

Personality Predictors of Charismatic Leadership

* **Fakir M. Sahoo**

** **Archana Bhagat**

*** **Kalpana Sahoo**

* Research Professor, Xavier Institute of Management, Bhubaneswar

** Assistant Professor, National Institute of Science & Technology, Berhampur

*** Assistant Professor, Xavier University

Abstract

Charismatic leadership represents a paradigm shift in contemporary research. Because of its seminal role in modern organizations, attempts are geared to understand and to identify predictors of charismatic leadership. The objective of the present investigation is to delineate the personality predictors of charismatic leadership. The study is based on Conger and Kanungo's (1998) model of charismatic leadership. The model has provided an operational definition of charismatic leadership; it has identified five components: articulation and vision, sensitivity to environment, sensitivity to members' needs, personal risk and unconventional strategy. Drawing on this model, 300 managers in two major sectors (nationalized banks and NTPC) were individually administered Conger and Kanungo's measure of charismatic leadership and Big Five Factors of Personality. The personality measures include Five Big Factors such as Neuroticism, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Openness and Conscientiousness. The extensive empirical investigation evinces that the Factor of Conscientiousness explains 21 percent of charismatic leadership. When warmth, gregariousness and excitement-seeking are further included, 30 percent of variance is accounted for. There is no group difference across job categories; bank managers exhibit greater charisma than do NTPC managers. The findings are explained and implications are outlined.

Introduction

The focus of this study is on charismatic leadership in an organizational environment, a field that saw great evolution during the late 1970's mainly because of dramatic changes, which occurred in the business world (Conger & Kanungo, 1998). Charismatic and transformational leadership are two of the most popular approaches, which both identify charisma as a necessary condition for effective leadership (Northouse, 2004). Charisma is a Greek word used to describe a gift, a talent or a special quality that makes the person who owns it able to do extraordinary things (Weber, 1947). According to Conger and Kanungo, this term is attributed to leaders whose personality and individual abilities have a powerful effect on their followers. Charismatic leaders are usually dominant figures within an organization; they inspire trust and devotion, articulate future vision and build up relationships based on respect and admiration (Conger & Kanungo, 1998). Charismatic leadership can transform the nature of work and the vision of an organization by making them appear meaningful, morally correct and more heroic (House & Shamir, cited in Northouse, 2004).

Charismatic Leadership

The study of leadership, its outcomes and its effectiveness has ebbed and flowed over the years. Leadership research was typically classified based on its primary focus, commonly on leader traits, leader behavior, power and influence or situational factors (House & Podsakof, 1994). Most definitions of leadership have reflected an assumption around a process where one person exerts influence over another to guide and facilitate relationships in a group or organization (Yukl, 2011). Many differences in how leadership is defined, revolve around how influence is applied, who applies it and the resulting

outcomes. For years the definitions of leadership emphasized a rational and cognitive perspective. Many recent conceptions, however, emphasize the emotional aspects of influence more than the reason (Yukl, 2011). Common within this view is the perspective that leaders inspire followers to willingly sacrifice their selfish interests for a higher cause. This new class of “outstanding leadership theories” (House & Podsakoff, 1994) emerged and centered on the “major effects (that leaders can have) on the emotions, motives, preferences, aspirations, and commitment of followers, as well as on the structure, culture, and performance of complex organizations” (House & Podsakoff, 1994, p.55).

Charismatic and transformational leadership were part of this new class of theories which emphasized “symbolic leader behavior, visionary and inspirational ability, non-verbal communication, appeal to ideological values, and the empowerment of the followers by the leader...outstanding leaders transform organizations by infusing into them ideological values and moral purpose, thus inducing strong commitment, rather than by affecting the cognitions or the task environment of followers, or by offering material incentives and the threat of punishment.” (House & Podakoff, 1994, p.55).

The basic theme underlying the concept in this class of leadership is that leaders are proactive rather than reactive in their thinking; radical than conservative; more innovative and creative and more open to new ideas (Bass, 1985). Here leadership exercises involve influence to produce enthusiastic commitment by subordinates as opposed to reluctant obedience or indifferent compliance (Yukl, 2011). Leadership is visionary; it transforms those who see the vision and gives them a new and stronger sense of purpose and meaning. It views leadership as a process of collective action (Roberts, 1985) and that leadership rests not on the shoulders of one individual but also on all who share the mission and vision. Thus this theory of charismatic leadership is a comprehensive theory in which leader traits, behavior, influence and situational factors combine to increase subordinate receptivity to ideological appeals (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; House, 1977). It has come to be recognized as 1) complex interactive process with behavioral, relational and situational elements 2) found solely not only in a leader but believed to occur at individual, dyadic, group and organizational levels 3) promoted upwards from lower organizational levels as much as it is promoted downwards from higher levels 4) occurs internally within the leader-subordinate interaction, as well as externally, in the situational environment 5) motivates people intrinsically by improving expectations, not just extrinsically by improving reward system.

The term charisma (Weber, 1947) was used to describe those exceptional qualities in a leader who used their influence based on followers’ perceptions rather than traditional or formal authority. From this foundation of charisma, numerous theories of charismatic leadership have emerged. House (1977) described a charismatic leader as one who has profound and unusual effects on followers. These charismatic leaders were: (a) highly self-confident with a strong conviction in their own beliefs and values, (b) likely to set behavioral examples for their followers to imitate, (c) describing the group goals within the shared values, ideals and aspirations of the followers, and (d) likely to communicate high expectations of their follower’s performance (Yukl, 2011). This theory of charismatic leadership (House, 1977) has been expanded to be described in more behavioral components by Conger and Kanungo (1994). These charismatic leaders challenge the status quo and have an idealized vision of the future state; they act in unconventional ways to achieve their vision, pursue their vision through personal risk and high costs, and are confident about their direction Conger, 1989, 1999; Conger & Kanungo, 1997).

These definitions of charismatic leadership were further refined and incorporated within a transformational leadership construct by Burns (1978). Burns (1978) described transformational leadership as a process in which “leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation” (p. 20).

This process of leadership is “a stream of evolving interrelationships in which leaders continuously evokes motivational responses from followers and modifying their behavior as they meet responsiveness or resistance, in a ceaseless process of flow and counter flow” (Burns, 1978, p. 440). These transformational leaders “seek to raise the consciousness of followers by appealing to higher ideals and moral values such as liberty, justice, equality, peace, not to baser emotions such as fear, greed, jealousy, or hatred” (Yukl & Van Fleet, 1982, p. 176).

Components of Charismatic Leadership

As indicated earlier, the Conger and Kanungo’s (1998) factor analytic studies of charismatic leadership identified five factors of charismatic leadership. These include sensitivity to environment, sensitivity to members’ needs, articulation of vision, personal risk and unusual strategy. Based on these five components, they developed and validated effective instrument for their measurement.

Sensitivity to Environment

To be effective, a leader must be capable of making realistic assessment of an environment. These assessments in turn dictate the shape of initiative and their timing as well as the measures leader must seek out and where they will be employed. In Mintzberg’s (1973) taxonomy of the 10 roles that managers play, two roles – the monitor and the liason – describe the activities of leaders in the assessment phase. Accordingly to Yukl (2011), leaders in their role of monitoring seek information from a variety of sources, such as reading reports and memos, attending meetings and briefings, conducting observational tours. Most of the information is analyzed into problems and opportunities.

The liason role involves establishing relationship outside the leaders’ immediate work group. Their interest lies in maintaining an interface with the larger environment and devising appropriate adaptation strategies. Pawar and Eastman (1997) maintain that effective leaders display more boundary spanning and adaptive functions compared to technical and efficiency functions.

A bulk of studies evinces a positive correlation between active environmental scanning and organizational effectiveness (Yukl, 2011). Despite such research findings, many leaders in organizations are influenced by short-term objectives and seek out temporary profits.

The extent of growth in an organization’s particular domain may divert leaders’ attention from new environmental scanning. In addition the prior experiences and training of managers may constrain their ability to seek out new information.

