

4 Research Stand of Charisma

4.1 Charismatic leadership

At present, what we call charisma or charismatic leadership, has existed throughout time. There are many examples of historical characters who are considered charismatic: Gandhi, Martin Luther King, J.F. Kennedy etc., just to name a few (Willner, 1984; Shamir et al., 1994 cited by Molero, 1994). These leaders create lasting impact in the history and development of their organizations. Even in previous eras, many philosophers and thinkers have dealt with this particular theme. Nonetheless, at the mere mention of charismatic leadership, Max Weber comes to mind, since in 1922 he was the first to introduce the term into the social sciences. Weber differentiates between three kinds of leadership: traditional, rational-legal and charismatic. Max Weber (1947) first used the term “charismatic” to describe a form of social authority that evolved from an individual who was believed to be endowed with a gift of divine grace. The charismatic authority does not obtain its legitimating from formal rules and structures but mainly from the faith in the leader’s unique personality. Leaders who possess charisma stand out from the crowd, enjoy special respect and attention and are treated in a specific way. And only a few of the ”chosen“ are blessed with charisma.

To Weber, charisma is a quality that is beyond extraordinary. A person who possesses such a trait is considered a person in possession of supernatural or superhuman forces. The bearer of charisma demands obedience and adhesion in order to fulfill a personal mission, but the charismatic and his/her mission have to be valued by means of successes that give benefit to the followers. The creation of a type of charismatic dominion is always fruit to an extreme situation in the political, economic or legal field. It also gives rise to a great exaltation that being shared between a certain numbers of people tends to the consecration of any kind of heroism. Therefore, the charismatic dominion has a deeply emotional character.

The majority principle, a feature of rational- legal dominions, bears the risk of weakening the value of individual responsibility in society. Going beyond this point, Weber also fears that an emerging rationality, which is entering all areas of live, holds the danger of identity crises.

According to Weber, charismatic authority stands in opposition to social dominions and structures of modern societies in the twentieth century, which are increasingly built on rational-legal legitimating. To the extent in which rational-legal dominions predominate, charismatic forms fade into the background. Weber does not perceive this progression as solely positive. He fears that the individual's freedom and creativity is affected if rational strategies and valuations replace initial social and emotional fields. Transferring the results he gained by characterizing present dominions and authorities, Weber questions the forces that cause either alteration and change or stagnation and stability. In a context resistant to change due to increasing bureaucracy, charisma, when seen from this perspective, becomes a concept of change and innovation based upon individual responsibility and creativity. With the help of an attractive vision and special personal abilities, charismatic leadership manages to break with traditional and rational-legal authorities and develops a special relationship and bond with the led individuals.

To summarize, Weber not only introduces the term into the social sciences, he also highlights some important points about charisma that many authors have subsequently explored. Nonetheless, it is worth mentioning that Weber's work has constituted an obligatory reference point for people that have subsequently studied charisma.

Trice and Beyer (1986) added some elements to Weber's theory: a) an extraordinarily gifted person, b) a social crisis or situation of desperation, c) a set of ideas providing a radical solution to the crisis, d) a set of followers who are attracted to the exceptional person and come to believe that the leader is directly linked to transcendent powers, and e) the validation of the person's extraordinary gifts and transcendence by repeated successes (Tejada et al., 2001).

Both authors concentrate themselves in answering the following question: What happens when the charismatic person disappears? In his 1986 study, Molero points out that these researchers conclude that the continuation of the charismatic person's mission is favored if such mission is in some way incorporated into the cultural norms of the organization. At the same time, the designation of a successor while the charismatic person is still active, favors the acceptance of the new leader. In Trice and Beyer's studies, the researchers emphasize an aspect of charismatic leadership that many other researchers have left aside: charismatic leaders not only affect their

followers, they always have important impact in the organizational culture they are a part off.

According to Molero (1995), many authors have studied the charismatic relationship from many different perspectives. Nonetheless, the different theoretical orientations are not always well delimited.

