

---

---

## PUTTING CHARISMATIC LEADERSHIP IN CONTEXT

**J.B. Majige<sup>1</sup> and B.A.T. Kundi<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>P.O. Box 5609, Dar es Salaam, <sup>2</sup>Mechanical Engineering Dept., University of  
Dar es salaam P.O. Box 35131, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

### ABSTRACT

*Charismatic leadership is one of the least known and developed forms of leadership. The study performed factor analysis on questionnaire items reflecting bureaucratic leadership, expertise-based leadership, incentive-based leadership, coercive leadership, affiliative leadership, benevolent autocratic leadership, participative leadership, normative leadership and charismatic leadership. The results show that charismatic leadership, defined as the ability of a leader to influence subordinates' behavior through his/her sacrifices for the betterment of subordinates, is a unique form of leadership and has significant relevance to the management of organizations/industries.*

### INTRODUCTION

There has been a steadily growing interest in the theory and research in charismatic leadership [1-5]. In the words of business and politics and even in our local communities, we see many leaders who seem to have the "magic" to transform our institutions, and the society at large through the sheer force of their personalities. We attribute this "magic" in leadership to a personality quality called "charisma".

The most detailed theoretical and empirical studies so far on the construct of charismatic leadership have been done by Conger and Kanungo [2-4]. Their work focussed mainly on the delineation of the behavioral components of the construct. Unfortunately, the utility of these efforts has been severely limited by the apparent lack of a clear conceptual definition of the construct (of charismatic leadership). For such a definition is the foundation for reliable and valid measures and models of the construct.

Behaviorial theorists mostly focus on the behaviour of the leader. Katz

---

## ***Putting Charismatic Leadership in Context***

---

---

and Kahn (1979)[6], House and Baetz (1979)[7] and Conger and Kanungo (1990)[4] argue that the leader and subordinates must share a common belief in order to have the leader's charisma valid. Furthermore, they argue that behavioural characteristics that distinguish charismatic leaders from the noncharismatic ones are unquestionable acceptance of leader's beliefs, obedience, emotional involvement of subordinates etc. so as to fulfil the leader's goals. They emphasize that subordinates perceive extra-ordinary performance of the leader, then attribute this to charisma.

However, it can be revealed from the literature that organizational and behavioural theorists have very little empirical evidence to support their arguments. Even the sociological theorists who view charismatic leaders as those leaders with "supernatural" qualities and the Weberian theorists who believe that charismatic leaders have magical abilities, power of mind and speeches which are not possessed by ordinary people[3] have not had their theories tested through systematic empirical research.

Without much difficulty it can be seen from the aforementioned views that studies of charismatic leadership have been made more difficult by a general lack of agreement concerning how best to conceptualize and measure the concept of charismatic leadership.

### **TYPES OF LEADERSHIP AND RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**

There is no doubt that leadership is one of the most important concepts in the modern day literature on organizational behavior. Yet, despite its importance, it:

"still remains... an unexplainable concept. It is known to exist and has been a subject for speculation and research for years and to have a tremendous influence on human performance, but its inner workings and specific dimensions cannot be precisely spelled out" [8].

A review of the widely known literature of leadership reveals a considerable lack of conceptual distinction between the various types of leadership. Here an attempt to arrive at clear conceptions of the main types of leadership including charismatic leadership is done.

Leadership is the process of moving followers to achieve a set of desirable objectives or goals. The idea of moving is important here. Moving implies that the leadership process has power to drive it. Power is defined as the ability to easily get someone to do something you want done, the way you want it [9]. Without some sort of power there is no leadership. Indeed, if we conceptualize any type of leadership in terms of the required source of power, much of the present confusion about leadership and its models disappears.

Based on the classification of types of leadership according to the source of origin of power, the following leadership types become evident: bureaucratic leadership, expertise-based leadership, incentive-based leadership, affiliative leadership, coercive leadership, normative leadership, benevolent autocratic leadership, participative leadership and charismatic leadership. Table 1 below contains definitions of these leadership types.

