Organization Management Journal

Volume 7 | Issue 3 Article 7

11-1-2010

The relationships between social and formal working conditions and charisma

Rudi Kirkhaug
University of Tromsø

Organization Management Journal (2010) 7, 229–239

Current Empirical Research

The relationships between social and formal working conditions and charisma

Rudi Kirkhaug

Faculty of Social Science, University of Tromsø, Tromsø, Norway

Correspondence:
Rudi Kirkhaug, Faculty of Social Science, University of Tromsø, Tromsø N-9037, Norway.
Tel: +47 91 19 47 96;
Fax: +47 77 64 49 05;
E-mail: rudi.kirkhaug@uit.no

Abstract

This study discusses the relationship between social and formal working conditions and employees' propensity to attribute charisma to their leaders in normative and professional organizations. Several studies have argued that crises, organic structures, and social conditions, such as group and organizational belonging, are positively correlated with charisma, while formal conditions such as rules and routines are negatively correlated with charisma. However, this study hypothesized that employees attribute charisma to their leader if they are provided with conditions that help them succeed in performing their work, and if such conditions can be related directly to their leader, such as rules and routines. Group and organizational belonging are considered to be weaker sources of charisma since they are more ambiguously related to both the work execution and the leader, and may even render the leader superfluous. Hierarchical regression analyses supported this hypothesis. Practical and theoretical implications are provided.

Organization Management Journal (2010) **7,** 229–239. doi:10.1057/omj.2010.27

Keywords: charisma; church; formalization; group belonging; organizational belonging

Organization
Management
Journal

Introduction

During recent decades, an interest in leadership charisma has increased as a result of demands for radical organizational changes, as well as the desire to motivate employees to perform above and beyond the call of duty, and transform their self-interests into collective interests (Shamir *et al.*, 1993; Pillai and Meindl, 1998; Yukl, 2006). However, despite this increased interest and the recognition in theory that charisma is an attributional phenomenon affected by context, few empirical studies have proposed organizational context as a potential cause of charisma.

This lack of empirical research may be due both to interpretations of what charisma actually is, and methodological difficulties. For instance, Conger and Kanungo (1987) suggest that lack of empirical research on charisma in organizational settings may be due to the elusive nature and mystical connotation of charisma, and thus to difficulties in defining and operationalizing the term, and also to difficulties in obtaining access to charismatic leaders. According to Shamir and Howell (1999), the omission of context in empirical research may be due to a return to the "one best way" approach to thinking about leadership that has been typical of most research on leadership trait and style. For instance, both

House (1995) and Bass (1997) have argued that there is, in fact, a "one best" and universal leadership style across situations and cultures.

The few studies that have taken contextual conditions into consideration have rather one-sidedly argued that crises, organic structures, a clan or cultural mode of control, and collectivist orientations such as group and organizational belonging, are appropriate conditions for charisma to arise (Pillai and Meindl, 1998; Shamir and Howell, 1999). The basic assumptions supporting these arguments are that such working conditions both necessitate a strong leadership for helping employees reduce uncertainty as well as structure their workday, and provide opportunities for the leader to take bold and forceful actions. In contrast, formal working conditions, such as rules and routines, have been regarded as being unfavorable for the emergence of charisma, since such conditions hold the organization together, provide the employees with substitutes for leadership, and limit the leader's ability to act in novel ways (Bass, 1985; Fry, 2003; Howell *et al.*, 2007).

This study makes the claim that such formal conditions may constitute a better basis for the emergence of charisma than social conditions such as organizational and group belonging. This claim is based on observations of charismatic management in successful and well-structured organizations (Etzioni, 1975; Scott, 1978; Weber, 1978; Conger, 1989; DiTomaso, 1993; Nelson, 1993; Shamir *et al.*, 1993; Kelly, 2007), and on empirical surveys revealing negative correlations between crises and charisma (Pillai and Meindl, 1998). When employees succeed in their work and satisfy their growth needs, while also being devoid of crises and chaos, they may feel appreciative of their leader, and regard him as competent and trustworthy. This is true providing that the leader can be associated with the working conditions that contribute to successful work performance.

Formal working conditions have been regarded as a conscious and strategic means utilized by leadership to achieve order, coordination, communication, and rational decision making (Simon, 1997; Scott, 1998), while also supporting work execution in providing knowledge and guidance (Adler and Borys, 1996; Kieser *et al.*, 2001). On the other hand, social working conditions, such as organizational and group belonging, may not be as easily connected with the leader; as such conditions may develop through various mechanisms over a long period of time. In addition, such conditions may be better suited to satisfy employees' needs for affiliation and safety (Allen and Meyer, 1990; Schein, 1994; Hackman *et al.*, 1995; Herzberg, 1966; Lawler, 1995).

The relationship between context and charisma has thus far been studied in "normal" work organizations with explicit and tangible goals. However, for a theory to maintain its validity, its main hypotheses should be tested in different settings (Weick, 1989; Kerlinger and Lee, 2000). Therefore, this study sought to examine the relationship between context and charisma in a normative and professional organization: the Church.

According to Etzioni (1975), a normative organization is characterized by the utilization of normative power, that is, persuasive, manipulative or suggestive power, and highly committed and intrinsically motivated employees often guided by philanthropic values. A professional organization is often described in terms of delegation, autonomy, and strong specialist environments focused on goal achievement (Mintzberg, 1989; Reed, 1996).

