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A single factor, seven-level, repeated measures, unbalanced experiment was conducted with 191 college undergraduates to test Boal and Bryson's (1988) assertions that: (1) there are at least two forms of charismatic leadership under crisis conditions—visionary and crisis-responsive; and (2) once the crisis condition has abated, the effects of crisis-responsive leadership deteriorate comparatively faster than other forms of charismatic leadership. The experiment consisted of four crisis condition leadership treatments (crisis-responsive, visionary under crisis, exchange under crisis, and low expressiveness under crisis) and three no-crisis condition leadership treatments (visionary no crisis, exchange no crisis, and low expressiveness no crisis) at time one followed by low expressiveness no crisis at time two. Two graduate student "leaders" who memorized carefully prepared scripts delivered the leadership treatments. Analysis consisted of 28 a priori comparisons of cell means and repeated measures ANOVA to determine significant main effects as well as interactions. We found support for our hypothesis that there are two forms of charisma (visionary and crisis-responsive) and that, in the absence of crisis, the effects of crisis responsive charisma decay faster than do the effects of visionary charisma.

Some men see things as they are and ask why? I dream things that never were and ask, why not?

—Robert F. Kennedy as quoted in Ted's eulogy for Robert (Kennedy, 1968, p. 58)
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There are no great men. There are only great challenges which ordinary men are forced by circumstances to meet.
—W. F. "Bull" Halsey in Lay and Gilroy (1959)

The quotes above capture the essence of much of the current literature concerning charismatic leadership. Is charisma primarily based on the vision of an extraordinary leader or does it evolve from rising to face extraordinary circumstances, such as a crisis? Strong adherents of Weber (e.g., Beyer, 1999; Trice & Beyer, 1986, pp. 118–119) argue that he considers the following five interacting elements as crucial in producing charisma:

1. An extraordinarily gifted person;
2. A social crisis or situation of desperation;
3. A set of ideas providing a radical solution to the crisis;
4. A set of followers who are attracted to the exceptional person and who come to believe that he or she is directly linked to transcendent powers; and
5. The validation of that person's extraordinary gifts and transcendence by repeated successes.

Trice and Beyer (1986) viewed charisma as a sociological phenomenon that emerged from the interaction of all of these elements, and argued that all of them must be present to some degree for charisma to occur.

For such scholars, in a necessary but not sufficient conceptualization, charisma involves the essence of both of the previous quotes in the form of a highly gifted leader with a radical vision to deal with a clearly perceived crisis. Much of the "new leadership" literature (a term coined by Bryman, 1992) is equivocal about these alternative views. For some, vision is the key while for others crisis plays a critical role. (For a thorough discussion of these studies, see, Yukl, 1998.)

Boal and Bryson (1988) addressed this issue by proposing that there are really two kinds of charismatic leadership—visionary (the first quote) and crisis-responsive (the second quote). The purpose of this article is to empirically examine in an experimental setting Boal and Bryson's (1988) contention that visionary and crisis-responsive leader behaviors are each perceived as different but related kinds of charismatic leadership and that their impact differs across time.

CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT

Following Brickman's (1978) phenomenological notions, Boal and Bryson (1988) argue that the essential function of charismatic leadership is to help create a new or different world that is both "phenomenologically valid" or real to the followers and different from the one before. The visionary charismatic does this by linking followers' needs to important values, purposes, or meanings through articulation of vision and goals. This articulation helps create a phenomenologically valid world, a form of interpretive scheme or theory of action that is different from the followers' previous world. The visionary charismatic also shows how follower behavior can
contribute to the fulfillment of these new values, purposes, or meanings (Boal & Bryson, 1988, p. 17).

Boal and Bryson (1988, p. 16) define a crisis situation as a condition where a system is required or expected to handle a situation for which existing resources, procedures, policies, structures, or mechanisms are inadequate. In a crisis condition the linkage between follower behavior and its positive consequences is severed. The crisis-responsive charismatic leader acts to re-establish a link between the followers' behavior and its positive consequences in times of crisis. Thus, visionary charismatics start with new interpretive schemes or theories of action and move to actions. In contrast, crisis-responsive charismatics start with actions (to deal with the crisis) and then move to new interpretive schemes or theories of action to support or justify the actions. Boal and Bryson (1988) contend that in this latter case, the charismatic attributes of followers will be short-lived unless the leader remains in a key position and can relate the handling of the crisis to a new phenomenological world with which the followers can continue to identify.

Anecdotally, the preceding argument helps explain why President George Bush went from an approval rating greater than 90% during the Gulf War to being voted out of office in the following November's election. He neglected the "vision thing" after establishing crisis-responsive charisma. History also records that Winston Churchill was a highly successful crisis-responsive leader during World War II. Shortly after the war ended and the crisis was over, however, he was voted out of office. Similarly, in a more systematic case study, Roberts and Bradley (1988) report on a district superintendent of education who was seen as charismatic during a major educational crisis and was viewed as non-charismatic after assuming a promotion without a crisis.

We sought to test experimentally Boal and Bryson's two basic assertions. Their first assertion was that the attributes of charisma and effects of charismatic behavior could be produced by establishing for followers a phenomenologically valid world through visionary-charismatic leadership or, during times of crisis, through crisis-responsive charismatic leadership. To provide baseline comparisons, we examined the effects of these two forms of charismatic leadership with a low expressiveness treatment and with an exchange-based treatment emphasizing leader-follower exchange relationships.

Our leadership treatments were conceptually similar, respectively, to laissez-faire and transactional leadership in the literature (e.g., Bass, 1996). However, we preferred not to use the specific good, better, best (laissez-faire, transactional, transformational) leadership types and measures represented by the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). The statistical problems with the MLQ are well documented (Bass & Avolio, 1993; Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995; Carless, 1998; Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990) and these measures are proprietary. Rather, the leadership types represented by our leadership treatments merely bear a family resemblance to the MLQ types and are well documented elsewhere in the leadership literature (Bass & Avolio, 1991; Gerstner & Day, 1997; Hackman & Oldham, 1975; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, & Bommer, 1996; Rivera, 1994; Scandura & Schriesheim, 1994; Yukl, 1998). Thus, we proposed the following:
Hypothesis 1: There are two forms of charismatic leadership under crisis conditions; specifically, at time one, crisis-responsive and visionary under crisis leadership will produce the same levels of charisma in followers as measured by leader affect, leader attributed charisma, performance beyond expectations, confidence in leader, and task accuracy and completion measures.²

Hypothesis 2: Both forms of charismatic leadership under crisis conditions are at least equally efficacious; specifically, at time one, crisis-responsive and visionary under crisis leadership will produce significantly greater levels of charisma in followers as measured by leader affect, leader attributed charisma, performance beyond expectations, confidence in leader, and task accuracy and completion measures than the levels of those variables produced by exchange under crisis and low-expressive under crisis leadership.