Based on Shamir's (1991) classification, Molero proposes a new classification that allows a better understanding of the charismatic phenomenon:

4.2 Positions based on psychoanalysis

4.2.1 The charismatic relationship as an unresolved Oedipus conflict

Based on Freud's work. The father-son conflict is reproduced in the charismatic relationship and the leader is seen as an omnipotent figure that demands submission and dependence. Behind this submission is a hidden desire of rebellion (death of the father). Nonetheless, Molero summarizes Lindholm's (1992) studies and explains that in this type of groups, the leader can escape, at least momentarily, from the hostility of his followers by channeling the group's aggressiveness outward, towards a type of "scapegoat". Molero assures that an authoritative leader with a strong power "aura" can ease the creation of the charismatic bond. The key of the charismatic relationship would lie in the pathology of the followers and an environment of individual or social crisis would ease the rise of such a pathology. In this model, the message or mission of the leader do not have any particular importance.

4.2.2 Narcissist explanation of the charismatic relationship

Also based on Freud's work: In the initial stages of a child's development, the infant does not establish any difference between himself and the external world: the child is the entire universe. Subsequently, the child begins to understand that the mother and he are separate entities, but still the child maintains a sense of omnipotence for this all-powerful being, the mother, that responds to his demands. Nonetheless, bit-by-bit and based on frustrations, since the necessities are not always immediately satisfied, the child begins to discover the cruel reality. Nonetheless, the desire to return to this "omnipotent" stage is always present. One way to return to this phase is to identify oneself with someone who is perceived as powerful: the charismatic leader. In addi-

tion, this desire of identification is probably stronger when the person is in a crisis situation.

Post (1996 cited by Molero, 1995) highlights that the tendency to follow charismatic leaders originates from an unresolved conflict in the Narcissist stage. This conflict makes people identify themselves with the charismatic leader in order to create part of a superior unit. But what happens to the leaders themselves? According to Post, the leaders resolve their problems in a way that is opposite to the followers' way, since they try to re-establish their omnipotence by exerting their dominion over others. In this way, the personalities of the leader and his followers are pathologically complementary and the stages of crisis would ease the rise of regressive frames of mind that positively influence the charismatic relationship. In this case, the message of the charismatic leader would have no importance either. Naturally, and like in the previous case, the effects of this type of relationship are not positive for either the followers or the society. Nonetheless, in this case, the submission or dependence on the leader is not as marked, as the identification with the leader what actually auspices in the follower a feeling of ennoblement and increase in power.

4.3 Sociological/Symbolic explanations of charisma

According to this explanation, the human being has a basic need to search for a symbolic order of the universe that would permit the person to learn where to find a position that would give a sense of coherence, continuity, and justice to life and would allow the person to flee from chaos when needed. According to Shils (1965 cited by Molero, 1995), the charismatic leader seems to be connected to the transcendental powers of the universe and is able to re-establish a sense of order in his followers. Therefore, all the rites and ceremonies and all type of messages or conducts that tend to create the impression that the leader is connected to transcendental powers would help to strengthen the charismatic relationship.

The key of this relationship lies in the followers and their necessity for order. Therefore, a situation of inconsistency in values, norms and beliefs would make the presence of this charismatic relationship more probable. The messages that in some way point to the allusion that the leader possesses bonds with contacts to transcendental powers would have a certain importance. These messages could include, for exam-

ple, allusions to the bible or other myths of society itself (Willner, 1984 cited in Molero, 1995).

4.4 Explanations of charisma based on the follower's attributions.

4.4.1 Charisma as a simple attribute

Molero points out that the authors that believe in this idea think that leadership in an organization is considered more important than it actually is. The reason for this overestimation in the influence of the leader in the organization, is what this author citing Ross (1977), calls "fundamental error of attribution," which consists in the tendency to attribute the conduct of a person to one's characteristics or qualities diminishing the importance on the influence of the situational factors. Meindl et al. (1985) point out that the organizations have complex contexts and many times are ambiguous, therefore it is hard to understand what is going on. In this frame, the attribution of the responsibility of the events to a prominent person, in this case the leader, is a very plausible solution to comprehend and control the environment. At the same time, the leaders maintain this position in order to justify their privileges and status. Meindl, 1990, suggests that the attribution of charisma is given because of social contagiousness. In other words, in situations of great arousal (for whatever reason), the members that present charismatic effects are converted into social models for the channeling of the arousal through the attribution of charisma to the leader. In this case, the attribution of charisma is a group process that has little to do with the qualities or the conduct of the leader. In the attribution of charisma, the key is in the followers and the leader is not that important.

