a detailed analysis of social-cognitive information processing has to be carried out when perceiving leadership, because this seems to be the key to understanding charisma; on the other hand, we have to ask in which way leaders in a modern organizational context can be exceptional/exemplary figures. Weber explicitly leaves open how these qualities are to be defined. It seems to be justified, however, to assume that in various social contexts different attributes are regarded as differing from the ordinary. In this sense, Weber also defines numerous different sub-types of charisma. Hummel (1972: 95 ff.), for example, proves 17 different phenotypes in his analysis of relevant texts by Weber: e.g. revolutionary charisma; the politically effective prophet; the magician as innovator; magician and warrior; genuine or personal political charisma; plebiscitary rulership; individualistic charisma; conservative charisma; hereditary kingship. Consequently, therefore, Weber explicitly writes that charismatic relations lead the followers to a 'devotion to heroism, no matter which content it has' (Weber 1976: 661).

This, however, is opposed to the fact that the formation and articulation of a vision is perhaps the most commonly emphasized behaviour in the current conception of charismatic leadership in organizations (Bennis and Nanus 1985; Conger and Kanungo 1987; Westley and Mintzberg 1988; House and Shamir 1992; Kirkpatrick and Locke 1996). Furthermore, charis-

matic leadership is sometimes referred to as visionary leadership (Sashkin 1988; Shamir et al. 1993; House and Shamir 1993).

From the above remarks, however, it can be concluded that, in Weber's sense, charisma can manifest itself in polymorphous phenotypes, and that the limitation of the 'New Leadership Approach' to the dimension of 'prophetic charisma', for which the articulation of a vision is a constitutive element, is a very limited view of the phenomenon indeed.

Deficits of Charisma Research So Far

If we try to systematize the charisma concepts developed so far, we can differentiate in principle between four different approaches: (1) leader-centred, (2) follower-centred, (3) interdependency-oriented, and (4) context-centred approaches. Since the latter approach refers to concepts that deal with the phenomenon on a macro-level, and since the following model is based on micro-theory, only the first three approaches will be dealt with below.

Leader-centred approaches depart from the assumption that charisma is a phenomenon in which followers respond to exceptional, exemplary characteristics of behaviour on the part of the leader by allocating charisma to him/her. The explanation pattern has the following form: exceptional, exemplary individual person + vision → (contextual crisis) → followers under stress → allocation of charisma (e.g. Willner 1984; Conger and Kanungo 1987; Howell and Frost 1989; Puffer 1990; Howell and Higgins 1990; House et al. 1991; Kirkpatrick and Locke 1996; Deluga 1997).

The basic assumption therefore is 'that no one specific context (e.g. a context of crisis) plays the determining role in the appearance or presence of a charismatic leader', but that specific characteristics of the leader cause an allocation of charisma. The question therefore is: 'If the follower's attribution of charisma depends on observed behaviour of the leader, then what are the behavioural components responsible for such attributions' (Conger and Kanungo 1987: 640).

Even if, in the meantime, researchers have succeeded in formulating relatively detailed indications regarding the specific modes of behaviour and characteristics of charismatic leaders, one central point of criticism remains: This approach departs from a downright 'naive' interpretation of the charisma attribution process. Followers thus respond to the perception of specific modes of behaviour/characteristics on the part of the leader by mechanistically attributing charisma to him/her. The active part solely lies with the leader, whereas the followers react passively. Their position in the relation system can therefore be compared to a 'plane mirror' that reflects a 'real' picture of the leader.

In *follower-centred models*, on the other hand, the question is what makes followers project exceptional/exemplary qualities onto a leader, the main emphasis being on the illusionary character of perception (e.g. Downton 1973; Miyahara 1983; Meindl 1990; Meindl 1992; Mayo et al. 1994). The explanation pattern here has the following form: (contextual crisis) →

followers under stress → appearance of leader + vision → attribution of charisma.

Charismatic phenomena therefore emerge: '(...) within the context of lateral relations that develop among followers and subordinates themselves. These are, to a large degree, functionally autonomous from whatever forces are emanating from the traits and behaviour of the leaders *per se*' (Meindl 1990: 197).

Thus, compared to the leader-centred perspective, there is a reversion of relations. The active part in the relationship is ascribed to the followers who, as a consequence of group-dynamic processes and psychic conflicts, respectively, project charisma on a focal person if this person proves to be able to find an answer to critical experiences. Here, too, we find a one-sided, distorted relation concept that interprets the leader as a socio-psychologically conditioned draft of the followers.

Interdependency models, which deal with the interactive relation between leaders and followers, have the following form: exceptional/exemplary leader + followers under stress → charismatic interaction. The decisive factor here is the idea that charisma cannot be analyzed in a one-sidedly linear manner, either top-down or bottom-up, but only while considering the interactive correlation that is taking place (e.g. Schweitzer 1984; Lindholm 1990; Pauchant 1991; Shamir et al. 1993; House and Shamir 1993).

Lindholm expresses the research perspective on which this model is based as follows: 'Charisma is, above all, a relationship, a mutual mingling of the inner selves of leader and follower. Therefore, if the charismatic leader is able to compel, the follower has a matching capacity for being compelled, and we need to consider what makes up the personality configuration of the follower, as well as that of the leader, if we are to understand charisma' (Lindholm 1990: 7).

The charisma concept of Shamir et al. (1992) and House and Shamir (1993) appears to be promising in this connection. The target of their concept is to supplement current theories of charismatic leadership with a motivational theory that is able to better explain the relationship between leader behaviour and its effects on followers. Emphasis is, however, relatively one-sidedly put on visionary leadership, so that charismatic leadership is regarded as being a synonym of visionary leadership.

The main point of criticism against research carried out so far, therefore, is that cognitive processes have not been taken into consideration in the perception of leadership. The resulting ontological polarization of charisma is to be criticized in the light of a social-cognitive framework of relations. Either a mechanistic allocation of charisma is implied, where the leader is what he/she appears to be in the eyes of his/her followers; or the phenomenon is 'diluted' exclusively into 'projective' emanation, where the leader becomes a carrier of charisma without any efforts on his/her part.

Leadership and Information Processing

Cognitive processing research attempts to explain how people acquire, store, retrieve, or use information during the perception of leadership. The social individual is here defined as an active information processor who, by means of a 'subjective' perception and processing of 'objective' stimuli, creates his/her own image of reality (Lord and Maher 1989, 1990, 1991). Basically a difference is made between inferential processes (how do events and outcomes come about) and recognition-based processes (how are traits and behaviours perceived). These processes can either proceed automatically (perceptually guided, simplified causal analysis or prototype matching based on face-to-face contact) or be controlled (prototype matching based on socially communicated information or logically based, comprehensive causal analysis). Inferentially-based processing has to do with the idea that a major function of leaders is to produce good performance outcomes. Basically, it has been proved in this connection that success enhances the perception of leadership, while failure limits it (e.g. Binning and Lord 1980; Rush et al. 1981; Pillai and Meindl 1991).

