The relevance of charisma for transformational leadership in stable organizations

Timothy R. Hinkin
Cornell University

J. Bruce Tracey
Cornell University

Abstract

One of the primary dimensions of the multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass and associates is idealized influence, or charisma. However, there has been very little empirical support for this dimension in a number of previous studies. We argue that this lack of support is due to the attributional nature of charisma and the situational impact on the existence of, or the need for, charismatic leadership. The current study supported this contention and provided a more parsimonious operationalization of the MLQ, which did not include the idealized influence dimension.

Overview

Most of the research on transformational leadership has used the multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass and his associates (e.g. Bass, 1985; Bass and Avolio, 1994). Bass proposed that transformational leadership is composed of four dimensions (i.e. "Four Is"): idealized influence, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation. To date, however, no published study has empirically supported the proposed dimensional structure. Owing to poor factor structure and high correlations among the dimensions, the MLQ items have

usually been aggregated to form a single transformational leadership scale. (e.g. Bycio *et al.,* 1995; Tepper and Percy, 1994). Moreover, the idealized influence, or charismatic, dimension has been particularly troublesome; in particular, it has been very highly correlated with the inspirational motivation scale (e.g. Yammarino and Dubinsky, 1994).

The concept of idealized influence was derived from the study of charismatic leadership, characterized by extraordinary leaders who usually emerge in a context of crisis or major change (Yukl, 1994). However, most of the research using the MLQ has been conducted in organizations that were not experiencing crisis or major change (e.g. hospitals). Thus, contextual stability may explain in part why there has been little evidence for the idealized influence dimension of the MLQ. In a stable organization, charismatic leadership would be neither necessary nor expected nor, possibly, even desirable (Conger and Kanungo, 1987). Another possible explanation for the lack of empirical support is the manner in which idealized influence has been operationalized. An examination of the items included in Bass and Avolio's scale suggests that it may be multidimensional in nature, and contains items that assess multiple constructs, including behaviors, attributions and outcomes.

The purpose of the current study is twofold. First, we will examine the extent to which the MLQ measures the dimensions that it purports to measure. The MLQ has not been subjected to an independent assessment of its content adequacy. Second, we will assess the relevance of idealized influence in a stable work organization. Bass (1985) suggested that charismatic leadership would be more likely to be found in a new and struggling organization or an old one that is failing, than in a successful, stable organization.

We will begin by briefly discussing the literature on transformational leadership. Next, we will discuss the empirical results from previous studies that have used the MLQ. Finally, we will present the results from the current study examining the conceptual adequacy and psychometric qualities of the MLQ.

Transformational leadership

Burns (1978) proposed that the leadership process occurs in one of two ways, either transactional or transformational. Transactional leadership emphasizes the clarification of goals, work standards, and task assignments and focuses on task completion with compliance based on incentives and rewards to appeal to the self-interest of followers (Bass, 1985). In contrast, Burns characterized transformational leaders as those who motivate followers by appealing to higher ideals and moral values. More specifically, Yukl defined transformational leadership as "the process of influencing major changes in the attitudes and assumptions of organization members and building commitment for the organization's mission or objectives" (Yukl, 1989, p. 204).

Based on the work of Burns and others, Bass and his colleagues (e.g. Bass, 1985; 1990; Bass and Avolio, 1994; Seltzer and Bass, 1990) developed a theory and measure of transformational leadership. In their recent book, Bass and Avolio (1994) proposed that transformational leadership is composed of four dimensions, described as the "Four Is'' and measured by the MLQ. The first is idealized influence (II; charisma), which is based on a follower's respect and admiration for the leader. Next is individualized consideration (IC), the extent to which the leader cares about the individual followers' concerns and developmental needs.

Third is intellectual stimulation (IS), the degree to which the leader provides followers with interesting and challenging tasks and encourages them to solve problems in their own way. Finally, inspirational motivation (IM) is based on communication of expectations and followers' confidence in the leader's vision and values. Like Burns, Bass and Avolio also discussed transformational leadership as a contrast to transactional leadership. Bass and Avolio argued that these styles of leadership are not necessarily mutually exclusive, however, and that the same individual may vary his or her leadership style at different times or in different situations.

A number of studies have demonstrated support for the predictive validity of the MLQ. Bass, Avolio, and their associates (e.g. Bass, 1985; Hater and Bass, 1988; Seltzer and Bass, 1990; Avolio and Howell, 1992) found significant relationships between transformational leadership and subordinate satisfaction with the leader and leader effectiveness. However, there have been some criticisms regarding the measurement qualities of the MLQ. Sashkin and Burke (1990) argued that "the MLQ does not adequately incorporate key theoretical elements of transformational leadership..(p. 301). Bycio et al. (1995) stated that acceptance of the validity of the factor structure of the MLQ is premature. Yukl (1994) argued that some of the items are attributional in nature, not assessing specific leadership behaviors. In addition, he argued that limitations of the research used in the development of the MLQ make it difficult to draw any firm conclusions.