These environmental assessment led to tactical action on the part of Microsoft. On returning from his trip to India, Gates decided to make some important product revisions and to expand operations there. Gates stated in an interview:

I never realized that there are 14 distinct written and spoken languages in India. Now that I understand that, we are going to invest a whole lot more in localizing our products. And the raw software talent you see there really grabs you. A billion people is a lot of people, and even though the country is really poor, there are a lot of talented people with world-class educations, and companies that are as forward-looking and capable as anywhere. I came back quite enthused about taking some of our software development overload here and moving it over there. (Schlender, 1997, p. 81)

Sensitivity to Members’ Needs

An effective attainment of leaders’ vision requires leader’s sensitivity to members’ needs. The charismatic leader must be a keen observer, skillful in reading the abilities of followers.

When leaders have such skills, followers describe them as having good antennae. Leaders know what is going. Leaders choose risks which are carefully calculated.

People sensitivity allows the leader to assess realistically the talent and resources followers possess. Leaders know how best to deploy such talents and resources. Leaders also know where critical deficits exist. There are other benefits of this form of sensitivity because followers perceive that the leader's actions are meant to serve them rather than serve only the leader; a people-oriented sensitivity may help the leader to gather, "Idiosyncrasy credits" (Hollander, 1979). These credits permit leaders to deviate from certain norms of the organization. These also lead to greater tolerance of personal peculiarities the leaders might be having. Furthermore, followers suspend quick judgment of leaders' risk-taking behavior. Such sensitivity is instrumental in building credibility.

To demonstrate this sensitivity in action, Dawson (The vice-president of Zebco) undertook a series of initiatives. The goal was to end the class differences between the workforce and management. He adopted highly visible actions to send a clear message. He removed all parking spaces reserved for senior managers. He explained that this type of arrangement (reservation) gives a signal "we (management) are better than you". He initiated a program called president's club. It was decided that anyone who has 100% attendance would reserve a space. The other changes he implemented were indicators of trust.

By showing great sensitivity to employees, leaders establish credibility in their workforce. In return, workforce provides concessions that improve quality and productivity. Prior to Dawson's joining, Zebco (a sporting equipment company) was having a series of problems compounded by stiff competition from its Asian counterparts.

Another benefit of people sensitivity is the facilitation of vision formulation. Many researchers believe that vision is significantly shaped around the followers' needs, values, and aspirations. (Bass & Avolio, 1993). Shamir (1992, 1995) argues that leaders acquire commitment to their visions by addressing followers' motives. Shamir further argues that the visions of charismatic leaders are built primarily around the self-concepts of followers. In other words, the vision must be formulated in a way that incorporates values and an ideology that have intrinsic meanings for followers.

Articulation of Vision

Effective leaders realize that vision must be clearly communicated to people across the organization to elicit commitment. Zaccaro and Banks (2001) have explained how critical the process of communication is to ensure its smooth implementation. Vision provides the necessary strategic direction for the organizational members to achieve goals. The values and ideology embedded in the vision act as a concrete source of impassioned empowerment that motivates employees.

The effective leader also uses 'story telling' as a tool to communicate the vision to the followers. Kaye and Jacobson (1998) describe the salient components of storytelling as: telling the story, understanding of the implicit metaphor by the listeners, and the creation of shared meaning. Stories tap into both the intellect and emotions and help people to understand in relevant and meaningful ways when stories are vivid and memorable. Story telling is a collective act and they help in the sharing of meaning.

Kantabutra and Avery (2007), in a research article, have examined the relationships between vision attributes (of brevity, clarity, challenge, stability, abstractness, future orientation, and desirability or ability to inspire) and content (relating to customer and staff satisfaction imageries), and customer and staff satisfaction in Australian retail stores, taking into account vision realization factors of vision communication, organizational alignment, motivation, empowerment and a staff personal factor comprised of staff emotional commitment to and use of the vision. Variables of vision attributes and content, vision communication, organizational alignment, motivation, empowerment and staff

personal factor were derived from the literature. Data were from store managers, staff and customers of 101 apparel stores in Sydney. These variables were tested for significant relationships through chi-square and regression analyses. Findings endorse the importance of espousing a vision containing reference to customer and staff satisfaction.

In a recent study, Heracleous and Klaering (2014) examined the association between rhetorical competence and charismatic leadership in the context of Steve Job. They found supportive evidence for positive association.

Personal Risk

Leaders' sensitivity to environment and sensitivity to members' needs lead to personal risks. Charismatic leader recognize deficiencies within the present context. They actually search out shortcomings in the status quo. They may, for example, exploit overlooked market opportunities or launch initiatives that successfully undermine the standard practices or conventions of organizations.

Furthermore, they may challenge internal organizational deficiencies. Any organization that presents unexploited opportunity offers challenge for a charismatic leader. Because of the emphasis on the shortcomings of an environment, these leaders are perceived as entrepreneurs or agents of change. They are also perceived as risk-takers. In contrast, transactional managers are basically maintainers of the status quo. Transactional managers are usually guided by rigid cost-and-benefit analysis; they avoid risk-taking behaviors. They operate within the bounds of the status quo.

There are reasons as to why charismatic leaders go for risk-taking behaviors. Charismatic leaders are by nature entrepreneurial and change-oriented. It appears that such leaders have high achievement needs and power motivation. They enjoy a high level of visibility and attention. This disposition prompts them to go beyond convention and adopt challenging postures.

The other personality disposition prominent in them is excitement-seeking. They search out novel and stimulating situations. This personality trait prompts them to cross the boundaries of cost-and-benefit analysis. They accept new challenges and take personal risks for the attainment of their goals.

The classic case of Southwest Airlines (USA) provides documentation of risk-taking behavior of its charismatic leader, Herb Kelleher. In mid-1972, when the Southwest Airline was in serious financial crisis, the company was forced to sell one of the four 737 jets. It meant a 25% reduction in capacity. Employees apprehended the lay-off.

The workforce persuaded the company president Kelleher that the company maintains its existing schedule built around four planes even though it had only three planes. To succeed they would turn planes around in 10 minutes – an unusual feat for the airline industry (turnaround time at airport gates typically ranges from 30 to 50 minutes). Greater teamwork and job redesign made it possible. Soon supervisors and pilots assisted for baggage clearance. Planes were stocked through the rear of the craft while passengers disembarked at the front. Tickets were collected in the planes instead of the gate. No seat arrangement meant rapid yet orderly entry into the plane. Southwest airline achieved its target of the 10-minute turnaround, much to the shock of its competitors. It was possible owing to risk-taking strategy of its charismatic leader, Kelleher (Petzinger, 1995, pp 31-31)

Unusual Strategy

There is a plethora of definitions encompassing the concept of strategic leadership. Gerry Johnson and Kevan Scholes (2002) define strategic leadership as encapsulating entrepreneurial processes and strategic vision. They also suggest that strategic leadership is concerned with strategy development and change.

Philip Stiles (2001) in his research quotes one of the interviewees as saying 'The mission is why we are in business. The vision is where we want to be. These are fundamentally the responsibility of the board.' Some writers argue that the sole role of the strategic leader is providing vision, mission and guiding principles (values and rules). Beverley Mobbs (2004), a quality consultant, calls vision, mission and values as 'critical factors' in the pursuit of excellence. Katherine Beatty and Laura Quinn (2002) say 'strategic leaders create a shared vision for the future; linking the efforts of everyone in the organization to the organization's goals; not just accomplishing objectives but also steadily improving the organization.' Essentially strategic leadership refers to the top management team, and strategic leadership theory has evolved from upper echelons theory (Hambrick & Mason, 1984).