For the present context, recognition-based models of perceptual processes are particularly important. Since social interactions often place high processing demands on actors, it makes sense to think of recognition-based processes as proceeding more automatically (Lord and Maher 1991). Thus, these processes involve the use of pre-existing knowledge about leadership. Such knowledge has been referred to as '*implicit leadership theories*' or cognitive categories (Phillips and Lord 1982; Lord et al. 1984; Binning et al. 1986; Lord and Foti 1986). Through general, day-to-day experiences as well as through experience in a particular organizational context, people develop detailed knowledge structures pertinent to leadership. Empirical research shows that classifying an individual as a leader involves matching certain stimulus properties to a prototype of a leader held in memory. The 'prototype' here is defined as 'an abstraction of features common to leaders that is developed through experience' (Lord and Maher 1991: 54), the whole perception process (selective attention, encoding, storage/retention and retrieval) being selectively influenced by these prototypical attributes.

Lord and his colleagues' (1984) findings, based on an extensive analysis of college students' leadership categories, have led to a first list of prototypical leadership traits, such as: determined, open-minded, informed, intelligent, verbal skills, strong character. Offermann et al. (1994) went one step further and, by means of factor analysis, subdivided individually generated prototypical characteristics of leaders into eight classes that represent collective expectations. We will come back to this point later.

What can be concluded for the perception of charisma? If charisma is based on the aura of the exceptional/exemplary quality of a leader, it cannot — according to our thesis — have its origins in the prototypical. The prototypical, in this sense, is downright 'anti-charismatic' because it corresponds to normative expectations, to what is anticipated.

The following model is based on the thesis that the categorization of a stimulus person as a charismatic leader emerges from the allocation of evaluative borderline attributes. These borderline attributes are closely related to socially stigmatized characteristics, consciously or unconsciously intended by the leader, either by means of social dramatization or by social reversion (borderline behaviour) of prototypical attributes. The expressive quality of leaders and the cognitive impressive quality that they have on their followers are only partly congruent.

The basic concept of this model is the assumption that stigma and charisma mutually refer to each other and emerge from each other. This idea goes back to a sociological study by Lipp (1985). In order to make this thesis comprehensible it is necessary first of all to discuss the concept of stigma. Then Lipp's theory will be explained, as far as this seems relevant in the present context. Finally, our own model will be discussed.

Dialectics between Stigma and Charisma

Etymologically speaking, the concept of stigma is related to 'sting', originally meaning a tattoo, and in a broader sense a brand for a slave, criminal or traitor. In a sociological context, stigma refers to attributes that serve as signals within a group or society to treat carriers of these attributes in a way deviant from the norm. Goffman (1959, 1967) uses this concept in connection with a person who 'has a quality that distinguishes him/her from others in this category of people' (Goffman 1967: 19), a stigma being a quality that 'is deeply discrediting' (Goffman 1967: 11). He differentiates between three different kinds of stigmata: disfigurements of the body, consisting in various types of physical deformation, individual character defects, as well as phylogenetic stigmata based on race, nationality or religion. For our purposes, character attributes such as 'a weak will, predominant or unnatural passions, malicious or inflexible opinions and disreputability' (Goffman 1967: 12f.) are particularly relevant.

Having a stigma therefore means that somebody is 'other than anticipated in some undesired way' (Goffman 1967: 13). Stigma in this sense is the dialectic counterpart of charisma, so to speak, where a person is different from what is generally expected in a 'desired' way. Lipp departs from the assumption that processes which lead to the formation of charismatic qualities originally have their roots in stigmatization: 'Charismatic characteristics are closely related to stigmatic characteristics, the latter defining their carriers as primarily "miserable", i.e. socio-morally deficient; (...) making connections visible that are of a fundamental character' (Lipp 1985: 11f.).

What does this fundamental character consist of? Lipp regards deviant behaviour, which he calls 'borderline behaviour', as essential both for the stigma and the charisma phenomena. Borderline behaviour is experienced as being deviant because it pushes its carrier towards the edge or out of the group. Borderline behaviour could, however, also make a group begin to doubt the validity of the practice it assumes to be normal. Consciously

applied, borderline behaviour could therefore create the possibility of initiating social changes and of making oneself the centre of events, or even of occupying a morally highly valued position. In this sociological sense, the term 'borderline behaviour' therefore has nothing to do with psychiatric diagnosis criteria, as used e.g. by Kernberg (1984) for describing severe personality disorders.

In this sociological context Lipp also talks about 'self-stigmatization'. Through the process of self-stigmatization, people could be capable of giving the situation of the establishment a negative connotation and the situation of the 'oppressed' a positive connotation, by reevaluating the latter's afflictions cognitively and normatively, and by requiring potential addressees to make a virtue of necessity, i.e. to actively and consciously identify with the situation of the underprivileged members of society.

Lipp sub-divides self-stigmatization into the following phenotypes: exhibitionism, provocation, asceticism and ecstasy (Lipp 1985: 131f.). Each of these strategies, which Lipp further sub-divides into different expressive, dominative and cognitive forms, reacts to the predominant order of a society in different ways. 'Originalism', for example, can show itself as an exhibitionist display of "'natural" (...), unrestrained, uncouth, wild' characteristics (Lipp 1985: 174). In a civilized society, it carries the stigma of being defective, naked, vulnerable, but it helps to attract attention and to put forward one's own claims to power. Other examples are: 'Banditry', 'Sectarianism', and 'Messianism'.

These examples make clear that Lipp discusses the mutual interplay between stigma and charisma within the framework of a sociology of deviant behaviour. Charisma emerges from stigma or is rooted in self-stigmatization. This leads to the question of what can be concluded from analyses of socially deviant behaviour of members of social fringe groups, such as provokers, ascetics, ecstasies, etc. when analyzing leaders in organizations. Such leaders are part of the core of the establishment in a society, and their charisma certainly does not result from expressly deviant behaviour.

Impression Continuum and Impression Dimensions of Leadership

The following model departs from the assumption that evaluative borderline attributes can be derived from the prototypical attributes connected with the concept of a leader. These evaluative borderline attributes can hold their ground in the light of normative expectations of organizations, thus not making their carriers members of social fringe groups. They are, however, in a dialectic relation with the prototypical, and they determine the dialectics between stigma and charisma according to their specific expressiveness/impressiveness.

