

## Tilburg University

### On charisma and need for leadership

de Vries, R.E.; Roe, R.A.; Taillieu, T.C.B.

*Publication date:*  
1997

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

de Vries, R. E., Roe, R. A., & Taillieu, T. C. B. (1997). *On charisma and need for leadership*. (WORC Paper / Work and Organization Research Centre (WORC); Vol. 97.12.018/3). Unknown Publisher.

#### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

#### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**On Charisma and Need for Leadership**

**Paper presented at the workshop on Transformational  
Leadership, Tilburg University, the Netherlands,  
May 5-7, 1997**

**R.E. de Vries  
R.A. Roe  
T.C.B. Taillieu**

**WORC Paper 97.12.018/3**

**February 1998**

# On Charisma and Need for Leadership

R.E. de Vries  
R.A. Roe  
T.C.B. Taillieu

*Keywords: leadership, charisma, situational theories, moderators*

Some scholars have argued and found that the relationship between transformational leadership and outcomes can be moderated by subordinate or situational characteristics (e.g. Bass and Avolio, 1990; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Bommer, 1995). Still, there is insufficient evidence on this issue. In this paper we examine need for leadership (De Vries, 1997) as a moderator of the relation between a measure for charismatic leadership (Bass, 1985a; Den Hartog, Koopman & Van Muijen, 1994) and subordinate outcomes. Need for leadership is found to moderate the relation between charismatic leadership and three out of four criteria. Furthermore, we examine the relation between charismatic leadership and need for leadership. While it has been asserted that transformational leaders are able to empower and develop subordinates to become leaders themselves (e.g. Bass and Avolio, 1990; Kuhnert, 1994; Yammarino, 1994) we find a positive relationship between charismatic leadership and need for leadership, which suggests that subordinates are more, instead of less, dependent when a charismatic leader is present.

## 1. Introduction

One of the attributes which has often been associated with exceptional personal characteristics is *charisma*. Since 1977, several theories on charisma have been proposed, using terms such as charismatic leadership (House, 1977; Conger & Kanungo, 1994), transforming leadership (Burns, 1978), transformational leadership (Bass, 1985a; Bass, 1985b; Bass, 1990; Bass & Avolio, 1994), visionary leadership (Westley, 1991), inspirational leadership (Bass, 1988; den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1994), or change-centered leadership (Ekvall, 1991; Ekvall & Arvonen, 1991). These theories focus on leaders who have an exceptional influence on the effort, motivation, and performance of subordinates. In this study we will investigate the role of *need for leadership* (De Vries, 1997) in relation to charismatic leadership and outcomes. We will examine how charisma relates to need for leadership, and whether need for leadership moderates the relationship between charisma and subordinate outcome variables. We will start with a brief overview of the research on charisma (in 1.1) and an introduction of the 'need for leadership' construct (in 1.2). Next, we will discuss the direct relationship of need for leadership and charismatic leadership (in 1.3) and the possibility of a moderator effect (in 1.4). We will discuss our method of research in section 2, and present the results in section 3. Our paper will finish with the conclusions and a discussion in section 4.

## *1.1 Charisma*

Originally, charisma referred to individuals endowed with special qualities, standing out of the crowd. House (1977) specified various indicators of charismatic leadership involving follower perceptions, leader traits, and leader behavior. Traits typical of charismatic leaders include a strong need for power, high self-confidence, and strong convictions. Need for power, for instance, was found to be a predictor of presidential charisma (House, Spangler, & Woycke, 1991). The following behaviors were regarded to be typical of leaders: impression management, articulation of an appealing vision, communication of high expectations, and expression of confidence in followers.

Some scholars have abandoned the personal characteristics view of charismatic leadership. Bryman (1992) noted that the sheer variety of charismatic leaders made it impossible to single out special traits that were common to all. Although Bryman notes that highly charismatic leaders have often been described as having striking eyes, a powerful voice, an abundance of energy and confidence, and a capacity for empathy, none of these characteristics could be attributed to all charismatic leaders. In an investigation of the relation between personal characteristics (emotional coping, behavioral coping, abstract orientation, innovation, risk-taking, and use of humor) and transformational leadership using sales agents, it was found that none of the characteristics were consistently related to transformational leadership (Dubinsky, Yammarino, & Jolson, 1995). It is doubtful, though, whether in a population of sales agents managers, in contrast with a population of presidents, enough (variation in) charismatic behavior is present. In a study using personality adjectives, charismatic leaders were perceived to differ significantly from non-charismatic leaders on a great number of personality adjectives (Atwater, Penn, & Rucker, 1991). Charismatic leaders, in contrast with non-charismatic leaders, were strongly characterized by personality adjectives such as dynamic, adventuresome, inspiring, enthusiastic, outgoing, zestful, sociable, insightful, imaginative, enterprising, secure, confident, wise, and competent.

Bass and Avolio (1994) make a distinction between four aspects of transformational leadership, i.e., idealized influence (formerly charisma), intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and individualized consideration. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) measures the four aspects described above together with three transactional factors (contingent reward, active management by exception, and passive management by exception) and laissez faire (Bass & Avolio, 1995). Transactional leadership refers to the exchange or withholding of favors (clarifications, feedback, support) for subordinates' performance. Leaders who practice laissez-faire leadership basically abstain from trying to influence subordinates.