4.4.2 Charismatic leadership as an attribution based on the leader's conducts

The main representatives of this model are Conger and Kanungo (1987,1988, 1998). Both authors characterize charismatic leadership by the following features: an attractive vision, believable and convincing communication, unconventional behavior, ideological function and empowerment. They believe that these factors are not isolated but are to be seen in their overall context. To what extent charisma is attributed to the leaders' personalities, relies on one hand on the amount of the perceived factors and on the other hand on the intensity of the delivered behavior. Additionally these factors can be weighted differently depending on the differing organizations.

These authors propose a charismatic leadership model that contains three stages. In the first stage, the leader is capable of making a realistic evaluation of the environment that permits him to perceive the existent deficiencies. In the second stage, this evaluation leads to the formulation of a vision, a project that will lead to a future that is highly desirable for the followers and the organization. Finally, in the third stage, the leader is capable of making the followers believe in him and work for him in order to accomplish his mission.

In each of these stages, there are a series of conducts that ease the attribution of charisma to the leader. In the first, the leader must demonstrate desires to change the status quo, that he is capable of perceiving the existent opportunities in the environment and also the necessities of his followers. In the second stage, he must be able to articulate and transmit his vision in a manner that motivates and inspires his followers. In the third stage, he must gain the confidence and respect of his followers for him and his mission. This confidence is achieved through unconventional and innovative conducts, manifesting great energy, self-confidence, and presenting himself as an expert. He must also demonstrate an absolute compromise with his own mission, being ready to, if necessary, run certain personal risks for its fulfillment. Conger and Kanungo (1994) formulate assumptions concerning a model of process with consecutive phases by which processes of change that are created and initiated by charismatic leadership can be ideally illustrated. It is admitted though that these phases do not represent a unique process but need to be constantly repeated on different levels. This represents the processes of change in the level of organization. The above-described characteristics are emphasized differently according to each phase.

In this vision, the leaders as well as the followers are important, since the followers attribute the leader with charisma based on a series of very concrete conducts of the leader. Therefore, the leader's proposed vision has a great importance since reaching such a vision constitutes the principal connection between the leader and his followers. The environment may influence in the surge of charisma, since a determined type of environment (that of a crisis, for example), may ease the follower's formulation of visions. According to Molero (1995), the charismatic relationship produces a great faith and confidence in the leader and his vision, and consequently, the followers' disposition to work hard for the achievement of such a vision.

4.5 Explanation of charisma based on the follower's self-perception

During his studies, House (1977 cited in Molero, 1995) identified the following characteristics of charismatic leadership: a) goal articulation b) image building c) motive arousal behavior d) role modeling e) exhibiting high expectations and showing confidence. In this sense, Shamir, House and Arthur (1993) determine that the relevant cause for the motivation of the led individual is change and influence of the self-conception. Regarding the plenitude of the mentioned behaviors, the authors explain the following connection: thereby people express through their behaviors their attitudes, values and emotions and additionally define their actions through them. Therefore they become self-expressive. The increase of the self-esteem as well as the stabilization and continuity of the self-consistency and the maintenance of hope are hereby-central motivational mechanisms. If it is managed to connect goals and tasks in a believable way with these mechanisms, a strong intrinsic motivation can be expected, which leads to a high level of identification as well as an increasing labor- efficiency.

Shamir, House and Arthur believe that the important effects the charismatic leaders have obtained over their followers are achieved through various processes that directly affect the self-perception of the follower:

- a) Increasing the intrinsic value of the effort. In other words, highlighting that the effort must be achieved by the values that he possesses and not by the external rewards.
- b) Obtaining the increase in personal followers empowerment sensation. Through a series of conducts like expressing high output expectations, expressing a high confidence in the followers in an individual manner as well as a group one, etc., the charismatic leaders increase self-esteem and the sense of self-efficiency of the followers.
- c) Increasing the intrinsic value of the fulfillment of the goals. The charismatic leaders make the goals "significant" for his followers. They stress the importance of the fulfillment of the mission for the group identity and in order to differentiate themselves from other groups. This gives importance to the follower's effort because it makes the follower identify himself with circumstances that transcend in his own person.

- d) Increasing the degree of commitment of the followers with the leader. The charismatic leader, increasing the manifestation of certain values and placing them in relation to the fulfillment of the mission, achieves the creation of personal bonds. Such bonds are progressively enforced due to the fact that the commitment behavior unites the self-consistency of the follower to the leader and to the mission.