The dialectic relation can be based on a gradual increase of the prototypical. This can be exemplified by means of the characteristic 'dedicated' as follows: 'dedicated' — 'passionate' — 'fanatic'. Observers can therefore

not only judge each individual case, but they have got a 'semantic continuum' of attributes at their disposal by means of which they are able to evaluate the leader's individual attributes. 'Passionate' as an impressive attribute (charisma) borders on 'fanatic', which is a discrediting attribute.

We depart from the assumption that these evaluations are not completely separated from the 'actual' characteristics of the leader and that — depending on regularities of interpersonal perception — leadership expressiveness and impressiveness partly correspond to each other. Furthermore, we assume that there are psycho-dynamically justifiable needs that prompt a leader to advance towards becoming a carrier of charisma consciously/unconsciously, or to function as a focal person in charismatic relations. A means to achieve this end are actions of impression management or self-presentation, where the prototypical elements of leadership are stylized and exaggerated.

We call such behaviour-related accentuation and intensification of prototypical leadership qualities '*social dramatization*'. On the part of the followers, these expressive qualities are connected with symbolic codes (encoding) on the cognitive level. These qualities are 'comparisons of prototypical attributes' and mark '*hyper-representativity*' in the semantic sense. The dialectics between stigma and charisma lies in the fact that overdrawing action from a certain moment onwards becomes or appears to be exaggeration.

Furthermore, the dialectic relation between these diametrical opposites can lie in a gradual reversion of the prototypical. This can be exemplified by means of the characteristic 'dedicated' as follows: 'dedicated' — 'poised, tolerant composure/tranquil' — 'indifferent, impassive'.

The prototypical leadership characteristics can therefore also be contrasted with attributes which, in their first degree of intensity, signal that somebody is different, in a positive sense. The carrier of these attributes appears to be raised beyond everyday life and is characterized by exceptionality. The stigmatic aspect lies in the fact that over-exaggerations of this expressive quality easily turn negative, since they are diametrically opposed to what is expected from leaders: tolerant composure/tranquillity, an important attribute (charisma), borders on being impassive/indifferent, which is a discrediting attribute (stigma).

We call these inverse behaviour-related accentuations and intensifications of prototypical leadership characteristics '*social reversion*'. On the part of the followers, these expressive qualities are connected with symbolic codes on a cognitive level. They are also comparisons of prototypical attributes in a semantic sense, but mark '*anti-representativity*'.

Therefore we can conclude that somebody who judges a leader using leadership-related representativity heuristics has a continuum of evaluative attributes at his/her disposal. Departing from prototypical assumptions, intensifications are located in one direction on this continuum and reversions in the other. Intensifications appear as '*hyper-representativity*', reversions as '*anti-representativity*'. Placing a stimulus person on this continuum outside the area showing prototypical features is at the same time an occasion

for classifying him/her as a charismatic leader. The symbolic codes (cognitive impressive qualities) can be plotted on a continuum that we term 'impression continuum of leadership'.

Based on a list of 57 items of prototypical leadership attributes generated by test subjects, Offermann et al. (1994) were able to generate an eight-dimensional factor structure: '*Dedication*' (e.g. dedicated, goal-oriented); '*Sensitivity*' (understanding, helpful); '*Tyranny*' (forceful, assertive); '*Charisma*' (inspiring); '*Attractiveness*' (well-groomed); '*Masculinity*' (masculine); '*Intelligence*' (intelligent, knowledgeable); '*Strength*' (strong). We call these collective expectations '*impression dimensions*'. On the one hand, they function as cognitive points of orientation in the perception of leadership, and on the other as social dramatization or social reversion options, respectively.

In Table 1, a corresponding continuum is formulated by means of two attributes for each of the 'impression dimensions' determined by Offermann et al. Due to relatively high correlations between 'strength' and 'masculinity', as well as between 'attractiveness' and 'charisma' (or 'communicativeness'), these two pairs of factors are each combined into one dimension.

At the centre of each impression continuum there is a prototypical attribute based on the findings of Offermann et al. Therefore the continuum always has to be read from the centre. The opposites of leadership with the maximum negative connotation are located in the columns at the very left and right, respectively. The columns left and right of the centre show the positive opposites.

If during a further step we attempt to concisely express the polarizing contrariety of the evaluative borderline attributes along the individual dimensions, we arrive at the following differentiation: The '*Dedication*' dimension is located in the dialectic relation between '*Severity/Consistency*' and '*Gentleness/Openness*'; '*Sensitivity*' is located between '*Involvement/Ability to Promote Regulated Development*' and '*Detachment/Ability to Promote Independent Development*'; '*Tyranny*' is located between '*Regulatory Behaviour*' and '*Free Development*'; the '*Communicativeness*' dimension extends between '*Extroversion/Persuasive Behaviour*' and '*Introversion/Irritation/Authenticity*'; '*Strength/Masculinity*' lies between '*Phallic Exhibitionism*' and '*Phallic Discretion*'. '*Intelligence*' is located between '*Left-hemispheric Specialization*' and '*Right-hemispheric Specialization*'.

Summing up the basic thesis, we can say that the classification of a stimulus person as a charismatic leader results from the allocation of evaluative borderline attributes (symbolic codes in the sense of hyper/anti-representativity) which emerge from the prototypical core of leadership and are closely related to stigmatized characteristics. Social dramatization of prototypical attributes is perceived as attractive up to a certain level: the stimulus person appears as a paragon, as 'the' incarnation of leadership (charisma). An additional intensification, however, can be perceived as an invalidating exaggeration (stigma). Social reversion of prototypical attributes makes a leader a significant personality due to his/her positively connoted manner

of behaving differently (charisma): The significance lies in the reversion of what has been anticipated. Additional intensification evokes social aversion (stigma).