There have been at least four recent attempts to assess the dimensionality of the MLQ. Yammarino and Dubinsky (1994) conducted a principal components factor analysis of the idealized influence (ten items), inspirational

motivation (seven items), intellectual stimulation (ten items) and individualized consideration (ten items) dimensions of the MLQ. Owing to "very high loadings on a single transformational factor" (Yammarino and Dubinski, 1994, p. 799) and high correlations among the four dimensions (0.70 to 0.91), the scales were collapsed into a single transformational measure and incorporated into their study. Howell and Avolio (1993) also attempted to provide some support for the factor structure of the measure, using Form 10 of the MLQ, which consists of three dimensions: idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. However, they appear to have used a within-scale (i.e. dimension) factor analytic procedure for assessing the degree of item fit (see Fornell, 1982) and correlations among the dimensions ranged from 0.48 to 0.58.

In one of the two studies that focussed on the measurement qualities of the MLQ, Bycio et al. (1995) conducted a series of confirmatory factor analyses using data from 1,376 nurses (97 percent female) who responded to a subset of items from Form 1 of the MLQ. Twenty-seven items were used to represent three transformational leadership dimensions (17 II items, seven IC items, and three IS items) and 13 items were used to assess two transactional leadership dimensions (seven contingent reward items, and six passive management-byexception items). They found weak support for the five-factor model, and the correlations among the transformational and contingent reward scales were high (0.81 to 0.91). Tepper and Percy (1994) also investigated the factor structure of the MLQ using two independent samples (N - 290 undergraduates and N - 90 managers). They examined an eight-factor model that included the Four Is, and four dimensions of transactional leadership (two contingent reward scales, and active and

passive management-by exception). Similar to Bycio et al. (1995), Tepper and Percy administered a subset of the MLQ items to the sample 1 participants. Using 24 items from the 72-item version of the MLQ (three items per dimension), the results provided little support for the eight- factor model. Consequently, Tepper and Percy eliminated eight items (including all six items from the two management-by-exception scales), and then conducted several additional confirmatory analyses to determine the number of factors that best represented the data. The best fitting model consisted of four factors, with the idealized influence and inspirational items loading on a single factor, and the individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and contingent reward items each loading on their own factor. Sample 2 participants completed all 72 MLQ items. However, the analyses only focussed on the convergent and discriminant validity of the idealized influence, inspirational motivation, and contingent reward dimensions. Again, Tepper and Percy were unable to distinguish the idealized influence and inspirational motivation dimensions and argued that these dimensions represented a single latent construct.

The studies by Bycio *et al.* (1995) and Tepper and Percy (1994) support the measurement concerns associated with the MLQ, particularly with the charisma dimension. However, these recent findings should be interpreted cautiously. Both studies used older versions of the MLQ. In addition, neither study provided an adequate justification for using a subset of the total items. Finally, neither study considered the theoretical implications of the results. Consequently, a more rigorous assessment of a recent version of the MLQ is warranted.

The current study

Owing to the concerns noted above, two studies were conducted to explore the measurement qualities and factor structure of the MLQ, and to provide guidance for future scale development and refinement. In Study 1, a content adequacy assessment (see Schriesheim et al., 1993) of the transformational leadership items was conducted. In Study 2 a series of confirmatory factor analyses, internal consistency estimates, and correlations was conducted on a revised set of transformational leadership items.

Study 1

Sample, procedure and measure

Based on a procedure suggested by Schriesheim *et al.* (1993), a content adequacy assessment was conducted to examine the extent to which the transformational leadership items adequately represent the respective leadership dimensions. The sample consisted of 57 graduate business students at a large north-eastern university. The average age of the students was 28, 46 percent were female, and they had an average of seven years of work experience. The researchers administered questionnaires during normal class time, taking approximately 20 minutes to complete. Explicit verbal instructions (as well as written directions) were provided prior to administration, and the responses were anonymous.

Respondents rated each of the 39 transformational leadership items from Form 5-X of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass and Avolio, 1990) on the extent to which they believed the items were consistent with each of the four dimensions of transformational leadership. Response choices ranged from one (not at all) to five (completely). The

definition of one of the four transformational leadership dimensions was presented at the top of each page of the questionnaire, followed by a listing of all transformational leadership items. To control for response bias that may occur from order effects, four versions of the questionnaire were administered, each with the definitions presented in a different order. Extreme care was taken to ensure that the definitions were consistent with Bass and Avolio's (1994) conceptualization of the four transformational leadership dimensions. Table I presents the definitions used for this assessment.

Analyses

To identify those items that were appropriately categorized, an analysis of variance procedure was employed. First, the mean score for each item on each of the four transformational leadership scales was calculated. Then, a comparison of means was conducted for each item across the four definitions to identify those items that were evaluated appropriately (i.e. statistically significantly higher on the appropriate definition utilizing t-tests; $p < 0.05$). It was felt that the sample size was quite adequate for assessing the practical significant differences between the means. A larger sample would have revealed smaller statistically significant differences that may in fact be less consequential.