Big Five Personality Factors

'Personality is that pattern of characteristic thoughts, feelings, and behaviors that distinguishes one person from another and that persists over time and situation' (Phares, 1991). It is the sum of biologically based and learnt behavior, which forms the person's unique responses to environmental stimuli (Ryckman, 1982). It refers to the characteristics of the person that account for consistent patterns of feeling, thinking and behaving (Pervin, Cervone & John, 2005). The concept of personality must be hypothetically understood (Ryckman, 1982). No clear neurological ground can be found for it, although attempts have been made to describe the basis of personality in terms of neurophysiology (Rowe, 1989) or cortical dopamine activity (Pickering & Gray, 2001). The personality structure is fairly stable and predictable throughout different situations and time (Phares, 1991). There are personality traits of different depth and significance. The innermost layer is the basis, while the outermost layer is situation-bound and influenced by, for example, tiredness. A tired person might accordingly behave in a way that is not like his/her true self (Cattell, 1950). Dependent on the situation, personality traits may be more or less visible and personality may develop over time (Phares, 1991). The changes, which reflect events and feelings during the lifespan, only affect the surface and not the core character. Profound changes in personality are usually consequences of major life changes or deliberate effort (Costa & McCrae, 1992). It is important that the individuals adapt to their circumstances in life at the same time as they retain the feeling of a solid inner core. Some adaptations seem to be general and follow a certain pattern. Sensation seeking is one example of characteristics, which diminish over time from adolescence to middle age in all cultures (Costa & McCrae, 1980). Neuroticism and Openness to experience tend to decrease over time, while self-esteem, Conscientiousness and Agreeableness tend to increase (Neyer, 2000). The expressions of personality are moreover dependent on age and maturity. The same activity level may thus enhance an interest for football at a young age and gardening in later days (Costa & McCrae, 1980).

After 50 years of personality research there is a common agreement in the field that there are five basic dimensions that can be used to describe differences in cognitive, affective and social behavior. This is the base for the five-factor model of personality. The five dimensions are usually described in the following order of decreasing robustness based on previous personality scales: Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to experience, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness (Costa & McCrae, 1992: 14-16). The dimensions are stable across a lifespan and seen to have a physiological base. The five-factor model discussion evolved from an analysis of the terms, which are used to describe personality. The lexical hypothesis states that there is enough information in natural language to describe differences in personality, as natural basic characteristics are reflected into language (Goldberg, 1990). Besides the lexical analysis, additional support for the five-factor model was found in the analysis of personality questionnaires. Almost all of the personality tests existing today measure one or more of the five factors (McCrae & John, 1992). The five dimensions are depicted below:

Personality dimensions and the poles of traits they form. Based on Costa & McCrae (1992)

Personality dimensions	High-level	Low level
Neuroticism	sensitive, nervous	secure, confident
Extraversion	outgoing, energetic	shy, withdrawn
Openness to experience	inventive, curious	cautious, conservative
Agreeableness	friendly, compassionate	competitive, outspoken
Conscientiousness	efficient, organized	easy-going, careless

The five-factor model is a well-established framework for measuring personality traits. The Big Five were identified by searching for the smallest number of clusters in the English language that could account for the greatest variation of personality differences. Replications of this process in other languages have identified the same five clusters. This generally is referred to as the “lexical hypothesis,” which assumes that natural language contains sufficient information to account for individual differences in personality (John, Angleitner, Ostendorf, 1988). The factors in the Big Five model are meant to measure the underlying traits of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience by using personality markers to identify the degree of each of these factors that an individual possesses. Extraversion represents a preference to be around others. It is the trait that deals with a person’s social behaviors, willingness to express opinions and leadership. Agreeableness describes how we relate to others including tolerance and acceptance. In addition, agreeableness represents an eagerness for communion. Conscientiousness refers to a tendency to push toward goals and act dutifully. It encompasses self-discipline and dependability. Neuroticism is the tendency to experience unpleasant emotions and often is referred to as the anxiety factor. Openness to experience describes the willingness to enjoy new experiences and ideas. It includes creativity, preference for the complex and willingness to accept change. The five-factor model is one well-accepted measure used to evaluate the Big Five personality traits, but it does not overcome the length and cost restrictions of the instruments. The Big Five personality traits have been used widely in management to assess organizational fit.

Rationale and Objectives

The review of pertinent literature in the domain of charismatic leadership posits the construct as an integrative concept. It has been shown that the existing and conventional theories stated in terms of traits, behaviors and situational contingency could not explain all phenomena encountered in contemporary research. Zelenzik’s (1990) stress on the distinction between managers and leaders led to a new frontier of research on neo-leadership.

Kuhn (1976) in his book ‘The Structure in Scientific Revolution’ has persuasively argued that men and women take things granted for a while. Then they encounter some “deviate cases” that could not be explained by existing concepts and theories. This creates “essential tension” in the mind of scientists. They attempt to solve these deviate cases; as a result, science takes a big leap. This is how existing theories in science, social science and behavioral science get changed. In other words, a “paradigm crisis” leads to *paradigm shift*.

In the domain of leadership research, we also experience a paradigm shift. The research on charismatic and transformational leadership is the result of such paradigm crisis. The research has filled a leadership gap. It has provided operational definition of the construct. The components of the concept have been delineated.

They include articulation of vision, sensitivity to environment, sensitivity to members' needs, personal risk and unusual strategy. An effective method of measurement of an empirical level has also been developed and validated (Conger & Kanungo, 1998).

Research on charismatic leadership has crossed many boundaries. Different types of organizations have been studied. Different culture systems have been included (Gill, 2006). The impact of charismatic leadership has been examined. Some investigators have also looked into negative side of charismatic leadership (Yukl, 2011).

Despite such proliferation of research on charismatic leadership, some fundamental issues have remained under-investigated. A basic issue concerns training dimension. What sort of OD techniques would be appropriate for fostering charismatic leadership is a seminal question? Although the developmental sequence of charismatic leadership in terms of stage-wise progress (sensitivity to gaps, articulation of vision, and adoption of unusual strategy on three-stage development) has been formulated by Conger and Kanungo's (1998) model, it is not clear as to what sort of managers are likely to enter into such developmental matrix. In other words, delineation of predictors of charismatic leadership is a central issue (Oreg & Berson, 2015).

With a view to identifying factors linked with charismatic leadership, a comprehensive list of predictor variables is required. Random attempts with a small number of dispositional factors may not be a worthwhile effort. In this context, the consideration of Big Five Factors of Personality offers a promising horizon. This instrument is new with introduction to the personality research during 90's. It has been used transculturally. Apart from providing scores on big five factors it provides scores on 30 facets or sub-factors. Thus, the range is very substantial.

A substantial amount of research has been undertaken in the study of organization behavior employing this NEO-PIR instrument (Nelson, Quick, & Khandelwal, 2009; Robbins, Judge & Sanghi, 2009). The bulk also includes studies conducted in Indian sociocultural system. Yet, an examination of linkages between Big Five Factors of Personality and charismatic leadership demands research attention with a view to filling an existing academic gap. This is also needed in view of the practical requirement of developing appropriate leadership in our system.

India is a plural and multicultural society. Some of the findings obtained in individualistic societies may not be applicable to our collectivist form. Consequently, the present research is geared to delineate personality predictors of charismatic leadership. In addition, two different types of organizations with two varied job levels are examined.

Hypotheses:

In addition to comparing the two organization types and job categories with respect to several parameters, the following hypotheses are formulated for empirical testing.

1. Charismatic leadership is significantly related to Big Factor of Conscientiousness, as well as its facets.
2. Charismatic leadership is significantly associated with Big Factor of Extraversion and its facets.
3. Charismatic leadership is significantly associated with Big Factor of Openness and its facets.
4. Charismatic leadership is *negatively* associated with Big Factor of Neuroticism and its facets.

Method of Study

The basic purpose of the investigation was to identify significant predictors of charismatic leadership. The objective was also to examine the association amongst variables. Accordingly, a sequence of activities was undertaken.

An Overview of the Design

The study involves a 2(organization types) X 2(job categories) factorial design where employees from two different types of organizations (NTPC and Banking organizations) were crossed with two levels of managerial jobs (junior and senior managers). The main outcome variable was charismatic leadership. The personality dimensions examined as predictors included Five Big Factors namely Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. The predictor variables also included sub-factors of each of these Five Big Factors of Personality.