Yet, there are several other reasons for why religious organizations should provide a promising setting for the study of leadership. Churches can be considered to be a big business if the number of employees and members of religious organizations are taken into account. According to Nelson (1993), about 80 million people visit church every Sunday in the United States, and the budgets of some denominations exceed that of many Fortune 500 corporations. Corresponding figures for European countries are hard to estimate, but the central influence of both the Lutheran and Catholic Church on culture and politics in these countries is indisputable, especially since the churches are key actors in educational, health-related, and charitable sectors (Pierson, 1994; Massignon, 2007). Owing to such functions, formalization is also a characteristic feature, and its employees are often professionals (Weber, 1978; Bahle, 2002). Moreover, churches have adopted leadership styles like those being practiced in social work, business management, academia, and political science (Starkloff, 1997; Jones, 2009). Despite such characteristics, the churches have almost been totally neglected in organizational and leadership studies (Nelson, 1993; Bekker, 2008).

The aim of this study is therefore to present an empirical model that reveals the relationships between the social and formal working conditions of employees and their propensity to attribute charisma to their leaders in a typical normative and professional organization, the Norwegian Church, thereby filling an empirical gap. This aim links the study to earlier contingency theories of leadership (e.g. Fiedler, 1967; Hersey and Blanchard, 1977), which attempted to specify the conditions under which dimensions of leadership might appear.

Charisma as an attributional phenomenon

Charisma means "gift" in Greek, and it is used in the Christian Bible to describe the Holy Spirit. Prophecy, ruling, teaching, ministry, wisdom, and healing are among such charismatic gifts. As Conger and Kanungo (1987) argue, over time the word has also come to signify the basis of the ecclesiastical organization of the Church itself. Therefore, the various roles played by members of the Church were perceived as being determined by gifts of God, rather than by a set of rules or procedures designed by man.

Charisma in the religious sense seems to have been revitalized through the global charismatic movement, which was initiated during the last half of the 20th century in the United States, and is characterized by spiritual manifestations such as ecstatic expressions of glossolalia and prophecy. However, such ecstatic expressions seem to be less practiced in well-established and bureaucratic denominations compared with more fundamental evangelistic churches (Nelson, 1993; Coleman, 2000; Massignon, 2007).

In this work, charisma is studied in a well-established and bureaucratic church as a relational phenomenon between leader and employee, not as a religious phenomenon in the interaction between priest and congregation. Thus, in order to identify leadership charisma, I first relied on Weber (1978), who borrowed the concept of charisma from theology, but expanded it to mean the belief in the extraordinary qualities of a specific individual, such as wisdom, heroism, or exemplary behavior. Weber admitted, however, that charisma emerged not as a result of a specific behavioral style but because of the belief a group of followers had in a leader's qualities. He also discussed charisma as a routinized phenomenon, that is, the conception that charismatic authority is frequently transformed by the codification of rights and responsibilities into a bureaucratically structured institution (Blau, 1963; Etzioni, 1975; DiTomaso, 1993). Consequently, when compared to the original Biblical interpretation of charisma, Weber's notion is less mysterious and more pragmatic, since it is contingent upon conditions such as social structures in the society, the leader's formal position in the organization, and employees' actual perception of the leader (Rieff, 2008).

Other researchers, such as Paul *et al.* (2002), have suggested that the mutability of charisma is what has extended charismatic leadership theory from the domain of theology to multiple facets of the organizational sciences, such as leader traits, leader behaviors, situational contingencies, leader and organizational communications, and organizational cultures.

Recent research on charisma is mainly based on a behavioral framework such as the one developed by Conger and Kanungo (1987). These authors suggest that charismatic leadership, like any other form of leadership, should be considered to be an observable behavioral process that can be described and analyzed in terms of a formal model. Charisma must therefore be viewed as an attribution made by followers who observe certain behaviors within organizational contexts. Conger and Kanungo refer to behavioral characteristics, such as likable, trustworthy, visionary, unconventional, and knowledgeable, and to organizational contexts associated with psychological distress as suitable factors for employees to ascribe such characteristics to the leader.

Research on charisma as an attributional phenomenon also tends to favor cognitive approaches rather than affective ones that tend to emphasize employees' uncritical beliefs in the extraordinary and generic qualities of their leader (Dow, 1969; Shamir and Howell, 1999). For instance, Pillai and Meindl (1998) maintain with reference to "implicit leadership theories" that followers' attributions of leadership, in part, are determined by the extent to which behavioral displays of a leader match or activate the leadership schemas held by the follower. Similar ideas have been proposed by Lord and Emrich (2001). On the basis of a literature review they concluded that cognition is accorded a central place in a surprisingly large proportion of current models of leadership, and consequently, that leadership resides, at least to some extent, in the minds of followers.

Although attributional processes are central to the understanding of charisma, there appears to be some confusion regarding the definition and role of attribution processes in leadership studies. According to Heider's (1958) original definition, attribution is a causal ascription for a positive or negative outcome, or, more precisely, fundamental cognitive processes by which people ascertain cause and effect so that they can solve problems and become efficacious in interacting with their environments. Early attribution-leadership research such as that of Green and Mitchell (1979) focused on how member behavior led to informational cues that influenced leader attributions, which, in turn, influenced leader behavior directed toward the members. Weiner (2004) has suggested that attribution theory, when applied to areas of social impression (e.g., charisma), may require some theoretical adaptation. Martinko *et al.*, (2007) noted that, in some cases, attribution appears to have been viewed as synonymous with perceptions of causality, responsibility, and personal characteristics, while in others, it is constrained within the domain originally suggested by Heider (1958). The majority of recent research on leadership charisma seems to focus on perceptions of the personal characteristics of leaders.

