

# CHARISMATIC LEADERSHIP AND SELF-EFFICACY : IMPORTANCE OF ROLE CLARITY

Vasudha Nandal and Venkat R. Krishnan\*

This study explored the relationship between charismatic leadership and followers' self-efficacy and role clarity. Charismatic leadership was taken as comprising five factors—strategic vision and articulation, sensitivity to the environment, sensitivity to member's needs, personal risk, and unconventional behaviour. Role clarity was measured as a lack of role ambiguity and role conflict. Results indicated no relationship between charisma and self-efficacy. Three of the five factors of charismatic leadership were however positively related to lack of role ambiguity, which in turn was positively related to self-efficacy.

Charismatic leadership theory is an extension of the attribution theory. It says that followers make attributions of heroic or extraordinary leadership abilities when they observe certain behaviours (Conger & Kanungo, 1998). An increasing body of research shows an impressive correlation between charismatic leadership and high performance and satisfaction among followers. People working for charismatic leaders are motivated to exert extra work effort, and, because they like their leader, express greater satisfaction. Charisma has come to be regarded as one of the core components of transformational leadership.

## THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

Burns (1978) was the first person to make a differentiation between transactional and transformational leadership. Bass's (1985) theory of transformational leadership is derived

from Burns's classification. In transactional leadership, leader-follower relations are based on a series of exchanges or bargains between leader and followers. Two factors identified by Bass as comprising transactional leadership differ with respect to the leader's activity level and the nature of the interaction with followers. Contingent reward leadership is viewed as an active and positive exchange between leaders and followers, whereby followers are rewarded or recognized for accomplishing agreed upon objectives. Rewards may involve recognition from the leader for work accomplished, bonuses or merit increments. Leaders can also transact with followers by focusing on mistakes, delaying decisions or avoiding intervening until something has gone wrong. Such transactions are referred to as management by exception, which can be either an active or a passive interaction between leaders and followers (Bass, 1998).

A central thesis of Bass's (1985) theory is that transformational leadership goes beyond exchanging inducements for desired performance by developing, intellectually stimulating, and inspiring

\* Vasudha Nandal is a human resources executive in a multinational company in India and Venkat R. Krishnan is an associate professor of organizational behaviour at XLRI, Jamshedpur. Correspondence regarding this article may please be sent to Venkat R. Krishnan (e-mail: rkvenkat@yahoo.com).

followers to transcend their own interests for a higher collective purpose, mission, or vision. Such behaviours broaden the range of leadership beyond simply focusing on corrective or constructive transactions.

Bass depicted transformational leadership as a higher order construct comprising four conceptually distinct factors—charisma, inspiration, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. Leaders, described as transformational, concentrate their efforts on long-term goals, and place value and emphasis on developing a vision and inspiring followers to pursue the vision. They change or align systems to accommodate their vision rather than work with the existing systems, and coach followers to take a greater responsibility for their own development, as well as the development of others. These leaders are often described by followers as inspirational (Howell & Avolio, 1993). Transactional and transformational leadership should not, however be viewed as two opposing approaches to getting things done (Bass, 1990). Thus in contrast with Burns's (1978) distinction, research has indicated that transformational and transactional leadership behaviours can be displayed by the same leader in different amounts and intensities, while complementing each other (Bass, 1998). Transformational leadership is built on top of transactional leadership; it produces levels of subordinate effort and performance beyond what would occur with a transactional approach alone.

---

**Bass depicted transformational leadership as a higher order construct comprising four conceptually distinct factors—charisma, inspiration, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration**

---

## **Charisma**

Bass (1985) argued that charisma comes from a combination of emotional expressiveness, self-confidence, self-determination, and freedom from internal conflict. Bass studied transformational leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). Charisma emerged as the most important element in the quantitative studies carried out by Bass and his colleagues since 1985 in educational institutions, the armed forces, business, industry, hospitals and other non-profit organizations (Bass, 1998). Subordinates who described their immediate superiors as charismatic also rated their units as more productive. Charismatic leaders were seen to be more dynamic. Those working under them had high levels of self-assurance and saw more meaning in their work. Those working under charismatic leaders worked for longer hours, and revealed higher levels of trust in their leaders than those working for non-charismatic leaders did. High correlation was found between ratings of the charisma of leaders and measures of leadership effectiveness.

