The Development of Charismatic Leaders

Micha Popper
University of Haifa

This paper explores the origins of leadership potential and motivation for leadership, primarily with regard to two types of leaders: personalized and socialized charismatic leaders. Bowlby's attachment theory (1969, 1973) provides a theoretical basis for determining an individual's potential to be in leadership positions. The "internal working model," formed (according to Bowlby) in the course of attachment processes in infancy, has a considerable impact on self-perception, which may later affect the development of "ego resources" required for leadership. The motivation to be a leader is analyzed with the help of various psychodynamic concepts and models.

The study of leadership developed during the last century through a series of paradigms. From the beginning of the 20th century to the late 1940s, the "great man" paradigm reflected the assumption (Carlyle, 1841/1907) that the leader is a person endowed with extraordinary qualities that are the source of his or her influence, so leadership was viewed as a collection of inborn qualities that can be uncovered and measured. As early as 1948, Stogdill (in Bass, 1990) reviewed 124 leadership studies examining dozens of characteristics that might distinguish leaders from others. Some of the studies examined physical traits; others examined characteristics such as intelligence, determination, and originality. Many of the findings contradicted each other; characteristics identified in one study did not appear in others, and it was not possible on the basis of these studies to make any clear, unequivocal statement about leadership qualities.

Disappointment with traits research paved the way for a diametrically opposite avenue, the situation approach; this eventually gave way to contingency models, which conceptualized leadership in terms of an interaction between leadership styles and situation variables (e.g., Fiedler, 1967; Reddin, 1967; Vroom & Yetton, 1973). These studies usually present data such as correlations between various

leadership styles and the followers' attitudes and behaviors, or comparative findings on attitudinal variables emanating from different leadership styles (see Bass, 1990).

In recent years, criticism of the "leader-centric" perspective has grown (Lord, Foti, & DeVader, 1984; Meindl, 1995; Meindl, Ehrlich, & Dukerich, 1985). These approaches argue that "leadership is very much in the eyes of the beholder, followers, not the leader, and not researchers define it" (Meindl, 1995, p. 331). Two types of leadership are usually discussed in the "follower-centric" perspective: instrumental and emotional. The instrumental leader (termed in the literature as "transactional leadership") is a leader who maintains give-and-take dynamics in the context of a set of given expectations (Hollander, 1978). The leader, in this perspective, is someone who satisfies the followers' instrumental expectations by establishing a close link between effort and reward. This view refers mostly to leadership in work settings (Bass & Avolio, 1990).

In contrast to the calculated instrumental nature of transactional leadership, the other form of leadership is based on emotions. "Charismatic leadership" (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; House, 1977; Shamir, 1991) is the most frequent name given to the emotional bonds between followers and leaders. Charisma was first discussed by Weber (1946), who claimed that "in charismatic relations people no longer obey customs or laws, instead, the followers submit to the imperious demands of a heroic figure, whose orders are legitimated not by logic, nor by the hero's place in ascribed hierarchy, but solely by the personal 'power to command' of the charismatic individual" (p. 52). Indeed, "charismatic relations" are regarded as the "most emotional" (Heifetz, 1994; Shamir, 1991; Willner, 1984). Some even compare these relations to romantic love (e.g., Lindholm, 1988, 1990).

The label "charisma" has been applied to very diverse leaders (Howell & Avolio, 1992) in politics (Adolf Hitler, Benito Mussolini, Franklin Delano Roosevelt), in religious spheres (Jesus Christ, Jim Jones), in social movements (Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Malcolm X), and in business (Lee Iacocca, Mary Kay Ash, John Z. De Lorean). This list underscores the neutral connotation of charismatic leadership; it does not distinguish between good or moral and evil or immoral charismatic leadership. It means that charisma can lead to blind fanaticism in the service of megalomaniac and destructive values or to heroic self-sacrifice in the service of beneficial causes. In the last two decades some writers have referred to differences between "positive" and "negative" charismatic leaders (House & Howell, 1992; Howell, 1988; Howell & Avolio, 1992; Volkan, 1980).

Probably the most theoretically prominent distinction between the different "faces" of charisma was presented by Howell (1988), who distinguished personalized charismatic leaders and socialized charismatic leaders. Howell and Avolio (1992) treated this distinction in terms of communication patterns. Socialized charismatic leaders use power to serve others, align their vision with the followers' needs and aspirations, maintain open, two-way communication, and rely on moral standards. Personalized charismatic leaders, by contrast, use power for personal gain only, promote their own personal vision, maintain one-way communication,

and rely on convenient external moral standards to satisfy self-interests. House and Howell (1992) concluded that personalized and socialized charismatic leaders differ in the following aspects. Personalized charismatic leaders are characterized by strong power needs, authoritarianism, self-serving behavior, and exploitation of others and disregard for their rights and feelings. Socialized charismatic leaders, on the other hand, tend to serve the collective interest without being motivated solely by self-interest, empower their followers, and have regard for their followers' feelings and rights.