Table 1 Impression Continuum of Leadership

	Anti-representativity social reversion		Prototypicality	Hyper-representativity social dramatization		
	stigma	charisma		charisma	stigma	
			'Dedication'			
'Gentleness, Openness'	indifferent, passive	poised, tolerant	dedicated	passionate	fanatic	'Severity, Consistency'
	aimless, careless	flexible, spontaneous	goal-oriented	visionary	dogmatic, totalitarian	
			'Sensitivity'			
'Detachment, Ability to Promote Independent Development'	withholds guidance, indifferent	holds back, non-interfering	helpful	self-sacrificing	plays the martyr	'Involvement, Ability to Promote Regulated Development'
	insensitive	analytically critical	understanding	deeply empathetic	patronizingly considerate	
			'Tyranny'			
'Free Development'	subservient	conciliatory, harmonizing	forceful	dominant	despotic, tyrannical	'Regulatory Behaviour'
	accepts everything passively	patient	assertive	aggressive	belligerent, militant	
			'Communicativeness'			
'Introversion, Irritation, Authenticity'	causes distrust	productively disconcerting	inspiring	rousing	indoctrinating, messianic	'Extraversion; Persuasive Behaviour'
	seedy	indifferent to outward appearances, bohemian	well-groomed	concerned with outward impression	vain, dandyish	
			'Strength/Masculinity'			
'Phallic Discretion'	weak	inconspicuous	strong	self-assured, potent	presumptuous, conceited	'Phallic Exhibitionism'
	hesitant	circumspect, cautious	bold	heroic	stops at nothing	
			'Intelligence'			
'Right-hemispheric Specialization'	other-worldly	wise, intuitive	intelligent	sharp-witted, analytic, nearly a genius	genius on the verge of insanity	'Left-hemispheric Specialization'
	badly informed	has a good general idea of the whole	knowledgeable	knows every detail	tunnel-visioned	

Impression Management and the Archetypes of Leadership

Dramatization and social reversion are acts of '*self-presentation*' of a leader. Processes of self-presentation are discussed in socio-psychological literature under headings such as '*impression management*', '*image control*' or '*self-presentation*' (Mummendey 1990: 128). The core of this theory goes back to Goffman (1959, 1967), according to whom individuals in social interactions try to control the impression they make on their interaction partners as far as possible. Individuals, therefore, are not only passively exposed to social impressions, but they control the anticipated influence that is exerted upon them by conveying a certain expressive quality of themselves. A definition offered within this expansive perspective is that impression management is the regulation of 'information about some object or event, including the self' (Schlenker and Weigold 1992: 138). Within the scope of self-presentation, leaders therefore show behaviour which they hope will trigger the desired conclusions and attributions regarding their personal qualities (hyper/anti-representativity) with their target audience.

The question that now poses itself is whether certain patterns can be derived by means of which leaders control the image others have of them by using dramatization and reversion. One possible answer to this question is given by Neuberger, who departs from the assumption that the 'generic category of leadership is not the last, but a derived analytic unit' (Neuberger 1990: 72). He assumes that behind the category of leadership there is another and more basic dimension, namely '*archetypes*' of leadership that are structured according to the images of '*fathers*', '*heroes*', and '*saviours*' (Neuberger 1990: 41ff). Under the concept of archetypes, Neuberger subsumes 'those mighty archetypes of the mind' which 'embody the manifold phenotypes of one area of reality in a fundamental and typical way, thus representing the original' (Neuberger 1990: 42). The concept of the archetype goes back to C. G. Jung. It was first re-discovered for organization research by Mitroff, who speaks of so-called 'stakeholders of the organizational mind', a factor 'which has been almost totally ignored in modern theories of organization, but which nonetheless exerts a considerable hold on the behaviour of individuals, groups, organizations, and even whole societies' (Mitroff 1983: 163).

Subsequently, we depart from the assumption that the archetypes of leadership can be understood as '*mythical "super" categories*' which determine which basic forms of leadership exist in the first place, and how leadership becomes symbolic and significant — by means of dramatization and reversion (borderline behaviour). At the same time, these mythical 'super' categories function as symbolically charged representativity heuristics (identification signs) when perceiving leadership, and define imaginable and presentable polymorphic phenotypes of charisma.

Neuberger himself does not indicate how the archetypes he mentions (father, hero, saviour) are incorporated in Western culture. However, in my opinion, it is obvious that, in addition to the mythological component, as often expressed in fairy tales and legends, he thus ultimately addresses the

'Trinity' of the Christian concept of God. This is manifested, for example, in the Creed: 'In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost'.

Subsequently, a short general description of the individual archetypes will be given, and their connection to Christian theology will be outlined. Furthermore, the typology will be exemplified by means of short case studies of leaders, as found in relevant management literature. In addition to father, hero, and saviour, we will finally define a fourth archetype of leadership, namely the 'king'.

The Father

In Christian tradition, God as the father stands first of all for 'fatherly love' (inspires dedication, awe, confidence), 'fatherly wisdom' (puts relations in order) as well as 'fatherly care' (opens up the soul). Eventually the relation to God the Creator is decisive, which is particularly evident in the prayer: 'I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth' (Raidt 1993: 251).

In Neuberger's sense, the image of the father contains both the 'despotic sovereign-father' and the 'infantilizing benefactor'. In a patriarchally dominated society, the Father represents the 'archetype of the creator, generator and absolute lord'. Corresponding to the despotic sovereign type, he appears 'superior, strong, knowing, great and paramount, stable, dependable and reliable'. As an infantilizing benefactor, he appears to his followers both as someone 'understanding, forgiving, benevolent, protective, caring' and 'strict, demanding, punishing, threatening, predominant and castrating' (Neuberger 1990: 44 *f. passim*). Sennet gets to the heart of this ambivalence: 'The force of the paternalistic metaphor is ultimately based on the substance of what it reconciles: custody and power, or to formulate it more precisely and more irritatingly: love and power. Those have authority who use their strength for caring for others' (Sennet 1985: 101).

Georg Pullman, an American sleeping car manufacturer, can be seen as an example for this type of paternalistic leadership. He cared for his staff like a father and even built his own town, where his employees could live inexpensively, but they also had to submit themselves to his care and his ideas of order, e.g. as regards smoking, drinking and cleanliness. Sennet describes this as 'large, efficient, moralistic, governed by stern discipline — the town was a reflection of its founder' (Sennet 1985: 77f.). In the framework of his paternalistic benevolence, Pullman forced a father-child relationship upon his employees, which culminated, among other things, in the fact that he did not accept personal property in houses, his reason being that 'families might settle down there who are not sufficiently familiar with the habits I want to develop in the inhabitants of Pullman City, and who put everything good my work has created at risk by their presence' (Sennet 1985: 78 f.). Despite the care and protection they received, the workers did not accept this kind of patronage in the long run, and this resulted in a strike which had to be suppressed by the national guard.

Subsequently, we will talk of '*paternalistic charisma*' in connection with the phenotype of the 'Father'. Hypothesis 1 is as follows: The phenotype of the 'Father' is primarily connected with borderline attributes in the area of 'Involvement/Ability to promote Regulated Development' (e.g. self-sacrificing — patronizingly considerate), 'Regulatory Behaviour' (dominant — despotic/tyrannical) and 'Phallic Exhibitionism' (self-assured/potent, presumptuous/conceited).