The MLQ is a widely used instrument. Its contents and empirical structure have been subject to discussion, however. Many MLQ items measuring charisma, for instance, have been defined in terms of their effects, augmenting the chance that high correlations with outcomes are obtained (Den Hartog, Koopman, & Van Muijen, 1994). Tepper and Percy (1994), using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) with a reduced MLQ version, found that two dimensions, one transformational and one transactional, captured the essence of the MLQ. In a CFA conducted by Bycio, Hackett, and Allen (1995), a two-factor solution, reflecting Active versus Passive leadership was found to best represent the data obtained using the MLQ. Den Hartog, Van Muijen, and Koopman (1994; 1997) could not interpret

an eight-factor solution in an explorative principal component analysis of the MLQ. A three-factor solution was proposed instead, comprised of an inspirational leadership factor, a transactional leadership factor, and a passive leadership factor. Although Bass and Avolio (1993) maintain that a conceptual distinction can be made between the eight transformational and transactional factors, they admit that often transformational factors could not be distinguished empirically. Related to the behavioral point of view is the question whether charismatic or transformational leadership can be learned. According to Avolio and Bass (1988), charisma is not an inborn trait, but is something that can be trained in a laboratory setting. Preliminary results from a study by Avolio and Bass (1995) showed a positive shift in inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation rated by subordinates six months after a training program was conducted. When participants had proposed changes, the effects were greater than when no change was proposed. However, no significant changes were observed in idealized influence (charisma) and individualized consideration.

Although the question remains whether charisma is something that resides in the person (House & Howell, 1992), whether it is a behavioral phenomenon (Conger & Kanungo, 1994), an aspect of social exchange (Bryman, 1992), or an attributional phenomenon (Lord & Maher, 1993), most researchers endorse the importance of charisma for organizational outcomes. Some studies have shown that this stance could only be supported if the same raters were used. This supports the view that charisma holds at an individual level of analysis but not at a dyad or group level (Yammarino & Dubinsky, 1994). Hater and Bass (1988), for instance, found that transformational leadership significantly added to the effectiveness of subordinates when subordinate ratings were used but not when superior ratings were used. Seltzer and Bass (1990) found that transformational leadership (but especially charisma) added 12% in leader effectiveness rated by subordinates to the variance explained by initiating structure and consideration; another 28% in subordinate's extra effort and another 8% in subordinate's satisfaction with the leader. These effects disappeared when a criss-cross design was employed. With different subordinates providing independent and dependent measures, transformational leadership only added an extra 6% of variance in leader effectiveness and 8% of variance in satisfaction with the leader. The explained variance was mainly brought about, though, by a negative relation of intellectual stimulation with the outcome variables, which did not conform to expectations. Charisma did not explain any additional variance in the outcomes.

In another study, it was found that charisma significantly added variance to contingent reward, in explaining performance evaluation and recommended early promotion, when a criss-cross design was used (Waldman, Bass, & Yammarino, 1990). Conversely, contingent reward did not add any variance to charisma in explaining the outcomes. In a longitudinal design in the US Navy, transformational leadership (i.e., one latent variable with charisma, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational leadership as its indicators) was found to be related to objective as well as subjective performance evaluations, while transactional leadership was not related to any of these evaluations (Yammarino, Spangler, & Bass, 1993). Bycio, Hackett, and Allen (1995) showed that, of all transformational leadership characteristics, charismatic leadership was the most important predictor of satisfaction with the leader, leader effectiveness, intent to leave, and organizational commitment.

While charisma seems to affect organizational and individual outcomes, it remains to be established how charisma relates to subordinate characteristics, and how its effectiveness depends on such characteristics. These questions are central in this paper.

Only few studies have been conducted on the first question. Burns (1978) and Yukl (1989) argued that transformational or charismatic leadership can change the values, attitudes, assumptions, and behaviors of subordinates. Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993), for instance, proposed that charismatic leadership has an influence on subordinate's self-expression, self-esteem, self-consistency, identity, and faith. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) found that transformational leadership was positively related to subordinates' extra-role or 'organizational citizenship behaviors' (OCBs). However, these effects were indirect. Transformational leadership was positively related to trust in the leader, which in its turn had a positive relation with the OCBs altruism, conscientiousness, courtesy and sportsmanship, but not with civic virtue. Again, contrary to expectations, intellectual stimulation had a negative relation with a criterion, in this case, trust.

Even less research has been devoted to the second question. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Bommer (1995) proposed that subordinates' need for independence moderates the relation between intellectual stimulation and outcomes. They suggested that intellectual stimulation can be irritating and ineffective for subordinates with a high need for independence while being effective for subordinates with a low need for independence. This proposition was not substantiated. They did find a positive relation of intellectual stimulation with role conflict, which was moderated by professional orientation. With low professional orientation, intellectual stimulation was positively related to role conflict while with high professional orientation there was no relation between intellectual stimulation and role conflict. They also found a moderator effect of group cohesiveness. At low levels of group cohesiveness, intellectual stimulation was negatively related to general satisfaction, while at high levels of group cohesiveness, intellectual stimulation was positively related to general satisfaction.

