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Some scholars have argued and found that the relationship between transformational or charismatic leadership and outcomes can be moderated by subordinate or situational characteristics (e.g., Bass & Avolio, 1990; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996). Still, there is insufficient evidence on this issue. In this article we examine need for leadership (De Vries, 1997) as a moderator of the relation between a measure of charismatic leadership (Bass, 1985a; Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1994) and subordinate outcomes. Need for leadership is found to moderate the relation between charismatic leadership and three out of four subordinate outcomes. Furthermore, we examine the relationship between charismatic leadership and need for leadership. Although it has been asserted that transformational or socialized charismatic leaders are able to empower and develop subordinates to become leaders themselves (e.g., Bass & Avolio, 1990; Kuhnert, 1994; Yammarino, 1994), we find a positive relationship between charismatic leadership and need for leadership, which suggests that subordinates are more, instead of less, dependent when a charismatic leader is present.

INTRODUCTION

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

CHARISMA

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

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

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

The MLQ is a widely used instrument. Its contents and empirical structure have been subject to discussion, however. Many MLQ items measuring charisma, for instance, have been defined in terms of their effects, augmenting the chance that high correlations with outcomes are obtained (Den Hartog, et al., 1994). Tepper and Percy (1994), using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) with a reduced MLQ version, found that two dimensions, one transformational and one transactional, captured the essence of the MLQ. In a CFA conducted by Bycio, Hackett, and Allen (1995), a two-factor solution, reflecting Active versus Passive leadership, was found to best represent the data obtained using the MLQ. Den Hartog, Van Muijten, and Koopman (1994, 1997) could not interpret an eight-factor solution in an explorative principal component analysis of the MLQ. A three-factor solution was proposed instead, comprising an inspirational leadership factor, a transactional leadership factor, and a passive leadership factor. Although Bass and Avolio (1993) maintain that a conceptual distinction can be made between the eight transformational and transactional factors, they admit that often transformational factors could not be distinguished empirically. Related to the behavioural point of view is the question of whether charismatic or transformational leadership can be learned. According to Avolio and Bass (1988), charisma is not an inborn trait, but is something that can be trained in a laboratory setting. Preliminary results from a study by Avolio and Bass (1995) showed a positive shift in inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation rated by subordinates six months after a training programme was conducted. When participants had proposed changes, the effects were greater than when no change was proposed. However, no significant changes were observed in idealized influence (charisma) and individualized consideration.

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

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

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

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

Even less research has been devoted to the second question. Podsakoff et al., (1996) proposed that subordinates’ need for independence moderates the relation between intellectual stimulation and outcomes. They suggested that intellectual stimulation can be irritating and ineffective for subordinates with a high need for independence, while being effective for subordinates with a low need for independence. This proposition was not substantiated. The researchers did find a positive relation of intellectual stimulation with role conflict, which was moderated by professional orientation. With low professional orientation, intellectual stimulation was positively related to role conflict, whereas with high professional orientation there was no relation between intellectual stimulation and role conflict. They also found a moderator effect of group cohesiveness. At low levels of group cohesiveness, intellectual stimulation was negatively related to general satisfaction, while at high levels of group cohesiveness, intellectual stimulation was positively related to general satisfaction.

**NEED FOR LEADERSHIP**

In this study we focus on “need for leadership” (De Vries, 1997) as a characteristic of subordinates. Need for leadership differs from other relevant conceptualizations in the leadership domain because it is not an asset of the leader, but an asset of the subordinate in his or her situation, job, or organization. In this way, the concept of need for leadership fulfils the wish of scholars for a more follower-centred theory of leadership (Hollander & Offermann, 1990; Meindl, 1990; Mmobuosi, 1991). Leader-centred approaches have dominated the leadership research agenda with their focus on the personality traits, behavioural styles, and decision-making methods of the leader. According to Hollander and Offermann (1990), it has become important to incorporate the subordinates in leadership models in order to deepen our understanding of the leadership process. Meindl (1990) points at a lack of theories fitting leader traits and behaviours to the needs and personalities of subordinates. Need for leadership, with its focus on followers, may be a solution to the theoretical gap by filling this vacuum. We use the following definition: *Need for leadership is the extent to which an employee wishes the leader to facilitate the paths towards individual, group, and/or organizational goals.*

