

Charismatic Leadership and Power

Tuomo Takala

Abstract

The purpose of this article is to consider the concepts of charisma, power, and leadership, and illustrate these phenomena by putting forth some examples: e.g. Finnish leadership, and on the other hand, the dark side of charisma, Osama bin Laden. The nature of charisma and charismatic leadership is nowadays quite popular area of research. For instance, leadership scholars have discussed the importance of impression management. It has been suggested that charismatic leaders engage in impression management techniques in order to bolster their image of competence, increasing subordinate compliance and faith in them. Or it is reported that charismatic leaders can be distinguished from other leaders by their use of articulation and impression management practices to inspire followers in pursuit a vision. Charismatic leadership in organizations has been recently focused in several organizational studies even if the basic conceptual as well as empirical work has been done in the field from 70's until now. Origins of charisma discourse dates back to Weber. In general, there is nowadays a tendency to focus on personality issues, like charisma of the leader, in relation to organizational contexts more often compared to earlier times. At the same time dramaturgical perspectives on leadership and charisma have emerged, and fantasies, intuitions, visions and other mental activities have been recognized to have role also in leadership.

In this article the method called "interpretative study of concepts" developed by Takala and Lämsä is used. Results: e.g., a practical implications concerning manager's leadership training are put forth.

Key words: Charisma, Business Ethics, Leadership, Management.

1. Introduction

The nature of charisma and charismatic leadership is nowadays quite popular area of research. Leadership scholars often have discussed the importance of impression management. It is suggested that charismatic leaders engage in impression management techniques in order to bolster their image of competence, increasing subordinate compliance and faith in them. Or it is reported that charismatic leaders can be distinguished from other leaders by their use of articulation and impression management practices to inspire followers in pursuit a vision (see Gardner and Avolio, 1999). The common core of many overlapping approaches lies in their viewing leadership as the conveyance of values and meaning by means of exemplary actions, as well in the articulation of inspiring vision. The basic assumption is that this kind of leadership transforms the needs, values, preferences, desires and aspirations of followers from their individual interests to collective interests, so that followers become highly committed to the mission of the leader and are prepared to make sacrifices in the mission (see Steyreyr, 1998).

The most current theory on leadership considers leadership *as a process* in which leaders are not seen as individuals in charge of followers, but as members of a community of practice. A community of practice is defined as "people united in a common enterprise who share a history and thus certain values, beliefs, ways of talking, and ways of doing things". This definition may be thought of as a variation of organizational culture. These authors believe that the vast majority of leadership theories and research has been based on the idea that leadership involves a leader and a group of followers, and dominance, motivation, and influence are the primary vehicles of leadership.

This has been a primary focus of research to date. Building on and modifying this view, Drath and Palus (1994) propose a theory of leadership as a process. Instead of focusing on *a leader and followers*, they suggest studying the social process that happens with groups of people who are engaged in an activity together. With this view, leadership is not defined as the characteristics of a

leader, but instead leadership is the process of coordinating efforts and moving together as a group. This group may include a leader, per se, but the dynamics are dramatically different than traditional leadership theories have suggested. People, therefore, do not need to be motivated and dominated. Instead, everyone involved in the activity is assumed to play an active role in leadership (see Appelbaum, Leroux and Hebert, 1999).

According to Conger and Canungo (1996) the charismatic leadership role is effective when the leader behaviours are motivated by *altruistic* motive. At any given point in time, it is possible for the charismatic leader, to be motivated by one or more needs such as the needs for affiliation, power, and achievement. However, regardless of the need that operates as the motive, the leader's effectiveness will ultimately depend on whether the behaviour is manifested by that need is a reflection of and is guided on whether the behaviour is manifested by that need is a reflection of and is guided by overarching altruistic need. According to Rushton (1982), for example, altruism means pursuit of the good of others, whether motivated by self-centred or other-centred interest, or whether by disinterest or a sense of duty. In such definitions of altruism, unselfishness is not the core issue. The *result* of the action is the key. Does it really matter whether or not a person acts from self-interest, if the result of the action is morally praiseworthy? In our view, it does. Society or personal relationships without altruism would lead to disaster in the long run. Social intercourse needs to be based on both altruistic and egoistic actions, in the right proportions.

In a discussion about altruism, it is difficult to avoid another central ethical term, egoism. Rushton's (1982) above description of altruism approaches egoistic thinking and, thus, blurs the usage of the concepts of altruism and egoism.

The following two definitions describe the concept of egoism:

"Everyone ought to concern himself with his welfare alone." (Emmons, 1969)

"Everyone ought exclusively to pursue his own interests." (Williams, 1973)

Altruism is often defined in relation to egoism. The term *egoism* is ordinarily used to mean exclusive concern with satisfying one's own desires: getting what one wants (Machan 1998, p. 192). In a sense, egoism can be regarded as the opposite of altruism. According to Blum (1998), however, these two terms need not be opposed; they can be mutually enhancing. Blum argues that persons with the most secure sense of self and self-worth are frequently very altruistic.

Although the definitions of altruism differ in their emphasis of different aspects of the concept, the main features of altruism as we understand it, can be summarised as follows:

Altruism is action

- which contributes to the well-being of others
- without expectation of personal benefits.

