While much is known about what charismatic leaders do, where they emerge, and what their followers’ reactions are, relatively little systematic empirical research has been conducted to assess who charismatic leaders are, and how we differentiate charismatic from noncharismatic leaders. To address this gap in the literature, multi-source field data were collected in five technology-driven organizations to examine the relationship between five personal attributes of leaders (i.e., self-monitoring, self-actualization, motive to attain social power, self-enhancement, and openness to change), ratings of charismatic leadership, and follower (i.e., extra effort, self-actualization, collectivistic work motivation, organizational citizenship behavior) and managerial performance outcomes. Two hundred and eighteen managers provided self-reports of their personal attributes and 945 subordinates provided ratings of follower outcomes and their manager’s charismatic leadership. Superiors of the managers provided ratings of the manager’s charismatic leadership and managerial performance two months after collecting the managers’ and subordinates’ ratings. Results indicated that managers rated by subordinates as high on charismatic leadership reported higher levels of self-monitoring, self-actualization, motive to attain social power and self-enhancement values than managers rated low on charismatic leadership. Managers rated by superiors as high on charismatic leadership were associated with followers who reported higher levels of extra effort and OCB than managers rated low on charismatic leadership.

Over the past two decades, the charismatic leadership literature has been expanded substantially and a number of authors have examined charisma as a focal point of their leadership research. This is due in part to the turbulent business context that today’s organizations must face, which calls for charismatic leaders who provide an appealing vision and meaning for their employees in the globally competitive business environment (Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Kets de Vries, 1998). Willner (1984) described charismatic leaders as “spellbinders,” whose magnetic personalities and dynamic speaking skills motivate followers to achieve high levels of performance in such contexts. Conger (1989, p. 92) described charismatic leaders as “meaning makers.” The business community also glorifies visionary leaders, such as Steve Jobs of Apple Computer and Jack Welch of General Electric, who define reality for followers, command an extraordinary level of respect from their followers, and effectively initiate change and innovation.

While several authors have pointed out the negative or dark side of charismatic leadership (e.g., Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Howell, 1988), numerous studies have reported positive effects that charismatic leaders have on followers’ motivation, effectiveness, and satisfaction as well as organizational performance (Fiol, Harris, & House, 1999). These positive effects that charismatic leadership has on various criteria are based on the leader’s ability to garner strong personal attraction from followers (Bass, 1990), articulate a compelling and evocative vision (Bligh, Khhles, & Meindl, 2004), transform the nature of work by making it appear more heroic, morally sound and meaningful (Conger & Kanungo, 1998), and enhance followers’ self-conceptions (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993).

Despite these encouraging results and well-developed theoretical frameworks that link charismatic leadership, positive outcomes and contexts that support their emergence, less is known about what constitutes the personality profile of charismatic leaders. Researchers have given little empirical attention to identify
common personal characteristics among charismatic leaders. Although some authors have theoretically linked several personal attributes to charismatic leaders (e.g., Conger & Kanungo, 1998; House & Howell, 1992), their discussion is quite limited and does not provide empirical data to support their arguments. However, as we are moving from the Weber’s (1947) conceptualization of charisma as “divinely inspired gift” to “neocharismatic” theories, the identification of potential charismatic leaders becomes more important for organizational effectiveness (Yukl, 2002).

The purpose of the present study is to identify a comprehensive set of personal attributes among charismatic leaders in terms of their values, needs, self-presentation skills, and self-identity and examine how they influence followers’ reaction towards their leader. Specifically, we chose five personal attributes (i.e., self-monitoring, self-actualization, motive to attain social power, self-enhancement, and openness to change) based on theoretical frameworks proposed by House (1977) and Conger and Kanungo (1998). These characteristics have been mentioned by a number of other charismatic leadership scholars as some of the most frequently displayed and defining attributes of charismatic leaders (House & Howell, 1992; Pillai, Williams, Lowe, & Jung, 2003; Riggio, 1998; Shamir et al., 1993). An examination of such attributes may help contemporary organizations select individuals who are more likely to display the “spellbinding” and “meaning making” charismatic behaviors that can energize followers to collectively work to achieve a high level of performance.

**Theoretical Background and Hypotheses**

House’s (1977) model of the charismatic leadership provided the general theoretical framework for this study. This model proposes that the leader, who possesses an unusually high level of vibrant personal attributes (e.g., dominance, self-confidence, need for influence), tends to articulate an exciting vision and engage in personal image-building that produces favorable perceptions of himself/herself on the part of the followers. These favorable perceptions enhance the leader’s role modeling, motive arousal of followers, and dynamic communication activities, which produce favorable outcomes for followers and their organization. Followers’ outcomes include loyalty to and trust in the leader, obedience to the leader, emulation of the leader’s value system by followers, arousal of followers’ needs and acceptance of challenging goals, and enhanced self-esteem and performance expectations of followers. As a result, performance levels are enhanced.