Results

The results from the content adequacy analysis revealed that 23 of the 39 items were classified correctly. These results provided some support for the Four Is, as three idealized influence items, four inspirational motivation items, eight intellectual stimulation items, and eight individualized considerations items were judged to reflect the proposed

leadership dimension. Table II presents the mean ratings for all items.

Table I. Definitions of transformational leadership dimensions

---

Idealized influence (II). Transformational leaders behave in ways that result in their being a role model for their followers. The leaders are admired, respected, and trusted. Followers identify with the leaders and want to emulate them. Among the things the leader does to earn this credit is considering the needs of others over his or her own personal needs. The leader shares risk with followers and is consistent rather than arbitrary. He or she can be counted on to do the right thing, demonstrating high standards of ethical and moral conduct. He or she avoids using power for personal gain and only when needed

Inspirational motivation (IM). Transformational leaders behave in ways that motivate and inspire those around them by providing meaning and challenge to their followers' work. Team spirit is aroused. Enthusiasm and optimism are displayed. The leader gets followers involved in envisioning attractive future states. The leader creates clearly communicated expectations that followers want to meet and also demonstrates commitment to goals and shared vision

Intellectual stimulation (IS). Transformational leaders stimulate their followers' efforts to be innovative and creative by questioning assumptions, reframing problems, and approaching old situations in new ways. Creativity is encouraged. There is no public criticism of individual members' mistakes. New ideas and creative problem solutions are solicited from followers, who are included in the process of addressing problems and finding solutions. Followers are encouraged to try new approaches, and their ideas are not criticized because they differ from the leaders' ideas

Individualized consideration (IC). Transformational leaders pay special attention to each individual's needs for achievement and growth by acting as coach or mentor. Followers and colleagues are developed to successively higher levels of potential. The individually considerate leader listens effectively. The leader delegates tasks as a means of developing followers. Delegated tasks are monitored to see if the followers need additional direction or support and to assess progress; ideally, followers do not feel they are being checked.

Item	Scale: II	IM	IS	IC
II1	3.94	3.87	2.80	3.11
IM1	4.09	4.24	3.28	3.61
IS1	2.93	3.04	**4.63**	3.06
IC1	3.31	2.87	3.81	**4.61**
II2	3.91	4.35	3.22	3.54
IM2	3.07	4.37	4.30	3.19
IS2	2.89	2.83	**4.57**	3.04
IC2	3.56	3.02	3.76	**4.52**
II3	3.96	4.22	3.09	3.70
IM3	3.59	**4.63**	3.24	3.43
IS3	2.96	3.09	**4.69**	3.50
IC3	3.46	2.54	3.09	**4.59**
II4	**4.61**	2.83	2.69	3.02
IM4	3.70	**4.41**	3.35	3.94
IS4	2.61	2.81	**4.50**	2.87
IC4	3.37	2.87	3.30	**4.65**
II5	4.46	4.13	2.72	3.02
IM5	3.89	4.13	3.72	4.48
IS5	2.94	2.78	**4.56**	3.26
IC5	3.41	3.15	3.20	**4.57**
II6	**3.80**	3.04	2.57	2.72
IM6	3.26	3.19	2.54	3.96
IS6	2.91	3.02	**4.39**	3.30
IC6	3.61	2.93	3.63	**4.69**
II7	3.65	4.07	3.00	3.37
IM7	3.74	**4.48**	3.33	3.46
IS7	3.35	3.31	4.56	**4.43**
IC7	3.33	3.02	3.17	3.72
II8	3.65	3.43	2.74	3.33
IM8	3.22	3.11	2.94	3.35
II9	3.59	4.69	2.78	3.09
IM9	3.61	**4.70**	3.04	2.85
IS8	2.85	2.89	**4.59**	3.50
IC8	3.50	2.74	3.81	**4.50**
II10	**4.70**	3.74	3.11	3.48
IM10	4.37	3.96	3.00	3.20
IS9	2.85	2.78	**4.69**	3.17
IC9	3.57	2.85	2.93	**4.39**
IS10	3.41	3.04	3.20	3.28

Note: Items in bold were rated significantly higher than other items on the appropriate dimension ($p < 0.05$); The number associated with each item refers to the order in which the item appeared in the questionnaire: II = idealized influence; IM = inspirational motivation; IS = intellectual stimulation; IC = individualized consideration

Table II. Mean ratings from content adequacy assessment for Study 2

Study 2

Sample

Although the late 1980s had been quite turbulent in the hotel industry, at the time the data were collected in the mid- to late 1990s the industry was very stable with steady growth. The 291 responses included in this study came from upper-level and middle-level managers from two large US hotel management organizations. The referent leaders for this study were the respondents' managers with whom they interacted on a frequent basis. The average age of respondents was 38, and 45 percent were females. Most of the individuals (67 percent) had been in their current job longer than one year, and most (69 percent) had at least some undergraduate college experience.

Procedure and measure

The authors administered questionnaires directly to 214 respondents. An additional 140 questionnaires were distributed through the mail. Of these, 77 usable questionnaires (56 percent) were returned. There were no significant mean differences between the two sub-samples on any of the variables used in this study. Therefore, all analyses were based on a total sample of 291 cases. All participants responded on a voluntary basis and were assured that responses would remain confidential.