However, Martinko *et al.* (2007) have criticized the use of attribution theory in leadership research for being too leader-centric and focused on the individual level of analyses. Consequently, the theory does not pay sufficient attention to the interactive effects of leader and member attributional processes. They also note that research designs used to prove cause and effect suffer from a lack of focus on interactions between the multitude of variables that exist in organizations. The unique or interactive effects of various working conditions on the employees' attribution of superior characteristics to the leader, and the leader's subsequent behavior, have therefore been hard to demonstrate empirically.

This study argues that charisma is found in the interplay between the leader's qualifications, including competence, trustworthiness, and exemplary behavior, and the needs, beliefs, values, and perceptions of the employees, all of which are influenced by their working conditions (Dow, 1969; Weber, 1978; Willner, 1984; Bass, 1985, Pillai and Meindl, 1998; Avolio *et al.*, 1999).

Social and formal working conditions and charisma

Social conditions and charisma

In this study, two forms of social conditions were identified – those between employees and the organization (organizational belonging), and those between the employees themselves (group belonging). Following Allen and Meyer (1990), organizational belonging was defined as employees' affective commitment to the organization in the form of identifying with it, as well as being involved and experiencing enjoyment in being a member of the organization. Group belonging was identified following Schein (1994), as employees' perception of having a stable pattern of relationships with colleagues with whom they share goals and interests.

Shamir and Howell (1999) suggested that in an organization that uses a clan type of control which emphasizes shared values and commitment to the organization, charismatic leadership is likely to emerge and be effective. Their argument was that such conditions would help the leader to spread his or her ideas, because employees would see an alignment between the organization's interests and their own. However, a main hypothesis of this study is that employees may attribute charisma to their leader on the basis of contextual conditions if these conditions support employees in performing their work, and if an apparent relationship exists between the conditions and the leader.

Organizational belonging often grows slowly as a result of many factors, such as the employees feeling that they have a safe job, and experiencing a good social environment (Allen and Meyer, 1990; Greenberg and Baron, 2008). Thus, it may not intuitively be associated with the leader. Moreover, organizational belonging may be better suited to satisfy lower order needs, such as affiliation and safety needs, rather than growth needs (Hackman *et al.*, 1995; Lawler, 1995; Herzberg, 1966). Therefore, in contrast to Shamir and Howell (1999), I expected that organizational belonging would serve as a rather weak basis for employees to attribute capacities such as competence, trustworthiness, and exemplary behavior to their leader.

Some theorists have proposed that collectivism on the group level, referred to here as group belonging, is an important outcome of charismatic leadership (e.g., Kellet *et al.*, 2002; Choi, 2006). Others, like Pillai and Meindl (1998), suggest that work group collectivism provides a fertile ground from which charismatic leadership can emerge. Their argument is that a tight-knit group forming a collectivistic culture is a precondition for the dispersion and sharing of values, visions, and goals among the employees.

However, the functions of groups, particularly for professional employees, may undermine Pillai and Meindl's (1998) argument that group belonging is conducive to charisma. For example, group belonging may evolve because professionals seek autonomy from leadership in executing their work, while simultaneously trying to fulfill their affiliation needs (Quinn, 1992; Schein, 1994; Wallace, 1995). Since control in professional organizations lies in the hands of the professional community (Etzioni, 1975; Mintzberg, 1989), colleagues may constitute a more important source of information and inspiration than a leader, and thus act as a substitute for leadership (Kerr and Jermier, 1978; Yukl, 2006). In other words, since the group is able to influence organizational activity, and control the reward-sanction system, the individual may respond to group pressures and codes more than to signals from the leader (Tosi, 2009). Moreover, a coherent group may develop its own identity, and therefore check the tenability of leadership signals and values, as well as environmental impulses, and state which of these are good or bad for the group (Schein, 1994; Leavitt, 1995).

Although group belonging may contribute to better work execution, the relationship between group belonging and leadership is ambiguous. Therefore, on the whole, group belonging may be an even more uncertain source of leadership charisma than organizational belonging.

Formal conditions and charisma

According to Scott (1998), formal conditions may be viewed as an attempt to make more explicit and visible the structure of relationships among a set of roles, as well as the principles that govern behavior in the system. As such, rules and routines are associated with the strategic leadership of the organization (Mintzberg, 1989). However, employees also link rules and routines to their immediate leaders because these leaders normally inform the employees about them, and manage their adherence to them (Shils, 1965; Simon, 1997).

Still, rules and routines have been assumed to be negatively correlated with charisma because they may provide employees with substitutes for leadership for instance in terms of detailed work instructions, and also restrict the behavior of the leader. Instead, more ambiguous and less structured organizational forms, as well as chaos and crisis have been regarded as fertile soils for the emergence of charisma (Shamir and Howell, 1999).