The present study focuses on examining the relationship between the aforementioned five personal attributes of leaders and ratings of charismatic leadership. **Self-monitoring** is a personality trait involving observation and regulation of expressive behavior (Snyder & Gangestad, 1986). **Self-actualization** is a higher-order need to become what one is capable of becoming (Maslow, 1954). **Motive to attain social power** represents the need for power involving the restrained use of power in the service of others (McClelland, 1985). **Self-enhancement** is a personal value that drives self-promotional image-building and egotistic behavior (House & Howell, 1992). **Openness to change** is a personal value that involves the willingness to try new experiences and alter the status quo (Howell & Higgins, 1990).

We also examined the relationship between ratings of charismatic leadership and four outcomes for followers [i.e., extra effort, self-actualization, collectivistic work orientation, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB)] and managerial performance. **Extra effort** represents motivation and effort exerted beyond what is generally expected (Bass, 1985). **Collectivistic work motivation** is defined as an individual’s orientation to be motivated by the favoring of interdependent group work over independent individual work (Shamir, 1990). **OCB** refers to discretionary behavior that is not part of one’s formal contractual job requirements, but that nevertheless promotes effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1990).

**Charismatic Leaders and Personal Attributes**

Since the concept of charismatic leadership has became a more popular topic in the
leadership literature, some authors have examined several behaviors that are consistently associated with charismatic leaders such as instilling confidence, appealing ideological goals, and developing emotion-based relationship (Conger & Kanungo, 1998). The reason for focusing on leader behaviors and followers’ corresponding reactions in prior research is due to the belief that a relational basis for charismatic leadership and interplay between the leader and followers is important to uncover the basic mechanisms through which the charismatic leader exerts influence over his/her followers. As such, several research frameworks (e.g., Conger & Kanunger, 1998, House, 1977) introduced in the past for studying charismatic leadership focused primarily on leader behaviors. Such focus is further evidenced in a recent review article by Conger (1999) who included only leader behavior, follower dispositions, and contextual factors to integrate the charismatic literature. An exception is the recent study by Pillai and her colleagues (2003) who found that empathy and need for achievement were related to attributed charisma among the two presidential candidates, George W. Bush and Al Gore in the 2000 US presidential election.

Consequently, we know relatively a lot about “what charismatic leaders do” and “what followers’ reactions are.” However, what is less known to the literature is “who charismatic leaders are,” “what common personal attributes among charismatic leaders are,” and “how we differentiate charismatic from noncharismatic leaders.” Therefore, the present study addressed these questions by identifying five key personal attributes of charismatic leaders that have been highlighted in the charismatic leadership literature (e.g., Conger & Kanungo, 1998; House, 1977; Shamir, et al., 1993) and tested them empirically. The five attributes we identified are self-monitoring, self-actualization, motive to attain social power, self-enhancement, and openness to change.

**Self-Monitoring**

Charismatic leadership involves a higher level of social exchange between the leader and followers in which the leader exerts profound personal influence upon his/her followers. In turn, followers make attributions of extraordinary leadership abilities based on images created and maintained by the leader (Conger & Kanungo, 1998). The charismatic leader needs to carefully orchestrate his/her behaviors in order to maintain positive images. Gardner and Avolio (1998) described charismatic leaders as actors who “perform,” while interacting with followers and other constituents. They argued that the images of trustworthy, credible, morally worthy, innovative, esteemed, and self-confident are especially relevant to developing charismatic leadership perception among followers.

In order to project such images, effective impression management is an important process through which a leader builds charismatic images. In fact, many well-known and successful business executives known for their charismatic leadership, such as Carly Fiorina and Herb Kelleher, possess a “dramatic flair” as they enact various roles and interact with others (Sosik, Avolio, & Jung, 2002). The need to maintain successful images as a leader is noted carefully by Bass (1985, p. 40) who argued that “The effectiveness must be real or apparent. Often, the charismatic survives with more attention given the apparent than the real. Image of success and effectiveness is pursued.”