The 39 items that comprise the transformational leadership measures of the MLQ were administered to all respondents. However, only the reduced set of items from Study 1 (23 items) was retained for further analysis.

Analyses

First, a confirmatory factor analysis of the 23 items

was conducted using LISREL 8.03 (Joreskog and Sorbom, 1993). Internal consistency reliabilities (Cronbach's alpha) were then computed for each of the revised factors. Finally, correlations among the revised scales were computed to examine the relationships among the dimensions.

Results

The fit of the four-factor confirmatory model was evaluated using the variance- covariance matrix as input and a maximum likelihood solution. The overall chi- square was statistically significant (y^2 = 532.28; df = 224; p < 0.01), the goodness of fit index was 0.76, the comparative fit index was 0.86, the normed fit index was 0.78, the non-normed fit index was 0.84, and the root mean square residual for the predicted minus observed correlation matrices was 0.09. As these indices were not within the range of conventionally accepted values (see Bollen, 1989), the four-factor model was not supported.

However, modification indices for the lambda matrix suggested that fit could be improved. One approach that can be taken to enhance model fit is to eliminate items that load on multiple factors. According to Medsker *et al.* (1994), values less than four are acceptable for defining a factor, while values higher than five indicate that the items load on multiple factors and that error terms may be correlated. The modification indices showed that ten items exceeded the suggested cutoff. Thus, the three remaining idealized influence items were eliminated, one inspirational motivation item was eliminated, five individualized consideration items were eliminated, and one intellectual stimulation item was eliminated. The remaining three factors were defined by 13 items: three IM items; three IC items; and seven IS items.

Results from a confirmatory factor analysis of the revised scales supported a three-factor model. Using the sample variance-covariance matrix as input and a maximum likelihood solution, the overall chi-square was statistically significant (x^2 = 159.00; df = 62; $p < 0.01$), the goodness of fit index was 0.92, the comparative fit index was 0.95, the normed fit index was 0.92, the non- normed fit index was 0.94, and the root mean square residual for the predicted minus observed correlation matrices was 0.06. Although the chi-square was statistically significant, this finding was not considered problematic, as this statistic is particularly sensitive to sample size (cf. Bollen, 1989). Moreover, all other indices provided convincing support for a three-factor model.

Descriptive statistics, internal consistency reliability estimates, and correlations among the revised transformational leadership scales are listed in Table III.

The internal consistency estimates were adequate (0.80 to 0.85) and the correlations among the revised transformational leadership scales were substantially lower than those found in previous research.

Discussion

The results from the current and previous research suggests that perhaps Bass and his colleagues have developed a good theory of transformational leadership, but they have not designed a measure that assesses it very well. Alternatively, perhaps their theory is flawed. As in many studies in the past, the proposed factor structure of the MLQ did not receive empirical support. Unlike studies in the past, however, we have learned more about why this may be the case. On the surface, the three factors supported by the confirmatory factor analyses in Study 2 appear to be

consistent with three of the "Four Is" proposed by Bass. However, a close inspection of the items revealed a more narrow behavioral operationalization of transformational leadership, suggesting that MLQ dimensions are too broadly defined as shown in Table IV.

Table III. Means, Standard Deviations, internal consistency reliablility estimates, and correlations among resvised MLQ scales

Mean	SD	α	1	2	3	4	5
1. IM	2.14	1.06	0.84				
2. IS	2.11	0.83	0.80	0.64			
3. IC	1.63	1.10	0.85	0.64	0.67		

Note: Correlations 0.24 and above are significant at $p < 0.01$; IM = inspirational motivation; IS = intellectual stimulation; IC = individualized consideration

Table IV. Questionnaire items from the multifactor leadership questionnaire

Idealized influence
1. Talks to us about his/her most important values and beliefs
5. Emphasizes the importance of being committed to our beliefs
9. Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose
17. Displays conviction in his/her ideals, beliefs, and values
25. Clarifies the central purpose underlying our actions
29. Talks about how trusting each other can help us to overcome our difficulties
31. Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission
13. *Considers the moral and ethical consequences of his/her actions*
21. *Takes a stand on difficult issues*
35. *Behaves in ways that are consistent with his/her expressed values*IT>

Inspirational motivation
2. Sets high standards
6. Envisions exciting new possibilities
18. Provides continuous encouragement
22. Focusses my attention on "what it takes" to be successful
30. Makes me aware of essential work-related issues
36. Shows determination to accomplish what he/she sets out to do
14. *Expresses his/her confidence that we will achieve our goals*
10. ***Talks optimistically about the future***
26. ***Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished***
32. ***Articulates a compelling vision of the future***