It is apparent that most literature on leadership focuses on leaders' actions and the impact those actions have on others. The literature is missing explanations of the internal processes, motivational states, or personality differences that give rise to different patterns of leadership (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). There have been very few attempts to examine the developmental antecedents of leadership, and those attempts are not based on a coherent theoretical framework. Avolio and Gibbons (1988), for example, examined retrospective accounts of leaders with regard to previous important experiences that influenced their leadership perspective and style, such as early leadership positions. Apart from a few mainly descriptive historical or anecdotal illustrations, such as psychobiographies like that of Gandhi (Erikson, 1969), we have very little knowledge as to the developmental precursors of a person who might become a leader in general, and a socialized or personalized leader in particular. This is not accidental. In the absence of conceptual formulations and clear operationalizations of the antecedent conditions promoting personalized and socialized charismatic leaders, the study of the developmental trajectories relevant to the formation of such leaders has been hampered.

This article is an attempt to shed some light on psychological aspects underlying the differences between personalized and socialized charismatic leaders, as well as to formulate a conceptual framework that might contribute to research on leadership development in general, and the development of personalized and socialized charismatic leaders in particular. This, as shown, is clearly missing from the psychological literature on leadership.

The Conceptual Framework

The assumption underlying the present discussion is that leadership, like many human manifestations, is a function of potential and motivation (Popper, Mayseless, & Castelnovo, in press). To become a musician, for example, one needs a musical ear (potential) and a motivation to engage in music. A person who does not have a good ear for music, however highly motivated, will not be an outstanding musician. Conversely, an individual with the potential to be a musician but with no interest (motivation) will clearly not give expression to his or her talent. Similarly, to become a leader, one needs the potential to be a leader—in particular, certain "ego resources" to be in leadership positions (or to appear as having such

resources in the eyes of followers)—and a strong desire to be a leader (e.g., Avolio & Gibbons, 1988).

This article deals with these two factors: the potential for leadership, namely the ego resources required to be in leadership positions, and the motivation to be a leader. The aspects of leadership potential are analyzed with the help of attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969, 1973, 1988); the motivation to be a leader is analyzed with the help of some psychodynamic concepts, theories, and models (e.g., Kohut, 1971, 1977; Zaleznik, 1992). Analysis of the processes determining the potential and the motivation for leadership is assumed to clarify the forces that affect the direction of leadership (i.e., personalized or socialized).

Attachment Patterns and the Potential for Leadership

Bowlby's attachment theory and the theoretical and empirical developments that followed (Ainsworth, Blehar, Wates, & Wall, 1978; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Hazan & Shaver, 1987) provide a relevant theoretical basis and rich bedrock of research findings that may contribute to the understanding of leadership potential. The term "attachment" refers to the individual's ongoing emotional ties with the figure (usually the mother) on whom he or she learned to rely for protection and care. Differences in the ability to signal the need and desire for closeness, as well as differences in the caregiver's responsiveness, determine the variations in babies' attachment styles. On the basis of the baby's primary experience, an "internal working model" is formed that constitutes a mental representation of the self, of significant others, and of the child's relations with them. This internal representation forms the basis for later representations of the self and the world, and guides the individual's interactions with others (Bowlby, 1969, 1973, 1988).

On the basis of Bowlby's theories, Ainsworth et al. (1978) identified three styles of infant attachment: secure, ambivalent, and avoidant. As summarized by Cassidy (1994), the internal working model of secure individuals includes a basic trust in the caregiver and confidence that he or she will be available, responsive, and helpful should the individual encounter adverse or frightening situations. With this assurance, secure individuals are bold in their explorations of the world and are able both to rely on themselves and to turn to others when in need. This pattern is promoted by a caregiver, usually a parent, who is readily available, sensitive to the child's signals, and lovingly responsive when the child seeks protection and/or comfort.

The internal working model of the ambivalent pattern is characterized by uncertainty as to whether the parent or caregiver will be available, responsive, or helpful when called upon. Because of this uncertainty, the ambivalent individual is always prone to separation anxiety and tends to be clinging, while manifesting unresolved anger directed at the caregiver. This behavior is seen as an attempt to elicit attention from an unresponsive caregiver. This pattern, in which conflict is

evident, is brought about by such conditions as a parent being available and helpful on some occasions but not others (Cassidy & Berlin, 1994).

A third pattern is that of avoidant attachment, in which individuals do not believe that when they seek care they will receive it. On the contrary, they expect to be rebuffed. Sometimes these individuals attempt to become emotionally self-sufficient, and in extreme cases they devalue the importance of attachment for their lives and use a strategy of minimizing attachment behavior and feelings (Cassidy, 1994; Main, 1990). They may, nevertheless, exhibit hostility and antisocial behavior toward others (Kobak & Sceery, 1988; Sroufe, 1983).

