University of New Orleans Theses and Dissertations

Dissertations and Theses

# Charismatic Leadership Perceptions from K-12 Administrators: Phenomena of Follower and Leader Interdependency

Lucinda G. Martinez
*University of New Orelans*, lgmarti1@uno.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uno.edu/td

Part of the Educational Leadership Commons, and the Other Educational Administration and Supervision Commons

Charismatic Leadership Perceptions from K-12 Administrators:
Phenomena of Follower and Leader Interdependency


A Dissertation




Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
University of New Orleans
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of




Doctor of Philosophy
in
Educational Administration




by

Lucinda G. Martinez

B.A. Nicholls State University, 1999
M.Ed. Nicholls State University, 2002

December 2017

## Dedication

To my husband, Joseph, without whose emotional support, encouragement, and belief in me this dissertation would not have been completed.

To James E. Barr who implanted a research foundation within me and provided enlightenment when I hit a wall.

To Louis V. Paradise whose foresight and expert commentary advised my progress.

# Table of Contents

# List of Tables

# Abstract

A greater understanding of the nature of leadership can be gained by empirical analyses, such as this quantitative study, addressing the influence executive administrators have on their message recipients, their followers. This study sampled 64 non-teaching K-12 school, district, and state administrators and measured their perceptions of their immediate supervisors' leadership behaviors by completing the ©*Conger-Kanungo Charismatic Leadership Scale* (Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 1997) and the ©*Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory* (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000). Analyses of variables measuring perceived leadership behaviors and those effects on the attitudes and perceptions of their followers may contribute to a better understanding of the phenomena of non-teaching administrator follower and leader interdependency in K-12 organizations. Leaders can develop more refined leadership skill characteristics that might enhance ones' abilities in communicating exemplary characteristics and charismatic behaviors. In turn, these refined abilities can contribute to an organization's effectiveness by lowering leader and teacher attrition, promoting team building and bonding, and contribute to K-12 administrative leadership development program effectiveness. A General Linear Model with multivariate tests analyses were used to examine correlations between the charismatic leadership behavioral components and the followers' perceptions of their own motivation, trust, and satisfaction. A significant correlation existed ($p$ = <.000) between the entire CK Leadership Scale (Conger et al., 1997) items and the listed CK Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (Conger et al., 2000) items. Correlations ($p$ = <.00) showed statistically significant relationships were found between the followers' empowerment and the perceptions of reverence, trust, and satisfaction with their leaders. Follower empowerment also correlated significantly with leadership vision and articulation, and satisfaction with the leader.

Keywords: Charismatic Leadership; Follower Effects; Follower/Leader Interdependency; Follower Empowerment; Conger and Kanungo

Chapter 1

Introduction

Leaders need followers – they need to inspire those who can assist them in achieving goals and in working towards accomplishing organizational objectives. Different groups of followers require different attributes in a leader. It is not one attribute, but several traits, skills and behaviors used in concert by leaders that inform leadership success (Conger, 2012; English, 1997; Goff, 2003; Khoury, 2006; Stogdill, 1948; Weber, 1968b). Lunenburg and Ornstein (1996) noted that early in the 20th century, scientific studies of leadership attempted to isolate and identify the physical traits and personality characteristics that reliably differentiated leaders from non-leaders. They found that most school administrators' leadership practices and behaviors were theory based. For the past century, the nature of charisma and its relevance to organizational contexts and followers has been discussed (e.g., Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009; Bass, 1985, 2008; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000; Rumsey, 2012; Sohm, 1895/1958; Weber, 1947, 1968a). More recent interest and research into charisma in organizational leadership applications and followership is emerging (e.g., Anderson & Sun, 2017; Dinh et al., 2014; Caughron & Friedrich, 2008; Gardner, Lowe, Moss, Mahoney, & Cogliser, 2010). A brief summary of this research on charismatic leadership provides a background to this study on follower perceptions of charismatic leadership behaviors.

Researchers investigating the differences between managership and leadership addressed organizational issues and stated that managership was supervisory in nature (Campbell, 2012; House, 1995; Kanungo & Mendonca, 1996; Zaleznik, 1990). They concluded that leadership needed to address empowerment of the employees. Conger and Kanungo (1998) noted that it was not until the 1980s that "a genuine interest in studying the phenomenon of charismatic leadership in organizations" (p. 3) became apparent among social scientists and organizational theorists. Interest in the topic of charismatic leadership has contributed to the

development of comprehensive theories that have encouraged empirical studies (Bass, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1987, 1988). Sandberg and Moreman (2015) tribute Conger and Kanungo as contributing "seminal work" (p. 2) in charismatic leadership as a behavioral process. The Conger and Kanungo (1987) conceptual framework that can influence the development of charismatic leadership identified four variables:

> [1] the degree of discrepancy between the status quo and the future goal or vision advocated by the leader, [2] the use of innovative and unconventional means for achieving the desired change, [3] a realistic assessment of environmental resources and constraints for bringing about such change, and [4] the nature of articulation and impression management employed to inspire subordinates in the pursuit of the vision. (p. 640).

Their framework linked organizational contexts to charismatic leadership by identifying theoretical hypotheses. They hypothesized that charismatic leadership was, from the views of the followers, observable behavior(s) that were describable and analyzable. Moreover, the components of charismatic leadership were interrelated and varied in intensity among different leaders.

Bass (1990) reassessed Stogdill's 1948 survey noting five dimensions of personality traits perceived by both the leaders in supervisory capacities and their followers. Bass (2008) explained that by 2006 the extensive development in charismatic leadership since Weber introduced the concept in the early twentieth century contributed to charisma as "a frequent topic of empirical research" (p. 617). He concluded that the essential attributes of charismatic leader-follower interdependency are that charismatic leaders be self-confident, determined, of strong conviction, and emotionally expressive -- and that the followers "must want to identify with the leaders as persons" (p. 617). Bass stated that extraordinary performance of followers is "generated" by charismatic leaders, and that charismatic leaders' followers are "more susceptible … in their readiness to identify with it and accept its mystique" (p. 617).

Bass (2008) distinguished between charismatic and transformational leadership behavioral attributes and noted that charismatic leaders also formulate and articulate visions and goals (Bass & Avolio, 1993; Conger & Kanungo, 1998). In 1988, Conger and Kanungo proposed that when subordinates feel powerless, the need for leaders to empower them becomes crucial. Their critical analyses of the literature resulted in the identification of context factors contributing to a sense of powerlessness or lowered perception of self-efficacy. These factors fell into four categories: organizational factors, supervisory style, reward systems, and job design. Conger and Kanungo noted that identifying and correcting organizational conditions contributing to subordinate feelings of powerlessness may influence task perseverance and may motivate subordinates to reach higher performance goals. In 2005, Sullivan and Shulman stated that still more study of charismatic leadership and perceived follower efficacy was needed.

This study employed the Conger-Kanungo Charismatic Leadership Scale (Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 1997) and the Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000). Conger and Kanungo (1994) noted that the follower perspective from which leadership phenomena is viewed contributed to the confusion in identifying charismatic leadership behavioral attributes. They postulated that individuals choose to follow leaders not only based on formal authority, but also due to the followers' perceptions of the charismatic behaviors of the leader. Charismatic attributes may be perceived by some followers and not others – charisma is "in the eye of the beholder" (Campbell, 2012, p. 27). Charismatic authority, as interpreted by Conger and Kanungo, is informal authority developed through human inter-relationships. The authors stated that the relational demands of charismatic authority require that leaders be perceived as, and sensitive to, addressing the needs of their followers (Conger 2011). This informal arrangement contributes to the bonding and commitment of followers to the leader -- in essence: a commitment from the follower to follow the leader (Conger & Kanungo, 1994). Conger (2012) stated that leaders communicate and articulate to their followers to relate organizational vision, goals, and to meet the needs of the followers, and

that followers perceiving charisma in leaders develop trust and collective identity. The authors concluded that followers choose to follow leaders in managerial positions based on the followers' perceptions of the leader. They noted that the identification of elements of charismatic leadership behaviors could lead to the ability of managers to develop those charismatic attributes.

Judge, Woolf, Hurst, and Livingston (2008) noted the dominance of charismatic leadership as a concept in organizational behavior, and that *neo-charismatic* was the "single-most dominant paradigm" to emerge (Gardner, Lowe, Moss, Mahoney, & Cogliser, 2010, p. 936). Fabbi (2012) showed that training of leaders in charismatic communication behaviors significantly ($p < .01$) increased the leadership communication behavioral scores of the trained over the non-trained (p. 114). The trained leaders rated increased charismatic communication self-efficacy illustrating that the ability to train leaders in charismatic behaviors is possible. Antonakis, Fenley, and Liechti (2011) found that charisma could be taught (p. 392), and suggested that charismatic leaders would probably be rated highly and, thus, be promoted to higher leadership levels (p. 384). Antonakis and House (2013) state that there is a need for studies identifying how to develop charisma.

Communication studies of business practices of messaging began to only recently be addressed to the degree that it deserves academically (Godhwani, 2017, p. 11). Godhwani stated that "few studies have been done on the effects leaders have on followers" (p. 66). Moreover, above average abilities to share a vision along with high levels of trust of the leader are important follower responses linking the effectiveness of a leader with one's communication skills. Thus, leader behavior is linked to follower effects through follower self-concepts (Godhwani, 2017; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993) and may be realized by the followers' role modeling of the leader; the potential measure of charisma is how a leader makes the followers feel (Antonakis, Fenley& Liechti, 2011). Studies showing what perceptions of leader behavior resulting in positive follower effects can contribute to training of leaders in promoting these

behaviors and increase follower effects of collective identity and empowerment, as noted by Antonakis et al. (2011). Bass (1985) indicated further study is needed addressing the possibilities of behavioral dimensions of charismatic leaders and follower effects. The empirical evidence from this study will address that gap in the literature.

Leithwood, Day, Sammons, Harris and Hopkins' (2006) theoretical review of successful leadership noted a leader's "setting directions" and building a shared vision as compelling tasks of leadership models; they stated Harris and Chapman (2002) noted the importance of "cooperation and alignment of others to [the leader's] values and vision" (pg. 34). Leithwood et al. contended that much time of school leaders is spent towards leader relationship behaviors noted by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) -- encouraging teachers' cooperation in working towards common goals (p. 35). Leithwood, Jantzi and Steinbach (1999) stated that leadership and management may be complementary concepts, and that there is an assumption that leaders are able to master a large group of various leadership practices (p. 18). Zaleznik (1990, 2004) explained this consideration of differences, between leadership and managership was a leader's ability to maintain a sense of self which sets him or her apart from the organization and enables the leader to intuitively relate to, and be perceived by, followers as the leader. However, it is important to understand that one individual can incorporate both functions, and use both approaches. Hooper (2017) noted the difficulty of organizations combining management and leadership roles, as did Gosling and Mintzberg (2003), suggesting Kotter's (1990) possibilities of an organization's abilities to develop "leader-managers" (p. 13).

Much criticism explaining the importance, or lack thereof, of charismatic leadership has been offered in the literature. Differences in the ability to measure and define charisma contributed to misinterpretations of charismatic leadership as a concept (Yukl, 1999, 2010). House (1999) stated that the effects of charismatic leadership on the followers as individuals were made of much greater import than the effects upon the followers as groups or the organization's performance. Sandberg and Moreman (2015) contended that there were gaps in

5

the literature addressing the nature of charismatic leadership at organizational levels that could lead to an understanding of the importance of charisma, since Conger and Kanungo identified it as behavioral. The abundance of recent transformational leadership scholarship investigating educators and institutional effectiveness speaks to the need for investigation of charismatic leadership in education (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005).

Decades of research (Bass, 2008, Stogdill, 1948, Yukl, 1994) has focused on the corporate executive, and middle- or lower-level managerial realms of leadership[1], the contexts of teacher leadership[2], school effectiveness (student outcomes) leadership[3], or military leadership[4]. Sigmund Freud (1922/1939) began early investigations into the impact charismatic leaders had on their followers, as did Fromm (1941). Shamir, Zakay, Breinin and Popper (1998) noted that the behaviors and effects of charismatic leadership in hierarchical organizations whose leaders relate with others in multiple constituencies, other than solely with subordinates, required further study. Howell and Shamir (2005) suggested the need for further study of intragroup variances differing relationships between leaders within same groups or organizations. School principals perform roles similar to middle managers (Bass, 2008, p. 658). They are appointed to positions of formal authority, and many of the tasks in which they engage, such as managing resources and allocating staff to fulfill plans, are supervisory or compliance-oriented in nature.

In the specific context of this study, the perceptions of follower effects and efficacy from the perceived charismatic leadership behaviors in differing K-12 school leadership relationships were analyzed. Campbell (2012) noted that in 2009 Avolio, Walumbwa, and Weber stated that

---

[1] See, for example, Bass, Waldman, Avioli, and Bebb (1987), Bryman, (1993), Crant and Bateman (2000), O'Reilly, (1984), Smith (1982).
[2] See, for example, Beachum and Dentith (2004), Hammerly-Fletcher and Brundrett (2005), McEwen, Carlisle, Knipe, Neil, & McClune (2002).
[3] See, for example, Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach (1999).
[4] See, for example, Boyd, (1989), Clover (1989), Shamir, Zakay, Breinen, and Popper (1998), Yammarino and Bass (1989).

the perceptions of the follower could produce reactions. Avolio et. al. concurred with Shamir (2007) and noted that there was a gap of followership [acceptance of the leader] and leadership [behavior] effectiveness studies. However, Campbell commented that great consistency across leadership theories and models, from 1950 to the present, shows what constitutes leadership performance (behavior) structures that can be applied to any organizational level, and that these consistencies converge back to Weber, House, Bass, Burns, Shamir, House and Arthur, Conger and Kanungo, and Yukl (2012, pp. 8-9). Campbell stated that there has been a paradigm shift in leadership theory that has revitalized the field and the "reformation of charismatic leadership" (p. 14) and that leadership effectiveness can be measured by reactions of superiors or subordinates. Moreover, that the measure can include job satisfaction, group or unit commitment, self-efficacy, and accomplishment of important goals, among other indicators. He contended that some behavior items include follower reactions -- the perceptions of what the leader is communicating to them through his or her behaviors.

Campbell (2012) stated that leadership is the responsibility of usually one person at the hierarchal top, such as a supervisor, manager, or executive, as noted by Yukl and Lepsinger (2005), and that each follower decides what behavioral actions of a leader are relevant to him or her. Campbell noted the focus of charismatic leadership concepts in the current literature, and the importance of articulating (communicating) vision, goals, and empowering followers of all the models as being complementary in addressing leadership effectiveness; that leadership effectiveness equates to organizational goal achievement. This study contributes new research of charismatic leadership and follower effects in educational settings.

Conger, Kanungo, and Menon (2000) noted an absence of empirical studies linking charismatic leadership behavioral dimensions with specific effects, such as the attitudes in followers, and suggested further studies using their scale might record these effects, and that reverence of the leader may be due to other factors. They suggested that not grouping dependent variables as they had might produce different patterns. It is unknown how

representative the Conger et al. sample was in relationship to the population of corporate management at the time. Moreover, the sample was not inclusive of highly educated management -- only "80 percent had a least a college degree" (p. 753). This investigation measuring perceptions of school administrator leadership behaviors and the perceptions of the followers of those in leadership tiers above them can contribute to the relevance of the specific nature of charisma in K-12 organizational non-teaching administrator contexts. All respondents in the current study held a college degree.

**Purpose of the Study**

The researcher looked to identify what defines a *leader* based on business and educational profession definitions, rather than using Drucker's very broad definition, "the only definition of a leader is someone who has followers" (Bariso, 2015, July 30). The Business Dictionary (2017) defines a *leader* as "a person or thing that holds a dominant or superior position within its field, and is able to exercise a high degree of control or influence over others." This, too, is a broad definition. The educational leadership Organization for Cooperation and Development (OECD) publication by Pont, Nusch, and Moorman (2008) addressed the globalization of improving school leadership. OECD is a unique international forum of 30 countries including the United States. They stated that the terms *school leadership*, *school management*, and *school administration* are often used interchangeably. They defined school leaders as "principals, deputy and assistant principals, leadership teams, [and] school governing boards" (p. 18), noting that principal, headmaster, director, and head of school were used interchangeably. Also included as leaders were professional school-level personnel, officers of K-12 schools, entities operating K-12 schools, local educational agencies, or those "responsible for the daily instructional leadership and managerial operations in the . . . school building" (Pont, et al., p. 17). Executive and upper management professionals in K-12 schools were selected for inclusion in the study based on the above definition of educational *leader*. The perceptions of the effects of higher ranking leader behaviors on the attitudes and behaviors of educational

administrators who are followers could provide an understanding of the phenomena of administrator follower and leader interdependency in K-12 public educational organizations. Results of this study targeting non-teaching K-12 administrators of Louisiana schools and school districts may increase leader and follower understanding, and contribute to the success of K-12 administrative leadership developmental programs. Moreover, these data may indicate parameters for a new model of line, administrative school leadership.

The perceptions of charismatic leadership behaviors of the respondents' immediate supervisors from the point of view of non-teaching Louisiana K-12 school administrators from assistant principals all the way to school board, system, or state officials holding advanced degrees were investigated. Furthermore, the effects of charismatic leadership upon the followers, as groups, were included in the study. These perceptions were correlated with the respondents' perceived feelings of collective identity, group performance, and empowerment. Analyses of variables measuring perceived leadership behaviors and perceived effects on the attitudes and perceptions of their followers can contribute to better understanding of the phenomena of follower and leader interdependency.

Building on Antonakis, Fenley, and Liechti (2011), Conger, Kanungo, and Menon (2000), Fabbi (2012), Fox, Gong, and Attoh (2015), and Godhwani (2017), this study will use variables found to be valid and reliable, as indicated by studies (see Chapter 2, Validation and Reliability). School principals perform roles similar to middle managers (Bass, 2008, p. 658). They are appointed to positions of formal authority, and many of the tasks in which they engage, such as managing resources and allocating staff to fulfill plans, are supervisory or compliance-oriented in nature. Bass noted that leadership -- the capacity to motivate, influence, and enable others towards their contributing to the success and effectiveness of the organization -- was not a consequence of position but rather a commitment spontaneously granted or awarded by one's followers (p. 23). Leadership became associated with the ability to produce overarching changes that adapted to an organization's needs and evolving long-term strategies and mission.

Leadership generated employee commitment to meeting changes in objectives, and incorporated empowering followers with the attitudes, means, and fortitude to accomplish long-term goals. Bass (1985) concluded that charisma and inspirational leadership are a single construct. In 2008, Bass noted that follower trust in the leader was enhanced when leadership behaviors were perceived by followers as giving meaning to followers' actions and needs.

Bligh (2017) stated that trust is "critical in relationships between leaders and followers" (p. 22), adding that the primary role of trust as an influence in leader and follower interactions has been ignored. She identified two core components: 1) *competence or ability*, perceptions that one has the skills and knowledge needed to do a job, and the skills and wisdom needed to succeed; and 2) *benevolence*, the perception that the trustee wants to do what is good or best for the trustor. The author noted Bass (1985) recognized the importance of follower trust in the leader to leadership style effectiveness, and stated that trust is the basis of authentic leadership. Bligh identified the leader behaviors of trustworthiness as indicative antecedent variables to follower trust. An antecedent variable is one occurring prior to a response variable that may explain a relationship. She elaborated that trust behaviors include showing sensitivity to members' needs. Bligh related that experiments including behaviors of supervisors perceived as benevolent by followers had the strongest impact on follower trust. Moreover, follower job satisfaction and commitment to the organization was affected by trust, or lack thereof, in leadership that contributed to job attrition.

## Research Questions

The relationships between followers' attitudes and behaviors and their perceptions of the behavioral attributes of their immediate supervisors were examined in this study. One survey instrument that included the 20-item Conger-Kanungo (C-K) Charismatic Leadership Scale (Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 1997) and the 34-item Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000) was used to measure these perceptions. The following research questions were investigated:

*Question 1:* *What relationships exist between the perceived behavioral components of charismatic leadership and the attitudes and behaviors of the followers?*

This question was investigated using responses from both the 20-item C-K Charismatic Leadership Scale (Conger et al., 1997) and the 34-item Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (Conger et al., 2000). Using a General Linear Model, a bivariate Pearson Correlation was run between the observed leader items from the C-K Leadership Scale and the perceived behaviors items from the Leadership Behaviors Measures Inventory. To better understand follower and leader interdependency, multivariate tests were used to investigate the relationships between each leader and follower focus variable, and each dependent sub-set variable item of vision and articulation, personal risk, sensitivity to the environment, sensitivity to member needs, and unconventional behavior. For example, resourcefulness was measured by the three questions addressing personal risk taking: involvement in activities of risk pursuing organizational objectives, taking high personal risk for the organization's sake, and incurring high personal cost. The results indicated that significant correlations ($p = <.01$) existed between the perceived behavioral components of charismatic leadership and the attitudes and behaviors of the followers.

*Question 2:* *What leader behaviors contribute to the followers' perceptions of the efficacy of their leader?*

This question was investigated using responses to items from the 34-item Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (Conger et al., 2000). Each leader focus sub-set item from reverence, trust, and satisfaction with the leader was correlated by item with the responses from each of the 15 follower focus sub-set empowerment items using multivariate tests. For example, follower perceptions of empowerment, such as having the ability to influence the way work is done, or feeling inspired by the organization's goals were correlated with leader focus perceptions of one's having "complete faith in" and feeling good being around one's leader. The results indicated that significant correlations ($p = <.00$) existed between the feelings of

empowerment by the followers and the perceived leader focus items.

*Question 3:*	*What leader behaviors contribute to follower's perceptions of self-efficacy?* To investigate this question, responses from the 34-item Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (Conger et al., 2000) of each of the leader focus sub-set items of reverence, trust, and satisfaction with the leader were correlated by item with responses from each of the follower focus sub-set five collective identity items and five group performance items. For example, the perceptions of the leader focus items of having high respect or great esteem for the leader were correlated with followers feeling that they worked as a cohesive team or that group conflict was out in the open. The results indicated that significant correlations ($p$ = <.00) existed between some feelings of collective identity by the followers and some perceived leader focus items of reverence of, and satisfaction with, the leader.

## Data Use

The data were disaggregated by the demographic variable *Your administrative job level is* and the respondents scoring *Not Listed* were removed, reducing the analyses to administrators only. The review of the raw data revealed that 11 participants responded to only the demographic questions. Three other respondents did not complete the second portion of the survey, the Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000). These 14 data strings were removed prior to analyses. The preliminary review of the data tabulated responses from the electronic questionnaires by item in each sub-group and sub-set and arranged them into columns by scores indicating the numbers and percentages of responses per item. This arrangement of data permitted an *a priori* exploration of patterns of sample characteristics. General Linear Model analyses and multivariate tests of between-subject effects correlated items addressed by each research question. The specifics of these analyses are discussed in Chapter 4. The following section explains the significance of this study that the past decade of research and discussion addressed in Chapter 1. Absences of empirical studies in charismatic leadership have been noted in the literature indicating a void.

## Significance of the Study

This study investigated the links between the behavioral dimensions of charismatic leadership, such as having great esteem or admiration for the leader, and the followers' perceptions of collective identity, empowerment, and feelings of self-efficacy using .01 probability levels to indicate significance. Moreover, these quantitative analyses of variables not grouped by sub-sets and correlated by items using a General Linear Model with multivariate tests advances the knowledge of the specific nature of charisma in organizational leadership in K-12 schools. Research investigating the interdependency[5] of followers and leaders will contribute insight to understanding what K-12 administrators perceive as being necessary in choosing to follow their immediate supervisors and contribute to educational leadership effectiveness knowledge. Interdependency may be explained as an exchange relationship between the leader and follower which results in an outcome (such as trust, job satisfaction, organizational commitment), or a result (such as job performance). This understanding could inform non-teaching educational administrators in inspiring those who can assist them in achieving goals and in working towards accomplishing organizational objectives and thus, to lead more effectively. Moreover, the need for follow-up studies of the concept of charismatic leadership was suggested by Conger, Kanungo, and Menon (2000) who postulated that future studies using their scale could record perceived behavioral component effects of charismatic leaders on the attitudes and behaviors of their followers. That is essentially the approach of this study, which recorded perceived behavioral responses of leaders and the perceived effects on their followers. By investigating these relationships between components of charismatic leadership behaviors and follower trust and feelings of efficacy, a greater understanding of

---

[5] See *Winning the hearts and minds of followers: The interactive effects of followers' emotional competencies and goal setting types on trust in leadership* by L. Monzani, P. Ripoll, and J. M. Peiro, 2015, Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología, Volume 47, Issue 1, 2015, Pages 1- 15. Copyright © 2015 Fundación Universitaria Konrad Lorenz.

follower and leader interdependency may be achieved. Leaders able to be trained in or able to hone behaviors perceived by followers as inspiring and empowering can gain a greater commitment from followers in meeting organizational visions. Hooper (2017) made note that Bass (1985) and House (1977) contended that trust in followers may be an outcome of charisma of a leader.

