Charismatic Leadership and Ethics from Gender Perspective

By: **Tuomo Takala** [biography]
Iiris Aaltio [biography]

1. Introduction

In this paper we will explore leadership, charismatic leadership, gender issues and ethical aspects together. All these areas have been developed around organization studies on leadership. There is no doubt that leadership plays a role in organizational creation and growth. A number of studies are conducted that have shown its dependency on surrounding cultural context, focused on special behavioural characteristics, individual features etc. Charismatic leadership research has developed so far from 1980´s, and led from individual characters to analyse its nature in the mirror of media, social environment and various other contextual up-to-date aspects. In leadership studies gender is nowadays used as a critical focus to understand its nature, whereas in charismatic leadership studies gender as a focus is not used so far. We wonder is there are issues in charismatic leadership that make it gender related and in this paper we discuss, if the theory of charismatic leadership is gender neutral, or, laden by features favourable to masculine aspects. We will also cross issues from leadership theory, charismatic leadership theory and gender studies to explore the possibility of "feminine charisma". We use examples from political life to study their "leadership philosophy" and its charismatic nature, using ethic as a frame. All these examples of feminine and masculine charisma also reflect ideals about what it means to be a good or bad leader and we will discuss if these features also differ between women and men.

Charisma, in terms used by Max Weber (1964), means literally "the gift of grace". It is used by Weber to characterize self-appointed leaders followed up by people who are in distress and

who need to follow the leader because they believe him to be extraordinarily qualified. The role of a follower is to acknowledge this destiny, and the authority of genuine charisma is derived from the duty of the followers to recognize the leader. The very nature of charismatic authority is unstable; this is because the source of charisma is continuously "moving on". It will never be stable and unchanging.

Charismatic leader uses power on his followers, but also the followers use power over the leader. This leads to the question what is good and what is bad. The study of ethics of charismatic leadership is related to questions of how to use power, i.e which ways and in what manner. The aims and vehicles, he/she uses, are the main objects when one evaluates the ethical behaviour of the charismatic leader. Gender is a cultural creation instead a feature of an individual, whether biological or psychological. It is laden with cultural meanings, and these meanings create the gendered context for women and men leaders to use their charisma. We discuss the possibility of "good" or "bad" charisma in terms of gendered leadership behaviour. While gender is a cultural creation, it is probably woven to understanding of charisma much more than usually thought.

2. Leadership and gender

In organization studies the complex relationships between leadership, power and gender became a research topic in 1970's, when Rosabeth Moss Kanter started the debate on the "blind spots" of organizational analysis (Kanter, 1977). The aspects of organizational life that hide gender attributes of leadership and power became topical in research. The prevailing gender-neutral tradition, particularly in the US, was broken, and the discourse of organizations as sites where gender attributes are presumed and reproduced, started to gain foothold especially in 1990's. The under-representation of women in high-status roles has been documented by feminist literature (for example Acker, 1992; Auster; 1993; Gherardi; 1995).

In organizations and management, gender segregation and gender relations occur in roles and organizational positions, like the (female) secretary is subordinate to the (male) boss (Pringle, 1988), in similar way the supportive wife / mother looks up to the authoritative husband / father. There are inequalities that favor men on various criteria including salary and professional grade. Feminist theory argues that sex roles exist in patriarchal societies and organizations, which are established by social

structures and relationships that favor men. (Gough, 1998). Gender regime exists and continues to exist. (Wahl, 1992). Social roles are gendered and determined by a variety of social, political and economic factors, and in addition to sex and biological differences between men and women, there are cultural and historical factors that build them. It is generally believed that leadership, organizational culture and communication are constructed with a masculine subtext, and dominant views on leadership are difficult to integrate with femininity. (Lipman-Blumen, 1992; Aaltio, 2002).

Earlier management research took it for granted that managers were men, (see for example Mintzberg, 1973, 1989; Dalton, 1959), and ignored gender issues altogether. The so-called great-man theory is one of the earliest management theories. It argues that persons (men) who have influenced Western civilization, have characteristics that are needed in a good leader.

To give an overview of leadership theories, there are, rougly, three bodies of theories: trait, behavioural and contingency theories (Metcalfe & Altman, 2000, 107-111). Early theory development in 1930's and 1940's usead a trait theory approach based on the premise that successful leaders would possess distinguishable characteristics not found in their followers (Weiss, 1996).