The need is not a basic need, such as the need for food or social contact, since it lacks the distinguishing feature of an urge that persists until gratification is achieved. It is rather a quasi-need in the sense of Lewin (1951), evoked in a particular setting. For this reason De Vries (1997, p. 93) speaks of need for
leadership as a social-contextual motive. “Social” refers to the social setting in which the motive develops. People typically acquire new needs in group settings by means of socialization and acculturation processes. For example, a cohesive group may evoke or enhance the need for leadership among its members. “Contextual” refers to environmental contingencies of the need. Ryan (1995) argues that people may have different needs in different settings and/or at different times. People who are self-confident and capable in one setting may feel insecure and adroit in another. Need for leadership may thus become salient in work situations and reflect the organizational setting people are in, the type of work they perform, their tenure, etc.

The subordinate’s need for leadership has different aspects. First of all, the subordinate may wish or may not wish a leader’s intervention. The wish implies that the subordinate has positive feelings towards the contribution the leader is expected to make. The reverse, no wish, implies that the subordinate does not feel that the leader will make a contribution or even that the leader may hinder his or her goal achievement. Second, the facilitation of paths implies that the leader is seen as fulfilling certain functions which are instrumental and valuable in the subordinate’s eyes. In the third place, the leader’s influence contributes to the fulfilment of individual, group, and/or organizational goals. It should be noted that the organizational and group goals may or may not be compatible with the individual goals. Organizational and group goals may become individual goals when they are internalized by the subordinate. A subjective need for leadership is associated with individual goals; a more objective need for leadership is associated with group or organizational goals.

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

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

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

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CHARISMA AND NEED FOR LEADERSHIP

The first research question addressed in this article is: What is the relationship between charismatic leadership and need for leadership? Following Bass and Avolio (1990), Kuhnert (1994), and Yammarino (1994), employees with a transformational leader should show a lower need for leadership compared to employees with a non-transformational leader. Since charismatic leadership is an important part of transformational leadership, this line of argument would make one expect a negative correlation between the degree of charismatic leadership and the strength of the need for leadership. In another vein, one might argue that charismatic leadership may produce a stronger bond between the leader and subordinate, which may result in a higher need for leadership. Actually, Bass (1985a) acknowledges that charismatic leaders may keep followers weak and dependent. On this basis one would expect a positive correlation between charismatic leadership and need for leadership. Alternatively, one may conceive of a process in which the presence of subordinates with a higher need for leadership provides better chances for superiors to manifest themselves as charismatic leaders. Such a process would also result in a positive correlation between charismatic leadership and need for leadership, the causal order being reversed. And finally, of course, there is the possibility that these different processes take place simultaneously.
NEED FOR LEADERSHIP AS A MODERATOR

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

In our study, we focus on the following employees’ outcomes: job satisfaction, organizational commitment, work stress, and role conflict. We expect charismatic leadership to be positively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. There is strong empirical evidence that these outcomes are positively related to transformational or charismatic leadership (e.g. Bycio et al., 1995; Den Hartog 1997; Podsakoff et al., 1996). We expect it to be negatively related to work stress and role conflict. The negative relation between role conflict and transformational leadership has been substantiated by Podsakoff et al. (1996). Need for leadership is expected to moderate the relation between charismatic leadership and outcomes in the following way: Among subordinates with a low need for leadership we expect the relation between charismatic leadership and outcomes to be weaker than among subordinates with a high need for leadership. Performance outcomes will not be considered in this study, since our sample did not permit objective and comparable performance criteria to be obtained.