To project such positive images effectively, a leader needs to observe his/her self-expressive behavior and adapt it to the demands of the situation. The need to project and maintain extraordinary images for charismatic leadership perception necessitates leader’s active effort to adjust his/her behavior to fulfill demands from audience and situation (Gardner & Avolio, 1998). Stated differently, high levels of self-monitoring not only facilitate the development of a charismatic image, but also help sustain the positive image to exert a high level of influence. High levels of self-monitoring also allow the charismatic leader to actively seek situational and social cues to adjust their message and the way that s/he articulates vision and convince the audience (Anderson, 1990). Despite the theoretically important linkage between self-monitoring and charismatic leadership, few scholars have yet to empirically demonstrate that self-monitoring is a required personal attribute of the charismatic leader (see Sosik & Dworakivsky, 1998, and Sosik, et al., 2002 for
exceptions). Thus, we tested this relationship with the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 1:** Managers who are rated high on charismatic leadership will report a higher level of self-monitoring than managers who are rated low on charismatic leadership.

**Self-Actualization**

Numerous authors (cf., Bass, 1985, 1990; Burns, 1978) have argued that one feature of charismatic and transformational leadership that distinguishes it from other types of leadership (e.g., transactional leadership) is the leader’s ability to raise followers’ needs from lower-level, such as physiological and safety, to higher-level of needs, such as self-esteem and self-actualization. Bass (1985) argued that transformational/charismatic leadership processes usually involve the upgrading of needs from low- to higher-level of Maslow’s (1954) needs hierarchy among followers. This upgrade helps followers transcend their own self-interest for the good of the group, organization, or country, thereby fulfilling their high-level of needs. Burns’ (1978) original conceptualization of transforming leadership also focused on elevating followers’ needs and motives.

Indeed, increased awareness and the arousal of higher-level of needs (i.e., self-actualization) is what allow the charismatic leader to exert fundamental influence over his/her followers and produce extraordinary performance (Conger & Kanungo, 1998). Leaders with socialized charismatic abilities make the development of followers an important priority, and as a result, followers are willing to go beyond a contractual agreement in order to elevate their needs.

Yet, it is equally important for the charismatic leader to focus on developing his/her own self-actualization needs in order to communicate messages that could be more easily resonated among followers. Dvir and Shamir (2003) argued that some initial level of leader-follower compatibility in terms of similar needs, motivation, and morality is necessary for the emergence of transformational and charismatic relationships. They tested this hypothesis by measuring the initial level of followers’ self-actualization needs to predict their superior’s leadership style in 54 military units. Their results indicated that platoon leaders displayed more of transformational leader behaviors when their indirect (i.e., distant) followers’ initial level of self-actualization needs was high. Given that charismatic leaders typically emphasize ideological values and focus on fulfilling vision based on personal values, we believe that charismatic leaders should also have a high level of self-actualization needs. Thus, we formulated:

**Hypothesis 2:** Managers who are rated high on charismatic leadership will report a higher level of self-actualization than managers who are rated low on charismatic leadership.

**Motive to Attain Social Power**

Socialized power influences others in a controlled manner and is required to marshal the human, informational, and material resources to get things done (Hollander & Offermann, 1990). In any leadership framework, it is assumed that leaders need to possess a certain amount of social power in order to exert influence over their followers. According to the idiosyncratic credits model (Hollander, 1986), leaders gain acceptance by demonstrating task competence as well as control over resources that followers value. However, the very nature of the social exchange between the charismatic leader and his/her followers which involves transforming followers’ values, motives, and attitudes, necessitates a stronger need for the leader to obtain social power.

House (1977), House and Howell (1992) and Bass (1985, 1990) suggest that most charismatic leaders embody the traits and behaviors that are consistent with a socialized power motive. In fact, charismatic leadership has been described as a social influence process (Gardner & Avolio, 1998; Sosik, et al., 2002). According to Conger and Kanungo (1998), a charismatic leader’s strong social influence on followers stems from the leader’s social and/or personal rather than position power. In other words, the charismatic relationship is based on the leader’s personal qualities that are perceived as extraordinary by followers. These impressions of extraordinary qualities come from the charismatic leader’s strong motives to obtain social power that is required for charismatic motivational processes to occur (Shamir et al., 1993). Thus, we expected that
charismatic leaders should possess a strong motive to attain social power, and formulated:

**Hypothesis 3:** Managers who are rated high on charismatic leadership will report a higher level of need for social power than managers who are rated low on charismatic leadership.

**Self-Enhancement**

Charismatic leadership involves profound social influence exerted upon followers who perceive their leader as “supernatural” or extraordinarily talented (House, 1977). As such, there is a need for the charismatic leader to enhance his/her image and perceived ability through impression management. Gardner and Avolio (1998) argued that charismatic leaders are actors who “perform,” while interacting with followers in order to create trustworthy, credible, positive, and confident images, which is relevant to stereotypical charismatic leadership images. Sosik et al. (2002) pointed out that charismatic leaders possess a “dramatic flair” and keen self-awareness as they enact many roles in interactions with others in various situations. Thus, charismatic leaders are likely to value self-enhancement of their image aimed at sustaining their attributions of charisma from others.