## Limitations

The study was limited to non-teaching K-12 administrators in Louisiana schools, systems, or the state, and PK-16 Council members possessing a Master's Degree or PhD. In 1999, the Blue-Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality, formed by the Louisiana Board of Regents and the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, was charged with creating partnerships to address how to meet university growth targets for the Teacher Preparation Accountability System and the K-12 School Accountability System. The Commission recommended that universities appoint PK-16+ Councils made up of representatives from all levels of education beginning with pre-kindergarten (PK) through post-graduate school (16+). Council members can include system superintendents, assistant superintendents, other administrative staff, and members of the education and business communities. Only those sitting Council members, and not the members of the communities that they represented, were invited to participate in the study.

Respondents may be enrolled in, or alumni of, seven Louisiana Universities. They may also include administrators who were trained in other states, or by alternative providers. Since the sample was voluntary, it is unknown how proportionate the distributions of gender, age, and ethnicity of the participants was, or of what percentage of the entire state of Louisiana school administrators was the sample. The gender identity question was skipped by 55% of the respondents disallowing any gender response comparisons by the researcher. The *your immediate supervisor is* question was skipped by 50% of the respondents disallowing any correlations between supervisor to follower by title. This study relied on single-source

perceptions of leadership behaviors. However, it is possible that multiple respondents shared the same immediate supervisor. The results of the study generalized the perceptions of non-teaching K-12 administrators from an accessible population in one southern state, Louisiana.

Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

To situate charismatic leadership within the broader range of leadership theories, the literature review focuses on what Bass (2008) refers to as the *new* leadership and he devotes separate chapters to each -- charismatic and transformational leadership. Bass was an authority on leadership and wrote extensively on the subject. The review begins with a brief history of the origins of charismatic leadership, followed by the managership and leadership differences, and the newest charismatic leadership theories. Next follows a discussion of the differences and similarities of the components between charismatic and transformational leadership relevant to the study. That is followed by the seminal study of school superintendents' personality traits by Lide (1929) and Charters and Waples (1929). It continues through relevant leadership studies addressing perceivable leader behaviors (Bass, 1985, 1990; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993; and Conger, Kanungo, & Menon 2000). The review includes relevant follower empowerment studies (Beer, 1980; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1988, 1998; Conger, 1989a, 1990; Jung & Avolio, 2000, and Khoury, 2006). It continues through relevant proactive personalities studies (Crant & Batemen, 2000, and Sullivan & Shulman, 2005). The review concludes with validity and reliability studies of the C-K Charismatic Leadership Scale (Conger & Kanungo, 1987, 1994, and Conger, Kanungo, Menon & Mathur, 1997), followed by a summary.

## Origins of Charismatic Leadership

The origins of charismatic leadership begin as early as the 19th century. The legal theorist and professor of German and ecclesiastic law Rudolph Sohm (1895/1958) noted the relevance of perceived charismatic attributes for effective leadership if the follower trusted in the leader's abilities. Weber (1947) credited Sohm as the first to clarify the very substance of the concept of charisma. Weber perceived that leaders whose basis of authority is charismatic are obeyed because followers place personal trust in them and believe in their authority. Moreover,

Weber stated that what is of sole importance to charismatic leadership is the followers' perceptions of the leaders' charisma. Followers perceive the charismatic leader as being exemplary, or perceive that the leader possesses wisdom and, thus, it is these perceptions of the followers that set the charismatic leader apart. Weber termed this perception of the charismatic qualifications of a leader as *charismatic authority*.

Weber postulated that it is the charismatically qualified leader – that leader with the gift of grace – followers choose to obey. The followers instinctively recognize the charismatic leader as being qualified to lead. Moreover, it is the followers' personal trust in the leader and his or her exemplary qualities, as long as these qualities fall within the scope of the followers' beliefs, which provides the basis for authority (Weber, 1958). Weber (1968a) contended that charismatic leadership perceptions of one person might be different from the perceptions of another person. Charismatic attributes perceived by the individual follower, therefore, are self-determined by the follower. Thus, followers may or may not perceive charismatic qualities in a leader. This means that the effectiveness of a leader's ability to lead is dependent upon the perceptions by the followers of a leader. Thus, the ability to communicate ones exceptional or exemplary characteristics and charismatic behaviors to others becomes an important leadership skill.

Further investigations noted differences between managership, the profession of management, and leadership. Drucker (1985) stated that the predominantly American term *management* indicated generic function, supervision of employee productivity and achievement, and the responsibility to see to employee productivity and achievement completion. Management was not a science but a practice, and "not leadership" (Drucker, p. 17). Bass (2008) concurred, and noted that leadership -- the capacity to motivate, influence, and enable others towards their contributing to the success and effectiveness of the organization -- was not a consequence of position but rather a commitment spontaneously granted or awarded by one's followers (p. 23). Campbell (2012) concurred, and contended that leadership and management have substantive differences. That management is the acquisition and allocating of resources to

meet goals, whereas leadership addresses interpersonal influence. Moreover, neither is based on hierarchical relationships, but on the accrued effects of individuals' performance attitudes – their perceptions. Leadership became associated with the ability to produce overarching changes that adapted to an organization's needs and evolving long-term strategies and mission. Leadership generated employee commitment to meeting changes in objectives, and incorporated empowering followers with the attitudes, means, and fortitude to accomplish long-term goals. On the other hand, managership addressed overseeing immediate objectives and maintaining the status quo (Conger & Kanungo, 1998). Furthermore, researchers concluded that leaders and managers were different (Conger & Kanungo, p. 6). This resulted in the reclassification of the leadership studies conducted at Ohio State University and the University of Michigan in the 1950s and 1960s as considered managerial in focus (Conger & Kanungo, 1998). With this new view of differences between roles and tasks of managership versus leadership, researchers began to extrapolate the essence of leadership roles.

In 1978, Burns stated that leaders fall into two types – transformational or transactional. The transformational leader interacted with others in such a way as to motivate leaders and followers to higher principles and greater mutual support for accomplishing organizational objectives. This common mutual support transformed the behaviors, activities, and aspirations of both the followers and the leader, thus, transforming both. The transformational leader viewed a purpose in an organization's mission, and the need to achieve the mission. Alternatively, transactional leaders dealt with the day-to-day operations of an organization and the compliance of the employees with contractual obligations or incentives - more work for more pay, or other mutually beneficial transactions. Organizational behaviorists would determine that the roles and tasks performed in leadership are transformational and that roles and tasks of managership are transactional (Conger & Kanungo, 1998). These investigations inspired theoretical discussions of the different components of charismatic leadership.

In 2009, Avolio, Walumbwa, and Weber contended that there were new(er) genre of leadership models noting authentic leadership, leader member exchange theory, servant leadership, cross-cultural leadership, and global leadership, to name a few. Gardner, Lowe, Moss, Mahoney, and Cogliser (2010) stated that of the eight future leadership directions, only four received considerable interest, and that Transformational/Charismatic and Levels of Analysis were foremost in attention. They noted the importance of trust from the followers as a perceived leadership behavior. Anderson and Sun (2017) noted the baffling number of new leadership styles introduced in the research since 2000, and identified charismatic/transformational as the "dominant conceptualization of leadership in organizational behavior" (p. 76). They alluded to the need for consolidation of these leadership styles. Fox, Gong, and Attoh (2015) stated that charismatic leadership is integrated into authentic leadership, and elaborated that follower identification with the authentic leader is yet to be empirically tested due to its recent status in leadership development. Dinh et al., (2014) stated that because neo-charismatic theories emerged from charismatic leadership theory they can be a component of a theory or style, or stand alone. They noted that research into leadership behaviors is under-researched and they called for more interest and research into the behavioral aspects of leadership. The authors implied that more investigation is needed in the development of charismatic leadership. The identification of charismatic components and behaviors follows.

## Components of Charismatic and Transformational Leadership

Charisma has long been identified as an important component of leadership, and when transformational leadership was identified, charisma was originally included as an element of that leadership. Since Weber's (1922/1963) concept of charismatic leadership was introduced it has been defined, and re-defined by various theorists. Throughout the discourse of leadership theories, charismatic leadership has splintered from a leadership concept to an element of transformational leadership, then an element or component of other theories such as authentic

19

leadership, and returned as a singular leadership theory, as previously noted. For the purpose of

this study, some differences and similarities are presented as clarification for the reader. This

researcher sees charisma as phenomena, which are not fixed, but vary due to situation,

individual, and the interactions of the two. For instance – followers need not agree with the

leader about all things at all times, nor must visionary charismatic leadership present only in

times of crisis. Both charismatic and transformational leaders formulate and articulate visions

and goals. Their followers see charismatic leaders as envisioning shared goals, and perceive

the leader as willing to take risks, make personal sacrifices, and possessing exceptional abilities

and commitment to the cause. Moreover, followers are drawn to the charismatic leader and **want**

to identify with the leader. Transformational leaders motivate followers to reach higher purposes

and address organizational changes. Charismatic leaders do not necessarily advocate change;

however, both leaderships are seen as able to elevate the performances of the followers. Many

researchers agree that one must possess some perceivable amount of charisma to be

successful in transforming followers, and that was defined by Bass (2008) as morally elevating

the beliefs of what is valued and considered important by followers (p. 1217). Bass (1985) noted

that charismatic leadership was central to the processes of transformational leadership. For the

purpose of this study, leadership that elevates followers morally will be deemed as

transformational leadership. Charismatic leaders do not necessarily transform their followers.

Moreover, there are multiple perceivable and observable behaviors, once considered to be traits

of a leaders' personality, attributed to charismatic leaders. Sandberg and Moreman (2015)

contended that charisma manifests as a personality trait -- an aspect recognized by the follower

in a leader-follower relationship – that is crucial to charismatic leadership.

**Personality Traits as Charismatic Behaviors**

The seminal empirical study by Lide (1929) identified personality traits of school

administrators from the perceptions of followers, and that these traits can affect leadership

effectiveness. Lide noted that a consensus of educational experts believed certain personality

traits to be desirable of school administrators. These included alertness, resourcefulness, and magnetism as exhibited traits of leadership perceived to be important for principals and superintendents. He used The Commonwealth Teacher-Training Study (Charters and Waples, 1929) definitions of the traits in his study. Expanding on elements of leadership traits, the Conger-Kanungo (CK) Charismatic Leadership Scale (Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 1997) included recognizing new opportunities, generating new ideas for the organization, and seizing new opportunities to achieve goals. These are elements of alert and resourceful leadership. Charters and Waples defined magnetism as a personal quality generating attraction or interest, an "attractiveness" or a "power to gain . . . affections" (p. 59). Magnetism in Lide's study equates to charisma. Lide's traits of alertness, resourcefulness, and magnetism may be perceived as charismatic behaviors.

This study required the respondents to score their perceptions of the behavioral attributes of their immediate supervisors, including supervisory boards that can be evaluated as one entity, using the C-K Charismatic Leadership Scale (Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 1997). Included in the C-K Scale are questions that measure characteristics addressing vision and ideas about possibilities for the future, providing inspiring strategic and organizational goals, generating new ideas for the future, and recognizing new environmental opportunities that may facilitate achievement or organizational objectives. Once considered as a personality trait, alertness can be perceived as seizing new opportunities to achieve goals (as having vision) and sensitivity to the environment. Magnetism can be perceived as being an exciting public speaker (as in articulation). Resourcefulness can be perceived as incurring high personal costs or engaging in personal risk, or risky behaviors, for the organization. In the current study, competence or ability can be measured as perceptions of sensitivity to members needs and sensitivity to the environment from the CK Leadership Scale.

**Perceivable Behaviors**

Theoretical discussions and research investigated perceivable behaviors that could be identified and that could be attributed to charismatic leadership. With perceptions being so critical to leader-follower behavior, Bass (1985) proposed that leaders might also be able to facilitate change of conceptual frameworks. He observed that leaders have the ability to change or alter the perceptions of their followers and the perceptions of what the followers see as needs. Moreover, successful leaders can increase the awareness of their followers and elevate the followers' ability to understand issues of consequence. Bass explained that leadership with the ability to heighten the awareness of followers required the leader to be self-confident, possess the ability to articulate a vision, and possess insight and the inner strength to lead. Furthermore, Bass explained that leaders must make a conscious effort to understand how their followers perceive leadership qualities. These follower perceptions are grounded in the personalities of the followers as well as in followers' perceptions of the leaders' abilities.

In addition, Bass (1985) noted that leaders need to understand that there are consequences to leadership effectiveness grounded in the follower's perceptions. Bass (1990) contended that the perceptions of a leader's charismatic attributes are in the eyes of the beholders -- the followers. He argued that charismatic leaders held great power because their followers wanted to identify with them. These perceptions can be revealed as components of interpersonal relationships in that the followers perceive that they and the leader are like-minded. Further clarifying this, Bass (1990) and Stogdill[6] noted that followers of charismatic leaders have a strong desire to identify with the leader. Thus, their perceived like-mindedness promotes their loyalty to the leader. Bass explained that research involving several studies identified charisma or charismatic leadership behaviors as consequential to instilling respect in

---

[6] See *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications* (3rd ed.), by B. M. Bass, 1990, New York: Free Press.

the leader and inspiring the followers. Bass stated, "Charisma, by itself, was practically synonymous with satisfaction and rated effectiveness . . ." (1990, p. 219).

In 1985, Bass conducted several studies to measure the relationships between the perceived charismatic leadership effectiveness of administrators or supervisors, and their professional personnel. Two New Zealand studies, one of 23 high-ranking educational administrators and another of 45 high level business professionals and managers, and a third study of 256 U.S. Fortune 500 supervisors and managers, all describing their immediate supervisors, rated positive correlations between leaders' charisma and job effectiveness. The follower focus item sub-set of group performance addressed perceptions of administrators' job effectiveness. In the aggregated data of the multiple studies, charismatic leadership was associated most strongly with motivation in heightening the efforts of subordinates to achieve greater than original expectations, and showed a high correlation with intellectual stimulation resulting from these activities.

Bass (1985) found six leadership roles and behaviors factoring highest for charisma: (1) a model to follow, (2) pride to be associated with the leader, (3) the leader's ability in seeking what is really important for followers to consider, (4) follower faith in the leader, (5) encouraging understanding of other members' points of view, and (6) the ability to transmit a sense of mission to the followers. The factors Bass identified indicated the possibility of predictable follower outcomes. Bass also found that charismatic leadership showed a positive correlation with inspiring loyalty to the leader. Furthermore, charisma correlated highest with active-proactive leadership dimensions, which appear to be the kinds of leadership required of high-performing systems (Vaill, 1978). Active-proactive leaders use "charisma, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and contingent reward involve[ing] foresight, planning ahead, and taking steps when necessary in anticipation of perceived opportunities and threats" (Bass, 1985, p. 215). High performance is indicative of meeting greater than originally anticipated expectations, or as elevating follower expectations of what can be achieved. Bass

23

stated that what might set the proactive leader apart is the ability to be more creative and innovative with ideas, more radical than conservative in ideology, and less inhibited in searching for solutions. Moreover, proactive leaders were active and self-starting.

Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993) further investigated the relationships between charismatic leadership and the effects of charismatic behaviors on followers' performance levels and satisfaction. Their review of 35 empirical investigations of charismatic leadership led them to note, "Collectively, [the] findings indicate that leaders who engage in the theoretical charismatic behaviors produce the theoretical charismatic effects" (Shamir et al., p. 578), supporting Bass (1985). The authors theorized that motivational charismatic leader behaviors influence follower self-esteem and self-worth, supporting Conger and Kanungo (1987). Conger and Kanungo stated that the attributes of charisma must be perceived by the followers for a leader to be able to inspire followers to follow and share in achieving future goals and visions. Shamir et al. noted that those leaders exhibiting charismatic behaviors received higher performance ratings from superiors and followers. Thus, the follower's perceptions of self-efficacy and self-esteem further motivated them to engage in those objectives articulated by the leader, supporting Bass's findings that proactive leaders with high performance elevated the expectations in their followers as to what could be achieved. Additionally, Shamir et al. identified positive correlations of 0.50 or better between charismatic leadership and followers' performance levels and followers' satisfaction.

In 2000, Conger, Kanungo, and Menon hypothesized that charismatic leadership resulted in followers performing at higher levels of productivity. Moreover, these followers would be more satisfied and motivated. They investigated empirical evidence by employing a five-factor model (strategic vision and articulation, sensitivity to the environment, sensitivity to member's needs, personal risk, and unconventional behavior) to examine the hypothesized links between charismatic leadership behaviors and follower effects in a managerial sample of 252 participants. Results of their study indicated that statistically significant relationships existed

between leaders' charismatic behaviors and the followers' sense of reverence for that leader, the sense of group collective identity, and the perception of group performance through empowerment. The causal relationships between components of charismatic leader behaviors and follower trust were also investigated. Conger et al. found that followers of charismatic leaders develop a reverence for the leader that appears strongly based in the followers' perceptions of the leader's sensitivity to environmental constraints and contextual occurrences. Moreover, the leader's ability to articulate an inspiring vision and perception of the leader as sensitive to group member needs measured as relevant (Conger, 2012).

Theoretical work addressing the behavioral dimensions of charismatic leaders suggests that there is the possibility of predictable follower effects and thus, Bass (1985) indicated a need for further study. This researcher correlated follower perceptions of charismatic leadership behaviors (articulating vision, inspiring followers, seizing opportunities, forging personal connections, etc.) and follower perceptions of leadership's follower focus items in group effectiveness, collective identity, and group empowerment.

**Follower Focus Behaviors**

Followers with feelings of empowerment can develop feelings of self-efficacy, as noted by Conger and Kanungo (1998). Moreover, leaders can use techniques and strategies to strengthen follower perceptions of empowerment and self-efficacy (Conger, 1989b). Kouzes and Posner (1987, 2006) noted that inspiring a shared vision, showing the way, and encouraging others to act towards meeting goals contributed to the perception of empowerment in followers. Beer (1980) found that employees who are given additional responsibilities in their jobs or who complete complex job-related tasks have opportunities to develop feelings of empowerment and efficacy. Conger and Kanungo (1988) found employees who perceive that they can do and are competent to do their jobs feel empowered. Conger and Kanungo (1998) stated that leaders who exhibit exemplary behavior or who are perceived by followers as engaging in unconventional behavior or taking personal risks can empower followers to improve

performance. Furthermore, Bennis and Nanus (1985) found that leaders could learn risk taking

from leaders they worked under, and later model risk taking behaviors for their followers thus

leading to follower perceptions of empowerment. This study targeted educational administrator

followers in a hierarchy who are leaders and thus, have followers themselves. Conger and

Kanungo (1998) noted that followers with feelings of empowerment develop feelings of self-

efficacy (Conger, 2012).

Self-efficacy, self-esteem, and value congruence in followers can be motivational factors

(Jung & Avolio, 2000, Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). To examine follower performances

inspired by leadership effects, Bass and Avolio (1993) stated that controlled experimentation

was necessary. Bass and Avolio (1991) noted that charismatic theorists avoided manipulative or

socially unacceptable leader-group relationship discussion preferring to place greater emphasis

on the socially acceptable leader-follower relationships. An experimental investigation

conducted by Jung and Avolio (2000) further tested the role of trust and value congruence in

leadership on follower development and performance. The 194 participants were business

students from a Northeastern U.S. public university. The experiment, in a controlled setting, was

conducted with two extensively trained research associates acting as leaders who consistently

portrayed verbal and non-verbal core behaviors associated with charismatic/transformational or

transactional leadership styles. Trust in the leaders was measured using three items, such as

confidence that the leader will always try to treat one fairly. Direct and indirect effects on follower

performances were indicated as being statistically significant by the chi-square differences

indicating performance mediated through trust and performance from transformational

leadership. Moreover, the study indicated that value congruence between leaders and followers

influenced performance.

While examining possible negative effects of charismatic leadership, Conger (1989a,

1990) noted that leaders focusing on their own needs, or who mislead their followers, destroyed

follower feelings of trust, self-efficacy and self-worth. Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary defines

*trust* as assured reliance on the character, ability, strength, or truth of someone or something, or one in which confidence is placed. Conger and Kanungo (1998) measured trust in the leader by survey questions asking followers' perceptions of having complete faith in the leader and perceiving the leader to be trustworthy (p. 107). Additionally, they stated that follower trust could be developed by leaders showing followers that the needs of the followers were of the greater concern to the leader than the needs of the leader (Conger & Kanungo, 1998, p. 56).

Avolio and Bass (1995) found that empowerment of followers to make their own decisions can build trust of followers in their leader. Jung and Avolio (2000) noted that trust in the leader, a behavioral dimension of charismatic leadership noted by Conger, Kanungo, and Menon (2000), enhanced the leaders' effectiveness, and increased follower performance. However, Jung and Avolio noted that although there was a positive effect influencing performance quality ($p$ = <.01) there was a negative effect on performance quantity ($p$ = <.05). Those results indicated that there was a large negative impact on the quantity of ideas (fewer ideas) although there was a high level of trust and value congruence (shared values) in the leaders. This relationship may have been due to short task time duration involving innovative ideas. Their findings supported the assumptions of Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993) that charismatic leader behaviors could influence follower performance by motivating followers through enhancing the followers' sense of self-efficacy and self-esteem that can promote followers' perceptions of being treated fairly. Most importantly, charismatic leaders are able to articulate a shared vision and the confidence that their followers can achieve the vision. This perception that the leader has confidence in followers' abilities increases follower feelings of self-efficacy.

Khoury (2006) studied the importance of leadership behaviors inspiring followers' perceptions of trust and commitment to them from the leader. Bass (1985) concluded that charisma and inspirational leadership are a single construct. In 2008, Bass noted that follower trust in the leader was enhanced when leadership behaviors were perceived by followers as

giving meaning to followers' actions and needs. Khoury investigated the causes of failure to develop effective leaders in the leadership development programs at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. An assumption of the researcher was that to lead and inspire followers required courage, risk taking, and belief in one's self on the part of the leader. The perceptions of subordinates and their managers were reported on E-surveys. The five factors measuring leadership credibility on the questionnaire included: 1) model the way, 2) enable others, 3) encourage the heart, 4) challenge the process, and 5) inspire a shared vision. Khoury found that effective leaders exhibited the credibility factors: enable others, model the way, and encourage the heart. Moreover, she found that the most effective leaders modeled the factors, enabling others and encouraging the heart. Subordinates also perceived these most effective leaders as honest, trustworthy, and respectful and supporting of others. Khoury noted that both general and leadership specific self-efficacy was significantly and highly correlated with the self-perception of the leader in the ability to inspire a shared vision, and challenge the process -- take risks, and model the way. Moreover, those participants with Master's Degrees or PhD's desired encouragement, being believed in by those who led them, and being led by those whom they trusted to inspire them in accomplishing organizational goals and objectives. Khoury's findings supported those of Conger and Kanungo (1998). Khoury concluded that effective leaders establish the environment in which followers contribute to the organization by the behaviors of the leader that instill the perception of trust and commitment from the followers. Effective leaders could be proactive in establishing these environments and projecting inspiration in their followers.

**Proactive Behaviors**

The following studies investigated what behaviors identified proactive leaders. Crant and Bateman (2000) defined the proactive personality as including the behaviors showing initiative, identifying and acting on opportunities, and persevering until meaningful change that effects environmental change is brought about. Furthermore, persons with proactive personalities are

able to transform the organization's mission, find and solve problems, and have a self-driven impact on the world around them. The authors stated that proactivity was separate from performance-based measures and that it "should explain variance in charisma beyond that explained by" performance-based measures (Crant & Bateman, 2000, p. 66). In 2000, Crant and Bateman studied 156 pairs of managers and supervisors employed in Puerto Rican financial services organizations and investigated the subordinate business managers' leadership perceptions of their supervisors. They hypothesized that supervisor charismatic leadership ratings would show positive association with subordinate manager proactive personality ratings. Bass (1990) proposed that the lack of empirical research might be attributed to the assumption that charismatic leadership was not validly measurable due to its phenomena like attributes -- that charismatic leadership behaviors may be observed or perceived through the senses. It should be noted that identifying and acting on opportunities may be interpreted as environmental sensitivity, and sensitivity to member needs. Showing initiative may be perceived as having vision and the ability to articulate. Conger, Kanungo, Menon, and Mathur (1997) noted these dimensions as parallels existing between Weber's (1968a) charismatic leaders and the C-K Charismatic Leadership Scale.

Secondly, Crant and Bateman (2000) hypothesized that proactive personality behaviors would explain variance in perceptions of a manager's charisma beyond the five-factor Big Five personality model, performance based in-role behavior, and social desirability. Their findings revealed that those mangers scoring themselves higher on proactive personality ratings also were rated higher on charismatic leadership measures by their immediate supervisors. The authors suggested that proactive behavior aimed towards subordinates may impress superiors, supporting Bass's (1985) assertion that charisma correlated highest with the active-proactive leadership dimensions required of high-performance organizations. Bass, and Crant and Bateman indicated that further research was needed.