Trait approaches link psychological features and capabilities like intelligence, superior judgement, decisiveness and a high need for achievement to leadership, and even physical features characteristics like weight, height, physique and energy were argued to be needed in affective leadership. This is not surprising thinking the close link between leadership and military occupations and law enforcement. There was a subtext in the trait theories that there are natural reasons that lead to the fact that there are more men than women as leaders. Instead of intelligence and logic, emotionality and therefore irrationality suit better, stereotypically, to female traits than to male, and in body strength they also become the second sex.

There are many interesting pieces of research like the one by Maddock and Parkin (1993) that highlight how women in organizations may struggle to convey appropriate female behaviour and valued management competence. They look to be difficult to combine. There is even "gentlemen's" culture which acknowledges the special skills and abilites of women, leading

them to "ladies' club" that supports male management decision making. In locker room cultures there is exclusion of women from men´s club with sporty male outlook, and inclusion would mean to attend football matches and partaking male sexual joking that undermine women, that means, to compromise their feminine identity. The idealization of masculine features and seeing them as representations of ideal leadership traits is the outcome of these cultures.

Behavioral theories focus on managers' behavior. There are three main types of behavioral theories. One distinguishes between two types of behavior; task-oriented style and interpersonally oriented style. Another distinguishes between two types of leadership; autocratic and democratic. The third type, situational theory, regards different types of behavior appropriate for various situations. The behavioral theories implicitly suggest that better managers are either masculine (i. e. high task / low interpersonal style, autocratic decision making) or feminine (i. e. low task / high interpersonal style, democratic decision making). (Powell, 1993), and are gendered as well as trait theories and great-man theories are.

Behavioral theories are seemingly more gender-neutral in that they study effective leadership in terms of leaders help their sub-ordinates to achieve their goals. Usually, the samples consisted male managers, seeing gender not relevant at all (Mills, 1988). If gender sometimes was focused, there were found interesting differences like that identical leadership style may be seen differently depending on the gender of the manager (Eagly et al., 1992), or the idea of sex-role spillover that refers to gender-based expectations for behavior that are irrelevant or inappropriate to work (discussed in Metcalfe & Altman, 2000, 108-109).

Contingency theories focus on organizational contexts that make some leadership behaviors or features more effective than the others. There are some studies that give emphasis on the situation and its gendered consequences on leadership behavior. Men and women work differently, like women communicate in a way that exchanges feelings and creates personal relationships, whereas men communicate to establish their status and show independence. In addition, men are socialized to believe that they have the right to influence and the historical evidence with male dominantly managed organizations supports this.

3. Charismatic leadership and gender

The basic nature of charismatic leadership is in its emotional tie between the leaders and the led. Charismatic leadership takes place within the process between the leader and the subordinates, which relationship is personalized and intimate and where mutual trust prevails. Organizational contexts that allow emotionality may trigger charismatic leadership and followership in organizations. Charismatic leadership can also lead to bad or good consequences. We can study it using the threatening examples taken from history, but it is also possible to adopt a brighter and more everyday understanding of its nature instead and see it as a commonly shared attribute.

Differences and similarities between female and male managers

Overall, there is some research made using male and female gender as a critical factor. We now review a few of those studies where comparisons between female and male managers are made. Powell (1993) brings forward a modern approach to management theory and claims that there are three perspectives on the difference between female and male managers. (1) there are no differences between men and women as managers, women managers try to become like men and reject the gender stereotype. (2) men make better managers because their early socialization experiences differ: they are playing more team sports than girls do (Hennig and Jardim, 1977). (3) stereotypical differences between the sexes, where women in managerial roles bring out their feminine characteristics that tend to be stereotypical.

Feminist researchers, such as Rosener (1990), argue that female and male leaders differ in accordance with gender stereotypes. She argues that femininity is particularly needed in today's work life. Rosener claims, along the same lines as Powell (1993), Gardiner and Tiggemann (1999), that there are profound differences between male and female leaders; female leaders concentrate on the relationships between people whereas men tend to concentrate on the issues or tasks. Women use more personal power, i. e. power based on charisma and personal contacts, whereas men tend to use structural power, i. e. power based on the organizational hierarchy and position. (Eagly and Johnson, 1990). Lundberg and Frankenhaeuser (1999) in turn argue that there is no difference between men and women in interpersonal style of leadership, but that men are more task-

oriented than women.