From this theory, it is predicted that the charismatic leader will make it possible for the followers to demonstrate a high level of collective identity in the self-consistency, to manifest a high degree of self-esteem and feeling of worth, to have a high perception of personal efficacy as well as collective efficacy, to present a high degree of similarity between their own self-consistency and the concept they have of the leader and finally, to manifest a high degree of “positive affect” in relation to their role by the fulfillment of the charismatic leader’s mission. Therefore, the charismatic relationship is conceived as a relationship between the members of a group and a person that represents the collectivist through his/her proposition of values. The charismatic leader achieves the internalization of such collective values in the follower’s self-consistency.

Molero (1995) points out that the contents of the charismatic leader’s message have great importance; since it is through it that the leader affects the self-consistency of the followers. Therefore, the leader’s message will contain references to values and moral justifications, to the collective identity and history and to a project whose future is consistent with this history. He will also allude to the followers’ self-esteem and individual as well as collective efficacy.

4.6 Models centered in the *effects* of the charismatic leadership

4.6.1 The charismatic leadership as a compromise of the followers with the leader

Willner (1984 cited by Molero, 1995) defines charismatic leadership as a type of relationship between the leader and his followers that produces the following effects; a) the followers perceive the leader as possessing superhuman qualities, b) they blindly believe in the leader’s affirmations, c) they unconditionally accept the leader’s directives, and d) they offer him complete emotional compromise.

In addition, this model does not clearly state where the follower's commitment to the leader comes from; the charismatic leadership is simply defined by its effect on the followers.

Despite of this, there is a series of behaviors in the leader that are very important in order for him to be perceived as charismatic: he must be successful (real or apparent) in solving an until then unresolved problem, he must to make people identify him with a myth or hero of his society, he must have certain rhetoric abilities, etc. The mission of the charismatic leader is not absolutely necessary for the surge of charisma, since if it was, any leader with an adequate message could be charismatic, which is not true. A crisis environment is not absolutely necessary either, since sometimes; the charismatic leader himself provokes the crisis with his message or mission.

4.6.2 The effects of the charismatic leadership in the follower's performance

Bass (1985) and Bass and Avolio (1990) present the model of charismatic leadership with the most repercussion, at least within psychology (Bryman, 1992). This model, unlike all the previous ones, has had a fundamentally empiric development. Bass speaks about charismatic leadership in a broader context: the transformational leadership that will be mentioned later in a more detailed manner. For now, transformational leadership will be referred in a reduced form in order to explain this first part of the classification of the different models within the charismatic leadership.

In his article titled "The study of charisma and charismatic leadership in social sciences: a psychosocial approach", Molero (1995) points out that transformational leaders are capable of changing the attitudes, beliefs and value of their followers through four types of conducts: a) charismatic conducts, though which the leader is capable of gaining the followers' faith, respect and confidence, b) inspirational conducts, though which the leader is capable of transmitting the importance of the current mission to the followers, c) intellectually stimulating conducts, though which the leader incites innovation and creativity for the resolution of problems, and d) individual consideration conducts, though which the leader treats each subordinate in a personal manner, helping them when needed.

This model has had a mainly empirical development; Bass creates a questionnaire that measures the leader's conducts, which were mentioned above (Multifactor Lead-

ership Questionnaire MLQ). Through the use of this questionnaire, the fact that charismatic conducts are the most important within the transformational leadership has been proven. Nonetheless, in 1999, Bass himself proposed to stop the use of the term charisma in order to avoid any false interpretations. This is because the researches conducted in Europe, especially in Germany, critically see the concept of charismatic leadership and fears a relapse into the theory of the leader as a “great-man.” The negative consequences of this type of leadership, such as the blind obedience and the addiction derived from the political and religious contexts, have been placed on the discussion table. The fact that in Weber’s conception (1956 cited in Molero, 1995)), the concept of charisma has been related with religious roots combined with mystical aspects might cause difficulties with this general concept of charisma. From Bass’ model 1985, an important increase in the satisfaction and performance of the subordinates of the transformational leaders is predicted in comparison to the subordinates of other types of leaders. Numerous research studies have compared this aspect (Bass and Avolio, 1990; Bass, 1990). Studies accomplished in Spain, using a Spanish version, have confirmed a substantial part of Bass’ model, a point that we will deal with further on in the chapter of empirical studies.