The Hero

The word 'hero' derives from the Indo-European word *kel-* 'to drive' and at first denoted the driver of the herd. The herdsman of primeval times, however, had to defend his herd against human and animal robbers, at the risk of his own life. Therefore, the word came to denote a courageous fighter who is well aware of his task (Lurker 1987: 288).

In this sense, Jesus Christ is also described as the 'Good Shepherd' (John 10,1–16): 'Here the Lord presents to us the ideal of authority (...): care, carefulness, intimacy, disinterestedness, willingness to make sacrifices, combined with strong leadership. (...) The Good Shepherd leads his sheep to the pasture, and "he goes ahead of them", he fulfils his leadership task. He "lays down his life" for them. He is prepared to make sacrifices for them, to pay a price for leadership' (Raidt 1993: 249).

For Neuberger the hero is the 'juvenile counterpart' of the 'patriarchal person', representing 'what the father used to be: a hero well-proved in courageous fights'. The hero goes 'his way unwavering and lonely' and defeats 'all foes with super-human powers, gains admiration, appreciation and immortality'. He 'does not subordinate himself to others', but realises the 'collective dream of power and self-determination'; he can 'do without company, fancies himself to be self-sufficient, mighty, strong, in short: magnificent' (Neuberger 1990: 45ff. *passim*). Hofstede defines heroes as '(...) real or invented people (...) who function as models for behaviour within a culture' (Hofstede 1993: 127). Founders of businesses in particular fulfil the function of heroes within a company's inventory of symbols.

The example of Steven Jobs, the co-founder of Apple Computers, illustrates how much he, in his self-presentation, aimed at staging the juvenile hero. His biographer writes that Jobs, although being the son of devoted parents, 'wanted to look and feel like an orphan who had spent a few years bumming around the country, hopping on freight trains or riding in eighteen-wheelers' (Butcher 1989: 41). Job did not change his appearance even when he took on his first job at Atari Computer Company: 'While at Atari, Jobs was following Ehret's mucousless diet, eating yoghurt and fruit. He believed that the diet eliminated the need for bathing. Others disagreed' (Butcher 1989: 49). When recruiting prospective employees, he would take them to lunch at a nearby restaurant: 'Often Jobs would throw his dirty bare feet up on a table and attack them mercilessly' (Butcher 1989: 119). In numerous instances, it becomes evident with what intensity, virtually bordering on fanaticism, Jobs tried to put his objectives into practice. With

regard to his intelligence, we find the following passage: 'After hounding an advertising representative Jobs wanted to represent Apple, he got him to visit the operation. The representative said that within three minutes he knew that Jobs "was an incredibly smart young man"' (Butcher 1989: 82). Butcher shows that this ability to manage an impression of great intellect may have been responsible for Jobs' success at persuading others. Once in power, Jobs used the following leadership style: 'He ruled by intimidation, yelling and screaming at people' (Butcher 1989: 96).

In connection with the 'Hero' phenotype, we now look at '*Heroic Charisma*'. Hypothesis 2 is as follows: The phenotype of the 'Hero' is primarily connected with borderline attributes in the area of 'Authenticity' (productively disconcerting — causes distrust; indifferent to outward appearances, bohemian — seedy), 'Left-hemispheric Specialization' (sharp-witted, analytic, nearly a man of genius — genius on the verge of insanity); 'Phallic Exhibitionism' (heroic — stops at nothing; self-assured, potent — presumptuous, conceited); 'Severity/Consistency' (passionate — fanatic).

The Saviour

In Christian theology the 'Holy Ghost' is described as the 'animator in the Holy Trinity', it represents the 'dynamic, creative principle' and 'is vitality incarnate', creating the 'inner motivation', giving 'formation' and representing 'enlightened leadership' (Raidt 1993: S. 250 f.).

In ancient very advanced civilizations, as well as among the peoples who had no writing system, these mythic figures appear as:

'mediators of cultural goods; they bring fire, give food plants, instruct people how to hunt or fish, or teach them religious truths. (...) An essential element of saviours is their fight against the divine opponent, the Evil; (...) thus making them saviours, redeemers'. (Lurker 1987: 282)

According to Neuberger, the saviour is the 'charismatic innovator, the great and magic transformer of the existing to the better'. He holds 'the masses spellbound', breaks their 'own will' and makes them 'a willing tool'. The 'ready subjection to the extraordinary charisma of this luminous figure, so far removed from everyday life that it "can no longer be measured by earthly standards"' (Neuberger 1990: 54) is at the centre of the saviour's impact. Under the archetype of saviour, Neuberger therefore subsumes the phenotype of leadership which Weber referred to by the notion of prophetic charisma. The function and position of the saviour, exemplified by means of prophetic charisma, culminate in the statement 'This is what was laid down — but this is what I tell you'. As could be shown above, this phenotype of charisma is also the focus of recent literature. The element of 'salvation' is explained by means of the concepts of vision, mission, or transformation and lies in offering strategies for overcoming current crises.

Donald Burr, founder of *People Express*, can be mentioned as an example here. His vision was to establish an organization representing 'a better way of doing things', and 'a better way for people to work together within the

American system of democracy' (Chen and Meindl 1991: 529). Chen and Meindl studied journalistic reports on Burr to find out how he was characterized there. It emerged that the metaphor of the preacher was predominant: 'Highlighted in this system were the specification of a message (horizontal-management philosophy), the unorthodox nature (not a minister or reverend or clergy), a strong sense of morality (he condemns and praises), the whole-hearted dedication and commitment (fervour, zeal, sweat-in-the-tent), and the spiritual hold (evangelic, the glue, the messiah) the preacher had on his followers' (Chen and Meindl 1991: 540). Such characterizations of Burr were e.g.: "He could've been a preacher". They don't say "minister", or "reverend", or "clergy", they say "preacher" because it conveys exactly the right sense of sweat-in-a-hot-tent, evangelical fervour that makes the pulse race. Burr works hard when he talks. He paces; he sits; he stands; he throws out his arms; he condemns and praises, implores and jokes. It takes almost a messiah, William Hambrecht says: "that's the glue that holds it together" (Chen and Meindl 1991: 550 f.).

Now we will look at '*Missionary Charisma*' in connection with the 'Saviour' phenotype. Hypothesis 3 is as follows: The phenotype of the 'Saviour' is primarily connected with borderline attributes in the area of 'Extroversion/Persuasive Behaviour' (rousing — indoctrinating, messianic); 'Severity/Consistency' (visionary — dogmatic, totalitarian); 'Right-hemispheric Specialization' (wise, intuitive — other-worldly).