METHOD

Sample

In order to maximize the power of our moderator analyses, we decided to draw a large sample of working people employed by different organizations. Thus, a random sample of 4523 Dutch households in Middle Brabant (a region in the province Noord-Brabant in The Netherlands) was selected from the telephone directory and contacted by telephone. Of these, 2000 households had one or more job-holders willing to participate, who subsequently received a questionnaire. A total of 958 questionnaires were returned. The average age of the respondents was 39.2 years (SD = 9.6), the mean tenure was 10.7 years (SD = 8.9). Of the 958 respondents 291 (30.4%) were female and 665 (69.4%) were male. The educational level of the respondents in the sample shows sufficient variation.
the sample, 3.4% completed junior high school, 15.4% completed high school, 14.7% completed lower occupational training, 34.1% completed middle occupational training, 24.3% completed higher occupational training, and 8.1% were university graduates.

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

### TABLE 1
Comparison of the Labour Force in The Netherlands, Middle Brabant, and the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Sector</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Middle Brabant</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N(1,000s)$</td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>34,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public utilities</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>9,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/hotels/restaurants</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>35,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and storage</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks and insurance</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>13,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>1,951</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>48,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,960</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150,181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


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

Two different instruments have been used in the research on need for leadership, a subjective (the NL-S) and an objective part (the NL-O). The construction of the need for leadership instrument was conducted in three phases, a theoretical-rational phase, an internal-structural phase, and an external-criterion phase (Millon, 1983). In the first phase, the theoretical-rational phase, items were written on the basis of the theory involved. In this phase a judgement was made of the content of the items taking into account criteria regarding the level of complexity, the length, and the comprehensibility of the items. In the second phase, the internal-structural phase, scales from the items were tested on their internal homogeneity. Factor-analyses and reliability analyses were part of this phase. In the third phase, the external-criterion phase, the scales were correlated with external criteria, to evaluate their (convergent and discriminant) validity. Both the NL-S and the NL-O contained adequate reliability and validity. In this study the NL-S has a Cronbach alpha of 0.93 and the NL-O of 0.94. The instruments are fully described in De Vries (1997).

The scale measuring charismatic leadership is a reduced version of Bass’s (1985a) scale measuring transformational leadership. Den Hartog et al. (1994, 1997) factor-analysed a 40-item Dutch version of the transformational leadership scales. The first factor contained 18 items and represented inspirational leadership. This scale had a Cronbach alpha of 0.95. Eleven items with high item-total correlations were selected for the scale used in our study. We renamed the scale “charismatic leadership”, because the items strongly resemble the items derived from the first factor in Bass’s (1985a, pp. 207–210) original factor analysis of the transformational leadership scales, which was originally named “charismatic leadership”. In our study this scale has an alpha of 0.93. It should be noted that the items representing charismatic leadership describe different domains. In contrast with human- and task-oriented leadership, which clearly describe leadership behaviours, some of the charismatic leadership items resemble personality traits (e.g. “My supervisor projects a powerful, dynamic and magnetic presence”), some describe behaviours (e.g. “My supervisor mobilizes a collective sense of mission”), some describe subordinate affects (e.g. “I have complete confidence in my supervisor”), and some describe subordinate perceptions (e.g. “In my mind, my supervisor is a symbol of success and accomplishment”).

The employee outcome variables used in this study are: job satisfaction, organizational commitment, work stress, and role conflict. As indicated in Table 2, the reliabilities of these outcome variables are adequate, ranging from 0.75 for role conflict to 0.81 for job satisfaction. The instruments for job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work stress have been obtained from Taillieu (1987) and were further refined and extensively described in the insurance company study (Taillieu & De Vries, 1995; Taillieu, Van der Wielen, De Vries,
The job satisfaction scale contains 11 items. It consists of items which denote the degree of satisfaction derived from the level of variation, autonomy, responsibility in the job, career possibilities, salary, and interaction with colleagues. An example of an item is: “I am satisfied with the amount of variation in my job”. The scale has a Cronbach alpha of 0.81.