#### **Bareaucratic leadership**

The source of power for this type of leadership is formal (legal) rules, regulations and hierarchical set up of the organisation. Each occupant of a position has a defined sphere of competence, with obligations, authority and powers to compel obedience. According to the principle of hierarchy, each lower position is under control and supervision of the occupant of the higher one. This model of leadership is more appropriate only in certain conditions, e.g., with large groups of people whereby the leader will not be above to deal with every individual but people will follow the laid down rules and regulations for their day to day activities.

#### **Expertise-based leadership**

This model of leadership has its power from the extent to which subordinates believe that their leader has special knowledge and expertise on the particular task/problem they are handling. Subordinates must perceive the leader to be credible, trust worthy and relevant before expertise-based leadership can be effective [8]. This model of leadership is more relevant in complex problem solving situations where subordinates expect a lot of directions from their leaders.

**Table 1: Types of leadership & their definitions**

1. Bureaucratic Leadership	Leadership characterized by the extensive use of formal laws/rules and regulations and a rigid hierarchy by the respective individual [1987].
2. Expertise-based Leadership	Leadership which relies on the influencing of subordinates through the power of the leader to deliver information, knowledge, or expertise in the context of solving problems faced by subordinates. [Luthans, 1985]
3. Incentive-based Leadership	The ability of an individual (leader) to influence another person (subordinate) towards targets important to the leader by using resources within the control of the leader to satisfy salient needs of the subordinates [Brown, 1984]
4. Coercive Leadership	The influencing of subordinate's behavior through the use of punishments and forceful means to instill fear. It is the fear of being punished that drives the subordinates to be in line.
5. Affiliative Leadership	The influencing of subordinates behavior through making them willing to emulate or to be associated with the leader.
6. Benevolent Autocratic Leadership	The influencing of subordinate behaviors towards positive organizational goals through the leader's imposed "removal" or "reduction" of the task-related insecurities and uncertainties of subordinates.
7. Participatory Leadership	The influencing of subordinates' behavior through the use of consultations and involvement to satisfy their intrinsic needs (for competence and self-determination [Deci, 1975]).
8. Normative Leadership	The influencing of subordinates' behavior through the use of cultural norms/values.
9. Charismatic Leadership	The ability of a leader to influence subordinates' behaviour through self-sacrifice and personal risk done to protect/or promote their (subordinates) interests and hence build their confidence and trust in the leader.



### **Incentive-based leadership**

The drive for this leadership type comes from the leader's ability and resources to meet the salient needs of the subordinate. This model of leadership is more applicable to a situation where needs of subordinates are clearly known, work behaviours of subordinates are measurable and predictable, and can be related closely to rewards. Also, relevant needs of subordinates must not conflict with one another and there should be no constraints in the ability of the leader to dish out significant rewards.

### **Coercive leadership**

The drive for this type/style of leadership is fear of punishment [13]. This type of leadership is more appropriate for use where high crisis situation is demanding exceedingly quick response; leader/subordinates have very divergent views while the leader wants his view of things to be implemented. Also, it valid where there is high resistance from subordinates and subordinates generally have no self-initiative.

### **Affiliative leadership**

The drive for this type of leadership comes from the leader's admired personality characteristics and good reputation which influence subordinates. In other words, the source of affiliative leadership is referent power. The appropriate conditions for affiliative leadership are when a leader is recognized as a winner, where there are popular issues championed by the leader and when the leader's actions are considered fashionable.

### **Benevolent autocratic leadership**

The source of power for this model of leadership comes from the leader's ability of influencing subordinate behaviour towards positive organisational goals through the leader's imposed "removal" or "reduction" of the task-related insecurities and uncertainties of subordinates [10,14]. The model is more relevant where there are task-related insecurities and uncertainties on the part of subordinates e.g. where the subordinates, cannot handle a complex problem and the leader knows its solution very well.