A meaningful advance in the study of adults' internal models occurred with the development of the adults' self-report questionnaire by Hazan and Shaver (1987). As well as developing the questionnaire, Hazan and Shaver helped to expand the examination of the influence of the internal model on relationships with other adults. For example, they and many others following them (e.g., Collins & Read, 1990; Mikulincer, Florian, & Tolmacz, 1990) examined the connections between attachment patterns and romantic love, and their findings were compatible with findings from studies on childhood attachment patterns.

The basic claim underlying all of these studies is that the internal model, which is formed in the course of attachment processes in infancy, has two aspects: self-perception and perception of others.

The concept of the internal working model (expressing the attitude to self and to others), which can be measured by instruments that measure attachment style, together with the ability to predict from attachment measures the quality of the adult's relationships with other adults, constitute the basis for the theoretical arguments on the potential and directions of leaders' development. The fundamental argument in this context is as follows:

Because the leader is a product of potential and motivation, it is assumed that fearful people with high anxiety levels will find it hard to be in positions of leadership. The ability to convey a sense of strength is central in the attribution processes of the followers (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Meindl, 1995; Shamir, 1991). Only individuals with secure and avoidant patterns (for different reasons) convey a sense of strength and certainty, especially to those who are consumed by doubt and uncertainty. Even for the "narcissistic leaders" (described below), this mask of certainty is no mere pose (Popper, in press; Post, 1986). To sustain grandiose feelings of strength, these individuals use a mechanism of splitting to maintain their illusion (Post, 1986; Volkan, 1980).

In conclusion, individuals with a secure pattern, with positive self-evaluation, or alternatively, with an avoidant pattern—those who, according to the evidence of attachment studies, "have learned to go it alone" without dependence on others—will display to their followers projections and attributions that the followers might seek (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Gardner & Avolio, 1998; Kets de Vries, 1989; Mikulincer & Florian, 1995; Popper et al., in press). Nonetheless, as mentioned above, an individual's possession of considerable ego resources and

leadership potential is insufficient; motivation to be a leader is also needed. Therefore, models that can help to define both the potential and the motivation for leadership can advance the developmental study of leadership.

Motivation for Leadership

Winston Churchill, reviewing his life, formulated an intuitive explanation for his motivation to be in a leadership position: "Famous men are usually the product of an unhappy childhood. The stern compression of circumstances, the twinge of adversity, the spur of slights and taunts in early years are needed to evoke that ruthless fixity of purpose and tenacious mother-wit without which great actions are seldom accomplished" (Gardner, 1995, p. 33). The connection between early childhood and the motivation to be a leader appears in the better-known psychobiographies of leaders (e.g., Burns, 1978; Erikson, 1958, 1969; George & George, 1956; Kets de Vries, 1989; Lasswell, 1930).

Surprisingly, there has been no comprehensive and systematic discussion of why that longing for leadership positions produces sometimes a socialized and sometimes a personalized charismatic leader. Two types of dynamics might be relevant for explaining the differences between them: dynamics related to the absence of a father, and dynamics related to insufficient adoration in early childhood. Each results in a different pattern that the individual adopts in becoming a leader.

Absence of a Father

Iremonger (1970), who collected biographical materials on 24 British prime ministers from Spencer Perceval in 1809 to Neville Chamberlain in 1937, discovered that 15 of them (66%) had lost a father in childhood, compared to only 2% of the general population. Zaleznik (1992) concluded that the leaders he studied had in common a deep inner feeling of father deprivation, whose source may have been the physical absence of the father (through death or divorce) or absence in the psychological sense, through detachment, aloofness, or unavailability on account of work or other occupations. Whatever the cause, the father was "not there for the child." This deep, persistent feeling, in Zaleznik's view, gave rise to a strong desire for leadership. This is one expression of a general principle that Zaleznik describes as "twice born." In the specific case of father deprivation, it is one of the possible psychological outlets. The child, lacking a father to lean on, is motivated to become himself "an improved" father, a leader.

Similar motives were found by Burns (1978) in reviewing biographies of some famous leaders. In the cases presented (e.g., Gandhi), the picture was similar: The father was detached or absent and the mother was close. Like Zaleznik, Burns saw the absence of a close and supportive father as a key factor in the motivation to become a leader, but added the dynamics with the mother. In the absence of a father,

Burns claimed, the developing child lacks an identification figure; thus, the psychological element needed to resolve the Oedipal conflict is missing, and then, according to the psychoanalytical argumentation, the child's motivation to be a "big father" himself grows increasingly powerful. This kind of motivation may be especially strong when there is a deep emotional attachment to the mother.

