Spring 4-14-2014

Revisiting Weber's charismatic leadership: Learning from the past and looking to the future

Ivana Milosevic
University of Nebraska Lincoln

A. Erin Bass
University of Nebraska at Omaha, aebass@unomaha.edu

Recommended Citation

Revisiting Weber's charismatic leadership: Learning from the past and looking to the

future

Ivana Milosevic
Management Department
University of Nebraska
Lincoln Nebraska
Email: ivana.a.milosevic@gmail.com

A. Erin Bass
Management Department
University of Nebraska
Lincoln Nebraska
Email: andreaerinbass@gmail.com

Corresponding author: Ivana Milosevic, College of Business Administration, University of Nebraska, Lincoln

Email: ivana.a.milosevic@gmail.com

Revisiting Weber's charismatic leadership: Learning from the past and looking to the future

Weber's work needs little introduction, as his writings made a terrific impact on the social sciences in general, and management research in particular. His writings are an important aspect of management history that shapes much of our thinking today (Houghton, 2010). Weber's approach was groundbreaking, as he used rich descriptions and analysis of societies as a whole. He explored the emergence, continuity, and change of social organizations and the phenomena embedded within (Eisenstadt, 1968). To this end, Weber's work was the springboard for many avenues of research in the management field. He paved the way for work on power (Courpasson, et al., 2012; Jermier, 1998; Katz and Kahn, 1978), economic organization and change (Hannan and Freeman, 1984; Mintzberg, et al., 2005; Suchman, 1995), and charisma (Bass, 1985; Bryman, 1993; Conger and Kanungo, 1987; Howell and Shamir, 2005). Particularly relevant, and our focus in this paper, is his portrayal of charisma. He describes charisma as a quality by virtue of which extraordinary individuals are distinguished from ordinary ones. This quality gives the bearer of charisma power, and the appearance of supernatural strength in leadership to drive change (Weber, 1947).

Inspired by the promise of charisma, leadership scholars in the past two decades aimed to understand charismatic leadership within the organizational context. During this time, scholars discovered that charismatic leadership is an important antecedent to a host of beneficial organizational outcomes, such as leader and employee effectiveness, employee job satisfaction, and employee commitment (DeGroot, et al., 2000; Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1996; Lowe, et al., 1996; Waldman, et al., 2004). In an effort to better understand charisma within the organizational context, contemporary research focuses on exploring charismatic leaders' characteristics and

behaviors at differing organizational levels (Bass, 1988; Conger and Kanungo, 1987; Klein and House, 1995; Waldman, et al., 2004), examining roles that followers play in shaping charismatic leadership (Choi, 2006; Ehrhart and Klein, 2001; Howell and Shamir, 2005), and on charisma as shaped by the distance between leaders and followers (Antonakis and Atwater, 2002; Katz and Kahn, 1978; Yagil, 1998).

The extant literature addresses a multitude of facets of charismatic leadership. However, upon closer examination, contemporary research may have overlooked some of the important tenets put forth in Weber's work. Contemporary research on charismatic leadership views charisma as a fairly stable, measurable characteristic of those in formal managerial positions. These charismatic individuals seek to influence individual and organizational performance (Bass and Bass, 2008; Burns, 1978; Conger and Kanungo, 1987; House, 1971; House and Shamir, 1993). Yet, this view of charismatic leadership as existing in an organizational role stands in stark contrast to the emergent, relationship-oriented, and temporally unstable nature of charismatic leadership put forth by Weber (1978). Given this paradox, it seems necessary to reexamine Weber's writings in combination with current conceptualizations of charismatic leadership. Closer examination of Weber's depiction of charisma thus allows us to theorize as to how these historical findings may not just inform current practice, but also advance our future understanding of charismatic leadership (Lamond, 2006).

In this paper, we take a closer look at Weber's conceptualization of charisma in order to uncover and highlight unexplored avenues in charismatic leadership research. In doing so, we identify three questions at least partially unanswered by the extant literature: (1) The question of the informal structure as a context for the emergence of charisma; (2) The question of following as a dynamic power relation between leaders and followers; and finally, (3) The question of

charisma as a temporally bound phenomenon. In uncovering these questions, we offer historical findings by situating a selection of Weber's quotes within contemporary charismatic leadership research to uncover conceptual implications that may provide potential avenues for future inquiries in organizational charisma. To this end, the purpose of this paper is to revisit charisma as conceptualized by Weber and chart future opportunities for contemporary charismatic leadership research.

This paper is organized as follows. First, we briefly address Weber's seminal work and the contemporary literature on charismatic leadership. We do this to provide a theoretical context in which our subsequent arguments are grounded. Second, we present and analyze three questions stemming from Weber's initial conceptualization of charismatic leadership that are yet to be fully addressed by contemporary research. Third, we build on this discussion and argue that researchers need to address these remaining questions and broaden their conceptual and methodological palettes for a renaissance in charismatic leadership research to occur. Finally, we end the paper with a call for learning from the past to advance the future of charismatic leadership research.

Theoretical context

I. Weber's conceptualization of charismatic leadership

I.A. The view of charisma in leaders. Weber (1978) portrays the charismatic leader as a natural leader who, "in moments of distress–whether psychic, physical, economic, ethical, religious, or political–were neither appointed officeholders nor professionals in the present day sense, but rather the bearers of specific gifts of body and mind that were considered supernatural," (p. 1112). Thus, a charismatic leader emerges suddenly in times of need, such as during uncertainty or distress. Further, a charismatic leader need not be an appointed leader—a

charismatic leader can emerge outside of a formal managerial position. Moreover, charisma is a gift, and those that possess charisma also seem to develop a supernatural power over followers.