Participants

There were 300 employees (in the managerial rank) randomly selected from two types of organization. One hundred fifty (75 junior managers and 75 senior managers) were from NTPC located at Kania, Dhenkanal, Odisha. Their age ranged from 25 years to 50 years (Mean = 35.3; SD = 8.9 years). The other half of the participants (75 junior and 75 senior managers) were sampled from banking sector organization spread around similar geographical area. Their age ranged from 23 years to 50 years (Mean = 31.7; SD = 7.7 years). Care was taken to sample participants within comparable income brackets.

Measures

The study involves two sets of standardized psychometric measures: Five Big Factors of Personality (Neo PI-R) and Measure of Charismatic Leadership.

Five Big Factors of Personality. Costa and McCrae (1992) have developed and validated Five Big Factors of Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) that has demonstrated impressive trans-cultural validity. Five Big Factors of Personality include Neuroticism, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Openness and Conscientiousness. Each of the Five Big Factors also include sub-factors. Neuroticism includes facets like anxiety, anger-hostility, depression, self-consciousness, impulsiveness, and vulnerability. Big Five Factor of Extraversion includes facets like warmth, gregariousness, assertiveness, activity, excitement-seeking, and positive emotion. Big Five Factor of Openness includes fantasy, aesthetics, feelings, actions, ideas, and values. Facets of trust, straight-forwardness, altruism, compliance, modesty and tender-mindedness are included in Agreeableness. Facets of competence, order, dutifulness, achievement-striving, self-discipline and deliberation comprise the Big Factor of Conscientiousness. There are 240 items in NEO PI-R. Respondents are asked to read each statement carefully. They are asked to indicate their approval-disapproval on a five-point Likert form of scale where '1' denotes strong disapproval and '5' represents strong approval. Scorings are generated after considering the reversal of negatively-keyed items. Scores are derived for each of the Five Big Factors as well as all sub factors. The NEO PI-R is one of the few personality measurements that have demonstrated a high level of reliability and validity. Reliabilities for the facet scales range from .66 to .92 (reported in the test Manual). Costa and McCrae also report that there is clear evidence of both convergent and discriminant validity. In recent years NEO PI-R has extensively been used in cross-cultural research. It has also been used in organizational settings in India (Lodhi & Deo, 2009).

Measure of Charismatic Leadership. Conger and Kanungo (1998) have developed a standardized measure of charismatic leadership. The measure consists of 20 items. It represents five domains of charisma: strategic vision and articulation, personal risk, sensitivity to the environment, sensitivity to members' needs, and unconventional

behavior (strategy). An example of vision statement reads: I am fond of vision and often bring up ideas about possibilities for the future. An item from the domain of personal risk reads: I engage in activities involving considerable personal risk in pursuing organizational objectives. A sample item from the domain of 'sensitivity to the environment' reads: I recognize the limitation of other members of the organization. Similarly, a sample item from the domain of 'sensitivity to member need' reads: I attempt to influence others by developing mutual liking and respect. An instance from the domain of unconventional behavior (strategy) reads: I exhibit unconventional behavior in order to achieve organizational goals.

Respondents are asked to indicate the extent to which an item is uncharacteristic or characteristic of themselves. They are required to indicate their response on a six-point scale where '1' represents the choice 'very uncharacteristic' while '6' represents the choice 'very characteristic'. Scores are generated for each of five dimensions after considering the reversal of scores for negatively keyed items. The composite score of charismatic leadership is also computed for each individual by summing scores across five domains.

The scale has been extensively used in cross-cultural research. Reliability and validity studies have been reported by Conger and Kanungo (1998). The Cronbach's alpha indicating very high internal consistency range from .76 to .92. (Conger & Kanungo, 1998)

Procedure

The study was conducted in two phases. During Phase 1, employees at managerial levels were contacted individually and consents were obtained for their participation. They were individually administered NEO PI-R. A small number of words/expressions were changed to suite Indian conditions. Rapport was established and data were collected during free-time of an employee. Scores were computed for each of the Big Factors as well as each facet of Big Factors.

Two weeks after the administration of personality test, the measure of charismatic leadership was individually administered. In addition, personal information with respect to each individual along with their demographic features was collected. Scores were obtained for each of five dimensions of charismatic leadership as well as overall leadership.

Appropriate statistical tests were applied to fulfill the objectives of the study.

Results

The purpose of the present investigation is to examine the role of personality in charismatic leadership. Accordingly, the Big Five Personality Factors along with their facets have been included for consideration. However, the setting of the study involves two job categories (junior and senior managers) in two different organizations (nationalized banks and NTPC). Prior to examining the predictive role of personality, group differences are analyzed with the application of analysis of variance.

Group Differences

The Analysis of Variance performed at each of the dimensions of charismatic leadership (vision and articulation, personal risk, sensitivity to environment, sensitivity to members' needs, unconventional strategy) and overall charisma shows a number of interesting features.

Table 1: Analysis of Variance Performed on Dimensions of Charismatic Leadership

Dimensions	Source	df	MS	F
Vision & Articulation	Job Category	1	33.20	1.75
	Organization	1	254.38	13.37**
	Category X Organization	1	9.74	.051
	Error	296	19.09	
Personal Risk	Job Category	1	.00	.00
	Organization	1	69.61	4.0*
	Category X Organization	1	5.97	.34
	Error	296	17.40	
Sensitivity to Environment	Job Category	1	.51	.04
	Organization	1	1492.28	122.87***
	Category X Organization	1	1.72	14
	Error	296	12.75	
Sensitivity to Members' Needs	Job Category	1	18.53	1.63
	Organization	1	185.89	16.33***
	Category X Organization	1	6.53	.57
	Error	296	11.36	
Unconventional Strategy	Job Category	1	10.12	1.04
	Organization	1	76.35	7.81**
	Category X Organization	1	14.43	1.48
	Error	296	9.73	
Overall Charisma	Job Category	1	37.80	.42
	Organization	1	7275.21	81.52***
	Category X Organization	1	3.53	.04
	Error	296	88.25	

* p<.05

** p<.01

*** p<.001

Table 2: Mean Charismatic Leadership Scores on Each Dimension

Dimensions	Groups	Junior Managers		Senior Managers		All	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Vision & Articulation	Bank	33.06	4.3	33.63	4.3	33.24	4.3
	NTPC	28.97	4.5	30.88	4.3	29.58	4.5
	Combined	31.01	4.8	32.25	4.4		
Personal Risk	Bank	12.79	4.1	13.31	4.6	12.96	4.2
	NTPC	11.53	4.1	11.00	4.0	11.36	4.0
	Combined	12.16	4.1	12.16	4.4		
Sensitivity to Environment	Bank	17.56	3.8	17.69	3.7	17.60	3.7
	NTPC	9.56	2.9	9.13	3.9	9.42	3.2
	Combined	13.56	5.2	13.41	5.7		
Sensitivity to Members' Needs	Bank	14.00	3.5	14.38	3.2	14.12	3.4
	NTPC	10.53	3.4	12.00	3.2	11.00	3.4
	Combined	12.26	3.9	13.19	3.4		
Unconventional Strategy	Bank	11.62	2.9	11.75	3.3	11.66	3.0
	NTPC	10.56	3.1	9.06	3.4	10.08	3.3
	Combined	11.09	3.0	10.41	3.6		
Overall Charisma	Bank	89.03	11.4	90.75	12.6	89.58	11.7
	NTPC	71.15	5.7	72.06	7.4	71.44	6.2
	Combined	80.09	12.7	81.41	14.0		

The job category effect is non-significant (see Table 1). Junior managers and senior managers do not differ significantly with respect to any of the dimensions (see Table 2). These groups also do not differ with respect to overall charisma. However, the organizations effect is statistically significant for each of the dimensions as well as overall charisma. As shown by Table 2, bank managers exhibit higher scores than do NTPC managers. This superior performance is not only reflected on each of the components of charisma, but also on the overall charisma.

Correlation Analysis

With a view to examining the association between personality factors and dimensions of charismatic leadership, correlation analyses are carried out. As shown in Table 3, strategic vision is independent of factors of Neuroticism. However, personal risk is related significantly to anger-hostility, $r(298) = .13, p < .05$. As expected, personal risk is negatively associated with depression, $r(298) = -.11, p < .05$. There is significant relation between impulsiveness and personal risk, $r(298) = .17, p < .01$. Sensitivity to environment bears a strong negative relation with impulsiveness as well as vulnerability $r(298) = -.21$ and $-.19, p < .01$ respectively. Big factor of Neuroticism is also negatively correlated with sensitivity to environment, $r(298) = -.11, p < .05$. With respect to sensitivity to members' needs, some interesting features are observed. Anxiety is negatively associated, $r(298) = -.11, p < .05$.