Schein's (1973) classic study concluded that both female and male executives believed that managers possessed characteristics that were more associated with men than with women. In later studies that examined the perceptions of executive women, women have no longer described successful managers as having only masculine characteristics. More recent management theories, such as the Managerial Grid Theory, claim that both masculine and feminine characteristics are important in a good manager. The Theory suggests that best managers are androgynous: they combine both (masculine) high task and (feminine) high interpersonal styles. (Powell 1993). Although the concept of androgyny has received mixed support, one aspect has been agreed upon: Leadership is generally conceived in masculine terms (Goktepe and Schneier, 1988; Kruse and Wintermantel, 1986), but also feminine features are needed in a manager. Frankenhaeuser et al. (1989) claim that female managers are psychologically more androgynous than men suggesting that female managers absorb masculine features, whereas men stick to the masculine style more.

Some researchers suggest that women should adopt a masculine style to become accepted as leaders (Sapp, Harrod, and Zhao, 1996). Women in leading positions have shown to be more masculine (Fagenson, 1990). However, Watson (1988) has indicated that masculine women's performance level is low, and women choosing such a strategy often experience role conflicts (Geis, 1993). Baril, Elbert, Mahar-Potter and Reavy (1989) claim that adopting one's masculine and feminine behavior to suit each situation separately might be the best approach. Powell (1993) argues that both feminine managers and androgynous managers seem to fit in today's work environment. This is true even if the managerial, masculine favorable subtext still exists. However, management and leadership are dependent on the local context and culture where they are practiced, and this makes drawing universal theories difficult. When overall conclusions are led, the outcome looks to be that masculine is dominant. When we essentialize the difference, the implication is that women lead not like men, but are lesser than men or men with a lack (Oseen, 1997). This is because people hold sex stereotypical beliefs and attitudes about women and men, and not tend to see that women as leaders can be as competent as their male colleagues.

About charisma and leadership

Even ancient philosophers like Plato already talked about charisma, society and leadership. Plato's view of leadership, from a normative standpoint, was that a leader must be a man of power with a sincerely truth-seeking vision. According to Plato, a leader must have charisma, a gift of grace, to be successful in his actions. Without charisma, a leader is unable to do his job, to head an organization. And this charisma is something mystical, which cannot be obtained by force or through training. It is of divine origin. Charisma is based on the aura of the leader's exceptional quality and deviates from the prototypical (Weber, 1964, Takala, 1998).

Leadership theories can be divided into transactional and transformational theories Conger & Kanungo, 1998). In the transactional approach, leaders are seen as people who motivate and guide their followers in the direction of established goals by clarifying their role and their tasks. There is also another type of leader who inspires his or her followers to transcend their own self-interests for the good of the organization and who is capable of having a profound and extraordinary effect on the followers. Among these leaders, who may be called transformational, are charismatic leaders such as Mother Teresa and Lee Iacocca. They use their personal abilities to transform their followers' values by creating a sense of importance and value to the tasks. The inspirationality of the leadership function is emphasized in these approaches.

Charismatic leadership in organizations has recently been the focus of several organizational studies (Steyer, 1998, Gardner & Avolio, 1998), even though basic conceptual work (Bryman, 1992, Cogner & Kanungo, 1987, 1998) and empirical work (House, 1977) has been ongoing in the field from 70´s onwards. Nowadays it is often studied in relation to organizational contexts (like Aaltio-Marjosola & Takala, 1999). The interrelationships between the leader's inner world and its outcomes affect the nature of organizational culture and even the strategic choices made in the company, as pointed out in several investigations. Among the outcomes there are also the effects of the dark sides of the leaders personalities on organizations, as amphasized in the psychodynamic approaches (Kets de Vries and Miller, 1984).

Charisma is stigmatized by the glory given to a selected few. Charisma can serve not but personal interests but the society,

and the organization as a whole. The followers must feel the over-individual, leader-independent targets and visions in charismatic leader context, in order to commit themselves to their leadership style. A charismatic leader´s selfisheness and narcissism may together lead to undesired consequences, whereas the unselfish and sacrificing features of a charismatic leader may be seen to bring about desired and admirable consequences. The nature of charisma is not very rational. Charisma works between the leaders and their followers and is evidently based on authority given to the leader only because of his or her overwhelming knowledge or experience, but rather is based on his or her personal characteristics. The acceptance of charisma, from the follower's point of view, can be regarded as dubious and showing the tendency to be easily impressed by others - a sign of weakness and subordination. Followers may leave space for irrational forces to operate in society (Aaltio-Marjosola, 1994).