## ***Putting Charismatic Leadership in Context***

---

---

### **Participative leadership**

The source of power for this model of leadership is based on intrinsic motivational needs of an individual. Appropriate conditions for participative leadership are, for example, when the leader has complete confidence and trust in subordinate in task-related matters and when subordinates feel completely free to handle aspects of the job and have ability. Deci (1975)<sup>[12]</sup> has identified such needs as the need to use ones competence and desire for self-determination.

### **Normative leadership**

In this case, leadership is driven by moral values. Norms and values which make the general culture of the organizations become the driving forces behind employee behaviours that are consistent with the cultural norms/values. Organization members, where there are strong cultural norms/values, are expected to behave in ways which are consistent with the norms/values.

### **Charismatic leadership**

The source of power for this model of leadership is the ability to influence subordinates through self-sacrifice and personal risk done to protect their (subordinates) interests.

Of all the above mentioned types of leadership, charismatic leadership is the least understood, least researched and developed. The research has been sporadic and narrow in scope. In fact the concept of charismatic leadership has been largely overlooked by organizational theorists<sup>[2]</sup>. Defining and analyzing the array of other forms of leadership as done above has served as the necessary foundation and point of departure for a full discussion and understanding of charismatic leadership. This has placed the concept (of charismatic leadership) clearly in relation to the array of other (existing) types of leadership.

It should be noted, however, that no single leadership type is perfect. Each has strengths and weaknesses. As a result, it is futile to search for the ideal leadership. A more realistic approach is to identify the relative merits of each of the leadership types. On the basis of this endeavour, a combina-

tion of suitable leadership types can be selected to meet the needs of a particular situation.

This paper reports on research which was designed to establish whether the concept of charismatic leadership as defined in Table 1 represents an empirically unique and useful leadership construct for industrial/organizational management.

## **METHOD**

### **Sample and procedure**

The population which is the focus of this paper was that of leaders in industrial organizations in Tanzania. The sample was drawn from the industrial directory compiled by TISCO. First, a list of all large organizations was obtained. Large organizations were considered for this study in order to obtain a sufficiently large number of subordinate-leader pairs which was the basic unit of analysis in the study. The selected organizations were Tanzania Electric Supply Company Limited (TANESCO), Tanzania Posts and Telecommunications Corporation (TP & TC), Tanzania Harbors Authority (THA), Tanzania Railways Corporation (TRC), Aluminium Africa (ALAF), Mwananchi Engineering and Contracting Corporation (MECCO), National Printing Company (NPC or KIUTA), National Engineering Company Limited (NECO) and Ubungo Farm Implements (UFI). A total of one hundred and ninety five (194) pairs of questionnaires were distributed to the nine selected organizations out of which 122 pairs were fully filled and collected, giving a return rate of 63%.

Questionnaires were as much as possible randomly distributed to different levels of the organization. As a result, every individual had an equal chance of being selected. They were distributed to participants in their natural working places during normal hours and participation was optional. That is any one who wished not to participate was given the opportunity to decline. Complete anonymity was guaranteed to the respondents in order to encourage them to answer the questions honestly.

## Measures

### Item development process

Charismatic leadership measures were developed according to recommended procedures [15].

The authors had to generate lists of potential scale items on the basis of the construct definitions in Table 1. Independent panels of judges who are experts in the subject of organizational behavior evaluated the lists for conformity to the theoretical definitions and for redundancy. These experts (judges) were given the construct definitions and were requested to check whether the items reflected the meaning of the relevant theoretical constructs.

### Pilot testing

Pilot testing of the questionnaire was done so as to check for obvious errors, to ensure it was not boring, and was presentable and clear. TANESCO (2 pairs) and ALAF (2 pairs) were selected and results showed that there was no ambient problems with the questionnaire items and that they were clear.

In order to cover a big range of respondents, a swahili version of the questionnaire was translated from the english version by an expert (a linguist). Then the swahili version was re-translated to english by another person to check if it retained the same original meaning. Copies of both questionnaire can be obtained from the authors.