I.B. The organizational context. Given Weber's conceptualization of the charismatic leader, emphasis on formal positions in the organizational hierarchy, or bureaucratic structure, is unnecessary. Weber sees charismatic leaders as not appointed or selected within the formal bureaucratic structure, but existing in the informal structure of the organization. That is, a charismatic leader need not hold the title of "manager" or "leader" in the organization. Rather, charismatic leaders emerge suddenly in contexts of distress, abnormality, or extreme enthusiasm, and disappear equally suddenly once the gifts of the emergent leader no longer exist.

I.C. The power of followers. Because charisma does not exist in the formal bureaucracy, it does not lie in reason or cognitive appraisal of the ruled. Rather, it is conceptualized as an emotional bond between leaders and followers. Weber emphasizes the irrationality of charismatic leadership and offers an extreme example to illustrate his conceptualization: "Though he creates a frenzied commitment to the battle among his comrades, the ideal-typical berserk warrior does not have a message to those whom he inspires. His effectiveness is due solely to his overtly expressed extreme excitement," (cited in Greenfeld, 1985, p. 120). In other words, charisma is an emotional bond between leaders and followers. It emerges in times of distress and exists in an array of social relationships, fuelled by emotion and the frantic commitment of followers. As such, although charisma is viewed as a supernatural characteristic of individuals, it may also be described as an unstable, emotional relation that emerges in the relationship between followers and leaders in times of distress.

I.D. The temporal context. Weber's work on charisma was the springboard for theoretical development of charismatic leadership. Katz and Kahn (1978) built on Weber's work and

recognized the supernatural, yet unstable, quality of charisma. More specifically, these authors argued that charisma in its pure form cannot remain stable. Over time, it will either transform into a traditional role in which the manner of succession is established, or it will move toward institutionalization (i.e. become part of the bureaucratic structure). In other words, charisma is time-dependent. It emerges suddenly and lives briefly as relationships are created and maintained. Further, charisma disappears equally sudden when the recognition of the charismatic leader is removed. In sum, charisma is born in recognition of the ruled, and so does it die once that recognition is lost. Thus, Weber portrays charisma as a temporally bound, processual phenomenon that can be both created and destroyed.

II. Contemporary research on charismatic leadership

II.A. The view of charisma in leaders. The contemporary charismatic leadership literature is extensive. As such, any attempt at a comprehensive review is beyond the scope of this paper (for excellent treatments of the charismatic leadership literature see Bass and Bass, 2008; Conger, 1999; Yukl, 1999). However, contemporary charismatic leadership research focuses on the characteristics and behaviors of leaders—such as the importance of vision or appealing ideological goals, the ability to build confidence in others, the ability to inspire, and the need to influence unconventional behavior (Bass, 1985; Conger and Kanungo, 1987). In this paper, we focus on contemporary charismatic leadership research that implicitly and explicitly deals with three focal questions: that of charisma in the bureaucratic structure, the role of followers, and the impact of time.

II.B. The organizational context. Contemporary research on charismatic leadership in organizations focuses predominately on the identification of characteristics that charismatic leaders possess (Antonakis and House, 2002; Avolio and Bass; 1985; House, 1985; Yukl and

Van Fleet, 1982). Leaders in much of this research are defined by the organizational hierarchy. That is, the majority of contemporary research focuses on examining charisma in formally appointed leaders. For example, contemporary charismatic leadership research focuses on charisma of strategic leaders (Waldman et al., 2004) and how contextual factors influence the effectiveness of leaders in organizations (Antonakis, Avolio and Sivasubramaniam, 2003). Though the majority of work in contemporary charismatic leadership research focuses on charismatic leadership of formally appointed leaders, Bryman (1993) is an exception. He builds on Weber's work and implicitly recognizes the informal nature of charisma in his discussion of the routinization of charisma. However, Bryman focuses on the routinization, rather than the informal nature, of charisma, and as such leaves much to be examined regarding the informal emergence of charisma in organizations.

II.C. The power of followers. Though much contemporary research is directed at the importance of individual characteristics, some of the first advances in contemporary charismatic leadership research emphasize the importance of followers (Choi, 2006; Howell and Shamir, 2005). Early research indicates that leaders and followers must share basic beliefs and values for charismatic leadership to exist (House and Baetz, 1979; Katz and Kahn, 1978). Building on this insight, Conger and Kanungo (1987) provide a theoretical framework of charismatic leadership in an organizational setting. They argue that charisma lies in followers' attributions of leaders' behaviors. In doing so, specific leadership behaviors that are attributable to the possession of charisma in leaders are identified. In this sense, although the role of followers is recognized, the power given to followers in determining charisma is limited. Thus, the focus remains on the leader and the leader's behaviors.