These tendencies may be intensified if the mother expects her son to be some sort of a "father figure." These expectations may lead the child to perceive himself as a father substitute, and with this come the feelings that are usually related to the father's self-perception: responsibility, centrality, and even existential meaning through a "fatherhood feeling." A child who grows up in this kind of atmosphere and with this kind of expectation might perceive leadership as the most natural and desirable position for himself.

Insufficient Adoration in Early Childhood

Insufficient adoration in early childhood and its meanings and implications are usually related in the psychological literature on narcissism. During the past three decades, psychoanalytic theories have been concerned with illuminating the psychology of narcissism. Heinz Kohut (1971, 1977) and Otto Kernberg (1975, 1976, 1982) have played the leading role in the psychoanalytic inquiries into the nature of narcissism. Although Kohut's explanations seem to be more relevant to the dynamics of leadership development (as will be explained later), because of the importance and centrality of both writers' contributions, I briefly refer to Kernberg's thought also. This will help to better clarify why Kohut's explanations seem more appropriate to the specific issues discussed in this article.

Classical psychoanalysis has postulated intrapsychic conflict—the dynamic tension between drive and defense—as a fundamentally explanatory mechanism of psychopathology. Kernberg (1975, 1976), while supporting the essential validity of the conflict model, sought to expand his focus by incorporating the infant experience of the external world of objects as a basis for elaborating the drives and defenses that shape the infant's internal reality. Initially, these drives are an amalgam of affects and cognitions associated with them, all embedded in a web of object relations. Over time, these affects and cognitions separate into libidinal and aggressive, positive and negative components, in part as a function of the experiences of gratification and frustration with the object role. Intense aggression as an outgrowth of the interplay between drive and deprivation is assigned a primary etiological role in Kernberg's theory. For him, unmanageable aggression (in the context of overwhelming dependency needs) generates the intrapsychic conflict, and the associated primitive defenses anchored in splitting, that define pathological narcissism. The precipitates of these intrapsychic processes manifest themselves in *grandiosity*, a major part of the defense constellation against aggression, which for Kernberg characterized pathological narcissism. For Kernberg the grandiose self is always pathological; the narcissistic personality develops only in response

to psychological damage inflicted early in the course of development. The resulting pathological grandiose self is associated with primitive and defective superego formation (Kernberg, 1975, pp. 263–282).

Kernberg's model might be relevant for explaining certain types of leaders' motivation and behaviors. However, pathological narcissism as described by Kernberg can find manifestations in various outlets that are not necessarily related to interaction with people (Storr, 1972). Therefore, Kohut's explanation might be more relevant to our discussion because, unlike intrapsychic conflict models, it emphasizes interactions that might be parallel to leader-followers interactions (Post, 1986).

For Kohut (1971, 1977), narcissistic pathology is the ultimate end-product of the parents' unsuccessful attempts to negotiate the infant's grandiose and idealizing needs. Like many others (e.g., Lichtenstein, 1964; Pines, 1981; Winnicott, 1971), Kohut emphasized the parents, especially the mother's adoration, her satisfaction of the infant's narcissistic needs, the feeding of the "grandiose self," as an essential part of the infant's development. Lichtenstein (1964), Winnicott (1971), and Pines (1981) claimed that the formation of primary identity is always based on the mirroring experience. In addition to effectively "mirroring" the infant's grandiosity, the parents serve as a repository for the infant's primitive idealizations of the parent. These idealizations permit the infant to merge with the omnipotent self object, and thereby ward off the threat of disorganization in the face of helplessness (Kohut, 1977).

If the child is traumatized during this critical period of development, his emerging self-concept is damaged, leading to the formation of what Kohut (1971) called "the injured self." Such damage can occur in several ways. Children rejected by cold and ungiving mothers may be left emotionally hungry, with an exaggerated need for admiration. A special form of rejection is overprotection by the intrusive narcissistic mother. She cannot let her child individuate because she sees him as an extension of herself.

For Kohut, the aggression described by Kernberg, and the conflicts and defense that it spawns, are not the primary etiological agents in the pathogenesis of narcissism. Rather, the explanations are anchored in the empathic failures and failed idealization. These particular failures are, according to Kohut, self-psychology argumentation, the principal causal underpinning of narcissism.

According to Kohut, the formation of the injured self results in two personality patterns. The first is the *mirror-hungry personality,* who pursues mirroring self-object relationships with other people (followers, for instance) who are expected to verify his sense of personal greatness. The second type is the *ideal-hungry personality.* Individuals of this type can experience themselves as worthwhile only as they can relate to individuals whom they can admire for their prestige, power, beauty, intelligence, and so forth. They are forever in search of such idealized figures. "Mirroring explanations," by definition, emphasize the interaction with other people as a primary source of compensatory dynamics that might be expected to

affect the injured self. Thus, this kind of explanation might be particularly relevant to the analysis of leadership phenomena (Popper, in press; Post, 1986, 1993). Nevertheless, the discussion in this paper relates only to those who are driven by the need for adoration, who are constantly seeking to nourish their famished self, who are compelled to display themselves in order to attract the attention of others.