## RESULTS

### Factor Analysis of Leadership Scales

#### Factor matrix

Factor analysis was employed to analyse the leadership items in order to ascertain whether the respondents perceived the nine apriori leadership dimensions in the questionnaire items and whether there dimensions were relatively independent from each other.

The data from the 122 respondents were subjected to a principal axis factor analysis with varimax rotation.

The factor analytic process converged after 19 iterations after which 11 factors were extracted. The eigen values of the 11 factors ranged from 1.015 to 9.153.

Appendix 2 below contains the factor loadings and communalities with respect to each questionnaire items. Those items with loadings greater than 0.5 were retained for scale development. Out of the 36 leadership items, 9 failed to meet the 0.5 retention criterion, hence were dropped from subsequent analysis.

### **Factor interpretation**

The results from the factor analysis showed a very good reproduction of the a priori factors with suggestions for combining some scales/items. In this section, description of how the final interpretation and the corresponding labelling of the factors are presented.

The first factor (see Appendix 2) was named participative leadership and had item loadings ranging from 0.553 to 0.802. The scale items were: "Happiness in my work does not come mainly from having this person as my supervisor" "My supervisor asks us for ideas and opinions and always tries to make constructive use of them", "My supervisor involves us in decision making in job related matters", "Under my supervisor, subordinates feel free to discuss things about the job with him/her", "My supervisor has confidence and trust in us in all job related matters." This type of leadership has grouped together items for participative and affiliative scales. This should be expected because with a participative leader, subordinates would also like to affiliate with him.

The second factor was named professional leadership. It had five items with loadings exceeding the retention criterion of 0.5. The items' loadings ranged from 0.573 to 0.762. The items were: "My supervisor ensures that I have clear responsibilities", "My supervisor tries to specify clearly the tasks I have to accomplish", "My supervisor provides me with good technical suggestions which I normally follow", "My supervisor always gives me the needed technical knowledge when I am stuck", "I always get sound

---

---

## ***Putting Charismatic Leadership in Context***

---

---

technical direction from my supervisor". For this type of leadership, items came from the apriori bureaucratic and expertise-based leadership scales. This is in line with what has been stated by Weber (1947) that in bureaucratic organizations, there is specialization or division of labour and also positions have to be filled by competent people. This, therefore, makes it very difficult to differentiate between bureaucratic and expertise-based leadership empirically, though conceptually they can be differentiated.

The third factor was labelled authoritative leadership. Its items had loadings ranging from 0.648 to 0.749. The items were: "When I am stuck, my supervisor rarely gives me the needed technical knowledge", and "My supervisor always orders us on what to do."

The fourth factor was termed charismatic leadership with an eigen value of 1.759. It had items loadings ranging from 0.521 to 0.792. The items were: "My supervisor gives priority to the interest of his/her group of subordinates before his/her personal interests", "Given the opportunity our leader would be willing to take extra (un-assigned) duties and responsibilities if he/she thinks that this will benefit his/her subordinates' section", "My leader would consider leaving his/her present group of subordinates (us) if he/she is given position in other parts of the organisation or other companies with better benefits" [negatively worded]. This leadership scale consisted of items from the a priori charismatic leadership scale only.

The fifth factor was labelled normative leadership with an eigen value of 1.645. This had only one item with significant loading of 0.650. The item was: "Most subordinates under my supervisor believe strongly in achieving excellent performance in our work activities".

The sixth factor had one item of the apriori charismatic leadership with an eigen value 1.560 and an item loading of 0.765. The item was: "My supervisor would not take on extra work for the benefit of groups of subordinates unless he/she is paid to do so". This factor was dropped.

The seventh factor was labelled equity-based leadership with an eigen value of 1.418. It had only one item with a significant loading of 0.826. The scale item was: "My supervisor does not hand out the rewards for working here fairly". It consisted of an item from the apriori scale for incentive-based leadership.



The eighth factor was termed expectancy-based leadership and had an eigen value of 1.370. It had only one item with a significant loading of 0.709. The item was: "My supervisor provides clear rewards for what I do." It consisted of an item from the apriori incentive-based leadership scale.