In Bass's (1985) model, charisma is only a factor under transformational leadership. Vision is treated as being indicative of inspirational rather than charismatic leadership. This is in sharp contrast to the majority of conceptualizations, which treat vision as a component of charismatic leadership. Bass also implied that charisma is both a product of transformational leadership and a component of it. As Bryman (1992) has noted, it is difficult to see how it can be both (Conger et al., 1997).

Behling and McFillen (1996) have developed a model of the processes of charismatic leadership, which is based on six attributes of leader behaviour, and three beliefs held by the followers. The six

attributes are a mixture of personal qualities and behavioural patterns—empathy, dramatization of the mission, projecting self assurance, enhancing own image, assuring followers of their competence and ability to achieve great things, providing followers with opportunity to achieve success by delegating responsibility and removing obstacles to followers' performance. In this model, these behaviours on the part of the leader generate or strengthen three important responses on the part of the subordinates—awe, inspiration and empowerment.

House (1977) offered seven propositions about the more overt aspects of charismatic leadership in complex organizations:

1. Characteristics that differentiate leaders who have charismatic effects on subordinates from leaders who do not have such effects are dominance and self-confidence, need for influence, and a strong conviction of the moral righteousness of their beliefs.
2. The more favourable (attractive, nurturant, successful or competent) the perceptions of the potential follower of a leader, the more the follower will echo: (a) the values of the leader; (b) the expectations of the leader that effective performance will result in desired or undesired outcomes for the follower; (c) the emotional responses of the leader to work-related stimuli; (d) the attitudes of the leader toward work and toward the organization.
3. Leaders who have charismatic effects are more likely to engage in behaviours designed to create the impression of competence and satisfaction than leaders who do not have such effects.
4. Leaders who have charismatic effects are more likely to articulate ideological goals than leaders who do not have such effects.
5. Leaders who simultaneously communicate high expectations of and confidence in followers are more likely to have followers who accept the goals of the leader and believe that they can contribute to goal accomplishment. They are also more likely to have followers who strive to meet specific and challenging performance standards.
6. Leaders who have charismatic effects are more likely to engage in behaviours that arouse motives relevant to the accomplishment of their mission than are leaders who do not have charismatic effects.
7. A necessary condition for a leader to have charismatic effects is that the role of the follower be definable in ideological terms that appeal to the follower.

In its simplest form, leadership processes in organizations can be conceptualized around several distinct stages of activity (Yukl, 1998). The three stages can be summarized as (a) environmental assessment, (b) direction formulation and communication and (c) membership alignment and implementation. While the stages are presented as a linear process, in reality they are stages of activity that are often ongoing and overlapping. In addition, environmental stages require that these stages be continually repeated.

---

**Leaders who simultaneously communicate high expectations of and confidence in followers are more likely to have followers who accept the goals of the leader and believe that they can contribute to goal accomplishment**

---

Conger and Kanungo (1987) developed a model of charismatic leadership within organizations that distinguishes behavioural components in three distinct stages of the leadership process. In the assessment stage, the behaviour of charismatic leaders is perceived to focus on the follower's needs and on environmental opportunities that challenge the status quo of the organization. In contrast, other leadership forms will be more intent on building on or undertaking incremental improvements to the status quo. In stage two, charismatic leaders are more likely to be seen as conveying futuristic visions for their organizations in an inspirational manner. In the implementation stage, charismatic leaders rely on unconventional means and exhibit behaviours of self-sacrifice and personal risk taken to build up commitment from followers and to empower them to act. On the other hand, non-charismatic leaders rely more on transactional approaches such as the exchange of extrinsic rewards (Burns, 1978) to gain support from followers.