Although Bass’ model is centered on the effects of leadership over the followers’ performance, it also suggests some ideas to explain these effects. The transformational leaders would achieve the “transformation” of their followers: a) making them understand the importance of the achievement of the goals they propose, b) impelling the followers to transcend their particular interests in benefit of the group or company, c) developing a necessity of a higher level in the followers. In Bass’ model, an environment of great changes and transformations make a surge of transformational leadership more probable and useful. On the other hand, in order for the effects of the charismatic leadership to be “transformational” in a positive sense, the charismatic leadership must be accompanied by conducts of intellectual stimulation and individual consideration argues Molero (1995). Otherwise, the charismatic leader could provoke a blind pursuit by his followers that would have negative consequences for themselves and the organization.

4.7 Bi-dimensional classification of the models of charisma

Molero (1995) proposes an interesting classification that allows a new order of the different models of charisma: to conceive charisma as a restricted phenomenon versus to conceive it as a broad phenomenon and to grant importance or not to the mission proposed by the leader.

4.7.1 Broad vs. restricted conception of charismatic leadership

According to Molero (1995), there is a restricted conception of the charismatic phenomenon when it is maintained that the charismatic leadership is an isolated fact that only presents itself in exceptional circumstances. This perspective implies having determinate ideas about the leader, the followers and the effects of charismatic leadership. The leader, due to his “special” characteristics, is the most important factor of charismatic leadership. This perspective implies a determined closeness to the study of the charismatic phenomenon (historical studies after the occurrence of the charismatic fact). On the contrary, according to Molero, the authors with a broad idea of charismatic leadership believe that this type of relationship can be found with relative frequency in all the levels of the diverse social organizations. Then, a charismatic leader could attract anyone and the effects are circumscribed to the environment of the charismatic leader (company, political party, etc.) From this perspective, the charismatic leadership can be approached in an empirical manner, through questionnaires and even laboratory studies (Howell and Frost, 1989).

According to Molero (1995), both perspectives study the same phenomenon that, under determined historical, social or personal circumstances can reach an exceptional repercussion. Therefore, the study of a more spread out type of charisma (that is of easier access) would allow us to improve the knowledge of the more exceptional type of charisma.

4.7.2 The importance of the mission proposed by the leader

The second classification that Molero proposes (1995) is independent of the previous one and it makes reference to the importance given to the mission or vision proposed by the leader, which has clear implications in the conception of the charismatic phenomenon.

Those authors that give little importance to the leader's mission tend to consider charisma as an irrational phenomenon, like a type of social contagiousness. These authors highlight the expressive and emotional facets of the charismatic leader. Molero indicates that from this perspective, the way the leader expresses him is more important than what he actually says. On the contrary, the authors consider that the message of the leader is more important, they consider that the leader achieves the attraction of followers precisely because of his vision of the future. They give more importance to the rationality of the leaders and his followers.

Tab. 1: Classification of the charisma models according the bi-dimensional proposal

Mission's importance	Concept of charisma	
	Restricted	Broad
High	I Weber Sociological/symbolic explanations of charisma	II Bass Tryce & Beyer Explanation about charisma based on attributions that the followers give to the leader based on his conduct and explanations of charisma based on the self-perception of the follower.
Low	III Willner Lindholm Psychoanalytic Explanations	IV Friedmann Theories that conceive charisma as a mere attribution.

Through this table, Molero (1995) explains that the models or authors placed in quadrant I (referred to the restricted perception of charisma/high importance of the mission), represent the classic perception of charisma since Max Weber. From this vision, certain exceptional leaders, in virtue of their message or mission, achieve radical effects over their followers. In quadrant III (restricted conception of charisma/low importance of the message), the attention is centered on the leader's capacity to express and transmit emotions. In this way, the established bond would be due to certain complementary pathological characteristics between the leaders and the followers or in other cases, by a sort of social contagiousness. In quadrant II (broad conception of charisma/ high importance of the message) are represented

most of the models of organizational psychology, argues Molero. From this perspective, charisma may be found in all the organizations and the followers follow the leader not because of his superhuman characteristics, but because of the message or project that he has proposed. Generally, these models emphasize the effects that the charismatic leaders achieve over their followers' performance. Finally, in quadrant IV (broad conception of charisma/low importance of the mission), those theories are represented that affirm that even though the charismatic relationship is found with relative frequency, it is based more in the emotional transmission than in the message of the leader.

Molero (1995) affirms that its not by chance that all the models of empiric inspiration are found in quadrants II and IV, since according to him, the only sensible way to empirically study the charismatic relationship is through this broad perspective.