Sullivan and Shulman (2005) studied the role of school district leadership in affecting change. The authors conducted a case study on the phenomena of one New York City school district superintendent's leadership behaviors and perceived efficacy in promoting change. The superintendent was perceived by senior staff and other followers as knowledgeable, and a visionary who was sensitive to members' needs. He used unconventional behavior (dropping in to school classrooms -- which had never been done by previous superintendents). The superintendent viewed himself as *the leader* of the district, as did his senior and the district staff, and he was perceived as a visionary able to articulate his vision. The authors stated that the charisma of the superintendent was "instrumental in shaping the staff's ideas and actions" (Sullivan & Shulman, 2005, pg. 136). Some interview participants stated directly that the superintendent was charismatic as a leader. That study employed Conger and Kanungo's 1998 model and showed that empowerment of followers was inconsistent. Although the superintendent was perceived as a charismatic leader, he could not be perceived as a transformational leader using Bass' definition (2008). However, the authors stated that the literature did not adequately describe the data, implying that more study was needed.

This researcher investigated the respondents' perceptions of their immediate supervisors' behaviors of showing initiative using the scores from the vision and articulation section on the C-K Charismatic Leadership Scale (Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 1997). Identifying and acting on opportunities, and sensitivity to the needs of followers was measured with the responses from sensitivity to the environment and the sensitivity to members needs sections on the C-K Scale. Immediate supervisors' proactive personality behaviors were measured by responses on the Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000) empowerment section questions, and the C-K Scale unconventional behavior section. To verify these attributes as distinguishable as charismatic indicators, as noted by Crant and Bateman (2000), pro-activity may be illustrated by effecting change in the

30

environment. It may also be perceived as unconventional behaviors and eliciting excitement in followers (as empowerment).

## Validation and Reliability Studies

To investigate the phenomena of charisma more thoroughly, Conger and Kanungo (1987) proposed a model that aligned organizational contexts with charismatic leadership. They noted that the attribute of charisma must be perceived by the followers. Moreover, they observed the inferred leadership behavior of "charisma can be considered to be an additional inferred dimension of leadership behavior" (Conger & Kanungo, 1987, p. 640). The authors noted that rank could not imply charismatic behavior; only observable behaviors can exhibit charismatic leadership.

Their 1987 model presented 13 hypotheses that contained both a set of the attributions of followers and a set of the manifested behaviors of leaders (Conger & Kanungo). The authors presented what they hypothesized to be 11 identifiable critical components of charismatic leadership: (1) both challenging and striving to change the status quo, (2) presenting an idealized vision of future goals that differs from the status quo, (3) is likeable in that the shared vision presents him/her as being worthy of imitation, (4) advocates trustworthiness by incurring great personal risk, (5) shows expertise in rising above the existing order or in using unconventional means, (6) exhibits unconventional behavior, (7) the need for changing the status quo is perceived to result from environmental sensitivity, (8) is able to both articulate vision and is motivated to lead, (9) possesses personal power grounded in followers' perceived expertise, respect, and admiration of the leader, (10) is entrepreneurial and exemplary in leader-follower relationships, and (11) is able to inspire followers to share in and follow to achieve future goals and visions.

To test these hypotheses and to develop a reliable and valid questionnaire measuring perceived behaviors, Conger and Kanungo (1994) collected data from 488 managers of four large corporations in Canada and the United States. The education levels of the respondents

31

ranged from high school to advanced degrees. Each respondent completed a three-part questionnaire. The first part of the questionnaire contained the Conger-Kanungo (C-K) 25-item Charismatic Leadership Scale describing observable charismatic behaviors of managers. The second part contained the Bass (1985) Charisma Scale containing the six items with the greatest charisma factors from Bass' studies. Other items listing behaviors of leaders addressing task orientation, people orientation, and participative orientation included elements from three other behavior orientation study scales including the Ohio State leadership scales (see Halpin and Winer, 1957). The third part of the questionnaire requested demographic responses. The authors combined elements of the above scales to provide five items to measure each task. The behavioral elements were grouped into three leadership process stages: assessment of the environment, vision formulation and articulation, and implementation. Their findings using principle component analysis on the 25 items of the C-K Scale identified a six-dimension sub-scale: (1) vision and articulation, (2) environmental sensitivity, (3) unconventional behavior, (4) personal risk, (5) sensitivity to member needs, and (6) does not maintain status quo as factors of charismatic leadership. To support their findings, they noted that the C-K factors of vision and articulation, environmental sensitivity, personal risk, and sensitivity to member needs related positively with the Bass (1985) scale.

Using regression analyses, Canonical Correlations were conducted between each C-K charismatic subscale with the other leadership behaviors. Correlations between the task-oriented roles of leadership (day-to-day administration and task accomplishment) and the follower-directed roles (influencing followers' behaviors and attitudes) fell into two distinct groupings. The follower-directed roles, measured by the Bass (1985) scale, the C-K Charismatic Leadership Scale (Conger & Kanungo, 1994), and the participative and people-oriented leadership behavior items showed significant positive correlations with each other. The C-K scale measuring charismatic leadership had the highest correlation with the Bass scale ($r =$ 0.69). The total sample reliability index was 0.88 (Cronbach's alpha). Conger and Kanungo

(1994) found that the major factors comprising charismatic leadership are vision and articulation, unconventional behavior, personal risk, and striving to change the status quo.

In 1997, Conger, Kanungo, Menon, and Mathur re-analyzed the data collected in the above 1994 study and re-examined the data from the 1987 model (Conger & Kanungo) identifying variables that influence the development of charismatic leadership. They also re-examined the model presenting hypotheses containing attributions of followers and manifested behaviors of leaders. These further analyses resulted in a revision of the 1994 25-item C-K Charismatic Leadership Scale into a 20-item scale. To investigate the validity of the new 20-item C-K Scale further, the authors conducted three additional studies. This researcher's study used the revised C-K Charismatic Leadership Scale (Conger et al., 1997) that has been tested and proven valid as documented below.

The first study measured perceptions of 103 middle and senior level organizational employees attending an international company's training program. Ninety-seven percent of these participants had a college degree. The participants were asked to describe their immediate superiors by completing the revised 20-item C-K Charismatic Leadership Scale (C-K Scale) and a second survey part containing items from Yukl's (1988) managerial practices survey (MPS) (Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 1997). Conger et al. (1997) noted that the relationship between the C-K Scale and a more standardized and widely used scale, the MPS, measuring different leadership role management practices could better establish validity of the C-K Scale. Many correlations between the C-K subscales and the MPS subscales were significantly and strongly related.

The second study assessed the ability of the C-K Scale to measure those leaders identified as charismatic from those leaders identified as non-charismatic. The 71 participants were attending a Canadian political leadership convention, and completed a questionnaire comparing two of four leaders using the C-K Scale and one single-item question asking an overall measure of perceived charismatic or not charismatic attributes. The previously rated

charismatic or non-charismatic leaders were not identified as such on the respondents'

questionnaires. The mean score of the leaders identified as charismatic was significantly higher

than that of the leaders identified as non-charismatic. The analyses of the data indicated that the

C-K subscales could be used in differentiating charismatic from non-charismatic leaders.

The third study, conducted in India, investigated 49 pairs of randomly selected male

subordinates working under the same manager, with each pair working under different mangers

in a large national corporation. Each participant independently completed the C-K Scale and the

Bass scale. The convergent validity tests indicated that correlations between same traits

measured by the different scales were statistically significant. C-K Scale correlations between

independent measures was 0.84 and Bass scale correlations between independent measures

was 0.80.

These three studies supported the five-factor structure of the C-K Scale and provided

some evidence of cross-cultural validity. Conger, Kanungo, Menon, and Mathur (1997)

concluded that close parallels exist between Weber's (1968a) charismatic leader and the five

dimensions in the C-K Scale: (1) vision and articulation, (2) environmental sensitivity, (3)

unconventional behavior, (4) personal risk, and (5) sensitivity to member needs. The authors

stated that the exceptional qualities of a leader envisioned by follower perceptions corresponds

to responses measured by unconventional behavior and personal risk, paralleling Weber's

individuals' personal gifts and abilities. Moreover, Weber's charismatic individuals with vision of

the future or a prophetic vision correspond to the C-K Scale strategic vision and articulation.

Furthermore, that Weber's charismatic leader would minister to the needs of others parallels

sensitivity to the environment and sensitivity to members' needs on the C-K Scale. The authors

noted that the effects of perceived behaviors of charismatic leaders on follower behaviors could

be revealed using the C-K Scale as a measure.

This study measured the perceived leadership behaviors and the relationships with

followers' attitudes and behaviors using one survey instrument that included the 20-item C-K

Charismatic Leadership Scale (Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 1997) and the 34-item

Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000). In

1997, Conger et al. contended that the five factors -- strategic vision and articulation, sensitivity

to the environment, unconventional behavior, personal risk, and sensitivity to member' needs --

paralleled Weber's (1968a) conceptualization of charismatic leadership. Weber's concept

contended that followers perceived the exceptionalities of the leader, the leader's vision of the

future, and that the leader would tend to the followers' needs. Conger et al. (2000) identified

vision and articulation, unconventional behavior, personal risk, and striving to change the status

quo as parallels to Weber's concepts. Conger et al. (1997) noted that the effects of perceived

leadership behaviors of charismatic leaders on follower behaviors could be revealed using the

C-K Scale as a measure.

## Summary

Charisma in leadership is an interaction of perceived behaviors between leaders and

followers, and can be determined by how the leader makes the followers feel. Perceived

charismatic leadership behaviors can signify a leader's confidence of follower abilities, influence

follower feelings of empowerment and self-efficacy, and motivate follower achievement. For

example: employees given complex tasks can feel empowered, leaders articulating their vision

promote self-efficacy in their followers and motivate them, and followers are inspired by leaders

they trust, and who trust in them.

This study contributes to the literature by expanding empirical evidence of perceived

charismatic leadership behaviors and the effects those behaviors have on how followers feel, a

gap in the literature noted by Antonakis, Fenley, and Liechti (2011) and Godhwani (2017). This

study targeted multiple levels of educational leadership personnel in K-12 schools holding a

Master's degree or a PhD. Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) noted the need of charismatic

leadership studies in education, and Howell and Shamir (2005) noted a lack of empirical

research investigating intragroup variances within same groups or organizations was needed

that included differing relationships between the leaders. This study in education explores

intragroup variances within K-12 schools and organizations with differing relationships between

the school leaders who are administrators and supervisors. Avolio, Walumbwa, and Weber

(2009) indicated a lack of followership (acceptance of the leader) and leadership (behavior)

effectiveness studies, also noted by Shamir in 2007. Sullivan and Shulman (2005) indicated that

more research of charismatic leadership and perceived follower efficacy was needed, as also

reported by Campbell (2012) who noted that leadership effectiveness indicated by articulation

(communication) of vision, goals, and empowering followers could address leadership

effectiveness.

In 2000, Conger, Kanungo, and Menon noted the need for empirical studies linking

charismatic leadership behavioral dimensions with specific effects and the attitudes in followers,

suggesting that using their scale might record these effects. Antonakis and House (2013) stated

a need for studies identifying how charisma might be developed. Insight of supervisors'

charismatic behaviors such as vision and articulation, personal risk taking, unconventional

behavior, and sensitivity to the environment and members' needs was collected and measured

by the current study. This study further measured correlations of the relationships between

follower perceptions of charismatic leadership behaviors such as vision, risk taking, motivation,

and concerns for their needs with follower perceptions of feeling like-minded and similarities in

values, reverence, satisfaction, and trust. Bass (1990, 1999) indicated the need for further

studies of follower effects and noted the lack of empirical research.

Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993) noted that theorization between leader charismatic

behavior, self-concept, and self-esteem of the follower was still needed so as to learn how

leadership is affected "by the context in which the leadership occurs" (p. 23). This study

measured the respondents' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's leadership behaviors of

the concern for followers' needs by using scores from the CK Charismatic Leadership Scale

(Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 1997). Other responses form the CK Scale were used to

measure perceived leadership behaviors of risk taking, inspiring vision and motivation, influencing mutual like and respect, and expressing concern for the personal needs and feelings of others.

Scores from the Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000) were used to measure the respondents' perceptions of trust of their immediate supervisors, and feelings of being enabled. This study ran correlations between the trust variables items and the empowerment variables items. Data from this study measured perceptions of Louisiana K-12 administrators holding advanced degrees and leads to insight of their perceptions of the behaviors of their immediate supervisors that indicate empowerment, and can inform leadership program development on how to increase follower commitment and performance.

# Chapter 3

## Methodology

This study investigated the overall research question: *What relationships exist between the perceived behavioral components of charismatic leadership and the attitudes and behaviors of the followers?* The followers were non-teaching administrators and their leaders were of higher-rank. Follower's perceptions of their current leaders' behaviors, and if these perceptions contribute to respondent feelings of powerlessness and/or self-efficacy, were examined by investigating the additional two research questions:

1) What leader behaviors contribute to the follower's perceptions of the efficacy of their leader?

2) What leader behaviors contribute to follower's perceptions of self-efficacy?

Research from investigating the perceptions of high-ranking school administrators might contribute to the relevance of the specific nature of charisma in K-12 organization leadership contexts. This descriptive study used survey variables to provide results that were tallied into charts, cross-reference tables, and sorted into profile percentages or patterns. Using a General Linear Model, multivariate tests were performed to investigate correlations. The participants, instrumentation, procedures, data collection, and analysis follows, ending in a summary.

### Participants

The population for the study targeted a convenience sample of 249 non-teaching, administrative leaders in Louisiana K-12 educational organizations -- public schools, public school systems, and leadership consortiums. All participants held baccalaureate degrees. Some participants were working either towards a Specialist Degree or towards a PhD, or held advanced degrees. Additional participants were the members of Nicholls State University or the University of New Orleans PK-16 Councils. The other participants included Louisiana Consortium members or alumni, and principals, vice-principals, assistant principals, and other non-teaching administrators at the school, district, and state levels. Additional participants may

include administrative leaders trained through alternative providers or in other states. This study

included only those participants employed in K-12 educational organizations (see Table 1).

**Table 1**

*Sample Administrative Job Levels*

| Your administrative job level is | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | Assistant Principal | 10 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 15.6 |
| | Vice-Principal | 2 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 18.8 |
| | Principal | 14 | 21.9 | 21.9 | 40.6 |
| | Other School Administrator | 22 | 34.4 | 34.4 | 75.0 |
| | Assistant District Superintendent | 1 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 76.6 |
| | Other District Administrator | 9 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 90.6 |
| | Other State Administrator | 6 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 64 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

*Note.* N = 64
[a.]0% responded State Supervisor, 0% responded State Superintendent

## Instrumentation

Two instruments copyrighted by Conger and Kanungo (Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 1997; Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000) were utilized for this study by combining them as separate sections into one survey. Written permission to use these instruments for this study was granted by both Conger and Kanungo (see Appendix A). The first section of the questionnaire included demographic information including gender, ethnicity, year of birth, highest level of education and degree program, administrative level, years serving in a non-teaching administrative capacity, and years in current position (see Appendix B). The second section of the questionnaire containing the C-K 20-item Charismatic Leadership Scale (Conger et al., 1997) was rated using a six-point scale measuring from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree" (see Appendix C). This survey measured the respondent's perceptions of the immediate supervisor's vision and articulation, personal risk, sensitivity to the environment and to members' needs, and unconventional behavior. The third section of the questionnaire

39

contained the 34-item Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (Conger et al., 2000)

rated on a six-point scale measuring from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree" (see Appendix

D). This survey measured reverence, trust, and satisfaction with the leader, and collective

identity, group performance, and empowerment perceptions of the respondents. The

respondents were asked to indicate their perceptions of their immediate supervisor in their

immediate work group, department, or unit. The C-K questionnaire has been found to have

"acceptable reliability and validity as a diagnostic tool in diverse contexts" (Conger et al., 1997,

p. 290). The authors noted that the 0.88 (Cronbach's alpha) total C-K Scale reliability index

"justif[ies] its use as an overall measure of charismatic leadership as proposed in [their] model"

(Conger et al., 1997, p. 295).

## Procedures

An Institutional Review Board (IRB) application requesting approval to conduct the study

was approved at the University of New Orleans, compliant with 45 CFR Part 46 (see Appendix

E). The questionnaires were delivered electronically using SurveyMonkey™. The researcher e-

mailed the survey's link to administrators of Louisiana school districts as bulk email. University

of New Orleans (UNO) and Nicholls State University PK-16 Council members received the e-

mail of the survey's link by a third party, such as a secretary or other university employee, at

those institutions who electronically distributed it to the groups. All surveys contained the

informed consent message (see Appendix E). The participant's permission to participate in the

study was voluntary. The College of Education and Human Development, Director of Unit

Effectiveness, sent out UNO Master's and doctoral student targeted e-mail.

Five hundred forty-eight electronic messages containing a link to the electronic

questionnaires in SurveyMonkey™ were emailed to a convenience sample of 249 University of

New Orleans College of Education and Human Development Doctoral candidates and Master's

Degree candidates enrolled in university School Leadership or Education Administration

programs, PK-16 Councils members of University of New Orleans and Nicholls State University,

and non-enrolled non-teaching administrators of Louisiana schools and school districts. Many

student participants listed more than one electronic address. All surveys were anonymous. Of

the 548 sent emails, 108 or 19.71% were returned as undeliverable. The use of

SurveyMonkey™ questionnaires protected the respondents' anonymity. The participant's

permission to participate in the study was voluntary. Because the study included UNO Master's

Degree and PhD leadership students, and other universities leadership students and alumni,

special efforts were made to maintain anonymity such as grouping years of birth and not

including questions identifying the participants' institutions of enrollment or geographic location.

Although the possibility of a respondent completing the survey more than once existed, it is

unlikely that multiple responses from the respondents were received. The electronic surveys

contained an informed consent message email, and the respondents were instructed in the

informed consent message that "If you have completed this survey electronically or on paper,

please do not complete it again" (see Appendix F).

## Data Collection

One hundred fifty-seven respondents [35.68% of the delivered 440 emails] began the

questionnaire combining elements of the two instruments; 144 respondents (91.72%) completed

both instruments. Seventy-eight (49.68%) of the 157 respondents beginning the questionnaire

combining elements of the two instruments responded that they held administrative level

positions at the school, district, or state level. Using SPSS software, to enable analyses specific

to the study, the data were disaggregated by the demographic variable *Your administrative job

level is* scored *Not Listed* and were removed from the analyses. The data strings from 11

participants responding to only the demographic questions and from three participants not

completing the Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (Conger, Kanungo, and

Menon, & Mathur, 2000) portion of the survey were removed from the raw data set prior to

further analyses. This reduced the analyses of data to only administrators. Data from the 64

respondents (14.55% of the 440 delivered emails) indicating that they were employed in K-12 administrative positions were analyzed.

### Analysis

After running cross-tabulations and Chi-Square Tests of Independence the expected cell count values indicated that no expected cell count was greater than 5. Data for two Leader Focus variables, *I have complete faith in him/her* and *I cannot count on him/her to be trustworthy*, from the 20-item C-K Charismatic Leadership Scale (Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 1997) were reverse coded to be consistent in pattern with the other data files permitting general linear model analyses and multivariate tests.  Data from the 20-item C-K Charismatic Leadership Scale (Conger et al., 1997) and the 34-item Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000) variables were transformed to create two additional variables each, one variable as the sum of the raw score for each item and another variable as the percentage.

Data collected from the task-oriented roles of leadership (day-to-day administration and task accomplishment) variables and the follower-directed roles (influencing followers' behaviors and attitudes) variables (Conger & Kanungo, 1994) were included in the analyses of the 20 components of charismatic leadership and the followers' perceptions of leader reverence, trust, satisfaction, and empowerment. Leadership effectiveness, the independent variable, was correlated with the perceived factors itemized in the C-K Charismatic Leadership Scale (Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 1997) and the Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000). Additionally, analyses in the study investigated respondent perceptions of powerlessness and self-efficacy in their current employment environment. Correlations between follower perceptions of charismatic leadership behaviors and self-efficacy were also measured. Conger et al., (2000) suggested that not grouping dependent variables into leader focus and follower focus, or at all, might produce different patterns. They noted an absence of empirical studies examining the links between charismatic leadership's behavioral

dimensions and the specific effects in followers. Using SPSS software, frequency tables of the data were analyzed, and cross tabulations conducted. *A piori* patterns were examined in an explorative way. Significant differences were measured by .01 probability level.

Variables from the C-K Charismatic Leadership Scale (see Appendix C, Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 1997) and variables from the Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (see Appendix D, Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000) were correlated by item. The preliminary analysis ran correlations between perceived leadership behaviors and the effects on the follower to examine the relationships between the respondents' attitudes as followers and their perceptions of the behavioral attributes of their immediate supervisors. The preliminary analysis data supported investigation of question one: *What relationships exist between the perceived behavioral components of charismatic leadership and the attitudes and behaviors of the followers?* Conger et al. (2000) postulated that further studies using their scale could record perceived behavioral component effects of charismatic leaders on the attitudes and behaviors of their followers.

Responses to the sub-group items of Leader Focus variables, shown in Table 2, Follower Focus variables of collective identity shown in Tables 3, group performance shown in Table 4, and empowerment shown in Table 5 from the 34-item Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000) were run as sub-group correlations by item and the sub-sets items within these groups. These data were compared by item from the preliminary analysis, and *a priori* patterns were investigated. Additional correlations were run by item between the sub-groups and sub-sets data and the items listed on the 20-item C-K Charismatic Leadership Scale (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 1997) shown in Appendix C.

Data from the sub-sets of reverence, trust, and satisfaction with leader (Table 2) and collective identity (Table 3), group performance (Table 4), and empowerment (Table 5) sub-set correlations will support question two: *What leader behaviors contribute to the perceptions of the efficacy of their leader?* The respondent perceptions of the items listed on the "great esteem" for

**Table 2**

*Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory Variables Grouped as Leader Focus*

| Identified as sub-sets |
| --- |

Reverence (Bass, 1985)
- I hold him or her in high respect
- I have great esteem for him/her
- I admire him/her as a leader

Trust
- I have complete faith in him/her (Bass, 1985)
- Sometimes I cannot trust him/her (Butler, 1991)
- I cannot count on him/her to be trustworthy (Butler, 1991)

Satisfaction with Leader (Bass, 1985)
- I feel good to be around him/her
- I am satisfied that his/her style of leadership is the right one for getting our group's job done
- I am pleased (or satisfied) with his/her leadership

*Note.* From "Charismatic Leadership and Follower Effects," by J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, & S. T. Menon, 2000, *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(7), p. 766-767. Copyright © 2000

**Table 3**

*Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory Variables Grouped as Follower Focus*

| Collective Identity sub-set |
| --- |

- We see ourselves in the work group as a cohesive team
- In our work group, our conflict is out in the open and is constructively handled
- Members of our organizational unit share the same values about our task and purpose
- Among our work group, we are remarkably similar in our values about what has to be done
- There is widely shared consensus about our goals and the approaches needed to achieve them

*Note.* From "Charismatic Leadership and Follower Effects," by J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, & S. T. Menon, 2000, *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(7), p. 766-767. Copyright © 2000

**Table 4**

*Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory Variables Grouped as Follower Focus*

| Group Performance sub-set |
| --- |

- We have high work performance
- Most of our tasks are accomplished quickly and efficiently
- We always set a high standard of task accomplishment
- We always achieve a high standard of task accomplishment
- We almost always beat our targets

*Note.* From "Charismatic Leadership and Follower Effects," by J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, & S. T. Menon, 2000, *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(7), p. 766-767. Copyright © 2000

the leader, "complete faith in" and "feeling good to be around" the leader, and having satisfaction

or pleasure with their immediate supervisors' style of leadership are leadership behaviors

contributing to a followers' perceptions of the efficacy of one's leader.

**Table 5**

*Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory Variables Grouped as Follower Focus*

Empowerment sub-set
- I can influence the way work is done in my department
- I can influence decisions taken in my department
- I have authority to make decisions at work
- I have the authority to work effectively
- Important responsibilities are part of my job
- I have the capabilities required to do my job well
- I have the skills and abilities to work effectively
- I can do my work efficiently
- I can handle the challenges I face at work
- I am inspired by what we are trying to achieve as an organization
- I am inspired by the goals of the organization
- I am enthusiastic about working toward the organization's objectives
- I am keen on our doing well as an organization
- I am enthusiastic about the contribution my work makes to the organization

*Note.* From "Charismatic Leadership and Follower Effects," by J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, & S. T. Menon, 2000, *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(7), p. 766-767. Copyright © 2000

Data from the sub-sets collective identity, group performance, and empowerment

correlations (Tables 3, 4, and 5) will support question three: *What leader behaviors contribute to*

*follower's perceptions of self-efficacy?* The respondent perceptions of empowerment and of

perceiving oneself as part of "a cohesive team" and sharing values of sameness or similarity and

"consensus about … goals," as well as perceptions of "high work performance" and quickness,

efficiency, "high standard[s]" and "beat[ing] targets" result from the leadership behaviors

contributing to followers' perceptions of self-efficacy. The responses from all reverence, trust,

satisfaction with leader, collective identity, empowerment, and the C-K Charismatic Leadership

Scale (see Appendix C, Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 1997) were explored, and patterns

and correlations measured. Causal relationships between components of leader behaviors

contribute to the perceptions of trust in the leader. The respondent perceptions of "complete

faith in" the leader, "sometimes I cannot trust" the leader, and "I cannot count on [the leader] to be trustworthy" are leadership behaviors contributing to followers' perceptions of trust in one's leader.