Research in the last decade, however, recognizes the more active role that different types of followers occupy in the charismatic relationship (Choi, 2006; Howell and Shamir, 2005; Klein and House, 1995; Erez, et al., 2008). Howell and Shamir (2005) distinguish between personalized and socialized types of charismatic relationships and suggest that the follower's self-concept plays a role in determining the relationship between the follower and the leader. In socialized relationships, followers have a clear self-concept and as such derive their sense of direction and self-expression from the leader's message rather than from personal identification with the leader. In personalized relationships, contrastingly, followers often have low self-concept and are disoriented. Thus, they use the relationship with the leader as a guide for obtaining self-confidence (Howell and Shamir, 2005). Though contemporary charismatic leadership research acknowledges the importance of the relationship between followers and leaders, it does so in a static sense. That is, although the follower's role is a more active part of contemporary charismatic leadership research, the dynamism of the follower's involvement in this relationship is underplayed.

II.D. The temporal context. Examination of time in contemporary charismatic research is nearly absent. As such, how charisma emerges, is maintained, and dissipates is mostly lacking from most contemporary charismatic leadership research. There is some agreement that crises are the most suitable context for the emergence of charisma (Bligh, et al., 2004; Houghton, 2010), and with it a recognition that once a crisis has passed, charisma will disappear. To this end, Bryman's (1993) discussion of routinization is especially relevant:

> "Charisma is unstable because it is oriented to the person to whom it applies and when leaders' powers and abilities seem to desert them or they are unable to bring benefits to their followers, loss of charisma, or decharismatization, may ensue," (Bryman, 1993, p. 299).

Although Bryman (1993) raises an important point in his writings, little systematic research examines the loss of charisma and its unstable nature (Houghton, 2010). As a result, in reviewing contemporary charismatic leadership research, little attention is paid to the existence of charismatic leadership in time. Thus, what is left for exploration is examination of the circumstances driving the emergence and disappearance of charisma in organizations. Moreover, the consequences of the emergence or disappearance of charisma in the organization is also under-researched.

Our summary thus far suggests that although contemporary charismatic leadership research is expansive, questions are left to be addressed. In order to provide a platform for novel insight into charismatic leadership, we highlight the treatment of the three questions by Weber (1978) alongside findings from contemporary charismatic leadership research in the Table 1. In subsequent sections, we focus on these historical findings to illuminate differences in the conceptualization of charisma and to illustrate conceptual implications that provide several opportunities for future research.

Insert Table 1 about here

Learning from the past and looking to the future

Comparing and contrasting Weber's conceptualization with contemporary charismatic leadership research

Although progress in contemporary charismatic leadership research is both broad and significant, some questions, as indicated above, still remain. At this juncture, it seems important to look to the past to uncover what the future of charismatic leadership research may hold. In this

paper, we look at Weber's work on charisma to illuminate some overlooked facets of organizational charisma. In doing so, we hope to open a new dialogue in charismatic research. Our endeavor results in several important historical findings as discussed below.

We discover that the contemporary conceptualization of charismatic leadership in organizational roles stands in stark contrast with Weber's (1978) view of charisma as an emergent property in organizations that exists outside of the formal bureaucratic structure:

> "In radical contrast to bureaucratic organization, charisma knows no formal and regulated appointment or dismissal, no career, no supervisor or appeals body and no permanent institutions which are independent of the incumbents and their personal charisma. Charisma is self-determined and sets its own limits," (p. 1112).

In other words, charisma is not determined, shaped, or sanctioned by the formal hierarchy—it waxes and wanes irrespective of the formal bureaucratic structure. Even this brief quote of Weber stands in contrast with contemporary charismatic leadership research. The focus of contemporary research is on managerial leadership occurring in formal roles. Thus, this research has almost entirely excluded leadership occurring outside the formal bureaucracy. Looking back to Weber's writings illustrates this paradox more clearly.

Secondly, although much research conceptualizes leadership as jointly determined by followers and leaders (e.g., Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995; Hollander, 1993; Howell and Shamir, 2005; Klein and House, 1995; Uhl-Bien, 2006; Uhl-Bien and Ospina, 2012), contemporary charismatic leadership research often overlooks the immense impact of followers on charisma. As such, the attention given to followers in this relationship is far from the one emphasized by Weber. Weber (1978) argues that charisma may not exist without followers: "If the people withdraw their recognition, the master becomes a mere private person and if he claims to be more, a usurper deserving of punishment," (p. 1115). Accordingly, the power of followers to shape the charisma of leaders is yet to be fully addressed in contemporary research.

Finally, the temporally bound nature of charisma is almost unnoticed by contemporary charismatic leadership research. Though Weber (1978), in referring to charisma, emphasizes that "every hour of its existence brings it nearer to this end," (p. 1120), contemporary charismatic leadership research neglects to address this particular aspect.

Weber was thorough in his descriptions of charisma in leaders. Therefore, it would take more than this endeavor to capture his holistic conceptualization of charismatic leadership. In order to most parsimoniously address the three remaining questions highlighted by our historical findings of charismatic leadership as outlined above—that of charisma in the informal structure, the power of followers, and time—the following paragraphs specifically focus on Weber's depictions of these issues. By elucidating these remaining questions, we seek to provide a groundwork upon which potential answers can be explored in future charismatic leadership research.

The question of the informal structure: Understanding the organizational context

Weber (1978) clearly distinguishes between the bureaucratic rational rule and the charismatic irrational rule in his writings. In particular, he argues that bureaucracy entails a relentless pursuit of economic objectives according to a dehumanized set of rules:

> "Objective discharge of business primarily means a discharge of biasness according to calculable rules and without regard for persons….Bureaucracy develops the more perfectly, the more it is 'dehumanized', the more completely it succeeds in eliminating from official business love, hatred and all purely personal, irrational and emotional elements which escape calculations," (p. 975).