However, in relying on cognitive approaches highlighting the social construction of leadership by followers, this study suggests that a climate of chaos and crisis may appear in the eyes of the employees as evidence of a weak leadership, and therefore result in a diminishing of charisma. In contrast, feelings of belonging to a well-structured and well-functioning organization, which allow employees to satisfy their growth needs, may lead to perceptions of a strong leadership and thus to the amplification of charisma (Pillai and Meindl, 1998). This latter assumption is supported by observations of charisma in successful and well-structured organizations (Etzioni, 1975; Scott, 1978; Weber, 1978; Conger, 1989; DiTomaso, 1993; Nelson, 1993; Shamir *et al.*, 1993; Kelly, 2007), and empirical demonstrations of the supportive capacity of formalization particularly with regard to decentralized work.

For instance, James and Jones (1976) suggested that rules and routines are a precondition for decentralization and autonomy, since they contribute to coordination and provide necessary information, allowing employees to make decisions. Adler and Borys (1996) proposed that while the coercive form of rules and routines restricts the behavior of employees and makes them feel devoid of personal initiatives, the enabling form provides organizational memory, which captures lessons learned from experience and codifies the best practice routines for stabilizing and diffusing new organizational capabilities. According to Adler *et al.* (1999) and Bigley and Roberts (2001), rules and routines may also offer assistance under competitive and risky conditions, as they may expedite access to sophisticated technological resources. Snizek and Bullard (1983) found that formal work procedures were positively related to job satisfaction among forest rangers. Damanpour (1991) even reported positive correlations between rules and routines and innovation.

If employees experience such positive effects of rules and routines, and simultaneously hold the leader responsible for them, I expected that they might ascribe certain qualities to that leader, such as exceptional skills, power, and talent, and the ability to keep crises at a distance. In other words, when compared to social conditions there seems to be a more distinct relationship between formal conditions, work performance, and leadership responsibility. Thus, I hypothesize:

> **Hypothesis**: Formal working conditions such as rules and routines are capable of increasing the attribution of charisma by employees to their leaders beyond social working conditions such as organizational and group belonging.

Research setting and method

In this study, I chose to examine the Norwegian church. Eighty-six percent of the Norwegian population belongs to the Lutheran-Protestant religious faith, which also serves as the official religion in Norway, as it is set in the Constitution. There are strong links between the Government and the Church in several respects. The most important aspect of their relationship is that the activities and organization of the Church are regulated by government legislation. Further, the Government appoints bishops, all of which make the Church part of the state bureaucracy. Still, the Church profits from the delegation of power to each bishopric, which again delegates power to each deanery. In the deanery, the pastor has a relatively high degree of autonomy. To hold a position as pastor, up to six years of university study is required, which gives the pastors of the Norwegian church professional status. However, aside from this clerical structure, each bishopric has an executive staff structure under the supervision of a diocese director, who takes care of personnel and finance issues, as well as development strategies, and sees to it that laws and other central contracts and agreements are followed. This implies that clerical employees are also governed by a considerable set of rules. These characteristics have probably meant that the Norwegian Church, like well-established churches in many other countries, have been less part of the global "charismatic movement" (Coleman, 2000).

Sample and procedures

This survey is part of a larger organizational analysis that came about as a result of leadership discussions between the researcher, the bishop, and the diocese director in a bishopric in Norway in 2005. The survey used to collect data was constructed with the assistance of a group consisting of the diocese director, a union official representing the clergymen, a clergyman, two senior rectors, a representative of the administrative staff of the diocese director, and the researcher. By including members of the organization in the preparation of the survey, several advantages could be achieved. For instance, questions and terminology would fit the actual culture better, and the relevance and thereby the legitimacy of the survey would increase employees' motivation to participate and honestly report their opinions.

Respondents consisted of all employees, including the administrative staff at the diocese office, and clerical staff spread around the diocese. The data were gathered through Quest Back, an Internet-based system using existing e-mail addresses. Anonymity was guaranteed, and also technically dealt with by Quest Back. In total, 150 employees were addressed, and 94 complete questionnaires were received, which means that the response rate was 63%. Thirty-two percent were women and 68% men.

Measures

Items were ranked on Likert-scales from (1) not at all or strongly disagree, to (5) very much so or strongly agree. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient (α) was used as a reliability test.

The charisma scale was developed on the basis of the behavioral framework and cognitive approaches presented above, and in accordance with the emphasis in leadership research on goals and values, sensitivity to employees, admiration, respect, and confidence as central elements of leadership charisma (Weber, 1978; Willner, 1984; Conger and Kanungo, 1987; Pillai and Meindl, 1998). Also leaders' capabilities of accomplishing change have been regarded as a central element of charisma by several researchers. However, since change is not a central dimension of daily life of employees in the Norwegian church, this dimension was omitted in this study. Also personal risk, for instance in pursuing organizational objectives, has by some researchers been included in the operationalization of charisma. This aspect of charisma may also seem somewhat irrelevant for leadership charisma in a church organization, and was therefore left out. More precisely, charisma was here assessed through seven items adapted from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, first developed by Bass (1985) and later refined by Avolio *et al.* (1999). I also relied on the scales used by Barbuto (2005), Conger and Kanungo (1994), and Waldman *et al.* (2001). The items are as follows: (1) Do you feel that your superior is preoccupied with values and goals that are advantageous to the church? (2) Does your superior radiate authority and confidence? (3) Do the attitudes and behavior of your superior serve as a good guideline for you in your daily work? (4) If any type of crisis occurs, are you confident that your superior can solve it? (5) When referring to your superior in conversations, do you do so with pride? (6) Do you feel comfortable when socializing with your superior? (7) Do you respect your superior? The inter-item reliability coefficient (α) was 0.92.