Personalized and Socialized Charismatic Leaders: A Motivational Analysis

Generally, the argument is that the tendency to be a personalized charismatic leader is rooted in the narcissistic explanation, whereas the possibilities deriving from the absence of a father are more likely to lead to the socialized charismatic leadership pattern. Clarifying this argument requires further discussion of mirroring and narcissism.

According to Kohut (1971), in the transition from childhood to maturity, the grandiosity fantasy must be gradually worked out with the support of those closest to the child. In these personal relationships there is a process of transference, defined as "mirroring transference," when the child creates an idealized object image like an image in a mirror. In this way the child's self-image acquires the grandiosity fantasy. Herein lies the danger: The grandiosity fantasy lets the individual see reality as he wishes it to be. However, normal development means constant improvement of the ability to test reality. There are milestones in the normal progress of the grandiosity fantasy: recognition of others as existing in their own right with their strengths and weaknesses, recognition of one's personal limitations and the limitations of reality, all of which are necessary for forming relationships. When the normal process of working through the grandiosity fantasy is disrupted, the result is a narcissistic disorder expressed in a self-absorbed personality, revealing elements of vulnerability and need for adoration.

The longing for leadership may be connected with narcissism and mirroring in the following ways. During the mirroring process, the process of building the "grandiose self," not enough narcissism exists to sustain ongoing development, owing to insufficient adoration from the mother (Freud, 1914/1986), perhaps because of the lack of a mother in a concrete physical sense or lack of an adoring relationship with the mother. It may be predicted that these factors will lead the individual to seek the missing admiration at later stages in his life. According to these explanations, narcissistic deprivation in infancy might cause in some a constant aspiration to be big, strong, admired—in short, to be grandiose.

In the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (American Psychiatric Association, 1994), the individual with a narcissistic disturbance is described as follows: (1) has a grandiose sense of self-importance (e.g., exaggerates achievement and talents, expects to be recognized as superior without commensurate achievements); (2) is preoccupied with fantasies of unlimited success, power, brilliance, beauty, or ideal love; (3) believes that he or she is "special" and unique and can only be understood by, or should associate with, other people

(or institutions) who are special or have high status; (4) requires excessive admiration; (5) has a sense of entitlement, namely, unreasonable expectations of especially favorable treatment or automatic compliance with his or her expectations; (6) is interpersonally exploitative, namely, takes advantage of others to achieve his or her own needs; (7) lacks empathy: is unwilling to recognize or identify with the feelings and needs of others; (8) is often envious of others and believes that others envy him or her; (9) shows arrogant, haughty behaviors or attitudes.

A position of leadership can, of course, produce these feelings. The motivation of leaders who are narcissistic at the pathological level springs from such a search for admiration or a sense of uniqueness. Such leaders have no desire for real human interaction and intimacy, although in some cases this might not be clearly evident. Volkan (1980), for example, distinguished "reparative" leaders and "destructive" leaders. Both are in constant search of adoration; however, reparative leaders want adoration from "valued" followers, followers who are elevated into becoming idealized objects so that their representatives can be fused into their grandiose self. In destructive leaders, the lack of genuine interest in others is more salient. Indeed, many leaders through history, such as King Herod, who immortalized his cruel reign with vast monuments, and in modern times Stalin and Hitler (Bullock, 1991), can serve as examples of this description of pathological narcissism: constant and tireless fostering of the grandiose self, combined with indifference and lack of real interest in others.

Socialized charismatic leaders, on the other hand, are not characterized by this combination of lack of empathy for others and constant attempts at self-aggrandization—the conspicuous characteristics of personalized charismatic leaders. Socialized charismatic leaders' sources of motivation do not lie in the pathological narcissistic space of the obsessive quest for adoration and uniqueness.