Organizational bureaucracy presents a formal organizational structure in which legitimacy and power to drive economic results rest on the assumption of norms and impersonal application of organizational rules (Pugh, et al., 1968; Thompson, 1967). Specifically, bureaucracy emphasizes the importance of hierarchical position, rather than person, in its

treatment of managers and leaders, thus eliminating the emotional/irrational side of the organization (Hartley, 2006; Pindur and Rogers, 1995). Organizations are viewed as formal rule-based structures that are linked by specific goals and policies: "the essence of a model bureaucratic organization lies in the rationalized and impersonal character of these structural elements and of the goals that link them," (Meyer and Rowan, 1977, p. 342). These rules represent administrative mechanisms that govern the organization and enable the coordination of activities. Thus, the bureaucratic structure is necessary to achieve legitimacy and efficiency, and drive the stability of the organization (Weber, 1978).

In radical contrast to this rational and dehumanized system of rules aimed at the maximization of economic value, organizations also inhabit an informal structure. The informal structure coexists with the formal, bureaucratic structure. The duality of structure, or the simultaneous existence of formal and informal structures within an organization, has been acknowledged and debated in organizational research for decades (Brown and Eisenhardt, 1997; Giddens, 1984; Selznick, 1948). Yet, the purposes of the formal and informal structures differ greatly. Whereas the formal structure drives economic efficiency and maximization, the informal structure drives creativity and change (Uhl-Bien and Marion, 2009; Uhl-Bien et al., 2007). The informal structure emerges from individual interactions and various and often unpredictable behaviors that are internal to the organization. These interactions inject uncertainty and volatility into the organization, driving ambiguity and continuous redefinition. It is in this informal structure that opportunities for charisma to emerge exist. According to Weber, charisma is fully self-determined and embedded in emotional and irrational commitment. That is, the bearer of charisma elicits following through his destined mission and rejection of the externally imposed

order. Thus, it is precisely in this informal structure that emotional, irrational, and committed behavior may emerge:

> "Genuine charismatic justice does not refer to rules; in its pure type it is the most extreme contrast to formal and traditional prescription and maintains its autonomy toward the sacredness of tradition as much as toward rationalist deductions from abstract norms," (Weber, 1978, p. 1115).

More importantly though, Weber did recognize that formal bureaucratic and informal charismatic rule may coexist side by side. This is further emphasized by Eisenstadt (1968) who argues that to truly appreciate Weber's insight of the informal structure, one must transcend the formal/informal dichotomy and explore the overlap of these organizational structures. Similarly, Udy (1962) argues that the tension between the rational goals of economic organizations and the irrational goals of their social milieu must always exist. As such, an organization can never attain full rationality. Thus, formal organizational structures are unable to fully overcome the irrational side of the organization (Selznick, 1948). Weber also recognizes that the organizational context is an important consideration in the charismatic rule, and that the coexistence of informal charismatic and formal bureaucratic rule is a major characteristic of a social system. To illustrate this coexistence, Weber offers a following example:

> "Whether we look at Teutonic or American Indian tribes, the charismatic hero, who marches out with a voluntary following appears next to the chieftain of peace, who is responsible for the routine economic affairs if the community…The double nature of what may be called the 'capitalist spirit', and the specific character of modern routinized capitalism with its professional bureaucracy can be understood only if these two structural elements, which are ultimately different but everywhere intertwined , are conceptually distinguished," (1978, p. 1118).

Building on the preceding discussion, we propose:

> *Proposition 1a: The interplay of the emergent informal charisma and formal bureaucratic structure permeates the context of organizations.*

When considering the role of charisma in inciting change in organizations, Weber's writings and contemporary charismatic leadership research offer divergent views. Contemporary charismatic leadership research emphasizes the importance of formal leaders in guiding organizational change (Bass and Bass, 2008; Gilley et al., 2009; Waldman et al., 2004). Weber acknowledges the formal structure as a revolutionary organizational force when necessary. However, Weber argues that charisma emerging in the informal structure of the organization is an important catalyst to organizational change. As such, charismatic leadership exists outside the formal bureaucracy, and emerges in the informal structure. Thus, any attempt at institutionalizing charisma in the formal, bureaucratic structure minimizes the charismatic essence of the bearer. Thus, we propose:

Proposition 1b: Charismatic leadership originates within the informal organizational structure and drives change from within the organization.

The question following: Understanding the power of followers

Weber (1978) was explicit in his argument that charisma lies in the relationship between followers and leaders. In particular, he gives power to followers to deprive the leader of charisma by withdrawing their recognition. As he argues: "If those to whom he feels sent do not recognize him, his claim collapses; if they recognize it, he is their master as long as he 'proves' himself," (p. 1113). Contemporary research in charismatic leadership recognizes the important role that followers play in this relationship—from determining the nature of the relationship (Choi, 2006; Shamir and Howell, 2005) to placing charisma within the followers' attributions of leaders' behaviors (Conger and Kanungo, 1987). However, Weber differs is his belief that followers are instrumental in determining the charisma of the leader. Without the followers' approval, the one who claims to possess charisma is both deceptive and devoid of charisma. More specifically,

Weber argues that only through the approval of the ruled is charismatic leadership recognized. Without it, "the master becomes a mere private person and if he claims to be more, a usurper deserving of punishment," (Weber, 1978, p. 1115). Although the source of the charismatic leader's power lies in unique individual qualities and exquisite abilities, followers in fact hold the power to shape charisma of the leader.