### *1.2 Need for leadership*

In this study we focus on 'need for leadership' (De Vries, 1997) as a characteristic of subordinates. Need for leadership differs from other relevant conceptualizations in the leadership domain because it is not an asset of the leader, but an asset of the subordinate in his or her situation, job, or organization. In this way, the concept of need for leadership fulfills the wish of scholars for a more follower-centered theory of leadership (Meindl, 1990; Hollander & Offermann, 1990; Mmobiuosi, 1991). Leader-centered approaches have dominated the leadership research agenda with their focus on the personality traits, behavioral styles, and decision-making methods of the leader. According to Hollander and Offermann (1990), it has become important to incorporate the subordinates in leadership models in order to deepen our understanding of the leadership process. Meindl (1990) points at a lack of theories fitting leader traits and behaviors to the needs and personalities of subordinates. Need for leadership, with its focus on followers, may be a solution to the theoretical gap by filling this vacuum. We define need for leadership as ...

**... the social-contextual perception of an employee of the relevance of the leader's legitimate acts of influence towards him-/herself or the group (s)he belongs to (De Vries, 1997, p. 94).**

The relevance of need for leadership in research on charismatic leadership is obvious. We expect subordinates with a low need for leadership to act more or less independently, and to show little responsiveness to the interventions by their leaders. Subordinates with a high need for leadership, on the other hand, may be expected to subject themselves to the acts of the leader, and to contribute to the superior's image as charismatic leader. A certain level of need for leadership might even be considered a prerequisite for the influence of charismatic leaders on their subordinates.

A number of studies have focused on constructs which resemble need for leadership. Most of the studies have paid little attention to the definition and operationalization of the proposed constructs. Furthermore, the subordinate leadership needs have usually been explored as part of a wider study. Consequently, the results have not been integrated in the mainstream of research on leadership. The studies can be roughly divided into two contrasting types, i.e., research on need for leadership and research on need for work without a leader. Examples of the first type are studies on need for closer supervision (Ashkanasy & Gallois, 1994), need for supervision (Martin, 1983), need for clarity (Keller, 1989), need for structure (Stoker & De Jong, 1996), and leadership need strength (Seers & Graen, 1984). Examples of the second type are studies on need for autonomy (Emans & Radstaak, 1990; Landeweerd & Boumans, 1994) and need for independence (Kerr & Jermier, 1978).

Most studies have investigated the effects of these 'needs' on the relation of leadership with subordinate or organizational outcomes. Some studies have used subgrouping, comparing the relation of leadership and outcomes between groups high and groups low on the investigated 'need.' Others have used moderated multiple regression to find significant interactions between leadership and the 'need.' The findings of Keller (1989), Stoker and De Jong (1996), Emans and Radstaak (1990) and Landeweerd and Boumans (1994) point in the same direction, even though they suffered from methodological weaknesses resulting in low power. In those cases in which a significant moderator effect was detected, i.e. whenever employees needed clarity in their job or less autonomy, leadership was more strongly related to subordinate outcomes than in cases in which employees did not have such needs. The findings concerning need for independence (Kerr & Jermier, 1978) have not been less clear. Need for independence did moderate the relation between several forms of leadership behavior and criteria in 6 out of 82 (7.3%) cases (De Vries, 1997). There was no consistency, though, in the type of the moderator effect in these instances. In three of the cases, a negative (simple or pure) moderator effect was found, while in the other three cases a positive (simple or pure) moderator effect was found.

The research on need for leadership represents an improvement in this field of follower-centered research on leadership (De Vries, 1997). Unlike the preceding studies the construct is well-defined and operationalized, and better research designs have circumvented the problem of insufficient power in moderated regression analysis .

### *1.3 The relationship between charisma and need for leadership*

The first research question addressed in this paper will be:

#### **1. What is the relationship between charismatic leadership and need for leadership?**

Following the transformational leadership theory (Bass & Avolio, 1990; Kuhnert, 1994; Yammarino, 1994) employees with a charismatic leader should show a lower need for leadership compared to employees with a non-charismatic leader. This line of argument would make one expect a negative correlation between the degree of charismatic leadership and the strength of the need for leadership. In another vein, one might argue that charismatic leadership may produce a stronger bond between the leader and subordinate, which may result in a higher need for leadership. On this basis one would expect a positive correlation between charismatic leadership and need for leadership. Alternatively, one may conceive of a process in which the presence of subordinates with a higher need for leadership provide better chances for superiors to manifest themselves as charismatic leaders. Such a process would also result in a positive correlation between charismatic leadership and need for leadership, the causal order being reversed. And finally, of course, there is the possibility that these different processes take place simultaneously.

### *1.4. Need for leadership as a moderator*

Although situational theories of leadership have been abundant, there has been a lack of research on the issue whether the relation between charismatic leadership and outcomes may be moderated by situational characteristics. Bass and Avolio (1990), for instance, propose that the relation between charismatic leadership and outcomes may be moderated by 'crisis.' In times of crisis, charismatic leaders may be more successful than in stable periods. The need for leadership among subordinates is another situational variable that may moderate the relationship between charismatic leadership and outcomes. Need for leadership qualifies as a potential moderator, since it is likely to capture the effects of other individual, task, and organizational characteristics (De Vries, 1997). Thus we formulate our second research question as follows:

#### **2. Does need for leadership moderate the relation between charisma and job satisfaction, organizational commitment, work stress, and role conflict?**

To start with, we expect charismatic leadership to be positively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. We expect it to be negatively related to work stress and role conflict. Need for leadership is expected to moderate the relation between charismatic leadership and outcomes in the following way; among subordinate with low need for leadership we expect the relation between charismatic leadership and outcomes to be weaker than among subordinates with a high need for leadership.