This implies that leaders high on anxiety scores display lower sensitivity to members need. Similar pattern is indicated with respect to depression and self-consciousness $r = -.13$, $p < .05$ and $-.16$, $p < .01$ respectively. Sensitivity to members’ need is also negatively related with Big Factor of Neuroticism, $r(298) = -.15$, $p < .01$. Unusual behavior does not show significant relation with any of the factors except the solitary case of anger-hostility. Anger-hostility is negatively associated with unusual strategy.

Table 3: Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between Facets of Neuroticism and Dimensions of Charismatic Leadership (N = 300)

Facets	Charismatic Dimensions					
	Strategic vision	Personal risk	Sensitivity to environment	Sensitivity to members needs	Unconventional behavior	Overall Charismatic
Anxiety	-.09	-.06	.04	-.11*	-.10	-.12*
Anger-hostility	.00	.13*	.09	-.04	-.11*	.08
Depression	.03	-.11*	-.08	-.13*	.02	.00
Self-consciousness	.00	-.03	-.01	-.16**	-.10	-.11*
Impulsiveness	.06	.17**	-.21**	-.03	.01	.01
Vulnerability	-.09	.03	-.19**	-.09	-.03	-.13*
NEUROTICISM	-.03	.02	-.11*	-.15**	-.09	-.12*

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

When overall charisma is considered, negative associations are shown with anxiety. Self-consciousness and vulnerability, $r(298) = -.12$, $-.11$, $-.13$, $p < .05$ respectively. It implies leaders high on these dimensions indicate less charisma. As expected, there is negative association between Big Factor of Neuroticism and charisma, $r(298) = -.12$, $p < .05$ (see Table 3).

Table 4: Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between Facets of Extraversion and Dimensions of Charismatic Leadership (N = 300)

Facets	Charismatic Dimensions					
	Strategic vision	Personal risk	Sensitivity to environment	Sensitivity to members needs	Unconventional behavior	Overall Charismatic
Warmth	.05	-.03	-.04	.04	-.04	.12*
Gregariousness	.04	.00	.08	.05	-.19**	.13*
Assertiveness	-.07	-.18**	.00	-.15	.18**	-.11*
Activity	-.09	.01	.06	-.01	.06	.00
Excitement-Seeking	.07	-.02	.08	.00	.03	.11*
Positive-Emotions	-.02	.00	.19**	.02	-.03	.05
EXTRAVERSION	.01	-.18**	.09	.01	.08	-.19**

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

In the context of Extraversion, it is shown that strategic vision is unrelated to facets of Extraversion (see Table 4). However, personal risk is negatively related to assertiveness, $r(298) = -.18, p<.01$. Personal risk is also negatively related to Big Factor of Extraversion, $r(298) = -.18, p<.01$. It denotes that leaders high on assertiveness and extraversion indicate lower level of personal risk. Both sensitivity to environment as well as sensitivity to members' needs are unrelated to facets of Extraversion. As expected, assertiveness and use of unconventional behavior (strategy) are significantly correlated, $r(298) = .18, p<.01$. In addition, gregariousness, warmth and excitement seeking are related to overall charisma. The factor of Extraversion is also related to charisma. .

Table 5 depicts correlations between facets of Openness and dimensions of charismatic leadership.

Table 5: Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between Facets of Openness and Dimensions of Charismatic Leadership (N = 300)

Facet	Charismatic Dimensions					
	Strategic vision	Personal risk	Sensitivity to environment	Sensitivity to members needs	Unconventional behavior	Overall Charismatic
Fantasy	.10	-.08	-.11*	.06	.00	.01
Aesthetics	.04	-.03	.08	.03	.09	.08
Feelings	.19**	.06	-.04	.10	-.02	.13*
Actions	-.11*	-.03	-.11*	-.11*	.18**	.09
Ideas	.05	-.21**	-.05	.09	-.12*	-.09
Values	-.02	-.02	-.08	-.13*	.00	-.10
OPENNESS	.09	-.11*	-.10	.02	.04	-.02

* $p<.05$

** $p<.01$

As shown in Table 5, strategic vision is significantly related to feelings, $r(298) = .19, p<.01$. In contrast, strategic vision is negatively related to action, $r(298) = -.11, p<.05$. Furthermore, personal risk is negatively related to ideas, $r(298) = -.21, p<.01$. It is also negatively related to Big Factor of Openness, $r(298) = -.11, p<.05$. Sensitivity to environment is negatively related to both fantasy and action, $r(298) = -.11, p<.05$ and $r(298) = -.11, p<.05$ respectively. Sensitivity to members' needs is negatively related to action as well as values, $r(298) = -.11, p<.05, r(298) = -.13, p<.05$ respectively. Action is positively correlated with unusual behavior, $r(298) = .18, p<.01$ whereas idea is negatively related to unusual strategy $r(298) = -.12, p<.05$.

In the context of overall charisma, it is revealed that overall charisma is independent of facets of Openness except that it is positively associated with feelings, $r(298) = .13, p<.05$.

The relationship of Big Factor of Agreeableness is considered with respect to dimensions of charismatic leadership (see Table 6). It is revealed that strategic vision is positively associated with a number of facets of agreeableness. It is significantly correlated with trust, straight-forwardness, altruism and compliance. For instance, there is high positive relationship between strategic vision and trust, $r(298) = .17, p<.01$. Similarly it is positively associated with compliance, $r(298) = .17, p<.01$. However, personal risk shows highly negative association with each facet of Agreeableness. It also shows negative relation with Big Factor of Agreeableness, $r(298) = -.30, p<.01$.

Table 6: Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between Facets of Agreeableness and Dimensions of Charismatic Leadership (N = 300)

Facet	Charismatic Dimensions					
	Strategic vision	Personal risk	Sensitivity to environment	Sensitivity to members needs	Unconventional behavior	Overall Charismatic
Trust	.17**	-.15**	.06	.10	-.05	.05
Straight-forwardness	.13*	-.16**	.03	.00	-.10	-.04
Altruism	.12*	-.24**	.11*	.11*	-.01	.02
Compliance	.16**	-.23**	.14*	.04	-.11*	.00
Modesty	.00	-.20**	-.22**	-.03	-.02	-.18**
Tender-mindedness	.04	-.13*	.00	.11*	-.03	-.01
AGREEABLE-NESS	.17**	-.30**	.04	.09	-.09	-.04

* p<.05

** p<.01

Sensitivity to environment is positively associated with altruism and compliance, while it is negatively associated with modesty, $r(298) = -.22, p<.01$. Sensitivity to members' needs is positively associated with altruism and tender-mindedness. As expected, there is negative relation between unusual strategy and compliance.

In the context of overall charisma it is shown that overall charisma and modesty are negatively related, $r(298) = -.18, p<.01$.

Table 7 depicts correlations between facets of Conscientiousness and dimensions of charisma. It is shown that strategic vision is significantly associated with competence and dutifulness. It is also associated with Big Factor of Conscientiousness, $r(298) = .12, p<.05$.