The current study included correlations of follower perceptions of leadership behaviors and responses of like-mindedness and similarities in values, and reverence, satisfaction, and trust of the leader. Follower perceptions of leadership behaviors were measured from responses on the C-K Charismatic Leadership Scale (Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 1997) of articulating vision. Responses on the Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000) measured like-mindedness and similarities in values, and reverence, satisfaction, and trust of the leader that were originally used by Bass (1985). Questionnaire ratings from individual followers were averaged to measure attributions of charismatic leadership ratings of the beholders -- the followers (Bass, 2008).

## Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of non-teaching school administrators as followers, and measure the correlations of those perceptions with the respondents' feelings of collective identity, group performance, and empowerment. The perceptions of the leadership behaviors of their immediate supervisors were scored on electronic surveys. The relationships between the perceived charismatic leadership behaviors and the respondents' feelings of empowerment and/or self-efficacy were examined. Results from the study can lead to understanding of the phenomena of administrator follower and leader interdependency in K-12 public educational organizations. Analyses of these data may indicate parameters for new models of school administrator leadership. The findings are detailed in the following chapter.

# Chapter 4

## Findings

This chapter is organized into sections beginning with the administrator sample characteristics including a table of frequency counts for the demographic variables. Following are administrators' perceptions of their immediate supervisors' vision and articulation, personal risk, sensitivities, and unconventional behavior from the C-K Leadership Scale (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 1997). Next are the administrators' perceptions of the behaviors of their immediate supervisors from the Perceived Leadership Behaviors Measures Inventory (Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 2000). Initial findings of preliminary observations precede the correlations addressing the three research questions. The research question one section includes a bivariate Pearson Correlation between the CK Leadership Scale (Conger et al., 1997) items and the Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (Conger et al., 2000) items followed by vision and articulation multivariate tests of between-subjects effects with leadership and follower focus items, and the tests of empowerment and sensitivity to members needs with the follower focus items. Following is the research question two section including tests of between-subjects effects of follower empowerment with reverence of, and satisfaction with, the leader.  Next are the research question three findings including follower focus tests of between-subjects effects of follower collective identity with reverence of, and satisfaction with, the leader. The chapter ends in a summary.

### Administrator Characteristics

All 64 administrators responded that they held administrative level positions at the school, district, or state level (see Table 1). Thirty-one (48%) answered the gender identity question with five (8%) as male and 26 (41%) as female; 33 (52%) skipped the question. All 64 responded to the ethnicity question with 61% as Caucasian, 33% as African American, and the remaining six percent Hispanic, Native American, Asian, or Multi Ethnic. Forty-seven percent were born before 1963, 22% were born between 1964 and 1973, 31% were born between 1974

47

and 1983, and none were born after 1983. All of the respondents held advanced degrees with 61% responding that the degree was in Educational Administration. Thirty percent reported to school administrators, 14% to district administrators, three percent to state administrators, two percent to a board, and one percent to a not listed individual; 50% skipped the question. Twenty-two percent were employed in a non-teaching administrative capacity of one year or less, 30% between two and five years, 21% between six and nine years, and 27% for 10 years or more. Fifty-eight percent were employed in their current position for three years or less, 29% between four and nine years, and 12% for 10 or more years. Table 6 displays the frequency counts for the demographic variables.

**Table 6**

*Frequency Counts for Demographic Variables*

| Ethnicity | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Caucasian | 39 | 60.9 | 60.94 | 60.94 |
| African American | 21 | 32.8 | 32.82 | 93.76 |
| Hispanic | 1 | 1.6 | 1.56 | 95.32 |
| Native American | 1 | 1.6 | 1.56 | 96.88 |
| Asian | 1 | 1.6 | 1.56 | 98.44 |
| Multi Ethnic | 1 | 1.6 | 1.56 | 100.0 |
| Total | 64 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Year if Birth | | | | |
| 1948 or earlier | 6 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 9.4 |
| 1949-1953 | 7 | 10.9 | 10.9 | 20.3 |
| 1954-1958 | 8 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 32.8 |
| 1959-1963 | 9 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 46.9 |
| 1964-1968 | 9 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 60.9 |
| 1969-1973 | 5 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 68.8 |
| 1974-1978 | 14 | 21.9 | 21.9 | 90.6 |
| 1979-1983 | 6 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 64 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Highest completed level of education | | | | |
| Master's Degree | 42 | 65.6 | 65.6 | 65.6 |
| Specialists Degree | 10 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 81.3 |
| JD | 1 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 82.8 |
| EdD | 2 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 85.9 |
| PhD | 9 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 100.0 |
| Total | 64 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

(table continued)

(continuing table)

| Degree program for above question | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Education | 14 | 21.9 | 21.9 | 21.9 |
| Reading | 1 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 23.4 |
| Curriculum & Instruction | 2 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 26.6 |
| Educational Administration | 39 | 60.9 | 60.9 | 87.5 |
| Psychology | 2 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 90.6 |
| Arts & Science | 1 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 92.2 |
| Business | 2 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 95.3 |
| Not Listed | 3 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 64 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| **Immediate supervisor in your present work group, department, or unit is** | | | | |
| Principal | 15 | 23.4 | 46.9 | 46.9 |
| Other School Administrator | 4 | 6.3 | 12.5 | 59.4 |
| Assistant District Superintendent | 5 | 7.8 | 15.6 | 75.0 |
| District Superintendent | 1 | 1.6 | 3.1 | 78.1 |
| Other District Administrator | 3 | 4.7 | 9.4 | 87.5 |
| Other State Administrator | 2 | 3.1 | 6.3 | 93.8 |
| A Board | 1 | 1.6 | 3.1 | 96.9 |
| Not Listed Individual | 1 | 1.6 | 3.1 | 100.0 |
| Missing | 32 | 50.0 | | |
| Total | 64 | 100.0 | | |
| **Years employed in a non-teaching administrative** | | | | |
| None | 5 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 7.8 |
| Less than 1 | 6 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 17.2 |
| 1 | 4 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 23.4 |
| 2 | 4 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 29.7 |
| 3 | 3 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 34.4 |
| 4 | 4 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 40.6 |
| 5 | 7 | 10.9 | 10.9 | 51.6 |
| 6 | 2 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 54.7 |
| 7 | 3 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 59.4 |
| 8 | 3 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 64.1 |
| 9 | 6 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 73.4 |
| 10 | 1 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 75.0 |
| Over 10 | 16 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 64 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| **Number of years employed in current position** | | | | |
| Less than 1 | 4 | 6.3 | 12.9 | 12.9 |
| 1 | 4 | 6.3 | 12.9 | 25.8 |
| 2 | 6 | 9.4 | 19.4 | 45.2 |
| 3 | 4 | 6.3 | 12.9 | 58.1 |
| 4 | 2 | 3.1 | 6.5 | 64.5 |
| 5 | 1 | 1.6 | 3.2 | 67.7 |
| 6 | 2 | 3.1 | 6.5 | 74.2 |
| 7 | 1 | 1.6 | 3.2 | 77.4 |
| 8 | 2 | 3.1 | 6.5 | 83.9 |
| 9 | 1 | 1.6 | 3.2 | 87.1 |
| 10 | 1 | 1.6 | 3.2 | 90.3 |
| Over 10 | 3 | 4.7 | 9.7 | 100.0 |
| Missing | 33 | 51.6 | | |
| Total | 64 | 100.0 | | |

*Note.* N = 64

[a] 0% responded State Supervisor, 0% responded State Superintendent

Data of the 64 administrators responding that they held administrative level positions at the school, district, or state level were further investigated. Analyses between follower perceptions of charismatic leadership behaviors and willingness to follow were correlated. Analyses of perceptions indicating the leader's behaviors contributing to the respondent's feelings of powerlessness or self-efficacy in their current employment environment were investigated. Correlations between follower perceptions of charismatic leadership behaviors and willingness to follow were measured. Using SPSS software, frequency tables of the data were analyzed, and cross tabulations conducted. *A piori* patterns in ethnicity, gender, highest level of education, administrative job level, etc. were examined in an exploratory way.

**C-K Leadership Scale Administrator Perceptions of Immediate Supervisor**

All 64 respondents completed all items in the second section, the C-K 20-item Charismatic Leadership Scale (Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mather, 1997), of the questionnaire (see Appendix C). Respondents were asked to "indicate your perceptions of your immediate supervisor in your present work group, department, or unit" by choosing a response in each row on the six-point scale from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree." Table 7 contains the frequency counts of the responses to the respondents' perceptions of their immediate supervisors' observable behaviors by item.

The notable points from these analyses indicate that 63% of the respondents perceived their supervisors had vision. Yet 53% found them uninspiring, and only 34% saw them as exciting speakers. Thirty-three percent of the respondents perceived their supervisors as engaging in high personal risk. Fifty-two percent of the supervisors were seen as sensitive to the environment with 54% able to recognize members skills and abilities, and 52% recognizing physical environmental constraints such as technological limitations and lack of resources. Fifty-two percent were seen as able to influence others by developing mutual liking and respect and were perceived as sensitive to member's needs. Nineteen percent of the supervisors were seen

50

as engaging in unconventional behavior, 27% as using non-traditional means, and 23% as

exhibiting very unique or surprising behavior.

**Table 7**

*Administrator Perceptions of Immediate Supervisor Frequency Counts*

| Vision and Articulation | N | % | Cumulative % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Has vision; often brings up ideas about possibilities for the future | | | |
|     Strongly Agree | 21 | 32.8 | 32.8 |
|     Agree | 19 | 29.7 | 62.5 |
|     Somewhat Agree | 8 | 12.5 | 75.0 |
|     Somewhat Disagree | 4 | 6.3 | 81.3 |
|     Disagree | 7 | 10.9 | 92.2 |
|     Strongly Disagree | 5 | 7.8 | 100.0 |
| Provides inspiring strategic and organizational goals | | | |
|     Strongly Agree | 15 | 23.4 | 23.4 |
|     Agree | 16 | 25.0 | 48.4 |
|     Somewhat Agree | 10 | 15.6 | 64.1 |
|     Somewhat Disagree | 8 | 12.5 | 76.6 |
|     Disagree | 4 | 6.3 | 82.8 |
|     Strongly Disagree | 11 | 17.2 | 100.0 |
| Consistently generates new ideas for the future of the organization | | | |
|     Strongly Agree | 14 | 21.9 | 21.9 |
|     Agree | 21 | 32.8 | 54.7 |
|     Somewhat Agree | 11 | 17.2 | 71.9 |
|     Somewhat Disagree | 5 | 7.8 | 79.7 |
|     Disagree | 7 | 10.9 | 90.6 |
|     Strongly Disagree | 6 | 9.4 | 100.0 |
| Entrepreneurial; seizes new opportunities in order to achieve goals | | | |
|     Strongly Agree | 15 | 23.4 | 23.4 |
|     Agree | 18 | 28.1 | 51.6 |
|     Somewhat Agree | 12 | 18.8 | 70.3 |
|     Somewhat Disagree | 6 | 9.4 | 79.7 |
|     Disagree | 3 | 4.7 | 84.4 |
|     Strongly Disagree | 10 | 15.6 | 100.0 |
| Readily recognizes new environmental opportunities (favorable physical and social conditions) that may facilitate achievement or organizational objectives | | | |
|     Strongly Agree | 11 | 17.2 | 17.2 |
|     Agree | 21 | 32.8 | 50.0 |
|     Somewhat Agree | 9 | 14.1 | 64.1 |
|     Somewhat Disagree | 11 | 17.2 | 81.3 |
|     Disagree | 5 | 7.8 | 89.1 |
|     Strongly Disagree | 7 | 10.9 | 100.0 |
| Inspirational, able to motivate articulating effectively importance of what organizational members doing | | | |
|     Strongly Agree | 13 | 20.3 | 20.3 |
|     Agree | 17 | 26.6 | 46.9 |
|     Somewhat Agree | 8 | 12.5 | 59.4 |
|     Somewhat Disagree | 8 | 12.5 | 71.9 |
|     Disagree | 5 | 7.8 | 79.7 |
|     Strongly Disagree | 13 | 20.3 | 100.0 |
| (table continued) | | | |

51

(continuing table)
Exciting Public Speaker

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 13 | 20.3 | 20.3 |
| Agree | 9 | 14.1 | 34.4 |
| Somewhat Agree | 11 | 17.2 | 51.6 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 8 | 12.5 | 64.1 |
| Disagree | 13 | 20.3 | 84.4 |
| Strongly Disagree | 10 | 15.6 | 100.0 |

**Personal Risk**

In pursuing organizational objectives, engages in activities involving considerable personal risk

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 9 | 14.1 | 14.1 |
| Agree | 14 | 21.9 | 35.9 |
| Somewhat Agree | 10 | 15.6 | 51.6 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 12 | 18.8 | 70.3 |
| Disagree | 8 | 12.5 | 82.8 |
| Strongly Disagree | 11 | 17.2 | 100.0 |

Takes high personal risk for the sake of the organization

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 10 | 15.6 | 15.6 |
| Agree | 11 | 17.2 | 32.8 |
| Somewhat Agree | 10 | 15.6 | 48.4 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 15 | 23.4 | 71.9 |
| Disagree | 8 | 12.5 | 84.4 |
| Strongly Disagree | 10 | 15.6 | 100.0 |

Often incurs high personal cost for good of the organization

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 6 | 9.4 | 9.4 |
| Agree | 15 | 23.4 | 32.8 |
| Somewhat Agree | 10 | 15.6 | 48.4 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 15 | 23.4 | 71.9 |
| Disagree | 11 | 17.2 | 89.1 |
| Strongly Disagree | 7 | 10.9 | 100.0 |

**Sensitivity to the Environment**

Readily recognizes constraints in the physical environment (technological limitations, lack of resources, etc.) that may stand in the way of achieving organizational objectives

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 12 | 18.8 | 18.8 |
| Agree | 21 | 32.8 | 51.6 |
| Somewhat Agree | 14 | 21.9 | 73.4 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 3 | 4.7 | 78.1 |
| Disagree | 9 | 14.1 | 92.2 |
| Strongly Disagree | 5 | 7.8 | 100.0 |

Readily recognizes constraints in the organization's social and cultural environment (cultural norms, lack of grass roots support, etc.) that may stand in the way of achieving organizational objectives

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 10 | 15.6 | 15.6 |
| Agree | 21 | 32.8 | 48.4 |
| Somewhat Agree | 14 | 21.9 | 70.3 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 9 | 14.1 | 84.4 |
| Disagree | 6 | 9.4 | 93.8 |
| Strongly Disagree | 4 | 6.3 | 100.0 |

Recognizes the limitations of other members in the organization

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 11 | 17.2 | 17.2 |
| Agree | 19 | 29.7 | 46.9 |
| Somewhat Agree | 19 | 29.7 | 76.6 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 6 | 9.4 | 85.9 |
| Disagree | 5 | 7.8 | 93.8 |
| Strongly Disagree | 4 | 6.3 | 100.0 |

(table continued)

(continuing table)

Recognizes the abilities and skills of other members in the organization

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 14 | 21.9 | 21.9 |
| Agree | 21 | 32.8 | 54.7 |
| Somewhat Agree | 12 | 18.8 | 73.4 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 4 | 6.3 | 79.7 |
| Disagree | 10 | 15.6 | 95.3 |
| Strongly Disagree | 3 | 4.7 | 100.0 |

**Sensitivity to Member Needs**

Shows sensitivity for the needs and feelings of other members in the organization

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 15 | 23.4 | 23.4 |
| Agree | 14 | 21.9 | 45.3 |
| Somewhat Agree | 17 | 26.6 | 71.9 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 8 | 12.5 | 84.4 |
| Disagree | 5 | 7.8 | 92.2 |
| Strongly Disagree | 5 | 7.8 | 100.0 |

Influences others by developing mutual liking and respect

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 11 | 17.2 | 17.2 |
| Agree | 22 | 34.4 | 51.6 |
| Somewhat Agree | 11 | 17.2 | 68.8 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 10 | 15.6 | 84.4 |
| Disagree | 6 | 9.4 | 93.8 |
| Strongly Disagree | 4 | 6.3 | 100.0 |

Often expresses personal concern for the needs and feelings of other members of the organization

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 11 | 17.2 | 17.2 |
| Agree | 19 | 29.7 | 46.9 |
| Somewhat Agree | 15 | 23.4 | 70.3 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 9 | 14.1 | 84.4 |
| Disagree | 6 | 9.4 | 93.8 |
| Strongly Disagree | 4 | 6.3 | 100.0 |

**Unconventional behavior**

Engages in unconventional behavior in order to achieve organizational goals

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 4 | 6.3 | 6.3 |
| Agree | 8 | 12.5 | 18.8 |
| Somewhat Agree | 12 | 18.8 | 37.5 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 17 | 26.6 | 64.1 |
| Disagree | 9 | 14.1 | 78.1 |
| Strongly Disagree | 14 | 21.9 | 100.0 |

Uses non-traditional means to achieve organizational goals

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 6 | 9.4 | 9.4 |
| Agree | 11 | 17.2 | 26.6 |
| Somewhat Agree | 8 | 12.5 | 39.1 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 21 | 32.8 | 71.9 |
| Disagree | 8 | 12.5 | 84.4 |
| Strongly Disagree | 10 | 15.6 | 100.0 |

Often exhibits very unique behavior that surprises other members of the organization

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 7 | 10.9 | 10.9 |
| Agree | 8 | 12.5 | 23.4 |
| Somewhat Agree | 11 | 17.2 | 40.6 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 15 | 23.4 | 64.1 |
| Disagree | 6 | 9.4 | 73.4 |
| Strongly Disagree | 17 | 26.6 | 100.0 |

*Note.* N = 64
[a] ©C-K 20-item Charismatic Leadership Scale

## Administrator Perceptions of Behavior Measures of Immediate Supervisor

The third section of the questionnaire contained the 34-item Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000) rated on a six-point scale measuring from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree" (see Appendix D). The scale is divided into sub-sets noting Leader Focus and Follower Focus. All 64 respondents that held administrative level positions at the school, district, or state level completed this section. The tabulated responses were broken into two tables: 1) measuring the leader focus sub-set items and 2) measuring the follower focus sub-set items.

The leader focus items identified by Bass (1985) included reverence of the leader, and were measured by respect, esteem, and admiration. Trust items identified by Bass (1985) and Butler (1991) were measured by responses of complete faith in the supervisor, or ability to trust in or count on him or her to be trustworthy. Satisfaction with the leader items identified by Bass (1985) were measured by pleasure with, satisfaction getting the job done, and feeling good to be around the respondents' supervisor. Of note from the leader focus responses is that 61% of the respondents felt reverence for their leader and 56% held him or her in high esteem, but 45% them trusted their leader. This anomaly may be due to respondents using *respect* as denoting a position of authority. Moreover, 47% were satisfied with their supervisor (see Table 8).

Table 8

*Administrator Perceptions of Immediate Supervisor's Leader Focus*

| Leader Focus | N | % | Cumulative % |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Reverence** | | | |
| Hold him or her in high respect | | | |
|     Strongly Agree | 24 | 37.5 | 37.5 |
|     Agree | 15 | 23.4 | 60.9 |
|     Somewhat Agree | 12 | 18.8 | 79.7 |
|     Somewhat Disagree | 3 | 4.7 | 84.4 |
|     Disagree | 6 | 9.4 | 93.8 |
|     Strongly Disagree | 4 | 6.3 | 100.0 |

(table continued)

(continuing table)

I have great esteem for him/her

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 22 | 34.4 | 34.4 |
| Agree | 14 | 21.9 | 56.3 |
| Somewhat Agree | 13 | 20.3 | 76.6 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 2 | 3.1 | 79.7 |
| Disagree | 9 | 14.1 | 93.8 |
| Strongly Disagree | 4 | 6.3 | 100.0 |

I admire him/her as a leader

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 20 | 31.3 | 31.3 |
| Agree | 13 | 20.3 | 51.6 |
| Somewhat Agree | 9 | 14.1 | 65.6 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 8 | 12.5 | 78.1 |
| Disagree | 5 | 7.8 | 85.9 |
| Strongly Disagree | 9 | 14.1 | 100.0 |

## Trust

I have complete faith in him/her

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 16 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| Agree | 13 | 20.3 | 45.3 |
| Somewhat Agree | 9 | 14.1 | 59.4 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 8 | 12.5 | 71.9 |
| Disagree | 10 | 15.6 | 87.5 |
| Strongly Disagree | 8 | 12.5 | 100.0 |

Sometimes I cannot trust him/her

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 8 | 12.5 | 12.5 |
| Agree | 9 | 14.1 | 26.6 |
| Somewhat Agree | 12 | 18.8 | 45.3 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 9 | 14.1 | 59.4 |
| Disagree | 8 | 12.5 | 71.9 |
| Strongly Disagree | 18 | 28.1 | 100.0 |

I cannot count on him/her to be trustworthy

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 7 | 10.9 | 10.9 |
| Agree | 10 | 15.6 | 26.6 |
| Somewhat Agree | 10 | 15.6 | 42.2 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 7 | 10.9 | 53.1 |
| Disagree | 12 | 18.8 | 71.9 |
| Strongly Disagree | 18 | 28.1 | 100.0 |

## Satisfaction with Leader

I feel good to be around him/her

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 16 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| Agree | 14 | 21.9 | 46.9 |
| Somewhat Agree | 17 | 26.6 | 73.4 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 5 | 7.8 | 81.3 |
| Disagree | 7 | 10.9 | 92.2 |
| Strongly Disagree | 5 | 7.8 | 100.0 |

I am satisfied that his/her style of leadership is the right one for getting our group's job done

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 16 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| Agree | 13 | 20.3 | 45.3 |
| Somewhat Agree | 9 | 14.1 | 59.4 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 7 | 10.9 | 70.3 |
| Disagree | 6 | 9.4 | 79.7 |
| Strongly Disagree | 13 | 20.3 | 100.0 |

(table continued)

(continuing table)
 I am pleased (or satisfied) with his/her leadership

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 16 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| Agree | 12 | 18.8 | 43.8 |
| Somewhat Agree | 13 | 20.3 | 64.1 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 5 | 7.8 | 71.9 |
| Disagree | 7 | 10.9 | 82.8 |
| Strongly Disagree | 11 | 17.2 | 100.0 |

*Note.* N = 64 Adapted from "Charismatic Leadership and Follower Effects," by J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, & S. T. Menon, 2000, *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(7), p. 766-767. Copyright © 2000
[a]·©34-item Perceived Leadership Behavior Measure Inventory

Research into followers of charismatic leaders was noted in 1998 by Conger and

Kanungo as being "very poorly explored" (p. 19), and still later noted by Antonakis, Fenley, and

Liechti (2011) and Godhwani (2017). The analyses of those data contribute to filling this gap in

the research. The follower focus sub-set included empowerment items identified by Menon

(1999), and collective identity and group performance items developed by Conger, Kanungo,

and Menon for their 2000 study (see Table 9).