Intellectual stimulation
27. Encourages me to express my ideas and opinions
39. Encourages addressing problems by using reasoning and evidence, rather than unsupported opinion
15. *Questions the traditional ways of doing things*
3. ***Emphasizes the value of questioning assumptions***
7. ***Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate***
11. ***Encourages us to rethink ideas which had never been questioned***
19. ***Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems***
23. ***Suggests new ways of looking at how we do our jobs***
33. ***Gets me to look at problems from different angles***
37. ***Encourages non-traditional thinking to deal with traditional problems***

Individualized consideration
28. Teaches me how to identify the needs and capabilities of others
4. *Treats me as an individual rather than just a member of a group*
16. *Focusses me on developing my strengths*
24. *Treats each of us as individuals with different needs, abilities and aspirations*
34. *Promotes self-development*
38. *Gives personal attention to members who seem neglected*
8. ***Listens attentively to my concerns***
12. ***Provides useful advice for my development***
20. ***Spends time teaching and coaching me***

Note: Number denotes item number on questionnaire, items in italics were retained in the content adequacy assessment, and items in bold italics were retained in the final revised scales.

One dimension was represented by seven intellectual stimulation items. These items are primarily associated with creative problem-solving behaviors such as "encourages non-traditional thinking to deal with traditional problems" and "re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are important". It appears that these items measure that part of the intellectual stimulation dimension and that this scale possesses both conceptual and empirical distinctiveness. One of the items from the MLQ scale that was not included in the revised measure, "questions the traditional ways of doing things", was not judged to be empirically consistent in the confirmatory factor analysis. Two other items, "encourages me to express my ideas and opinions" and "encourages addressing problems by using reasoning and evidence, rather than unsupported opinion" did not survive the content adequacy assessment and appear to be conceptually inconsistent with the creative and innovative theme associated with the seven retained items.

A second dimension included three individualized consideration items. These items reflect behaviors that demonstrate a concern for individual subordinate development. However, in addition to a concern for subordinate development, Bass and Avolio (1994) suggested that this dimension involves more general consideration behaviors such as treatment of others and treatment as individuals. Thus, it appears that a more narrow set of consideration behaviors may characterize transformational leaders.

The third dimension was represented by three inspirational motivation items. While these items include motivating elements, they also have a future- oriented theme that is based on open, verbal communication. Similar to

individualized consideration, this dimension appears to be more narrowly defined, as items such as "provides continuous encouragement" were not included in the final scale.

One of the most striking results was the lack of support for idealized influence. The fact that only three of the nine charismatic items survived the content adequacy assessment analysis suggests that there is a lack of conceptual consistency among the items and the difficulty followers may have in perceiving values and beliefs. Even though these three items had some degree of content adequacy, the results from the initial confirmatory factor analysis in Study 2 showed they loaded on multiple factors. Charisma is purported to be one of the cornerstones of transformational leadership, yet this dimension did not receive much empirical support. It would appear that respondents cannot differentiate idealized influence as an independent construct, which may be due to large variances in attributions in a stable organization. These results are similar to several other studies that have been unable to demonstrate support for the charismatic leadership dimension (Bycio, et *al.,* 1995; Tepper and Percy, 1994).

Bass and Avolio (1993) acknowledged there has been difficulty in establishing the discriminant validity of the four factors. That may be true, but Form 5-X of the MLQ does not seem to adequately capture this distinction. Several reasons for this seem plausible.

First, it would appear that the problem with the MLQ comes partially from the manner in which it was created. This measure was developed inductively by generating measures from individual items rather than developing items based on a theoretical definition. While this approach is often used, it

requires expertise in content analysis and relies heavily on *post hoc* factor analytical techniques to ultimately determine scale construction (Hinkin, 1995). This technique also makes interpretation and labeling of factors more difficult (Ford *et at.,* 1986). As noted earlier, measures may often demonstrate adequate internal consistency reliability, yet do not demonstrate stable factor structure and are highly intercorrelated. Simply because items correlate with one another does not mean that they assess the same construct. Without a strong theoretical foundation, there is little assurance that results will demonstrate adequate construct validity (Nunnally, 1978).

Second, the studies using the MLQ have focussed on the relationships between the MLQ dimensions and various independent and dependent variables. Little attention has been given to the psychometric qualities of transformational leadership measures (Bycio et at., 1995). In particular, the MLQ has not been subjected to any rigorous form of factor analysis that has supported the proposed theoretical structure. In addition, there has been little attempt to establish discriminant or convergent validity of the MLQ. These problems are particularly troublesome, as much more information is necessary to judge the validity of the measure.

Third, there appear to be problems with the theoretical (content) adequacy of some of the items included in the MLQ. Study 1 demonstrated that 16 of the MLQ items have questionable properties. In addition, several other items were shown to possess poor perceptual and thus factor-analytic distinctiveness. However, a great deal of clarity was revealed when these items were deleted. As Thurstone (1947) stated, measures should be parsimonious, comprising the minimum number of items that adequately assess the

domain of interest. This can be achieved for most constructs with as few as three to five items (Harvey et at., 1985; Hinkin and Schriesheim, 1989). Thus, the refinement of scales and the identification of unidimensional underlying constructs may be keys to better understanding transformational leadership.