The scale for organizational commitment consists of six items. Examples of items used are: “I would change company, if another were to offer me a higher salary” (reversely scored), “I feel at home in my company”, and “I praise my organization when talking to acquaintances”. The scale has a Cronbach alpha of 0.78. The scale for work stress consists of seven items as used in the cross-sectional study. Examples of items are: “I have to hurry to finish my work in time”, “I often cannot cope with the amount of work”, “This work is putting a strain on my health”, and “This work requires a great deal of effort”. The scale has a Cronbach alpha of 0.77.

Role conflict was measured using the instrument of Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970). Role conflict is viewed in terms of incompatibility between organizational demands and own values, problems of personal resource allocation, conflict between obligations to several other people, and conflict between excessively numerous or difficult tasks. The scale consists of eight items. Alpha coefficients reported range from 0.56 to 0.82 (Cook, Hepworth, Wall, & Warr, 1981). In our cross-sectional study the scale has a Cronbach alpha of 0.75.

Analyses

To obtain the relation between charismatic leadership and need for leadership, we computed Pearson correlations between the variables. To find moderator effects we used a modified version of the Hierarchical or Moderated Multiple

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of items</th>
<th>Cronbach α</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic leadership</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>32.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for leadership (NL-S)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>44.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for leadership (NL-O)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>56.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>42.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>22.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work stress</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>21.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role conflict</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>19.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aLikert (1–5) completely disagree–completely agree scales were used.
Regression (MMR) procedure suggested by Howell, Dorfman, and Kerr (1986). The following regression model was tested:

\[ y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x + \beta_2 z + \beta_3 xz + \varepsilon \]

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

RESULTS

Correlations

In Table 3 the results of our correlational analysis are shown. As one can see, charismatic leadership is positively correlated to both need for leadership scales. It appears that employees with charismatic leaders have a higher need for leadership than those with leaders low on charisma. This is contrary to the expectations of leadership scholars, who argue that charismatic leadership reduces the dependency of subordinates by empowering them. Furthermore, charismatic leadership is positively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and negatively related to work stress and role conflict. The sub-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charisma</th>
<th>NL-S</th>
<th>NL-O</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
<th>Work Stress</th>
<th>Role Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charisma</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL-S</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL-O</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.72**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work stress</td>
<td>−0.09*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.12**</td>
<td>−0.21**</td>
<td>−0.24**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role conflict</td>
<td>−0.15**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12**</td>
<td>−0.28**</td>
<td>−0.36**</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\( P < .05 \); **\( P < .01 \).
jective and objective need for leadership scales are strongly correlated to each other. Of the two need for leadership scales, only NL-O shows a weak positive correlation with the outcome variables work stress and role conflict. This indicates that when subordinates perceive a leader to be needed in their type of work, they are somewhat more troubled by work stress and role conflict. Last of all, the criteria are modestly to strongly correlated to each other.

Moderator Effects

The results of the hierarchical MMRs are shown in Table 4. In the table, the criteria are regressed on charismatic leadership, need for leadership, and their interaction term. The relations between charismatic leadership and the criteria are moderated in three out of four cases. In the case of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, a low need for leadership is associated with a weaker relation between charismatic leadership and criteria than a high need for leadership. The negative relation between charismatic leadership and work stress is not moderated by need for leadership. Need for leadership does act as a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2_{adj}$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$%^a$</th>
<th>$\Delta F$</th>
<th>$\beta^c$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion: Job satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic leadership</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>220.58</td>
<td>0.52***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for leadership</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>−0.11***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>0.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion: Organizational commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic leadership</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>214.01</td>
<td>0.50***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for leadership</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>−0.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>0.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion: Work stress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic leadership</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>−0.12***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for leadership</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>0.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>−0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion: Role conflict</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic leadership</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>−0.20***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for leadership</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>0.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>−0.09*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$% of net explained variance explained by particular independent variable; $^b$when $F > 3.84$, $P < .05$; when $F > 6.63$, $P < .01$. $^c$fully standardized final $\beta$s; i.e. when all variables are in the equation.

