Re-Drawing Concepts: Adding "Trusting" to "Transformational Leadership" Discerns It from Charismatic Leadership

By Reuven Shapira, Ph.D., Western Galilee Academic College, Acre, Israel
Email: shapira.reuven@gmail.com Website: http://www.transformingkibbutz.com Phone: 972-46320597; Cell: 972-542-209003. Fax: 972-46320327.

Leadership is an evasive phenomenon and its constructs remain deeply contested. Van Knippenberg and Sitkin (2013) found four major problems with theory and research of the widely used "charismatic–transformational leadership" concept, calling for its re-drawing. However, re-drawing cannot solve its fundamental defect, unsuccessful combining contrary types:

> "A transformational leader… empower followers and makes them partners in the quest to achieve important objectives. A charismatic leader… emphasizes the need for radical change that can only be accomplished if followers put their trust in the leader's unique expertise" (Yukl, 1999: 301)

Charismatic leaders lead transformations by morally neutral charisma (Antonakis et al., 2016), emphasizing the leader's unique superior expertise and exceptional "magic gift" helped by distancing from followers and often adopting a radical vision which radiates charismatic image, seeking "adoration, idolization, and unquestioning obedience" (Howell & Shamir, 2005: 107), asserting their decisions/orders' logic only they fully understand (Tucker, 1968). Charismatic leaders often distrust followers grasped as inept as they failed solving their problems, but this distrust is rarely mentioned (e.g., Antonakis et al., 2016); it is discernible in their autocratic practices, seeking unilateral followers' trust, derogating followers' faculties and subduing them by various means including immoral ones such as abuse of power.

Transformational leaders as the concept originated by Downton (1973) and Burns (1978) and used by others (e.g., Barbuto, 1997; Shapira, 2017) avoid boast uniqueness nor they demand unquestioning obedience as they trust followers' faculties and encourage achieving high-moral goals by collaborative innovative problem-solving to which everyone contribute intangible resources and ingenuity (Yukl, 1999). Both transformational and charismatic leaderships achieve transformations; calling one type "transformational" does not discern it from the other and the "charismatic-transformational" conception furthers confusion. The concept of above authors should be designated "trusting transformational leadership" as it generates ascending spirals of mutual trust while leaders allow followers much discretion (Fox, 1974), encourage innovative problem-solving and exemplify trustworthy commitment to high-moral goals (Shapira, 2017), mutually elevating own and followers' morality (Burns, 1978).

Transformational leadership literature often missed morality; of the 534 publications citing Van Knippenberg and Sitkin (2013) 294 (55%) did not mention "moral(ity)," a prime characteristic of transformational leadership, while "distrust" which characterizes charismatic leadership was mentioned by only 35 works (6.5%), 93.5% of works missed it (Google

Scholar, approached 18.8.2018). Scholars who were seemingly "protected from close contact with reality" (Kärreman & Alvesson, 2014: 11) also missed Weber's and Etzioni's insight that charisma is about wisdom, hence its explanation requires paying attention to the tensions involved in its emergence (DiTomaso, 1993). Tensions generate the dependency of leaders' wisdom on followers providing them with premises of decisions (Simon, 1957), and tacit know-how and *phronesis* acquired on the job in practitioner communities (Orr, 1996). Followers provide these intangibles only to, trusted leaders who have proved trusting them (Shapira, 2015); as charismatic leaders avoid this their wisdom is impaired, they suffer mistakes, failures and further followers' distrust.

Howell and Shamir (2005: 107) proposed that "the more the leader felt empowered, the more he or she will engage in charismatic behaviours, such as displaying self-confidence and presenting a challenging vision." Trusting transformational leaders do the opposite, gaining followers' trust and goal commitment by candid admittance of obstacles/unknowns and by leading collaborative efforts to discover unknowns, overcome obstacles and advance transformations. They facilitate emancipatory dialogue with followers (Raelin, 2013), transforming followers' values, needs, preferences, and aspirations and motivate them for OCB beyond the call of duty (Organ, 1997) that fruit prestigious successes that empower such leaders to further transformations.

Conclusion

The mix "charismatic-transformational leadership" is nadir as most characteristics of charismatic and transformational leaders are contradictory and mostly leaders who generate transformations are either high-moral trusting transformational or charismatic. The latter distrust followers' faculties, they are indifferent to morality or even worse, use immoral means and having other characteristics contrary to the formers. The prefix "trusting" for "transformational leadership" overcome the conceptual confusion. Overcoming is essential: successful tenured trusted transformational leaders often reach dysfunction phase, becoming low-moral distrusting oligarchic conservatives and conceal this by charismatic posture (Shapira, 2018).

References

Antonakis, J., Bastardoz, N., Jackuart, P., & Shamir, B. (2016). Charisma: An ill-defined and ill-measured gift. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 3,* 1-26.

Barbuto, J.E. (1997). Taking the charisma out of transformational leadership. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, *12,* 689-697.

Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper.

DiTomaso, N. (1993). Weber's social history and Etzioni's structural theory of charisma in organizations: Implications for thinking about charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 4,* 257-275.

Downton, J.V.Jr. (1973). *Rebel Leadership.* New York: Free Press.

Fox, A. (1974). *Beyond Contract*. London: Faber.

Howell, J.M., & Shamir, B. (2005). The role of followers in the charismatic leadership

process: Relationships and their consequences. *Academy of Management Review, 30,* 96-112.

Kärreman, D., & Alvesson, M. (2014). The ideology of leadership. Paper presented at the 13th International Studies of Leadership Conference, Copenhagen, December.

Organ, D.W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: it's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance, 10,* 85–97.

Orr, J. (1996). *Talking about Machines.* Ithaca (NY): Cornell University Press.

Raelin, J. (2013). The manager as facilitator of dialogue. *Organization, 20,* 818-839.

Shapira, R. (2015). Prevalent concealed ignorance of low-moral careerist managers: Contextualization by a semi-native multi-site Strathernian ethnography. *Management Decision, 53,* 1504-1526.

-------------. (2017). *Mismanagement, "Jumpers," and Morality.* New York: Routledge.

-------------. (2018). Prolonged dysfunction of ex-trusting transformational leaders and its amoral camouflage by charismatic postures. *Open Journal of Leadership, 7,* 187-208.

Simon, H. (1957). *Administrative Behavior.* New York: Free Press.

Tucker, R. H. (1968). The theory of charismatic leadership. *Daedalus, 97,* 731−756.

Van Knippenberg, D., & Sitkin, S.B. (2013). A critical assessment of charismatic-transformational leadership research: Back to the drawing board? *The Academy of Management Annals*, *7,* 1-60.

Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly, 10,* 285-305.