An example of a charismatic leader’s self-enhancement tendency is Richard Branson, the colorful CEO of the Virgin Group. Branson relies on self-promotion to show off his self-confidence and special talents (Kets de Vries, 1998), as evidenced the antics he displays on the Fox television network’s show “The Rebel Billionaire: Branson’s Quest for the Best.” Through self-promotion activities such as those displayed by Branson, charismatic leaders create and maintain follower’s dependency toward their leadership, which is attributed by several scholars as a necessary condition for the emergence of charismatic leadership (Yukl, 2002). Based on these arguments, we expected that leaders who display a high level of charismatic leadership place much value on self-enhancement. Thus, we formulated:

**Hypothesis 4:** Managers who are rated high on charismatic leadership will value self-enhancement to a greater extent than managers who are rated low on charismatic leadership.

**Openness to Change**

It is widely recognized that one of the most distinctive characteristics of transformational and charismatic leaders is their very strong desire and/or willingness to provoke changes in an organization. There are numerous examples of charismatic business leaders such as Steve Jobs, Lee Iacocca, and Michael Dell who defined or re-defined the industry in which they operate by introducing important changes based on their personal vision. Charismatic leaders use their extraordinary talents and highly appealing communication skills to create a sense of crisis among followers and justify the need for changes. As such, Howell and Higgins (1990) referred to charismatic leaders as “champions of change.” Similarly, Conger and Kanungo (1998) called charismatic leaders “agents of radical change.”

The charismatic leader’s role as a change agent stems from the need to challenge the status quo. Oftentimes, charismatic leaders recognize deficiencies and/or potential problems with the existing situation and communicate reasons for initiating changes. Charismatic leaders’ openness to change values might also come from their ability to recognize future trends. When they recognize important business trends and potential opportunities that are otherwise not noticed by other organizational members, charismatic leaders challenge the status quo and initiate changes to survive. Stated differently, valuing openness to change may be what enables charismatic leaders to become more visible and receive more attention. This expectation is in line with charismatic leaders’ high level of need for power and images of self-confidence (House, 1977). Thus, we formulated:

**Hypothesis 5:** Managers who are rated high on charismatic leadership will value openness to change to a greater extent than managers who are rated low on charismatic leadership.

**Outcomes of Charismatic Leadership**

Given these forceful personal attributes associated with charismatic leadership, the impact that a charismatic leader has on followers is profound in terms of follower’s motivation and attitudes (Conger & Kanungo, 1998; House,
Therefore, we assessed follower’s extra effort, self-actualization, collectivistic orientation, and OCB. These variables represent the intended outcomes that are especially pertinent to charismatic and transformational leadership because charismatic and transformational leaders go beyond contractual agreements to motivate followers by articulating the importance of making self-sacrifices for the good of the organization and community to which they belong. Such leaders focus on followers’ development in terms of their individual ability, career, collectivistic work motivation, and also make followers’ self-actualization more salient than lower level needs (Bass, 1985). The confidence and extraordinary image of the charismatic leader (House, 1977), coupled with the developmental and motivational effects on followers (Shamir et al., 1993), has been linked to high levels of performance (see meta-analyses by Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramium, 1996, and Dum dum, Lowe, & Avolio, 2002). Therefore, we formulated the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 6: Managers who are rated high on charismatic leadership will be associated with followers who report higher levels of (a) extra effort, (b) self-actualization, (c) collectivistic work orientation, and (d) OCB than followers associated with managers who are rated low on charismatic leadership.

Hypothesis 7: Managers who are rated high on charismatic leadership will outperform managers who are rated low on charismatic leadership.

Method

Participants and Procedure

Three hundred adult students enrolled in an offsite Executive Master of Business Administration program in a large public university in the Northeast were invited to participate in the study for course credit. The final sample consisted of 218 individuals (leaders) holding managerial positions, their 945 respective subordinates (followers) and 218 superiors. Of the 300 individuals, 61 did not participate because they did not hold managerial positions at the time of this study, and data from the remaining 21 individuals were not included in the study because their surveys were unusable as a result of missing data.