Rules and routines were assessed by four items adapted from James and Jones (1976). These items are: (1) To what degree are there written instructions for the work you perform? (2) Do you have to solve your tasks according to fixed procedures? (3) Do memos and similar items assist you in your work? (4) Do you feel that service regulations, instructions, strategy documents or handbook assist you in daily work? (α=0.70).

Group belonging was developed particularly for this study through three items. These items are: (1) To what degree do you and your colleagues feel like a tight-knit unit? (2) Are you receiving attention and support from your colleagues? (3) Do you exchange confidential and personal information with your colleagues? (α=0.73).

The alphas for "rules and routines" and "group belonging" are low, although comparable to those achieved by Pillai and Meindl (1998). One explanation is that the number of items comprising these two factors is few and lack homogeneity. For instance, the "rules and routines" scale includes four items that can be perceived both as enabling and restrictive, while the "group belonging" scale include three items reflecting both feelings of intimacy and exchange of information.

Organizational belonging was assessed by six items adapted from Allen and Meyer (1990). These items are as follows: (1) I would like to spend the rest of my working life in this organization. (2) I feel the problems of the organization are also my own. (3) I feel like part of the family. (4) Working for this organization is meaningful. (5) I am proud of belonging to this organization. (6) I do not feel emotionally tied to this organization (reverse coded). The internal reliability (α) amounted to 0.78.

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted using LISREL 8.8 (Jøreskog and Sørbom, 2001) to examine how well the measurement model performed. Since the data followed a normal distribution, the maximum likelihood estimation method was preferred. The following model fit indices were reported: Chi-square deviation statistics in order to indicate degree of absolute model fit, as well as RMSEA and CFI to indicate a relative fit. However, since models are never an exact replica of reality, various degrees of misspecification are always present. Most weight was therefore placed on the interpretation of the RMSEA-index, indicating the degree to which a model represents a reasonable approximation of the observed data. According to Hu and Bentler (1999), RMSEA values equal to or below 0.06, and CFI values above 0.95, indicate an adequate model fit. However, in a recent simulation study of Chen *et al*. (2008), the optimal RMSEA cut-off varies considerably with sample size, implying that too many correct models based on a small sample size are being rejected. Because the sample size of this study was small, a RMSEA of less than 0.08 is required to keep the risk of a type I error reasonably low.

Although the CFA of all constructs under study indicates some degree of model misspecification (e.g., items loading on factors not specified), the model performed within acceptable limits (χ^2= 225.95 d.f.=166, $P<0.01$; CFI=0.94; RMSEA=0.06). These values are comparable to other studies of charisma with a similar sample size (e.g., Berson *et al*., 2007; Den Hartog *et al*., 2007). No significant correlations were identified between rules and routines and affective commitment, nor between rules and routines and group belonging. Significant correlations were identified between rules and routines and charisma (0.31, $P<0.05$), between affective commitment and group belonging (0.53, $P<0.01$), between affective commitment and charisma (0.39, $P<0.01$) and between group belonging and charisma (0.27, $P<0.05$).

As *control variables*, age and educational level measured in number of years of academic schooling were used. These were included as controls because previous research has shown that the older the employees become and the better educated they are, the more independent they feel, which again could influence the employees' relationship to their leaders (Greenberg and Baron, 2008).

Findings

The results from the bivariate analysis are presented in Table 1. This analysis showed no significant correlation between charisma and the two controls, age and educational level, but positive and significant correlation between charisma and organizational belonging, and also between charisma and rules and routines.

In order to test the hypothesis suggesting that rules and routines are capable of increasing employees' attribution of charisma to their leaders above and beyond the effects of social working conditions, such as organizational and group belonging, a hierarchical regression analysis was accomplished (see Table 2). In step one, age and educational level were entered. This model was not significant. In step two, the two social working conditions were entered, which increased the explained variance significantly by 10%. However, only organizational belonging was significant. In step three, rules and routines were entered, which increased explained variance significantly by 10%. Organizational belonging remained

Table 1 Means, standard deviations, and Pearson correlations ($N=94$)

Measure	*M*	*SD*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*
1. Age	46.93	11.18	—					
2. Educational length	5.88	2.98	0.03	—				
3. Group belonging	3.52	0.80	0.06	−0.09	—			
4. Organizational belonging	3.67	0.75	0.32**	0.19	0.34**	—		
5. Rules and routines	3.09	0.80	0.10	−0.25*	−0.07	0.05	—	
6. Charisma	3.67	0.94	0.01	0.01	0.20	0.30**	0.29**	—

*$P<0.05$; **$P<0.01$.

Table 2 Results of hierarchical regression for predicting charisma

	Model 1	*Model 2*	*Model 3*
1. Age	0.01	−0.09	−0.11
2. Educational length	0.01	−0.04	0.04
3. Group belonging		0.10	0.15
4. Organizational belonging		0.28*	0.25*
5. Rules and routines			0.34**
ΔR^2		0.10	0.10
ΔF		4.63*	10.39**
R^2	0.01	0.10	0.20
F-value	0.01	2.32	4.14**

Note: Standardized Beta-coefficients are reported.
*$P<0.05$; **$P<0.01$.

significant along with rules and routines. Thus, the hypothesis was supported.