Therefore, charismatic leadership is more than the attributions of followers. Charisma should be seen as service to the ruled that can be rescinded at any moment. Whether through emotional bond or persuasion, charisma is shaped by the relationship between leaders and followers where followers may accept or reject charisma. To illustrate the relational nature of charisma, Weber (1978) portrays it as emanating from a dynamic power negotiation between leaders and followers in which the charismatic leader must repeatedly prove his power in action and seduce people into believing in his divine abilities:

> "The charismatic hero derives his authority not from an established order and enactments, as if it were an official competence, and not from custom or feudal fealty, as under patrimonialism. He gains and retains solely by proving his powers in practice… Genuinely charismatic ruler who is responsible to the ruled-responsible, that is, to prove that he himself is indeed the master willed by God," (p. 1114).

Power, thus, becomes an important yet insufficiently explored aspect in charismatic leadership research.

Furthermore, charisma is context sensitive as charismatic or "natural" leaders emerge in times of great distress. This is because peaceful times demand rules and economic behavior satisfied by the formal bureaucratic structure. As such, the perfect storm of follower needs, characteristics, actions, and contextual contingencies give rise in an unpredictable manner to charismatic leadership. Further, these charismatic leaders exist only as long as they prove exquisite abilities to the ruled. The specification of different types of followers or contexts as

often exemplified in contemporary research may prove fruitless here. Rather, a focus on the process of how followers determine, give, and rescind charismatic leadership in the organization should be embraced and further explored. Building on this discussion, we argue that charisma is dynamic and exists within a contextually sensitive relationship between the leader and followers. Thus, we propose:

> *Proposition 2: Charismatic leadership exists in a dynamic power relation between leaders and followers where charisma is continuously negotiated.*

> *The question of time: Understanding the temporal context*

The temporal element of charisma in organizations is neglected in contemporary research. It is widely assumed that charismatic leadership either exists or not, and that if it does exist, it can be objectively measured at any point in time. Whereas some effort has been put forth to identify charismatic behaviors as developable, as well as recognition that crises may add to the development or perception of charisma in leaders (Bligh, et al., 2004), the assumption remains that once charisma is developed, it persists. Weber, however, adopts the idea that charisma emerges and dissipates with the passage of time. As he explains: "Every charisma is on the road from a turbulent emotional life that knows no economic rationality to a slow death by suffocation under the weight of material interests: every hour of its existence brings it nearer to this end," (1978, p. 1120). Weber emphasizes the temporal nature of charisma to accentuate its inherent instability. More specifically, as charismatic leadership flows from the exquisite abilities of the leader, leaders need to continually prove those abilities to keep charisma alive. Once the followers rescind their devotion, or show disbelief in those abilities, charisma will vanish. Thus, understanding the process of emergence of charisma in leaders, and how charisma emerges and

dissolves over time, is a fruitful opportunity for future research. Building on these arguments, we propose that:

Proposition 3: Charismatic leadership is temporally bound, where every hour of its existence brings it closer to its end.

Discussion

In looking to the past to learn about the future, our primary purpose in this paper is to advance our understanding of charismatic leadership in organizations. By reviewing Weber's conceptualization alongside contemporary research, we make explicit three important, yet unanswered questions in charismatic leadership research. In this section we build on our historical findings with regards to the three remaining questions in order to provide conceptual and methodological implications of our work, and suggest several alternative avenues for future research.

Conceptual implications

Revisiting Weber's writings have several important conceptual implications for future research. Thus far, research in charismatic leadership has predominately focused on the exploration of charisma within formal organizational roles. Additionally, while the role of followers in the emergence of charisma has been recognized, the power that followers hold in this relationship is underplayed. Furthermore, the unstable and dynamic nature of charisma has not received notable attention (Bryman, 1993). By looking to the past, we are in a position to learn, discover, and chart new opportunities for future charismatic leadership research.

However, the questions we raise demand a considerable conceptual shift in the way leadership is viewed. As such, it deems important to consider theoretical frameworks and philosophical views that may enable us to address these questions more appropriately. We

believe that complexity leadership theory (CLT) (Uhl-Bien and Marion, 2009; Uhl-Bien et al., 2007) may offer a fruitful framework for analysis of Weber's ideas and correspondingly advance contemporary charismatic leadership research. Traditional assumptions of leadership are grounded in hierarchy and authority. However, CLT views leadership as generated by interactions of informal (adaptive) leaders operating alongside formal managerial (administrative) leaders (Marion and Uhl-Bien, 2001; Uhl-Bien et al., 2007).

The main focus of CLT is the interplay of managerial (bureaucratic) and adaptive (charismatic) leadership to maintain viability in times of uncertainty and distress. Thus, within CLT, bureaucracy is necessary to drive organizational efficiency. Yet, at the same time, the emergent, temporally sensitive social construction of leaders is equally important. Adaptive leadership emphasizes how leaders and followers redefine their roles, fulfill their own goals, or pursue a distributed pattern of influence (Hunt and Ropo, 1995; Uhl-Bien and Marion, 2009). CLT focuses on adaptive leadership and the interplay of formal and informal leadership structures in organizations operating in a state of distress. Thus, CLT may offer an appropriate conceptual rationale for advancing Weber's insight and with it, contemporary charismatic leadership research.