The discussion on charisma in leadership and organizations takes often a tone of danger. Charisma has sometimes been interpreted as the politically dubious characteristics of individuals in society, and it is searched the psychological mechanisms which lead to the emergence of charismatic leaders and attraction of such leaders to the people that follow them. Totalitarian aspects of societies and the truth manipulation practiced by charismatic leaders are negative and undesired consequences of charismatic leadership, as some gloomy examples taken from the history show (Aaltio-Marjosola & Takala, 2001)..

Recent developments have brought insights that emphasize the organizational contexts of charismatic leadership, as well as its consequences for organizations and followers. It looks as if charismatic leadership comes into question especially when the visionary nature, transformational role and emotionality of leadership is explored. In general, charismatic followership is crucial for understanding charismatic leadership and the processes by which it takes place. The legitimacy of charisma and charismatic leadership is sociologically and psychologically attributed to the belief of the followers and not so much to the quality of the leader. In this respect, the leaders are important because they can 'charismatically' evoke this sense of belief and can thereby demand obedience. At the same time the nature of charisma is not very rational. Charisma works between the leaders and their followers, and is evidently not based on authority given to the leader only because of his or her

overwhelming knowledge or experience, but rather is based on his or her personal characteristics. The message of sceptical approaches towards charismatic leadership is that the charisma of leaders together with its acceptance by followers may leave space for 'irrational' forces to operate in society. This allows extra space for persuasion and manipulation in charismatic leadership.

Charismatic leadership is created in the ongoing process between leaders and followers in which the environment, different actors and different audiences play their role in defining a situation and in jointly constructing a charismatic leadership. Charismatic leaders make efforts to manage their followers' impressions of themselves by framing, scripting, staging and performing, which constitute the basic phases in the process.

Charismatic leadership and ethical dimensions

In such processes between the leaders and the led ethics and emotions are important. Applied business ethics, in its traditional form, seeks to "say and define" what kind of action Good Business Life is. A tricky issue is that different ethical theories state different criteria, and thus give different and occasionally contradictory solutions to ethical problems. Applied business ethics can be used in the role of a guardian in evaluating which kind of charismatic leadership is "good" or "bad", or "right" or "wrong", when studying its effect on the followers and on society as a whole. But values are both born socially and they die socially. There is no objective measure for value, and not only one right way of defining and explaining charisma. Traditional ethical theories are also rational in the sense that they imply cutting off emotions and the so-called irrational elements of the mind, or in general they do not focus on them. But certainly charismatic leadership involving persuasion and rhetoric between the leaders is emotionally charged. By contextualizing it is possible to break the guardianship and explore ethical issues in the field by showing the multiplicity and complexity in real-life occurrences of charismatic leadership.

Business ethics is a controversial issue, although it is seen as a vital part of everyday business life. The importance of ethics has usually been justified by suggesting that most people want to live in a society in which justice and charity prevail. Concern for business ethics is also a matter of practical life when the

economic system is considered. The economic systems can endure only if they operate in such a way that the majority of the people believe that at least some degree of justice prevails there. If the system lacks legitimacy, it is likely to fail. Conger and Kanungo (1998, 213) refer to Thomas Aquinas, according to whom the moral goodness of behaviors should be judged on the basis of the objective act itself, the subjective motive of the actor, and the context in which this act is performed. Applying this to charismatic leadership, there are three ethical dimensions: the leader's motives, the leader´s influence strategies, and the leader's character formation. As further analyzed by Kanungo and Mendonca (1996), charismatic leadership in its positive form is altruistic, influences in empowering ways, emphasizes vision by changing followers' core attitudes, beliefs and values, and manifests needs that are self-developmental. In negative forms there are egoistic interests, control strategies, needs for personal power, and emphasis on compliance behavior and identification with the leader, that makes the charismatic leadership unethical. We now ask if charismatic theory with ethical dimensions is gender biased.