In my opinion, what makes altruism such a difficult conception is the attention to the motive of the action. Could it even be possible that the whole idea of altruism is impossible in real life, that altruism is just a concept created for philosophical discussion? There are actually some views which argue that behind all beneficent action there lies a pursuit of self-benefit, whether conscious or unconscious. Blum (1998, p. 20), however, sees an important difference between being *aware* of the satisfaction one derives from altruistic pursuits and being *motivated* by that satisfaction.

The purpose of this article is to consider the concepts of charisma, power and leadership, and illustrate these phenomena by putting forth some examples; e.g. Finnish leadership, and on the other hand, the dark side of charisma, Osama bin Laden.

2. Method used in the article

'Methodology' can be understood in a limited sense to mean the various kinds of methods used for gathering data (Hirsjärvi and Hurme, 1985). Interpretative research can be divided into two main groups based on the nature of the data. The underlying idea is a classification into naturally occurring data and data collected only for the purposes of a given study. In this article I will use method called "interpretative study of concepts" developed by Takala and Lämsä (Takala and Lämsä, 2001). A common feature in interpretative research based on naturally occurring data is

that the data exist regardless of the researcher, and the researcher does not interact with the producer of the data. The following types of interpretative research belong to this category:

- Interpretative study of concepts: The data are written texts about concepts.
- Interpretative study based on other written textual data: The data are written texts not specifically concerned with definitions of concepts; e.g. life histories, biographies, letters, diaries.
- Interpretative study based on other symbolic data: The data are visual and material; e.g. pictures, paintings, cartoons, logos, furniture, buildings etc.

In interpretative empirical research, on the other hand, the data are empirical, collected specifically for the purposes of the study.

- Empirical interpretative research based on interviews: The data consist of interviews done for the study. The researcher always interacts with those who are interviewed.
- Empirical interpretative research based on observation: The data are constructed through observation and gathered only for the research at hand. The researcher usually interacts with those who are observed.

A significant number of studies in the field of management research utilise an empirical material, such as interviews or observations. This kind of interpretative empirical research and its data are based on the researcher's field work. In other words, the researcher sets out to the field and gathers the data that she or he then interprets. The data collection process is usually based on the researcher's interaction with those in the field, and the data are gathered only for a particular study. The idea in grounded theory according to Glaser and Strauss (1967), for example, is to collect data in the field and then inspect the gathered data to see whether any theory could be developed from patterns found in the data. On the other hand, the researcher's objective may be to describe and interpret a concept or concepts, and such interpretation always has to rely on some kind of sources as well. If we interpret a concept presented in a textual source, in written texts by other researchers or in the professional literature and journals of management and organisations, then we are dealing with an interpretative study of concepts.

Hence, the data in *the interpretative study of concepts consist of other authors' written texts and the definitions of concepts in those texts*. Interpretative research based on naturally occurring data utilises other kinds of data as well, which differentiates it from the interpretative study of concepts as we have defined it. Such data may include diaries, life histories, biographies, advertisements, pictures, logos, TV programmes etc. In one respect, however, these data resemble the data in the interpretative study of concepts: namely, the researcher does not interact with the original producer of the data; that is, the data were created regardless of the research and the researcher.

The interpretative study of concepts, thus, refers to research that emphasises the interpretation and further development of concepts and their definitions as well as conceptual systems. In this method the data could also be described as 'mute', because they do not enable personal contact between the researcher and other people, as is usually the case in empirical interpretative research. In the interpretative study of concepts the researcher faces a 'mute' text which needs to be made to 'talk'. This is linked with a constant problem with methods, namely, the problem of meaning. The researcher must be able to detect some thematized meanings from a certain aspect of the mute data. The data themselves are mute; they could be thought of as an ignorant respondent to whom the research questions need to be posed from a special thematized angle.

Since the interpretative study of concepts is concerned with written sources, it could also be called '*desk research*'. The term emphasises the methodical aspect of this research method with respect to data gathering. The researcher has not set out to the field to interview or to observe, but has collected written material which she or he then tries to interpret at her or his desk. If this process is not carried out successfully, the whole study may end up as a summary of the data. The report would only be a compilation of associated text passages from the books. For example, the researcher may have listed and described numerous definitions of the concept of 'organizational ethics' by different organisation researchers, without considering the meanings these definitions convey or the way they are associated with one another. So, several texts concerning ethics, and business ethics, are used as research "data" (Takala & Lämsä, 2001).

3. The Concept of Charisma

Charismatic leadership in organizations has been recently focused in several organizational studies (like Steyrer, 1998; and Gardner, Avolio, 1998), even if the basic conceptual (Bryman, 1992, Cagner and Kanungo, 1987) as well as empirical (like House, 1977) work has been done in the field from 70's until now. Origins of charisma discourse dates back to Weber (1964). In general, there is nowadays a tendency to focus on personality issues, like charisma of the leader, in relation to organizational contexts more often compared to earlier times. At the same time dramaturgial perspectives on leadership and charisma have emerged, and fantasies, intuitions, visions and other mental activities have been recognized to have role also in leadership (Aaltio-Marjosola, Lehtinen, 1998).

The interrelationships between the leader's inner world and its outcomes have effect on the nature of organizational culture and even strategic choices made in the company, as pointed out in many investigations. Among the outcomes are so called "dark sides" of personality issues of leaders on organizations, as emphasized in the psychodynamic approaches (Kets de Vries, 1984).