Boal and Bryson's second assertion was that temporal effects of crisis-responsive charismatic leadership would significantly decay over time when compared with visionary-charismatic leadership under both crisis and no crisis conditions. Thus we hypothesized:

Hypothesis 3: Once the crisis has abated, the effects of crisis-responsive leadership will deteriorate faster than the other forms of charismatic leadership. More precisely stated, there will be a significant interaction between leadership treatments and time such that the charismatic effects of crisis-responsive leadership as measured by leader affect, leader attributed charisma, performance beyond expectations, confidence in leader, and task accuracy and completion measures will decay faster than will the charismatic effects of visionary under crisis leadership and visionary no crisis leadership.

METHOD
Overview

Mook (1998) argued that one goes to the laboratory to see if a phenomenon can occur, not to see if it does occur. Based on this argument, we were interested in establishing whether there could be two different kinds of charismatic leadership and, if so, whether the effects of crisis-responsive charisma would decay faster than those of visionary charisma. Thus, we determined that a laboratory experiment would be both appropriate and feasible, based on the work of those such as Howell and Frost (1989), Pillai and Meindl (1998), and Kirkpatrick and Locke (1996).

Essentially, we designed this laboratory study to induce: (1) visionary leadership; (2) a crisis; and (3) crisis responsive leadership as a function of the crisis. We wanted to determine the effects of visionary charisma on various measures of follower perceptions, attitudes, and task performance under crisis and no-crisis situations as well as the effects of crisis-responsive charisma under crisis situations. Unless one
believe that subordinates can perceive a crisis when there is none (such as with
the "Chicken Little phenomenon") it made no sense to examine crisis-responsive
leadership in a no-crisis situation. Additionally, we designed the study to examine
the relative impact of each kind of charisma on criteria as compared to that of low
expressiveness and exchange-based leadership treatments under no-crisis and crisis
conditions. Finally, we established a low expressiveness treatment at the second
time period to compare the decay effects of followers previously exposed to the
various leadership treatments under crisis and non-crisis conditions.

### Design Details

Our laboratory investigation involved a single-factor, seven-level, subjects nested
within levels, repeated measures, unbalanced design using 191 upper-level college
students at a large, publicly supported state university in the southwestern United
States. The design allowed us to test our hypothesis with 21 a priori determined
comparisons of cell means and repeated measures ANOVA to determine significant
main effects as well as interactions.

As Table 1 illustrates, each of the levels of the single factor in Time One is
composed of combinations of leadership treatments, crisis or no-crisis situations,
and tasks. In Time Two, the levels represent the previously mentioned low expres-
siveness treatment, a no-crisis situation, and one of two different tasks. Note that
the design is unbalanced, since, as previously indicated, it was not appropriate to
include a crisis-responsive charismatic treatment where there was no crisis.³

### Subjects

Subjects were upper-division students enrolled in one of two sections of a prin-
ciples of management class taught by the same instructor. Our sample consisted of
81 females and 110 males with an average age between 20 and 22 years with 3 to
4 years of work experience. The students were informed that they had the opportu-
nity to participate in a university strategic planning project sponsored by the presi-
dent's office and administered by a chaired professor within the business school

---

Table 1. Single Factor, Seven Levels, Repeated Measures, Unbalanced Experimental Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time One</th>
<th>Task A: Under Crisis</th>
<th>Time Two</th>
<th>Task B: No Crisis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crisis-Responsive Leadership</td>
<td>Leader One and Leader Two</td>
<td>Low Expressiveness No Crisis Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visionary Under Crisis Leadership</td>
<td>Leader One and Leader Two</td>
<td>Low Expressiveness No Crisis Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exchange Under Crisis Leadership</td>
<td>Leader One and Leader Two</td>
<td>Low Expressiveness No Crisis Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Expressiveness Under Crisis Leadership</td>
<td>Leader One and Leader Two</td>
<td>Low Expressiveness No Crisis Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task B No Crisis</td>
<td>Visionary No Crisis Leadership</td>
<td>Leader One and Leader Two</td>
<td>Low Expressiveness No Crisis Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exchange No Crisis Leadership</td>
<td>Leader One and Leader Two</td>
<td>Low Expressiveness No Crisis Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Expressiveness No Crisis Leadership</td>
<td>Leader One and Leader Two</td>
<td>Low Expressiveness No Crisis Leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(one of the authors of this article). If they chose to participate they were informed that it would involve two sessions (on a Saturday or Sunday), each two-hours in length, three-weeks apart, and that they could receive a bonus of 2% of their course grade if they successfully completed both sessions.

Those interested then signed up and were randomly assigned to one of the crisis or no-crisis situations and treatment conditions. The design called for 30 subjects per cell in each of seven factor-level treatments. Fifteen individuals were to be randomly assigned to a session with one of two leaders representing a factor-level treatment. The 15 subjects' responses for each leader were combined to provide the targeted sample size for each factor-level. We assumed some attrition between the first and second treatment administrations and over-scheduled so that there were slightly more than 30 people in some treatment conditions during Time One. In total, 223 subjects were treated during Time One and 191 returned for Time Two treatments, three weeks later. The reduced sample forms the basis for our analyses.

Setting and Nature of Tasks and Crisis

The setting and tasks were updated versions of those used by Rivera (1994), which she based on material in US News and World Report that summarized university ratings. The setting was described initially in each of the two management classes from which the students volunteered. The class instructor mentioned earlier in the semester that a major project was coming up in which the students would have a chance to participate. The earlier-mentioned chaired professor later briefly described the project in each of the classes.

The students were informed that they would have the opportunity to participate in a project sponsored jointly by the President of the University and US News and World Report (USN&WR). The project would involve a contest where the contestants would have the opportunity to provide ways to move their university up in the standings based on USN&WR data. Those students judged to have done the best on the assigned tasks would have their work seriously considered for submission to the president's office as a possible contest entry to USN&WR for "up and coming" universities. Thus, both individual students and their university had a chance to receive recognition. With this as a background, students were given a chance to sign up for appropriate time blocks on sign-up sheets.

The students then showed up at the appointed time at designated classrooms. To enhance the feeling of a special project, as opposed to an experiment, the rooms were deliberately chosen so as not to resemble laboratory experiment rooms. As they reported, students were each randomly assigned to a given leader in groups of about 15. Those reporting late were taken to another room and given another assignment not directly connected with this study.