Table 7: Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between Facets of Conscientiousness and Dimensions of Charismatic Leadership (N = 300)

Facet	Charismatic Dimensions					
	Strategic vision	Personal risk	Sensitivity to environment	Sensitivity to members needs	Unconventional behavior	Overall Charismatic
Competence	.12*	-.43**	.18**	.12*	.00	-.02
Order	.04	-.10	.28**	.17**	-.18**	.08
Dutifulness	.24**	-.14**	.15**	.24**	-.07	.17**
Achievement-Striving	.06	-.07	.20**	.04	-.06	.07
Self-discipline	.04	-.21**	.16**	.23**	.12*	.11*
Deliberation	.00	.01	.19**	.27**	-.10	.14*
CONSCIENTIOUS-NESS	.12*	-.23**	.30**	.28**	-.07	.14*

* p<.05

** p<.01

Interestingly personal risk is negatively related to facets such as competence, dutifulness and self-discipline. It is also negatively associated with Big Factor of Conscientiousness $r(298) = -.23, p<.01$. Sensitivity to environment is significantly associated with each of the facets of Conscientiousness. It is also related to Big Factor of Conscientiousness, $r(298) = .30, p<.01$. Similarly, sensitivity to members’ needs is significantly associated with all facets of Conscientiousness except with achievement striving. Sensitivity to members’ need is also related to Big Factor of Conscientiousness $r(298) = .28, p<.01$. The correlation analysis with respect to unusual behavior shows that there is negative association between unusual strategy and order whereas there is positive association between unusual strategy and self-discipline, $r(298) = .12, p<.05$.

Overall charisma is found to be related to dutifulness, self-discipline and deliberation. It is also associated significantly with Big Factor of Conscientiousness, $r(298) = .14, p<.05$.

Correlation analysis is geared to examine the association amongst dimensions of charismatic leadership. As expected, each dimension is strongly and positively associated with overall charisma (see Table 8).

Table 8: Inter-correlation amongst Dimensions of Charismatic Leadership

Charismatic Dimensions	1	2	3	4	5
1. Strategic vision					
2. Personal risk	.03				
3. Sensitivity to environment	.15**	-.06			
4. Sensitivity to members’ needs	.41**	.04	.25**		
5. Unconventional behavior	-.07	.09	.11*	.07	
6. Overall Charismatic	.65**	.48**	.47**	.63**	.28**

For example, strategic vision and overall charisma are strongly correlated, $r(298) = .65, p<.01$. Strategic vision is also significantly related with sensitivity to environment and sensitivity to members’ needs. Sensitivity to environment is associated with sensitivity to members’ needs, $r(298) = .25, p<.01$. It is also related to unconventional behavior, $r(298) = .11, p<.05$. Thus, an overall picture of internal consistency is revealed.

Table 9: Step-wise Multiple Regression

Predictors	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
Conscientiousness	.457	.209	.201	11.659	.209	25.846	1	98	.000
Warmth	.515	.265	.250	11.294	.056	7.444	1	97	.008
Gregariousness	.548	.301	.279	11.074	.036	4.880	1	96	.030
Excitement seeking	.576	.331	.303	10.885	.031	4.375	1	95	.039

Note: Dependent Variable: Charismatic Leadership

Finally, the step-wise regression conducted on the outcome variable of charismatic leadership shows interesting features. Conscientiousness, with a correlation of .457, explains 20.9 percent of charismatic leadership. The correlation is increased when three other factors are included. When “warmth” is added, R is .515 and adjusted R² is .250, indicating 25 percent of variance. When gregariousness and excitement-seeking are further included, 30.3 percent of variance is accounted for. Thus, factors of Conscientiousness, warmth, gregariousness, and excitement seeking explain 30.3 percent of variance in charismatic leadership.

Summary of Results

Bank managers report greater scores on each of the components of charismatic leadership (strategic vision, personal risk, sensitivity to environment, sensitivity to members’ needs, unusual of strategy) and on overall charisma.

The correlation analysis shows interesting features. Neuroticism is found to be negatively related with sensitivity to environment, sensitivity to members’ needs and overall charisma. Extraversion is negatively associated with personal risk and related positively to overall charisma. Openness is also negatively related to personal risk. Agreeableness is positively associated with strategic vision, but negatively associated with personal risk. Furthermore, all facets of Agreeableness are negatively related to personal risk. Conscientiousness shows positive association with strategic vision, sensitivity to environment, sensitivity to members’ needs and overall charisma. However, Conscientiousness is negatively related to personal risk. Moreover, a number of facets of Conscientiousness competence, dutifulness and self-discipline are negatively related to personal risk. Finally, it is evinced that each of the dimension of charismatic leadership is strongly associated with overall charisma. An overall picture of internal consistency of dimensions of charisma is depicted.

Finally the regression analysis identifies critical factors of charismatic leadership. The Big Factor of Conscientiousness emerges as a significant factor. In addition, the facets of warmth, gregariousness and excitement seeking (sub-factors of Extraversion) emerge as significant predictors. These four components account for 30.3 percent of variation in charismatic leadership.

Discussion

The purpose of the present investigation was to identify critical predictors of charismatic leadership. Charismatic leadership was defined in terms of an attribution phenomenon. According to this phenomenon, followers’ attribution of charismatic qualities to a leader is jointly determined by the leader’s behavior, expertise, and aspects of the situation. A refined version of the theory was presented by Conger (1989) and by Conger and Kanungo (1998). According to this theory, charismatic leadership includes five major components: Vision and articulation, personal risk, sensitivity to the environment, sensitivity to member needs, and unusual behavior (strategy). Conger and Kanungo’s (1998) measure of charismatic leadership is an effective instrument having robust cross-cultural reliability and validity.

The present investigation operationalized charismatic leadership with the help of Conger and Kanungo’s measure of charismatic leadership. Personality dimensions were measured with the help of Costa and McCrae’s NEO PI(R) measure of Five Big Factors of Personality (Costa & McCrae, 1992). The use of this comprehensive measure generated scores on 35 factors of personality including Big Five Factors of Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. With scores available on these dimensions, it was possible to identify stable predictors of charismatic leadership.

It is shown that the Big Factor of Conscientiousness is a stable predictor of charismatic leadership. Furthermore, facets of warmth, gregariousness, and excitement-seeking (all from Big Factors of Extraversion) emerge as stable predictors. These factors account for approximately 30 percent of variation in charismatic leadership.

The comparison of managers on several dimensions of charismatic leadership also reveals superiority of bank managers. They report higher scores on each of the dimensions (strategic vision, sensitivity to environment, sensitivity to member need, personal risk, and unusual behavior) and on overall charisma. However, there was no difference between junior and senior managers with respect to any of the dimensions of charismatic leadership.

The correlation analysis shows that each of the dimensions is strongly correlated with overall charisma. This is in the expected direction. Neuroticism is negatively related to sensitivity to environment, sensitivity to members' need and overall charisma. Extraversion, Openness and Agreeableness are negatively related to personal risk. All facets of Agreeableness are negatively related to personal risk. However, Agreeableness is associated with strategic vision in a positive direction.

Conscientiousness shows positive association with strategic vision, sensitivity to environment, sensitivity to member need and composite charisma. In contrast, Big Factor of Conscientiousness and sub-factors of this domain such as competence, dutifulness and self-discipline are negatively related to personal risk.

Role of Personality Factors

The main findings summarized are explainable in terms of current conceptualizations and development. First Big Five Factors of Personality Test is an off-used contemporary instrument. The NEO-PI-R was developed to operationalize the five-factor model of personality, a representation of the structure of traits, which was developed and elaborated over the past four decades (Digman, 1990). The five factors represent the most basic dimensions underlying the traits identified in both natural languages and psychological questionnaires.

In recent years, leadership scholars have shown increasing interest in using Big Five Factor taxonomy to facilitate interpretations of results in the massive and confusing literature on leadership (e.g., Goodstein & Lanyon, 1999; Hogan Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). The broad trait categories correspond to many of the specific traits found relevant for leadership emergence, advancement, or effectiveness. Reviews and meta-analyses of studies on the five factors find that most of them are related to leader effectiveness (Bono & Judge, 2004; Judge, Bono, Lllies, & Gerchardt, 2002). In general, effective leaders had higher scores on conscientiousness, extraversion, and openness to learning from experience, and lower scores on neuroticism. However, the consistency was sensitive to the types of organizations.

In the present investigation, Conscientiousness emerges as a stable predictor of charismatic leadership. The facets of warmth, gregariousness and excitement seeking from the category of Extraversion also emerge as reliable predictors.