Partly the discussion on charisma in leadership and organizations has carried the tone of danger. Charisma has been seen as politically dubious characteristics of individuals in the society and it has been searched the psychological mechanisms which lead to the emergence of charismatic leaders and their attraction to the people that follow them. For instance, Lindholm has studied extremely destructive charismatic leaders like Hitler, Manson and Jim Jones and their impact on the society (Downtown, 1973, Conger, 1990). Totalitarian aspects of societies and truth manipulation practiced by charismatic leaders are seen negative and undesired consequences of it at societal level. Images of charismatic leaders are coloured by these gloomy examples taken from the history. At the same time charisma is stigmatized by the gloria given to a few and rare. Charisma can serve not only the personal interests of the leader, but also the larger society (Allert, Chatterjee, 1997; and Robbins, 1992, p. 151). Selfishness and narcissism of a charismatic leader may come together and lead to undesired consequences, whereas unselfishness and sacrificing features of a charismatic leader can be seen to cause desired and admirable consequences. The nature of charisma is not very rational. It works between the leaders and the followers, it is evidently not very rational by nature, not based on authority of the leader given to him only because his or her overwhelming knowledge or experience but more based on the personal features of the one. Accepting charisma, from the followers point of view, can be seen as dubious and showing the tendency to become impressed by others, a kind of sign of weakness and subordination. Charisma of the leaders, and its acceptance on behalf of the followers might leave space for "irrational" forces in the society is the message of suspicious approach towards charismatic leadership. This gives extra space for persuasion and manipulation tendency in charismatic leadership processes. Charismatic followership (Aaltio-Marjosola, 1996) can be seen crucial in understanding the charismatic leadership and the processes where it takes place.

Overall, discussion on charisma has been held from the beginning of the century, but even the ancient philosophers like Plato (see Takala, 1998) talked about charisma, society and leadership. Political leaders were focused. Recent developments have brought insights that emphasize the organizational contexts of charismatic leadership, as well as its consequences on the organizations and followers. It looks as if charismatic leadership comes in question especially when visionarity, transformational role and emotionality of leadership are explored.

Charisma, in terms used by Max Weber, means literally "the gift of grace". It is used by Weber to characterize self-appointed leaders followed up by people who are in distress and who need to follow the leader because they believe him to be extraordinarily qualified. The charismatic leaders' actions are enthusiastic, and in such extraordinary enthusiasm a way is given to fraternization and exuberant community sentiments. For this reason, charismatic heroes and prophets are viewed as truly revolutionary forces in history (see Gerth & Mills, 1964). Weber emphasizes that the charismatic leader is self-ordained and self-styled. The foundation for this self-styling is the charismatic leader's "mission". He sees his role and actions to be his destiny. The role of a follower is to acknowledge this destiny, and the authority of genuine charisma is derived from the duty of the followers to recognize the leader (ibid). The very nature of charismatic authority is unstable;

this is because the source of charisma is continuously "moving on". It will never be stable and unchanging.

As Weber (1964) states, charismatic leadership usually arises in times of crisis when the basic values, institutions, and legitimacy of the organization are brought into question. Genuine charisma is connected with something "new". And in extraordinary situations this "new" thing calls forth a charismatic authoritarian structure so that charisma, at least temporarily, leads to actions, movements, and events which are extraordinary, not routine, and outside the sphere of everyday life. The evocation of pure charisma and charismatic leadership always leads at least temporarily away from the world of everyday life; it rejects or transcends routine life. Because pure charisma and charismatic leadership conflict with the existing, the established order, they work like a catalyst within an organization. But charisma is the specifically creative force in an organization only briefly before being unavoidably transformed or routinized into some more solid form.

The legitimacy of charisma and charismatic leadership is sociologically and psychologically attributed to the belief of the followers and is not so much the quality of the leader. The leader is in this respect important because he can "charismatically" evoke this sense of belief and can thereby demand obedience. Weber thought that the unavoidable fate of charisma is routinization and institutionalization. Pure charisma is personal, direct, radical and extraordinary. The authority of charisma is based on belief, after which the charismatic leadership as a movement is successful, then charisma becomes ordinary; charismatic leadership becomes routinized, depersonalized, and deradicalized. Therefore, the nature of belief may also be transformed.

Plato's view of leadership, as a normative standpoint, was that a leader must be a man of power with a sincerely truth-seeking vision. This point of view comes close to the Weberian concept of charisma discussed above. Plato saw that a leader must have charisma, the gift of grace, to be successful in his actions. Without it a leader is not able to do his job, to be the head of an organization. And this charisma is something mystical which cannot be obtained by force or by training. It is of divine origin (Takala, 1998).

These early developments of charisma and charismatic leadership have guided understandings in the field until now pointing the individual characteristics of the phenomena. Charisma is based on the aura of the exceptional quality of the leader and does not have its origins in the prototypical. The prototypical is downright "anti-charismatic" because it corresponds to normative expectations, to what is anticipated (Steyrer, 1998). Recent discussion on charisma has dealt more with the organizational context of using the charismatic way of leading and the processes of charismatic leadership between the leaders and the led.

During the last 15 years research has been done in the area of charisma in leadership. According to Steyrer (1998, p. 807) charismatic leadership has been explored in different frames, like in comparing management and leadership, in comparing transformational and transactional leadership and in the analysis of charisma phenomenon. Examining leadership in terms of its dark sides for the organization and for the followers has triggered perspectives with origins of psychoanalysis, focused on questions on what is the impact of charismatic leadership influences on the followers and on the organization.