Summary Tasks based on USN&WR Information

Task A

In Task A, executed during Time One by groups in the first four treatment levels and again during Time Two by groups in the last three treatment levels, students
prioritized the 12 cost-cutting and revenue-enhancing measures judged most important for college presidents to take to strengthen their school’s standing. Raising tuition and fees, consolidating non-faculty positions, cutting the budget for intercollegiate sports, and reducing service for the off-campus community are some examples of the cost-cutting and revenue-enhancing measures used. In addition, the students justified each measure’s prioritization in one or two carefully articulated sentences.

**Task B**

In Task B, executed during Time One by groups in the last three treatment levels and again during Time Two by groups in the first four treatment levels, each subject reviewed eight criteria currently being used in the USN&WR rankings of national universities. Freshmen in the top 10% of their high school class, percentage of faculty with Doctor of Philosophy degrees, retention rate, graduation rate, and average SAT are examples of the criteria used.

Using their university’s current statistics (provided by USN&WR) in each of these rankings, the subjects recommended more stringent yet reasonable targets to move the university’s standing up one quartile by the end of the decade. Similar to Task A, students were asked to justify each of their selections in two well-articulated sentences.

**The Crisis**

The crisis that was part of the conditioning in the first four levels of Time One used a modification of Rivera’s (1994) work based on a review of key aspects of crisis and charisma. Crisis was defined as a “situation that threatens high priority goals . . . and which suddenly occurs with little response time available” (Jick & Murray, 1982). It involved a person entering the workroom five minutes after the session began and informing the leader that USN&WR guidelines allowed only 15 minutes for the task (the subjects originally were informed that they had 30 minutes). Furthermore, in addition to the earlier specified cost-cutting/revenue-enhancing items, five more items requiring prioritization had been inadvertently left out because of an outside mistake and would have to be completed to meet contest rules. The outside person then left the room.

The task meaningfulness criterion will be discussed later. It suffices to say, however, that analysis of this variable revealed the student subjects took each of the tasks seriously. There was no indication, through either the analysis of the task meaningfulness criterion or the debriefing of the students, that they considered the tasks to be impractical or that they considered the imposed time constraints to be unrealistic.

**Leaders, Leadership Scripts, and Task Procedures**

**Leaders**

The leaders were two graduate students chosen because they gave the appearance of dynamic and mature young men. However, unlike leaders used in experiments by those such as Howell and Frost (1989), our leaders were not actors. Part of our
intent was to check the extent to which attributed charisma could be induced in
the laboratory from non-actors. As indicated below, each leader was trained to
operate in each of the leadership treatments, following scripts. Each graduate
student leader administered all of the seven leadership treatments. The results of
two groups receiving the same leadership treatment from a different graduate
student leader were combined to form a single experimental cell. None of the
dependent criteria varied based on graduate student leader.

The lack of variance in the criteria based on graduate student leader can be
attributed to the fact that each of the graduate student leaders performed using
separate scripts for each of the seven leadership factor-levels at Time One except
for low expressiveness level four and low expressiveness level seven where similar
scripts were used. The scripts for each of the seven low expressiveness treatments
administered during Time Two were identical to those used at Time One.

At Time One, subjects in the first four levels of the experiment performed the
cost-cutting and revenue-enhancing task. The leader in each of the four leadership
factor-level treatments (crisis-responsive charismatic, visionary charismatic, ex-
change-based, and low expressiveness) started by handing out task instructions and
work sheets for the subjects. The instructions reinforced the previously mentioned
points concerning the context, in addition to specifying what was to be done, Providing
the necessary information to be acted upon, and specifying a 30-minute time
limit for completing the tasks.

While the written instructions and materials were identical for each leadership
condition, the scripted behaviors differed substantially. The scripts and the tasks
were modifications of those originally used by Rivera (1994). They were modified
based on changes in our research design compared with Rivera’s and the feedback
from three earlier pilot studies—extensive discussions drawing on the experience
of Jane Howell and exemplified in her publication with Peter Frost (see, Howell &
Frost, 1989).

Conceptual rationale for the behaviors came from several sources that are sum-
marized in Yukl (1998). Besides this conceptual rationale, the scripted behaviors
were related to the nature of the tasks and the context in which the subjects were
operating. For example, relatively short-term contacts and reward structures built
around possible course points, doing well in the competition, doing something to
enhance the university of which the students were a part, and the leader’s helping
or not helping to resolve the crisis scripted according to task and context. Key
aspects included demonstrating self-confidence, projecting visionary behavior ap-
propriate to the situation, demonstrating high performance standards and a high
degree of confidence that the followers could meet these standards, and, in general,
demonstrating a high degree of expressiveness and excitement through animated
facial expressions, an engaging voice tone, direct eye contact, and the like. Opera-
tional details are covered next.

Leadership Factor-Level Treatments at Time One

Level One: Crisis-Responsive Charismatic Leadership Treatment (CRES)

The crisis-responsive leader began the session unexpressively. He inactively did
the minimum beyond initially handing out the materials and indicating that after
the subjects had read the written materials, he was not allowed to answer any questions except procedural ones. After being told about the crisis, however, the leader became very dynamic with appropriate voice inflections and animated facial and body movements. He indicated that even though he was only supposed to answer procedural questions, he did not think it was fair for the subjects not to be able to complete the tasks without some kind of help. Therefore, on his own responsibility, he would answer any questions. He followed by extolling a vision involving the success of students such as these in past USN&WR contests. He next reinforced both his own competency and that of the subjects. He gave them a couple of helpful suggestions and reinforced the importance of their work in the way the university would be viewed. He finished by saying he would try to get the chaired professor to give the subjects extra consideration because they had worked so hard and been treated unfairly.

**Level Two: Visionary Under Crisis Leadership Treatment (VSUC)**

The visionary leader was very active and expressive; he early and frequently tied the followers' work into such things as its linkage with improved standing of their university and how that would benefit them, their siblings, and even their future children. He also expressed confidence in their abilities and indicated his previous success with such tasks as this. After being told about the crisis, the visionary leader essentially conveyed the same information as the low expressiveness and exchange-based leaders, but was much more expressive. He then continued extolling variations of the earlier expressed vision until the time period was up.

**Level Three: Exchange Under Crisis Leadership Treatment (EXUC)**

The exchange-based leader was reasonably expressive and active but restricted himself to linking the subject's work with course points. After being told about the crisis, the exchange-based leader, in addition to making the same points as the low expressiveness leader, indicated that subjects still should be able to finish and earn their points.

**Level Four: Low Expressiveness Under Crisis Leadership Treatment (LEUC)**

The low expressiveness leader was unexpressive and inactive and did the minimum beyond handing out the materials initially, and indicating that after the subjects had read the written materials he was not allowed to answer any questions except procedural ones. This condition was to represent a low expressiveness base condition. After being told about the crisis, the leader indicated to the subjects that there were only 10 more minutes and five additional items to complete, and sat down at his desk.