The ninth factor was labelled as autocratic leadership and had an eigen value of 1.189. It had two items with loadings of 0.539 and 0.828. The items were: "My supervisor single-handedly (on his own) decides or takes action on behalf of the subordinates when he feels that this is in their interests". and "My supervisor always resorts to punishments". These items came from the apriori benevolent autocratic and coercive scales.

The tenth factor was termed "face-protection" leadership with an eigen value of 1.179. It had only one item with a significant loading of 0.817. The item was: "I don't feel guilty if I don't work well on something which might embarrass my supervisor" [negatively worded].

The eleventh factor was termed incentive-based leadership with an eigen value of 1.015. It had one significant item with a loading of 0.904. The item was: "My supervisor recommends/ensures that salary increments are given to those group of subordinates who are hard working". It consisted of an item from the a priori incentive-based leadership scale.

Scales for each of the 10 factors were constructed by unit weighting of the retained items defining each factor. Items reflecting negative content were reversely scored. The resultant scales are summarized in Table 2 below.

**Table 2: Empirically-tested leadership scales**

Name	Number of Items	Cronbach Alpha
1. Participative	Q55, Q23, Q41, Q49, Q56	0.834
2. Professional	Q2, Q25, Q3, Q18, Q26	0.787
3. Authoritative	Q30, Q31	0.678
4. Charismatic	Q6, Q10, Q16	0.501
5. Normative	Q52	Single item scale
6. Equity	Q14	Single item scale
7. Expectancy	Q4	Single item scale
8. Autocratic	Q5, Q7	0.381
9. Face-Protection	Q57	Single item scale
10. Incentive-based	Q32	Single item scale

## ***Putting Charismatic Leadership in Context***

---

---

### **Internal consistency reliabilities**

Internal consistency reliability estimates (Cronbach alpha) were calculated for the relevant resultant scales and are as shown in Table 2. The reliability of the charismatic leadership scale is low but of an acceptable level.

### **Correlations among leadership scales**

Correlations among the resultant 10 leadership scales are shown in appendix 1. There are significant relationships between the charismatic leadership scale and four out of the nine leadership scales shown in the appendix 1. Charismatic leadership has significant positive relationships with participative, equity, and expectancy - based leadership types; it has significant negative relationship with autocratic leadership. This suggests that charismatic leaders are also associated with participative, equity and expectancy-based management styles.

### **Establishing the Psychometric Properties of the Charismatic Leadership Scale**

In this section, the analysis focussed on establishing the following psychometric properties of the construct (charismatic leadership) scale:

- (1) internal consistency reliability;
- (2) test-retest reliability;
- (3) discriminant validity;
- (4) convergent validity; and
- (5) predictive validity.

These are the most important and essential parameters for establishing psychometric properties of any scale [16].

### **Internal consistency reliability**

Estimate of internal consistency reliability for the charismatic leadership scales was calculated in a two step procedure: (1) factor analysis and (2) computation of Cronbach's coefficient alpha. On the basis of the factor analysis performed on all leadership items, a factor labelled, charismatic leadership, emerged, consisting of three significant charismatic leadership

---

items, all of them from the apriori list of charismatic items. The Cronbach's coefficient alpha based on the 3 item-scale was 0.501; which is considered low but of an acceptable level of internal consistency.

#### **Test-retest reliability**

Using the three retained charismatic leadership items, a test-retest reliability was calculated and found to be  $r=0.904$ . This result of ( $r=0.904$ ) was considered to be very good. This showed that the measure of charismatic leadership overtime was stable. The testing was done in a period of one week using a sample of 10 respondents.