Leadership theories can be divided into *transactional* and *transformational* ones. In transactional approach leaders are seen as people who guide and motivate their followers in the direction of established goals by clarifying their role and task requirements. There is also another type of leader who inspires followers to transcend their own self-interests for the good of the organization and who is capable of having a profound and extraordinary effect on his or her followers. Among the leaders, who can be called as transformational ones, are charismatic leaders like Mother Teresa and Lee Iacocca. They use their personal abilities to transform their followers values by raising the sense of importance and value of the tasks (Robbins, 1992, p. 151). The inspirationality of leadership function is emphasized in these approaches. In 1980's and 1990's it has been done research on the area.

Consider a dominant leadership theory of the last ten years, transformational or visionary leadership. James M. Burns coined the term "transformational leadership" in 1978 in reaction to the "transactional" leadership of the previous two decades. Burns and others criticized the leadership theories and contingency models of the 1970s and 1980s for being contractual, mechanical,

and promoting procedures over purpose. These observers argued the need for a leadership that would be unifying and encouraging from the heart rather than merely utilitarian. It has been difficult for the potential-leader in-the-trenches to distinguish between the transformational leadership of today and the charismatic, great man, "leaders are born not made" theory of old. Attempts to clarify this distinction by focusing on concepts such as common vision, core values, and empowerment have only clouded the issue. Too often, the examples given evoke the traditional perceptions described earlier. Creating and communicating a common vision seem to many to be a task beyond comprehension, let alone completion. The ability to inspire others via value-related activities or empowerment appears to be largely a function of personality and charisma. When Jack Welch, the transformational leader of GE, comments on the subject, he suggested as if the concept of leadership and the character of the leader are one and the same: Good business leaders create a vision, articulate the vision, passionately own the vision, and relentlessly drive it to completion. Above all else, though, good leaders are open. They go up, down, and around their organization to reach people. They don't stick to the established channels. They're informal. They're straight with people. They make a religion out of being accessible. They never get bored telling their story (Appelbaum, Leroux, Hebert).

Characteristics that differentiate charismatic leaders from noncharismatic ones are seen by Robbins (1992, p. 151) self-confidence, complete confidence in their judgment and ability, a vision, idealized goal that proposes a future better than the status quo, strong convictions in that vision, willingness to take high risks and engage in self-sacrifice to achieve their vision, behaviour out of the ordinary as well as radical change taking instead of caretakers of the status quo. Prototypicality is out of charismatic leadership, because it corresponds to normative expectations, to what is anticipated. Charisma is based on the aura of the exceptional/exemplary quality of a leader (Steyrer, 1998, p. 811). In general, leadership is that part of executive action that is directly attributed to the inner life of the leader, to her personal vision, her imagination and fantasies. The self-confidence that she manifests and her ability to impress and to persuade others rely on certain theatricality (Lapierre, 1991, p. 72).

The case of Finnish Leadership

Let us take an example and consider the phenomenon of Finnish leadership, specifically from the viewpoint of charismatic leadership. According to Kostamo (2004), the history of the Finns offers a relevant context in which to examine the particular features of Finnish leadership. The so-called Winter War, fought in 1939-40 against the Soviet Union, was a major historical event which moulded our national spirit and also shaped our leadership styles. There is a significant relationship between Finnish independence and World War II. The fact that Finland was able to retain her sovereignty as a result of the war, in contrast to many other small countries, has been considered a miracle by many. However, the country was obligated to pay heavy war indemnities to the Soviet Union. The whole nation joined in this massive effort, which further strengthened the national spirit. Nowadays Finland is a modern information society, an industrialised country with large metal, pulp and paper industries, and also a leader in ICT technology.

All this recent history contributes to the phenomenon of Finnish leadership. In his book *The Unknown Soldier*, Vainö Linna portrays a "good" leader in the Finnish sense. Lieutenant Koskela is a man of honour with inborn skills of leadership. His leadership style could be called "leading amidst his followers". He is "one of the guys", not a superior officer above the ranks. And he certainly has charisma: his followers' bindings to him are based on emotion, not on formal status. As a leader he is able to build trust and commitment.

Koskela is an archetype of the Finnish leader. Other charismatic figures in Finnish history include Field Marshal Mannerheim, wartime commander-in-chief of the Finnish army, and President Kekkonen, who led the country for a record 25 years. Both are good examples of Finnish masculine charisma.

Still, this kind of role model could well be problematic for modern leaders. The archetype of a "Great Warrior" might pave the road for an authoritative model of leading. Finnish leaders are known for their straightforward leadership style, which is often referred to as "management by

perkele". The phrase contains a swearword in the Finnish language, implying that in the extreme this style of leading can mean rude and commanding management practices.