**Level Five: Visionary No Crisis Leadership Treatment (VSNC)**

The visionary leader was very active and expressive, and early and frequently tied the subjects' work into such things as its linkage with improved standing of their university and how that would benefit them, their siblings, and even their future children. He also expressed confidence in their abilities and indicated his
previous success with such tasks as this. There was no crisis to interrupt the leader’s or the group’s behavior.

**Level Six: Exchange No Crisis Leadership Treatment (EXNC)**

The exchange-based leader was reasonably expressive and active but restricted himself to linking the subject’s work with course points. There was no crisis to interrupt the leader’s or the group’s behavior.

**Level Seven: Low Expressiveness No Crisis Leadership Treatment (LENC)**

The low expressiveness leader was unexpressive and inactive and did the minimum beyond handing out the materials initially, and indicating that after the subjects had read the written materials, he was not allowed to answer any questions except procedural ones. There was no crisis to interrupt the leader’s or the group’s behavior. This leadership script was considered as a baseline treatment for all levels during Time Two.

**Time Two**

Three weeks after participating in the Time One leadership treatments, all subjects within a group completed the other task. Subjects who had originally worked on Task A now worked on Task B and vice versa. This time, however, all subjects received the low expressiveness leadership baseline treatment condition. Again the time limit was 15 minutes and there was no crisis.

In summary: (1) the same two leaders were used across all leadership factor treatments in both time periods and were scheduled in random order within and across treatment conditions so that each leader covered all treatment levels; (2) there was no crisis-responsive charismatic leadership treatment in the no crisis levels (since the treatment depended on a crisis condition); (3) there were different subjects in each leadership factor treatment level and they participated in both Time One and Time Two tasks (separated by three weeks); and (4) the same two tasks, but in different order, were used in the first four and last three levels.

**MEASURES**

**Manipulation Checks**

Manipulation checks were conducted to determine the perceived degree of crisis and perceptions of leadership behaviors among participants. Each subject answered 19 questions included in the end of session-questionnaire that measured whether a greater degree of crisis was perceived for the Under Crisis treatment levels (1 through 4) than the No Crisis levels (5 through 7) and whether perceptions of leader behavior matched intended leadership treatments.

The crisis manipulation check consisted of four items based on the work cited earlier. Respondents answered these items on confidential questionnaires at the end of each the two work sessions. Refined through pilot work, the items probed perceptions of a crisis situation, time pressure, stress, and threatening of important goals. Five-point Likert scales anchored by strongly agree and strongly disagree
responses were used. Cronbach's Alpha for the four-item scale was .77 across the crisis leadership treatments.

Items measuring perceptions of leader behavior were derived from the earlier cited literature and were refined using the same pilot work as for the crisis items. Ultimately, five items were used for low expressiveness leadership (Cronbach's Alpha = .73), two items for exchange leadership (Cronbach's Alpha = .75), three items for visionary leadership (Cronbach's Alpha = .75), and five items for crisis-responsive leadership (Cronbach's Alpha = .78). Both the visionary and crisis-responsive measures emphasized confidence in leader, confidence in subordinates, and a vision of a future university that would be far greater than the present one partly because of the subject's efforts. The visionary charismatic extolled his vision early and throughout the session. In contrast, the crisis-responsive charismatic extolled his vision only after the crisis occurred and tied his vision into dealing with the crisis and his concern for helping the subjects.

Analysis of the manipulation checks is contained in Table 2. In sum, the degree of crisis for the Under Crisis treatment levels was perceived as greater than the degree of crisis for the No Crisis treatment levels and perceptions of leadership behavior matched intended leadership treatments across all seven treatment levels.

**Dependent Variables**

A questionnaire using five-point Likert scales anchored with strongly agree and strongly disagree responses was used to measure a wide range of subordinate subjects' perceptions and attitudes at the end of each work session. Subjects were informed that this information would supplement the contest entries in terms of helping to develop leaders at their university. In addition, objective measures of task accuracy and task completion were used as dependent performance measures in this study. As applied in the present context, reviews by Bryman (1992), House and his colleagues (e.g., Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993), and Bass and his colleagues (e.g., Bass & Avolio, 1993), and Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Bommer (1996) provided the rationale for the specific measures chosen.

Measures chosen and their sources were: (1) commitment to the leader (Rivera, 1994); (2) trust in the leader (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990); (3) satisfaction with the leader (Bass & Avolio, 1991); (4) leader attributed charisma (Rivera, 1994); (5) performance beyond expectations (Bass & Avolio, 1991); (6) subordinate self esteem (Rivera, 1994); and (7) task meaningfulness (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). Items comprising the measures focused on perceived outcomes or responses to the treatment behaviors as opposed to descriptions of the behaviors themselves (which were used as manipulation checks). Thus we avoided the confounding that sometimes occurs between descriptions of behavior and descriptions of responses to behavior (Hunt, 1991). These dependent variables were chosen because they represented the kinds of changes in subordinates one would expect a charismatic leader to produce. Our aim was to capture numerous follower responses that would result from exposure to charismatic leader behavior.

To check the dimensionality of the measures, we first separated out the three-item performance beyond expectations measure (BASSAV) since there is now a
### Table 2. Results of Manipulation Checks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>F or t value</th>
<th>p Value</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived degree of crisis across the four crisis treatment levels</td>
<td>$F = .32$</td>
<td>$&gt;.81$</td>
<td>Crisis was perceived the same across the four under crisis leadership treatment levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived degree of crisis across the first four crisis treatment levels is higher than the perceived degree of crisis across the last three no crisis treatment levels</td>
<td>$t = 5.9$</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
<td>The degree of crisis was perceived as higher for the first four under crisis treatment levels than the last three no crisis treatment levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of leader behavior correspond to intended leadership treatments for:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1: Crisis-Responsive</td>
<td>$F = 44.35$</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
<td>Crisis-Responsive leader behavior was perceived as intended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2: Visionary Under Crisis</td>
<td>$F = 22.03$</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
<td>Visionary Under Crisis leader behavior was perceived as intended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3: Exchange Under Crisis</td>
<td>$F = 7.35$</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
<td>Exchange Under Crisis leader behavior was perceived as intended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4: Low Expressiveness Under Crisis</td>
<td>$F = 67.00$</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
<td>Low Expressiveness Under Crisis leader behavior was perceived as intended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5: Visionary No Crisis</td>
<td>$F = 21.87$</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
<td>Visionary No Crisis leader behavior was perceived as intended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 6: Exchange No Crisis</td>
<td>$F = 21.64$</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
<td>Exchange No Crisis leader behavior was perceived as intended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 7: Low Expressiveness No Crisis</td>
<td>$F = 47.14$</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
<td>Low Expressiveness leader behavior was perceived as intended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means of the 7 Time Two Low Expressiveness Treatments were not significantly different from each other nor the Time One Low Expressiveness No Crisis Treatment and were significantly different from the other six Time One Treatments at the $p < .05$ level.