The Development of Personalized and Socialized Charismatic Leaders: Toward a Researchable Conceptual Framework

Recently there have been some attempts to empirically investigate the differences between personalized and socialized charismatic leaders. This line of research adds measurable criteria to the conceptual work done so far in this domain (e.g., House & Howell, 1992; Howell, 1988). In a validation study conducted in the Israeli army's officers school (Popper & Neeman, 1999), the most outstandingly charismatic leaders among the cadets were selected by their commanders. (The assumption was that in these courses, the commanders-instructors have many opportunities to observe the cadets' functioning as leaders. After all, these courses are intended for "leaders in the making," and hence they provide an ideal research laboratory for the study of leadership qualities.) The selection was based on a method used by Mikulincer et al. (1990). Each platoon commander and team commander (a platoon consists of three teams) was asked to choose four cadets in

each team. There was 84% agreement among platoon and team commanders. Those for whom there was no agreement were excluded from the sample, which eventually included 104 cadets. The next step was to construct an instrument for measuring socialized and personalized charismatic leadership tendencies that were based on Howell's theoretical distinctions. The instrument consisted of nine statements, five relating to personalized leadership and four to socialized leadership. A study was carried out to examine the internal validity of the items. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the personalized charismatic leadership scales was .81 (typical items: "He uses his influence for personal benefits"; "His personal success is more important to him than the success of the team"). The Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the socialized charismatic leadership scales was .75 (typical item: "He acts beyond his personal interest for the good of the whole team").

Another validation check was of whether the constructed instrument clearly distinguished socialized and personalized charisma. For that purpose, correlations between the socialized and personalized leadership measures were computed. The correlation between the socialized charismatic leadership and personalized charismatic leadership measures was -0.62 ($p = .05$). The results are in the expected direction, namely, those who score high on personalized charismatic leadership will score low on socialized charismatic leadership, and vice versa.

Next, each cadet received a score indicating the cadet's inclination to be either a personalized or socialized leader. In addition, the cadets' level of narcissism was measured by the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Hall, 1979). The research findings supported the supposition that cadets with a tendency toward personalized charisma evince a more prominent narcissistic tendency than leaders with a tendency toward socialized charisma.

Mumford, Gessner, Connely, O'Connor, and Clifton (1993), using qualitative and quantitative analysis of leaders' biographies and historic documents, found that personalized leaders articulate a vision of an unsocialized world. Further, the events in childhood experienced by personalized leaders contributed to a view of the world where personal safety is achieved through domination. On the other hand, socialized leaders believe that power is to be used not as a method of domination but as a method of empowering others (O'Connor, Mumford, Clifton, Gessner, & Connely, 1995).

This kind of research provides us with more accurate criteria regarding the differences between personalized and socialized charismatic leaders. However, despite this progress, the developmental aspects of such leadership patterns still remain unresearched. Optimally, such developmental investigations require thorough longitudinal studies, which demand a major research effort. In the absence of measurable concepts, no other alternatives of developmental research have been carried out (Popper et al., in press). The conceptualization presented in this article offers integrative variables that reflect variability in childhood experiences. These variables can be applied to developmental trajectories of research on leadership.

With the help of attachment theory, leadership potential is defined in terms of internal working models derived from attachment patterns. As mentioned, the assumption is that potential leaders must have either a secure or an avoidant attachment pattern. Such individuals are not too anxious to be intimidated or paralyzed by others, and they are assumed to have the ego resources required for being in a leadership position, namely providing followers with a screen for projections and attributions. [Projection is "the process by which specific impulses, wishes, aspects of the self, or internal objects are imagined to be located in some object external to oneself" (Rycroft, 1995, p. 139).] Obviously, followers will not attribute strength or project power wishes onto someone who is perceived ambivalent or weak (Gardner & Avolio, 1998). Empirical support in line with such claims was presented by Mikulincer and Florian (1995), who found in an army basic training course that those who were "anxious ambivalent" were rated by their peers as "non-leaders." Smith and Fotti's (1998) research also supports this line of argumentation. It was found that the most important variable affecting preference of leaders by group members was the degree of self-efficacy the followers attributed to the leader (perceived self-efficacy of the leader was more important than the leaders' intelligence or dominance). This, as stated, does not mean that everyone with such ego resources will be a leader.

The motivation to be in leadership positions and the direction of this motivation are derived from the described psychological processes and the type of internal working models originated in early childhood. For example, it can be assumed that socialized charismatic leaders will be individuals with a secure pattern. Their pattern of attachment is reflected in their self-assurance and positive self-regard, as well as in their positive regard of others and keen interest in others, along with a general inclination to invest in interpersonal relations. Moreover, according to Bowlby's (1969, 1973) attachment theory, the secure pattern is usually enhanced by mothers who are available, sensitive, and loving-responsive when the child seeks protection or comfort; therefore, children of this type who become leaders are, as Zaleznik described, likely to be characterized by internal feeling of the absence of a father. Such children might have experienced expectations to be leaders and successfully practiced leadership roles in childhood (e.g., Avolio & Gibbons, 1988; Gibbons, 1986). This argument is consistent with "self-efficacy" models (Bandura, 1977) as well as with descriptions of some prominent leaders (e.g., Gandhi; Erikson, 1969).