4. The Concept of power

Where the power lies ? This is a good question. Appelbaum, Hebert and Leroux (2004) have studied the relation between empowerment and power. They state, that the first step in gaining insight into the concept of empowerment in the workplace is to examine the notion of power itself and how it influences the process of empowerment, be it from the perspective of organizational leadership or from the perspective of the employees. In the competitive world, individuals continually strive for power and control over their environment. It is the most fundamental and most easily recognized of primal needs. There is never enough of it without it we feel powerless. Acquiring power is in everything we say, do, and read. Power has always been at the center of human motivation. It can even affect the psyche of a nation. Whole cultures are affected by the need to feel powerful. People seek anything that gives them a greater sense of power and Rosabeth Moss-Kanter's studies revealed that, "When people feel powerless, they behave in petty ways. They become rule minded, and are over-controlling because they are trying to grab hold of some little piece of the world that they do control and then over-manage it to death". The message for leaders is simple. All people to some degree crave power and prestige. We have an innate need to feel powerful. Anything that makes us feel powerless is a destructive force. Once acquired, power not only will be protected, but enlarged, if possible. Power is not in a steady state of equilibrium.

I will agree with Appelbaum, Leroux and Hebert (2004), who state that power is believed to be exercised in several dimensions. Power is exercised, in *the first dimension*, by using various resources to influence the outcome of decision-making processes, in *the second dimension*, by controlling access to those processes, and, in *the third dimension*, through *hegemonic* processes, which means the legitimization of power through cultural and normative assumptions.

The first dimension rests on the assumption that power is mobilized only in the face of conflict and opposition. Thus, the control of at least some of the resources associated with the first dimension of power remains with existing power holders. Moreover, there is little discussion about how resources related to either the value created by empowerment, or the incentives for increased effort and responsibility should be assessed and/or distributed. Some typical features of this power conceptualization:

- Power over the individuals
- Controlling the subordinates
- Suppressing and neglecting the conflict

Most definitions of power, in the first dimension, including an element indicating that power is the capability of one social actor to overcome resistance in achieving a desired objective or result. For example, Dahl (1957) defined power as a relation among social actors in which one social actor, A, can get another social actor B, to do something that B would not otherwise have done.

Although power is a tricky issue to measure, it is a typical feature of this position. Researchers using this kind of approach often try to assess power, and try to estimate and diagnose the effects and results of using power (Pfeffer, 1981).

The second dimension can be called a position of "structural power".

a) Radical weberian approach: Power is tightly connected with structures. Regards conflict as an ubiquitous and disruptive motor force propelling changes in society in general and in organization in particular. Conflict may suppressed feature of a social system, not always evident at the level of empirical "reality". Regards power as an integral, unequally distributed, zero-sum phenomena, associated with a general process of social control. Society in general and organisations in particular are seen as being under the control of ruling interest groups which exercise their power through various norms of ideological manipulation, as well as the more visible forms of authority relations.

b) Traditional marxian position stressing the conflict between work and capital, and opposite classes acting in the society. Power is seen connected with and emanating from hegemonic

class – interests, and is seen as a form of capitalistic exploitation of work-force (see Burrell and Morgan, 1979).

The third dimension, through its grounding in *critical theory*, acknowledges that power is always connected with the conflict. The third dimension of power assumes that increased communication promotes organizational priorities by instilling shared conceptions of these goals among subordinates (Hardy and Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1998). Managerial control is reinforced through the language of the team effort. Individuals who are opposing e.g. change management processes are often “delegitimized” by being labeled as pejorative terms. In this way, power exercising can be viewed as a professional practice in the management of meaning to enhance the legitimacy of organizational goals and to influence behavior unobtrusively. By managing meaning and using power to create the perception that organizational and employee interests converge. The stronger such unobtrusive, cultural controls are, the less likely organizational norms will be transgressed, and the more comfortable managers will feel in delegating power (see Appelbaum, Leroux, Hebert, 2004).

Critical theorist Alvesson (2003) states that most literature on leadership is broadly seen as a solution to a variety of problems. But leadership in itself, not just “bad leadership” *a la* Hitler, can be seen as a problem. As ideologies and social practices, the negative consequences of management and leadership should be adjudicated as well (p. 171). Management becomes, according to this contrasting picture, a system for the production of subordinated, dependent individuals. Leadership is a matter of creating subordination and dependence on the superior, supplying ideas, values and visions. Also charismatic leadership can be problematic, especially matters dealing with the dark charisma are seen severe.

The fourth dimension of power can be called as postmodern perspective. Postmodern writers think that power is fragmented around the organization. No one has privilege to own it. Leaders have power over their followers but followers have power over them, too. Power is interactive relationship between different organizational actors. The fourth dimension of power also draws attention to the limits of power.

Foucauldian perspective, which labels a fourth dimension of power, would acknowledge that practices that constitute business, e.g empowerment, could result in some positive experiences for some individuals. If, power relations stimulate “a positive sense of self-discipline by transforming individuals into subjects who secure their sense of identity, meaning, and reality through participating in [certain] practices” (see Appelbaum, Leroux and Hebert, 2004).

The important point is the problem of human agency in Foucault's analysis. It can be seen arising from his assumption that we are moving from the *power* based on the imposition of monarchical will to that based on the discursive discipline (see Newton, 1996). The social reality constituted by discourse is imbued with power. For Foucault, discourse is inseparable from power. Power is embedded in knowledge and any knowledge system constitutes a system of power, as succinctly said as Foucault's conception of power/knowledge. In constructing the available identities, ideas and social objects, the context of power is formed; ‘it is in discourse that power and knowledge are joined together’ (Foucault, 1998). Power is embedded in discourse in a way that makes an actor powerful only within particular discursive context since discourses create categories of power within which actors operate (Hardy and Phillips, 2004).

So, power is not solely “a bad thing”, but can also be fruitful relationship between actors.