A considerable body of literature using it (e.g., Bass, 1996; Bass & Avolio, 1991, 1993; Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995; Carless, 1998; Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; Lowe, Kroek, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996) have used this rule of thumb see Hurley, Scandura, Schriesheim, Brannick, 1997; or Riordan, 1997). Following are the factors derived and their labels.
Leader Affect (AFFECT)

The AFFECT scale consisted of 12 items from the original commitment, trust and satisfaction scales. Sample items include: I enjoyed working with the leader; the leader was exceptional; and I had confidence in the leader.

Leader Attributed Charisma (CHARIS)

This scale consisted of nine items based on Rivera (1994) and extended through pilot work. Sample items include: leader was charismatic; leader was extraordinary; I felt truly inspired.

Performance Beyond Expectations (BASSAV)

Consisting of three items, this scale is based on Bass (1985) and Bass and Avolio (1991, 1993). Sample items include: leader was extraordinary; I felt moved to think beyond myself to the greater good; and I felt truly inspired.

Confidence in the Leader (CONFIL)

This scale consisted of three items based on Rivera (1994) and developed from the pilot work. Sample items include: leader was self-confident; leader had integrity.

Values (VALUES)

This scale consisted of seven items based on Rivera (1994) and developed from pilot work. Sample items included: excited about future; motivated toward greater (home, university); doing something worthwhile.

Task Meaningfulness (TASKME)

This scale consisted of five items based on Hackman and Oldham (1975). Sample items included: the work done on the task completed was meaningful to me; the task I just performed was one where a lot of other people could be affected by how well the work got done.

Task A Performance Measures

The objective performance measures for the cost cutting and revenue-enhancing task (Task A) consisted of an accuracy (quality) measure and two completion measures. Each student was asked to classify 12 items from USN&WR in terms of whether they should receive primary or secondary priority by college presidents for cost-cutting/revenue enhancing and to justify each of these in one or two well articulated sentences. Performance was measured in the following manner.

Accuracy (ST-ACCUR)

Standardized accuracy scores were calculated by comparing each student’s percentage agreement with priorities agreed to by an expert panel of college presidents (see USN&WR, September 28, 1992). Since the crisis-responsive charismatic had provided suggestions concerning two additional items, these were not counted in this or completion-rate scoring, in any of the other treatment levels. Standardized completion rate scores (STCOMP1) were computed from the number of items prioritized with an S (secondary priority) or a P(primary priority). STCOMP2 was
computed by standardizing the percentage of the total items containing a one or two sentence justification

**Task B Performance Measures**

For Task B, the admission standards task, the quality measure was how close, on average, each student’s recommended numbers (SAT, percentiles, acceptance rate percentages, etc.) were to those compiled by USNWR for schools in the next higher quartile from the university in question’s current quartile. The completion rates were calculated in the same way as those for the cost-cutting/revenue enhancing task.

Once performance measure scores were calculated for each subject on each task they were standardized. Standardization allowed scores to be compared with each other across tasks and time periods.

**Debriefing**

After the subjects’ questionnaires were collected at the end of Time One, they were thanked for their participation and were asked not to speak to anyone about their work during the session since they were competing against other students for course credit. Additionally, they were told that the leader had just been informed that working on the second part of the assignment would permit earning course points regardless of whether or not the participants finished the first task.

At the end of Time Two, (three weeks later), as before, subjects were thanked and reminded not to discuss the assignment. They also were informed that they would be provided with details about their contest standing and other information about the assignment during one of their later class periods. We then provided the promised information in an individually prepared memorandum that was handed out in class to each participant. The memorandum contained a full disclosure statement about the nature of the experiment.

**DATA ANALYSIS HIGHLIGHTS**

**Elimination of Dependent Variables**

The importance of task in general (e.g., Hackman & Oldham, 1975) and task choice in experimental design is well documented (e.g., Kirk, 1995; Neuman, 1999; Yukl, Kim, & Chavez, 1999). Each group performed a different task in Time One versus Time Two as well as receiving a different leadership treatment. Tasks were changed from Time One to Time Two to eliminate the possibility that learning-through-repetition influenced performance or other criteria; additionally, the effects of tasks on dependent variables could be determined. To determine the effects of tasks, an examination of the dependent variables was conducted by task alone using the Student t-Test. The mean of each dependent variable measured after completion of Task A versus the mean of each dependent variable measured after Task B was tested for a significant difference. Only Task Meaningfulness (TASKME) and Values (VALUES) were found to be significantly different based on task alone at the $\alpha = .05$ level and were not used in subsequent analysis.
The Effects of Visionary and Crisis-Responsive Charisma

The remaining dependent perceptual and attitudinal variables (unaffected by task) were leader affect (AFFECT), leader attributed charisma (CHARIS), performance beyond expectations (BASSAV), confidence in leader (CONFIL), and the measures of performance. Using these criteria allowed for a parsimonious consideration of dependent variables while ensuring that multiple dependent variables were considered (Hunt, 1991).

**Testing for Equal Means in Hypothesis One**

Hypothesis 1 asserts that there are two forms of charismatic leadership under crisis conditions; specifically, at time one, crisis-responsive and visionary under crisis leadership will produce the same levels of charisma in followers as measured by leader affect, leader attributed charisma, performance beyond expectations, and confidence in leader. In other words, we expect to find the means of the dependent variables to be equal or, in still other words, to find no differences among the means. By setting the means equal to zero (based on existing theory and logic) the ANOVA means model is over parameterized with three group means and a grand mean. Only two parameters are fixed to zero (e.g., the differences between two pairs of group means.) We are not testing the null hypothesis. The null hypothesis, which we reject, is that no relationship exists among crisis-responsive and visionary charisma. The alternative hypothesis is that a relationship exists—specifically, that both visionary and crisis-responsive leadership are related in that they both lead to charismatic effects in followers.