*$P < .05$, **$P < .01$, ***$P < .001$. 
moderator of the negative relation of charismatic leadership to role conflict. With a low need for leadership, again, the relation between charismatic leadership and role conflict is weaker than with a high need for leadership. The first research question can thus be answered positively. In three out of four cases (low) need for leadership makes the relation between charismatic leadership and criteria less strong.

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Our results show that charismatic leadership and need for leadership are related to each other. Subordinates with charismatic leaders have a higher need for leadership than subordinates with noncharismatic leaders. Furthermore, need for leadership moderated the relation between charismatic leadership and three of our four outcome variables. A lower need for leadership was associated with a weaker relation between charismatic leadership and the outcome variables in our study.

Our findings seem to contradict the ideas about transformational leadership and socialized charisma, but some clarifications on charismatic and transformational leadership concepts on the one hand, and personalized and socialized charisma on the other, are needed before we can conclude that this really is the case. First of all, when looking at the similarities and differences between charismatic and transformational leadership, according to Bass (1985a), charisma is a necessary, but not sufficient, component of transformational leadership. Although, just as charismatic leaders, transformational leaders may arouse strong emotions and identification, they may also serve as a coach, mentor or teacher of subordinates. Transformational leaders may make subordinates independent from the leaders by empowering them (Kuhnert, 1994; Yammarino, 1994). According to Yammarino (1994, p. 46), “Ultimately, the most successful transformational leaders, regardless of organizational level, are those who have made their followers, colleagues, and even superiors ... leaders in their own right”. Kuhnert (1994, p. 23) even sees it as a moral responsibility of leaders to develop their subordinates. In his words, “leaders must aspire to more than just getting others to follow: They must see the development of their associates as their personal responsibility if the organization is to grow and maximize its potential”. In other words, charisma itself seems to be neutral with respect to subordinate empowerment while transformational leadership should lead to subordinate development and empowerment.

Second, a distinction has been made between personalized and socialized charisma. Leaders who are exemplified by their personalized (rather than socialized) charisma resist empowering subordinates in order to maintain their

---

2 In fact, this implies that room is left for unsuccessful transformational leaders, who do not turn followers into leaders.
own base of power (Howell, 1988, in Bass & Avolio, 1990). Bass and Avolio (1990, p. 242) state that “Transformational leaders, although viewed as charismatic, gain greater levels of long-term performance by developing followers to a higher level of autonomy.” This would imply that transformational leaders show socialized charisma, which results in empowered subordinates. Personalized charisma, on the other hand, results in greater subordinate dependency and less empowerment. With empowerment, dependency, or need for leadership as a criterion, we could construct the following three clusters of charismatic leaders. On the one side are personalized charismatics, who have dependent subordinates with a high need for leadership; in the middle are “neutral” charismatics, whose subordinates are neither dependent nor independent; and on the other side are socialized charismatics or transformational leaders, who have empowered subordinates with a low need for leadership.

Given these distinctions, our results can be explained in different ways. First, we may have measured personalized charisma, and the findings are in line with expectations. Second, we may have measured “neutral” charisma or even socialized (transformational) charisma, and the findings are not in line with expectations. Third, it could be argued that need for leadership is different from empowerment and subordinate (in-)dependency, and that no conclusion can be reached. The last explanation can be ruled out, as De Vries (1997) has shown that need for leadership is negatively related to subordinate experience and need for independence. Furthermore, need for leadership has been validated with Martin’s (1983) changes in supervision. The more subordinates were willing to work independently without a supervisor, the lower their need for leadership. As a result, we believe that empowered subordinates have a lower need for leadership. The first possibility can be discarded as well. It does not seem likely that we have measured personalized charisma as the items are derived from the transformational factor of Bass’s Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Den Hartog et al., 1997). The items used in our study resemble the items from Bass’s (1985a) original charismatic leadership scale, and they are part of the transformational scales in later studies of Bass and co-workers. Consequently, it would seem as if we have measured socialized charisma or transformational leadership instead. However, close scrutiny of the items reveals that they are neutral with respect to the motivation and goals (socialized or personalized) of the leader, which suggests that we have measured “neutral” charisma. Still, “neutral” charisma is related to a stronger need for leadership, which may be contrary to expectations of transformational leadership researchers. Whether socialized (transformational) leadership itself is actually related to a stronger need for leadership is a subject of further study.