Examination by Kirkpatrick and Locke (1996) of seven leadership theories that address in some form the issue of charisma revealed that there are at least three components that are common across theories: (a) communicating a vision, (b) implementing the vision, and (c) demonstrating a charismatic communication style. Thus, from the discussion above, one can see that charismatic leaders inspire their followers to work towards implementation of the espoused vision. This is achieved by changing the attitudes of followers.

### **Role Clarity**

Roles serve as the boundary between the individual and the organization. Roles represent the expectation of the individual

and the organization. Roles can thus serve to tie the individual to the organization and the organization to the individual. Role clarity can be interpreted as the lack of role ambiguity and role conflict. Role conflict is defined as a condition of incompatible roles set for a person, and role ambiguity is lack of clarity in the set roles.

People with a great need for structure, prefer to work in clear settings where they are clear about their task roles and aware of what is expected from them. Satisfaction will be high when role clarity is high (Bass, 1990).

The earliest version of the path goal theory of leadership focused on the need for leaders to point out the path to successful effort (Bass, 1990). Leaders do so by increasing personal payoffs to subordinates for goal attainment, and making the path to these payoffs easier to travel by clarifying it, reducing road blocks and pitfalls, and increasing opportunities for personal satisfaction (House & Aditya, 1997).

---

**Role clarity can be interpreted as the lack of role ambiguity and role conflict. Role conflict is defined as a condition of incompatible roles set for a person, and role ambiguity is lack of clarity in the set roles.**

---

### **Charisma and Role Clarity**

Charismatic leaders increase role clarity by providing a frame of reference for describing expected performance. Charismatic leaders not only provide a vision but also exhibit behaviour and actions to further the vision (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996). Ensuring role clarity is one of the vision implementation behaviours and includes traditional supervisory structuring and transactional leader

behaviours, such as clarifying what is to be accomplished and how it is to be done (Yukl, 1989). Although these are traditional supervisory behaviours, theories of leadership consider them to be characteristic of charismatic and transformational leaders, especially because they provide some form of intellectual stimulation (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996). Thus, certain hypotheses can be made.

**Hypothesis 1:** Charisma and role clarity are positively correlated.

### Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is a construct derived from social cognitive theory, which posits a triadic reciprocal causation model in which behaviour, cognitions, and the environment influence each other in a dynamic fashion. Self-efficacy refers to a belief in one's capabilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources and courses of action needed to meet situational demands (Gist & Mitchell, 1992).

Self-efficacy is a comprehensive summary or judgement of perceived capabilities for performing a specific task. It is a dynamic construct that changes over time as new information and experience are acquired. It is not a trait but a judgement about task capability that is not inherently evaluative. Self-efficacy is an important motivational construct. It influences individual choices, goals, emotional reactions, effort, coping, and persistence.

Conger and Kanungo (1988), defined empowerment as a process of enhancing feelings of self-efficacy among organizational members through the identification of conditions that foster powerlessness and their removal by both formal organizational practices and informal techniques of providing efficacy information. Thomas and Velthouse (1990)

defined empowerment broadly as increased intrinsic task motivation manifested in a set of four cognitions reflecting an individual's orientation to his or her work role—meaning, competence (which is synonymous with Conger & Kanungo's self efficacy), self-determination, and impact.

Self-efficacy has three dimensions—magnitude, strength, and generality. Magnitude applies to the level of task difficulty that a person believes he or she can attain. Strength refers to whether the conviction regarding magnitude is strong or weak. Generality indicates the degree to which the expectation is generalized across situations (Gist, 1987). Four information cues influence self-efficacy. From most influential to least influential, they are enactive mastery, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and emotional (psychological) arousal. These cues provide important data, but it is the cognitive appraisal and integration of these data that ultimately determine self-efficacy (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). Self-efficacy is a predictor of future performance (Bowen & Lawler, 1992).

