A qualitative analysis of charismatic leadership in creative teams: The case of television directors

Susan Elaine Murphy [a,*], Ellen A. Ensher [b]

[a] Kravis Leadership Institute, Claremont McKenna College, 850 Columbia Avenue, Claremont, CA 91711, USA
[b] College of Business, Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles, CA 90045-2659, USA

ABSTRACT

Leadership continues to play an important role in team effectiveness [Burke, C.S., Stagl, K.C., Klein, C., Goodwin, G.F., Salas, E., & Halpin, S.M. (2006). What type of leadership behaviors is functional in teams? A meta-analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(3), 288–307.]. A special type of team, television show production, utilizes an intact team of highly specialized and creative members. Charismatic leadership theory provides a useful lens from which to study how television directors facilitate the team's work and creativity. In this study we used two types of qualitative software to analyze interview transcripts from 21 television directors. Semi-structured interview protocol resulted in transcripts coded for the six factors of charismatic leadership [Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.N. (1988). Behavioral dimensions of charismatic leadership. In. J.A. Conger and R.N. Kanungo (Eds.), Charismatic Leadership (pp. 78–97). San Francisco: Jossey Bass Inc.], and aspects of leader distance [Antonakis, J., & Atwater, L. (2002). Leader distance: A review and a proposed theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 673–704.; Shamir, B. (1995). Social distance and charisma: Theoretical notes and an exploratory study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 19–47.], shared leadership [Pearce, C.L., & Conger, J.A. (Eds.) (2003). Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.], and leadership self-schema [Gardner, W.L. & Avolio, B.J. (1998). The charismatic relationship: A dramaturgical perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(1), 32–58.; Murphy, S.E. (2001). Leader self-regulation: The role of self-efficacy and "multiple intelligences". In R. Riggio, S. Murphy, & F. Pirozzolo, (Eds.) Multiple intelligences and leadership, (pp. 163–186). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.; Wofford, J.C., & Goodwin, V.L. (1994). A cognitive interpretation of transactional and transformational leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly*, 5, 161–186.]. In addition, a computerized content analysis program DICTION was used to identify factors of charismatic speech content such as optimism and reference to collectives following the protocol used by Bligh, Kohles, & Meindl [Bligh, M.C., Kohles, J.C., Meindl, J.R. (2004b). Charisma under crisis: Presidential leadership, rhetoric, and media responses before and after the September 11th terrorist attacks. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 211–239.]. Results of the present study revealed that charismatic leadership can be important in explaining the leadership role of television directors in teams. Directors showed vision, sensitivity to member's needs, and other charismatic behaviors. Moreover, some charismatic leader behavior differed by leader distance from followers. Leadership self-schema appeared to be an important prerequisite for shared leadership.

1. Introduction

Ensuring that effective leaders are selected, trained, and developed is of significant importance to today's organizations. Leadership remains very important to successful organizations even when it comes at a premium. In fact, popular business

magazines that criticize many of today's business leaders for exorbitant salaries or ethical lapses, still feature the accomplishments of business managers with the celebrity once reserved for heads of state. Many management practices implemented by organizational leaders do improve the bottom line and employee satisfaction (Pfeffer, 1998). In fact, in a recent meta-analysis of experimental and quasi-experimental leadership research Reichard & Avolio (2005) showed support for the positive effects of leadership. However, other research suggests that leadership has less of an impact on organizational performance than do many other factors such as competitive market forces, changing economic circumstances, or highly motivated employees. We merely use leadership as a simple and convenient explanation for outstanding or poor organizational performance (Meindl, 1995, 1990; Meindl, Ehrlich, & Dukerich, 1985). Perhaps the issue, however, is not that leadership has little impact, but that the manner in which we study leadership is not consistently uncovering when and how leadership does make a difference.

One suggested method for closing the gap between leadership research and practice is to continue to use qualitative research methods to gather information-rich data that contributes significantly to our knowledge of leadership processes (Bryman, 2004; Conger, 1998; Conger & Toegel, 2002; Van Maanen, 1983). In fact, key paradigm shifts in the study of leadership have come from qualitative studies (Conger & Toegel, 2002 cite Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Mintzberg, 1973 as examples of this type of research). According to Conger & Toegel (2002) qualitative methods are an important tool specifically for the study of leadership for three reasons. First, this tool can help us understand how leadership is differentially exercised at various organizational levels. Second, as leadership is a dynamic process, qualitative research methods can add depth and richness that is lacking in data gleaned from questionnaires. Finally, because leadership is considered by some researchers and theories to be a socially constructed role, qualitative methods can aid in understanding the construct from multiple perspectives.