The relation between charismatic leadership and subordinate development has been an issue of debate. For instance, leaders who are exemplified by their personalized (rather than socialized) charisma resist empowering subordinates in order to maintain their own base of power (Howell, 1988; in: Bass and Avolio, 1990). Bass and Avolio state that



“Transformational leaders, although viewed as charismatic, gain greater levels of long-term performance by developing followers to a higher level of autonomy” (1990, p. 242). Other authors have also referred to the developing potential of transformational leadership. According to Yammarino “Ultimately, the most successful transformational leaders, regardless of organizational level, are those who have made their followers, colleagues, and even superiors ... leaders in their own right” (1994, p. 46). In fact, this implies that room is left for unsuccessful transformational leaders, who do not turn followers into leaders. Kuhnert (1994) even sees it as a moral responsibility of leaders to develop their subordinates. In his words “.. leaders must aspire to more than just getting others to follow: They must see the development of their associates as their personal responsibility if the organization is to grow and maximize its potential (Kuhnert, 1994, p. 23).

## 2. Method

### 2.1 Sample

A random sample of 4523 Dutch households in Middle Brabant (a region in the province 'Noord-Brabant' of the Netherlands) were selected from the telephone directory and contacted by telephone. 2000 households that had one or more job-holder willing to participate received a questionnaire, of which 958 were returned. The average age of the respondents was 39.2 years (sd=9.6). The mean tenure of the respondents was 10.7 years (sd=8.9). Of the 958 respondents 291 (30.4%) were female and 665 (69.4%) were male. The educational level of the respondents in the sample shows sufficient variation. In the sample, 3.4% completed junior highschool, 15.4% completed highschool, 14.7% completed lower occupational training, 34.1% completed middle occupational training, 24.3% completed higher occupational training, and 8.1% were university graduates.

In comparison with the national work force (Centraal Bureau voor Statistiek, 1996), the service sector is overrepresented, although the branches of trade, hotels & restaurants and banks & insurance are underrepresented (Table 1). However, there seems to be a good fit between the sample and the total Dutch population with regard to the labor force in farming, mining, industry, public utilities, construction and transport & storage. The deviations of the sample from the national population were found to be significant ( $\chi^2_{(8)}=290.03$ ,  $p<.001$ ). The sample deviated even more from the Middle Brabant labor force (Samenwerkingsverband Midden Brabant, 1996), notably with respect to industry, trade, hotels & restaurants and service ( $\chi^2_{(8)}=543.98$ ,  $p<.001$ ).<sup>1</sup> The number of respondents in industry matches the national population better than the Middle Brabant population. To obtain moderator effects, though, sufficient variation in business sector was found for the purpose of this study.

---

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that Peasons'  $\chi^2$  is biased when expected frequencies are lower than 1. Compared with the value of the sample of 2, we find an expected frequency in the sample of 0.03 when using the Middle Brabant mining population. The squared difference  $(2 - 0.03)^2$  of 3.88 is thus transformed to a  $\chi^2$ -value of 129.33 after division through 0.03; which is already more than five times the critical ( $p<.01$ ;  $df=8$ )  $\chi^2$ -value!

**Table 1:** Comparison of the labor force in the Netherlands (first semester, 1995), (Middle) North Brabant (may, 1995) and the sample (february, 1995)

Type of business	National <sup>a</sup>		Middle Brabant <sup>b</sup>		Sample	
	n(*1000)	%	n	%	n	%
Farming	103	1.7	715	0.5	25	2.6
Mining	9	0.2	5	0.0	2	0.2
Industry	1016	17.0	34992	23.3	161	16.9
Public utilities	43	0.7	587	0.4	20	2.1
Construction	353	5.9	9157	6.1	88	9.3
Trade/Hotels/Rest.	1147	19.2	35613	23.7	80	8.4
Transport & Storage	388	6.5	7760	5.2	34	3.6
Banks & Insurance	950	15.9	13200	8.8	50	5.3
Service	1951	32.7	48152	32.1	491	51.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>5960</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>150181</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>951</b>	<b>100</b>

<sup>a</sup> National statistics provided by the Central Office of Statistics, the Netherlands (Centraal Bureau voor Statistiek, 1996)

<sup>b</sup> Middle Brabant statistics provided by the Cooperation Middle Brabant (Samenwerkingsverband Midden Brabant, 1996)

## 2.2 Instruments

Three different instruments have been used in the research on need for leadership. In earlier studies we used a need for leadership instrument specifically constructed for an insurance company sample, which we called the preliminary need for leadership instrument (NL-P). Since there were some shortcomings we decided to construct a second instrument, which we called the full need for leadership instrument (NL-F). The NL-F consists of two parts, a subjective (the NL-F(S)) and an objective part (the NL-F(O)).