**Table 9**

*Administrator Perceptions of Immediate Supervisor's Follower Focus*

| Follower Focus | N | % | Valid % | Cumulative % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Collective Identity** | | | | |
| We see ourselves in the work group as a cohesive team | | | | |
| Strongly Agree | 15 | 23.4 | 23.4 | 23.4 |
| Agree | 11 | 17.2 | 17.2 | 40.6 |
| Somewhat Agree | 14 | 21.9 | 21.9 | 62.5 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 9 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 76.6 |
| Disagree | 9 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 90.6 |
| Strongly Disagree | 6 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 100.0 |
| In our work group, our conflict is out in the open and is constructively handled | | | | |
| Strongly Agree | 10 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 15.6 |
| Agree | 10 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 31.3 |
| Somewhat Agree | 14 | 21.9 | 21.9 | 53.1 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 12 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 71.9 |
| Disagree | 9 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 85.9 |
| Strongly Disagree | 9 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 100.0 |

(table continued)

(continuing table)
Members of our organizational unit share the same values about our task and purpose

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 12 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 18.8 |
| Agree | 9 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 32.8 |
| Somewhat Agree | 19 | 29.7 | 29.7 | 62.5 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 10 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 78.1 |
| Disagree | 9 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 92.2 |
| Strongly Disagree | 5 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 100.0 |

Among our work group, we are remarkably similar in our values about what has to be done

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 11 | 17.2 | 17.2 | 17.2 |
| Agree | 16 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 42.2 |
| Somewhat Agree | 21 | 32.8 | 32.8 | 75.0 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 7 | 10.9 | 10.9 | 85.9 |
| Disagree | 7 | 10.9 | 10.9 | 96.9 |
| Strongly Disagree | 2 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 100.0 |

There is widely shared consensus about our goals and the approaches needed to achieve them

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 12 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 18.8 |
| Agree | 15 | 23.4 | 23.4 | 42.2 |
| Somewhat Agree | 12 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 60.9 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 11 | 17.2 | 17.2 | 78.1 |
| Disagree | 10 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 93.8 |
| Strongly Disagree | 4 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 100.0 |

## Group Performance

We have high work performance

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 12 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 18.8 |
| Agree | 20 | 31.3 | 31.3 | 50.0 |
| Somewhat Agree | 13 | 20.3 | 20.3 | 70.3 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 8 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 82.8 |
| Disagree | 8 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 95.3 |
| Strongly Disagree | 3 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 100.0 |

Most of our tasks are accomplished quickly and efficiently

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 12 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 18.8 |
| Agree | 13 | 20.3 | 20.3 | 39.1 |
| Somewhat Agree | 18 | 28.1 | 28.1 | 67.2 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 9 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 81.3 |
| Disagree | 5 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 89.1 |
| Strongly Disagree | 7 | 10.9 | 10.9 | 100.0 |

We always set a high standard of task accomplishment

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 15 | 23.4 | 23.4 | 23.4 |
| Agree | 21 | 32.8 | 32.8 | 56.3 |
| Somewhat Agree | 17 | 26.6 | 26.6 | 82.8 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 3 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 87.5 |
| Disagree | 4 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 93.8 |
| Strongly Disagree | 4 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 100.0 |

We always achieve a high standard of task accomplishment

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 11 | 17.2 | 17.2 | 17.2 |
| Agree | 19 | 29.7 | 29.7 | 46.9 |
| Somewhat Agree | 17 | 26.6 | 26.6 | 73.4 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 5 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 81.3 |
| Disagree | 8 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 93.8 |
| Strongly Disagree | 4 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 100.0 |

(table continued)

(continuing table)
We almost always beat our targets

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 7 | 10.9 | 10.9 | 10.9 |
| Agree | 15 | 23.4 | 23.4 | 34.4 |
| Somewhat Agree | 21 | 32.8 | 32.8 | 67.2 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 10 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 82.8 |
| Disagree | 5 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 90.6 |
| Strongly Disagree | 6 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 100.0 |

## Empowerment

I can influence the way work is done in my department

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 27 | 42.2 | 42.2 | 42.2 |
| Agree | 17 | 26.6 | 26.6 | 68.8 |
| Somewhat Agree | 12 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 87.5 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 6 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 96.9 |
| Disagree | 2 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 100.0 |

I can influence decisions taken in my department

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 25 | 39.1 | 39.1 | 39.1 |
| Agree | 19 | 29.7 | 29.7 | 68.8 |
| Somewhat Agree | 11 | 17.2 | 17.2 | 85.9 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 7 | 10.9 | 10.9 | 96.9 |
| Disagree | 2 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 100.0 |

I have authority to make decisions at work

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 26 | 40.6 | 40.6 | 40.6 |
| Agree | 14 | 21.9 | 21.9 | 62.5 |
| Somewhat Agree | 13 | 20.3 | 20.3 | 82.8 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 6 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 92.2 |
| Disagree | 3 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 96.9 |
| Strongly Disagree | 2 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 100.0 |

I have the authority to work effectively

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 32 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| Agree | 12 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 68.8 |
| Somewhat Agree | 9 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 82.8 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 9 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 96.9 |
| Disagree | 2 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 100.0 |

Important responsibilities are part of my job

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 40 | 62.5 | 62.5 | 62.5 |
| Agree | 11 | 17.2 | 17.2 | 79.7 |
| Somewhat Agree | 12 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 98.4 |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 100.0 |

I have the capabilities required to do my job well

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 44 | 68.8 | 68.8 | 68.8 |
| Agree | 10 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 84.4 |
| Somewhat Agree | 9 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 98.4 |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 100.0 |

I have the skills and abilities to do my job well

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 41 | 64.1 | 64.1 | 64.1 |
| Agree | 13 | 20.3 | 20.3 | 84.4 |
| Somewhat Agree | 8 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 96.9 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 1 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 98.4 |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 100.0 |

I have the competence to work effectively

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 42 | 65.6 | 65.6 | 65.6 |
| Agree | 14 | 21.9 | 21.9 | 87.5 |
| Somewhat Agree | 6 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 96.9 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 1 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 98.4 |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 100.0 |

(table continued)

(continuing table)

I can do my work efficiently

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 39 | 60.9 | 60.9 | 60.9 |
| Agree | 16 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 85.9 |
| Somewhat Agree | 7 | 10.9 | 10.9 | 96.9 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 1 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 98.4 |
| Disagree | 1 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 100.0 |

I can handle the challenges I face at work

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 33 | 51.6 | 51.6 | 51.6 |
| Agree | 14 | 21.9 | 21.9 | 73.4 |
| Somewhat Agree | 14 | 21.9 | 21.9 | 95.3 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 1 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 96.9 |
| Disagree | 1 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 98.4 |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 100.0 |

I am inspired by what we are trying to achieve as an organization

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 29 | 45.3 | 45.3 | 45.3 |
| Agree | 16 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 70.3 |
| Somewhat Agree | 9 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 84.4 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 5 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 92.2 |
| Disagree | 3 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 96.9 |
| Strongly Disagree | 2 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 100.0 |

I am inspired by the goals of the organization

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 26 | 40.6 | 40.6 | 40.6 |
| Agree | 18 | 28.1 | 28.1 | 68.8 |
| Somewhat Agree | 12 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 87.5 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 6 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 96.9 |
| Disagree | 1 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 98.4 |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 100.0 |

I am enthusiastic about working toward the organization's objectives

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 29 | 45.3 | 45.3 | 45.3 |
| Agree | 14 | 21.9 | 21.9 | 67.2 |
| Somewhat Agree | 14 | 21.9 | 21.9 | 89.1 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 6 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 98.4 |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 100.0 |

I am keen on our doing well as an organization

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 36 | 56.3 | 56.3 | 56.3 |
| Agree | 17 | 26.6 | 26.6 | 82.8 |
| Somewhat Agree | 9 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 96.9 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 1 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 98.4 |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 100.0 |

I am enthusiastic about the contribution my work makes to the organization

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | 39 | 60.9 | 60.9 | 60.9 |
| Agree | 14 | 21.9 | 21.9 | 82.8 |
| Somewhat Agree | 6 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 92.2 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 4 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 98.4 |
| Disagree | 1 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 100.0 |

*Note.* N = 64 Adapted from "Charismatic Leadership and Follower Effects," by J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, & S. T. Menon, 2000, *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(7), p. 766-767. Copyright © 2000
[a]·©34-item Perceived Leadership Behavior Measure Inventory

Of note from the follower focus collective identity and group performance results are that 48%

perceived a negative group identity. Forty-one percent saw themselves as a team, 53% were

unable to handle conflict, 48% did not share the same values, and 68% did not have a shared consensus on their goals and purpose. However, 50% of them perceived that they had high work performance and 56% set high standards of task accomplishment; yet, only 35% of the respondents scored that they always beat their targets.

What stands out from the follower focus sub-set items are responses of the respondents' feelings of empowerment. When combining the "strongly agree" and "agree" scores, 88% felt competent to work effectively; 86% felt that they worked efficiently; and 85% had the required capabilities, skills, and abilities to perform their jobs well. Eighty-three percent (83%) felt enthusiastic about their contribution and a keenness on doing well as an organization, and 80% saw important responsibilities as being part of their jobs. All other responses scored 63% or higher.

### Initial Findings

This researcher's preliminary review of the findings, that of an evaluation based on response score percentages, would state that the respondents see two-thirds of their supervisors as having vision and bringing up possibilities for the future, but weak at articulating strategic goals, inspiring strategic goals, and public speaking. The respondents perceived that their supervisors did not take risks, nor were they particularly sensitive to the environment or members' needs. They were also seen as being very conventional. Moreover, two-thirds of the respondents had respect for their supervisor but did not trust him or her, nor were they satisfied with their supervisor. The respondents had a weak perception of collective identity and mediocre group performance. However, they had very high feelings of empowerment, and particularly high feelings of self-esteem and self-efficacy.

To further investigate the relationships between the charismatic leadership behavioral components and the followers' perceptions of their own motivation, trust, and satisfaction, correlations were run and examined. Leadership and follower-directed behavior variables (influencing followers' behaviors and attitudes) (Conger & Kanungo, 1994) were analyzed.

60

Leadership effectiveness, the independent variable, was correlated with the perceived factors itemized in the C-K Charismatic Leadership Scale (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 1997) and the Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 2000). Analyses investigated respondent perceptions of motivation, powerlessness, and self-efficacy in their current employment environment. The following sections separately discuss the results by addressing each of the research questions.

## Research Question One

Research question one asked, *What relationships exist between the perceived behavioral components of charismatic leadership and the attitudes and behaviors of the followers?* Variables from the 20-item C-K Charismatic Leadership Scale (see Appendix C, Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 1997) and from the 34-item Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (see Appendix D, Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000) were correlated by item. Perceived leadership behaviors and those effects on the followers' were investigated by the respondents' attitudes as followers and their perceptions of the behavioral attributes of their immediate supervisors. Conger et al. (2000) postulated that further studies using their scale could record perceived behavioral component effects of charismatic leaders on the attitudes and behaviors of their followers. A new variable, *raw score*, was created by condensing the multiple data points from each respondent (see Appendix G). To investigate question one, a bivariate Pearson Correlation was run between the CK Leadership Scale (observed leaders raw score) Variable and the Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (perceived behaviors raw score) variable (see Table 10). Table 10 illustrates that the administrators' perceived observations of their immediate supervisors, labeled *observed leaders raw score* ($r$ = .741), had a highly significant correlation with the perceived behaviors of the administrator followers ($p$ = <.000). The statistical correlation coefficient $r$ measures the strength and direction of a linear relationship between two variables. The closer $r$ is to +1 the more closely the variables are related. Significance indicates probability, with $p$ <.01 indicating

that there is a less than 1% chance that the outcome could have occurred by chance. Highly

significant in this instance indicates that there is no probability that the outcome occurred by

chance. In other words, it is probably true. To better understand relationships between follower

**Table 10**

*Correlations of CK Leadership Scale and Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory*

| | | Observe_Leaders _Raw_Score | Perceived_Behavior _Raw_Score |
|---|---|---|---|
| Observe_Leaders_Raw_Score | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .741** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .000 |
| | N | 64 | 64 |
| Perceived_Behavior_Raw_Score | Pearson Correlation | .741** | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | |
| | N | 64 | 64 |
| **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

*Note.* N = 64 Adapted from "Charismatic Leadership and Follower Effects," by J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, & S. T. Menon, 2000, Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21(7), p. 766-767. Copyright © 2000 and "Measuring charisma: Dimensionality and validity of the Conger-Kanungo scale of charismatic leadership" by J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, S. T. Menon, & P. Mathur, P, 1997, *Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration, 14(3) 290-302.*

and leader interdependency, multivariate tests of between-subjects effects were performed

between independent variables of leader focus and follower focus items, by item, with the

dependent variable in the sub-set items of vision and articulation, personal risk, sensitivity to the

environment, sensitivity to member needs, and unconventional behavior.

 **Vision and articulation correlations.** Values from the multivariate test of between-subjects

effects indicated significant correlations between some leader focus trust variables and vision

and articulation variables. Both *Consistently generates new ideas for the future of the*

*organization* and *Inspirational, able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what*

*organizational members are doing* contributed significantly to trust and satisfaction in the leader

(F = 4.211, *p* =.010), (F = 5.027, *p* = .004), (F = 4.531, *p* = .010) respectively (see Table 11).

There was one highly significant correlation between follower collective identity and the vision

**Table 11**

*Tests of Between-Subject Effects Trust / Satisfaction with Vision and Articulation*

| *Leadership Focus* Source | Dependent Variable | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| I have complete faith in him/her | Consistently generates new ideas for the future of the organization | 2.867 | 4.211 | .010 |
| I am satisfied that his/her style of leadership is the right one for getting our group's job done | Inspirational, able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what organizational members are doing | 2.367 | 5.027 | .004 |
| I am pleased (or satisfied) with his/her leadership | Inspirational, able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what organizational members are doing | 2.134 | 4.531 | .010 |

*Note.* N = 64 Adapted from "Charismatic Leadership and Follower Effects," by J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, & S. T. Menon, 2000, Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21(7), p. 766-767. Copyright © 2000 and "Measuring charisma: Dimensionality and validity of the Conger-Kanungo scale of charismatic leadership" by J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, S. T. Menon, & P. Mathur, P, 1997, *Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration, 14(3) 290-302.*

and articulation item *Provides inspiring strategic and organizational goals* (F = 4.754, *p* = .008)

(see Table 12). No other items significantly correlated to leader focus or follower focus from the

other observed subsets of personal risk, sensitivity to the environment, sensitivity to member

needs, or unconventional behavior.

**Table 12**

*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects Collective Identity and Vision and Articulation*

| Follower Focus Source | Dependent Variable | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| There is a widely shared consensus about our goals and the approaches needed to achieve them | Provides inspiring strategic and organizational goals | 3.043 | 4.754 | .008 |

*Note.* N = 64 Adapted from "Charismatic Leadership and Follower Effects," by J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, & S. T. Menon, 2000, Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21(7), p. 766-767. Copyright © 2000 and "Measuring charisma: Dimensionality and validity of the Conger-Kanungo scale of charismatic leadership" by J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, S. T. Menon, & P. Mathur, P, 1997, *Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration, 14(3) 290-302.*

The motivational factor, trust in the leader, noted by Jung and Avolio (2000) significantly

correlated with the perceptions of vision and articulation of the administrators' immediate

supervisor. Khoury (2006) noted high correlations between subordinate's perceiving effective

leaders as trustworthy with able to *model the way*. This analysis showed that supervisors

perceived as providing "inspiring strategic organizational goals" had significant correlation with

administrators perceiving "a widely shared consensus," supporting Khoury (see Table 12). To

further understand research question one relationships between follower and leader

interdependency, multivariate tests of between-subjects effects were performed between

independent variables of follower focus empowerment sub-set items with the dependent

variable items from the sub-set items of vision and articulation, personal risk, sensitivity to the

environment, sensitivity to member needs, and unconventional behavior.

    **Empowerment correlations.** There were significant correlations with the follower focus

empowerment items and the sub-set vision and articulation items in the tests of between-

subjects effects. Administrators' responses indicated perceptions that they were able to

"influence the way work is done" and how decisions are made in their departments, that they

had authorization in working effectively and in making decisions, that they had the capability and

the skills and ability "to do [their] job well," had the "competence to work effectively," ability to

"work efficiently," that they "can handle the challenges [they] face at work", are inspired by "what

[they] are trying to achieve" and "the goals of the organization," and that they are "enthusiastic

about working toward the organization's objectives" and "the contribution [their] work makes to

the organization" (see Table 13). The empowerment item "I am keen on our doing well as an

organization" and the vision and articulation item "Readily recognizes new environmental

opportunities (favorable physical and social conditions) that may facilitate achievement or

organizational objectives" was not significant.

    There were significant correlations with 93% of the follower focus empowerment items

and 86% of the vision and articulation items from the tests of between-subjects effects. To better

understand the values, administrators seen as empowering followers by highly significant

correlations ($p = $ <.000) showed that 5 of 14 (36%) were perceived as "provid[ing] inspiring

goals," 11 of 14 (79%) as consistently generating new ideas for the organization's future, and 6

**Table 13**

*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects Empowerment and Vision and Articulation*

| Followers Focus Source | Leadership Scale Dependent Variable | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| I can influence the way work is done in my department | Has vision; often brings up ideas about possibilities for future | 5.101 | 3.489 | .036 |
| | Provides inspiring strategic and organizational goals | 6.451 | 8.809 | .001 |
| | Consistently generates new ideas for future of organization | 5.825 | 18.731 | .000 |
| | Entrepreneurial; seizes new opportunities to achieve goals | 5.783 | 3.232 | .045 |
| | Readily recognizes new environmental opportunities (favorable physical and social conditions) that may facilitate achievement or organizational objectives | 6.889 | 4.747 | .012 |
| | Inspirational, able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what organizational members are doing | 6.221 | 8.326 | .001 |
| | Exciting Public Speaker | 6876 | 3.780 | .028 |
| I can influence decisions taken in my department | Has vision; often brings up ideas about possibilities for future | 8.743 | 5.981 | .010 |
| | Provides inspiring strategic and organizational goals | 9.760 | 13.329 | .000 |
| | Consistently generates new ideas for future of organization | 8.433 | 27.120 | .000 |
| | Entrepreneurial; seizes new opportunities to achieve goals | 8.746 | 4.889 | .019 |
| | Readily recognizes new environmental opportunities (favorable physical and social conditions) that may facilitate achievement or organizational objectives | 9.523 | 6.562 | .007 |
| | Inspirational, able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what organizational members are doing | 9.268 | 12.404 | .000 |
| | Exciting Public Speaker | 7.296 | 4.011 | .015 |
| I have authority to make decisions at work | Has vision; often brings up ideas about possibilities for future | 8.383 | 5.735 | .006 |
| | Provides inspiring strategic and organizational goals | 7.784 | 10.630 | .000 |
| | Consistently generates new ideas for future of organization | 7.719 | 24.822 | .000 |
| | Entrepreneurial; seizes new opportunities to achieve goals | 7.228 | 4.040 | .022 |
| | Readily recognizes new environmental opportunities (favorable physical and social conditions) that may facilitate achievement or organizational objectives | 5.818 | 4.009 | .023 |
| | Inspirational, able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what organizational members are doing | 9.778 | 13.086 | .000 |
| | Exciting Public Speaker | 6.253 | 3.437 | .038 |
| I have the authority to work effectively | Has vision; often brings up ideas about possibilities for future | 6.850 | 4.686 | .013 |
| | Provides inspiring strategic and organizational goals | 3.482 | 4.754 | .012 |
| | Consistently generates new ideas for future of organization | 3.948 | 12.697 | .000 |
| | Entrepreneurial; seizes new opportunities to achieve goals | 5.577 | 3.117 | .050 |
| | Readily recognizes new environmental opportunities (favorable physical and social conditions) that may facilitate achievement or organizational objectives | 3.499 | 2.411 | .099 |
| | Inspirational, able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what organizational members are doing | 3.764 | 5.038 | .010 |
| | Exciting Public Speaker | 4.515 | 2.482 | .092 |

(table continued)

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Has vision; often brings up ideas about possibilities for future | 3.885 | 2.657 | .012 |
| | Provides inspiring strategic and organizational goals | 6.633 | 9.058 | .007 |
| | Consistently generates new ideas for future of organization | 7.748 | 24.914 | .000 |
| I have the capabilities required to do my job well | Entrepreneurial; seizes new opportunities to achieve goals | 7.117 | 3.978 | .061 |
| | Readily recognizes new environmental opportunities (favorable physical and social conditions) that may facilitate achievement or organizational objectives | 7.235 | 4.985 | .038 |
| | Inspirational, able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what organizational members are doing | 4.600 | 6.156 | .023 |
| | Exciting Public Speaker | 2.218 | 1.219 | 2.83 |
| | Has vision; often brings up ideas about possibilities for future | 5.089 | 3.481 | .078 |
| | Provides inspiring strategic and organizational goals | 9.471 | 12.933 | .002 |
| | Consistently generates new ideas for future of organization | 4.735 | 15.227 | .001 |
| I have the skills and abilities to do my job well | Entrepreneurial; seizes new opportunities to achieve goals | 11.314 | 6.324 | .021 |
| | Readily recognizes new environmental opportunities (favorable physical and social conditions) that may facilitate achievement or organizational objectives | 11.518 | 7.937 | .011 |
| | Inspirational, able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what organizational members are doing | 15.777 | 21.116 | .000 |
| | Exciting Public Speaker | 17.202 | 9.456 | .006 |
| | Has vision; often brings up ideas about possibilities for future | 5.568 | 3.809 | .066 |
| | Provides inspiring strategic and organizational goals | 9.796 | 13.377 | .002 |
| | Consistently generates new ideas for future of organization | 3.508 | 11.281 | .003 |
| I have the competence to work effectively | Entrepreneurial; seizes new opportunities to achieve goals | 10.948 | 6.120 | .023 |
| | Readily recognizes new environmental opportunities (favorable physical and social conditions) that may facilitate achievement or organizational objectives | 6.381 | 4.397 | .050 |
| | Inspirational, able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what organizational members are doing | 20.955 | 28.046 | .000 |
| | Exciting Public Speaker | 24.574 | 13.509 | .002 |
| | Has vision; often brings up ideas about possibilities for future | 7.538 | 5.157 | .016 |
| | Provides inspiring strategic and organizational goals | 10.809 | 14.760 | .000 |
| | Consistently generates new ideas for future of organization | 6.647 | 21.376 | .000 |
| | Entrepreneurial; seizes new opportunities to achieve goals | 6.855 | 3.832 | .040 |
| I can do my work efficiently | Readily recognizes new environmental opportunities (favorable physical and social conditions) that may facilitate achievement or organizational objectives | 4.744 | 3.269 | .060 |
| | Inspirational, able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what organizational members are doing | 8.032 | 10.750 | .001 |
| | Exciting Public Speaker | 10.106 | 5.555 | .013 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **I can handle the challenges I face at work** | Has vision; often brings up ideas about possibilities for future | 7.591 | 5.193 | .016 |
| | Provides inspiring strategic and organizational goals | 7.450 | 10.174 | .001 |
| | Consistently generates new ideas for future of organization | 6.547 | 21.054 | .000 |
| | Entrepreneurial; seizes new opportunities to achieve goals | 5.347 | 2.989 | .074 |
| | Readily recognizes new environmental opportunities (favorable physical and social conditions) that may facilitate achievement or organizational objectives | 6.107 | 4.208 | .031 |
| | Inspirational, able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what organizational members are doing | 3.566 | 4.773 | .021 |
| | Exciting Public Speaker | 2.175 | 1.196 | .324 |
| **I am inspired by what we are trying to achieve as organization** | Has vision; often brings up ideas about possibilities for future | 7.291 | 4.987 | .018 |
| | Provides inspiring strategic and organizational goals | 6.393 | 8.731 | .002 |
| | Consistently generates new ideas for future of organization | 5.030 | 16.175 | .000 |
| | Entrepreneurial; seizes new opportunities to achieve goals | 4.824 | 2.696 | .093 |
| | Readily recognizes new environmental opportunities (favorable physical and social conditions) that may facilitate achievement or organizational objectives | 4.475 | 3.083 | .069 |
| | Inspirational, able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what organizational members are doing | 5.192 | 6.949 | .005 |
| | Exciting Public Speaker | 6.398 | 3.517 | .050 |
| **I am inspired by the goals of the organization** | Has vision; often brings up ideas about possibilities for future | 11.902 | 8.142 | .003 |
| | Provides inspiring strategic and organizational goals | 14.669 | 20.031 | .000 |
| | Consistently generates new ideas for future of organization | 6.799 | 21.863 | .000 |
| | Entrepreneurial; seizes new opportunities to achieve goals | 11.323 | 6.329 | .008 |
| | Readily recognizes new environmental opportunities (favorable physical and social conditions) that may facilitate achievement or organizational objectives | 5.429 | 3.741 | .043 |
| | Inspirational, able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what organizational members are doing | 12.950 | 17.332 | .000 |
| | Exciting Public Speaker | 10.948 | 6.018 | .009 |
| **I am keen on our doing well as an organization** | Has vision; often brings up ideas about possibilities for future | .398 | .272 | .608 |
| | Provides inspiring strategic and organizational goals | 8.722 | 11.911 | .000 |
| | Consistently generates new ideas for future of organization | 4.707 | 15.136 | .000 |
| | Entrepreneurial; seizes new opportunities to achieve goals | 1.759 | .983 | .334 |
| | Readily recognizes new environmental opportunities (favorable physical and social conditions) that may facilitate achievement or organizational objectives | 4.667 | 3.216 | .089 |
| | Inspirational, able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what organizational members are doing | 10.409 | 13.931 | .000 |
| | Exciting Public Speaker | .694 | .382 | .544 |

(continued table)

| I am enthusiastic about the contribution my work makes to the organization | Has vision; often brings up ideas about possibilities for future | 2.785 | 1.905 | .176 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Provides inspiring strategic and organizational goals | 4.754 | 6.492 | .007 |
| | Consistently generates new ideas for future of organization | 4.708 | 15.140 | .000 |
| | Entrepreneurial; seizes new opportunities to achieve goals | 3.313 | 1.852 | .184 |
| | Readily recognizes new environmental opportunities (favorable physical and social conditions) that may facilitate achievement or organizational objectives | 5.578 | 3.844 | .040 |
| | Inspirational, able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what organizational members are doing | .557 | .746 | .488 |
| | Exciting Public Speaker | .847 | .466 | .635 |

Note. *N=64.* Adapted from "Charismatic Leadership and Follower Effects," by J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, & S. T. Menon, 2000, *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21(7), p. 766-767.* Copyright © 2000 and "Measuring charisma: Dimensionality and validity of the Conger-Kanungo scale of charismatic leadership" by J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, S. T. Menon, & P. Mathur, P, 1997, *Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration, 14(3) 290-302.*

of 14 (43%) as inspiring, and motivating by articulating effectively the importance of what they were doing. The follower empowerment item "important responsibilities are part of my job" had significant correlation ($p$ = <.01) with only one perceived leader sensitivity to member needs item "influences others by developing mutual liking and respect" (see Table 14).