#### **Discriminant validity**

Charismatic leadership is expected to be significantly related with other "close" leadership styles. However, if we want to identify it as a unique type of leadership in the study of organizational behavior, it must show acceptable levels of discriminant validity when compared to those other close leadership styles. In order to establish this, it was compared against measures for the other nine leadership types on the basis of the magnitude of inter-correlations. As it can be seen from appendix 1, the correlation coefficients ranged from  $r=0.059$  to 0.334. Out of these 4 were significant. These correlations are sufficiently low (less than 0.5) to provide reasonable indication of an acceptable level of discriminant validity for the construct of charismatic leadership.

#### **Convergent validity**

It can be seen from appendix 1 that there is ample evidence of acceptable convergent validity for the charismatic leadership scale since some coefficients are significant and non-trivial while still maintaining reasonable levels of discriminant validity.

#### **Predictive Validity**

The theory underlying the charismatic leadership construct suggests that charismatic leadership is supposed to be positively associated with job satisfaction of subordinates, quality of work, quantity of work, attendance, punctuality and overall performance. It is evident from Table 3, there are

## ***Putting Charismatic Leadership in Context***

significant positive correlations between charismatic leadership and job satisfaction and overall performance. These data provide a very satisfactory and strong evidence for predictive validity of the charismatic leadership.

**Table 3: Pearson's product moment correlations between charismatic leadership and outcome variables**

Outcome Variables	R	Significance Level *
Job Satisfaction	0.229	*
Quality of work	0.029	
Punctuality	0.075	
Overall performance	0.217	*
Quality of work	0.043	
Attendance	0.034	

$r \geq 0.149, p=0.05$  \* Significant

## **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS**

The factor analysis results showed a very good reproduction of the a priori factors with some suggestions of combining some scales. For example, bureaucratic and expertise leaderships can be combined and termed professional leadership, benevolent autocratic and coercive leaderships resulting into autocratic leadership.

Combining some leadership styles should not be viewed as a discrepancy with the priori literature and research but be taken as important and interesting finding.

Since the results were consistent with the literature, it can be viewed with confidence that factor analysis has yielded important results which are interesting and concrete.

The results on the establishment of the psychometric properties of the charismatic leadership scale showed reasonably strong evidence for the internal consistency and test-retest reliabilities of the measure of charismatic leadership. The results compare favorably with those for measures of comparable attitudes reported in the literature<sup>[17]</sup>. However, the number of

charismatic leadership items has got to be increased for higher Cronbach's coefficient alpha. This therefore calls for replication of the study in other settings.

The items of the charismatic leadership questionnaire were found to be homogeneous and the results suggest that the overall measure was stable over time, and compares well with other measures for comparable attitudes[16,17].

From the inter-correlations between the nine leadership scales, the common variance shared by the measures was generally less than 25% which compare favorably to other studies[16]. This was a concrete evidence of convergent validity for the charismatic questionnaire.

For the predictive validity of charismatic leadership questionnaire, to a large extent there was a relatively consistent relationship in the predicted direction between charismatic leadership and subordinates work outcomes especially job satisfaction and overall performance which had significant correlation coefficients. But the study revealed that employee behavior in organizations is determined by a very complex set of factors not just by applying charismatic leadership alone in the organizations' management. This was revealed by the magnitude of the significant correlations (Appendix 1) which were not very high.

The study has provided concrete evidence that the charismatic construct is a unique type of leadership. There is an acceptable evidence of both discriminant and convergent validities obtained for the measure of this construct. Therefore, it has been shown empirically that charismatic leadership is a unique style of leadership.

## REFERENCES

1. B.M. Bass, *Leadership Performance Beyond Expectations*, New York: Academic Press, 1985.
2. J.A. Conger, and R. A. Kanungo, *Towards a Behavioral Theory of Charismatic Leadership in Organizational Settings*. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 1987, p.637-647.
3. J.A. Conger, and R.A. Kanungo, R.A. "Behavioral Dimensions of Charismatic Leadership". In J.A. Conger and R.A. Kanungo