As can be appreciated, there are many conceptions of charismatic leadership that are differentiated based on the importance that is given to the phenomenon itself and to its components. Nonetheless, the path until reaching the formulation of a general model of charisma is still far off and the only way to keep advancing towards this point lies in continuing with the empirical approaches to the charismatic leadership. Many researchers have made steps in this direction, aspect that will be dealt with further on in this study. In order to contribute to this proposal, research study is proposed that will be developed along this study. Nonetheless, before getting completely submerged into the empirical study, previously allude to certain theoretical aspects are pointed out that will permit the comprehension of the importance of the present study.

It is of great importance to make a brief review of some of the authors that have developed bases for many subsequent research studies. For example, inspired by House's "1976 theory of charismatic leadership" (cited in Molero, 1995), charismatic leadership has been rediscovered in the field of leadership research. Besides Weber, a second starting point was Burns' (1978) book on transformational leadership. One of the central theses that emerged in connection with charismatic leadership has been the fact that organizations and employees are over-managed but under led (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). In contrast to "managers" who are functionally orientated and maintain the status quo by doing things right, leaders are able to manage change and transform it by doing the right things in organizations as well as with human re-

sources, which is essential for competitiveness and long-range organizational improvement. For this function, leaders offer attractive visions of the future, they have skills to communicate their goals in a convincing manner, they treat employees as individual persons by considering their needs and values and they certainly offer trust and confidence. With this background, it is necessary to continue with a previous discussion about the difference between leaders and managers.

4.8 Leadership or Management?

It would be a serious mistake to conjecture or posit between both concepts. A director or manager, placed in a certain position, is expected to support or contribute to activities necessary for the organization to reach its objectives, and for the workers to be encouraged to act like an organized and integrated team.

In the words of Molero (1995), a manager, an administrator or a director of a team does not become a leader simply because he occupies a dominant or elevated position in an organizational structure. Also, in a political setting, a political administrator and a political leader have to fulfill distinct functions. The operational frame of the first is limited by the voters' expectations, without which he/she cannot advance. The second, is expected to create his own operational frame in accordance with his/her mandate. The distinction is valid also for an organizational leader and a group manager or administrator.

In general, the notion as well as the term "leadership" implies a goal-directed social influence on the attitude and behavior of the individual as well as on the interaction in, and among, groups with the objective of jointly achieving certain goals, although many other interpretations emphasize different sides of the matter (Neuberger, 1995).

At present, the term leader seems to be commonly reserved for those that carry out a key role in the act of leadership (Navas & Molero, 1994).

Scientific research on leadership reflects development of historical paradigms. While at the end of the 40s theoretical approaches focused on abilities and personal traits of leaders, the following investigations, till the end of the 60s, concentrated on behavior and elements of behavior. Till the early nineties site-specific and theoretical contingency approaches dominated. Since the mid 80s the "new leadership approach" has made new attempts, placing itself in the frontline (Bryman, 1992). Particular terms as 'transformational guidance', 'charisma' and 'leadership' can be wholly ascribed to

the "new leadership approach" (House & Singh, 1978 cited by Felfe, 2002). In this context, the ideas, approaches and works of the following authors are of specific interest: Bennis und Nanus (1985), Burns (1978), and Tichy und Devanna (1986).

These approaches pursue the problems of how leaders manage to guide the colleagues and organizations in such a way that outstanding results are achieved, which help meeting and resolving new demands and expectations. can be successfully resolved. Emotionally appealing behavior and the creation of motivation to be achieved by the inspirational vision of the leader, are accentuated as the main issues. Since the theoretical approach towards the leader's behavior and the extension of the contingency theory placed the leader's behavior or situational factors at the heart of the matter (Staehle, 1991), recent articles demand that the complete personality of the leader should be encompassed. Contrary to the older traditional approaches of ability theories which assume an exceptional personality with inborn talents and abilities, now the education and learning qualities as well as the ability of the leader's personal progression (which regards theories of behavior) are integrated (Staehle, 1991).

In view of the question how to cope with increasing changes, Zaleznik (1977 cited in Felfe, 2002) has differentiated between two strategies of leadership. These strategies represent two types – 'the manager' and 'the leader' - who differ with regard to their goals, attitudes, roles and strategy for action. Tending towards a rather impersonal, distant attitude to the company and the company's objectives, managers prefer to use well-known strategies to solve problems regarding colleagues and business partners as a functional device. Leaders work with visions. They are filled and fill others with enthusiasm for new ideas, are willing to take risks and strife for changes. Thereby they readily develop empathy with their colleagues.