4. Discussion on gender differences in charismatic leadership

Often sport teams with coaching give excellent examples about how to succeed in leadership. Even if the context for leadership differs in business enterprises and sports, there are similar issues: there is an intimate contact between the leader and the followers and the creation of team spirit. One example of charismatic sport leadership comes from Curt Lindström (Aaltio-Marjosola & Takala, 2000), who successfully coached the Finnish ice-hockey team in 1993-94 into World Championship. As a personality C.L. was not an extravert character, but rather resembled the Finnish "deep charisma" with humility, humbleness and silence. There is a lot of dramatics and theatre in Curre's behavior as well, and even impression management style looks to appear. Charisma will emerge, ripen, and fall down, which was also true with C.L. Paradoxically, there are no examples until now of female coaches who would be given the label of charisma; even in theatres, orchestras and other cultural organizations there looks to appear more men than women. Overall, leadership charisma with its strong emphasis on individuality and autonomy looks to apply more to male character than to women - exactly the same way as there are fewer women as leaders in top positions of

organizations all over the world.

But there are some examples of women who may be characterized as very charismatic, even in their old meanings of divine origin. Mother Theresa, who worked in Indian slums, was given the label of a "good" person because she sacrificed her life and made people in slums see their future lighter. Also Margaret Thatcher was a charismatic leader, in many ways having a strong impact on her followers, a strong vision for Britain that she held before the EU entering by England, and it was argued that her way to lead was very 'male-like', in a negative way, and she got labeled as an Iron Lady, in fact judged to be very masculine. She was loved and hated at the same time. In England there were also other ancient strong queens, like the Bloody Mary from Scotland.

Also a sort of ancient 'military' female leader was Jeanne D'Arch, a French young, poor shepherd girl who got a divine vision and led the solders for victories towards British army. She was later burnt as a witch in England. She happened to express very feminine characteristics, sensitivity - being able to get the divine vision - and being able to share her vision with the military forces, becoming a symbol of French patriotism in those times. There is a somewhat similar kind of Finnish story about Liisa Eriksdaughter in 1700-1800's, based on an investigation by Irma Sulkunen (1999). Also Liisa was a young shepherd girl from Kalanti in 1750's. She started a large-spread ecstasian movement in Finnish cultural structures. As Sulkunen argues, those structures are seen in religious revival movements, but as well in mental and ideological-social practices.

Liisa Eriskdaughter, a shepherd girl became in an odd way 'hit by God', being alone in Santtio forest with the cattle. She read the book by Arthur Dent about religious revival. There was a page telling about sufferings and pains of those driven to hell. Liisa continued reading and fell a deep sleep, waking up after a while with a scream. Pain and threat were so real that that Liisa thought to be in hell. She run, being greatly confused, to a village, and repeated what she had seen to the village inhabitants. After some time the whole village started the same scream, wiping and crying, because of their pagan, unchristian life. 'Madness', said someone, 'women's fancies', said another. Something like that had happened also before. But now it became differently. The odd phenomena did nod stop in Santtio but spread like a wind, felling down people also in other places. There were similar stories about these outbursts, where mind

and body became confused. Later those women gave religious speeches. Chaotic group movements spread, and also men joined those separatistic movements. Later there became new female revivers, some of those also older women as well, but the process of felling down was very much the same. Later the church took quite negative attitude towards the movements, and they moved far to East in Finland. Near the Eastern cost there was built a group of women revivers, who wandered around Eastern Finland. Later the atmosphere towards them became very negative. They were labeled as 'hysterical fancy-old-women' who treated the healthy Finnish Christianity. They should be silenced by men - and it was especially pointed the Bible messages according to which women should be silent in the congregation. As in the case of Jeanne D'Arch, also nationalism and patriotism walked hand in hand with religious revivals, so the treat for the state power and to male administrators, was multiple. "The healthy national fundamentals" gave their strict judgment to this turbid ecstasy, unruly mental behavior, that was breaking down the patriarchal hierarchy, and first of all, women's stepping down to modern arenas of powerful, influential positions in political and earlier church organization arenas. The image of women that these ecstasy movements pictured also became very opposite to that one built in educated, active and healthy women's movement that was religious as well. Shamanism was labeled as bad, a threat to the society and the communities rejected the ecstasy women, who, however, took their place at the history.

A person with a lot of charisma, but with very questionable consequences is Osama bin Laden. As a charismatic leader there are some notions that describe him and his ways to be a leader. Matters dealing with Osama bin Laden (abbrev.OSB) were considered in media very often during the last few years. He is called monster, hero, freak, manipulator and so on. However, there evidently are features that make it worth believing that he represents a kind of a leader, called charismatic leader.