## ***Putting Charismatic Leadership in Context***

---

---

- (Eds), Charismatic Leadership, San Francisco: Jossey Bass Inc. 1988, pp 78-79
4. J.A. Conger, and R.A. Kamungo, A Behavioral Measure of Charismatic Leadership in Organizations. *Proceedings of The Academy of Management Meetings*, San Francisco, 1990, p.187-194
  5. H.M. Trice, and J.M. Beyer, Charismatic and Its Routinization in Two Social Movement Organizations, *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 8, 1986, pp.113-164.
  6. D. Katz, and R.L Kahn, *The Social Psychology of Organizations*, New York: Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1978..
  7. R.J. House, and M.L. Baetz, "Leadership: Some Empirical Generalization and New Research Directions." In B.M. Staw (ed.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 1, Greenwich, CT: JSI Press. 1979, pp 399-401
  8. F. Luthans, *Organizational Behavior*, Fourth Edition: New York: Mc. Grall-Hill Series in Management, 1985.
  9. J.R. Schermerhorn, J.G. Hunt, and R.N. Osborn, *Managing Organizational Behavior*. Second Edition. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1985
  10. C. Govers, *Lecture Notes on Production Management Analysis*. Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Dar Es Salaam, 1987.
  11. J.A.C. Brown, *The Social Psychology of Industry*, Hardsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Publisher, 1985.
  12. E.L. Deci, *Intrinsic Motivation*, New York: Plemim Press 1975
  13. D. Kipnis, *The Power Holders*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.
  14. R.W.Nickson, *How To Be a Successful Manager*, Northampton shire, Great Britain: Thorsons Publishers Limited, 1978.
  15. J.C. Nunnally, *Psychometric Theory*, New York: Mc Graw-Hill, 1978.
  16. R.T. Mowday, R.M. Steers, and L.W. Porter, The Measurement of Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 1979, p.224-247.
  17. P.C. Smith, L.M. Kendall, and C.L. Hulin, *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*, Chicago: Road-Nc Nally., 1969.
  18. W.M. Harper, *Statistics*, Fourth Edition Plymouth: Mac Donald and Evans Ltd., 1982



19. J.W. Hellriegel, J.W., Slocum, J.W. and R.W. Woodman, Organizational Behavior, Fourth Edition. St. Paul: West Publishing Company, 1986.

*The manuscript was received on 24th October 1994 and accepted for publication on 5th May 1995*

Corr:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Charismatic	1.000									
2. Participative	.282	1.000								
3. Professional	.059	0.616	1.000							
4. Authoritative	-.112	-.350	-.241	1.000						
5. Normative	.098	.534	.334	-.056	1.000					
6. Equity	.262	.108	.135	-.047	-.030	1.000				
7. Expectancy	.334	.213	.159	-.177	.011	-.095	1.000			
8. Autocratic	-.249	.095	-.024	-.014	.100	-.015	.029	1.000		
9. Faceprotection	.084	.247	.214	-.027	.0205	.037	.120	.014	1.000	
10. Incentive	.129	.146	.111	-.138	.042	-.037	.076	.190	.143	1.000