The King

Let us amplify Neuberger's statements by defining a fourth archetype of leadership: *the king*. This archetypal figure cannot be traced back to Christian tradition, however, it plays a central role in European folk tales. To become king is the ultimate target of the hero and is often the reason for his adventures and travels: To become king is the final point of the hero's maturing process. Nobility by birth does not play a role here, but the message conveyed is that even central figures who come from a simple background are capable of 'becoming kings' in the sense of reaching maximum development of their individual talents (Biedermann 1989: 241).

Jung therefore sees the figure of the old king who appears in dreams as another archetypal figure 'who represents the wisdom of the collective subconscious' (Becker 1992: 150). Thus Jung distinguishes his understanding of the king from the symbolic figure of paternalistic rule (father archetype) and sees in it the archetype of 'higher insight and wisdom in the resources of inherited mental symbols' (Biedermann 1989: 241). The figure of the ideal king can finally manifest itself in the phenotype of the 'wise old man' who is seen as the personification of the 'spiritual principle'. Jacobi characterises this type as follows:

'Age-old, unlimited knowledge and understanding are drawn into the face of the "wise old man". His eyes are inward-looking, his features are immobile, his mouth is closed; they all express the highest spirituality, a spirituality that is as if it had grown into one with nature, that has become nature itself.' (Jacobi 1980: 125)

In their typology of 'masculinity' which goes back to Jung, Moore and Gillette (1990) also refer to the 'King' and give the following characterization: 'seeks peace and stability, orderly growth and nurturing for all people. (...) The King cares for the whole realm and is the steward of nature as well as of human society' (Moore and Gillette 1990: 62f.). Biedermann furthermore points out that, in ancient cultures, the king 'ideally' counted as 'the greatest of heroes', but was not allowed to 'participate actively in fights' (Biedermann 1989: 240).

The following paragraphs are summaries of the author's encounters with famous CEOs and the common characteristics he believes to have found in them:

'Fifth common characteristic: the lack of any image neurosis. (...) Managers who are still on the upward move vibrate. Managers who have already reached the top, convey a peculiar kind of calm — similar to the eye of the cyclone, this uncannily calm core zone at the centre of a tornado. Sometimes one can feel a touching modesty — be it play-acting or grateful humility — which is almost embarrassing. This happened rather unexpectedly, for example, with Helmut Maucher, the powerful boss of Nestlé. Discussing with him (...) was similar to an informal talk between mild monks, despite a very controversial topic, due to his friendly easiness. In some cases, the layer of deep piety was on top of the modesty layer, as e.g. with Jan MacAllister Booth, Polaroid's number one, or Word-Perfect's Alan Ashton, who rules at the heart of Mormon-dominated Utah. Relaxed normality (and a sympathetic embarrassment when being photographed) were also found in Hewlett-Packard's John Young, and Compaq's ex-hero Rod Canion. (...) It would be difficult to place Apple boss John Sculley or ex-Digital boss Ken Olsen in the higher ranks of the modesty list. However, even sportive, caffeine-addicted ex-Pepsi boss Sculley, and the gloomy, impressive, Ingmar-Bergman-type Olsen could serve as models for many a middle manager as regards their manners, composure and politeness (also towards their secretaries). (...) The sixth, final and at the same time summarizing common characteristic of these international businessmen is that they are personalities, they show a considerable degree of inner peace and appear largely self-determined and confident.' (Gansterer 1992: 20f.)

Attributes and metaphors such as 'inner peace', 'composure', 'politeness', conveying a 'peculiar kind of calm', 'touching modesty', 'relaxed normality', 'friendly easiness', 'grateful humility', 'layer of deep piety' document the antithetical contrast with the Hero and the Saviour prototypes, respectively.

Now we will look at '*Majestic Charisma*' in connection with the 'King'. Hypothesis 4 is as follows: The phenotype of the 'King' is primarily connected with borderline attributes in the area of 'Gentleness/Openness' (poised, tolerant — indifferent, passive); 'Phallic Discretion' (holds back, non-interfering — withholds guidance, indifferent); 'Right-hemispheric Specialisation' (has a good general idea of the whole — badly informed).

Conclusions and Research Perspectives

The central thesis of the model can be summed up as follows: Leaders whose self-presentation is located in the border areas, i.e. outside the area

showing prototypicality, always have to find the right balance because, in the eyes of their followers, they are moving on a razor's edge: Too little social dramatization or reversion means that they will not be distinguished from the mass of their competitors. If there is too much *mise-en-scène*, charisma turns into stigma. The classic charisma-dilemma, therefore, is the dramatic/playful approximation to the corresponding border zones, without actually crossing the Rubicon. If borderline behaviour turns into the direction of invalidating exaggeration, behaviour which for a long time has been considered awe-inspiring, becomes repulsive; what has long been impressive becomes grotesque and hypertrophic. In this sense, charismatic leaders in organizations are not border crossers who "turn" social order "inside out" and turn it into its contrary' (Lipp 1985: 44) — this is reserved for members of social fringe groups — but they are 'border crossers' at the periphery of social expectations in the context of leadership. Social dramatization and social reversion are respectively those modes of impression management from which charisma seems to emerge. On a mythical-religious basis, the archetypes determine which basic forms of self-presentation of leadership exist. They are based on common cultural heritage and determine well-tried models of behaviour which regulate human intercourse, reducing the amount of thought required.

Following Burrell and Morgan (1979), leadership research can also be placed along an 'objectivist-subjectivist continuum'. For the traditional scientific or objectivist position, leadership is 'real', can be measured in a relatively objective manner, and has generalizable and lawlike relationships waiting to be discovered. In contrast to that, the subjectivist position argues that reality cannot be objectively depicted and can only be understood when considering the actors' perspectives and their relations of significance. The mainstream of leadership research is, however, 'extremely objectivist in nature' (Hunt 1991: 52). Therefore, if we try, summing up, to enable some statements to be made on possible research perspectives in connection with the archetypes of leadership, we have to depart from the assumption that an 'interpretative approach' seems particularly suitable here. Besides a manifest-material dimension of leadership, the symbolic dimension could also be explored, in the sense of a theatre, drama and cultural perspective which sees leaders and followers as actors, using symbols to interpret and enact meaningful relationships with their world (Dandridge et al. 1980; Pondy et al. 1983). The individual archetypes could therefore, among other things, acquire the following 'symbolic functions' in organizations: The Father symbolizes the admissibility of an emotional dimension in addition to the objective-rational dimension, as well as the fact that there is an authority where all power is centralized and where reality is defined. The Hero acts as a symbol for the ideal of success and the fact that superhuman achievements are within human power, and that individuals are capable of having their way against large, anonymous, and non-transparent systems. The Saviour makes it clear that there are still large-scale perspectives worth supporting, and that there are solutions for urgent problems. The King creates a diametric counterpart to organizational ordinariness, thus stabilizing

the latter's general validity. It becomes obvious that the top of the hierarchy is different from the rest of the organization and that being admitted to the Olympus of leadership is worthwhile, because there, all severity, tension, extroversion and calculated effect seem to be at an end.