Methodological implications

This paper also offers methodological implications that should be explored further by researchers interested in charismatic leadership. In the extant literature, the description and analysis of the interactive dynamic processes that comprise most organizational phenomena, such as charismatic leadership, have been a challenge for many organizational scholars. Perhaps the main obstacles are an incomplete understanding of the nature of the complexities comprising leadership processes in organizations and a limited capability of traditional empirical methods to

capture these complexities. Therefore, longitudinal methodologies may be a more useful way to capture charisma in organizations and show the process behind its existence from origin to demise.

To more completely capture the emergent and unstable nature of charisma in organizations, in addition to more traditional longitudinal quantitative methods such as repeated measures and time series designs (Ployhart and Vandenberg 2010), we suggest that qualitative methods may be particularly useful. Process data are inherently messy and difficult to collect. Yet, Langley (1999) suggests that qualitative methodologies may offer greater opportunities for capturing process data in their entirety. For example, ethnographic approaches may be a useful methodology for capturing the dynamic nature of charisma in organizations.

Though ethnography has traditionally been reserved for anthropology, methodologists have advocated for its use to understand organizational processes. Ethnography is a method of extended observations of groups in which the researcher is immersed in and observes the day-to-day lives of the participants, and conducts interviews (Wolcott, 2008). In referencing ethnographic methods, Watson (2011, p. 204) argues that "we cannot really learn a lot about what 'actually happens' or about 'how things work' in organizations without doing the intensive type of close-observational or participative research that is central to ethnographic endeavor." Ethnography allows researchers to adopt an emic perspective of the organizational context. In doing so, researchers can explicate dynamic, emergent processes, such as charismatic leadership, in a holistic and reflexive manner (Richards and Morse, 2007; Walcott, 2008). Thus, we suggest that ethnography is a useful method for researching charisma from a processual perspective. To this end, researchers can refocus their methodological efforts from validating predetermined

theories and measures toward a more inductive approach to discover the complexities inherent in charismatic leadership.

Future directions

Building on our discussion, we suggest several avenues for future research. Firstly, researchers in charismatic leadership could benefit from moving away from traditional managerial leadership and exploring charisma within informal organizational structures. For example, once we move away from agency and control emphasized within managerial leadership and step into the dynamism of the informal context, how does the nature of leadership change? How may this informal leadership constrain or alternatively facilitate actions of formal leaders? This endeavor may highlight the actions and events that comprise change processes within organizations, as well as failures of formal managerial structures to drive change. This approach may also enlighten the processes that drive successful idea implementation, emergent innovations and strategy formulation, as well as adaptive processes and learning in organizations. Charismatic leadership operating outside the traditional formal bureaucracy may prove to be a missing link in both the leadership and change management literatures.

Secondly, further exploration of adaptive dynamics that give rise to charismatic leadership adds to our understanding of how formal managerial structures may enable charismatic leadership and foster conditions for its existence. Contemporary research does not fully recognize the role of followers in charismatic leadership emergence. Nor does it recognize the importance of relationships and networks in the process. Therefore, it is important to explore the process of relational construction and role negotiation that ultimately enable the emergence of charisma to occur. In other words, how do actors in organizational relationships define charisma within the informal structure? Addressing these questions may increase our knowledge

of how charisma emerges within adaptive processes, as well as how adaptive processes are maintained in organizations.

Finally, time in organizational research in general, and leadership research in particular, should be more strongly emphasized. Normal organizational life has evolved into one of instability, impermanence, and unpredictability. As a result, incorporating temporal elements in management and leadership research can inform the instability, impermanence, and unpredictability of organizations. As a corollary, research on charisma in organizations should incorporate time and the temporal instability of charisma to capture the process that constitutes its existence. Weber was specific in his discussion that charisma is inherently unstable, and with every minute, approaches its own demise. Contemporary research is yet to capture the temporally unstable nature of charismatic leadership—a future research avenue that permeates all others and with it, we believe, the most promise. Therefore, research questions aimed at understanding how the nature of charisma changes with the passage of time should be addressed both theoretically and empirically.

Conclusion

Revisiting Weber's writings on charismatic leadership provide fruitful avenues for contemporary research on the role, nature, and impact of charismatic leadership on organizational relationships and performance. Yet, to date, other facets of Weber's work have been overlooked. We argue that attempts to propel contemporary charismatic leadership research forward require learning from the past. That is, incorporating original insights by Weber on charisma may broaden and shape the future directions of contemporary charismatic leadership research. Though we suggest fruitful avenues for future research, such as investigating the informal structure as a context for the emergence of charisma, the power of followers to shape

charisma in leaders, and the temporally bound nature of charisma, other avenues may exist. In looking to the past of charisma in particular and leadership in general, current researchers can build on this groundwork to find unique, open-ended avenues for future research.

References

Antonakis, J. and Atwater, L. (2002), "Leader distance: a review and a proposed theory", *The Leadership Quarterly,* Vol. 13, pp. 673-704.

Antonakis, J. and House, R.J. (2002). "An analysis of the full-range leadership theory: The way forward". In B.J. Avolio and F.J. Yammarino (Eds.) Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The Road Ahead (pp. 3-24). Amsterdam: JAI Press.

Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J. and Sivasubramaniam, S. (2003). "Context and leadership: an examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire", *The Leadership Quarterly,* Vol. 14, pp. 261-295.

Avolio, B. J. and Bass, B. M. (1985), "Charisma and beyond", paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, San Diego, CA.

Bass, B. M. (1985), *Leadership performance beyond expectations,* Academic Press, New York, NY.

Bass, B.M (1988), Evolving perspectives on charismatic leadership. In Conger, J.A. and Kanungo, R.N. (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness,* Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA, pp. 40-77.

Bass, B.M. and Bass, R. (2008), *Handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and application*, Free Press, New York, NY.

Bligh, M. C., Kohles, J. C. and Meindl, J. R. (2004), "Charisma under crisis: Presidential leadership, rhetoric, and media responses before and after the September 11th terrorist attacks", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 15, pp. 211-239.

Brown, S. L. and Eisenhardt, K. M. (1997), "The art of continuous change: Linking complexity theory and time-paced evolution in relentlessly shifting organizations", *Administrative Science Quarterly,* Vol. 42, pp. 1-34.

Bryman, A. (1993), "Charismatic leadership in business organizations: Some neglected issues", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 4, pp. 289-304.

Burns, J.M. (1978), *Leadership,* Harper and Row, New York, NY.

Choi, J. (2006), "A motivational theory of charismatic leadership: Envisioning, empathy, and empowerment", *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, Vol. 13 pp. 24-43.

Conger, J. A. (1999) "Charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations: An insider's perspective on these developing streams of research", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 10, pp. 145-179.

Conger, J. A. and Kanungo, R. N. (1987), "Toward a Behavioral Theory of Charismatic Leadership in Organizational Settings*", Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 12, pp. 637-647.

Courpasson, D., Golsorkhi, D. and Sallaz, J. J. (Eds.). (2012), *Rethinking power in organizations, institutions, and markets (Vol. 34),* Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Bingley, UK.

DeGroot, T., Kiker, D. S. and Cross, T. C. (2000), "A Meta-analysis to review organizational outcomes related to charismatic leadership", *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences* Vol. 17, pp. 356-371.

Ehrhart, M. G. and Klein, K. J. (2001), "Predicting followers' preferences for charismatic leadership: The influence of follower values and personality", *The Leadership Quarterly,* Vol. 12, pp. 153-179.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1968), *Max Weber: On charisma and institution building*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

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

Giddens, A. (1984), *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structure*, University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

Gilley, A., McMillan, H. S. and Gilley, J. W. (2009), "Organizational change and characteristics of leadership effectiveness", *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, Vol. 16, pp. 38-47.

Graen, G. B. and Uhl-Bien, M. (1995), "Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange LMX theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 62, pp. 219-247.

Greenfeld, L. (1985), "Reflections on two charismas", *The British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 36, pp. 117–132.

Hannan, M. T. and Freeman, J. (1984), "Structural inertia and organizational change", *American Sociological Review,* Vol. 49, pp. 149-164.

Hartley, N. T. (2006), "Management history: an umbrella model", *Journal of Management History*, Vol. 12, pp. 278-292.

Hollander, E. P. (1993), "Legitimacy, power, and influence: A perspective on relational features of leadership", In Chemers, M. M. and Ayman, R. (Eds)., *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions,* Academic Press, San Diego, CA, pp. 29-47.

Houghton, J. D. (2010), "Does Max Weber's notion of authority still hold in the twenty-first century?", *Journal of Management History,* Vol. 16, pp. 449-453.

House, R. J. (1985), "Research contrasting the behavior and effects of reputed charismatic versus reputed noncharismatic", Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Administrative Science Association, Montreal, CA.

House, R. J. and Baetz, M. L. (1979), "Leadership: Some empirical generalizations and new research directions", in Staw, B. M. (Ed.), *Research in organizational behavior, vol. 1,* JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, pp. 399-401.

House, R. J. and Shamir, B. (1993), "Toward the integration of transformational, charismatic, and visionary theories", In Chemers M. M. and Ayman, R. (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions*, Academic Press, San Diego, CA, pp. 81-107.

House, R.J. (1971), "A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness", *Administrative Science Quarterly,* Vol. 16, pp. 321-338.

Howell, J. M. and Shamir, B. (2005), "The role of followers in the charismatic leadership process: Relationships and their consequences", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 30, pp. 96-112.

Hunt, J. G. and Ropo, A. (1995), "Multi-level leadership: Grounded theory and mainstream theory applied to the case of general motors", *The Leadership Quarterly,* Vol. 6, pp. 379-412.

Jermier, J. M. (1998). Introduction: Critical Perspectives on Organizational Control. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43(2), 235-256.

Katz, D. and Kahn, R. L. (1978), *The social psychology of organizations,* Wiley, New York, NY.

Kirkpatrick, S. A. and Locke, E. A. (1996), "Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 81, pp. 36-51.

Klein, K. J. and House, R. J. (1995), "On fire: Charismatic leadership and levels of analysis", *The Leadership Quarterly,* Vol. 6, pp. 183-198.

Lamond, D. (2006), "Management and its history: the worthy endeavour of the scribe", *Journal of Management History*, Vol. 12, pp. 5-11.

Langley, A. (1999), "Strategies for theorizing from process data", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 4, pp. 691-710.