**Table 14**

*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects Empowerment and Sensitivity to Members Needs*

| Follower Focus Source | Dependent Variable | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Important responsibilities are part of my job | Influences others by developing mutual liking and respect | 8.486 | 5.981 | .010 |

*Note*. N=64. Adapted from "Charismatic Leadership and Follower Effects," by J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, & S. T. Menon, 2000, *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(7), p. 766-767. Copyright © 2000

Research question one asking *What relationships exist between the perceived behavioral components of charismatic leadership and the attitudes and behaviors of the followers?* has been answered by examining the respondents' feelings as followers and their perceptions of the charismatic behaviors of their immediate supervisors. The bivariate Pearson Correlation showed that a highly significant relationship ($p$ = <.000) exists between the

administrators' perceptions of their immediate supervisors and their attitudes and behaviors as followers. Further multivariate tests indicated that supervisors' vision and articulation perceived as consistently generating new ideas for the future, and being inspiring and motivational, contributed significantly to follower trust and satisfaction with their leader. Trust of the leader, and satisfaction with leadership, were shown to be significant with the perceptions of vision and articulation of the leader's ability at generating new ideas and feelings of inspiration and motivation. Supervisor's ability to provide inspiring strategies and goals (vision) showed a significant relationship with follower feelings of collective identity indicated by the responses rating the shared consensus in goals and the approaches to reach them. Jung and Avolio (2000) noted trust in the leader was a follower motivational factor. This study found that supervisors being perceived as inspirational correlated with the follower perception of sharing a consensus, also noted by Khoury (2006). The current study's findings prove that there are significant relationships between the perceived charismatic behaviors of leaders that contribute to perceivable effects felt by their followers, as noted by Bass (1985), Conger (2012), Conger and Kanungo (1987), and Conger, Kanungo, and Menon (2000). Furthermore, the charismatic leader behaviors of vision and articulation produced follower effects of trust and collective identity as noted by Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993).

**Research Question Two**

Research question two asked, *What leader behaviors contribute to the followers' perceptions of the efficacy of their leader?* Responses from the 34-item Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (Conger, Kanungo, Menon, 2000) of the leader focus sub-sets reverence, trust, and satisfaction with the leader were correlated with follower focus responses from the empowerment items, to investigate this question. The respondents' perceptions of empowerment items such as having high esteem for the leader, "complete faith in" and a good feeling being around the leader, and satisfaction or pleasure with one's immediate supervisors' style of leadership are leadership behaviors that contribute to a followers' perceptions of the

efficacy of one's leader (Conger and Kanungo, 1988).

Reverence correlations. Values from the multivariate tests of between-subjects effects indicated highly significant correlations ($p = <.00$) between 79% of the follower empowerment independent variables and the leader reverence items. Follower perceptions of the ability to be influential with "the way work is done" and making decisions in one's department, having authority at work making decisions, working effectively, having the "skills and abilities" to perform ones job well, feeling competent to effectively work, able to efficiently work, feeling inspired by the organizations direction and goals, and enthusiasm working towards organizational objectives indicated highly significant correlations with all reverence of the leader items (see Table 15). "Important responsibilities are part of my job" and "Can handle the challenges I face at work" correlated significantly ($p = <.00$) with having "great esteem" of one's supervisor, as did "important responsibilities" as part of one's job with having "high respect" and handling challenges faced at work with admiration of one's supervisor. There were non-significant correlations between the follower empowerment variables "have capabilities required to do my job well," "I am keen on our doing well as an organization" and "I am enthusiastic about the contribution my work makes to the organization" with all leader reverence variables. Nor was significance found between follower ability to "handle the challenges I face at work" with holding "high respect" of the leader or part of one's job including "important responsibilities" with admiration of one's leader. The model presented by Conger and Kanungo (1987, Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 1997) included followers' respect and admiration of the leader. High esteem for one's leader was measured as reverence (Bass, 1985); 86% of the vision and articulation items indicated a highly significant correlation ($p = <.000$) with reverence for the leader.

Trust correlations. Values from the multivariate tests of between-subjects effects indicated highly significant correlations between follower focus independent variables and trust in the leader. Administrators having "complete faith" in one's leader showed the greatest impact

70

**Table 15**

*Tests of Between-Subject Effects Empowerment and Leader Focus Reverence*

| Follower Focus Source | Leader Focus Dependent Variable | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Can influence way work done in my department | I hold him or her in high respect | 1.844 | 12.133 | .000 |
| | I have great esteem for him/her | 3.465 | 14.548 | .000 |
| | I admire him/her as a leader | 4.056 | 8.353 | .001 |
| Can influence decisions taken in my department | I hold him or her in high respect | 1.507 | 9.915 | .001 |
| | I have great esteem for him/her | 4.948 | 20.773 | .000 |
| | I admire him/her as a leader | 5.670 | 11.676 | .000 |
| Have authority to make decisions at work | I hold him or her in high respect | 3.240 | 21.323 | .000 |
| | I have great esteem for him/her | 5.312 | 22.302 | .000 |
| | I admire him/her as a leader | 5.903 | 12.156 | .000 |
| Have authority to work effectively | I hold him or her in high respect | 2.905 | 19.119 | .000 |
| | I have great esteem for him/her | 5.172 | 21.715 | .000 |
| | I admire him/her as a leader | 4.967 | 10.229 | .000 |
| Important responsibilities are part of my job | I hold him or her in high respect | 3.753 | 24.701 | .000 |
| | I have great esteem for him/her | 2.502 | 10.504 | .001 |
| | I admire him/her as a leader | 2.485 | 5.117 | .017 |
| Have skills and abilities to do my job well | I hold him or her in high respect | 3.753 | 24.699 | .000 |
| | I have great esteem for him/her | 6.233 | 26.169 | .000 |
| | I admire him/her as a leader | 6.438 | 13.258 | .002 |
| Have competence to work effectively | I hold him or her in high respect | 7.351 | 48.382 | .000 |
| | I have great esteem for him/her | 8.844 | 37.133 | .000 |
| | I admire him/her as a leader | 8.989 | 18.511 | .000 |
| Can do my work efficiently | I hold him or her in high respect | 3.378 | 22.236 | .000 |
| | I have great esteem for him/her | 3.204 | 13.455 | .000 |
| | I admire him/her as a leader | 3.358 | 6.915 | .006 |
| Can handle the challenges I face at work | I hold him or her in high respect | .528 | 3.474 | .052 |
| | I have great esteem for him/her | 2.419 | 10.158 | .001 |
| | I admire him/her as a leader | 3.016 | 6.212 | .008 |
| I am inspired by what we are trying to achieve as an organization | I hold him or her in high respect | 3.400 | 22.375 | .000 |
| | I have great esteem for him/her | 4.824 | 20.255 | .000 |
| | I admire him/her as a leader | 4.686 | 9.650 | .001 |
| I am inspired by the goals of the organization | I hold him or her in high respect | 9.041 | 59.505 | .000 |
| | I have great esteem for him/her | 12.138 | 50.963 | .000 |
| | I admire him/her as a leader | 11.900 | 24.505 | .000 |
| I am enthusiastic about working toward the organization's objectives | I hold him or her in high respect | 6.781 | 44.633 | .000 |
| | I have great esteem for him/her | 9.438 | 39.629 | .000 |
| | I admire him/her as a leader | 7.945 | 16.361 | .000 |

*Note.* N=64. Adapted from "Charismatic Leadership and Follower Effects," by J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, & S. T. Menon, 2000, *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(7), p. 766-767. Copyright © 2000

with highly significant levels ($p$ = <.00) indicated in 64% of the empowerment items (see Table

16). Administrators perceiving that they "cannot trust" in or consider the leader trustworthy

indicated non-significant correlations. There were non-significant correlations between follower

empowerment and the follower's authority to work effectively, responsibilities of importance on

the job, required capabilities to perform the job well, feeling the organization was doing well,

enthusiasm of one's contribution to the organization, or ability to work efficiently, and the items

indicating trust in the leader. Administrators perceptions of inability to trust their leader and that

the leader was not trustworthy indicated non-significant correlations with having "skills and

abilities to do" ones "job well," feelings of having "competence to work effectively," ability to

"handle challenges" faced at work," and feeling "inspired by what we are trying to achieve as an

**Table 16**

*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects Empowerment and Leader Focus Trust*

| Follower Focus Source | Dependent Variable | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Can influence way work's done in department | I have complete faith in him/her | 4.629 | 10.421 | .000 |
| Can influence decisions in my department | I have complete faith in him/her | 4.869 | 10.961 | .001 |
| Have authority to make decisions at work | I have complete faith in him/her | 4.000 | 9.006 | .001 |
| Have skills and abilities to do my job well | I have complete faith in him/her | 8.380 | 18.867 | .000 |
| Have the competence to work effectively | I have complete faith in him/her | 7.634 | 17.187 | .001 |
| Can handle challenges I face at work | I have complete faith in him/her | 3.798 | 8.551 | .002 |
| Inspired by what organization trying to achieve | I have complete faith in him/her | 3.866 | 8.705 | .002 |
| Inspired by goals of organization | I have complete faith in him/her | 11.060 | 24.900 | .000 |
| Enthusiastic about working towards organizations objectives | I have complete faith in him/her | 7.001 | 15.763 | .000 |

*Note.* N = 64 Adapted from "Charismatic Leadership and Follower Effects," by J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, & S. T. Menon, 2000, *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(7), p. 766-767. Copyright © 2000.

organization" or "inspired by the goals of the organization." Nor were there any significant

correlations of follower perceptions of empowerment and feeling enthusiasm in working toward

the objectives of the organization. Values from nine of the 14 empowerment items indicated high

significance ($p$ = <.00) with the administrator "having complete faith in" one's immediate

supervisor and indicating followers' perceiving being enabled and empowered, support the

findings of Conger and Kanungo (1998) and Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur (2000).

**Satisfaction with leader correlations.** Values from the multivariate tests of between-

subjects effects indicated significant correlations between follower empowerment and

satisfaction with leader dependent variables. Administrators' feelings of pleasure or satisfaction with their supervisor's leadership correlated ($p = <.00$) with 12 of the 14 empowerment items (see Table 17). Followers indicated highly significant correlations ($p = <.00$) between the perceived empowerment from their supervisors by feeling that they could influence departmental work and decisions, that they had work decision making authority and "authority to work effectively," that they had the required capabilities, abilities, and skills to perform their jobs, and that they had the "competence" and ability to work "effectively" and "efficiently." Work contribution enthusiasm and facing job challenges indicated non-significant correlations with followers' pleasure or satisfaction with the leadership of their supervisor.

Highly significant correlations were indicated for the follower perceived empowerment items of handling work challenges, being inspired by what the organization is trying to achieve, and enthusiasm in working towards objectives and the organization doing well, with satisfaction that one's supervisor's leadership style is the correct one for "getting [the] job done" and pleasure or satisfaction with one's supervisor's leadership ($p = <.00$). Administrators' perceptions of feeling enthusiastic about their work contributing to the organization correlated significantly with an administrator's feeling satisfaction and with the supervisors' leadership style being "the right one for getting our group's job done" ($p = <.00$). There were non-significant correlations indicated in the follower empowerment item addressing job responsibilities being important. Nor were significant correlations indicated by administrators' perceptions of good feelings from being around their supervisors.

Values in the multivariate tests of between-subjects effects from 11 of 14 (79%) of the satisfaction with the leader. One of the 14 (7%) correlations indicated lower significance ($p = <.01$) between the ability to handle work challenges with having enthusiasm about one's work empowerment items indicated highly significant correlations ($p = <.00$) with the administrators'

**Table 17**

*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects Follower Empowerment and Satisfaction with Leader*

| Follower Focus Source | Leader Focus Dependent Variable | MS | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Can influence way work done in my department | I am satisfied that his/her style of leadership is the right one for getting our group's job done | 6.534 | 21.574 | .000 |
| | I am pleased (or satisfied) with his/her leadership | 3.390 | 15.578 | .000 |
| Can influence decisions taken in my department | I am satisfied that his/her style of leadership is the right one for getting our group's job done | 7.419 | 24.495 | .000 |
| | I am pleased (or satisfied) with his/her leadership | 4.717 | 21.678 | .000 |
| Have authority to make decisions at work | I am satisfied that his/her style of leadership is the right one for getting our group's job done | 6.259 | 20.666 | .000 |
| | I am pleased (or satisfied) with his/her leadership | 3.216 | 14.781 | .000 |
| Have authority to work effectively | I am satisfied that his/her style of leadership is the right one for getting our group's job done | 3.507 | 11.579 | .000 |
| | I am pleased (or satisfied) with his/her leadership | 1.454 | 6.684 | .003 |
| Have capabilities required to do my job well | I am satisfied that his/her style of leadership is the right one for getting our group's job done | 4.950 | 16.344 | .001 |
| | I am pleased (or satisfied) with his/her leadership | 4.621 | 21.236 | .000 |
| Have skills and abilities to do my job well | I am satisfied that his/her style of leadership is the right one for getting our group's job done | 11.364 | 37.519 | .000 |
| | I am pleased (or satisfied) with his/her leadership | 7.540 | 34.650 | .000 |
| Have the competence to work effectively | I am satisfied that his/her style of leadership is the right one for getting our group's job done | 14.826 | 48.950 | .000 |
| | I am pleased (or satisfied) with his/her leadership | 12.770 | 58.687 | .000 |
| Can do my work efficiently | I am satisfied that his/her style of leadership is the right one for getting our group's job done | 5.760 | 19.016 | .000 |
| | I am pleased (or satisfied) with his/her leadership | 4.798 | 22.048 | .000 |
| Can handle challenges at work | I am satisfied that his/her style of leadership is the right one for getting our group's job done | 3.471 | 11.460 | .001 |
| | I am pleased (or satisfied) with his/her leadership | 1.213 | 5.574 | .012 |
| Inspired by what we are trying to achieve as organization | I am satisfied that his/her style of leadership is the right one for getting our group's job done | 3.979 | 13.137 | .000 |
| | I am pleased (or satisfied) with his/her leadership | 1.287 | 5.914 | .010 |
| Inspired by goals of organization | I am satisfied that his/her style of leadership is the right one for getting our group's job done | 16.200 | 53.488 | .000 |
| | I am pleased (or satisfied) with his/her leadership | 12.702 | 58.374 | .000 |
| Enthusiastic working towards organization objectives | I am satisfied that his/her style of leadership is the right one for getting our group's job done | 8.794 | 29.034 | .000 |
| | I am pleased (or satisfied) with his/her leadership | 7.616 | 34.998 | .000 |
| Am keen on our doing well as an organization | I am satisfied that his/her style of leadership is the right one for getting our group's job done | 4.023 | 13.282 | .002 |
| | I am pleased (or satisfied) with his/her leadership | 5.134 | 23.594 | .000 |
| Enthusiastic about contribution my work makes to organization | I am satisfied that his/her style of leadership is the right one for getting our group's job done | 2.288 | 7.554 | .004 |
| | I am pleased (or satisfied) with his/her leadership | 1.167 | 5.363 | .014 |

*Note*. N=64. Adapted from "Charismatic Leadership and Follower Effects," by J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, & S. T. Menon, 2000, *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(7), p. 766-767. Copyright © 2000

contributing to the organization, two of the 14 (14%), showed no significance with the pleasure or satisfaction with the supervisor's leadership ability. One hundred percent (100%) of the administrator correlations indicated satisfaction that the immediate supervisors' "style of leadership [was] the right one for getting our group's job done." Eighty-six percent (86%) indicated that they were "pleased (or satisfied) with [the immediate supervisors'] leadership." The administrators' responses perceiving that they can do and are competent to do their jobs indicated feelings of empowerment as noted by Conger and Kanungo (1988). These perceived leader behaviors influenced the administrators' perceptions of ability and work performance (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993), supporting the efficacy of their leader.

Research question two asking *What leader behaviors contribute to the followers' perceptions of the efficacy of their leader?* has been answered by examination of the relationships between the followers' perceptions of reverence, trust, and satisfaction of their supervisor, with the followers' feelings of empowerment. Seventy-nine percent (79%) of the empowerment variables correlated significantly ($p = <.00$) with perceptions of the administrators' reverence for their supervisor. The administrators felt that they had influence, decision making authority, confidence, skills and abilities, and were enthusiastic and inspired by their unit's goals and objectives. They held "great esteem" and "high respect" for their supervisor when indicating that they held "important responsibilities" and could "handle" work challenges, but not admiration of their supervisor. Eighty-six percent (86%) of the vision and articulation items showed relationships as being highly significant ($p = <.000$) with follower reverence of the leader, and 64% showed being empowered by the trust item having "complete faith" in their leader.

**Research Question Three**

Research Question Three asked, *What leader behaviors contribute to follower's perceptions of self-efficacy?* Responses from the 34-item Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 2000) leader focus sub-sets items of reverence, trust, and satisfaction with leader were correlated with follower focus item responses

from the collective identity and group performance sub-sets to investigate this question. Values

from the multivariate tests of between-subjects effects of collective identity items "In our

workgroup, our conflict is out in the open and is constructively handled" correlated highly ($p = <$

.00) with the reverence items of having great respect and esteem for one's leader. Having

admiration of one's leader was non-significant. No significance was indicated by followers

seeing themselves as being cohesive team members, sharing the same values about "task and

purpose" of the organization, of their group having very similar "values about what has to be

done," or there being a group consensus of what the group's goals were and how to "achieve

them" (see Table 18).

**Table 18**

*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects Collective Identity and Reverence for the Leader*

| Follower Focus Source | Leader Focus Dependent Variable | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| In our work group, our conflict is out in the open | I hold him or her in high respect | 3.034 | 9.942 | .001 |
| | I have great esteem for him/her | 2.412 | 11.257 | .001 |

*Note*. N=64. Adapted from "Charismatic Leadership and Follower Effects," by J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, & S. T. Menon, 2000, *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(7), p. 766-767. Copyright © 2000

Non-significant values were found between the follower collective identity items and all of

the leader trust items. Values from follower collective identity items and satisfaction with the

leader items perceiving their group as a "cohesive team" had highly significant correlation ($p =$

<.00) with good feelings from being around the leader and pleasure in the supervisor's

"leadership style." The item on perceptions of conflicts in the work group being "out in the open"

and constructively handled had highly significant correlations ($p = <.00$) with the administrators'

satisfaction of the supervisor and the supervisor having the correct leadership style "for getting

our group's job done" and with being satisfied and pleased with the supervisor's leadership.  The

items perceiving shared task and purpose of organizational values, "remarkably similar" work

group values about direction, and a consensus on approaches to achieving goals being shared

showed non-significant correlations (see Table 19).

**Table 19**

*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects Collective Identity and Satisfaction with Leader*

| Follower Focus Source | Dependent Variable | Mean Sq | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| We see ourselves in the work group as a cohesive team | I feel good to be around him/her | 1.272 | 6.641 | .006 |
| | I am pleased (or satisfied) with his/her leadership | 2.258 | 9.525 | .001 |
| In our work group, our conflict is out in the open and is constructively handled | I am satisfied that his/her style of leadership is the right one for getting our group's job done | 1.893 | 6.408 | .006 |
| | I am pleased (or satisfied) with his/her leadership | 1.989 | 8.392 | .002 |

*Note*. N=64. Adapted from "Charismatic Leadership and Follower Effects," by J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, & S. T. Menon, 2000, *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(7), p. 766-767. Copyright © 2000

When multivariate tests of between-subjects effects of administrator group performance

perceptions of their supervisors' vision and articulation, personal risk, sensitivity to the

environment, sensitivity to member needs, and unconventional behavior items were correlated,

no significant levels were found. The respondents' perceptions of perceiving themselves as part

of a "cohesive team" contribute to perceptions of self-efficacy, and followers with feelings of

empowerment can develop feelings of self-efficacy as noted by Conger and Kanungo (1998).

Research question three asking *What leader behaviors contribute to follower's*

*perceptions of self-efficacy?* was answered by examining the relationships between follower

feelings of reverence, trust, and satisfaction of their immediate supervisor's leadership with their

feelings of collective identity and group performance. Having great respect or esteem for one's

leader correlated with the collective identity item of group conflict being in the open. Collective

identity of cohesiveness and open conflict showed correlations with leadership satisfaction.

**Summary**

Fifty-two percent of the respondents skipped the gender question, and 50% skipped the

question asking the title of their immediate supervisor. There is no apparent explanation that

indicates why these questions went unanswered. Cursory analyses indicated that about 53% of the respondents found their supervisor uninspiring and 66% did not see them as exciting speakers. Fifty-five percent of the supervisors were seen as able to recognize skills and abilities, and 48% able to recognize physical constraints such as lack of resources and technological limitations. However, that shows that 52% of the supervisors were unable to recognize a lack of resources or technological limitations. Forty-eight percent of the supervisors were seen as influential by developing mutual like and respect, and 48% as sensitive to follower needs. However, that would indicate that 52% were insensitive and not developing mutual like and respect. Moreover, 77% of the supervisors were not seen as being unique or inspiring and 19% seen as unconventional, showing that they were not viewed as engaging in personal risk. Sixty-one percent of the respondents felt reverence for their supervisors and 56% held their supervisor in "high esteem." Yet, 33% of the administrators trusted their supervisors and 44% were satisfied with their supervisors' leadership, which probably explains why they did not feel positive about their group identity. The followers felt unable to handle conflict in the open, did not see themselves as a cohesive team, nor did they share values, a goal consensus, or purpose. Fifty-six percent felt they had high standards for accomplishments and 50% had high work performance, yet 66% scored they did not always beat their targets. What stands out is that the respondents felt empowered by their competence to work effectively, work efficiently, and able to perform their jobs well by indicating they had the required capabilities, skills, and abilities.

Empirical analyses showed that follower feelings of trust were indicated by correlations of supervisors being inspirational and motivating (showed as satisfaction with leadership), and consistently generating future ideas (shown as having faith in the supervisor), and that trust (complete faith) in their supervisors made them feel empowered. Follower feelings of a group identity (a widely shared consensus about goals and approaches to achieve them) were indicated by a correlation with vision and articulation (providing inspiring strategic organizational goals), and did show relationships with group identity feelings that their conflict was in the open

as indicated by having reverence (high respect and esteem) for their supervisors. Most

noteworthy were follower feelings of empowerment. They were empowered through feelings of

job responsibility importance, influential in their jobs, and felt confident about their capabilities,

skills, and abilities, which were indicated by correlations with their supervisors' abilities to

articulate vision, and their collective identity (cohesion and conflict in the open) with satisfaction

with their supervisors. They were empowered by feelings of trust (having complete faith) in their

supervisors, but they did not admire their supervisors. Followers indicated not feeling *keen*

about the organization doing well by correlations indicating that their supervisors were unable to

see new opportunities for good social or physical conditions that could assist them in reaching

organizational goals and achievement. Discussions of these findings follows in Chapter 5.

# Chapter 5

## Discussion

The intent of this study was to examine the phenomena of charismatic leadership follower and leader interdependency between K-12 school, district, and state administrators and their perceptions of the leadership of their immediate supervisors. More specifically, the research sought to discover these relationships by examining data from the observed behaviors of immediate supervisors and the attitudes and behaviors those behaviors elicited from the followers. In 2012, Conger noted his concerns that leaders needed to address the empowerment of employees, and that there was a lack of research addressing this. He discussed the informal inter-relationships between leaders and followers that contributed to the bonding and commitment of followers to follow the leader. Conger stated that leaders communicate to their followers to relate the organization's vision and goals and to meet the needs of followers, and that if the followers perceive charisma in the leader it would enable them to develop trust and collective identity. Moreover, followers choose to follow leaders based on the followers' perceptions of the leader. He concluded that the identification of the elements of charismatic leadership could lead to the ability of supervisors to develop those attributes. The examination by this study sought to extricate which leadership behaviors strengthened the bond between followers and the organization's leadership.

This study concludes that a significant relationship exists between the perceived behaviors of the respondent's immediate supervisor and the effects those perceptions have on the attitudes, behaviors, and feelings of their followers. This chapter begins with a brief introduction and continues on with discussions of the findings grounded in the recent literature noted in Chapters 1 and 2. The current study identified relationships between leader behaviors and the effects on followers, and identified specific correlations between a leader's ability to share vision and the followers' trust, which were stated as concerns of Antonakis et al. (2011),

Conger (2012), and Godhwani (2017). The discussion is organized by the research questions with a conclusion, implications for leaders, suggestions to improving leader charismatic communication behaviors, and implications for future research.