The construction of the full need for leadership instrument was conducted in three phases, a theoretical-rational phase, an internal-structural phase, and an external-criterion phase (Millon, 1983). In the first phase, the theoretical-rational phase, items were written on the basis of the theory involved. In this phase a judgment was made of the content of the item using criteria such as the amount of complexity, the length, and the comprehensibility of the item. In the second phase, the internal-structural phase, the items were tested on their internal homogeneity. Factor-analyses and reliability analyses were part of this phase. In the third phase, the external-criterion phase, the items were correlated with external criteria, to judge their (convergent and discriminant) validity. All three instruments, the NL-P, the NL-F(S), and the NL-F(O) contained adequate reliability and validity. In this study the NL-P has a cronbach alpha of .85, the NL-F(S) has a cronbach alpha of .93, and the NL-F(O) has a cronbach alpha of .94. The instruments are fully described in De Vries (1997).

The scale measuring charismatic leadership is a reduced version of Bass' (1985a) scale measuring transformational leadership. Den Hartog, Van Muijen and Koopman's (1994; 1997) factor-analyzed a 40-item Dutch version of the transformational leadership scales. The first factor contained 18-items and represented inspirational leadership (Inspirerend leiderschap). This scale had a cronbach alpha of .95. Eleven items with high item-total

correlations were selected for the scale used in our study. We renamed the scale 'charismatic leadership,' because the items strongly resemble the items derived from the first factor in Bass' (1985a, p. 207-210) original factor analysis of the transformational leadership scales, which was originally named 'charismatic leadership.' In our study this scale has an alpha of .93 (m=32.4, sd=9.3). It should be noted that the items representing charismatic leadership describe different domains. In contrast with human- and task-oriented leadership, which clearly describe leadership behaviors, some of the charismatic leadership items resemble personality traits (e.g.: "My supervisor projects a powerful, dynamic and magnetic presence," which in Dutch is: "Mijn chef heeft een sterke dynamische persoonlijkheid en een krachtige uitstraling"), some describe behaviors (e.g.: "My supervisor mobilizes a collective sense of mission," which was translated into Dutch: "Mijn chef creëert een gemeenschappelijk gevoel aan een belangrijke opdracht/missie te werken"), some describe subordinate affects (e.g.: "I have complete confidence in my supervisor," which was translated into Dutch: "Ik heb volledig vertrouwen in mijn chef"), and some describe subordinate perceptions (e.g.: "In my mind, my supervisor is a symbol of success and accomplishment," which was translated into Dutch: "Voor mij is mijn chef een symbool van succes en bekwaamheid").

**Table 2:** Number of items (n), means (m), standard deviations (sd) and cronbach alpha's ( $\alpha$ ) of the most important scales in our study

	no. <sup>a</sup>	$\alpha$	m	sd
Charismatic leadership	11	.93	32.40	9.30
Need for leadership; NL-F(S)	17	.93	44.69	13.65
Need for leadership; NL-F(O)	17	.94	56.28	14.06
Need for leadership; NL-P	6	.85	15.40	5.87
Job satisfaction	11	.81	42.60	6.38
Organizational commitment	6	.78	22.02	5.25
Work stress	7	.77	21.12	5.12
Role conflict	8	.75	19.48	5.45

<sup>a</sup> no. is number of items,  $\alpha$  is cronbach alpha, m is mean, and sd is standard deviation; in all studies Likert (1-5) completely disagree - completely agree scales were used

The main criteria used in this study are: job satisfaction, organizational commitment, work stress, and role conflict. The reliabilities of the criteria are adequate, ranging from .75 for role conflict to .81 for job satisfaction. The instruments for job satisfaction, organizational commitment and work stress were obtained from Taillieu (1987) and are further refined and extensively described in the insurance company study (Taillieu, Van der Wielen, De Vries, & Dikschei, 1993; Taillieu & De Vries, 1995) and in De Vries (1997). Job satisfaction contains 11 items. It consists of items which denote the degree of satisfaction derived from the degree of variation, autonomy, responsibility in the job, career possibilities, salary, and interaction with colleagues. An example of an item is: "I am satisfied with the amount of variation in my job." The scale has a cronbach alpha of .81.

The scale for organizational commitment consists of 6 items. Examples of items used are: "I would change company, if another were to offer me a higher salary" (reversed scored), "I feel at home in my company," and "I praise my organization when talking to acquaintances." Organizational commitment has a cronbach alpha of .78. Work stress

consists of seven items in the cross-sectional study. Examples of items are: "I have to hurry to finish my work in time," "I often cannot cope with the amount of work," "This work is putting a strain on my health," and "This work requires a great deal of effort." The scale has a cronbach alphas of .77.

Role conflict was measured using the instrument of Rizzo, House and Lirtzman (1970). Role conflict is viewed in terms of incompatibility of demands in the form of conflict between organizational demands and own values, problems of personal resource allocation, conflict between obligations to several other people, and conflict between excessively numerous or difficult tasks. Role conflict consists of 8 items. Alpha coefficients reported range from .56 to .82 (Cook, Hepworth, Wall, & Warr, 1981). In our cross-sectional study it has a cronbach alpha of .75.