In charismatic leadership, the question is “how to use power over emotions”, and do it as ethically acceptable way. This notion leads us to the next issue: manipulation and charisma.

5. Charisma, communication or/and manipulation

Pekonen (1996) views charisma from the politologist's perspective and states that a few arguments of Max Weber's pure charisma better described premodern and traditional societies than modern society. Rationalisation, for its part, was defined as a phenomenon decades ago. It was standard argument that the authority which described modernisation, was so called legal authority. Today the relationship between Weberian charisma and rationalisation is seen as more complicated. Mommsen (1987) emphasizes the view that Weber never understood charisma as

phenomenon characteristic only of past traditional societies. Pekonen continues that according to Mommsen, the anti-authoritative charisma was for Weber almost the only still-existing potential means of providing democratic government which does not lead to routine modes of action or to inefficiency as a result of shortage of leadership. By this anti-authoritative nature of charisma, Weber meant that the legitimacy of a charismatic leader depends on the consent of the voters (Pekonen, 1996, p. 16-17)

Although there is some ambiguity about the precise meaning of the term communication (Dance, 1970), communication can be defined as a process of sharing information, ideas, or attitudes, resulting in a degree of understanding between a sender and a receiver (Lewis, 1980). This can come about through face-to-face interaction; telephone conversations; listening to formal presentations; reading reports, letters, and memos; or using a variety of electronic media (see Mitchell and Larson, 1987).

Rhetoric for misleading people into believing that they can do anything they want to by using the right words. Without insight and wisdom, a person who studied rhetoric was likely to become what can be called a propagandist. However, a leader with charisma can never be such a propagandist, but only a real "Truth-seeker" with rhetoric based on matters that he or she finds as to be true. This communication model presented by Plato owns both rational elements and affectual elements. The leader must be a person who can combine these parts together in an appropriate manner. The leader must be a "magician with supernatural talents" and ability to communicate his vision in a manner which appeals to human feelings. But, he must also be an analytical ruler who uses his talents only in order to achieve wisdom and good. The leader's egoistic motives must be excluded. Communication of the leader must also follow these principles (Takala, 1997).

Personal sources of power include an individual's expertise, effort, and ability to persuade and manipulate (Weiss, 1996, p. 332). The ability to persuade upper management through direct and assertive appeal and by manipulating information effectively can accrue power to an individual. In this context, we understand that leadership can work as a means for personal power, using persuasive and manipulative rhetoric. In general, the classic blame given to management in general, to marketing functions and especially to advertisement is their manipulative nature, that means a conscious effort to effect people's needs, comprehensions and understanding for the benefits of oneself.

It can be seen that charisma gives space for manipulation in communication. Words frequently used as synonyms are propaganda, lies, distortion, deceit, manipulation, psychological warfare and brainwashing.

In general, propaganda, in the most neutral sense, means to disseminate or promote particular ideas. To identify a message as propaganda is to suggest something negative and dishonest (Jowett, O'Donnell, 1992, p. 2). By propaganda it is meant the deliberate and systematic attempt to shape perceptions, manipulate cognitions and direct behavior to achieve a response that furthers the desired intent of the propagandist. The research findings nowadays emphasize that the effects of propaganda and manipulation are conditional, depending upon individual differences, the context in which propaganda and persuasion take place, and a variety of contingent third variables (Jowett, O'Donnell, 1992, p. 122).

We can give an example concerning the dark charisma. Matters dealing with Osama bin Laden have been a focus of media attention very often over the past three years. He has been referred to as a "monster", a "hero", a "freak", a "manipulator", and so on. Yet, whatever we may think of him, he surely represents what is called a charismatic type of leader.

The case of dark charisma

Max Weber defined the ideal types of leadership as bureaucratic, traditional and charismatic. Afghanistan, Osama's adopted home country, can be defined as a traditional society, and the country with its numerous tribes and small villages has a long tradition of powerful tribal leaders. Charismatic leadership on the other hand, typically emerges at periods of transition in societies. The sad events of the WTC towers in New York were like the starting shot for the new coming of bin Laden as a charismatic leader. Charismatic action, to be successful, demands extraordinary conditions in the community.

The magical nature of charisma is generally acknowledged. Osama bin Laden is said to live in a dark, sinister cave and to possess mystical powers. These supernatural talents give him a strong ability to influence his followers. The leader-follower relation in this case is very tight, and manipulation may enter the picture. The dark side of charisma is that it convinces the followers of the leader's power and of the ethics of using that power. The leader must have a strong sense of personal responsibility to be a "good" charismatic leader. There are cases in which fatal consequences have been the rule rather than the exception.

Charismatic leadership is leadership based on emotions – Weber called it "irrational". Moreover, it is an interactive relationship: the leader has power over his followers, but his followers also have power over the leader. In this way, power becomes legitimated. Followers will obey when their values are congruent with those of the leader. This is not coercion, but voluntary action.

Presenting a vision of a better life is one of the issues on Osama's agenda. In a video for recruiting new members into his group, he puts forth some ideas concerning the *jihad*, the "holy war". First, the video tells why the whole Muslim world must rise against the U.S. Second, it states that it is the duty of every Muslim to join this holy war. Next, it describes the vision of a better life which can be attained by way of the *jihad*. The *jihad* is then further legitimised by texts from the Koran and other writings of holy men. And finally, Osama's video shows terrorist training camps in Afghanistan which supply the potential force by which the better world can be reached.