By means of individual case studies, trend analyses and hermeneutic interpretations of texts (Silverman 1985) we can trace social dramatization/reversion strategies of leaders and can demonstrate phenotypical forms of attributes. By means of 'constant comparative methods' (Lincoln and Guba 1985) and of procedures of qualitative content analysis a content-oriented examination of this typology could be carried out.

First of all, a positivist approach would have to develop a scale that can be used as an impression continuum for measuring charisma. This scale would have to be used in the sense of a polarity profile as used by Osgood (1952). Gerstner and Day (1994) prove that 'implicit leadership theories' are strongly dependent on culture, so that lists of attributes deriving from US studies cannot be applied one by one to Europe. In addition, the list by Offermann et al. (1994), which is used here, is based on 'effective leaders', so that we have to assume that some of the dimensions already contain hyper-prototypical attributes. By means of this scale, test subjects could describe both a charismatic and a non-charismatic leader in order to be able to measure the attribution of prototypicality, hyper-representativity and anti-representativity. This would allow an empirical answer to the question as to from which degree of hyper-representativity or anti-representativity onward charisma can be attributed. By means of indicators which measure the degree of identification of the rater with the leader's objectives, the hypothesis as to whether compatibility with objectives makes borderline behaviour appear charismatic and incompatibility with objectives makes it appear to be stigmatized would have to be examined. Eventually, an empirical test of the typology could be carried out by means of cluster analyses.

Finally, there is the problem that the derived archetypes are decidedly masculine. Here we have to state that the social connotations connected with the concept of 'leadership' are, to a large extent, influenced by patriarchy ('Masculinity' is an empirically determined impression dimension!). The Christian-theological roots of these archetypes are also relevant in this context. Morgan (1986) has defined several female types of leadership (e.g. Great Mother, Amazone, Daughter, Jeanne d'Arc). Here we would have to examine whether — based on specifically feminine attributes — an attribution of charisma could be provoked, or whether leadership and charisma only emerge by means of masculine forms of self-representation. If this is the case, then this might be one of the reasons why access to leadership positions is still much more difficult for women: Neither women nor men would then have secure role patterns as to how they should behave and present themselves in the context of leadership.

References

- Bass, Bernard M.
1985 *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Becker, Udo
1992 *Lexikon der Symbole*. Freiburg: Herder.
- Bennis, Warren, and Burt Nanus
1985 *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Biedermann, Hans
1989 *Knaurs Lexikon der Symbole*. München: Droemer Knauer.
- Binning, John F., and Robert G. Lord
1980 'Boundary conditions for performance cue effects on group process ratings: Familiarity versus type of feedback'. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 26/1: 115-130.
- Binning, John F., Andrea J. Zaba, and John C. Whattam
1986 'Explaining the biasing effects of performance cues in terms of cognitive categorization'. *Academy of Management Journal* 29/3: 521-535.
- Bryman, Alan
1992 *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. London: Sage.
- Burns, John M.
1978 *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Burrell, Gibson, and Gareth Morgan
1987 *Sociological paradigms and organisational analysis*. London: Heinemann.
- Butcher, Lynn
1989 *Accidental millionaire: The rise and fall of Steve Jobs*. New York: Paragon House.
- Chen, Chao C., and James R. Meindl
1991 'The construction of Leadership images in the popular press: The case of Donald Burr and People Express'. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 36/4: 521-551.
- Conger, Jay A.
1989 *The charismatic leader. Behind the mystique of exceptional leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Conger, Jay A., and Rabindra N. Kanungo
1987 'Towards a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings'. *Academy of Management Review* 12/4: 637-647.
- Dandridge, Thomas C., Ian I. Mitroff, and Warren F. Joyce
1980 Organizational Symbolism: A topic to expand organizational analysis'. *Academy of Management Review* 5/1: 77-82.
- Deluga, Ronald, J.
1997 'Relationship among american presidential charismatic leadership, narcissism, and rated performance'. *Leadership Quarterly* 8/1: 49-65.
- Downton, James V.
1973 *Rebel leadership: Commitment and charisma in the revolutionary process*. New York: Free Press.
- Gerstner, Charlotte R., and David V. Day
1994 'Cross-cultural comparison of leadership prototypes'. *Leadership Quarterly* 5/1: 121-134.
- Gansterer, Helmut
1992 'Begegnungen mit berühmten Top-Managern'. *Trend. Das Österreichische Wirtschaftsmagazin* 25/3: 20-23.
- Goffman, Erving
1959 *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Doubleday.
- Goffman, Erving
1967 *Stigma. Über Techniken der Bewältigung beschädigter Identität*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Hofstede, Geert
1993 'Die Bedeutung von Kultur und ihren Dimensionen im Internationalen Management' in *Globalisierung der Wirtschaft. Einwirkungen auf die Betriebswirtschaftslehre*. M. Haller et al. (eds.), 127-148. Bern: Haupt.
- House, Robert J.
1977 'A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership' in *Leadership: The cutting edge*. J. G. Hunt and L. L. Larson (eds.): 189-207. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