### Charisma and Self-Efficacy

Leadership is the ability to influence, inspire, and direct individual or group actions toward attaining desired objectives (Thorlakson & Murray, 1996). One of the characteristics of charismatic leaders evident from the literature, is the leader's ability to increase the self-efficacy of followers.

Self-efficacy may be involved in the Pygmalion effect through the persuasive influence of others holding positive expectations. The Pygmalion effect refers to enhanced learning or performance resulting from the positive expectations of others (Gist, 1987). This could have great

implications for leadership. Thus, the organizational processes of identifying, assessing, and developing high performers may be influenced by interactions between the leader's expectations and the subordinate's self-efficacy (Ford & Fottler, 1995).

Charismatic leaders have an idealized goal that they want to achieve, and a strong personal commitment to the goal. They are perceived as unconventional, and as agents of radical change, rather than managers of the status quo. The influence process begins by the leader articulating an appealing vision. This vision provides a sense of continuity for followers by linking the present with a better future for the organization. The leader then communicates high performance expectations and expresses confidence that the followers can achieve them. This enhances the followers' self-esteem and self-confidence (Pierce et al., 1989 which can lead to a higher level of self-efficacy. Thus it can be hypothesized that:

Charismatic leaders have an idealized goal that they want to achieve, and a strong personal commitment to the goal. They are perceived as unconventional, and as agents of radical change, rather than managers of the status quo

**Hypothesis 2:** Charisma and self-efficacy are positively correlated.

#### **Role Clarity and Self Efficacy**

When roles are clear, when it is clearly known what is expected, it is possible that an increased belief in self to perform the job results. The first thing a person needs to know before starting on a job is the purpose of the job. The individual needs to know the objectives of the job, the results expected out of the job, and the responsibilities that the job entails. This

basic information can increase an individual's confidence in his or her self-ability to perform on the job by enabling the person to chart out an action plan towards achieving the clearly known results expected. When a person does not understand his or her job, then that person may not have the belief in his or her self-ability to accomplish the job. Thus, it is expected that self-efficacy levels will increase with an increase in role clarity. This argument leads us to hypothesize that:

**Hypothesis 3:** Role clarity and self-efficacy are positively correlated.

#### **Charisma, Self-Efficacy and Role Clarity:**

Theories that have been outlined above indicate that charisma is dependent on the follower's perception of the leader. The charismatic leadership theory is an extension of the attribution theory and states that followers make attributions of heroic or extraordinary abilities when they observe certain behaviours. It is possible that charismatic leaders motivate their followers by increasing their self-efficacy levels. Charismatic leaders might increase role clarity by providing a frame of reference, though some others have considered this to be rather a transactional leadership behaviour (Conger & Kanungo, 1998).

Self-efficacy influences people's perceptions about their abilities to perform (Jones, 1986). Leader articulation of task cues, thereby providing role clarity, is one of the core components of charisma (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996). A person may have a greater belief in his or her self-ability to accomplish a job due to the charisma of the leader and the presence of role clarity acting in combination. This level of self-efficacy may be more than the level found in the presence of high role clarity or charisma alone. Thus, the interaction of

charisma and role clarity may explain more variance in self-efficacy than would be explained by either of the variables separately (Johns, Xie & Fang, 1992; Quinn & Spreitzer, 1997). We therefore have:

**Hypothesis 4:** Role clarity moderates the relationship between charisma and self-efficacy.

## METHODOLOGY

The sample for the study consisted of 105 executives of a large manufacturing organization in eastern India. The data was collected through a questionnaire that measured the three variables—charisma, self-efficacy, and role clarity. Responses were recorded on a five-point scale (1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=neither agree nor disagree; 4=agree; 5=strongly agree).

### Measurement of Charisma

Individuals choose to follow charismatic leaders in management settings, not because of their formal authority but out of a perception of their extraordinariness. Thus, any measure of charismatic leadership must be based on the followers' perception of certain specific behavioural attributes of the leader. (Conger & Kanungo, 1998). The leader's observed behaviour is interpreted by the followers as the expression of charisma in the same way as the leader's behaviour reflects that individual's participative, people, and task orientations.