Some other issues should be raised in considering the results of this study. In the first place, we cannot be absolutely sure about the exact nature of the relationship between charismatic leadership and need for leadership. Viewed from a behavioural perspective, charismatic leadership can instil a higher need in
subordinates. There may also be some reciprocity between these two variables. With a higher need for leadership, subordinates may also attribute more charisma to their leader, as would be suggested by attributional theorists. A longitudinal study should help to ascertain which of these propositions is closer to the truth. In the second place, the significant interaction effects found accounted for an average of only 1% of the total variance in the criterion. We should be wary, though, in dismissing a finding like this as insignificant. According to Cohen (1988), an explained variance of 1% is small, yet it is approximately equivalent to the difference in mean height between 15- and 16-year old girls. Since most of the effect sizes of the leader characteristics on the criteria are small to medium in size, with a relation hovering on the average between 0.2 and 0.3, an interaction effect accounting for 1% of the variance also means that for subjects scoring very low on the moderator, there is virtually no relation between the predictor and the criterion, whereas at high scores, the relation between the predictor and criterion is very strong (i.e. approximately 0.4 to 0.5).
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A Commentary on “On Charisma and Need for Leadership”
by Reinout de Vries, Robert Roe, and Tharsi Taillieu

Half a century ago Irving Knickerbocker (1948) set forth a leadership conceptualization based on leadership and follower need satisfaction. Hunt (1957) proposed an empirical work related to Knickerbocker’s conceptual notion. In the 1960s, Beer (1966) conducted an empirical study relating several dimensions of leadership to various aspects of the need satisfaction of followers. The latest transfiguration of this leadership and needs linkage appears in the need for leadership concept articulated in the present article.

This long-standing intuitive appeal of notions related to need for leadership is also shown by the earlier literature emphasizing follower leadership preferences, either implicitly or explicitly (e.g. Fleishman, 1973; House, 1973; House, Filley, & Gujarati, 1971; Nealey & Blood, 1968). Indeed, Yukl (1971) formulated a model which postulated that follower satisfaction with the leader would be a function of the difference between a follower’s leadership preference and the leader’s behaviour. That model was related to the more general attitudinal discrepancy models of that time proposed by a number of investigators (e.g. Porter, 1962; Wood, 1970).
Such preferences studies go back as far as the late 1950s (e.g. Hemphill, 1957) although their heyday was in the 1960s and early 1970s. Some of the studies used discrepancy scores similar to the Yukl model above (e.g. Beer, 1966; Hemphill, 1957). Others treated preference and behaviour interactively in a manner similar to the current need for leadership study (e.g. Foa, 1957; Mannheim, Rim, & Grinberg, 1967). Finally, in the early 1970s, Hunt and Liebscher (1973) did a study comparing different discrepancy models with an interactive preference model and with a simple model of perceived behaviour with no preferences. Ultimately usage of these kinds of models faded as statistical problems with discrepancy scores became more obvious (e.g. Edwards, 1994). However, the more general underlying notion appears alive and well in its newly emerging need for leadership form.

Aside from my retrospective perspective, which I like to emphasize in commentaries such as this, my next thought was that the need for leadership concept was probably not broad enough—it needed to be embedded in one of the leadership contingency approaches. Substitutes for leadership (e.g. Kerr & Jermier, 1978) immediately came to mind, followed shortly by path-goal theory (e.g. House, 1973, 1996) and situational leadership theory (Hersey & Blanchard, 1984). Relatedly, but with a charismatic twist, Meindl’s romance of leadership notion and RLS (Romance of Leadership) measure (Meindl & Ehrlich, 1988) entered my thoughts, as did the work of Hunt, Boal, and Dodge (1997).