$r \geq .148$ ,  $p \leq .05$  significant level

## *Putting Charismatic Leadership in Context*

### Appendix 2: Factor Matrix

ITEM	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5	FACTOR 6
OM1	0.861	0.330	0.020	0.108	0.231	0.020
OM2	0.873	0.301	0.171	0.063	0.180	0.236
OM3	0.678	0.478	0.014	0.019	0.316	0.115
OM4	0.671	0.671	0.111	0.076	0.228	0.088
OM5	0.754	0.574	0.018	0.049	0.265	0.107
OM6	0.777	0.571	0.268	0.155	0.217	0.111
OM7	0.807	0.267	0.218	0.133	0.081	0.178
OM8	0.111	0.114	0.245	0.071	0.478	0.064
OM9	0.167	0.136	0.719	0.066	0.041	0.051
OM10	0.138	0.141	0.711	0.226	0.189	0.056
OM11	0.048	0.082	0.136	0.128	0.117	0.184
OM12	0.245	0.316	0.016	0.007	0.258	0.105
OM13	0.577	0.047	0.132	0.046	0.255	0.177
OM14	0.144	0.145	0.017	0.031	0.045	0.048
OM15	0.187	0.184	0.049	0.011	0.018	0.041
OM16	0.158	0.047	0.148	0.101	0.077	0.338
OM17	0.041	0.101	0.111	0.134	0.048	0.158
OM18	0.071	0.144	0.086	0.105	0.135	0.064
OM19	0.087	0.115	0.047	0.038	0.221	0.075
OM20	0.115	0.111	0.048	0.047	0.088	0.211
OM21	0.232	0.138	0.076	0.211	0.148	0.236
OM22	0.046	0.131	0.226	0.087	0.017	0.121
OM23	0.061	0.078	0.141	0.171	0.149	0.128
OM24	0.138	0.389	0.307	0.041	0.254	0.075
OM25	0.033	0.218	0.256	0.076	0.046	0.045
OM26	0.208	0.266	0.041	0.036	0.147	0.087
OM27	0.225	0.041	0.116	0.261	0.248	0.101
OM28	0.125	0.136	0.144	0.077	0.177	0.048
OM29	0.076	0.128	0.175	0.147	0.058	0.041
OM30	0.135	0.288	0.048	0.211	0.041	0.071
OM31	0.071	0.141	0.213	0.045	0.253	0.101
OM32	0.046	0.151	0.182	0.201	0.082	0.046
OM33	0.187	0.041	0.138	0.087	0.158	0.241
OM34	0.045	0.048	0.026	0.148	0.046	0.265
OM35	0.138	0.111	0.129	0.224	0.087	0.048
OM36	0.271	0.138	0.175	0.101	0.048	0.118

Appendix 2 Continued

FACTOR 7	FACTOR 8	FACTOR 9	FACTOR 10	FACTOR 11	COMM
A.019	A.061	A.115	A.121	A.189	A.616
A.116	A.085	A.128	A.129	A.174	A.616
A.175	A.111	A.136	A.067	A.177	A.681
A.173	A.101	A.148	A.114	A.056	A.751
A.176	A.173	A.147	A.173	A.088	A.716
A.067	A.085	A.082	A.066	A.101	A.671
A.114	A.171	A.131	A.086	A.058	A.706
A.016	A.175	A.108	A.171	A.064	A.689
A.042	A.108	A.128	A.014	A.108	A.724
A.067	A.108	A.049	A.102	A.064	A.681
A.126	A.081	A.114	A.038	A.087	A.771
A.015	A.081	A.108	A.171	A.077	A.671
A.021	A.067	A.116	A.028	A.061	A.718
A.029	A.014	A.171	A.084	A.084	A.628
A.048	A.088	A.128	A.012	A.014	A.756
A.128	A.109	A.105	A.133	A.107	A.777
A.108	A.114	A.118	A.108	A.112	A.711
A.047	A.077	A.077	A.061	A.117	A.618
A.108	A.166	A.019	A.102	A.011	A.775
A.044	A.075	A.051	A.017	A.108	A.704
A.067	A.067	A.129	A.068	A.138	A.676
A.028	A.068	A.131	A.102	A.101	A.681
A.108	A.071	A.101	A.066	A.136	A.661
A.018	A.174	A.112	A.108	A.088	A.611
A.054	A.014	A.138	A.051	A.171	A.711
A.067	A.067	A.068	A.051	A.069	A.777
A.021	A.171	A.067	A.175	A.071	A.704
A.022	A.066	A.067	A.067	A.178	A.671
A.067	A.111	A.068	A.114	A.088	A.775
A.109	A.078	A.118	A.014	A.067	A.701
A.111	A.068	A.067	A.108	A.018	A.731
A.171	A.067	A.106	A.139	A.078	A.707
A.071	A.101	A.111	A.159	A.171	A.701
A.017	A.084	A.064	A.101	A.178	A.659
A.106	A.068	A.011	A.108	A.109	A.771
A.114	A.068	A.105	A.067	A.066	A.718