Initial attempts to measure charisma used a 25-item questionnaire capturing six behavioural dimensions of charismatic leadership—environmental sensitivity; sensitivity to member's needs; does not maintain status quo; vision and articulation; personal risk; and unconventional behaviour. This scale was later revised and the number of items

reduced to 20 (Conger et al., 1997). Research studies conducted by Conger et al., in the U.S., Canada and India provide evidence that the Conger-Kanungo 20-item (CK-20) scale has acceptable reliability and validity as a diagnostic tool in various contexts (Conger & Kanungo, 1998). We used this CK-20 scale to measure charismatic leadership. The CK-20 scale has five sub-scales—strategic vision and articulation (SVA), sensitivity to the environment (SE), sensitivity to member's needs (SMN), personal risk (PR) and unconventional behaviour (UB). The items used in this study are included in the Appendix.

---

**Individuals choose to follow  
charismatic leaders in management  
settings, not because of their  
formal authority but out of a  
perception of their  
extraordinariness**

---

### Measurement of Role Clarity

The perceived role clarity has been measured in this study by the Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman's (1970) scales of role conflict and role ambiguity. The scales deal with clear planned objectives, clear responsibilities, clear expectations, and a clear explanation of what has to be done. Role clarity can be interpreted as the lack of role ambiguity and role conflict. To systematically examine the role concepts of ambiguity and conflict and their relationships with organizational and personal variables, Rizzo et al. constructed, from a factor analysis of 29 items, two scales called the role ambiguity scale and role conflict scale respectively.

Studies by Schuler, Aldag and Brief (1977) examined the psychometric properties of the Rizzo et al. (1970) role conflict and role ambiguity scales,

including the factor structure, coefficients of congruency, internal reliabilities, test-retest reliabilities and absolute levels of conflict and ambiguity. The analysis was conducted across six samples. The results suggested that the continued use of role conflict and role ambiguity scales was warranted.

Though developed in 1970, these scales were chosen by us because they looked at the variables in totality. This scale can be used to measure role clarity in any job, as it is not specific to a particular kind of job and thus can measure role clarity in a variety of job situations. Kirkpatrick and Locke (1996) developed a scale to measure task clarity consisting of four items, but this was specific to their experimental design.

The role clarity items that we used in this study are included in the Appendix. The six items relating to role ambiguity measured the lack of it. In other words, in the chosen Likert scale of 1 to 5, a score of 5 indicates a high lack of role ambiguity, which contributes to high role clarity. The average of the scores of the six items was calculated and taken as the measure of lack of role ambiguity. The eight items relating to role conflict measured the presence of it. That is, a score of 5 indicates the presence of high role conflict. Hence, to measure lack of role conflict, we reversed the scores by subtracting them from 6. Thus, an initial score of 5 was reversed to 1 to indicate the lack of role conflict, which contributes to

role clarity. The average of the reversed scores of the eight items was taken as the measure of lack of role conflict.

### **Measurement of Self-Efficacy**

Spreitzer (1995) developed a scale to measure empowerment. In the development of this scale, the items relating to the measurement of the dimension of competence or self-efficacy were modified from Jones's (1986) self-efficacy scale. These three items, from the Spreitzer scale have been used in this study to measure self-efficacy. The items are included in the Appendix. The average of the scores of these three items was taken as the score for self-efficacy.

### **RESULTS**

Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations, internal consistencies of the scales, and correlations between all the variables in the study. There was no significant correlation between the two measures of role clarity—lack of role ambiguity and lack of role conflict. Four of the five charismatic leadership factors—strategic vision and articulation, sensitivity to the environment, sensitivity to member's needs, and personal risk were all significantly positively related to each other. Unconventional behaviour was however significantly positively related only to two of the remaining four charismatic leadership factors—strategic vision and articulation, and personal risk.