John Kotter (1990 cited by Felfe, 2002) proposes that the administration as well as managers are required to cope with complex problems. Good administration generates order and constancy, based on plans that are designed by rigid structures of organization and can control the results comparing them with the plans. Leadership relates to handling changing conditions. The leaders establish a vision of the future; they attract people by imparting the visions to them and by being a source of inspiration for overcoming obstacles. In order to achieve optimum efficacy of an organization, both leadership and a strong administration are needed.

Bennis and Nanus (1985) also differentiate between ‘manager’ and ‘leader’. The types are circumscribed by different understanding of their respective roles, their setting of priorities as well as their levels of behavior. Thus managers need to concentrate on “doing things right”, representing the type of the ‘technocrat’ or “working manager“ while leaders are capable of “doing the right things”. The leader gives his/her attention to a vision using emotional resources as accepted values and hopes (Bennis & Nanus, 1985).

Katz and Kahn (1986) refer to three basic types of conducting institutional leadership:

- The creation of the structure or formulation of the policies
- The interpolation of the structure
- The use or administration of the structure

Within the creation of the structure, they point out the presence of an external perspective of the system that refers to the environment’s demands, relates to the prerequisites that the organization must meet in order to maintain equilibrium with it. The external perspective includes sensibility towards environmental opportunities as well as towards possibilities of establishing fruitful relationships with the environment. Regarding creation, they point out the concept of internal perspectives. Since an organization has subsystems with distinct interests and necessities, the people in the respective system embody different types of conflicts. It is an imperative function of leadership to try, integrate and harmonize the differences of the subsystems. The leader that possesses a systematic perspective for the internal operation and the relationships in his/her organization comprehends the nature of symbols and the values of the organization and its subsystems in general. This is a leader of high grade supervision, whose conceptual capacities are greater than his technical competence and, possibly his/her aptitude for human relationships.

To interpolate the structure means to search for ways and mediums bring to play the chosen policies and to attain existing organizational goals. This aspect corresponds to a level of second line supervision where a certain degree of internal perspective is needed, especially a technical knowledge of the respective tasks of the important subsystems. This type of orientation has been associated with the ability to establish human relationships.

Katz y Kahn (1986) also point out that there exists a level inside of the organization, at which less important acts of leadership can use the existent organizational resources and follow the already established organizational rules. It is the level of the use of the structure or administration.

Orders and common obedience are evaluated as close to point zero of the continuum of leadership, but do have an influence over matters of organizational interest. It is at this point that the intention to exert influence becomes totally inefficient, since, either way, obedience will be accepted but the administration will lose its leadership properties in the process. Administration as well as use of the existent structure mark the lowest level of leadership, be it efficient or clumsy, useful or full of difficulties.

Consequently, given the contradictory character of the organizations that need to apply rules and ask for spontaneous or internal motivated actions in the interest of the organizational mission, there is a strong ambivalence with respect to the administration and the administrators. On the one hand these are perceived as bureaucrats, their activity is being perceived as a boring fulfillment of domestic tasks when compared with the elaboration of a policy or with creative leadership. On the other hand, the art of administration is glorified sometimes as a form of organizational control and some managers dedicate themselves to perform administrative tasks, leaving aside all policy and the initiation of a structure. As a consequence extremes may cause the negligence of fundamental organizational functions. If at the inferior levels excessive administration is perceived, maybe not enough time is spent on the essential points like change, the formulation of a policy or on planning. If the administrative part is neglected, many people will have to make costly efforts, in order to compensate the loss; in the same way, neglecting this aspect in the superior levels of an organization will force the fulfillment of a function without taking into account the elaboration of a policy.

There are many authors that have dedicated themselves to the classification of the different types of leaders, including Magerison and Kakabdse (1984); Maccoby (1977), Neuberger (1995) cited by Felfe 2002, others that have concentrated on studying the frequency of the managers' activities and, in this way, there is some overlap between the different classifications. Felfe, 2002, concludes that even though the styles of charismatic leadership described in the various classifications do not

appear to approach the ideal type of leader, they still may figure as the predestined ones for the transformational changes and the overcoming of crisis.