Max Weber defined the ideal types of leadership as follows, bureaucratic, traditional and charismatic. Afghanistan, Osama's home country, can be defined as traditional society with many tribes and villages. It has the long tradition of powerful tribe-leaders. Charismatic leadership emerges at periods of transition in societies. Those sad happenings in the WTC's towers in Washington were starting shots for the new coming of Bin Laden as charismatic leader. Charismatic leaders, to be

successful, demand unordinary conditions in the community.

Magical nature of charismatic leadership is commonly accepted phenomenon. It has been said that OSB lives in dark gave, and he has some kind of magical powers. His super natural talents give him strong possibilities to influence his followers. Leader-follower relation is in this case very tight. Here comes manipulation in the picture. The dark side of charisma convinces us the power and ethics of using power. The leader must have strong sense of personal responsibility to be a good charismatic leader. There have existed cases in which fatal consequences are more a rule than an exception.

Charismatic leadership is based on the emotions. It is irrational, as Weber put it. It is also interactive situation and relation, leader has power over his followers, but followers have power over the leader. The power becomes legitimised. The follower will obey in cases when his/her values are congruent with values of the leader. This is not coercion, but a voluntary action.

Presenting a vision of better life is one issue in Osama's agenda. He has a video in order to recruit new members to his group in which he puts forth some ideas concerning the wholly war. First, it is told why the whole muslim-world must rise against U.S. Second, it is told that the duty of every Muslim is to join in this war. Third, the vision of better life is presented, and the way to that is Ajihad. The texts of Koran and other writings of the wholly men are used as legitimize the jihad. In the end, there are showed terrorist training camps in Afghanistan. These camps offer a potential force for better world according to Osama's video.

The Latin word terreo means something like terrorize, or frighten people. The act of terror is messaging. Terrorist wants leave his message in any means. The purpose is justifying the means. His own ethical code is seen as suitable inner norm e.g for killing people if this is necessary to reach the ultimate purpose. This is a power in question, a power of media. The power rhetoric of media is based on violent messaging. The victims of terrorists are only means not purposes to terrorists. The discourse of violence constructs the subject receiving the message. Terrorist leaves his message, violence means more power on communication. We can see that this is a kind of talk, which is aimed to great public. The great public is a very general audience. The discourse of terrorism demands global

audience to be effective.

To study the ethical dimensions of charismatic leadership, and roughly place them in four boxes, we can put some of the figures now in their place.

ETHICAL DIMENSION

GOOD

ERIKSDAUGHTER JEANNE D'ARC	ERIKSDAUGHTER, JEANNE D'ARC JEESUS CURRE LINDSRÖM
BLOODY MARY MARGARET THATCHER	OSAMA BIN LADEN HITLER IVAN THE CRUEL

BAD

FEMININE "GENDER DIMENSION" MASCULINE

Figure 1. Gender and ethical dimension of charismatic leadership

Female and male characters carry charisma in ways that may differ. Many characterizations about charisma suit better to masculine ideals. This difference is not so much about the "real" differences people hold that means, their physiological differences, or tested psychological differences concerning mental abilities or personality issues. As much there are culturally based expectations, institutional and other that come from the audiences, from the followers and that have impact what is expected about female charisma. What is credible, allowed female charismatic leadership, what are the general stereotypes about essential female behaviour, and how these suit to charismatic ideals.

In general, stereotypic traits of women and men differ

(Rosenkranz, 1968, Brannon, 2002, 165):

Women:

- Gentle
- Talkative
- aware of feelings of others
- interested in own appearance
- neat in habits
- strong need for security
- expresses tender feelings
- tactful
- does not use harsh language
- quiet

Men:

- wordy
- active
- competitive
- dominant
- makes decisions easily
- independent
- logical
- direct
- acts as a leader
- ambitious
- able to separate feelings from ideas
- adventurous

The given stereotypes of men fit much better to definitions of leadership, especially to notion of transformational leadership. If we look at charismatic leadership definitions with a strong impact, often personal, that people make on their followers, the list, again fits much better to men than women. Women, portrayed as a passive, traditional, silent sex, fit evidently better for the role of followers. Mother Theresa might present a typical, accepted female charisma because she sacrifices for the other, for "higher" targets (to work for the poor people) with a caring attitude, the special and honoured feminine characteristics.