**Interactions and A Priori Comparisons**

The manipulation checks discussed above indicated that all of the leadership treatments and the orchestration of the crisis levels were successful. Having found support for our treatment levels, 28 a priori determined comparisons of treatment means were conducted in order to test hypotheses 1 and 2 and the second part of Hypothesis 3. Fisher's Least Significant Difference Method (Fisher's LSD) and Bonferroni's adjustment of alpha to control for experimentwise error rate was used (Bremer, 1996; Iman & Conover, 1989). Unequal cell sizes were taken into account by using the square root of the sum of the inverse of the cell sizes under examination to modify Fisher's LSD (Bremer, 1996). Additionally, in order to test the first part of Hypothesis 3, a repeated measures MANOVA was run comparing all dependent variables against the leadership treatments. The tests involved in this procedure were conducted to provide insight into the presence or absence of an overall interaction between the leader treatments and time.

**Performance Measures**

No meaningful relationship was found between any of the leadership treatments and accuracy or completion rate scores. A post hoc pairwise comparison of all possible cell means using Turkey's Studentized Range (Honest Significant Difference) Test to control for Type I experimentwise error rate at the p < .05 level (not shown, but data available from the authors) revealed only three significant
Table 3. Cell Sizes, Means, and Standard Deviations of Perceptual and Attitudinal Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>AFFECT</th>
<th>CHARIS</th>
<th>BASSAV</th>
<th>CONFIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CRSP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>VSUC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>EXUC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LEUC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>VSNC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>EXNC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LFNC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Treatment Levels: CRSP = Crisis-Responsive Leadership; EXNC = Exchange No Crisis Leadership; EXUC = Exchange Under Crisis Leadership; LFNC = Low-Expressiveness No Crisis Leadership; LEUC = Low-Expressiveness Under Crisis Leadership; VSNC = Visionary No Crisis Leadership; VSUC = Visionary Under Crisis Leadership.

Dependent Variables: AFFECT = Leader Affect; BASSAV = Performance Beyond Expectations; CHARIS = Leader Attributed Charisma; CONFIL = Confidence in Leader.

differences among the seven leader treatment levels in both time periods for either accuracy or completion rates. In fact, these hard measures of performance appeared to vary virtually randomly across leadership treatments. Consequently, performance measures were not used in analysis of the hypotheses.

RESULTS

Cell sizes, means, and standard deviations for each of the dependent variables are displayed in Table 3. A summary of the results across all of the hypotheses, for the perceptual and attitudinal criteria, is contained in Table 4.

Hypothesis 1

Evidence was found to support the statement that there are at least two forms of charismatic leadership under crisis conditions; specifically, at time one, crisis-responsive and visionary under crisis leadership will produce the same levels of charisma in followers as measured by leader affect, leader attributed charisma, performance beyond expectations, and confidence in leader.

Support was found for this hypothesis in the form of three non-significant contrasts that demonstrated there were no differences in the levels of affect, leader attributed charisma, performance beyond expectations, or confidence in leader for either the crisis-responsive leader treatment or the visionary under crisis leader treatment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 1*</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFFECT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis-Responsive Leadership at Time One—Visionary Under Crisis Leadership at Time One</td>
<td>0.39 (Not Significant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis-Responsive Leadership at Time One—Low Expressiveness Under Crisis Leadership at Time One</td>
<td>-0.16 (Not Significant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHARIS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis-Responsive Leadership at Time One—Visionary Under Crisis Leadership at Time One</td>
<td>0.13 (Not Significant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BASSAV</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis-Responsive Leadership at Time One—Visionary Under Crisis Leadership at Time One</td>
<td>0.18 (Not Significant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONFIL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis-Responsive Leadership at Time One—Visionary Under Crisis Leadership at Time One</td>
<td>0.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis-Responsive Leadership at Time One—Low Expressiveness Under Crisis Leadership at Time One</td>
<td>1.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Under Crisis Leadership at Time One—Exchange Under Crisis Leadership at Time One</td>
<td>0.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Under Crisis Leadership at Time One—Low Expressiveness Under Crisis Leadership at Time One</td>
<td>0.86*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically significant at the .05 level.

AFFECT = Leader Affect; BASSAV = Performance Beyond Expectations; CHARIS = Leader Attributed Charisma; CONFIL = Confidence in Leader.
Hypothesis 2

Mixed but positive support was found for the assertion that both forms of charismatic leadership under crisis conditions are at least equally efficacious. Specifically, at time one, crisis-responsive and visionary under crisis leadership will produce significantly greater levels of charisma in followers as measured by leader affect, leader attributed charisma, performance beyond expectations, and confidence in leader than the levels of those variables produced by exchange under crisis and low-expressiveness under crisis leadership.

Four comparisons for each of the four dependent variables were conducted to test this hypothesis. The levels of the dependent variables produced by crisis-responsive and visionary under crisis leadership were compared to the levels produced by exchange under crisis and low-expressiveness under crisis leadership. In every comparison except two, the crisis-responsive and visionary under crisis leadership treatments produced higher levels of the dependent variables than did the non-charismatic leadership treatments. The first exception was that visionary under crisis did not produce significantly higher levels of affect than did low expressiveness leadership although there was a positive difference in the right direction. The second exception was that visionary under crisis leadership did not produce significantly higher levels of confidence in leader than exchange under crisis. However, like the first exception, the difference was positive (in the expected direction). Despite these exceptions, mixed but positive support was found for this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3

Evidence was found to support the claim that once the crisis has abated, the effects of crisis-responsive leadership will deteriorate faster than the other form of charismatic leadership. In other words, there will be a significant interaction between leadership treatments and time such that the charismatic effects of crisis-responsive leadership as measured by leader affect, leader attributed charisma, performance beyond expectations, and confidence in leader will decay faster than will the charismatic effects of visionary under crisis leadership and visionary no crisis leadership.

A repeated-measures MANOVA was run on each of the dependent variables containing the leadership treatment*time interaction term. It revealed that the interaction term was significant at the $p < .001$ level for leader affect, leader attributed charisma, performance beyond expectations, and confidence in leader providing evidence of an interaction across the 7 leader treatments and the 2 time periods.

To determine the specific source of the interaction, 2 contrasts for each of the dependent variables at Time Two were conducted. The comparisons indicated that levels of affect, leader attributed charisma, performance beyond expectations, and confidence in leader at Time Two were significantly lower for crisis-responsive leadership than either visionary under crisis or visionary no crisis leadership. Recall that at Time Two all levels received a low expressive no-crisis leadership treatment so that levels of the dependent variables were residuals left over from the time one charismatic leadership treatments. Since there were no differences between the levels of the dependent variables at Time One and at Time Two and the levels for
Table 5. Summary of Hypotheses and Findings for Perceptual and Attitudinal Dependent Variables

Hypothesis 1: There are two forms of charismatic leadership under crisis conditions. Specifically, at Time One, Crisis-Responsive and Visionary Under Crisis Leadership will produce the same levels of charisma in followers as measured by Leader Affect, Leader Attributed Charisma, Performance Beyond Expectations, and Confidence in Leader.