By contrast, personalized charismatic leaders will probably be those individuals with avoidant patterns, those who do not have a keen interest in others and are reluctant to maintain intimate, ongoing relationships. When these individuals are motivated by narcissistic yearning, yearning for admiration (which does not require intimacy and closeness), they are highly likely to become personalized charismatic leaders.

The links among potential, motivation, and direction of leadership can be demonstrated in the following possible hypotheses: Individuals who are anxious

ambivalent will show more tendency to be dependent on others (Kunce & Shaver, 1994). They will most likely have low self-efficacy regarding their leadership, so there is less likelihood that they will be leaders (or be perceived as such). On the other hand, individuals with the secure attachment pattern will perceive themselves as having a sufficient level of self-efficacy to be in leadership positions. Moreover, they will feel competent to be leaders in social situations where close relations and intimacy might be required. Individuals with the avoidant attachment pattern will have self-efficacy in being leaders, especially in specific missions or in leading to a goal that does not require close, intimate relationships (e.g., Volkan, 1980). Differences in motivations to lead will exist between leaders with the avoidant pattern and leaders with secure patterns. Leaders with the avoidant pattern will find sources for adoration. Leaders with secure patterns will find sources to satisfy their needs for exploration and centrality, through care to others.

In sum, this article has connected the issues of potential to be in leadership positions, the motivation to lead, and the kind of leadership that might be expressed (socialized or personalized). In addition to the theoretical integration of issues not yet introduced into the psychological literature on leadership, this article facilitates the translation and formulation of these arguments into researchable avenues. The main concepts and models discussed above can be operationalized and measured. For instance, there are measurable instruments for the distinction between socialized and personalized charismatic leaders (e.g., Popper & Neeman, 1999), there are measures for examining childhood variability of experiences [the internal working models (e.g., Hazan & Shaver, 1987), the NPI (Raskin & Hall, 1979), etc.], and there is a conceptual framework that makes it possible to formulate hypotheses regarding the connections among the discussed variables. The formation of the concepts and measures discussed and the rationale for their construction may lead to a kind of infrastructure for future developmental studies on leaders.

AUTHOR'S ADDRESS

Correspondence concerning this article should be sent to Micha Popper, Department of Psychology, University of Haifa, 31905 Mt. Carmel, Israel. E-mail: popper@construct.haifa.ac.il

REFERENCES

Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M., Wates, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of strange situations.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

American Psychiatric Association (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed., p. 629). Washington, DC: Author.

Avolio, B. J., & Gibbons, T. C. (1988). Developing transformational leaders: A life span approach. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 276–308). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84,* 191–215.

Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61,* 226–244.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and management applications.* New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team and organizational development. In R. W. Woodman & W. A. Passmore (Eds.), *Research in organizational change and development* (pp. 231–272). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment.* New York: Basic Books.

Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 2.* Separation. New York: Basic Books.

Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: Clinical applications of attachment theory.* London: Routledge.

Bullock, A. (1991). *Hitler and Stalin: Parallel lives.* London: Harper and Collins.

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

Carlyle, T. (1907). *On heroes, hero-worship and the heroic in history.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin. (Original work published 1841)

Cassidy, J. (1994). Emotion regulation: Influences of attachment relationships. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 59* (2–3, Serial No. 240), 228–249.

Cassidy, J., & Berlin, L. J. (1994). The insecure/ambivalent pattern of attachment theory and research. *Child Development, 65,* 971–991.

Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adults' attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58,* 644–663.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review, 12,* 637–647.

Erikson, E. H. (1958). *Young man Luther: A study in psychoanalysis and history.* New York: Norton.

Erikson, E. H. (1969). *Gandhi's truth: On the origins of militant non-violence.* New York: Norton.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Freud, S. (1986). On narcissism: An introduction. In *Essential papers on narcissism* (A. Morrison, Ed.). New York: University Press. (Original work published 1914)

Gardner, J. (1995). *Leading minds. An anatomy of leadership.* New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, W. L., & Avolio, B. J. (1998). The charismatic relationship: A dramaturgical perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 23,* 32–58.

George, A. L., & George, G. L. (1956). *Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House: A personality study.* New York: Macmillan.

Gibbons, T. C. (1986). *Revisiting the question of born vs. made: Toward a theory of development of transformational leaders.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fielding Institute.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52,* 511–524.

Heifetz, R. H. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hollander, E. P. (1978). *Leadership dynamics.* New York: Free Press.

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

House, R. J., & Howell, J. M. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 3,* 81–108.

Howell, J. M. (1988). Two faces of charisma: Socialized and personalized leadership in organizations. In J. A. Conger & K. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership and the elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 213–236). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1992). The ethics of charismatic leadership: Submission or liberation? *Academy of Management Executive, 6*(2), 43–54.

Iremonger, L. (1970). *The fiery chariot.* London: Secker & Warburg.