**Research Question One Leader Behaviors and Follower Responses**

Research question one asked, *What relationships exist between the perceived behavioral components of charismatic leadership and the attitudes and behaviors of the followers?* The purpose of this question was to identify the perceived charismatic behaviors of the respondent's immediate supervisor, and what relationships existed between those behaviors and the consequential effects, such as the attitudes, behaviors, and feelings of the follower. This study was inspired in part by Yukl (2010) who identified that the ability to measure and define charisma contributed to misinterpretation of charismatic leadership as a concept, and that research is lacking in the literature. This study identified that a significant relationship does exist between the perceptions of the behaviors of the respondent's immediate supervisor and the effects those perceptions have on the attitudes, behaviors, and feelings of the follower. The relationships are identified by specific variables in the following sections.

**Leader and follower trust discussion.** The current study showed specific relationships between the follower's trust in the leader and the satisfaction of that leadership with vision and articulation items. The leader's ability to generate new ideas for the future of the organization was correlated with the followers' faith in that leader, a component of trust. The leader's ability to effectively articulate the importance of what the followers were doing for the organization, and to inspire and motivate them, was correlated to the follower's feelings of pleasure with the supervisor's leadership style and the satisfaction that it was the right one for their getting their job done, both components of satisfaction with the leader. The findings corroborate those of Conger (2012), in that relationships between followers' feelings of trust and their perceptions of their leaders' communicating vision and the ability to articulate it exists and were identified. These findings also supported those of Godhwani (2017), who theorized that perceptions of

leader communication is critical in influencing their followers. Gardner, Lowe, Moss, Mahoney, and Cogliser (2010) expressed that there was a link between follower trust in the leader and the leader's ability to share a vision with the follower, and these findings provide evidence of such.

**Follower empowerment discussion.** The current study identified relationships between followers feeling empowered and their leader's ability to share and articulate a vision, and to show sensitivity to members' needs. The following sections identify the specific variables linking the leader's ability to share vision, encourage followers to meet goals, and show sensitivity to their needs with feelings of empowerment in the followers, and perceptions of competence. The importance of follower empowerment as reported in the literature beginning with Bass (1985) and Kouzes and Posner (1987, 2006) is that empowered followers can develop feelings of self-efficacy (Conger & Kanungo, 1988, 1994, 1998; Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 2000; Crant & Bateman, 2000). This study further links leadership effectiveness follower effects with self-concepts that was also noted by Antonakis, Fenley, and Leichti (2011), who found that charisma can be learned by leaders, and when practiced it can increase organizational performance. They suggested future studies showing what perceptions actually produce positive follower effects can contribute to leader training that promotes the behaviors that increase the feelings of collective identity and empowerment in followers. This study responds and provides research supporting Conger's 2012 noted concern that leaders need to address the empowerment of employees. Studies such as this support Antonakis, et al., showing what perceptions of leader behavior result in positive follower effects and can contribute to training of leaders in promoting these behaviors and influence follower effects of collective identity and empowerment.

*Empowerment with vision and articulation discussion.* The current study identified specific variable relationships between follower feelings of empowerment and the perceived ability of the leader to articulate a vision. The identified perceptions of the followers were ranked by variables that were correlated with the most empowerment items. For example, the followers'

perceptions that their supervisor *consistently generates new ideas for the future of the organization* correlated with all 13 of the empowerment items. This finding illustrated that the followers felt able to influence decisions at work and the way they worked. They felt they had authority to proceed with their jobs, and felt capable, competent, and skilled to handle the challenges they faced at work. They wanted to do well, and were enthusiastic about their contributions and inspired by their organization's goals and what they were trying to achieve. However, they did not feel that they had important responsibilities, or were enthusiastic about working towards the organization's (schools) objectives. The administrators' perceiving that their supervisor *provides inspiring strategic and organizational* goals significantly correlated to 12 of 13 items. The perception of their leader's ability at being *inspirational, able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what organizational members are doing* correlated to 10 of 13 items. Yet, they did not feel they had the required capabilities to do the job, could not handle the challenges they faced at work, nor were they feeling enthusiastic about the contributions one's work makes to the school. These findings validated Antonakis et al. (2011) who stated that "charisma's effects are evident on observer attributions of the leader, and its antecedents stem from nonverbal and verbal influencing tactics that reify the leader's vision" (p. 376). The findings are evidence that perceived charismatic behaviors are observable and the resulting effects on followers are from one's perceptions of a leader's vision articulation.

   *Correlations with sensitivity to member needs discussion.* The current study identified one specific variable that produced follower feelings of empowerment resulting from the ability of the leader to show sensitivity to subordinates' needs. The followers perceiving *the ability of the leader to influence others by developing mutual liking and respect* correlated with their feelings that *important responsibilities were part of their job.* Fifty percent of the respondents skipped identifying the title of their immediate supervisor. Perceptions of one's supervisor being sensitive to one's needs might result from differing reasons. It would be more difficult for a supervisor who had minimal one on one interaction with a subordinate to project and develop feelings of mutual

like and respect, yet one might feel that his or her job responsibilities were important by virtue of one's position. These findings are similar to those of Conger (2012) in that the measured perception of the leader as being sensitive to subordinates' needs has an effect on the followers.

The current study was able to measure the reactions in followers resulting from the leader behaviors that they perceived, and supports Campbell (2012). He contended that leadership effectiveness can be measured by the reactions of superiors or subordinates. These findings inform the lack in the research noted by Conger (2012) and identify which leader behaviors show relationships to follower perceptions of reverence, trust, satisfaction with the leader, and with collective identity, group performance, and feelings of empowerment. The current study contributed research illustrating followership (acceptance of the leader) and leadership (behavior) effectiveness, a gap in the literature noted by Avolio, Walumbwa, and Weber (2012). Evidence from this study takes a step towards providing research addressing the empowerment of employees in a real-life setting, a need noted by Conger, and provides evidence in support of Campbell (2012) that leadership effectiveness can be measured by the reactions of subordinates. The current study refutes Yukl (2010) by giving evidence supporting the ability to measure charismatic leadership concepts.

**Research Question Two Discussion**

Research question two asked, *What leader behaviors contribute to the followers' perceptions of the efficacy of their leader?* The purpose of this question was to identify the perceived leader focus behaviors of the respondent's immediate supervisor, and what relationships existed between those behaviors and the perceptions of the followers feeling empowered. These data will contribute to the research noted as needed by Conger (2012) and in essence identify what leader behaviors show relationships to follower perceptions of reverence, trust, and satisfaction with the leader with follower feelings of empowerment. This part of study was inspired in part by Avolio, Walumbwa, and Weber (2012) who stated that there was a gap of followership (acceptance of the leader) and leadership (behavior) effectiveness

studies. These correlations contribute additional evidence to that of the previous section addressing follower empowerment. In 2000, Conger, Kanungo, and Menon stated that statistically significant relationships existed between leader charismatic behaviors and the followers' sense of reverence for that leader with follower perceptions of group performance through empowerment, noting that causal relationships exist between components of charismatic leader behaviors and follower trust.

The current study identified that there were 12 specific empowerment variables directly correlated with the followers' perceptions of reverence of their immediate supervisor to the item *I have great esteem for him or her*. Ten of the empowerment variables linked with two of the three reverence items. Reverence for the leader made followers feel influential, authoritative, inspired, enthusiastic, empowered, and that they had self-esteem. The data revealed nine specific empowerment variables linked to the one trust item - *I have complete faith in him or her*. The findings identified 14 specific empowerment variables linked with satisfaction that the supervisors' *leadership is the right one for getting* the respondents' group's job done, and 13 of those variables linked with the respondent being pleased (or satisfied) with their supervisors' leadership. The identified leader focus items perceived by the followers were ranked in order beginning with the empowerment variable correlated with the most leader focus items. For example, if the followers felt pleased or satisfied with the leadership of their immediate supervisor they feel empowered in their jobs. This finding provides evidence that they felt influential in decision making and work policies, authoritative in making decisions, skilled, competent, inspired by what their school was trying to achieve, and enthusiastic working towards school goals. These results have important implications because they illustrate the importance of satisfaction with one's supervisor, and that satisfaction can effect one's job performance and ability. Followers not feeling capable or able to make decisions most probably will not make any decisions.

These relationships proffer to Conger, Kanungo, and Menon (2000) empirical evidence linking the behavioral dimensions of charismatic leadership with specific effects on followers. Their Perceived Leadership Behaviors Measures Inventory was used to record specific effects of reverence, trust, and satisfaction with the leader that is attributed to specific components of empowerment feelings in followers. The analyses did not group any variables, but addressed each variable independently, as Conger et al. suggested. Avolio and Bass (1995) found that empowerment of followers to make their own decisions can build trust of followers in their leader. These perceived leader behaviors influenced the followers' perceptions of ability and work performance (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993), supporting the efficacy of their leader. Conger and Kanungo (1988) noted the importance of respondents' perceptions of empowerment that was realized from feelings such as having high esteem for the leader and faith in the leader, as well as a good feeling when being around the leader. They also noted that a satisfaction or pleasure with one's immediate supervisors' style of leadership was from leadership behavior that contributed to a followers' perceptions of the efficacy of one's leader.

The current study supports those findings that perceptions of charismatic leadership behaviors do increase employee feelings of empowerment, as noted by Antonakis, Fenley, and Leichti (2011). Campbell (2012) noted the need for leaders to communicate through behaviors that can be measured by accomplishments of follower self-efficacy and job satisfaction. This research question revealed that leaders can communicate through measurable behaviors indicated by the follower perception responses of self-efficacy and job satisfaction.

**Research Question Three Discussion**

Research question three asked, *What leader behaviors contribute to follower's perceptions of self-efficacy?* Where the purpose of the previous question was to identify the perceived leader focus behaviors of the respondent's immediate supervisor, and what relationships existed between those behaviors and the perceptions of follower feelings of *empowerment,* this question sought to identify what relationships exist between those behaviors

and the perceptions of the follower feelings of *self-efficacy* rated by responses to collective

identity and group performance items.

The current study identified that the collective identity variable, *in our work group our*

*conflict is out in the open*, correlated with the two reverence for the leader items *I hold him or her*

*in high respect*, and *I have great esteem for him or her*, as well as with the two satisfaction with

the leader items *I am satisfied that his or her style of leadership is the right one for getting our*

*group's job done* and *I am pleased (or satisfied) with his or her leadership*. Another collective

identity variable, *we see ourselves in the work group as a cohesive team*, was linked to the two

satisfaction with the leader focus items *I feel good to be around him or her*, and *I am pleased (or*

*satisfied) with his or her leadership*. For example, the followers perceiving themselves as a

collective, a group or team, might hold respect of and esteem for their leader, and be satisfied

that the leadership was the right style for them getting their work done as well as feeling good in

the company of that leader. This perception of having collective identity might contribute to

better team work throughout the school, and improved working relationships making them feel

empowered as well as having the ability to produce results – feelings of self-efficacy.

Those correlations, again, are supportive of the findings of Avolio and Bass (1995), Bass

(1985), and Conger and Kanungo (1988). This empirical evidence continues the contribution

noted as needed by Bass (1990, 1999) by identifying additional specific effects produced in the

followers resulting from perceptions of specific leader behavioral components of reverence,

trust, and satisfaction of the leader. The variables were again not grouped as suggested by

Conger, Kanungo, and Menon (2000). This study provides evidence that the perceptions of

charismatic leadership behaviors can influence the follower feelings of collective identity, as

stated by Antonakis, Fenley, and Leichti (2011). The current study showed that when

respondents perceived themselves as part of a *cohesive team* it contributed to their perceptions

of *self-efficacy*. This study corroborated that followers with feelings of empowerment can also

develop feelings of self-efficacy as noted by Conger and Kanungo (1998). Conger et al. 2000

found that followers of charismatic leaders developed a reverence for the leader that appears strongly based in the followers' perceptions of the leader's sensitivity to environmental constraints and contextual occurrences. The findings of the current study indicated these relationships exist, which is important because leaders can be taught to develop these attributes and to cultivate feelings of empowerment in their followers.

Results of the three research questions indicated what charismatic leadership behaviors of the respondents' immediate supervisors were perceived by the non-teaching K-12 organizational administrators who were followers. Supervisors able to articulate visions and goals can influence followers and contribute to follower feelings of empowerment and trust in their leader. These findings can serve as guidance towards the importance of leaders in sharing vision and goals with followers, and that the perceptions of those followers can contribute to feelings of trust and empowerment. Supervisors showing sensitivity and concern for the needs of their subordinates can build follower feelings of empowerment. These findings can contribute to leaders illustrating mutual like and respect of their subordinates, and being sensitive to their needs, and that can result in followers feeling empowered. Furthermore, these findings provide evidence that follower feelings of reverence, trust, and satisfaction of one's leader contribute to collective group identity. These results have important implications for organizational leadership by addressing the practical concerns regarding how leaders perceive their followers, and can influence leadership training curricula. All organizations need committed followers who can work as cohesive units towards the goals of those organizations.

## Conclusion

The current study examined the phenomena of charismatic leadership and follower interdependency through the perceptions of charismatic leadership behaviors of one's immediate supervisor from the executive K-12 administrator followers. This study began as an exploration to identify what relationships existed between leadership behaviors of supervisors and the specific effects, attitudes, and behaviors on their followers. A thorough review of the

literature addressing charismatic leadership identified recent theories and contributions that have identified and addressed needed further study. Avolio, Walumbwa, and Weber (2009) and Campbell (2012) saw leadership effectiveness studies as essential to placing leadership performance into the greater context of follower reactions and contributing to a paradigm shift in leadership theory. They noted that perceptions of what the leader is communicating to followers through behaviors has revitalized the field and the "reformation of charismatic leadership" (Campbell, p. 14). The current study provides evidence that leaders can communicate with their followers through behaviors, and that these perceptions effect those followers. This researcher suggests that leaders become educated in charismatic behaviors and the role they play in follower leader interaction. Dinh et al. (2014) stated that charismatic leadership could be a component of other theories, or that it can stand alone. The authors called for additional research in aspects of leadership behavior. This study addressed those calls and provided findings connecting leadership behaviors with follower effects, such as the importance reverence, trust, and satisfaction with a leader plays to the feelings of follower empowerment. Gardner, Lowe, Moss, Mahoney, and Cogliser (2010) stressed that follower trust in the leader is an important charismatic leadership behavior, and noted the lack of what leadership behaviors build trust addressing women leaders. The current study included 41% female respondents. However, the gender identification question was skipped by 52% of the respondents. Unfortunately, the gender of their supervisors was not included in the survey for anonymity purposes. Therefore, no correlations were run between gender and trust. The findings did show that there were significant relationships between: a) follower trust in the leader and leader vision and articulation behaviors, and b) followers having complete faith in the leader (trust) with follower empowerment and faith in the leader.

The findings of this study support those of Anderson and Sun (2017) in identifying vision and articulation leadership behaviors, such as providing inspiring goals, generating new ideas for the future, and being inspiring and motivating, that showed relationships linked with follower

89

feelings of empowerment. It is important for leaders to know that they can contribute to followers' trusting in them and being satisfied with their leadership by the ways they behave towards their followers. Leaders can assist followers in feeling empowered and enable follower self-efficacy by improving their leadership speaking abilities.

Bligh (2017) contended that research showing trust as being influential in follower and leader interactions had been ignored. The current study addressed these concerns and showed 59.4% of the respondents indicated they *somewhat agreed, agreed,* or *strongly agreed* with having *complete faith* -- trust -- in their immediate supervisor. The findings showed significant correlations between followers' feelings of empowerment with trust in the leader. Bligh noted that Bass (1985) had identified the importance of trust to leadership effectiveness, and she identified two components: 1) *competence or ability*, perceptions that one has the skills and knowledge needed to do a job, and the skills and wisdom needed to succeed; and 2) *benevolence*, the perception that the trustee wants to do what is good or best for the trustor as being critical between leader and follower interactions. The follower focus items in the current study included competence items, and it is concluded this illustrates empowerment. Items from the empowerment section of the survey contained benevolence perceptions of the respondents and of their leaders. These feelings of benevolence can contribute to follower feelings of commitment to the leader as well as their job performance. Bligh stated that leader behaviors perceived as trustworthiness or showing sensitivity to member needs could indicate followers' trusting the leader.

## Implications for Leaders

This researcher verified, in real-world settings, that there is a relationship between the behaviors of leaders in K-12 educational organizations with feelings of trust, empowerment, and collective identity in their followers. The researcher identified the correlations between administrators having trust in their supervisors, and feelings of empowered from the supervisor's ability to articulate a vision. A supervisor who can develop a mutual like and respect with

administrator followers who are able to perceive that one's job is important creates feelings of empowerment in those followers. Therefore, it should be noted that an awareness of an educational leader's communication behaviors is crucial to how followers feel, react, and perform.

Fabbi (2013) noted the importance of leader communication behaviors, and that these behaviors can influence followers through effective communication of vision. His research found that those behaviors can be developed through training. This research suggests that K-12 organizations and higher education leadership programs can implement charismatic communication skills training or integrate curriculum that enlightens the participants of charismatic components, such as self-efficacy, sharing vision, and projecting inspiration and motivation among followers. Fabbi's model included didactic instruction supplemented with video examples, PowerPoint slide presentations, and discussions. The didactic instruction included a brief overview of the history of charisma, charismatic leadership, and rhetorical devices.

The specific leadership behaviors that showed relationships with specific followers' perceptions of empowerment and collective identity identified from this study can inform leadership development, as suggested by Antonakis, Fenley, and Leichti (2011). The current study identified leader behaviors perceived as inspirational in providing strategic and organizational goals contributed to followers widely sharing the goals and approaches needed in achieving those goals. Followers' feelings of empowerment were nurtured by leaders influencing them through developed mutual liking and respect, and by the followers' feelings of trust in the leader, reverence for the leader, and satisfaction with the leader. Antonakis et al. supported Conger and Kanungo's (1998) findings that leaders could develop follower trust by communicating that followers' needs were of the greater concern to the leader than the leaders' own needs. Educational leaders need to address what behaviors they can present to bestow employees with feelings of empowerment, as suggested by Conger (2012). This researcher

agrees with Dinh et al. (2014) who implied that more investigation is needed in charismatic leadership development concepts.

**Implications for Further Research**

Further research addressing charismatic leadership is needed. Factor analyses of this study's data may produce different patterns. Other studies targeting larger groups of non-teaching K-12 administrators may provide broader analyses and contributions to the school leadership effectiveness literature. It is unknown why 52% of the respondents skipped the gender identity question. A 100% gender response rate could permit analysis of gender and leader/follower effects. Moreover, correlations using gender of followers and gender of leaders might produce different results. More disaggregation of the data by birth years, job level, or number of years employed in the current position might provide different patterns. Future research into followership and leadership dyads is needed, as indicated by Anderson and Sun (2017), and Avolio, Walumbwa, and Weber (2009). This researcher agrees that continuation with leadership research is needed to reveal leadership dynamics and processes, as noted by Gardner, Lowe, Moss, Mahoney, and Cogliser (2010).

# References

Anderson, M. H., & Sun, P. Y. (2017). Reviewing leadership styles: Overlaps and the need for a new 'full-range' theory. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 19(1)*, 76-96.

Antonakis, J., Fenley, M., & Liechti, S. (2011). Can charisma be taught? Tests of two interventions. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 10(3)*, 374-396.

Antonakis, J. & House, R. J. (2013), Addendum: A Re-Analysis of the Full-Range Leadership Theory - The Way Forward, in Bruce J. Avolio, Francis J. Yammarino (ed.) *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The Road Ahead 10th Anniversary Edition (Monographs in Leadership and Management, Volume 5)* Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp.35 - 37.

Avolio, B. J. & Bass, B. M. (1995). Individual consideration viewed at multiple levels of analysis: A multi-level framework for examining the diffusion of transformational leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, *6 (2)*. 199-218.

Avolio, B., Walumbwa, F., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *60*, 421-49. doi.10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163621

Bariso, J. (2015, July 30). Re: In Search of the Definition of Leadership What makes a leader? The question is more complex than it looks. Retrieved from Inc.com  https://www.inc.com/justin-bariso/in-search-of-the-definition-of-leadership.html

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

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

Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European journal of work and organizational psychology*, *8*(1), 9-32.

Bass, B. M. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (4th ed.). New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1991). *The multifactor leadership questionnaire: Form 5x*. Binghamton, NY: Binghamton University, Center for Leadership Studies.

Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership: a response to critiques. In *Leadership Theory and Research: Perspectives and Directions,* Chemers, M. M. Ayman, R. (eds). Academic Press: San Diego, CA; 49-88.

Bass, B. M., Waldman, D. A., Avioli, B. J., & Bebb, M. (1987). Transformational leadership and the falling dominoes effect. *Group and Organization Studies,* 12, 73-87.

Beachum, F. and Dentith, A. M. (2004). Teacher leaders creating cultures of school renewal and transformation. *The Educational Forum,* 68, Spring 2004, 276-286.

Bennis, W. G. and Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking change.* New York: Harper & Row.

Beer, M. (1980). *Organizational change and development: A systems view.* Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear.

Bligh, M. C. (2017). Leadership and trust. In J. Marques & S. Dhiman (Eds.). *Leadership today: Practices for personal and professional performance* (pp. 21-42) doi:10.10007/978-3-319-31036-7_2

Boyd, J. T., Jr. (1989). *Are military leaders more or less transformational then their superiors?* Unpublished manuscript.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row

Bryman, A. (1993). Charismatic leadership in business organizations: Some neglected issues. *Leadership Quarterly*, 4, 289-304.

Butler, J. K. (1991). Toward understanding and measuring conditions of trust: Evolution of a condition of trust inventory. *Journal of Management, 17(3), 643-663.*

Campbell, J. P. (2012). Leadership, the Old, the New, and the Timeless: A Commentary. In M. G. Rumsey (Ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership.* [Oxford Handbooks Online version]. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195398793.001.0001

Charters, W. W. and Waples, D. (1929). *The commonwealth teacher-training study.* Chicago The University of Chicago Press. University Digital Library, http://www.archive.org/details/commonwealthteac027990mbp 12-10-2010

Clover, W. (1989). Transformational leaders: Team performance, leadership ratings, and first hand impressions. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership*. West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

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

Conger, J. A, (1989b). Leadership: The art of empowering others. *Academy of Management Executive, 3* (1), 17-24.

Conger, J. A, (1990). The dark side of leadership. *Organizational Dynamics, 19*(2), 44-55.

Conger, J. A. (2011). Charismatic leadership. In A. Bryman, D. Collinson, K. Grint, B. Jackson, & M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.). T*he SAGE Handbook of Leadership* (pp. 86-102). London: Sage.

Conger, J. A, (2012). Charismatic leadership. In M. G. Rumsey (Ed.). *The* oxford *handbook of leadership* [Oxford Handbooks Online]. Do: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195398793.013.0022

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *The Academy of Management Review, 12*(4) 637-647. Retrieved May 2, 2006, from JSTOR database.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *The Academy of Management Review, 13*(3) 471-482. Retrieved May 10, 2006, from JSTOR database.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1994). Charismatic leadership in organizations: Perceived behavioral attributes and their measurement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15*(5) 439 452. Retrieved November 20, 2006, from JSTOR database.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., & Menon, S. T. (2000). Charismatic leadership and followers effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(7), 745-767. Retrieved July 10, 2007, from JSTOR database.

Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., Menon, S. T., & Mathur, P. (1997). Measuring charisma: Dimensionality and validity of the Conger-Kanungo scale of charismatic leadership. *Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration, 14*(3) 290-302. Retrieved May 6, 2008, from Business Source Complete database.

Crant, J. M., & Bateman, T. S. (2000). Charismatic leadership viewed from above: The impact of proactive personality. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(1) 63-75. Retrieved July 22, 2007, from JSTOR database.

Dinh, J. E., Lord, R. G., Gardner, W. L., Meuser, J. D., Liden, R. C., & Hu, J. (2014). Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(1), 36-62.

Drucker, P. F. (1985). *Management: tasks, responsibilities, practices*. New York, NY: Harper Colophon.

English, F. W. (1997, March). The recentering of leadership from the jaws of management science. *Deconstructing the talk, reconstructing the walk: Modern promises for teaching theory and practice in educational administration*, Symposium Division A #14.54. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED406725).

Fabbi, P. (2013). *The effects of charismatic communication training on leader communication Effectiveness* (Doctoral Dissertation) Paper 54. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.olivet.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1053&context=edd_diss

Fatt, L. W. (1993). Retrieved May26, 2017 from JSTOR database. file:///C:/Users/Lucinda/Downloads/1993Volume13Number2.pdf

Fox, J., Gong, T., & Attoh, P. (2015). The impact of principal as authentic leader on teacher trust in the K-12 educational context. *Journal of Leadership studies*, *8*(4), 6-18.

Freud, S. (1922/1939). *Moses and monotheism*. London: Hogarth Press. New York: A. A. Knoph.