Discussion and conclusion

Contextual conditions for charisma have received limited attention in the literature. The few studies that have been accomplished on this topic have rather one-sidedly argued that when a system is dysfunctional or faces crises, charisma has emerged due to needs for bold leadership. Further, collectivistic orientations such as group and organizational belonging have been regarded as hospitable to charismatic leadership, since charismatic leadership depends on the framing of meanings, and the linking of activities and goals to shared identities and values. On the other hand, formal working conditions such as rules and routines have been regarded as being unfavorable for the emergence of charisma, since such conditions may render the leader superfluous, and also limit the leader's scope of action.

However, the data presented here show that rules and routines are capable of increasing employees' perception of their leaders as charismatic over and beyond employees' feelings of organizational and group belonging. The most likely explanation is that rules and routines provide some guidance for employees, as well as facilitating coordination and organizational memory. Ambiguity and chaos are thus kept at a distance, enabling employees to realize professional and organizational goals and values (Adler and Borys, 1996; Scott, 1998). In experiencing this, subordinates may ascribe charisma to their leaders because they hold them responsible for formal working conditions, or, as Shils (1965) proposes, they do so because they subconsciously associate earthly, order-producing authority with supreme order.

In addition to rules and routines, organizational belonging appears to be positively related to the perception of leadership charisma. One possible explanation is that when employees feel tied to the organization, put their trust in it, and view it as a part of themselves, then the necessary conditions are met for achieving the sense of community required for charisma to exist (Shamir and Howell, 1999). The presence of positive relations between employees and the organization may also facilitate the leaders in communicating values and goals, since employees will already be mentally on the "right frequency" and motivated to make an extra effort. The gratitude and goodwill the employees may have toward the organization in feeling they are a vital part of it may also be directed at the leaders, as they are often the most visible part of the organization.

In contrast to Pillai and Meindl (1998), group belonging does not seem to be significantly related to charisma. A reasonable explanation for this is that within a professional group, internal standards and norms often develop, which may divert the employees' attention away from the leader's values, messages, and initiatives. In addition, a professional group often supports its members both with regard to more detailed work execution and personal and social affairs (Bass, 1990; Schein, 1994). Feedback on work performance by colleagues is also quite normal in such groups. Group members may therefore direct their attention, gratitude and even admiration toward colleagues rather than their leader. In other words, a cohesive group may fulfill so many central functions for its members that it is, at least in part, a genuine substitute for leadership (Kerr and Jermier, 1978).

Thus, a main conclusion from this study is that employees will largely attribute charisma to the leader if working conditions are conducive to successful job performance, help avoid stress and ambiguity, and make them feel part of the organization – provided the leader is given credit for creating and maintaining such conditions. However, since both formalization and organizational belonging implies indirect involvement by the leader in the daily work of employees, and even let the leader remain in the background, it can be argued that attribution of charisma is not solely dependent on leaders being dominant and highly visible, as assumed in much of the current literature on organizational leadership.

Still, this conclusion should not come as a surprise, considering the fact that professional employees are reluctant to be directly controlled by their leaders, and have less need for direct leader support than non-professionals. In other words, working conditions that are in harmony with employee expectations and needs seem to be an adequate basis from which employees might ascribe charisma to their leaders.

This conclusion has some managerial implications. Leaders in professional organizations who view charisma as a favorable characteristic should provide employees with means that allow them to have orderly working conditions, enabling them to utilize their competence and perform their jobs without direct interference from the leaders. Consequently, leaders should focus on the development of rules and routines so that they meet the qualities recommended by, for example, Adler and Borys (1996); that is, providing organizational memory and codifying the best practice routines. Moreover, the leaders should adopt a Human Resource policy that makes the organization's employees feel like members of an extended family. This might be more efficient than spending resources on team development. In other words, leaders in professional organizations who seek charisma should focus on tasks that are being perceived by employees as supportive of their performance, and which may strengthen their commitment to the organization.

Whether the conclusions and implications presented above are generalizable to other settings depends on the degree to which the organization under study is representative for other organizations. The Norwegian Church, through its formal structure and societal influence, may be representative of other large well-established religious communities irrespective of denomination, such as the Catholic Church. However, one should be careful in generalizing these findings to non-religious organizations, and in particular to pure secular organizations even if the differences between religious organizations and secular organizations have diminished through extensive use of values, norms, and rituals in the latter (Deal and Kennedy, 1982; Fry, 2003), and through professionalization and formalization in religious organizations (Nelson, 1993; Jeavons, 1998; Miller, 2002).

Still, some theoretical implications could be drawn from the findings presented in this study. A main hypothesis has been that charisma is likely to emerge and be effective in so-called weak situations, which are characterized by disorder and ambiguity, in organic structures, and under radical changes (Yammarino *et al*., 1993; Shamir and Howell, 1999; Yukl, 1999). An important theoretical deduction that could be drawn from this study is that charisma could also be associated with so-called strong situations, that is, structured and clear situations providing the employees with sufficient cues to guide their behavior. Since rules and routines tend to support the *status quo* and habitual actions (Scott, 1998), charisma could also be connected to stability and predictability. Moreover, charisma could be viewed as a characteristic resulting from need satisfaction among employees, and not necessarily from the underfulfillment of needs, which in the theory has been regarded as a motive for employees to address the leader.