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

Marion, R. and Uhl-Bien, M. (2001), "Leadership in complex organizations", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 12, pp. 389-418.

Meyer, J. W. and Rowan, B. (1977), "Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony", *American Journal of Sociology,* Vol. 83, pp. 340-363.

Mintzberg, H., Lampel, J. and Ahlstrand, B. (2005), *Strategy Safari: A Guided Tour Through The Wilds of Strategic Management,* Free Press, New York, NY.

Pindur, W., Rogers, S. E., & Kim, P. S. (1995), "The history of management: a global perspective", *Journal of Management History,* Vol. 1, pp. 59-77.

Ployhart, R. E. and Vandenberg, R. J. (2010), "Longitudinal research: The theory, design, and analysis of change", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 36, pp. 94-120.

Pugh, D. S., Hickson, D. J., Hinings, C. R. and Turner, C. (1968), "Dimensions of organization structure", *Administrative science quarterly,* Vol. 13, pp. 65-105.

Richards, L. and Morse, J.M. (2007), *Users guide for qualitative methods* (2nd ed.), Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Selznick, P. (1948), "Foundations of the theory of organization", *American Sociological Review,* Vol. 13, pp. 25-35.

Suchman, M. C. (1995), "Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches", *Academy of Management Review,* Vol. 20, pp. 571-610.

Thompson, J. D. (1967), *Organizations in action: Social science bases of administrative theory,* McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.

Udy, S. H. (1962), "Administrative rationality, social setting, and organizational development", *American Journal of Sociology,* Vol. 68, pp. 299-308.

Uhl-Bien, M. (2006), "Relational leadership theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 17, pp. 654-676.

Uhl-Bien, M. and Marion, R. (2009), "Complexity leadership in bureaucratic forms of organizing: A meso model", *The Leadership Quarterly,* Vol. 20, pp. 631-650.

Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R. and McKelvey, B. (2007), "Complexity leadership theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era", *The Leadership Quarterly,* Vol. 18, pp. 298-318.

Uhl-Bien, M., and Ospina, S. M. (2012), *Advancing relational leadership research: A dialogue among perspectives*, Information Age Pub Incorporated, Charlotte, NC.

Waldman, D. A., Javidan, M. and Varella, P. (2004), "Charismatic leadership at the strategic level: A new application of upper echelons theory", *The Leadership Quarterly,* Vol. 15, pp. 355-380.

Watson, T. J. (2011), "Ethnography, reality, and truth: The vital need for studies of 'how things work' in organizations and management", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 48, pp. 202-217.

Weber, M. (1947), *The theory of social and economic organization,* Oxford University Press, New York, NY.

Weber. M. (1978), *Economy and society,* University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

Wolcott, H.F. (2008), *Ethnography: A way of seeing,* AltaMira Press, Landham, MA.

Yagil, D. (1998), "Charismatic leadership and organizational hierarchy: Attribution of charisma to close and distant leaders", *The Leadership Quarterly,* Vol. 9, pp. 161-176.

Yukl, G. (1999), "An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories", *The Leadership Quarterly,* Vol. 10, pp. 285-305.

Yukl, G. A. and Van Fleet, D. D. (1982), "Cross-situational, multimethod research on military leader effectiveness", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance,* Vol. 30, pp. 87-108.

Table 1.
Charismatic Leadership as Conceptualized by Weber and Contemporary Research

	Weber's Conceptualization	Supporting Evidence	Contemporary Research	Supporting Evidence
View of Charisma in Leaders	Charisma is a fluid, supernatural power emerging in times of distress	"In moments of distress – whether psychic, physical, economic, ethical, religious, or political – where neither appointed officeholders nor professionals in the present day sense, but rather the bearers of specific gifts of body and mind that were considered supernatural," (Weber, 1978, p. 1112)	Charisma is an individual characteristic	Characteristics of charismatic leaders may include: • vision or appealing ideological goals • ability to build confidence in others • ability to inspire • need to influence unconventional behavior (Avolio and Bass, 1985; Bass, 1985; Yukl and Van Fleet, 1982)
The organizational context	Charisma exists in the informal organizational structure	Charisma emerges suddenly outside the traditional structure, lives briefly though the power struggle embedded in the set of relationships, and disappears equally sudden when the recognition is removed or when it is transforms into a formal rule nested within a traditional bureaucracy (Weber, 1978; Katz and Kahn, 1966)	Charisma exists in the formal, bureaucratic structure	Charisma is examined in formally appointed leaders of organizations (Conger and Kanungo, 1987; House, 1985; Waldman, et al., 2004)
The power of followers	Charisma exists within emotional power relations between leaders and followers	Charisma is embedded in an array of social relationships, fuelled by emotion, power struggles and often frantic commitment (Weber, 1978)	Followers are recognized as important contributors to the manifestation of charisma	Leaders and followers must share basic beliefs and values for charismatic leadership to exist. As such, different characteristics of followers are identified as more or less conducive to charisma (Ehrhart and Klein, 2001; House and Beatz, 1979; Howell and Shamir, 2005)
The temporal context	Charisma is processual—it emerges and dissipates with the passage of time	Charisma is born in recognition of the ruled during crises or times of distress. As such, it dies once that recognition is lost (Weber, 1978)	Charisma is a permanent characteristic of an individual	Charisma is a stable characteristic of individuals who either possess charisma, or do not (Avolio and Bass, 1985; Bass and Bass, 2008)