### 2.3 Analyses

To obtain the relation between charismatic leadership and need for leadership we computed pearson correlations between the variables. To find moderator effects we used a modified version of the Hierarchical or Moderated Multiple Regression (MMR) procedure suggested by Howell, Dorfman and Kerr (1986). The following regression model was tested:

$$y=\beta_0+\beta_1x+\beta_2z+\beta_3xz+\epsilon.$$

in which y stands for the criteria (i.e., job satisfaction, organizational commitment, work stress, and role conflict), x for charismatic leadership, z for need for leadership, and xz for the interaction between the charismatic leadership and need for leadership. Using the standardized regression values of need for leadership ( $\beta_2$ ) and the interaction term ( $\beta_3$ ) we can specify the type of effect of need for leadership when charismatic leadership ( $\beta_1$ ) is either positively, negatively, or not related to the criterion (De Vries, 1997). In the presentation of our research using MMR we will only include data using the NL-F(S). It should be noted that similar results were obtained using the NL-F(O) and the NL-P.

## 3. Results

### 3.1 Correlations

In Table 3 the results of our correlational analysis are shown. As we can see, charismatic leadership is positively correlated to all three need for leadership scales. It seems that employees with charismatic leaders have a higher need for leadership than those with leaders low on charisma. This is contrary the expectations of leadership scholars who argue that charismatic leadership reduces the dependency of subordinates by empowering them. Furthermore, charismatic leadership is positively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and negatively related to work stress and role conflict. The different need for leadership scales, especially NL-F(S) and NL-F(O) are strongly correlated to each other. NL-F(O) is positively related to work stress and role conflict. When subordinates perceive a leader to be needed in their type of work, they indicate that they are troubled to a higher degree of work stress and role conflict. Last of all, the criteria are strongly correlated to each other.

**Table 3:** The correlation between the (need for) leadership scales and the criteria

Charisma	1.00							
NL-F(S)	.24**	1.00						
NL-F(O)	.21**	.63**	1.00					
NL-P	.23**	.29**	.38**	1.00				
Job satisf.	.48**	.00	.01	.09*	1.00			
Org. commit.	.46**	.06	.04	.06	.72**	1.00		
Work stress	-.09*	.05	.12**	.01	-.21**	-.24**	1.00	
Role conflict	-.15**	.06	.12**	.02	-.28**	-.36**	.59**	1.00
	char.	nl-f(s)	nl-f(o)	nl-p	satisf.	commi.	stress	confl.

### 3.2 Moderator effects

The results of the hierarchical MMRs are shown in Table 4. In the Table, the criteria are regressed on charismatic leadership, need for leadership, and their interaction term. The relations between charismatic leadership and the criteria are moderated in three out of four times. In the case of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, low need for leadership is associated with a weaker relation between charismatic leadership and criteria than with a high need for leadership. The negative relation between charismatic leadership and work stress is not moderated by need for leadership. Need for leadership does act as a moderator of the negative relation of charismatic leadership to role conflict. With a low need for leadership, again, the relation between charismatic leadership and role conflict is weaker than with high need for leadership. The first research question can thus be answered positively. In three out of four cases (low) need for leadership makes the relation between charismatic leadership and criteria less strong.

## 4. Conclusions and discussion

Our results show the intertwined nature of charismatic leadership and need for leadership. We found charismatic leadership and need for leadership to be positively related to each other. Subordinates with charismatic leaders have a higher need for leadership than subordinates with noncharismatic leaders. Furthermore, need for leadership moderated the relation between charismatic leadership and three out of four criteria. In those cases in which there was a lower need for leadership, charismatic leadership has a weaker relation to the criteria in our study. The findings are in contrast with suggestions of scholars that transformational or charismatic leadership makes subordinates independent from the leaders by empowering them (Kuhnert, 1994; Yammarino, 1994). Instead of empowering them, it seems that charismatic leaders make themselves irreplaceable by instilling a leadership need in their subordinates. The need for leadership, in its turn, may enhance the influence of the leader on subordinate outcomes. Consequently, as is shown in our example, it looks as though the sword of charismatic leadership is double-edged, instilling a need for leadership which creates an enhanced possibility for the leader to influence his/her subordinates.

**Table 4:** Moderated Multiple Regression of criteria on charismatic leadership, need for leadership and their interaction

Variable	$R^2_{adj}$	$\Delta R^2$	% <sup>a</sup>	$\Delta f^b$	$\beta^c$
<b>Criterion: Job satisfaction</b>					
Charismatic leadership	.23	.23	92.6	220.58	.52***
Need for leadership	.24	.01	4.7	11.27	-.11***
Interaction	.25	.01	2.7	6.64	.08*
<b>Criterion: Organizational commitment</b>					
Charismatic leadership	.22	.23	94.4	214.01	.50***
Need for leadership	.23	.00	1.9	4.37	-.07*
Interaction	.24	.01	3.7	8.54	.09**
<b>Criterion: Work stress</b>					
Charismatic leadership	.01	.01	51.7	7.70	-.12***
Need for leadership	.02	.01	42.3	6.38	.10*
Interaction	.02	.00	6.0	0.88	-.03
<b>Criterion: Role conflict</b>					
Charismatic leadership	.03	.03	61.2	20.08	-.20***
Need for leadership	.03	.01	22.0	7.28	.10**
Interaction	.04	.01	16.7	5.57	-.09*

<sup>a</sup> % of net explained variance explained by particular independent variable

<sup>b</sup> when  $F > 3.84$ ,  $p < .05$ ; when  $F > 6.63$ ,  $p < .01$

<sup>c</sup> fully standardized final  $\beta$ 's; i.e. when all variables are in the equation