Participants were full-time corporate employees from various management-levels ranging from first-line to executive management within five organizations from the following technology-dependent industries: biotechnology, information technology, financial services, insurance and aerospace engineering. The leaders ranged in age from 21 to 65, with the average age being 31. They had worked, on average, three years in their current position and had a range of job tenure of one to 10 years. They had worked, on average, eight years for their current organization and had a range of company tenure of one to 32 years. Sixty-three percent of the managers were male, and the majority (78%) was white. The set of study variables did not differ significantly across the five organizations/industries, leader gender or race, and therefore were not controlled for in the data analyses (Stevens, 1996).

Data were collected through an Internet-based survey, which was introduced to leaders in class, completed online outside of class, and submitted directly to the researchers by the second week of class (Time 1). This survey assessed leaders’ personal attributes and demographics. At Time 1 leaders also identified 10 followers and their primary supervisor as potential raters. Five followers were randomly selected (by an algorithm built into the Web site) as invitees to participate in the study. An email was sent to these followers asking them to help the leader complete his/her course requirements by participating in a 360-degree feedback assessment and completing an online survey by the sixth week of class. To ensure that a minimum of three followers rated each leader, the Web site emailed a series of reminder notices to followers until they submitted their online surveys. Three to five followers rated each focal leader.

Two months after the followers had submitted their surveys (Time 2 – week 13 of class), an email was sent to the focal leaders’ supervisor asking him/her to participate in the study and help the leader complete his/her course requirements by completing an online survey within two weeks. This survey assessed
superiors’ ratings of leadership style and managerial performance of the focal leader. The Web site emailed a series of reminder notices to the supervisors until they submitted their online surveys. All surveys were completed confidentially by participants and returned directly to the research Web site.

**Measures**

**Leaders’ Personal Attributes**

The present study assessed five personal attributes of the leader that have been highlighted in the charismatic leadership literature (e.g., Conger & Kanungo, 1998; House, 1977; Shamir et al., 1993). Self-monitoring was measured using Snyder and Gangestad’s (1986) 18-item scale (e.g., “I would probably make a good actor,” α = .77), with items rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (extremely uncharacteristic of me) to 5 (extremely characteristic of me).

Self-actualization was measured using Dvir, Eden, Avolio and Shamir’s (2002) 10-item measure of self-actualization needs based on Hackman and Oldham’s (1980) growth needs index (e.g., “It presents opportunities for personal growth and development,” α = .83). Leaders rated each item on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all important) to 7 (extremely important).

Motive to attain social power was gauged using Good and Good’s (1972) 28-item dichotomously scored measure of social-power motivation (e.g., “I would enjoy deciding upon educational or social standards,” α = .83).

Self-enhancement and openness to change were measured using items from Stern, Dietz and Guagnano’s (1998) Brief Inventory of Values derived from Schwartz’s (1992) 56-item instrument measuring the structure and content of human values. Self-enhancement values were measured with 3 items (e.g., “authority, the right to lead or command,” α = .75). Openness to change values were measured with 3 items (e.g., “a varied life, filled with challenge, novelty, and change,” α = .76). Consistent with Stern et al. (1998) and the definition of a value, leaders rated each value “as a guiding principle in my life” using a 7-point scale on which a response of opposed to my values received a score of -1, not important received a score of 0, and positive numbers were assigned up to 5 for of supreme importance.

**Ratings of Charismatic Leadership**

Charismatic leadership was measured using three aggregated scales from the MLQ-Form 5X (Bass & Avolio, 1997). Subordinates and superiors completed the “Rater” form of the MLQ. Previous versions of the MLQ have been criticized for their failure to empirically generate the factor structure proposed by Bass and Avolio to underlie transformational leadership (e.g., Yukl, 2002). However, other research (e.g., Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Avolio, Bass & Jung, 1999) has shown the MLQ-5X to be a psychometrically sound instrument in terms of measuring the construct of charismatic leadership and what the authors refer to as a full range of leader behavior.

The MLQ sub-scales measured as components of charismatic leadership include the following: Inspirational Motivation (4 items, e.g., “Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished,” leader α = .78, subordinate α = .80, superior α = .77), Idealized Influence-Behavior (4 items, e.g., “Talks about his or her most important values and beliefs,” leader α = .69, subordinate α = .75, superior α = .69) and Idealized Influence-Attribute (4 items, e.g., “Instills pride in others for being associated with him/her,” leader α = .61, subordinate α = .74, superior α = .69). Respondents rated each item on a 5-point frequency scale (0 = not at all; 4 = frequently, if not always). In this study, the scales were highly intercorrelated (rs ranged from .66 to .73). Thus, based on prior research (Avolio et al., 1999), we considered charismatic leadership as one 12-item scale.