However, I was fortunate enough to have a copy of De Vries’ (1997) dissertation at hand and quickly discovered that in that dissertation, though not in the present article, most of these models had already been considered. Indeed, De Vries developed a conceptual model that did the very kind of embedding that first crossed my mind. It focused on follower task and organizational characteristics as these predicted the need for leadership and criteria and then related the need for leadership to leadership itself, reciprocally, and interactively between leadership and criteria. In so doing, the model set the stage for showing the role of need for leadership and various aspects of leadership substitutes as well as providing a broad gauge contingency framework allowing for numerous variables. Need for leadership provides a less abstract explanatory mechanism than has previously been used in the substitutes literature (see Hunt, 1991; Yukl, 1998, for the role of level of abstraction in the leadership literature).

Since this model has already been treated at great length in the dissertation, I will not rehash that here, even though the dissertation model did not emphasize charismatic leadership per se. What I will do is focus on a number of points raised by the current article either explicitly or implicitly in the charismatic context. I think these, rather than the 1% incremental criterion variance, are the concept’s major contribution, just as I think reinvigoration of the field has been transformational/charismatic leadership’s major contribution to the leadership area—even more than specific findings (Hunt, 1998).
DISCUSSION POINTS

For openers I couldn’t help thinking about Meindl’s (1990) notion of the romance of leadership, mentioned earlier. The authors mention Meindl’s “follower-centered theory of leadership” and its consistency with their need for leadership concept. An important part of Meindl’s approach has been his RLS instrument. This instrument essentially focuses on the extent to which followers attribute important occurrences to leadership as opposed to other causal agents. De Vries (1997) briefly mentions the romance of leadership notion in his dissertation but links it only indirectly with need for leadership. Here I am proposing that the relationship between need for leadership and romance of leadership be further explored, both conceptually and empirically using each of the scales. The RLS scale has begun to attract the attention of scholars beyond Meindl and its linkage with need for leadership seems natural, to me. Such work, among other things, could shed additional light on the follower-centric situational leadership model concerns of the present authors.

In a similar manner, I was struck by De Vries’ (1997) discussion of Hersey and Blanchard’s (1984) situational leadership model in his dissertation (although it was not mentioned in the current article). The model essentially argues that follower maturity moderates the response to leadership. The approach has been extremely popular among practitioners (Yukl, 1998) and, like preference approaches, has considerable intuitive appeal. However, there has not been much empirical work and what has been done has not been very supportive.

Need for leadership seems to me to provide a potentially more operational way to get at a concept similar to that of maturity (which does not have the careful empirical work that has gone into the need for leadership scale). What is really needed is a dynamic or at least a comparative statics longitudinal approach (e.g. Hunt, 1991). The dynamic approach is similar to a motion picture where the temporal process in moving from one time period to another is the central focus (Hunt, 1991, p. 280). The comparative statics approach is similar to a series of snapshots with the time periods between clearly identified (Hunt, 1991, p. 279). Either longitudinal approach also would call for modified conceptualization based on charismatic or transformational leadership as opposed to the task and relations dimensions in the original model. However, particularly if we think temporally and in terms of transformational leadership, such conceptualization and empirical work seems readily doable using the need for leadership scales in place of maturity.

Still another point, and one that pervades the charisma and transformational literature in general, is concerned with the criteria. Here, and in the broader literature, criteria seem to be used almost indiscriminately. It is almost as if charisma will predict any criterion equally well. In the present study there is some discrimination between satisfaction/involvement and stress/conflict. However, underdeveloped is the conceptualization concerning the specifics of why
these specific criteria were chosen and how and why they should be related to charisma and need for leadership. Missing here, of course, is any semblance of an effectiveness measure and how, specifically, need for leadership should help charisma to predict these. Although the authors indicate an awareness of this lack of an effectiveness measure in their study, future work needs to address this concern. Along with effectiveness, it would be useful to use such measures as turnover and absenteeism, commitment, and other aspects of human resource maintenance criteria (Hunt, 1991). A number of these have been used in the transformational literature (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996).