From the followers point of view, taking the example of Liisa Eriksdaughter, she used charisma, but in a very suggestive, manipulative and emotional way. She became a symbol of extreme female "inner" nature, features that turned out to be negative and a danger for the ruling class. She was a charismatic

"witch" that created feelings on her followers, but she also led them wrongly, to wrong directions. The vision she held was important, but only for a while, and not led to remarkable social movements. Also Jeanne D'Arch was burnt as a witch, after leading the French solders with a dream, vision for France, that she got while sleeping.

To be a "bad" charismatic leader would mean to manipulate followers, being egoistic, aggressive, to lead a group of followers for evil consequences (Osama bin Laden). Female charisma (like Jeanne D'Arch) might work in another way, leading people (in this case men) to wrong direction in a chaotic way, manipulate, lead with uncontrolled emotions, making people to follow without their own consideration. The ruling class (British, USA and the unmuslim world) sees the charisma of Jeanne D'Arch and OBL in a negative light. They are charismatic leaders, but only to their own followers - for the others they become enemies with evil acts and consequences. From relational point of view "good" and "bad" charisma are much more difficult to separate than it first looks. Sport coach like Curt Lindström is working in a way that does not cause any harm for the followers, he is neutral in that way.

There are much fewer female leaders than men, and there are much fewer charismatic female leaders than male ones. The whole idea that leaders use power, fit better to male ideals compared to female ones. Transformational leadership, part of any charismatic leadership with a strong, visionary and change agent- type of leading style fits better to male stereotypes than to female ones (look the earlier picture). Again the bad consequences of charismatic leadership style look to be gendered again: men's actions lead to warring, women´s to chaos and manipulation that threatens the ruling class ways that are suggestive. They both use the magic, the divine vision and the holy truth with divine origin, but end with bad consequences: killing people or rising patriotism that leads to war. A bad female charismatic leader might look as a witch, and a bad male charismatic leader as a devil, the sins they commit with, differs. A good charismatic leader is portrayed as self-sacrifying, inegoistic, and visionary in a sense that does not hurt anybody else, but works for other, more commonly shared and accepted targets, the holy mother and the humble saint would be the examples.

REFERENCES

Aaltio I. (2002) Interviewing Female Managers: Presentations of Gendered Selves in Contexts. In I. Aaltio & A. J. Mills (2002) Gender, Identity and the Culture of Organizations. (pp. 201-219). London: Routledge.

Aaltio-Marjosola, I. (1994) Gender Stereotypes as Cultural Products of the Organization. The Scandinavian Journal of Management Studies, Vol. 10, No 2, 147-162.

Aaltio-Marjosola I. & Takala T. (2000) Charismatic Leadership, Manipulation and the Complexity of Organizational Life. The Journal of Workplace Learning, Vol. 12, Issue 4, 2000, 146-159.

Aaltio-Marjosola I. & Takala T.: Bakom den stora framgången - karisma sedd I sitt sammanhang. Ledmotiv, 2/2001, pp. 19-29.

Acker, J. (1992). Gendering Organizational Theory. In A. Mills and P. Tancred (Eds.), Gendering Organizational Theory. (pp.248-260). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Auster, E. R. (1993). Demystifying the Glass Ceiling: Organizational and Interpersonal Dynamics of Gender Bias. Business and the Contemporary World, Summer 1993, 47-68.

Baril, G. L., Elbert, N., Mahar-Potter, S. and Reavy, G. C. (1989). Are Androgynous Managers Really More Effective?. Group and Organization Studies, 14, 234-249.

Brannon, Linda. (2002). Gender: Psychological Perspectives. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bryman A. (1992) Charisma and Leadership in Organizations. Sage, London.

Cogner J. & Kanungo R. (1998) Charismatic Leadership in Organizations. Sage, London.

Dalton, M. (1959). Men Who Manage. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Eagly, A. H. and Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and Leadership Style: A Meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 108, 233-256.

Fagenson, E. A. (1990). Perceived Masculine and Feminine

Attributes Examined as a Function of Individuals' Sex and Level in the Organizational Power Hierarchy: A Test of Four Theoretical Perspectives. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75, 204-211.

Frankenhaeuser, M., Lundberg, U., Fredrikson, M., Melin, B., Tuomisto, M., Myrsten, A., Hedman, M., Bergman-Losman, B. and Wallin, L. (1989). Stress On and Off the Job As Related to Sex and Occupational Status in White-collar Workers. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 10, 321-346.

Gardiner, M. and Tiggemann, M. (1999). Gender Differences in Leadership Style, Job Stress and Mental Health in Male- and Female-dominated Industries. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72, 301-315.