- House, Robert J., and Jane M. Howell
1992 'Personality and charismatic leadership'. *The Leadership Quarterly* 2/2: 81-108.
- House, Robert J., and Boas Shamir
1992 'Toward the integration of transformational, charismatic, and visionary theories' in *Leadership theory and research. Perspectives and direction*. M. M. Chemers and R. Ayman (eds.), 81-107. New York: Academic Press.
- House, Robert J., William D. Spangler, and James Woycke
1991 'Personality and charisma in the U.S. presidency: A psychological theory of leader effectiveness'. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 36/3: 364-396.
- Howell, Jane M., and Bruce J. Avolio
1992 'The ethics of charismatic leadership: Submission or liberation'. *Academy of Management Executive* 6/2: 43-54.
- Howell, Jane M., and Peter J. Frost
1989 'A laboratory study of charismatic leadership'. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 43: 243-269.
- Howell, Jane M., and Christopher A. Higgins
1990 'Champions of technological innovation'. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 35/3: 317-341.
- Hummel, Ralph P.
1972 'Charisma in politics: Psycho-social causes of revolution as pre-conditions of charismatic outbreaks within the framework of Weber's Epistemology'. Dissertation: New York University.
- Hunt, James G.
1991 *Leadership: A new synthesis*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Jacobi, Jolande
1980 *Die Psychologie von C. G. Jung. Eine Einführung in das Gesamtwerk*. Frankfurt: Fischer.
- Kernberg, Otto
1984 *Severe personality disorders*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kets de Vries, Manfred F. R.
1988 'Ties that bind the leader and the led' in *Charismatic leadership. The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness*. J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo (eds.), 237-252. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kirkpatrick, Shelley A., and Edwin A. Locke
1996 'Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes'. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 81/1: 36-51.
- Kotter, John P.
1988 *The leadership factor*. New York: Free Press.
- Kouzes, James M., and Barry Z. Posner
1987 *The leadership challenge. How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lincoln, Yvonna S., and Egon G. Guba
1985 *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Lindholm, Charles
1990 *Charisma*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Lipp, Wolfgang
1985 *Stigma und Charisma. Über soziales Grenzverhalten*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.
- Lord, Robert G., and Roseanne J. Foti
1986 'Schema theories, information processing, and organizational behavior' in *The thinking organization*. H. P. Sims and D.A. Gioia (eds.), 20-48. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lord, Robert G., Roseanne J. Foti, and Christy L. DeVader
1984 'A test of leadership categorization theory: Internal structure, information processing, and leadership perceptions'. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 34/3: 343-378.
- Lord, Robert G., and Karen J. Maher
1989 'Cognitive processes in industrial and organizational psychology' in *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*. C.L. Cooper and I.T. Robertson (eds.), 49-91. Chichester: Wiley.

Lord, Robert G., and Karen J. Maher
1990 'Perceptions of leadership and their implications in organizations' in *Applied social psychology and organizational settings*. J. S. Carrol (ed.), 129-154. Hillsdale: N.J. Erlbaum.

Lord, Robert G., and Karen J. Maher
1991 *Leadership and information processing. Linking perceptions and performance*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Lurker, Manfred
1987 *Wörterbuch der Symbolik*. Stuttgart: Kröner.

Mayo, Margarita, Juan-Carlos Pastor, and James R. Meindl
1994 'The forgotten aspects of leadership. The followers and the context'. Working Paper: State University of New York at Buffalo.

Meindl, James R.
1990 'On leadership: An alternative to the conventional wisdom' in *Research in organizational behavior*. B. M. Staw and L. L. Cummings (eds.), 159-203. Greenwich/London: JAI Press.

Meindl, James R.
1992 'Reinventing leadership: A radical, social psychological approach' in *Social psychology in organizations: Advances in theory and research*. K. Muringhan (ed.), 159-203. Englewood Cliffs: NJ: Prentice Hall.

Mitroff, Ian I
1983 *Stakeholders of the organizational mind*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miyahara, Karen
1983 'Charisma: from Weber to contemporary sociology'. *Sociological Inquiry* 53/4: 368-388.

Moore, Robert, and Douglas Gillette
1990 *King, warrior, magician, lover: Rediscovering the archetypes of the mature masculine*. New York: Harper Collins.

Morgan, Gareth
1986 *Images of organization*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Mummendey, Hans Dieter
1990 *Psychologie der Selbstdarstellung*. Göttingen: Hogrefe.

Neuberger, Oswald
1990 *Führen und geführt werden*. Stuttgart: Enke.

O'Conner, Jennifer, Michael D. Mumford, Timothy, C. Clifton, and Theodore L. Gessner
1995 'Charismatic leaders and destructiveness: An historiometric study'. *Leadership Quarterly* 6/4: 529-555.

Offermann, Lynn R., John K. Kennedy, and Philip W. Wirtz
1994 'Implicit leadership theories: content, structure and generalizability'. *Leadership Quarterly* 5/1: 43-58.

Osgood, Charles E.
1952 'The nature and measurement of meaning'. *Psychological Bulletin* 49/2: 197-237.

Pauchant, Thierry C.
1991 'Transferential leadership. Towards a more complex understanding of charisma in organizations'. *Organization Studies* 12/4: 507-527.

Phillips, James S., and Robert G. Lord
1982 'Schematic information processing and perceptions of leadership in problem-solving groups'. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 67/4: 486-492.

Pillai, R., and J. R. Meindl
1991 'The impact of a performance crisis on attribution of charismatic leadership: A preliminary study'. *Best paper proceeding of the 1991 Eastern Academy of Management meetings*. Hartford, CT.

Pondy, Louis R., Peter J. Frostm, Gareth Morgan, and Thomas C. Dandridge
1983 *Organizational symbolism*. Greenwich: JAI Press.

Puffer, Sheila M.
1990 'Attributions of charismatic leadership: The impact of decision style, outcome, and observer characteristics'. *Leadership Quarterly* 1/3: 177-192.

Raidt, Edith
1993 *Christliche Unternehmensführung*. Vallendar: Schönstadt.

- Rush, Michael, James S. Phillips, and Robert G. Lord
1981 'Effects of a temporal delay in rating on leader behavior descriptions: A laboratory investigation'. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 66: 442-450.
- Sashkin, Marshall
1988 'The visionary leader' in *Charismatic leadership. The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness*. J. A. Conger and R. N. Kanungo (eds.), 122-160. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schlenker, Berth R., and Michael F. Weigold
1992 'Interpersonal processes involving impression regulation and management'. *Annual Review of Psychology* 43: 133-168.
- Schweitzer, Arthur
1984 *The age of charisma*. Chicago: Nelson Hall.
- Sennet, Richard
1985 *Autorität*. Frankfurt: Fischer.
- Shamir, Boas, Michael B. Arthur, and Robert J. House
1994 'The rhetoric of charismatic leadership. A theoretical extension, a case study, and implications for research'. *The Leadership Quarterly* 5/1: 25-42.
- Shamir, Boas, Robert J. House, and Michael B. Arthur,
1993 'The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory'. *Organization Science* 4/4: 577-594.
- Silverman, David
1985 *Qualitative methodology and sociology*. Aldershot: Gower.
- Sullivan, Franz A.
1984 *Die charismatische Erneuerung. Wirken und Ziele*. Graz/Wien/Köln: Mohr.
- Steyrer, Johannes
1995 *Charisma in Organisationen. Sozial-kognitive und psychodynamisch-interaktive Aspekte von Führung*. Frankfurt: Campus.
- Weber, Max
1974 *The theory of social and economic organization*. New York: The Free Press.
- Weber, M.
1976 *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Westley, Frances R., and Henry Mintzberg
1988 'Profiles of strategic vision: Levesque and Iacocca' in *Charismatic leadership. The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness*. J. A. Conger and R. N. Kanungo (eds.), 161-212. San Francisco/London: Jossey-Bass.
- Willner, Ann Ruth
1984 *The spellbinders. Charismatic political leadership*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.