**TABLE 1**  
**Means, standard deviations, and correlations •**

(N=105)	Mean	s.d.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Self efficacy	4.27	0.53	(0.60)							
2. Lack of role ambiguity	3.87	0.55	*0.39	(0.73)						
3. Lack of role conflict	2.93	0.58	-0.02	0.10	(0.69)					
4. Strategic vision & articulation	3.19	0.84	-0.04	*0.43	0.19	(0.90)				
5. Sensitivity to environment	3.39	0.79	-0.01	*0.35	0.18	*0.77	(0.79)			
6. Sensitivity to members' needs	3.37	0.86	-0.09	*0.34	★ 0.23	*0.73	*0.72	(0.73)		
7. Personal risk	3.04	1.47	0.06	0.15	★-0.22	*0.32	†0.28	†0.26	(0.39)	
8. Unconventional behaviour	2.76	0.73	-0.08	0.07	†-0.26	★0.22	0.08	-0.05	*0.36	(0.56)

• Cronbach Alphas are in parentheses along the diagonal.

★  $p < 0.05$

†  $p < 0.01$

\*  $p < 0.001$

Lack of role ambiguity was significantly positively correlated to three of the five charisma factors—strategic vision and articulation, sensitivity to environment, and sensitivity to members' needs. Lack of role conflict was significantly positively correlated only to sensitivity to members' needs. Contrary to what we hypothesized, lack of role conflict was significantly negatively correlated to personal risk and unconventional behaviour. Thus, our hypothesis 1 was only partly supported.

Self-efficacy was not significantly correlated to any of the five charisma factors. Thus, hypothesis 2 was not supported. There was a significant positive correlation observed between lack of role ambiguity and self-efficacy. Self-efficacy was however not significantly related to lack of role conflict. This provided partial support for our hypothesis 3.

**Contrary to what we hypothesized,  
lack of role conflict was  
significantly negatively correlated  
to personal risk and unconventional  
behaviour. Thus, our hypothesis 1  
was only partly supported**

#### Interaction Effects

The moderating effect of role clarity on the relationship between charisma and self-efficacy was tested through regression analysis. The testing was done separately for each of the two measures of role clarity and for each of the five measures of charisma. Taking self-efficacy as the dependent variable, we entered role clarity as the independent variable in the first step of the regression equation. In the second step, we entered charisma as the next independent variable. In the last step, the

product of role clarity and charisma was entered. The product term did not add significantly to the variance already explained in the earlier step of the regression equation. Our hypothesis 4 was hence not supported.

## DISCUSSION

The results show that there is a positive correlation between charisma and lack of role ambiguity. This reinforces the findings of earlier studies that charismatic leaders help their followers gain an improved understanding of their roles. One important finding of this study is that lack of role ambiguity is related only to three of the five charisma variables, namely strategic vision and articulation, sensitivity to environment, and sensitivity to members' needs. This indicates that unconventional behaviour and personal risks taken by the managers are not seen as favourable and contributing to clarity by the followers. There was also a negative correlation observed between the lack of role conflict and unconventional behaviour, which gives an indication that unconventional behaviour by the manager, may actually increase the role conflict felt by subordinates. This finding calls for further studies to establish the validity of the personal risk and unconventional behaviour sub-scales of the CK-20 scale for charisma used in this study. These sub-scales may need modifications in the language or the terminology used. This finding could also possibly be attributed to the nature of the industry and the type of organization chosen for the study.

There was a significant correlation observed between the lack of role ambiguity and self-efficacy. However, there was no significant correlation between self-efficacy and the lack of role conflict. This could be because the items relating to the lack of role conflict mainly dealt with things

which were not in the control of the followers (the respondents) and hence could not have affected their belief in their own ability to do their job. Thus, people who know what their job entails are confident of their ability to do the job.