Gardner W. & Avolio B. (1998) The Charismatic Relation: a Dramaturgical Perspective. Academy of Management Review, Vol. 1, 32-58.

Geis, F. L. (1993). Self-fulfilling Prophecies: A Social Psychological View of Gender. In A. E. Beall and R. J. Sternberg (Eds), The Psychology of Gender (pp. 9-54). New York: Guilford.

Gherardi, S. (1995). Gender Symbolism and Organizational Cultures. London: Sage.

Goktepe, J. R. and Schneier, C. E. (1988). Sex and Gender Effects in Evaluating Emergent Leaders in Small Groups. Sex Roles, 19, 29-36.

Gough B. (1998) Roles and Discource. In K. Trew and J. Kremer (Eds.) Gender & Psychology. (pp. 15-27) London: Arnold.

House R. J. (1977) A 1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership. In J.G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (eds.) Leadership: The Cutting Edge. Carbondale: Southern Illinoisis University Press. 189-207.

Hennig, M. and Jardim, A. (1977). The Managerial Woman. London: Pan Books.

Kanter R. M. (1977) Men and Women of the Corporation.

Anchor Press, New York.

Kanungo R.N. & Mendonca M. (1996) Ethical Dimensions of Leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kauppinen K. & Aaltio I.: Leadership, Power and Gender. In Encyclopedia of Sex and Gender, ed. by C. Ember, Yale University (forthcoming).

Kets de Vries M. & Miller D. (1984) Neurotic Organizations.

Kruse, L. and Wintermantel, M. (1986). Leadership ms.-qualified: The gender bias in everyday and scientific thinking. In C. F. Graumann and S. Moscovici (Eds.), Changing conceptions of leadership (pp. 171-197). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Lundberg, U. and Frankenhaeuser, M. (1999). Stress and Workload of Men and Women in High-ranking Positions. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 4, 142-151.

Maddock S. & Parkin D. (1993) Gender Cultures: Women's Choices and Strategies at Work. Women in Management Review, 2 (2), 3-9.

Metcalfe B. & Altman Y. (2001) Leadership. In "Organizational Behaviour Reassessed. The Impact of Gender", ed. by E. Wilson, Sage, London, 104-129.

Mintzberg, H. (1973). The Nature of Managerial Work. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice Hall.

Mintzberg, H. (1989). Mintzberg on Management. New York: Macmillan.

Oseen C. (1997) Luce Irigaray, Sexual Difference and Theorizing Leaders and Leadership. Gender, Work and Organization, 4 (3), 170-84.

Powell, G. N. (1993). Women and Men in Management. 2nd ed. Newbury Park, California: Sage.

Lipman-Blumen J. (1992) Connective Leadership: Female Leadership Styles in the 21st Century Workplace. Sociological Perspectives, 35 (1), pp. 183-203.

Pringle, R. (1988). Secretaries Talk Sexuality, Power and Work. London: Verso.

Mills A. (1988) Organization, Gender and Culture. Organizations Studies, 9, 351-69.

Rosener J. (1990) Ways Women Lead. Harvard Business Review, November-December, 119-125.

Sapp, S. G., Harrod, W. J. and Zhao, L. (1996). Leadership Emergence in Task Groups with Egalitarian Gender-role Expectations. Sex Roles, 34, 65-80.

Schein, V. E. (1973). The Relationship Between Sex-role Stereotypes and Requisite Management Characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 57 / 2, 95-100.

Steyrer J. (1998) Charisma and the Architypes of Leadership. Organization Studies, 19, 5, 807-28.

Takala T. (1988) Social Responsibility of Business and Strategies to Legitimize it. Working Paper, University of Jyväskylä, School of Business and Economics, No 83 (in Finnish).

Takala T. (1998) Plato on Leadership. Journal of Business Ethics. Vol. 17, 785-98.

Wahl, A. (1992). Könsstrukturer i Organisationer: Kvinnliga Civilekonomers och Civilingenjörers Karriärutveckling (Gender Structures in Organizations: Female ?? and Engineer's Career Development). Stockholm: Fritze.

Weber M. (1964) The Theory of Social Economic Organization. Yhe Free Press, New York.
Weiss, J. W. (1996) Organizational Behaviour & Change. Managing Diversity, Cross-Cultural Dynamics and Ethics. USA: West Publishing Company.