Aggregation of scales for subordinate ratings of charismatic leadership was justified based on results of ANOVA and rwg analyses. One-way ANOVAs were employed to compare within-group variance and between-group
variance for the focal managers. ANOVA results where within-group variances are homogeneous while variances across groups are significantly different indicate that aggregation is appropriate (Dansereau, Alutto, & Yammarino, 1984). $r_{wg}$ analysis provides a measure of agreement or consensus among raters on a single variable. $r_{wg}$ index scores of .7 or above indicate that aggregation is appropriate (James, Demaree, & Wolfe, 1984). Thus, the statistical analyses for Hypothesis testing are based on a sample size of 218 focal leaders.

**Outcome Measures**

Follower’s motivation level was assessed in terms of extra effort and self-actualization. Extra effort was gauged using three items from the MLQ-5X (Bass & Avolio, 1997) measuring extra effort exerted by followers (e.g., “Gets others to do more than they expected to do,” $\alpha = .72$). Followers rated each item on a 5-point frequency scale (0 = not at all; 4 = frequently, if not always). Self-actualization was measured using Dvir et al.’s (2002) scale described above ($\alpha = .84$).

Collectivistic work orientation was measured using two scales from Wagner’s (1995) individualism/collectivism questionnaire: interdependence (4 items; e.g., “Only those who depend on themselves get ahead,” $\alpha = .74$), and collaboration (5 items; “It annoys me when other people perform better than I do,” $\alpha = .75$). Subordinates rated each reverse-coded item on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Results of principal components factor analysis with Varimax rotation generated a single factor model of all 9 interdependence and collaboration items. Thus, we assessed collectivistic work orientation in the data analyses as a single 9-item scale ($\alpha = .80$).

OCB displayed by followers was measured using two adapted scales develop and validated by Hui, Law, and Chen (1999): conscientiousness (3 items, e.g., “Take my job seriously and rarely make mistakes,” $\alpha = .71$), and identification with company (3 items, e.g., “Am eager to tell outsiders good news about my company and clarify their misunderstandings,” $\alpha = .61$). Subordinates rated each OCB item on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Results of principal components factor analysis with Varimax rotation generated a single factor model of all 6 conscientiousness and identification with company items. Thus, we assessed OCB in the data analyses as a single 6-item scale ($\alpha = .71$).

Managerial performance of the focal leader was measured using three items developed by Williams (1988). These items have been used in prior research and have demonstrated acceptable psychometric properties (e.g., Hui, et al., 1999; Williams & Anderson, 1991). A sample item reads “Meet(s) all formal job requirements” ($\alpha = .85$). Superiors rated each performance item on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

**Data Analysis**

We utilized three different sets of data to test our hypotheses in order to minimizing the potential biases due to the common source. First, we used subordinates’ ratings of the focal leader’s charismatic leadership as a basis to create two different groups. We split the sample equally into two sub-samples (each $n = 109$) comprised of data partitioned into low (scale score < 2.85 median) and high (scale score > 2.85 median) levels of charismatic leadership. We then compared the mean scores of the focal leaders’ personal attributes using MANOVA. We also compared superiors’ ratings of managerial performance across these two groups.

Next, we split the sample into two sub-samples (each $n = 109$) comprised of data partitioned into low (scale score < 2.82 median) and high (scale score > 2.82 median) levels of charismatic leadership as rated by superiors. We then compared the mean scores of the followers’ outcomes using MANOVA across these two groups.

**Results**

Table 1 presents the scale means, standard deviations, and Pearson Product-Moment correlations among the measures. Table 2 presents scale means and standard deviations across the low and high charismatic leadership groups and summarizes results of univariate tests of differences across the groups.
Table 1
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations (N = 218 managers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leader's personal attributes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-monitoring</td>
<td>54.60</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-actualization</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Motive to attain</td>
<td>21.72</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social power</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-enhancement</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Openness to change</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leader's behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Charismatic leadership (followers' aggregated ratings)</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Charismatic leadership (superiors' ratings)</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes of leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Extra effort</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Self-actualization</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Collectivistic work orientation</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. OCB</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Managerial performance</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.35*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

a Leader's personal attributes are based on the focal leader's self-reported data.
b Charismatic leadership ratings of the focal leaders and follower's outcome variables are based on the followers' reported data.
c The focal leader's managerial performance and ratings of charismatic leadership behavior are based on his/her superior ratings.
Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations across the Low and High Charismatic Leadership Rating Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Low Charismatic Leadership</th>
<th>High Charismatic Leadership</th>
<th>Result of Univariate Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leader’s Personal Attributes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td>53.28</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>55.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-actualization</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motive to attain social power</td>
<td>21.09</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>22.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-enhancement</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to change</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follower Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra effort</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-actualization</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivistic work orientation</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Outcome</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial performance</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes
To limit the potential for common source bias, low and high charismatic leadership groups for leaders’ personal attribute analyses were based on a median split of subordinates’ ratings of charismatic leadership. Low and high charismatic leadership groups for follower outcome analyses were based on a median split of superiors’ ratings of charismatic leadership. a Results of MANOVA for the multivariate personal attribute group of dependent variables is (Wilks’ $\lambda = .94, F(5,212) = 2.71, p < .05, \eta^2 = .06$). b Results of MANOVA for the multivariate follower outcome group of dependent variables is (Wilks’ $\lambda = .90, F(4,213) = 5.98, p < .001, \eta^2 = .10$).