Hypothesis supported. No significant differences between the Crisis-Responsive and Visionary Under Crisis Leadership treatments were found among the four criteria of Leader Affect, Leader Attributed Charisma, Performance Beyond Expectations, and Confidence in Leader.

Hypothesis 2: Both forms of charismatic leadership under crisis conditions are at least equally efficacious. Specifically, at Time One, Crisis-Responsive and Visionary Under Crisis leadership will produce significantly greater levels of charisma in followers as measured by Leader Affect, Leader Attributed Charisma, Performance Beyond Expectations, and Confidence in Leader than the levels of those variables produced by Exchange Under Crisis and Low-Expressiveness Under Crisis Leadership.

Mixed but positive support for the hypothesis. Crisis-Responsive Leadership produced higher levels of Leader Affect, Leader Attributed Charisma, and Performance Beyond Expectations than Exchange Under Crisis Leadership or Low Expressiveness Under Crisis leadership. Visionary Under Crisis leadership produced only higher levels of Leader Affect and Performance Beyond Expectations than Exchange Under Crisis leadership. Visionary Under Crisis leadership produced no significantly higher levels of Leader Affect than did the Low Expressiveness Under Crisis leadership. Further, Visionary Under Crisis leadership produced no significantly higher levels of Confidence in Leader than did Exchange Under Crisis Leadership.

Hypothesis 3: Once the crisis has abated, the effects of Crisis-Responsive leadership will deteriorate faster than the other forms of charismatic leadership. Specifically, there will be a significant interaction between leadership treatments and time such that the charismatic effects of Crisis-Responsive Leadership as measured by Leader Affect, Leader Attributed Charisma, Performance Beyond Expectations, and Confidence in Leader will decay faster than will the charismatic effects of Visionary Under Crisis Leadership and Visionary No Crisis Leadership.

Hypothesis supported. The Treatment Time interaction term was significant at the $p < .001$ level for Leader Affect and Performance Beyond Expectations and at the $p < .10$ level for Leader Attributed Charisma indicating that some kind of interaction was taking place somewhere across the 7 leadership treatments and 2 time periods. A series of comparisons at Time Two revealed that the levels of Leader Affect, Leader Attributed Charisma, and Performance Beyond Expectations remaining from Crisis-Responsive Leadership were significantly less than the levels of these variables remaining from the Visionary Under Crisis and Visionary No Crisis Leadership treatments.

Crisis-responsive treated dependent variables were significantly lower from time one to time two, the hypothesis is supported. A summary of these results is contained in Table 5.

**DISCUSSION**

We found support for Boal and Bryson's (1988) two basic assertions:

1. There are two forms of charismatic leadership—visionary and crisis-responsive; and
2. The temporal effects of crisis-responsive charismatic leadership significantly decay over time when compared with visionary charismatic leadership.

Put another way, in a stable setting (no crisis) vision matters; in a crisis setting,
crisis-responsive leadership matters but the crisis-responsive leadership has limited temporal effects unless it is reinforced across time. We conclude that these results are consistent with our earlier speculations concerning the election losses of Bush and Churchill and the superintendent’s loss of charisma. For us, this study suggests that crisis does indeed play a major role in charisma. If leaders respond to crisis, they will be perceived to be as charismatic as visionary charismatic leaders. Crisis alone does not create charisma but crisis and response does. The practical implications of this conclusion are potentially important for managerial-leaders at all levels.

... the potential for charismatic effects may be widespread. For example, leaders who successfully handle minor crises or engage in such seemingly mundane activities as job redesign may come to be seen as charismatic” (Boal & Bryson, 1988, p. 26).

In terms of sufficient versus necessary conditions regarding vision and crisis, we conclude that vision alone is a sufficient condition to establish charismatic leadership. Crisis is a necessary condition to establish charismatic leadership through crisis responsive behavior; in times of crisis, either crisis-responsive behavior or vision is each a sufficient condition to establish charismatic leadership.

Additional Considerations

There are several additional points that these findings suggest. First, we chose our dependent variables from among those reported in reviews of charismatic work. Usually, not all the ones we chose are included in a single study and typically the criteria are not factor analyzed. Our results show some collapsing of criteria when factor analysis is used. They also show that task meaningfulness and values (derived from our factor analysis) differed as a function of task. Hence, the nature of the task may well make a difference in the scores of at least some of the dependent variables used in charismatic/transformational leadership research. These findings suggest even more care than usual when dealing with such dependent variables.

Second, some may argue that our manipulations for either kind of charisma were not very strong. For example, the highest crisis mean reported was 3.42 out of 5.00 and the average mean reported for visionary charismatic leadership among the criteria was 3.46 out of 5.00 while for crisis-responsive leadership it was 3.45 out of 5.00. These suggest neither a crisis of trapped people in a crowded theater nor a white-hatted figure arriving on horseback to save a besieged town. What they do suggest, however, is that even these moderately strong manipulations were significantly different than traditional exchange-based leadership and low expressiveness leadership conditions and provided significant support for our hypotheses. What might one expect if there were crisis and charisma values closer to 5.00 on a five-point scale?

Third, and related, is the question raised earlier in this article concerning the nature of the phenomenon we set out to measure. Clearly we have not tapped charisma as conceptualized by Weber (1947). Beyer (1999) would argue that, like other new leadership approaches, we have “tamed the concept.” The vision is not
radical; the leader is not extraordinary. In fact, as we elaborate on below, our leaders were graduate students operating from memorized scripts. Nevertheless, when these leaders displayed the new leadership behaviors (suggested by the literature) and exhibited the greater university vision or solved a crisis (even a mild one), they generated significantly higher levels of energy and motivation in subordinates than they did in other leadership scenarios. Clearly, in a laboratory setting, leaders displaying the new leadership behaviors were able to generate an energizing force that went beyond traditional leadership. Given this, it seems clear that nonactors can generate at least charisma-like leadership in a lab setting, if not charisma in a Weberian sense.

The two previously mentioned points are reinforced when one considers Yorges, Weiss, and Strickland’s (1999) mention of Jermier’s (1993) discussion of “everyday” charismatic leaders, which can emerge from day-to-day activities. These authors argue that such charisma is what they developed in their laboratory study of charisma. For us, then, it appears reasonable to consider a continuum of charismatic leadership requirements with a Weberian perspective requiring five interacting elements at one end (see, Beyer, 1999) and a form of everyday charisma at the other. Various new leadership approaches would fall somewhere toward the middle and laboratory studies typically would fall toward the everyday end of the spectrum because of the relatively small impact of many charismatic treatments.