However, some limitations apply to the results and conclusions presented here. The research design used in this study may result in common method bias, weakening cause-effect deductions. Low alphas question the reliability of two of the variables. The choice of a church as a representative of normative and professional organizations may put some restrictions on the generalizability of the data, since influence from religious values could be difficult to separate from influence from fleshly superiors. For instance, the attribution of charisma in a normative organization like the church may be the result of employees accepting the leader as being entitled to represent a spiritual power they believe in. Future research should therefore test the actual research model in other types of normative and clan-governed organizations.

The assumption that working conditions would affect the needs of employees in different ways remained empirically untested in this study. Future research should therefore explicitly check for the mediating or moderating effects of need satisfaction on employees' attribution of charisma to the leadership.

Despite its weaknesses, this study modifies and complements our understanding of the conditions for charisma to emerge, by revealing that employees' attribution of charisma to leaders is affected by formal contexts in normative and professional organizations. In doing so, it also reduces the elusive nature and the mystical connotation of the term.

References

Adler, P.S. & Borys, B. (1996). Two types of bureaucracy: Enabling and coercive. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41: 62–89.

Adler, P.S., Goldoftas, B. & Levine, D.L. (1999). Flexibility versus efficiency? A case study of model changeover in the Toyota production system. *Organization Science*, 10: 443–468.

Allen, N.J. & Meyer, J.P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63: 1–18.

Avolio, B.J., Bass, B.M. & Jung, D.I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72: 441–462.

Bahle, T. (2002). Changing social service system in England, France and Germany: Towards de-institutionalism or institutionalisation? EUI Working Paper SPS NO. 2002/8.

Barbuto, J.E. (2005). Motivation and transactional, charismatic, and transformational leadership: A test of antecedents. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 11: 26–40.

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

Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership, theory research and managerial applications*, 3rd edn. New York: The Free Press.

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

Bekker, C.J. (2008). Towards a theoretical model of Christian leadership. *Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership*, 2: 142–152.

Berson, Y., Oreg, S. & Dvir, T. (2007). CEO values, organizational culture and firm outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29: 615–633.

Bigley, G.A. & Roberts, K.H. (2001). The incident command system: High-reliability organizing for complex and volatile task environments. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44: 1281–1299.

Blau, P.M. (1963). Critical remarks on Weber's theory of authority. *The American Political Science Review*, 57: 305–316.

Chen, F., Curran, P.J., Bollen, K.A., Kirby, J. & Paxton, P. (2008). An empirical evaluation of the use of fixed cutoff points in RMSEA test statistics in structural equation models. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 36: 462–494.

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

Coleman, S. (2000). *The globalization of charismatic Christianity. Spreading the gospel of prosperity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

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

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

Conger, J.A. & Kanungo, R.N. (1994). Charismatic leadership in organizations: Perceived behavioral attributes and their measurement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15: 439–452.

Damanpour, F. (1991). Organizational innovation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34: 555–591.

Deal, T.E. & Kennedy, A.A. (1982). *Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Den Hartog, D.N., De Hoogh, A.H.B. & Keegan, A.E. (2007). The interactive effects of belongingness and charisma on helping and compliance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92: 1131–1139.

DiTomaso, N. (1993). Weber's social history and Etzioni's structural theory of charisma in organizations: Implications for thinking about charismatic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 4: 257–275.

Dow Jr., T.E. (1969). The theory of charisma. *Sociological Quarterly*, 10: 306–318.

Etzioni, A. (1975). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations*. New York: The Free Press.

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

Fry, L.W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14: 693–727.

Green, S.G. & Mitchell, T.R. (1979). Attributional processes of leaders in leader-member interactions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 23: 429–458.

Greenberg, J. & Baron, R.A. (2008). *Behavior in organizations*, 9th edn. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice-Hall.

Hackman, R., Oldham, G., Janson, R. & Purdy, K. (1995). A new strategy for job enrichment. In B.M. Staw (Ed), *Psychological dimensions of organizational behavior*, 2nd edn. 59–76. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: Wiley.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K.H. (1977). *The management of organizational behavior*, 3rd edn. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. Cleveland, OH: World.

House, R.J. (1995). Leadership in the twenty-first century: A speculative inquiry. In A. Howard (Ed), *The changing nature of work*, 411–450. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Howell, J.P., Bowen, D.E., Dorfman, P.W., Kerr, S. & Podsakoff, P.M. (2007). Substitutes for leadership: Effective alternatives to ineffective leadership. In R.P. Vecchio (Ed), *Leadership. Understanding the dynamics of power and influence in organizations*, 2nd edn. 363–376. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Hu, L. & Bentler, P.M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Model*, 6: 1–55.

James, L.R. & Jones, A.P. (1976). Organizational structure: A review of structural dimensions and their conceptual relationships with individual attitudes and behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16: 74–113.