The examination of the pattern of correlation between charismatic leadership dimensions of Conscientiousness clearly shows positive associations. The Big Factor of Conscientiousness is significantly related to overall charisma as well as components of charisma with solitary exception of personal risk. Although personal risk is one of the components of charismatic leadership along with vision, sensitivity to environment, sensitivity to member needs, and unusual strategy (as represented in the instrument of charismatic leadership), it appears that personal risk has a different connotation in Indian context.

Singh and Krishnan (2005) conducted a study on charismatic leadership in India. The study involved 1,617 responses obtained from 250 managers. The results showed that the construct of leadership contains 44 percent trans-cultural (universal) element. The 56 percent Indian cultural dimensions were operationalized through seven sub-dimensions – “nurturant” (20 percent), “personal touch” (13 percent), “expertise” (7 percent), “simple-living-high-thinking” (7 percent), “loyalty” (4 percent), “self-sacrifice” (3 percent) and “giving model of motivation” (2 percent). It can be conjectured that indigenous elements of personal touch runs counter to personal risk; personal risk is not a representative component of charisma in Indian context.

Digman (1990) also looked into the relationship between charismatic leadership and personality factors. He found that 12% of the variation in charisma (idealized influence and inspirational motivation combined) were explained by Big Five Factors of Personality. Intellectual stimulation explained 5% whereas individualized consideration explained 6% of the variation in charisma. Extraversion was the strongest and most consistent correlate of charismatic leadership.

In the present investigation, facets of warmth, gregariousness and excitement seeking from the Big Factor of Extraversion emerge as stable predictors. It may be indicated that warmth is the seminal element in interpersonal relation. Warm people are friendly and affectionate. They genuinely like people and easily form close attachment to others. Gregariousness denotes longing for togetherness. Gregarious people enjoy the company of others. Excitement seeking is akin to some aspects of sensation seeking high scores feel need for thrills.

The correlation pattern between facets of extraversion and charisma presents a picture consistent with the past research. Positive association between facets of extraversion and dimensions of charisma are indicated.

Fotz and Hauenstein (2007) have shown that extraverts tend to be happier in their jobs and in their lives as a whole, compared to introverts. They experience more positive emotion than do introverts. They freely express their feelings. They also tend to perform better on jobs that require significant interpersonal relation. They have more social skills and more social resources. They have more friends and spend more time in social gathering. These benefits make it likely that extraversion is a strong predictor of effective leadership.

Although a downside of Extraversion involves their impulsive nature because of the facet of “sensation seeking” (Spirling & Persand, 2003), it appears that this aspect of personality plays a facilitative role in personal risk component of charismatic leadership.

Studies stressing the significant relationship between emotional intelligence and effective leadership highlights the importance of social skills (e.g., Goleman, 2000). Goleman (2000) has persuasively argue that effective leaders possess emotional intelligence, which is the ability to recognize and manage emotion in oneself and in others. In fact, some researchers argue that emotional intelligence is more important for effective leadership than either IQ or technical skills (Goleman, 2000). Sociability or extraversion is one of the major competencies included in emotional intelligence. The bulk of research linking emotional intelligence to effective leadership provides evidence on the significance of extraversion in charismatic leadership.

Although conscientiousness is the Big Five trait most consistently related to leadership effectiveness, the other traits are also related to aspects of leadership. Neuroticism is found to be negatively related with charismatic leadership. In the present investigation, neuroticism is found to be negatively associated with sensitivity to environment as well as sensitivity to member need. This is probably true because high scorers on neuroticism are more likely to be negative and pessimistic in their thinking and experience more emotion

that is negative. People high on emotional instability are hyper-vigilant (looking for problems or impending signs of danger). High scores on emotional instability (neuroticism) are also associated health complaints. According to Tamir and Robinson (2004), leaders high on neuroticism are likely to make wrong decisions.

Although past research shows relevance of Openness in the context of leadership, especially with regard to creativity (LePine, Colquinn, & Erez, 2000), no significant relationship is indicated between openness and charismatic leadership. Each of the components of leadership (vision, sensitivity to environment, sensitivity to member need, personal risk, and unusual strategy) is also unrelated to openness.

The discrepancy of the results obtained from the study vis-à-vis western findings can be explained in terms of cultural difference. It can be postulated that openness as a trait is valued more positively in individualistic countries of the West compared with collectivist countries of the East including India.

With respect to Agreeableness, the present investigation also finds no relationship except that agreeableness is significantly associated with vision component of charismatic leadership. Agreeableness has a special significance in the context of team activities (Barrack, Neuber, & Mount, 2007; Bell, 2007). Researchers find that teams do worse when they have disagreeable leaders. Perhaps one bad apple can spoil the whole bunch. However, contrary to the expectation of positive association between openness and charisma, no such evidence is found in the present investigation. The solitary exception involves the positive linkage between vision and agreeableness.

Thus, Conscientious and Extraversion (more specifically, warmth, gregariousness and excitement-seeking) are found to be significant predictor of charismatic leadership. Neuroticism and many of its facets are also negatively correlated with charisma. However, contrary to expectation, no linkage is found between openness and charisma. Only vision component of charisma is related to Agreeableness. While past studies support the findings related to the role of Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Neuroticism, the picture obtained with respect to Openness and Agreeableness needs future probing.

Group Variation

The comparison across organization types shows much difference in a specified direction. Managers in banks show consistently higher scores than NTPC managers with respect to almost all dimensions.

Some researchers have examined the workings of inspirational leadership in banking sectors. Schaubroeck, Lam and Cha (2007) examined inspirational leadership in 218 financial services teams that were branches of a bank in Hong Kong and the United States. They found that inspirational leadership including charismatic leadership produce positive effects by influencing team potency. The model was supported by data in both Hong Kong and the United States. It suggests a convergence in how effective leadership functions in the East and the West.

A seminal element that differentiates banking and NTPC leadership format seems to be the mentoring pattern. Some organizations adopt formal mentoring programme. Mentoring system, one of the initiating launched at NTPC, is for guiding, directing, and counseling young recruits with objectives of enhancing their commitment level. There are more than 350 mentors who help the new entrants in integrating and assimilating the culture and value system of the organization (reported in Robbins, 2009, p. 469)

In contrast to the formal mentoring system, banks rely on informal mentoring – with executives selecting a manager and taking on that employee as a protégé. Informal mentoring appears to be the most effective mentoring relationship.

In the Indian context, the *guru* (teacher) imparting *shiksha* to the *shishya* (disciple) is a well-established practice. Transfer of knowledge, skills and experience to the *shishya* is also very well documented in the great epic, *Mahabharat*, wherein the story of *Arjun*, the powerful warrior, mastering the art of archery from his *guru Dronacharya* stands testimony to learning through the *guru-chela* tradition. The superiority of bank managers may signal, atleast in part, the significance of informal mentoring process.

Major Implications

The empirical nature of the study provides output both in theoretical as well as applied terms. Theoretically, the study identifies the strong predictors of charismatic leadership. It is clearly shown Conscientiousness is a strong predictor of charismatic leadership. In addition, some aspects of Extraversion and Neuroticism are also strong correlates of charisma.

These findings impart some salient features of application. It suggests the specific nature of leadership training programme that needs to be promoted. Since almost all facets of conscientiousness is positively associated with charismatic leadership, interventions geared to develop competence, order, dutifulness, achievement-striving, self-discipline and deliberation are strongly recommended for leadership effectiveness.

In addition, negative emotionality is to be controlled. Findings clearly evince the adverse effects of anxiety, anger-hostility, depression, self-consciousness, impulsively and vulnerability. The positive role of yoga, meditation and other self-regulatory process in organization is strongly documented.

An effective approach to curbing negative emotionality involves the attempts to induce positive emotions (instead of reducing negative emotions). Fredrickson (2001) has developed a robust broaden-and-build theory of emotion. According to Fredrickson (2001), positive emotions help to build positive emotions and to broaden the range of activity. Thus, it is possible to curb neuroticism and develop positive emotions in organizational context.

Furthermore, the induction of extraversion is also needed. On the part of the leader, a high level of social skill is needed for interpersonal transaction. However, as highlighted by the present study the facets of warmth (showing affection and kindness), gregariousness (togetherness) and excitement seeking may be given special attention in leadership training programmes.