Finally, and for us most important of all, are the findings that though our leaders significantly energized their followers, that energy and motivation did not consistently lead to improved performance, indeed the few differences in performance essentially were random. Given most of the literature and particularly the review by Lowe, et al. (1996), this finding or rather lack thereof came as a surprise to us. Actually, though, it should not have.

What this study (and indeed many other leadership studies—both traditional and new leadership) has failed to consider are the notions encompassed within what has sometimes been referred to as the “individual performance equation.” This equation has been well articulated in Martin, Schermerhorn, and Larson (1989), based on the work of those such as Blumberg and Pringle (1982), Peters, O’Connor, and Eulberg (1985) and some of Schermerhorn’s earlier writings (Schermerhorn, 1986; Schermerhorn, Hunt, & Osborn, 1984). These approaches look at performance from the standpoint of factors (including leadership that can impede or enhance such performance). Essentially, in one way or another, these articles (especially the one by Martin et al., 1989) focus on performance as a function of one’s capacity to perform (ability), willingness to perform (effort) and opportunity to perform (support).

Capacity, among other things, encompasses task relevant ability. Willingness encompasses work effort, motivation, or energization. Organizational support encompasses many things, including adequate time, adequate budgets, adequate resources, and various aspects of leadership. For us, an important contribution would be to focus on these aspects contributing to performance and include the impact of leadership, especially charismatic or transformational leadership, as a part of that focus. In the present study, for example, there was no recognition of either leader or follower task relevant ability concerning the performance of the two tasks.
in question. Fiedler and Garcia (1987) are among the few leadership scholars providing detailed consideration of such abilities. Neither was there support opportunity in terms of discussing the task with others, receiving more than bare minimum task instructions from the leader, or the like. In attempting to isolate the effects of charisma, we designed the study as a highly individualistic one without group interaction opportunities or requirements.

Unlike many studies, there was no feedback concerning task performance. Thus, followers could not use task feedback to improve their performance. Interestingly, Shea and Howell (1999), in an experimental study of charisma, found that feedback made no difference in performance on a manufacturing task. Shamir, House and Arthur (1993) have argued that charismatic leadership is more likely to influence individual performance when performance goals cannot be defined and measured and when the ways of achieving the goals are ambiguous. Shamir et al. (1993) contend that in "weak situations" (such as the present study), charismatic leaders can appeal to and engage followers, values, identities and self concepts more readily in order to motivate them. Shea and Howell (1999) go even farther by arguing that their results suggest that charismatic leaders will be equally effective (in terms of performance) in situations, such as their manufacturing one, with clear goals and the means to measure progress as in situations where there are unclear goals and a lack of information about progress. As indicated, our study clearly fit the latter situation, but leadership of any kind did not systematically influence performance. In line with our earlier contention, one possible reason for this finding is our assumption about lack of task relevant ability on the part of either the leader or followers.

In sum, we are arguing that the individual performance equation is useful to keep in mind in leadership studies, in general, and particularly in studies of charismatic or transformational leadership. This argument is consistent with an increasing emphasis on context by those such as Shamir and Howell (1999) and consideration of substitutes for charisma (Podsakoff, et al., 1996). Here we emphasize especially the importance of ability, in combination with the charismatically induced motivation. More generally, we reiterate consideration of capacity, willingness, and opportunity to perform. Ultimately, it would be appropriate to consider boundary conditions for these performance elements and leadership.

**IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH**

This study possesses most of the strengths and weaknesses of leadership laboratory experiments (for a general discussion, see, Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; Korukonda & Hunt, 1989). As indicated earlier, a key focus and strength of this study is a demonstration of Mook's (1998) argument that a primary purpose of laboratory studies is to show that a phenomenon can happen. For us, this study has demonstrated that two different kinds of charismatic leadership can exist and have differential effects across time. As a part of this demonstration, a number of important questions have been raised as discussed above. Each of these questions is a byproduct of the charismatic questions with which we started. Answers to them can help forward the study of charismatic leadership, and each question has a number of research
implications. We invite readers to develop specific research questions based on the more general questions summarized earlier.

Here we wish to concentrate on three additional areas: crisis, temporality, and an examination of the phenomenology aspects of Boal and Bryson's (1988) arguments. In terms of crisis, the number of empirical studies, while increasing, is still quite sparse. This is surprising, given the pervasiveness of arguments in the charismatic literature, especially Weberian-based, concerning the importance of crisis. Much of the empirical work concerning crisis has emanated from research by Beyer and Browning (1999), House, Spangler, and Woycke (1991), Pillai (1996), Pillai and Meindl (1998), Roberts and Bradley (1988), and Trice and Beyer (1986). More work is clearly called for and our investigation serves as an empirical and conceptual addition to studies such as these.

In terms of temporality, here, as in other aspects of leadership, additional work also is needed. In the present study, we used a three-week time period. This period was influenced more by schedule constraints than it was by previous conceptual or empirical information, which was nil. Our desire, essentially, was to allow some, but not too much time to pass after the Time One treatments. We judged one week probably not to be enough time for decay, but more than three weeks to be too much. Three weeks is based on the heuristic that predicts that most humans grow used to changes within three weeks (Maxwell, 1973). Clearly, much more work is needed on this question, especially in field settings.

In terms of the phenomenology aspects, research is called for that examines the differences as a function of visionary or crisis-responsive leadership. Here, the interest is in how subjects feel and think about the two kinds of leadership in stable and crisis situations. Do they see visionary leaders starting with new interpretive schemes and then moving to action and the opposite sequencing for crisis-responsive leaders? This kind of work could provide cognitive and affective insights to help interpret the leadership findings in crisis and stable conditions.

In conclusion, we have examined Boal and Bryson's (1988) argument for two kinds of charismatic leadership and shown that such a phenomenon can exist. It is now time for follow-up work on this and the related notions suggested in this discussion.

NOTES

1. Rather than simply use such standard leadership measures as the Bass and Avolio MLQ, we used available literature to help tailor the underlying concepts and scripted behaviors in the crisis and no crisis situations. Thus, in addition to the two kinds of charisma, we considered exchange based and low expressiveness behaviors to be important baseline conditions.

2. As indicated shortly, we envisioned a wide range of subordinate subjects' perceptions and attitudes, as well as task performance measures as criteria. Ultimately, based on preliminary statistical analyses, the perceptual and attitudinal measures were boiled down to the specific ones specified in this and the subsequent hypotheses.

3. In effect, we had one experiment with three no crisis treatments and one experiment with four crisis treatments. Following in-house statistical recommendations, rather than run these separately we opted to use the unbalanced, seven-level design discussed here.
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