Jeavons, T.H. (1998). Identifying characteristics of "religious" organizations: An exploratory proposal. In N.J. Demerath, P.D. Hall, T. Schmitt and R.H. Williams (Eds), *Sacred companies. Organizational aspects of religion and religious aspects of organization*, 79–96. New York: Oxford University Press.
Jones, G. (2009). On the priesthood. *Anglican Theological Review*, 91: 47–60.
Jøreskog, K.G. & Sørbom, D. (2001). *LISREL 8: User's reference guide*. Mooresville, IN: Scientific Software Inc.
Kellet, J.B., Humphrey, R.H. & Sleeth, R.G. (2002). Empathy and complex task performance: Two routes to leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13: 523–544.
Kelly, J. (2007). Reforming public sector in the UK: Bringing in the third sector. *Public Administration*, 85: 1003–1022.
Kerlinger, F.N. & Lee, H.B. (2000). *Foundations of behavioral research*, 4th edn. London: Thomson Learning.
Kerr, S. & Jermier, J.M. (1978). Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 22: 375–403.
Kieser, A., Beck, N. & Taino, R. (2001). Rules and organizational learning: The behavioral theory approach. In M. Dierkes, A.B. Antal, J. Child and I. Nonaka (Eds), *Organizational learning and knowledge*, 598–623. New York: Oxford University Press.
Lawler, E.E. (1995). Foundations of job satisfaction. In B.M. Staw (Ed), *Psychological dimensions of organizational behavior*, 79–96. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
Leavitt, H.J. (1995). Suppose we took groups seriously. In B.M. Staw (Ed), *Psychological dimensions of organizational behavior*, 2nd edn. 108–113. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
Lord, R.G. & Emrich, C.G. (2001). Thinking outside the box by looking inside the box: Extending the cognitive revolution in leadership research. *Leadership Quarterly*, 11: 551–579.
Martinko, M.J., Harvey, P. & Douglas, S.C. (2007). The role, function, and contribution of attribution theory to leadership: A review. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18: 561–585.
Massignon, B. (2007). The European compromise: Between immanence and transcendence. *Social Compass*, 54: 573–582.
Miller, K.D. (2002). Competitive strategies of religious organizations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23: 435–456.
Mintzberg, H. (1989). *Mintzberg on management*. New York: The Free Press.
Nelson, R.E. (1993). Authority, organization, and societal context in multinational churches. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38: 653–682.
Paul, J., Costley, D.L., Howell, J.P. & Dorfman, P.W. (2002). The mutability of charisma in leadership research. *Management Decision*, 40: 192–200.
Pierson, P. (1994). *Dismantling the welfare state? Reagan, Thatcher and the politics of retrenchment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Pillai, R. & Meindl, J.R. (1998). Context and charisma: A "meso" level examination of the relationship of organic structure, collectivism, and crisis to charismatic leadership. *Journal of Management*, 24: 643–671.
Quinn, J.B. (1992). *Intelligent enterprise. A knowledge and service based paradigm for industry*. New York: The Free Press.
Reed, M.I. (1996). Expert power and control in late modernity: An empirical review and theoretical synthesis. *Organization Science*, 17: 573–597.
Rieff, P. (2008). *Charisma. The gift of grace, and how it has been taken away from us*. New York: Vintage Books.
Schein, E. (1994). *Organizational psychology*, 3rd edn. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
Scott, L.K. (1978). Charismatic authority in the rational organization. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 14: 43–62.
Scott, W.R. (1998). *Organizations. Rational, natural and open systems*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
Shamir, B., House, R.J. & Arthur, M.B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept theory. *Organization Science*, 4: 1–17.
Shamir, B. & Howell, A.M. (1999). Organizational and contextual influences on the emergence and effectiveness of charismatic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10: 257–283.
Shils, E. (1965). Charisma, order and status. *American Sociological Review*, 30: 199–213.
Simon, H.A. (1997). *Administrative behavior*, 4th edn. New York: The Free Press.
Snizek, W.E. & Bullard, J.H. (1983). Perception of bureaucracy and changing job satisfaction: A longitudinal analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 32: 275–287.
Starkloff, C.E. (1997). Church as structure and communitas: Victor Turner and ecclesiology. *Theological Studies*, 58: 643–668.
Tosi, H.L. (2009). *Theories of organization*. London: Sage.
Waldman, D.A., Ramírez, G.G., House, R.J. & Puranam, P. (2001). Does leadership matter? CEO leadership attributes and profitability under conditions of perceived environmental uncertainty. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44: 134–143.
Wallace, J.E. (1995). Organizational and professional commitment in professional and nonprofessional organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: 228–255.
Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology*, In G. Roth and C. Wittich (Eds), Berkeley: University of California Press.
Weick, K.E. (1989). Theory construction as disciplined imagination. *Academy of Management Review*, 14: 516–531.
Weiner, B. (2004). Social motivation and moral emotions: An attributional perspective. In M.J. Martinko (Ed), *Attribution theory in the organizational sciences: Theoretical and empirical contributions*, 5–24. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
Willner, A.R. (1984). *The spellbinders: Charismatic political leadership*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Yammarino, F.J., Spangler, W.D. & Bass, B.M. (1993). Transformational leadership and performance: A longitudinal investigation. *Leadership Quarterly*, 4: 81–102.
Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10: 285–305.
Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations*, 6th edn. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice-Hall.

About the author

Rudi Kirkhaug received his Ph.D. from the University of Tromsø, Norway in 2001 where he is currently an associate professor on the Faculty of Social Science. Prior to his academic career he was a member of the board of directors in banking and finance organizations, a member of executive groups both in the private and public sector, and has held positions of trust in parachute and flying clubs. Influenced by his varied experience, his research interests include work and organizational design, leadership, change, creativity, and risk. In the university he is currently responsible mainly for the leadership training programs. He can be reached at rudi.kirkhaug@uit.no.