The popularly held opinion is that charismatic leaders empower their followers by increasing their self-efficacy. This study failed to find any such relationship. Not even one of the five factors of charisma was related to self-efficacy. This result is most surprising, especially because the three components of charisma were positively related to lack of role ambiguity. The most significant finding of this study was that lack of role ambiguity was in the middle of a two-part relationship between three charismatic factors (strategic vision and articulation, sensitivity to environment, and sensitivity to members' needs) and self-efficacy. Charisma is positively related to lack of role ambiguity which in turn is positively related to self-efficacy, though charisma and self-efficacy are not related. This calls for future studies to explore relationships further.

It is the absence of role ambiguity and not the charisma of the leader that could directly result in empowerment of followers by increasing their self-efficacy. This study stresses the importance of lack of role ambiguity in the success of charismatic leadership in empowering followers. Thus, the removal of role ambiguity by clarification of job roles should be the primary goal of a manager. Every manager should make sure that his or her subordinates have clear planned goals and objectives for their jobs, and know what their responsibilities are and what exactly is expected of them. Subordinates should also feel certain about how much authority they have on the job. This would result in increased self-efficacy

of subordinates. Such a climate would be an ideal one for a manager to exhibit charismatic leadership, and lead to subordinate empowerment.

---

**Every manager should make sure that his or her subordinates have clear planned goals and objectives for their jobs, and know what their responsibilities are and what exactly is expected of them. Subordinates should also feel certain about how much authority they have on the job**

---

Caution must be exercised in attempting to generalize the findings of this study to other organizations. Our study may be peculiar to the type of industry studied and the context of eastern India. Let us note, in passing, that it is very difficult to get unbiased and genuine responses to questions about self-efficacy. This study has not shown any significant correlation between charisma and self-efficacy, contrary to the widely held notion that they are positively correlated. This has to be further researched. Also there is a negative correlation observed between unconventional behaviour and the lack of role conflict. This study establishes relationships between charisma and absence of role ambiguity, and between absence of role ambiguity and self-efficacy, thereby highlighting the importance of role clarity in the relationship between charisma and self-efficacy.

#### REFERENCES

- Bass, B.M. 1985. *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. 1990. *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications*. (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. 1998. *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Behling, O., & McFillen, J.M. 1996. A syncretic model of charismatic/transformational leadership. *Group & Organization Management*, 21(2): 163-191.
- Bowen, D.E., & Lawler, E.E. 1992. The empowerment of service workers: What, why, how and when. *Sloan Management Review*, Spring: 31-39.
- Bryman, A. 1992. *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. London: Sage.
- Burns, J.M. 1978. *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.N. 1987. Toward a behavioural theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(4): 637-647.
- Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.N. 1988. The empowerment process: Integrating theory and Practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(3): 471-482.
- Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.N. 1998. *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Conger, J.A., Kanungo, R.N., Menon, S.T. & Mathur, P. 1997. Measuring Charisma: Dimensionality and validity of the Conger-Kanungo scale of charismatic leadership. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 14(3): 290-302.
- Ford, R.C., & Fottler, M.D. 1995. Empowerment: A matter of degree. *Academy of Management Executive*, 9(3): 21-31.
- Gist, M.E., & Mitchell, T.R. 1992. Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *Academy of Management Review*, 17(2): 183-211.

Gist, M.E. 1987. Self-efficacy: Implications for organizational behaviour and human resource management. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(3): 472-485.

House, R.J. 1977. A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J.G. Hunt & L.L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge*, 189-207. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Howell, J.M., & Avolio, B.J. 1993. Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(6): 891-902.

House, R.J., & Aditya, R.N. 1997. The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23(3): 409-473.

Johns, G., Xie, J.L., & Fang, Y. 1992. Mediating and moderating effects in job design. *Journal of Management*, 18(4): 657-656.

Jones, G.R. 1986. Socialization tactics, self-efficacy, and newcomers' adjustment to organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29: 262-279.