Finally, the expectation that charismatic leaders exist or are needed in typical business organizations may be unrealistic. Much of the early theoretical development on charismatic leadership focussed on religious and political leaders, and emphasized the importance of situational factors as well as value or ideological congruence between the leader and followers (Yukl, 1994). Much of the work in this area in business settings emphasizes that a crisis may be a necessary condition for a charismatic leader to emerge (Tichy and Devanna, 1986). The attention to religious, political and national leaders suggests that it may be difficult to find, observe and measure charisma in typical work organizations. This is consistent with a suggestion by Bycio et at. (1995), who noted range restriction on transformational leadership items using a sample of nurses in a hospital setting and suggested situational factors may have an impact on charismatic leadership. In contrast, Keller (1992) found the means for charismatic leadership items in a research and development setting to be quite high with large standard deviations. The setting may play a very large role in the transformational leadership process, an idea that is consistent with contingency theories of leadership. This is clearly an area that needs further theory development and empirical research.

In addition, charisma involves an attributional process (Conger and Kanungo, 1987). Subordinates in a work

setting base this interpretive process on leader characteristics that may not be directly observable or discernible. A close look at the idealized influence items strongly supports this argument (e.g. "considers the ethical and moral consequences of his/her decisions"). The extent to which idealized influence can be operationalized in terms of specific behaviors may be quite limited. Perhaps it is time to de-emphasize the importance of idealized influence as a component of transformational leadership and focus on specific, identifiable leadership behaviors.

This approach would be consonant with Bennis and Nanus (1985), who studied 90 innovative leaders in industry and the public sector and found that articulating a vision of the future, emphasis on organizational and individual learning, and the development of commitment and trust were the factors that characterized transformational leaders; these results are very consistent with our own. Similarly, Yukl (1994) describes transformational leadership as influencing major changes in organization members and building commitment for the organization's objectives. Together, these studies should lead us to question whether we should expect to find charismatic leaders in typical work organizations.

In conclusion, this investigation has attempted to be constructive. Despite the shortcomings of the MLQ, it appears that Bass and his colleagues have identified several leader behaviors that appear to be components of transformational leadership. The current study demonstrated empirical support for three behaviorally oriented dimensions of transformational leadership that are consistent with theoretical propositions. The first dimension, intellectual stimulation, might be more appropriately defined as non-

traditional approaches to problems. The second dimension, individualized consideration, may be better thought of as individualized development. Dimension three, inspirational motivation, might be better described as articulating a future orientation.

There are several important managerial implications of this study. Previous research has found transformational leadership to be positively correlated with satisfaction with the leader, effectiveness of the leader, role clarity, mission clarity, and openness of communication (Hinkin and Tracey, 1994). Charisma may not be relevant for managers in stable organizational environments but the three other dimensions may be very important in achieving the aforementioned outcomes. Thus, managers should communicate a sense of where the organization is going, develop the skills and abilities of subordinates, and encourage innovative problem solving. It is these leadership behaviors that can truly transform organizations. In contrast, crisis may be a necessary precondition for a truly charismatic leader to emerge, when dissatisfaction is high and value congruence and unquestioned obedience are needed to ensure organizational survival. This line of thinking is consistent with several contingency theories of leadership proposing that individuals must modify their behavior to fit the situation or find a situation that fits their leadership style (e.g. Fiedler, 1967; House, 1971). Clearly, studying transformational leadership in turbulent environments might lead to better understanding of charismatic leadership, as implied by studies by Bycio *et al.* (1995) and Keller (1992).

It would certainly be appropriate for managers in organizations facing turbulence and uncertainty to utilize inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and

individualized consideration. By assuming these leadership roles managers can create awareness of the need for change, clarify the focus of the organization, and provide necessary resources and support for change. If idealized influence, as conceptualized by Bass, is not necessary in stable organizations, it would be interesting to understand the extent to which idealized influence would emerge in organizations successfully navigating turbulent environments. Future research should involve a closer examination of the idealized influence construct and the development of items to supplement the two three-item scales, assuring adequate domain sampling while maintaining parsimony. It would then be appropriate to replicate this study in different contexts and to examine the relationships between these behaviors and relevant organizational outcomes. It is hoped that the current work is useful for facilitating future development of the theoretical domain and measurement of transformational leadership.

References

Avolio, B.J. and Howell, J.M. (1992), "The impact of leader behavior and leader-follower personality match on satisfaction and unit performance", in Clark, K.E., Clark, M.B. and Campbell, D.R. (Eds), *Impact of Leadership,* The Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, NC.

Bass. B.M. (1985), *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations,* Free Press, New York, NY.

Bass. B.M. (1990), "From transactional to transformational leadership: learning to share the vision", OrsanizationalDynamics, Vol. 18, pp. 19-31.

Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (1990), *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire,* Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA.

Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (1993), "Transformational leadership: a response to critiques", in Chemers, M.M. (Ed.), *Leadership Theory and Research: Perspectives and Directions,* Academic Press, San Diego, CA, pp. 49-80.

Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (1994), *Improvins Orsanizational Effectiveness throush Transformational Leadership,* Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Bennis, W.G. and Nanus, B. (1985), *Leaders: The Stratesies for Takins Charse,* Harper & Row, New York, NY.

Bollen, K.A. (1989), Structural Eauations with Latent Variables, John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY.

Bycio, P., Hackett, R.D. and Allen, J.S. (1995), "Further assessments of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 80, pp. 468-78.

Conger, J.A. and Kanungo, R. (1987), "Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings'', Academy of Management Review, Vol. 12, pp. 637-47.

Fiedler, F. (1967), *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness,* McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.

Ford, J.K., MacCallum, R.C. and Tait, M. (1986), "The application of exploratory factor analysis in applied psychology: a critical review and analysis'', Personnel Psychology, Vol. 39, pp. 291314.

Fornell, C. (1982), *A Second Generation of Multivariate Statistics, Vol. 1,* Praeger, New York, NY.

Harvey, R.J., Billings, R.S. and Nilan, K.J. (1985), "Confirmatory factor analysis of the job diagnostic survey: good news and bad news'', Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 70, pp. 461-8.

Hater, J.J. and Bass. B. (1988), "Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 73, pp. 695-702.

Hinkin, T.R. (1995), "A review of scale development practices in the study of organizations", Journal of Management, Vol. 21, pp. 967-88.

Hinkin, T.R. and Schriesheim, C.A. (1989), "Development and application of new scales to measure the French and Raven (1959) bases of social power'', Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 74, pp. 561-7.

Hinkin, T.R. and Tracey, B.T. (1994), "Transformational leadership in the hospitality industry'', Hospitality Research Journal, pp. 49-64.

House, R.J. (1971), "A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness'', Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 16, pp. 321-39.

Howell, J.M. and Avolio, B.J. (1993), "Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, *locus* of control, and support for innovation: key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance'', Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 78, pp. 891-902.

Joreskog, K.G. and Sorbom, D. (1993), *LISREL 8.03.* Scientific Software, Inc., Morresville, IN.

Keller, R.T. (1992), "Transformational leadership and the performance of research and development project groups'', Journal of Management, Vol. 18, pp. 489-501.

Medsker, G.J., Williams, L.J. and Holohan, P.J. (1994), "A review of current practices for evaluating causal models in organizational behavior and human resources management

research'', Journal of Management, Vol. 20, pp. 439-64.

Nunnally, J.C. (1978), *Psychometric Theory*, 2nd ed., McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.

Sashkin, M. and Burke, W.W. (1990), "Understanding and assessing organizational leadership'', in Clark, K.E. and Clark, M.B. (Eds), *Measures of Leadership,* Leadership Library of America, Inc., West Orange, NJ.

Schriesheim, C.A., Powers, K.J., Scandura, T.A., Gardiner, C.C. and Lankau, M.J. (1993), "Improving construct measurement in management research: comments and a quantitative approach for assessing the theoretical adequacy of paper-and-pencil survey- type instruments'', Journal of Management, Vol. 19, pp. 385-417.

Seltzer, J. and Bass, B.M. (1990), "Transformational leadership: beyond initiation and structure'', Journal ofManagement, Vok16, pp. 693-704.

Tepper, B.T. and Percy, P.M. (1994), "Structural validity of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire'', Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol. 54, pp.734-44.

Thurstone, L.L. (1947), *Multiple Factor Analysis,* University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Yammarino, FJ. and Dubinsky, A.J. (1994), "Transformational leadership theory: using levels of analysis to determine boundary conditions", Personnel Psychology, Vol. 47, pp. 787-811.

Yukl, G.A. (1989), *Leadership in Organizations,* 2nd ed., Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Yukl, G.A. (1994), *Leadership in Organizations,* 3rd ed., Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Further reading

House, R.J. (1988), "Leadership research: some forgotten, ignored, or overlooked findings", in [1] Hunt, J.G., Baliga, B.R., Dachler, H.P. and Schriesheim, C.I. (Eds), *Emerging Leadership Vistas,* Lexington Books, Lexington, MA.

Howell, J.M. and Higgins, C.A. (1990), "Champions of technological innovation", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 35, pp. 317-41.

Messick, S. (1989), "Validity", in Linn, R. (Ed.), *Educational Measurement,* 3rd ed., American Council on Education, Washington, DC.

Waldman, D.A., Bass, B.M. and Einstein, W.O. (1987), "Leadership and outcomes of performance appraisal processes", Journal of Occupational Psychology, Vol. 60, pp. 177-86.

Waldman, D.A., Bass, B.M. and Yammarino, FJ. (1990), "Adding to contingent-reward behavior: the augmenting effect of charismatic leadership", Group and Organization Studies, Vol. 15, pp. 381-94.