The other implication concerns NTPC. Since managers in this organization lag behind, leadership training program in general and personality development programme in particular is strongly recommended.

Although results pertain to Banks and NTPC, the expected generality of the findings imparts the appropriateness of interventions in all types of organization. It may be asserted that an effective programme of elevating atleast Conscientious dimensions would induce many positive changes in leadership.

References:

1. Barrack, S., Neuber, M. & Mount, P. (2007). Team configuration. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92 (3), 885-892.
2. Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*, New York: Free Press
3. Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In M.M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and direction* (pp. 49-88). San Diego, CA: Academic Press

4. Beatty, K. & Quinn, L. (2002). Strategic command: taking the long view for organizational success. *Leadership in Action*, 22 (2), May/June, 3-7
5. Bell, S. T. (2007). Deep-level composition variables as predictors of team performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92 (3), 595-615.
6. Bono, J. E. & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89 (5), 901-910.
7. Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership* (2nd edition). New York: Harper and Row
8. Conger, J. A. (1989). *The charismatic leader: Behind the mystique of exceptional leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
9. Conger, J. A., (1999). Charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations: An Insider's perspective on these developing streams of research. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10 (2), 145-179.
10. Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. (1987), Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organisational settings, *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 637-47.
11. Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*. 13 (3), 471-482
12. Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. (1994). Charismatic leadership in organizations: Perceived behavioral attributes and their measurements, *Journal of Organisational Behavior*, 15, 439-452
13. Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. New Delhi: Sage Publications
14. Costa, P. T. & McCrae, R. R. (1980). *Still stable after all these years: Personality as a key to some issues in adulthood and old age*. In P. B. Baltes & O. G. Brim, (Eds.). *Life span development and behavior* (3rd. Ed.) (pp. 65-102). New York, NY: Academic Press.
15. Costa, P.T., & McCrae, R.R. (1992). *NEO PI-(R). Professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.
16. Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 41, 417-440.
17. Fotz, R. J., & Hauenstein, M. D. (2007). Pattern and variable approaches in leadership emergence and effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, March, 347-355.
18. Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, 56, 218-226.
19. Gill, R. (2006). *Theory and practice of leadership*. New Delhi: Sage
- Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative "description of personality": The Big-Five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59 (6), 1216-1229
20. Goleman, D. (2000). Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review*, 81, 78-90.
21. Goodstein, L. D., & Lanyon, R. I. (1999). Application of personality assessment to the work place: A review. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 13, 291-322.
22. Hambrick, D. C., & Mason, P. (1984). Upper echelons: The organization as a reflection of its top managers. *Academy of Management Review*, 9, 193-206.
23. Heracleous, L. & Klaering, L.A. (2014). Charismatic leadership and rhetorical competence. *Group and Organization Management*, 1-31.

24. Hogan, R. J., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about personality: Leadership and effectiveness. *American Psychologist*, 49, 493-504.
25. Hollander, E. P. (1979). Leadership and social exchange process. In G. Gergen, M.S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 103-118). New York: Winston-Wiley.
26. House, R.J. (1977). *A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership in leadership: The cutting edge*. Chicago: Southern Illinois University Press.
27. House, R. J., & Podsakoff, P. M. (1994). Leadership effectiveness: Past perspectives and future directions for research. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational behavior: The state of the science* (pp. 45-82). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
28. John, O. P., An;eitner, A. & Ostendorf, F. (1988). The lexical approach to personality. *European Journal of Personality*, 2, 171-203.
29. Johnson, G. & Scholes, K. (2002). *Exploring corporate strategy*, (6th Edition). Harlow: Pearson Education
30. Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Illies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 765-780
31. Kantabutra, S. & Avery, G. C. (2007). Vision effects in customer and staff satisfaction: An empirical investigation. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 28 (3), 209-229.
32. Kuhn, T. (1976). *The structure in scientific revolution*. Chicago: University Press.
33. LePine, J. A., Colquain, J. A., Erez, A. (2000). Adaptability in changing. *Personnel Psychology*, 53, 563-595.
34. Lodhi, P. H. & Deo, S. (2009). Personality. In F. M. Sahoo (Ed.) *Behavioral issues in ageing*. New Delhi: Concept
35. McCrae, R. R & John, O. (1992). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. *Journal of Personality*, 60 (2), 174-214.
36. Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The nature of managerial work*. New York: Harper & Row.
37. Mobbs, B. (2004). Linking the balanced scorecard to the [EFQM] excellence model. *Paper presented at the 'Quest for Excellence' Conference*, Quality Award Secretariat and Department of Economic Development, Dubai, UAE, and the British Quality Foundation, Dubai, UAE, March 15.
38. Nelson, D. L., Quick, J. C., & Khandelwal, P. (2009). *Organizational behavior*. Delhi: Cengage Learning
39. Neyer, F.J. (2000). *How does personality influence social relationships and choices of life patterns?*. Paper presented at the 10th European Conference on Personality, July 16-20, 2000, Cracow, Poland.
40. Northouse, P.P. (2004). *Leadership: theory and practice*, (3rd edition), London: Sage Publications.
41. Oreg, S. & Berson, Y. (2015). Personality and charismatic leadership in context. *Resonal Psychology*, 68, 49-77.
42. Pawar, B. S., & Eastman, K. K. (1997). The nature and implications of contextual influences on transformational leadership: A conceptual examination. *Academy of Management Review*, 22, 88-109.

43. Pervin, L. A, Cervone, D., John, O. P. (2005). *Personality: Theory and research* (9th Edition). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley
44. Petzinger, T. (1995). *Hard landing*. New York: Times Books
45. Phares, E. J. (1991). *Introduction to psychology* (3rd. Ed.) New York: Harper Collins Publishers
46. Pickering, A. D. & Gray, J. A. (2001). Dopamine, appetitive reinforcement, and the neuropsychology of human learning: an individual differences approach. In A. Elias & A. Angleitner (Eds.). *Advances in individual differences research*. (pp. 113-149). Lengerich, Germany: PABST Science Publishers
47. Robbins, S. P., Judge, T. A., & Sanghi, S. (2009). *Organizational behavior* (13th Edition). Delhi: Prentice Hall of India
48. Rowe, D. (1989). *Personality theory and behavioral genetics: Contribution and issues*. In D. Buss & N. Cantor (Eds.). *Personality psychology. Recent trends and emerging directions*. (pp. 294-307). New York: Springer-Verlag
49. Ryckman, R. (1982). *Theories of personality* (2nd Edition.). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole
50. Schaubroeck, S. S., Lam, S. & Cha, S. E. (2007). Embracing transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92 (4), 1020-1030
51. Schlender, B. (1997, May 26). On the road with Chairman Bill, *Fortune*, p.81
52. Shamir, B. (1992). Attribution of influence and charisma to the leader: The romance of leadership revisited. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22 (5), 386-407
53. Shamir, B. (1995). Social distance and charisma: Theoretical notes and an explanatory study. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6 (1), 19-47
54. Singh, N., & Krishnan, V. R. (2005). Towards understanding transformational leadership in India: A grounded theory approach. *Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective*, 9 (2), 5-17
55. Spirling, L. Z., & Persaud, E. (2003). Extraversion as a risk factor. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 42 (2), 130
56. Stiles, P. (2001). The impact of the board on strategy: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Management Studies*, 38 (5), 627-650.
57. Tamir, M. & Robinson, M. D. (2004). Knowing good from bad: The paradox of neuroticism, negative affect and evaluative processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87 (6), 918-925
58. Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organizations*, New York: Free Press
59. Yukl, G. (2011). *Leadership in organizations* (Seventh edition). New Delhi: Pearson
60. Yukl, G. A. & VanFleet, D. D. (1982). Cross-situational, multimethod research on military leader effectiveness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 30, 87-108
61. Zaccaro, S. J. & Banks, D. J. (2001). Leadership, vision, and organizational effectiveness. In S. J. Zaccaro and R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *the nature of organizational leadership: understanding the performance imperatives confronting today's leaders*. San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass
62. Zaleznik, A. (1990). The leadership gap. *The executive*, 4, 7-22