Leaders’ Personal Attributes

Hypothesis 1 was supported; the mean score for self-monitoring was significantly higher among managers in the high charismatic leadership group than among managers in the low charismatic leadership group, as shown in Table 2. Consistent with Hypothesis 2, the mean level of self-actualization was significantly higher among managers in the high charismatic leadership group as compared with those in the low charismatic leadership group. Managers rated high on charismatic leadership also reported a higher level of need for social power than those rated as low on charismatic leadership, thus supporting Hypothesis 3. Hypothesis 4 also was supported because the level of self-enhancement among managers in the high charismatic leadership group was significantly higher than those in the low charismatic leadership group. However, Hypothesis 5 was not supported because the level of openness to change valued by managers was not significantly different across the two groups.

Outcomes of Charismatic Leadership

As shown in Table 2, managers rated high on charismatic leadership by superiors were associated with subordinates who reported higher levels of extra effort and OCB than subordinates of managers rated low on charismatic leadership. Subordinates’ reports of self-actualization and collectivistic work orientation did not differ across the groups.
Thus, support was found for Hypotheses 6a and 6d, but not for Hypotheses 6b and 6c.

Hypothesis 7 was supported. As shown in Table 2, managers rated high on charismatic leadership by subordinates outperformed managers rated low on charismatic leadership.

**Discussion**

The primary purpose of our study was to identify several important personal attributes of charismatic leaders. Despite the distinctive personal characteristics that have been attributed to charismatic leadership, there hasn’t been much research on identifying and testing these attributes. However, if organizations select managerial candidates based on their charismatic leadership abilities and/or if they train executives for their charismatic leadership, it is imperative to identify common attributes of charismatic leaders for organizational effectiveness. As such, we identified five attributes commonly associated with charismatic leaders (i.e., self-monitoring, self-actualization, motive to attain social power, self-enhancement, openness to change) and compared them with managers with high versus low ratings of charismatic leadership.

The results of the two group comparison generally supported the common notion that charismatic leaders tend to be high self-monitors, have a stronger level of motive to attain social power, actively engage in impression management, and are motivated by the higher order need of self-actualization. However, the two groups were not significantly different from each other in terms of their attitudes towards change. This is a surprising result given that many charismatic leadership researchers have claimed that charismatic leaders tend to be agents of change (Bass, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1998) or champion of changes (Howell & Higgins, 1990).

This result might have been due to the fact that about 65 percent of our samples (n=142) were comprised of participants from lower organizational levels while the remaining 35 percent (n=76) indicated holding managerial positions at higher organizational levels. Thus, we broke the entire sample into low and high organizational level groups and compared their openness to change values between high and low charismatic leadership groups. The mean comparison revealed an interesting pattern. Openness to change values among the participants in the low organizational level group was virtually same between high (mean = 3.67) and low (mean = 3.69) charismatic leadership groups (F (1, 140) = .02, ns). However, openness to change values was substantially different among the participants in the high organizational level samples between high (mean = 3.90) and low (mean = 3.31) charismatic leadership groups (F (1, 74) = 7.50, p < .01) among managerial participants. Therefore, it can be inferred that although openness to change is an important personal attribute of charismatic leaders, it becomes more important and relevant among individuals in more advanced managerial- and executive-level positions.

Regarding followers’ outcomes, leaders rated high on charismatic leadership generated a higher level of extra effort as compared with leaders rated low on charismatic leadership. As expected, followers working with charismatic leaders also displayed a higher level of OCB, which is in line with the basic premise of charismatic leadership. Charismatic leaders emphasize going beyond the call of duty and making personal sacrifices for the good of their group, organization, and other greater entities (House, 1977). These extra-role behaviors were well represented by a higher level of OCB in the high charismatic leadership group. Given the current trend toward team-based organizations and re-engineering and merging businesses, an organization can sustain a competitive edge when employees initiate tasks and duties that are not prescribed by their job description since innovation oftentimes comes from intrinsically motivated employees’ personal initiatives (Amabile, 1998).