Yammarino, FJ. and Bass, B.M. (1990), "Long-term forecasting of transformational leadership and its effects among naval officers: some preliminary findings", in Clark, K.E. and Clark, M.B. (Eds), *Measures of Leadership,* Leadership Library of America, Inc.,West Orange, NJ.

istedo, Elias Samuels, Molly Kleinman. 2014. Do charismatic presidents influence college id alumni donations? Organizational identity and performance in US higher education. *on* 68, 397-415. [CrossRef]

Nicholas Sun-Keung Pang. 2013. Influence actions of school principals in Hong Kong, ia and the United States: a cross-

cultural perspective. *School Leadership & Management* 33,
ef]

is, Birgit Schyns, Roger Gill, Malcolm Higgs. 2012. The MLQ
factor structure in a UK *rship & Organization Development
Journal* 33:4, 369-382. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF] rons, David
H. Sommerfeld. 2012. Leadership, Innovation Climate, and
Attitudes Toward i Practice During a Statewide
Implementation. *Journal of the American Academy of Child &
hiatry* 51, 423-431. [CrossRef]

•ds, Roger Gill. 2012. Transformational leadership across
hierarchical levels in UK organizations. *Leadership &
Organization Development Journal* 33:1, 25-50. [Abstract]
[Full

tis. 2011. Transcendental leadership: The progressive
hospitality leader's silver bullet. *ournal of Hospitality
Management* 30, 708-713. [CrossRef]

s, Helen O'Donnell. 2011. What can business leaders learn
from sport?. *Sport, Business and in International Journal* 1:1,
12-27. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

Jonatan Jelen, Thomas Schmidt, Stuart Gold. 2011.
Leadership conceptual ambiguities. *iership Studies*
5:10.1002/jls.v5.1, 35-50. [CrossRef]

i. 2011. Male educational leadership in Greek primary
schools. *International Journal of 'anagement* 25:2, 164-185.
[Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

[Strang. 2011. Leadership substitutes and personality impact
on time and quality in virtual tvelopment projects. *Project
Management Journal* 42:10.1002/pmj.v42.1, 73-90.
[CrossRef]

mann. 2010. Swiss Armed Forces Militia System. *Swiss*

Journal of Psychology 69, 83-93.

ig. 2009. The Leadership Effectiveness in the Process of Planned Organizational Change. *ation Review* 9, 199-212. [CrossRef]

;, Marloes L. van Engen, Claartje J. Vinkenburg, Elisabeth Wilson-Evered. 2008. nal Leadership and Innovative Work Behaviour: Exploring the Relevance of Gender *reatwity and Innovation Management* 17:10.1111/caim.2008.17.issue-3, 227-244. [CrossRef] ody. 2008. Charisma as a cognitive-affective phenomenon: a follower-centric approach. *decision* 46:6, 832-845. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

:ody. 2008. Charismatic leadership in Sri Lankan business organizations. *Journal of development* 27:5, 480-498. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

ody, W.M.A. Sanjeewani. 2006. The impact of salesperson transformational leadership astomer relationship marketing behavior. *International Journal of Bank Marketing* 24:7, tract] [Full Text] [PDF]

-Costea. 2005. The challenges of human resource management towards organizational *ournal of European Industrial Training* 29:2, 112-134. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

framework. *International Journal of Leadership in Education* 7, 203-224. [CrossRef]

19.   Fred Ochieng Walumbwa, Cindy Wu, Lucy A. Ojode. 2004. Gender and instructional outc *of Management Development* 23:2, 124-140. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

20.   Emmanuel Ogbonna, Lloyd C. Harris. 2003. Innovative organizational structures and perforr *of Organizational Change Management* 16:5, 512-533. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

21. James S.Pounder. 2003. Employing transformational leadership to enhance the quality of development instruction. *Journal of Management Development* 22:1, 6-13. [Abstract] [Full ⌐

22. Barrie O. Pettman, Richard Dobbins. 2002. Leadership: a selected bibliography. *Equal International* 21:4/5/6, 1-192. [Abstract] [PDF]

23. James S. Pounder, Marianne Coleman. 2002. Women - better leaders than men? Ir educational management it still "all depends". *Leadership & Organization Development* 122-133. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

24. Iain L. Densten. 2002. Clarifying inspirational motivation and its relationship to extra effc *& Organization Development Journal* 23:1, 40-44. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]

25. Margaret Deery, Leo K Jago. 2001. Hotel management style: a study of employee pe preferences. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 20, 325-338. [CrossRef]

26. James S. Pounder. 2001. "New leadership" and university organisational effectiveness: relationship. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 22:6, 281-290. [Abstract] [Full

27. A. J. Trofino. 2000. Transformational leadership: moving total quality management t organizations. *International Nursing Review* 47, 232-242. [CrossRef]

28. Patricia Layzell Ward. 2000. An overview of the literature of management and of informati services management 1999. *Library Management* 21:3, 128-152. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PE

29. Tony L. Simons. 1999. Behavioral integrity as a critical ingredient for transformational leade *of Organizational Change Management* 12:2, 89-104. [Abstract] [Full Text]

[PDF]

30. Jonatan Jelen, Billy Brocato, Thomas M. Schmidt, Stuart S. Goldin Search of a Star Trek A 42-59. [CrossRef]

31. Organizational Contexts 65-88. [CrossRef]