The Latin word *terrere* means "to frighten", from whence the words "to terrorise", "terror" and "terrorism" are derived. Perpetrating an act of terror is about delivering a message – a very forceful message. The terrorist is prepared to use whatever means he can think of to leave his message: the end justifies the means. The terrorist's own ethical code suffices as an inner norm for killing people, for instance, if this is necessary to reach the ultimate goal of a better world.

This is a question of media power. The power rhetoric is based on violent messaging. For terrorists, the victims of terrorism are not the purpose of their action – only the means. The discourse of violence constructs the recipient of the message. The more violent the terrorists' message is, the more power it has over communication. It is a kind of "speech" addressed to the general public. In order to be effective, this is what the discourse of terrorism demands: a global audience. And, as we have witnessed, charismatic leadership is very effective in creating this kind of discourse.

6. Conclusions and Practical Implications

We have considered the concept of charismatic leadership by using conceptual approach and by taking some actual examples of leading, like Osama bin Laden and Finnish leadership. We have found that there is tendency to celebrate it by showing the unselfish and scarifying behaviour that is related on it. Charismatic leadership processes might leave more space to persuasion and manipulation processes between the leaders and the led, and therefore ethical questions concerning aspects in the field may be of relevance.

Charismatic leader use *power* over his/her followers, but also his/her followers have power over the leader. So, this relation is interactive by its nature.

It has been set forth several positions of power in the earlier chapters of this article.

The *ethics* of charismatic leader is strongly a question of how to use power, i.e how and in what manner. The aims and vehicles of leading are the main objects, when one evaluates the ethical behaviour of the charismatic leader. Perhaps the most suitable positions for analysing the power of charismatic leader are critical theory and postmodernistic view of power.

In the best case charismatic community is a truly community of humanity. The dark side of charisma is a dangerous phenomenon. How a leader can avoid this is a difficult question. Commitment and trust are natural elements of charismatic organization. People's willingness to act without a massive material rewards is strength in itself. People are eager to commit to an ethically good organization, and this is it, what leaders are praying nowadays. Trust is being created through ethically good leadership. Charismatic leadership can be a vehicle of good management, but this demands conscious efforts of the leader, good leading practices and efforts of the followers, too. Another point is *socio-cultural* characteristics of developing countries and the internal work cul-

ture of organizations in these countries. There usually is an urgent need for change, on all levels. Organizational change is the essence of development, and the charismatic leadership role emerged as the most appropriate and critical for organizational leaders in these countries. I agree with Conger and Kanungo (1996) who state that bringing about effective changes requires the initiative, guidance and effort of charismatic leaders – particularly in the development of appropriate strategies on the three fronts (a) environmental assessment, (b) visioning and responding to the complexities of the environment, and (c) member integration using a family metaphor and member empowerment to achieve organizational goals.

Practical implications: Leadership Training

If we take the position of the follower, we believe there is much to be gained by understanding how leaders use their skills to achieve influence in a constructive and/or manipulative sense.

In designing a training program, one could coach future leaders on the importance of getting followers to identify with their values in order to increase the chances of their message being embraced. With a higher level of identification, followers are more likely to exert their best efforts to achieve the vision.

The ability of leaders to develop a consensus among followers regarding how the situation is defined is also critical to their success. One aspect of training leaders requires that they understand signals emanating from the followers, as well as the context (see also Gardner and Avolio).

Finally, we can identify some principles of morally good charismatic leadership; these can also be called as professional training practices:

- do not use manipulative speech practices
- do not misuse rhetoric
- avoid “the dark charisma”
- do not use manipulative communication strategies
- avoid creating a symmetric power positions
- create servant leadership (altruistic motivation)

The principles mentioned above could be developed further by using e.g. so called discursive ethics. The German social philosopher and critical theorist Jurgen Habermas has put forth a theory of communicative action. It is called "The theory of distorted communication" and includes some strong contractual elements. Communication is a central element in relationship marketing and therefore we include the work of Habermas in our analysis. It offers a theory of equal negotiating partners and an opportunity for domination-free communication. The theory displays a rational way to proceed in communication practices; it assumes that it is possible for the parties to achieve an agreement by using effective negotiating mechanisms (Habermas, 1993). The basic idea is that every individual has the right to domination-free action. An application to charismatic leadership: every leader-follower relation should be evaluated and reconstructed on the base of ethics of mutual communication.

References

1. Allert, J. & Chatterjee, S. (1997). Corporate Communication and Trust in Leadership. *Corporate Communication – an International Journal*. 1: 14 - 22.
2. Appelbaum, C & Hebert, D. and Leroux, L (1999). Empowerment: power, culture and leadership – a strategy or fad for the millennium? *Journal of Workplace Learning*.
3. Aaltio-Marjosola I.& Lehtinen J. (1998). Male Managers as Fathers? Contrasting Management, Fatherhood and Masculinity. *Human Relations*, Vol. 51, No. 2: 121-136.
4. Aaltio-Marjosola, I. & Takala, T. (2000). Charismatic Leadership, Manipulation and the Complexity of Organizational Life. *Journal of Workplace Learning*. Vol. 12. Issue 4.
5. Alvesson, M. (2003)., *Critical Organization Theory*. In the “Northern Lights; Czarniawska, B. and Sevón, G.” (eds), Liber. Copenhagen.
6. Bass B.M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York: Free Press.