Lee, Mitchell, & Sabylnski (1999) describe four purposes for qualitative research that have implications for the study of leadership: theory generation, theory elaboration, theory testing, and critical theory development. Each of these aspects has been investigated in specific examples of qualitative leadership research (Bryman, 2004). For example, Elsbach & Kramer (2003) studied the creative process in Hollywood pitch meetings to uncover what methods creative leaders use to convince investors or managers of the importance of their ideas. Their work generated a new theoretical model for looking at creativity that has practical implications for a wide range of industries. Another qualitative study added to our knowledge of leadership requirements by uncovering the importance of external leaders to the development and functioning of self-managing work teams (Druskat & Wheeler, 2003). Kan & Parry (2004) used qualitative methods to investigate nursing leadership with respect to organizational change within a transformational leadership theory framework. Hirst, Mann, Bain, Pirola-Merlo, & Richver (2004) used both qualitative and quantitative data to develop and test a model of leadership learning. And finally as an example of critical theory development, a qualitative study of charismatic leadership and values in an advertising firm by Cha & Edmondson (2006) showed that although a charismatic leader's values were an important addition to charismatic theory, values could have a negative effect in the organization and cause employee disenchantment. In sum, qualitative research is a flexible tool that can enable researchers to bridge the gap between knowledge and practice in new and exciting ways, and is particularly useful for understanding leadership.

The purpose of the current study is to understand leadership processes within a specific type of creative team, television production crews, by using the qualitative research tool of in-depth interviews for the purpose of theory elaboration in the area of charismatic leadership and teams. Although the entertainment business and the TV industry in particular are vibrant components of the U.S. economy with undeniable world-wide influence (Ensher, Murphy, & Sullivan, 2002), it is surprising that there is so little research in organizational behavior that draws from this arena. Therefore, we contribute to knowledge of charismatic leadership, not only in real-world teams, but in an under-researched industry, to add richness to the understanding of the process underlying charismatic leadership. We also investigate the contribution of three additional concepts for the successful leadership of creative teams: distance between leaders and followers (Antonakis & Atwater, 2002; Shamir, 1995); the compatibility of charismatic leadership behavior with shared leadership (Pearce & Conger, 2003); and the role of leader self-schema for charismatic leadership behavior (Wofford & Goodwin, 1994; Wofford, Goodwin, & Whittington, 1998).

2. Theoretical background

2.1. Charismatic leadership of creative teams

Charismatic leadership theory is a popular and much researched approach to understanding effective leadership (Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 2003). Although the term charisma was initially used to describe the characteristics of religious figures and political and military leaders (Weber, 1947), charismatic leadership theory was expanded by a number of researchers who have produced complementary, yet somewhat different, conceptualizations of charismatic leadership (House, 1977; Sashkin, 1988; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993; Trice & Beyer, 1986), and charismatic leadership is one of the components in Bass' transformational theory of leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Each of these theoretical offerings links a leader's influence on group members or followers to important positive outcomes such as group performance, organizational performance, improved follower motivation, satisfaction, and effort. Charismatic leadership is not merely reserved for CEOs or Presidents of organizations even though much research has focused on high profile leaders such as U.S. presidents (House, Spangler, & Woycke, 1991) or CEOs (Beyer & Browning, 1999; Trice & Beyer, 1986). Instead, it can be found at various levels in an organization (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; House, 1977; Klein & House, 1995; Shamir et al., 1993), and charismatic leadership can operate either as an individualized or a group level phenomenon depending on organizational context (Avolio & Yammarino, 1990).

One of the well-researched models for studying the behaviors of charismatic leaders was developed by Conger & Kanungo (1994). This theory focuses on six behavioral factors said to be exhibited by charismatic leaders: strategic visioning and communication behavior, sensitivity to the environment, unconventional behavior, personal risk, sensitivity to organizational members' needs, and deviation from the status quo. A leader uses these behaviors together as part of a process to bring about change in his or her organization. More specifically, after scanning the environment for threats and opportunities for their organizations, charismatic leaders develop a vision for the organization (or work group) and communicate the vision to organizational members. The vision will often be different enough from what the company is currently doing (deviation from the status quo) and may also require that the leader incur personal risks. The charismatic leader may often engage in unconventional behavior such as flamboyant speech or other behaviors not typically seen in most leaders. The charismatic leader also carriers out his or her leadership while also being sensitive to the needs of followers. We chose to examine this charismatic leadership model for this study because the theory focuses on the behavioral aspects of charismatic leadership in addition to the attributional and relational aspects (Conger, 1998; Conger & Kanungo, 1987).