Kernberg, O. (1975). *Borderline condition and pathological narcissism.* New York: Aronson.

Kernberg, O. (1976). *Object relations and clinical psychoanalysis.* New York: Aronson.

Kernberg, O. (1982). Narcissism. In *Introducing psychoanalytic theory.* London: Methuen.

Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (1989). *Prisoners of leadership.* New York: Norton.

Kobak, R. R., & Sceery, A. (1988). Attachment in late adolescence: Working models, affect regulation of self and others. *Child Development, 59,* 135–146.

Kohut, H. (1971). *The analysis of the self.* New York: International University Press.

Kohut, H. (1977). *The restoration of the self.* New York: International University Press.

Kuhnert, K. W., & Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and transformational leadership: A constructive/developmental analysis. *Academy of Management Review, 12,* 648–657.

Lasswell, H. (1930). *Psychoanalysis and politics.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lichtenstein, H. (1964). The role of narcissism in the emergence of primary identity. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 45,* 49–56.

Lindholm, C. (1988). Lovers and leaders. *Social Science Information, 16,* 227–246.

Lindholm, C. (1990). *Charisma.* London: Blackwell.

Lord, R. G., Foti, R. J., & DeVader, D. L. (1984). A test of cognitive categorization theory: Internal structure, information processing, and leadership perceptions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 34,* 343–378.

Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (1993). *Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance.* London: Routledge.

Main, M. (1990). Cross-cultural studies of attachment organization: Recent studies, changing methodologies, and the concept of conditional strategies. *Human Development, 33,* 48–61.

Meindl, J. R. (1995). The romance of leadership as follower-centric theory: A social construction approach. *Leadership Quarterly, 6,* 329–341.

Meindl, J. R., Ehrlich, S. B., & Dukerich, J. M. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 30,* 78–102.

Mikulincer, M., & Florian, V. (1995). Appraisal and coping with real-life stressful situations: The contribution of attachment styles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 21,* 406–414.

Mikulincer, M., Florian, V., & Tolmacz, R. (1990). Attachment style and fear of personal death: A case study of affect and regulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58,* 273–280.

Mumford, M. D., Gessner, T. E., Connely, M. S., O'Connor, J. A., & Clifton, T. C. (1993). Leadership and destructive acts: Individual and situational influences. *Leadership Quarterly, 4,* 115–147.

O'Connor, J., Mumford, M. D., Clifton, T. C., Gessner, T. L., & Connely, M. S. (1995). Charismatic leaders and destructiveness: An historiometric study. *Leadership Quarterly, 6,* 529–555.

Pines, M. (1981). Reflections on mirroring. *International Review of Psychoanalysis, 11,* 27–42.

Popper, M. (In press). *Hypnotic Leadership—Leaders, Followers and the Loss of Self.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Popper, M., Mayseless, O., & Castelnovo, O. (In press). Transformational leadership and attachment. *Leadership Quarterly.*

Popper, M., & Neeman, O. (1999). *Personalized and socialized charismatic leaders: An empirical investigation.* Unpublished manuscript, University of Haifa.

Post, J. M. (1986). Narcissism and the charismatic leader–follower relationship. *Political Psychology, 7,* 675–687.

Post, J. M. (1993). Current concepts of narcissistic personality: Implications for political psychology. *Political Psychology, 14,* 99–121.

Raskin, R., & Hall, C. S. (1979). A narcissistic personality inventory. *Psychological Reports, 45,* 55–60.

Reddin, W. J. (1967). The 3-D management style theory. *Training and Developmental Journal* (April), 8–17.

Rycroft, C. (1995). *A dictionary of psychoanalysis.* New York: Penguin.

Shamir, B. (1991). The charismatic relationship: Alternative explained predictions. *Leadership Quarterly, 2,* 81–104.

Smith, J. A., & Foti, R. J. (1998). A pattern approach to the study of leader emergence. *Leadership Quarterly, 9,* 147–160.

Sroufe, L. A. (1983). Infant-caregiver attachment and patterns of adaptation in preschool: The roots of maladaptation and competence. In M. Perlmutter (Ed.), *Minnesota symposium in child psychology* (vol. 16, pp. 112–135). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Storr, A. (1972). *The dynamics of creation.* London: Secker & Warburg.

Volkan, D. V. (1980). Narcissistic personality organization and "reparative" leadership. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 30,* 131–152.

Vroom, V., & Yetton, P. W. (1973). *Leadership and decision making.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Weber, M. (1946). *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology* (H. Gerth & C. W. Mills, Eds.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Willner, A. R. (1984). *The spellbinders: Charismatic political leaders.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Winnicott, H. P. (1971). *Playing and reality.* New York: Basic Books.

Zaleznik, A. (1992). Managers and leaders: Are they different? *Harvard Business Review* (March–April), 126–133.