Kirkpatrick, S.A., & Locke, E.A. 1996. Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic components on performance and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(1): 36-51.

Pierce, J. L., Gardner, D.G., Cummins, L.L., & Dunham, R.B. 1989. Organization based self-esteem: Construct definition, measurement and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(3): 622-648.

Quinn, R.E., & Spreitzer, G.M. 1997. The road to empowerment: Seven questions every leader should consider. *Organizational Dynamics*, Autumn: 37-48.

Rizzo, R.R., House, R.J., & Lirtzman S.I. 1970. Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15(1): 151-163.

Schuler, R.S., Aldag, R.J., & Brief, A.P. 1977. Role conflict and ambiguity: A case analysis. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 20(1): 111-128.

Spreitzer, G.M. 1995. Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(5): 1442-1465.

Thomas, K.W., & Velthouse, B.A. 1990. Cognitive elements of empowerment: An "Interpretative" model of intrinsic task motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 15(4): 666-681.

Thorlakson, A.J.H., & Murray, R.P. 1996. An empirical study of empowerment in the workplace. *Group and Organization Management*, 21(1): 67-83.

Yukl, G.A. 1989. Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management*, 15(2): 251-289.

Yukl, G. 1998. *Leadership in organizations* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

## APPENDIX A

### Lack of role ambiguity (Rizzo, House & Lirtzman, 1970)

1. I have clear planned goals and objectives for my job.
2. I know that I have divided my time properly.
3. I know what my responsibilities are.
4. I know exactly what is expected of me.
5. I feel certain about how much authority I have on the job.
6. Explanation is clear of what has to be done.

### Lack of role conflict (Rizzo, House & Lirtzman, 1970)

(All the items were reverse scored)

1. I have to do things that should be done differently under different conditions.

2. I receive an assignment without the manpower to complete it.
3. I have to buck a rule or policy in order to carry out an assignment.
4. I work with two or more groups who operate quite differently.
5. I receive incompatible requests from two or more people.
6. I do things that are apt to be accepted by one person and not by others.
7. I receive an assignment without adequate resources and materials to execute it.
8. I work on unnecessary things.

**Charismatic leadership (Conger & Kanungo, 1998)**

***Strategic vision and articulation (SVA)***

1. Provides inspiring and strategic management goals.
2. Inspirational; able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what organizational members are doing.
3. Consistently generates new ideas for the future of the organization.
4. Exciting public speaker.
5. Has vision; often brings up ideas about possibilities for the future.
6. Entrepreneurial; seizes new opportunities in order to achieve goals.
7. Readily recognizes new environmental opportunities (favourable physical and social conditions) that may facilitate achievement of organizational objectives.

***Sensitivity to the environment (SE)***

8. Readily recognizes constraints in the physical environment (technological limitations, lack of resources, etc.) that may stand in the way of achieving organizational objectives.
9. Readily recognizes constraints in the

organization's social and cultural environment (cultural norms, lack of grass roots support, etc.) that may stand in the way of achieving organizational objectives.

10. Recognizes the abilities and skills of other members in the organization.
11. Recognizes the limitations of other members of the organization.

***Sensitivity to members' needs (SMN)***

12. Influences others by developing mutual liking and respect.
13. Shows sensitivity to the needs and feelings of the other members of the organization.
14. Often expresses personal concern for the needs and feelings of other members of the organization.

***Personal risk (PR)***

15. Takes high personal risks for the sake of the organization.
16. Often incurs high personal cost for the good of the organization.
17. In pursuing organizational objectives, engages in activities involving considerable personal risk.

***Unconventional behaviour (UB)***

18. Engages in unconventional behaviour in order to achieve organizational goals.
19. Uses nontraditional methods to achieve organizational goals.
20. Often exhibits very unique behaviour that surprises other members of the organization.

***Self-efficacy (Spreitzer, 1995)***

1. I am confident about my ability to do my job.
2. I am self-assured about my capabilities to perform my work activities.
3. I have mastered the skills necessary for my job.