Fromm, E. (1941). *Escape from freedom*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart.

Gardner, W. L., Lowe, K. B., Moss, T. W., Mahoney, K. T., & Cogliser, C. C. (2010). Scholarly leadership of the study of leadership: A review of The Leadership Quarterly's second decade, 2000-2009. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *21*(6), 922-958.

Godhwani, R. (2017). *Public Speaking Kaleidoscope*. Business Expert Press.

Goff, D. G. (2003). *What do we know about good community college leaders: A study in leadership trait theory and behavioral leadership theory*. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED476456).

Gosling, J. and Mintzberg, H. 2003, The Five Minds of a Manager, *Harvard Business Review*, November pp. 1-9.

Halpin, A. W., & Winer, B. J. (1957). A factorial study of leadership behavior descriptions. In R. M. Stogdill & A. E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement* (pp. 31-51), Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, Research Monograph No. 88.

Hammerly-Fletcher, L. & Brundrett, M. (2005). Leaders on leadership: The impressions of primary school head teachers and subject leaders. *School Leadership and Management*, 25(1), February 2005, 59-75.

Harris, A., & Chapman, C. (2002). *Effective leadership in schools facing challenging circumstances*. Nottingham, UK: National College for School Leadership (NCSL).

Hooper, A. (Ed.). (2017) *Leadership perspectives*. Routledge. May 15, 2017.

House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of leadership effectiveness. *Leadership: The cutting edge*, 189-207.

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

House, R. J. (1999). Weber and the neo-charismatic paradigm: A response to Beyer. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 563-574.

Howell, J. M., & Shamir, B. (2005). The role of followers in the charismatic leadership process: Relationships and their consequences. *Academy of Management Review, 30*(1) 96-112.

Judge, T.A.*,* Woolf, E.F.*,* Hurst, C. & *Livingston*, B. *(*2008*).* Leadership*.* In Barling, J. and Cooper, C.L. (eds), The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Behavior: Volume 1, Micro Approaches*.* Los Angeles, CA*: Sage, pp.* 334‐352*.* DOI:http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781849200448.n19 h*ttp://sk.sagepub.com/reference/hdbk_orgbehavior1*

Jung, D. I., & Avolio, B. J. (2000). Opening the black box: An experimental investigation of the mediating effects of trust and value congruence on transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(8), 949-964. Retrieved July 22, 2007, from JSTOR database.

Kanungo, R. N. & Mendonca, M. (1996). *Ethical dimensions of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Khoury, A. D. (2006, February). Bringing theory into practice: A study of effective leadership at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. In *Symposium 21-1. Academy of Human Resource Development International Conference (AHRD)* (pp. 449-456). Columbus, OH. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED492704).

Kotter, J. P. 1990, 'What Leaders Really Do' *Harvard Business Review*, 90, pp. 103-11.

Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (1987). *The leadership challenge.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass*.*

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2006). *The leadership challenge* (Vol. 3). John Wiley & Sons.

Leader. (n.d.). in *The Business Dictionary*. Retrieved from
  *http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/leader.html*

Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2006). *Successful school leadership: What it is and how it influences pupil learning* (Research Report RR800). National College for School Leadership, Department for Education and Skills. University of Nottingham. Retrieved from
  http://elan.wallacefoundation.org/SiteCollectionDocuments/WF/ELAN/RR800.pdf

Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2005). A review of transformational school leadership Research 1996-2005. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 4*, (3) September 2005, 177-199(23). doi: 10.1080/15700760500244769

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D. & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing leadership for changing times*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Lide, E. S. (1929, Apr. 3). Personality traits of school administrators. *Educational Research Bulletin, 8* (7) 141-143. Retrieved November 20, 2006, from JSTOR database.

Louisiana Board of Regents, Teacher Education Initiatives, PK-16+ Coordinators and Councils. Retrieved May 15, 2009, from
  http://www.regents.louisiana.gov/Academic/TE/pk16councils.html

Lunenburg, F. C., & Ornstein, A. C. (1996). *Educational administration: Concepts and Practice* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

McEwen, A., Carlisle, K., Knipe, D., Neil, P., & McClune, B. (2002, Jun). Primary school leadership: Values and actions. *Research Papers in Education Policy & Practice,17*(2) 147-163. (Eric Documentation Reproduction Services No. EJ660175). Retrieved October 19, 2006, from http://epoxy.nicholls.edu:2048/logon?url-http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db

Menon, S. T. (1999). Psychological empowerment: Definition, measurement, and validation. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 31*(3), 161-164.

Monzani, L., Ripoll, P., & Peiro, J. M. (2015). Winning the hearts and minds of followers: The interactive effects of followers' emotional competencies and goal setting types on trust in leadership. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología*, *Volume 47, Issue 1*, 1-15. © 2015 Fundación Universitaria Konrad Lorenz. Retrieved from
  http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0120053415300017

O'Reilly, C. A. (1984). *Charisma as communication: The impact of top management credibility and philosophy on employee involvement*. Paper. Academy of Management, Boston, MA.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly, 1*(2), 107-142.

Pont, B., Nusch, D., & Moorman H. (2008). Policy and Practice: Vol. 1. *Improving School Leadership*. Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/edu/school/44374889.pdf

Rumsey, M. G. (Ed.). (2012). *The oxford handbook of leadership*. [Oxford Handbook Online]. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195398793.013.0024

Sandberg, Y., & Moreman, C. M. (2015). Common threads among different forms of charismatic leadership. *Journal of Religion and Business Ethics*, *3*(1).

Shamir, B. (2007). From passive recipients to active co-producers: The roles of followers in the leadership process. In B. Shamir, R. Pillai, M. C. Bligh, & M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.). *Follower-centered perspectives on leadership: A tribute to the memory of James R, Meindl* (pp. *ix xxxix*). *Stamford, CT: Information Age Publishing*.

Shamir, B., House, R., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organizational Science, 4*(4), 577-594. Retrieved July 21, 2007, from JSTOR database.

Shamir, B., Zakay, E., Breinin, E., & Popper, M. (1998). Correlates of charismatic leader behaviors in military units: Subordinates' attitudes, unit characteristics, and superiors' appraisals of leader performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 41*(4), 387-409. Retrieved July 28, 2007, from JSTOR database.

Smith, B. J. (1982). *An initial test of a theory of charismatic leadership based on the responses of subordinates*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Ontario.

Sohm, R. (1958). *Outlines of church history* (M. Sinclair, Trans). Boston: Beacon Hill. (Original work published 1895)

Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology (25)*, (pp. 35-71).

Sullivan, S., & Shulman, V. (2005). Managing change: The superintendent as line director of instruction. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 8*(2), 1360-3124. Retrieved July 20, 2007, from http://www.informaworld.com/10.1080/01446190500041784

Trust. (n.d.). In *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*. Retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/trust

Vaill, P. B. (1978). Toward a behavior description of high-performing systems. In M. W. McCall, Jr. & M. M. Lombardo (eds.) *Leadership: Where else can we go?* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organizations* (A.M. Anderson & T. Parsons, Trans.). New York: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1924)

Weber, M. (1958). *The city* (D. Martindale & G. Neuwirth, Trans.). Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Weber, M. (1963). *The sociology of religion*. Beacon, N.Y.; Beacon Press. (Original work published 1922)

Weber, M. (1968a). *Economy and society* (G. Roth & C. Wittich, Eds.). New York: Bedminster.

Weber, M. (1968b). *Max Weber on charisma and institution building* (S. N. Eisenstadt, Ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Yammarino, F. J., & Bass, B. M. (1989). Long term forecasting of transformational leadership and its effects among naval officers: Some preliminary findings. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership*. West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America. Also, (1998). ONR Tech. Rep. No. 2 Bingham: State University of New York, Center for Leadership.

Yukl, G. A. (1988). *Development and validation of the managerial practices questionnaire.* (Technical Report). State University of New York, Albany, NY.

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

Yukl, G. A. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership potential. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 285-305.

Zaleznik, A. (1990). The leadership gap. *The Executive 4*, 7-22.

Zaleznik, A. (2004). Managers and leaders: Are they different? *Harvard Business Review. Inside the Mind of the Leader, January 2004,* 74-81. [Abraham Zaleznik, Harvard Business Review, volume 55, issue 5, pages 67-78.] Retrieved December 3, 2009 from http://tppserver.mit.edu/esd801/readings/managers.pdf

# Appendices

*Consent to Use Instruments*

RE: C-K Charismatic Leadership Scale Copyright Permission
Conger, Jay [Jay.Conger@ClaremontMcKenna.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2008 11:39 PM
To:Lucinda Grant Martinez - lgmart1
Dear Lucinda, I am happy to grant you permission to use the CK scale. You simply need to note that you have been granted permission and send me a copy of your study. My best, Jay

---

**From:** Lucinda Grant Martinez - lgmarti1 [mailto:lgmarti1@uno.edu]
**Sent:** Mon 4/21/2008 5:27 PM
**To:** Conger, Jay
**Subject:** C-K Charismatic Leadership Scale Copyright Permission

Dr. Conger-

I am a doctoral candidate at the University of New Orleans and I am writing to you requesting copyright permission. My dissertation research will investigate the links between charismatic leadership behavioral dimensions and followers' effects. Little research has addressed school administrators as followers or as effective leaders. The perceptions of the effects of leader behavioral components on the attitudes and behaviors of educational administrators who are followers could provide an understanding of the phenomena of high-level administrative follower and leader interdependency in K-12 educational organizations.

I am requesting copyright permission to use the 20-item C-K Charismatic Leadership Scale (Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 1997) and the Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000). Approximately 500 respondents will complete these surveys anonymously on hard copy using a third party and electronically in SurveyMonkey™. Please inform me of what process I must follow to gain permission to use the above-mentioned instruments.

References
 Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., & Menon, S. T. (2000). Charismatic leadership and
      follower effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(7), 745-767.

*Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., Menon, S. T., & Mathur, P. (1997). Measuring charisma:*
      *Dimensionality and validity of the Conger-Kanungo scale of charismatic leadership.*
      Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration,14*(3) 290-302*.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lucinda G. Martinez
University of New Orleans
New Orleans, LA  70148
985-381-9638
Lgmarti1@uno.edu

RE: C-K Charismatic Leadership Scale Copyright Permission
RABINDRA< KANUNGO [rkanunn234@rogers.com]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2008 1:25 PM
To:Lucinda Grant Martinez – lgmart1

Please do put copyright symbol.

*Lucinda Grant Martinez - lgmarti1 <lgmarti1@uno.edu>* wrote:
Dr. Kanungo-

Thank you for this permission. I will cite all correctly. Does the copyright symbol need to be placed with either instrument?

Thanks again,
Lucinda

---

**From:** RABINDRA KANUNGO
**Sent:** Thu 4/24/2008 12:23 PM
**To:** Lgmarti1@uno.edu
**Subject:** Permission to use C-K Scale in your research
Dear Lucinda,
This is to grant you permission to use our C-K Charismatic leadership scale and Perceived Charismatic Leadership Attributes items in your dissertation research. Please make appropriate citations to the sources in your publications.
Yours sincerely,
Rabindra N. Kanungo.


Rabindra N Kanungo, Ph.D.
Professor Emeritus, McGill University
4 Whitechapel Crescent
Nepean, Ottawa, Ontario
Canada K2J5A1

## Appendix B

### *Demographic Survey*

**2. Demographic Portion of Survey**

Please select the appropriate demographic responses for the below questions

**1. Your sex is**

☐ Male                    ☐ Female

**2. Your ethnicity is - Please select all that apply. (You may choose not to answer)**

☐ Caucasian          ☐ Hispanic          ☐ Asian

☐ African American   ☐ Native American   ☐ Multi Ethnic

**3. Your year of birth is**

○ 1948 or earlier    ○ 1964-1968    ○ 1984-1988

○ 1949-1953          ○ 1969-1973    ○ 1989 or later

○ 1954-1958          ○ 1974-1978

○ 1959-1963          ○ 1979-1983

**4. Your highest completed level of education is**

○ Baccalaureate Degree    ○ Specialists Degree    ○ EdD

○ Master's Degree          ○ JD                    ○ PhD

**5. Your degree program for the above question is**

○ Education               ○ Educational Administration    ○ Business

○ Reading                 ○ Psychology                    ○ Not Listed

○ Special Education       ○ Arts & Science

○ Curriculum & Instruction  ○ Liberal Arts

**6. Your administrative job level is**

○ Assistant Principal        ○ Assistant District Superintendent    ○ State Superintendent

○ Vice-Principal             ○ District Superintendent              ○ Other State Administrator

○ Principal                  ○ Other District Administrator         ○ Not Listed

○ Other School Administrator  ○ State Supervisor

**7. Your immediate supervisor in your present work group, department, or unit is**

○ Principal                        ○ Other District Administrator    ○ A Board

○ Other School Administrator       ○ State Supervisor                ○ Not listed individu

○ Assistant District Superintendent  ○ State Superintendent

○ District Superintendent          ○ Other State Administrator

**8. Number of years employed in a non-teaching administrative capacity**

○ None          ○ 4          ○ 9

○ Less than 1   ○ 5          ○ 10

○ 1             ○ 6          ○ Over 10

○ 2             ○ 7

○ 3             ○ 8

**9. Number of years employed in current position**

☐ Less than 1   ☐ 4          ☐ 8

☐ 1             ☐ 5          ☐ 9

☐ 2             ☐ 6          ☐ 10

☐ 3             ☐ 7          ☐ Over 10

# Appendix C

*C-K Charismatic Leadership Scale*

---

### Vision and articulation

1. Has vision; often brings up ideas about possibilities for the future
2. Provides inspiring strategic and organizational goals
3. Consistently generates new ideas for the future of the organization
4. Entrepreneurial; seizes new opportunities in order to achieve goals
5. Readily recognizes new environmental opportunities (favorable physical and social conditions) that may facilitate achievement or organizational objectives
6. Inspirational, able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what organizational members are doing
7. Exciting Public Speaker

### Personal risk

8. In pursuing organizational objectives, engages in activities involving considerable personal risk
9. Takes high personal risk for the sake of the organization
10. Often incurs high personal cost for good of the organization

### Sensitivity to the environment

11. Readily recognizes constraints in the physical environment (technological limitations, lack of resources, etc.) that may stand in the way of achieving organizational objectives
12. Readily recognizes constraints in the organization's social and cultural environment (cultural norms, lack of grass roots support, etc.) that may stand in the way of achieving organizational objectives
13. Recognizes the limitations of other members in the organization
14. Recognizes the abilities and skills of other members in the organization

### Sensitivity to member needs

15. Shows sensitivity for the needs and feelings of other members in the organization
16. Influences others by developing mutual liking and respect
17. Often expresses personal concern for the needs and feelings of other members of the organization

### Unconventional behavior

18. Engages in unconventional behavior in order to achieve organizational goals
19. Uses non-traditional means to achieve organizational goals
20. Often exhibits very unique behavior that surprises other members of the organization

---

*Note.* Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., Menon, S. T., & Mathur, P. (1997). *Measuring charisma:* Dimensionality and validity of the Conger-Kanungo scale of charismatic leadership. *Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration, 14*(3) 290-302.

# Appendix D

*Perceived Leadership Behavior Measures Inventory*

---

© 2000 J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, & S. T. Menon

## Leader Focus

Reverence (Bass, 1985)
1. I hold him/her in high respect
2. I have great esteem for him/her
3. I admire him/her as a leader

Trust
4. I have complete faith in him/her (Bass, 1985)
5. Sometimes I cannot trust him/her (Butler, 1991)
6. I cannot count on him/her to be trustworthy (Butler, 1991)

Satisfaction with Leader (Bass, 1985)
7. I feel good to be around him/her
8. I am satisfied that his/her style of leadership is the right one for getting our group's job done
9. I am pleased (or satisfied) with his/her leadership

## Follower Focus

Collective Identity
10. We see ourselves in the work group as a cohesive team
11. In our work group, our conflict is out in the open and is constructively handled
12. Members of our organizational unit share the same values about our task and purpose
13. Among our work group, we are remarkably similar in our values about what has to be done
14. There is widely shared consensus about our goals and the approaches needed to achieve them

Group Performance
15. We have high work performance
16. Most of our tasks are accomplished quickly and efficiently
17. We always set a high standard of task accomplishment
18. We always achieve a high standard of task accomplishment
19. We almost always beat our targets

Empowerment (Menon, 1999)
20. I can influence the way work is done in my department
21. I can influence decisions taken in my department
22. I have authority to make decisions at work
23. I have the authority to work effectively
24. Important responsibilities are part of my job
25. I have the capabilities required to do my job well
26. I have the skills and abilities to do my job well
27. I have the competence to work effectively
28. I can do my work efficiently
29. I can handle the challenges I face at work
30. I am inspired by what we are trying to achieve as an organization
31. I am inspired by the goals of the organization
32. I am enthusiastic about working toward the organization's objectives
33. I am keen on our doing well as an organization
34. I am enthusiastic about the contribution my work makes to the organization

---

*Note.* From "Charismatic Leadership and Follower Effects," by J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, & S. T. Menon, 2000, *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(7), p. 766-767.

## Appendix E

*Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approval to Conduct the Study*

**University Committee for the Protection
of Human Subjects in Research
University of New Orleans**

*Campus Correspondence*

| | |
|---|---|
| Principal Investigator: | Louis Paradise |
| Co-Investigator: | Lucinda Martinez |
| Date: | June 18, 2008 |
| Protocol Title: | "Perceptions of Charismatic Leadership of k-12 Administrators" |
| IRB#: | 12May08 |

The IRB has deemed that the research and procedures are compliant with the University of Ne w Orleans and federal guidelines. The above referenced human subjects protocol has been reviewed and approved under 45 CFR 46.116(a) category 7.

Please remember that approval is only valid for one year from the approval date. Any changes to the procedures or protocols must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to implementation. Use the IRB number listed on this letter in all future correspondence regarding this proposal.

If an adverse, unforeseen event occurs (e.g., physical, social, or emotional harm), you are required to inform the IRB as soon as possible after the event.

Best wishes on your project.
Sincerely,

Robert D. Laird, Chair
UNO Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research

## Appendix F

### Informed Consent Message

Thank you in advance for your participation in the SurveyMonkey™ survey. If you have completed this survey electronically or on paper, please do not complete it again. To thank you for completing the survey, when you are finished you may choose to enter into a drawing to win an iPod. I am a doctoral candidate under the direction of Professor Louis Paradise in the College of Education and Human Development at the University of New Orleans. In an effort to better understand perceptions of non-teaching administrators in the PK-12 realm, I am conducting the survey for a study titled *Charismatic Leadership Perceptions from K-12 Administrators*. The survey should take you about 5 – 15 minutes to complete and your responses will be kept completely confidential. SurveyMonkey™ upholds the strictest privacy policy. You may choose not to participate, or to stop completing the survey at any time; there will be no penalty, (it will not affect your grades). The results of the survey may be included in a research study that may be published, but there is no way to link your answers to your supervisor because you will not be asked any identifying questions about your supervisor. Your participation in completing this survey is voluntary. By completing the survey, you are giving your informed consent. Please click on the link to complete the survey. The respondent's IP address will **not** be stored in the survey results.

# Appendix G

*Raw Scores*

| Respondent | Observed Leaders Raw Score | Observe Leaders Percent | Perceived Behaviors Raw Score | Perceived Behaviors Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | 100 | 83.33 | 44 | 21.57 |
| B | 52 | 43.33 | 36 | 17.65 |
| C | 64 | 53.33 | 70 | 34.31 |
| D | 49 | 40.83 | 71 | 34.8 |
| E | 20 | 16.67 | 36 | 17.65 |
| F | 80 | 66.67 | 124 | 60.78 |
| G | 55 | 45.83 | 69 | 33.82 |
| H | 86 | 71.67 | 135 | 66.18 |
| I | 46 | 38.33 | 51 | 25 |
| J | 34 | 28.33 | 36 | 17.65 |
| K | 89 | 74.17 | 138 | 67.65 |
| L | 68 | 56.67 | 115 | 56.37 |
| M | 52 | 43.33 | 91 | 44.61 |
| N | 100 | 83.33 | 130 | 63.73 |
| O | 95 | 79.17 | 111 | 54.41 |
| P | 33 | 27.5 | 34 | 16.67 |
| Q | 48 | 40 | 52 | 25.49 |
| R | 82 | 68.33 | 93 | 45.59 |
| S | 89 | 74.17 | 118 | 57.84 |
| T | 54 | 45 | 35 | 17.16 |
| U | 104 | 86.67 | 110 | 53.92 |
| V | 47 | 39.17 | 104 | 50.98 |
| W | 87 | 72.5 | 128 | 62.75 |
| X | 69 | 57.5 | 86 | 42.16 |
| Y | 25 | 20.83 | 44 | 21.57 |
| Z | 44 | 36.67 | 42 | 20.59 |
| AA | 47 | 39.17 | 48 | 23.53 |
| BB | 20 | 16.67 | 44 | 21.57 |
| CC | 36 | 30 | 71 | 34.8 |
| DD | 37 | 30.83 | 39 | 19.12 |
| EE | 38 | 31.67 | 45 | 22.06 |
| FF | 52 | 43.33 | 87 | 42.65 |
| GG | 62 | 51.67 | 117 | 57.35 |
| HH | 84 | 70 | 141 | 69.12 |
| II | 60 | 50 | 99 | 48.53 |
| JJ | 60 | 50 | 98 | 48.04 |
| KK | 54 | 45 | 67 | 32.84 |
| LL | 64 | 53.33 | 95 | 46.57 |
| MM | 79 | 65.83 | 129 | 63.24 |
| NN | 94 | 78.33 | 103 | 50.49 |
| OO | 96 | 80 | 87 | 42.65 |
| PP | 112 | 93.33 | 141 | 69.12 |
| QQ | 71 | 59.17 | 92 | 45.1 |
| RR | 57 | 47.5 | 69 | 33.82 |
| SS | 96 | 80 | 78 | 38.24 |
| TT | 109 | 90.83 | 129 | 63.24 |
| UU | 39 | 32.5 | 56 | 27.45 |
| VV | 42 | 35 | 75 | 36.76 |
| WW | 84 | 70 | 104 | 50.98 |
| XX | 20 | 16.67 | 34 | 16.67 |
| YY | 79 | 65.83 | 127 | 62.25 |
| ZZ | 37 | 30.83 | 49 | 24.02 |
| AAA | 74 | 61.67 | 95 | 46.57 |
| BBB | 56 | 46.67 | 86 | 42.16 |
| CCC | 65 | 54.17 | 86 | 42.16 |
| DDD | 49 | 40.83 | 55 | 26.96 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| EEE | 45 | 37.5 | 55 | 26.96 |
| FFF | 40 | 33.33 | 104 | 50.98 |
| GGG | 51 | 42.5 | 72 | 35.29 |
| HHH | 58 | 48.33 | 126 | 61.76 |
| III | 83 | 69.17 | 99 | 48.53 |
| JJJ | 39 | 32.5 | 66 | 32.35 |
| KKK | 69 | 57.5 | 93 | 45.59 |
| LLL | 85 | 70.83 | 109 | 53.43 |
| N = 64 | | | | |

# Vita

Lucinda Grant Martinez was born in Boulder, Colorado, and grew up in Colorado and Pennsylvania. After moving to Louisiana, she obtained her Bachelors of Arts in art from Nicholls State University, Thibodaux, Louisiana in 1999. While pursuing this degree, she taught Nicholls Continuing Education courses in various art media. She joined the Nicholls State University graduate program in 2000 to pursue an M.Ed. in Higher Education Administration and Supervision. While at Nicholls, she worked at the Tutorial Learning Center tutoring university students in Developmental English, Composition, and Literature courses, and taught English Essay Writing Preparation. She taught Senior Composition and English Literature courses during the Upward Bound Summer Institute, and was a Freshman Studies Instructor teaching Academic Learning Strategies and Tutorials in the Freshman Division.

Martinez joined the Louisiana Charter School Evaluation Project at Nicholls State University in 2001, and held the position until 2004. In 2003, she was hired as the Assessment Coordinator and PASS-PORT Administrator at the College of Education at Nicholls, and she also served as the Coordinator for the PASS-PORT / Assessment Coordinators' Institute of the Louisiana Board of Regents Teacher Education Initiatives, from 2004-2005. In 2004, Martinez was hired at the University of New Orleans, Lakefront Campus, as the Accountability Coordinator / PASS-PORT Administrator, and the Technology Coordinator for Charter School Initiatives for the College of Education and Human Development. She gained admission to the K-12 Educational Leadership Graduate Program as a Ph.D. candidate in 2005.

She has served on the NCATE Committees at both Nicholls and the University of New Orleans, and the Technology Plan Task Force for the State of Louisiana Department of Education. Martinez has been an active volunteer in the General Federation of Women's Clubs of Louisiana since 2004, and has served as State Director of Junior Clubs and GFWC National Arts Partnership Chairman. She has been elected to serve as the 2018-2020 State President.