<sup>o</sup>  $p < .10$ , \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$

Some problems should be raised in considering the results of this study. In the first place, we can not be absolutely sure of the exact relation between charismatic leadership and need for leadership. Viewed from a behavioral perspective, charismatic leadership can instill a higher need in subordinates. There may also be some reciprocity between these two variables. With a higher need for leadership, subordinates may also attribute more charisma to their leader, as could be suggested by attributional theorists. A longitudinal study should help to ascertain which of these propositions is closer to the truth. In the second place, the significant interaction effects found accounted for an average of only 1% of the total variance in the criterion. We should be wary, though, in dismissing a finding like this as insignificant. According to Cohen (1988), an explained variance of 1% is small, yet it is approximately equal to the difference in mean height between 15- and 16-year old girls. Since most of the effect sizes of the leader characteristics on the criteria are small to medium in size, with a relation hovering on the average between .2 and .3, an interaction effect accounting for 1% of the variance also means that for subjects scoring very low on the moderator, there is virtually no relation between the predictor and the criterion, while at high scores, the relation between the predictor and criterion is very strong (i.e., approximately .40 to .50).

## References

- Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D.J. & Sanford, R.N. (1950). The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper.
- Ashkanasy, N.M. & Gallois, C. (1994). Leader attributions and evaluations: Effects of locus of control, supervisory control, and task control. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, *59*, 27-50.
- Atwater, L., Penn, R., & Rucker, L. (1991). Personal qualities of charismatic leaders. Leadership and Organization Development Journal, *12*, 7-10.
- Avolio, B.J. & Bass, B.M. (1988). Transformational leadership, charisma, and beyond. In J.G. Hunt, B.R. Baliga, H.P. Dachler & C.A. Schriesheim (Eds.). Emerging leadership vistas. International leadership symposia series (pp. 29-49). Lexington, MA, US: Lexington Books/D. C. Heath and Company
- Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Bass, B.M. (1985a). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. (1985b). Leadership: good, better, best. Organizational Dynamics, *Winter*, 26-40.
- Bass, B.M. (1988). The inspirational processes of leadership. Journal of Management Development, *7*, 21-31.
- Bass, B.M. (1990). Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research & Managerial Applications. New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1990). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. Research in Organizational Change and Development, *4*, 231-272.
- Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In M.M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.). Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions (pp. 49-80). San Diego, CA, US: Academic Press Inc
- Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1994). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1995). Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) profile. (un pub)
- Bryman, A. (1992). Charisma and leadership in organizations. London: Sage.
- Burns, J.McG. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.

- Bycio, P., Hackett, R.D., & Allen, J.S. (1995). Further assessments of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, *80*, 468-478.
- Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Conger, J.A. & Kanungo, R.N. (1994). Charismatic leadership in organizations: perceived behavioral attributes and their measurement. Journal of Organizational Behavior, *15*(5), 439-452.
- Crouch, A. & Yetton, P. (1988). Manager-subordinate dyads: relationships among task and social contact, manager friendliness and subordinate performance in management groups. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, *41*, 65-82.
- De Vries, R.E. (1997). Need for leadership: A solution to empirical problems in situational theories of leadership. Tilburg University: Dissertation.
- den Hartog, D., Van Muijen, J., & Koopman, P. (1994). Transactioneel versus transformationeel leiderschap. Een analyse van de MLQ in de Nederlandse situatie. / Transactional versus transformational leadership: An analysis of the MLQ in Dutch organizations. Gedrag en Organisatie, *7*, 155-166.
- Den Hartog, D.N., Van Muijen, J.J., & Koopman, P.L. (1997). Transactional versus transformational leadership: An analysis of the MLQ. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, *70*(1), 19-34.
- Dubinsky, A.J., Yammarino, F.J., & Jolson, M.A. (1995). An examination of linkages between personal characteristics and dimensions of transformational leadership. Journal of Business and Psychology, *9*, 315-335.
- Ekvall, G. (1991). Change-centred Leaders: Empirical evidence of a third dimension of leadership. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, *12*(6), 18-23.
- Ekvall, G. & Arvonen, J. (1991). Change-centered leadership: An extension of the two-dimensional model. Scandinavian Journal of Management, *7*, 17-26.
- Emans, B. & Radstaak, G. (1990). De rol van leidinggevenden bij verschillende niveaus van taakverruiming: Onderzoek op een aantal verpleegafdelingen van een ziekenhuis. Gedrag en Organisatie, *3*(5), 376-392.
- Frese, M., Zempel, J., Kring, W. & Soose, A. (1993). Everyday entrepreneurship in Germany: Differences in personal initiative between East- and West-Germany. Unpublished paper: Dept. of Psychology, University of Giesen.
- Hater, J.J. & Bass, B.M. (1988). Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, *73*, 695-702.