7. Bensman J. & Givant M. (1975). Charisma and Modernity: the use and abuse of a concept. *Social Research*, 42: 570-614.
8. Blum, Lawrence A. (1998). Altruism and benevolence. In Werhane, Patricia H. & R. Edward Freeman (eds.): *Blackwell Encyclopedic Dictionary of Business Ethics*. First published 1997. Blackwell Publishers Ltd, UK, pp. 19-21.
9. Bryman A. (1992). *Charisma and Leadership in Organizations*. London: SAGE.
10. Burrell, G & Morgan. K (1979). *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis*. London. SAGE.
11. Coganer J.A. (1990). The Dark Side of Leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 19(2): 44 – 55.
12. Conger, J and Canungo, R. (1996): *Ethical Leadership*. London. Sage.
13. Coganer J.A. & Kanungo R.N. (1987). Toward a Behavioral Theory of Charismatic Leadership in Organizational Settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12: 637-647.
14. Dance F. (1970). The Concept of Communication. *The Journal of Communication*, Vol. 20: 201- 210.
15. Downton J. (1973). *Rebel Leadership*. New York. Free Press.
16. Drath, W.H. and Palus, C.J. (1994). *Making Common Sense: Leadership As Meaning-Making In A Community Of Practice*, Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, NC.
17. Fischer Agneta (1998). Emotion. In Trew K. & Kremer J. (eds.) *Gender and Psychology*. Oxford University Press.
18. Gardner W. & Avolio B. (1998). The Charismatic Relationship: A Dramaturgical Perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 1: 32 - 58.
19. Geertz C. (1983). *Centers, Kings and Charisma*. In C. Geertz, *Local Knowledge*. New York. Basic Book.
20. Gerth H. & Mills C.W. (eds.) 1964. *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York. McGraw-Hill.
21. [Habermas, J., 1993, "Morality, society and ethics", Acta Sociologica, 33, 2, 93-114.](#)
22. Hardy, C. and Leiba-O'Sullivan, S. (1998), "The power behind empowerment: implications for research and practice", *Human Relations*, New York, April, pp. 451-483.
23. Hardy, C. and Phillips, N. (2004). *Organizational Discourse*. London. SAGE.
24. Hirschhorn L. (1988). *The Workplace Within: Psychodynamics of Organizational Life*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
25. Hirsjärvi, S. and Hurme, H. (1985). Theme-interview. *Gaudeamus*, Jyväskylä.(only in Finnish).
26. House R.J. & Spangler W.D. & Woycke J. (1991). Personality and Charisma in the US Presidency: a Psychological Theory of Leader Effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 364-96.
27. Howell J. (1988). Two Faces of Charisma. In Conger J. & Canungo R. (eds.) *Charismatic Leadership*. San Francisco. Jossey-Bass.
28. Jowett G. & O'Donnell V. (1992). *Propaganda and Persuasion*. SAGE Publ.
29. Kets de Vries M.F.R. (1991). Introduction: Exploding the Myth That Organizations and Executives Are Rational. In M.F.R. Kets de Vries etc. (eds.) *Organizations on the Couch*, Jossey-Bass Publications, 1-21.
30. Kets de Vries M. F. R. (1995). *Organizational Paradoxes*. Routledge.
31. Kostamo, J (2004). *The Finnish Leadership*. Talentum. (only in Finnish).
32. Lapierre L. (1991). Exploring the Dynamics of Leadership. In Kets de Vries etc.: *Organizations on the Couch*. Jossey-Bass Publishers, 69-97.
33. Lewis P. (1980). *Organizational Communication*. New York. Harper & Row.
34. Lindholm, C. (1990). *Charisma*. Oxford. Basil Blackwell
35. Linna, V. (1960). *Unknown Soldier*. New York. Raoutledge.
36. Machan, T.R. (1998). Egoism, psychological egoism and ethical egoism. In Werhane, Patricia H. & R. Edward Freeman (eds.): *Blackwell Encyclopedic Dictionary of Business Ethics*. First published 1997. Blackwell Publishers Ltd, UK, pp. 192-195.
37. Mitchell T. & Larson J. (1987). *Organizational Behavior*. Singapore. New Press.

38. Mommsen W.J. (1989). *The Social and Political Theory of Max Weber*. Cambridge. Polity.
39. Pekonen K. (1996). *Max Weber's Concept of Charisma*. Unpublished working paper. University of Jyväskylä. Dept. of Political Science.
40. Pfeffer, J (1981). *Power in Organizations*. NY: Pitman.
41. Robbins S. (1992). *Essentials in Organizational Behaviour*. Prentice-Hall international Editions.
42. Rushton, A. (1982). *Altruism and Society*. *Ethics*, No. 3.
43. Steyrer J. (1998). *Charisma and the Archetypes of Leadership*. *Organization Studies*, 19/5, pp. 807-828.
44. Takala T. (1998). *Plato on Leadership*. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17: 785-798.
45. Takala T. (1997). *Charismatic Leadership: a key factor in organizational communication*. *Corporate Communication – an International Journal*, 1: 8-14.
46. Takala, T. & Lämsä, A-M (2002). *Interpretative Study of Concepts*. *Finnish Journal of Business Economics*. No 3, pp. 371 - 390). (only in Finnish).
47. Weber M. (1964). *The Theory of Social Economic Organization*. New York. The Free Press.