However, the other two follower response outcomes we tested (i.e., self-actualization and collectivistic orientation) were not significantly different among the two groups. This is surprising given that it has been argued by a number of researchers that charismatic and transformational leaders focus on developing follower’s higher level of needs such as self-actualization, and use a different means (e.g., personal development versus contractual exchange) to motivate followers. In addition,
Shamir and his colleagues (1993) argue that charismatic leaders develop a deep collective identity among followers. By sharing a future vision articulated by the leader, followers develop a new meaning for their task and this oftentimes translates into a higher level of collective orientation.

This surprising lack of findings might have also been due to the different organizational ranks among participants. Accordingly, we followed the same approach to test these two follower outcomes in low and high organizational level samples. However, means for the two groups were not substantially different. Thus, further research is certainly needed to retest the hypotheses regarding followers’ outcomes of charismatic leadership.

**Limitations and Future Research Opportunities**

Several limitations of this study provide opportunities for future research. These include the sample characteristics, measurement issues, and several relevant variables not examined in the present study. The sample consisted of managers from the U.S. who work in technology-driven organizations. These sample characteristics may limit the generalizability of our findings. Leadership style and outcomes may differ based on culture and organizational context (Bass, 1985; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004). Thus, future research should examine how cultural differences relate to antecedents and outcomes of charismatic leadership using a more diverse sample of leaders and followers from various industries and countries.

A set of limitations concerns measurement issues. First, this study’s results were based upon measures of charismatic leadership (inspirational motivation and idealized influence). Whether study results would replicate for other transformational (intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration) and transactional leadership scales measured by the MLQ is an issue for future research. Second, the present study did not examine the relationship between personal attributes and charismatic rhetoric and symbols representing the primary tool used by charismatic leaders to motivate followers (Willner, 1984). Future research should assess how leaders’ and followers’ personal attributes relate to their strong emotional bonds that define the charismatic relationship.

Willner’s (1984) original premise for the “spellbinders” highlighted the social situation that would support the emergence of charismatic personalities capable of doing heroic deeds or carrying out villainous acts. Thus, future research also needs to control for other factors (e.g., organizational context, size, culture and structure) that may interact with the followers’ personal attributes to influence performance outcomes in high tech organizations, in addition to focusing on the leader’s personal attributes.

Finally, although we found a set of personal attributes that represented important characteristics of charismatic leadership, it is important to note that some scholars have recently argued that charisma could be understood as well-developed social and political skills (Rigio, 1998; Ferris, Treadway, Kolodinsky, Hochwarter, Kaemar, Douglas, & Frink, 2005). While it has been generally argued that charisma should be considered an individual trait or attribute (Bass, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1998), if charisma is a more of social or political skill that a leader employs in order to exercise influence over his/her followers, then researchers should consider this factor in the measurement of charisma in the leadership context.

Similarly, Hall, Blass, Ferris, and Massengale (2005) emphasized the importance of understanding leadership style as personal characteristics by arguing “we view leader style as an amalgam of the personal characteristics an individual possesses, and thus is reflective of one’s intelligence, personality, social and political skills (p. 521).” Based on this argument, they proposed a model in which accountability and trust are an important part of leadership processes through which followers perceive and evaluate their leader’s performance and effectiveness. Their view may help explain why several charismatic leaders with equally talented and attractive use their charisma in self-serving and destructive ways and create social harm. Therefore, more research is certainly needed to shed light on charisma as a set of personal attributes versus social and political skills and
how charisma is perceived by followers vis-à-vis trust in and accountability of the leader.

In conclusion, this study begins to address gaps in the leadership literature by identifying several personal attributes of charismatic leaders. Whereas much is known about what charismatic leaders do, how their followers react and what circumstances support their emergence, relatively little is known about whom charismatic leaders are and how they are different from noncharismatic leaders. Identifying personal attributes of charismatic leadership is especially important from a leadership development perspective because of the heightened need for change-oriented executives for organizational innovation. According to a survey conducted by the American Society for Training and Development, about 60 percent of surveyed companies reported that leadership development is a high or very high priority (Conger & Benjamin, 1999). Hence, it is an important task for an organization to select managerial candidates with several important attributes identified for charismatic leadership and then provide opportunities to further develop additional attributes or skills that are known to be related to effective leadership styles such as charismatic and transformational leadership. Our study offers some important charismatic attributes and future research should be followed to expand the array of personal characteristics associated with such leadership styles. The important question for the survival of organizations in the ever-changing environment in the 21st century is “Who Are the Spellbinders?”
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