- Hollander, E.P. & Offermann, L.R. (1990). Power and leadership in organizations: Relationships in transition. Special Issue: Organizational psychology. American Psychologist, 45, 179-189.
- House, R.J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J.G. Hunt & L.L. Larson (Eds.). Leadership: The cutting edge (pp. 189-207). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press
- House, R.J. & Howell, J.M. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. Special Issue: Individual differences and leadership: III. Leadership Quarterly, 3, 81-108.
- House, R.J., Spangler, W.D., & Woycke, J. (1991). Personality and charisma in the U.S. presidency: A psychological theory of leader effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 36, 364-396.
- Howell, J.M. (1988). Two faces of charisma: Socialized and personalized leadership in organizations. In J.A. Conger & R.N. Kanungo (Eds.). Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Howell, J.P., Dorfman, P.W., & Kerr, S. (1986). Moderator variables in leadership research. Academy of Management Review, 11, 88-102.
- Keller, R.T. (1989). A test of the path-goal theory of leadership with need for clarity as a moderator in research and development organizations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74, 208-212.
- Kerr, S. (1977). Substitutes for leadership: Some implications for organizational design. Organization and Administrative Sciences, 8, 135-146.
- Kerr, S. & Jermier, J.M. (1978). Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 22, 375-403.
- Kuhnert, K.W. (1994). Transforming leadership: Developing people through delegation. In B.M. Bass & B.J. Avolio (Eds.). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership (pp. 10-25). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Landeweerd, J.A. & Boumans, N.P.G. (1994). The effect of work dimensions and need for autonomy on nurses' work satisfaction and health. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 67, 207-217.
- Lord, R.G. & Maher, K.J. (1993). Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance. New York: Routledge.
- Martin, S. (1983). Managing without managers: Alternative work arrangements in public organizations. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Meindl, J.R. (1990). On leadership: An alternative to the conventional wisdom. Research in Organizational Behavior, 12, 159-203.

- Mmobuosi, I.B. (1991). Followership behaviour: A neglected aspect of leadership studies. Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 12, 11-16.
- Podsakoff, P.M. & MacKenzie, S.B. (1994). An examination of the psychometric properties and nomological validity of some revised and reduced substitutes for leadership scales. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79(5), 702-713.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B. & Bommer, W.H. (1995). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. (un pub)
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman, R.H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. Leadership Quarterly, 1, 107-142.
- Podsakoff, P.M., Niehoff, B.P., MacKenzie, S.B., & Williams, M.L. (1993). Do substitutes for leadership really substitute for leadership? An empirical examination of Kerr and Jermier's situational leadership model. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 54, 1-44.
- Podsakoff, P.M., Todor, W.D., & Schuler, R.S. (1983). Leader expertise as a moderator of the effects of instrumental and supportive leader behaviors. Journal of Management, 9, 173-185.
- Rizzo, J., House, R.J., & Lirtzman, S.I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 15, 150-163.
- Roe, R.A. (1976). Voorlopige handleiding bij de Autoritairisme-schaal (Provisional manual of the Authoritarianism scale). Amsterdam: Psychologisch Laboratorium UvA.
- Schwarzer, R. (1993). Measurement of perceived self-efficacy: Psychometric scales for cross-cultural research. Unpublished paper: Free University of Berlin.
- Seers, A. & Graen, G.B. (1984). The dual attachment concept: A longitudinal investigation of the combination of task characteristics and leader-member exchange. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 33, 283-306.
- Seltzer, J. & Bass, B.M. (1990). Transformational leadership: Beyond initiation and consideration. Journal of Management, 16, 693-703.
- Shamir, B., House, R.J., & Arthur, M.B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. Organization Science, 4, 577-594.
- Speier, C. & Frese, M. (1997). Generalized self-efficacy as a mediator and moderator between control and complexity at work and personal initiative: A longitudinal field study in East Germany. Human Performance, 10(2), 171-192.
- Stoker, J. & De Jong, R. (1996). Leidinggeven aan zelfstandige taakgroepen. Gedrag en Organisatie, 9(6), 401-415.

- Taillieu, T.C.B. (1987). Meaning of work: Relationships between personal and contextual factors. Oosterwijk: Research Meeting for the European Committee for Work and Pay.
- Taillieu, T.C.B. & De Vries, R.E. (1995). De arbeidsbeleving van de verzekeringsadviseur bij RVS-Rotterdam. Tilburg: Tilburg University.
- Taillieu, T.C.B., Van der Wielen, J.M.M., De Vries, R.E. & Dikschei, G.M.D.M. (1993). De arbeidsbeleving van de verzekeringsadviseur. Tilburg: Tilburg University.
- Tepper, B.J. & Percy, P.M. (1994). Structural validity of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Educational and Psychological Measurement, *54*, 734-744.
- Waldman, D.A., Bass, B.M., & Yammarino, F.J. (1990). Adding to contingent-reward behavior: The augmenting effect of charismatic leadership. Group and Organization Studies, *15*, 381-394.
- Westley, F. (1991). Bob Geldof and Live Aid: The affective side of global social innovation. Human Relations, *44*, 1011-1036.
- Yammarino, F.J. (1994). Indirect leadership: Transformational leadership at a distance. In B.M. Bass & B.J. Avolio (Eds.). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership (pp. 26-47). Thousands Oaks: Sage Publications
- Yammarino, F.J. & Dubinsky, A.J. (1994). Transformational leadership theory: Using levels of analysis to determine boundary conditions. Personnel Psychology, *47*, 787-811.
- Yammarino, F.J., Spangler, W.D., & Bass, B.M. (1993). Transformational leadership and performance: A longitudinal investigation. Leadership Quarterly, *4*, 81-102.
- Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. Special Issue: Yearly review of management. Journal of Management, *15*, 251-289.