At the same time, both the literature and the authors tend to treat the kinds of criteria used here as if they were independent. The authors’ correlation matrix shows varying relationships among these from moderate to strong. For some of our work we took commonly used measures in the charisma literature and found that factor analyses reduced the number of criteria considerably (see Hunt & Boal, 1996). The point here is that many criteria treated separately in the literature are really interrelated. I conclude from all of this that, future work should focus on an underlying framework relating criteria to each other and showing linking mechanisms among charisma, need for leadership, and the classes of criteria.

Related to the above arguments is a model called the “individual performance equation” by John Schermerhorn and colleagues (e.g. Martin, Schermerhorn, & Larson, 1989; Schermerhorn, Hunt, & Osborn, 1991), based on related work. The importance of that model here and for charismatic leadership in general is that it starts with a focus on performance and then works back to consideration of follower capacity, willingness, and opportunity to perform. Each of these three areas includes a number of aspects, and different components of leadership enter into the areas as appropriate. In some ways this model is not unlike the dissertation model mentioned earlier but, as indicated, one critical difference is the current model’s performance orientation and those aspects of the setting required to obtain it.

An additional point is raised by the authors and seems to be of increasing importance in the literature. That point concerns charisma, transformation, and empowerment. The authors do a nice job of focusing on this issue and, in effect, deriving a simple three-cluster model of personalized charismatics with dependent followers, neutral charismatics with neither dependent nor independent followers, and socialized leaders (termed “transformational” by the authors) with empowered followers possessing a low need for leadership. Here, it seems to me as the authors suggest, that their construct can help shed light on this increasingly important topic, where the focus has ranged from autocratic charismatics to empowering ones, and from positive charismatics to negative charismatics. (For more on this topic, see Bass, 1990; Yukl, 1998.)

Another point concerns the question of the specificity of the need for leadership measure. This is a point that De Vries (1997) himself raises in his
dissertation. It seems quite reasonable, as he argues there, to start with an overall measure such as reported there and here. Ultimately, one may want to consider such aspects as a need for charisma, a need for structure, a need for supportiveness, and the like. Interestingly, such a breakdown would lead one closer to the preference models mentioned earlier. While such models are not generally used any longer, per se, their reincarnation in need for leadership measures might be a useful move.

A final point, for me, that this article suggests both implicitly and explicitly, is the question of additional charismatic moderators. The authors argue that there is very little in the literature on this. I would agree, but would add some of the suggestions made by Bryman (1992) and even more detailed ones by Pawar and Eastman (1997). These latter authors do a thorough review of the literature, including much macro- and some micro-literature and develop a proposed set of “preliminary contextual factors”. The authors cover what they call the “inner context”, consisting of organizational structure, culture, strategy, and related aspects. This kind of framework is much broader than simply using need for leadership as a moderator and includes both moderators and mediators. It is perhaps more in the spirit of the earlier mentioned dissertation model, but is more macro and less micro. I mention it here to convey the flavour of how far some authors have gone in considering various kinds of contingencies for charismatic and transformational leadership.

CONCLUDING COMMENTARY

I now conclude with a few additional comments. First, it has been contended that leadership makes no difference (Pfeffer, 1977). However, I have argued earlier (Hunt, 1991) that that statement, though provocative, is not the point. The point is, “under what conditions (why, where, when, and how) does leadership make a difference”? The current article and De Vries’ (1997) dissertation help us focus on the conditions under which charisma might make a difference—how much need for leadership among followers is there (why, when, where, and how), and how might that need be related to criteria.

Second, the article hints at the relational emphasis stressed in the recent Klein and House (1995) article. Such an emphasis focuses on the dynamic relationship across time between charisma and other variables. One of these could well be need for leadership.

Finally, as De Vries points out in his (1997) dissertation, a major contribution of need for leadership is to show what it can add to current work. In this he echoes the arguments of those such as Mook (1983) concerning lab studies—they show what can happen. I would simply modify this a bit by saying that for me a major contribution of the current study has been to show what might be. The “what might be” is suggested by much of my previous discussion. Need for leadership has stimulated it.
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