Charismatic leadership theory is not without its critics. The various charismatic theories have been faulted for the overemphasis of studies at the dyadic level, ambiguity about essential behaviors, insufficient specification of facilitating conditions such as essential follower characteristics, and environmental conditions such as uncertainty and crisis, as well as ambiguity about implications for organizational effectiveness (Yukl, 1999). In the current study rather than a focusing on charismatic leadership within dyads, we examine charismatic leadership within the context of creative teams (see Osborn, Hunt, & Jauch, 2002; Shamir & Howell, 1999 for an expanded discussion of the importance of context in leadership research). Numerous studies have examined how leadership behavior enhances or distracts from team performance (see Burke et al., 2006). For example, in the study by Druskat & Wheeler's (2003) that we cited earlier, the external leaders of self-managed teams helped their teams succeed by demonstrating leader behaviors that included moving back and forth across boundaries to build relationships, scouting necessary information for task accomplishment, persuading the teams as well as outside constituents to support one another, and empowering the teams to achieve success. West et al. (2003) demonstrated that leaders who provided clarity of purpose to work team members increased the performance of teams in different departments of a health care organization. As summarized in a 2006 meta-analysis of 50 empirical studies, person-focused, and to a lesser extent, task-focused behaviors were found to be related to perceived team effectiveness, team productivity, and team learning (Burke et al., 2006). It comes as no surprise then the importance organizations place on effective team leadership.

Leaders not only play a very important role in team performance, but they also are integral for encouraging creative problem solving for organizational members as well as work teams (Basadur, 2004). Novel, ill-defined tasks require creative solutions and leaders that guide followers in appropriate ways. According to Mumford, Scott, Gaddis, & Strange (2002), leaders influence the creativity of individuals and teams by structuring and giving direction for problem solving, exercising influence, and balancing the need to be creative or innovative with the pressure from the organization to keep costs low. In a review of contextual and leadership factors affecting creativity, Shalley & Gilson (2004) speculated that leaders influence creativity somewhat indirectly by providing resources, training, job descriptions, rewards, and other factors. They also note that supportive leadership and behaviors associated with high quality leader member exchanges (LMX) increase creativity. In fact Amabile, Schatzel, Moneta, & Kramer, (2004) showed that creative project teams and individuals were more creative when they perceived their leaders' behavior to be supportive through both instrumental and socio-emotional aspects. Hunt, Stelluto, & Hooijberg's (2004) analysis of leadership and team work for orchestra members and conductors, showed that many of the same roles required of orchestra conductors are required of directors. For example, television directors have to balance behavioral flexibility with a controlling role. In addition, just like orchestra conductors, directors have to engage in the creative process in their leadership including idea generation, idea structuring, and idea promotion (Mumford et al., 2002).

Although these studies of leader behavior in teams and the importance of particular leader behaviors for increasing team creativity have not specifically explored the role of charismatic leader behavior, Mumford, Connelly, & Gaddis (2003) speculate that charismatic leadership theory has much potential for explaining effective leadership in creative teams, especially the constructs of motivation and inspiration. They base this assertion on studies that showed positive relationships between transformational leadership and group creativity (Sosik, Kahai, & Avolio, 1998, 1999). Therefore, an examination of charismatic leadership behaviors specifically within the context of creative teams is an important contribution to the extant research literature.

2.2. Leaders and follower distance: physical, social, and task interaction

Many studies of charismatic leadership have acknowledged that leaders who influence large group of followers at some distance may engage in different types of charismatic leader behavior than those leaders who practice charismatic leadership up close and personal at the dyadic or small group level. Shamir (1995) proposed that subordinates' perceptions of charismatic leadership would in fact differ for those leaders considered to be "socially close" compared to those seen as "socially distant". In an exploratory study he showed that follower's did hold different perceptions of these two categories of leader. Perceptions of socially distant leaders focused on the prototypicality of their behavior and their communication style, whereas perceptions of socially close leaders focused on interpersonal characteristics and their use of personal examples. The difference between close and distant in Shamir's study referred to the level of relationship interaction. He defined distant as those leaders with whom the followers had no direct relationship and close as those with whom the follower had a direct relationship. Another study examined how charisma was ascribed to close leaders (platoon commander) and differed in its manifestation as compared to distant leaders (battalion commander) (Yagil, 1998). These distant leaders, battalion commanders, were somewhat closer than the distant leaders (world

leaders) chosen by the participants in Shamir's study. However, the results of Yagil's study were similar to those reported by Shamir. Specifically, followers in close relationships reported that they saw their leaders as personal role models who engaged in confidence-building communication. Distant leaders used inspirational leadership in place of dyadic communication used by close leaders.

Antonakis & Atwater (2002) hypothesize that there are three independent dimensions of distance: leader–follower physical distance, perceived social distance, and perceived task interaction. They define social distance as "perceived differences in status, rank, authority, social standing, and power, which affect the degree of intimacy and social contact that develop between followers and their leader" (p. 682). They argue that although the three types of distance may appear linked, they are fact independent factors and set up different contexts for leader and follower interactions. For example, a leader can be physically close (in the next cubicle) yet socially distant. And even though the follower may interact frequently with the leader to complete a task, he or she could still be socially distant. The studies by Shamir (1995) and Yagil (1998) did not distinguish between these different types of distance. In their studies socially distant leaders appeared to be also physically distant with low leader–follower task interaction. In the current study we consider these three types of distance within the context of the television production crew and the director's charismatic leadership.

2.3. Shared charismatic leadership

One way in which charismatic leadership theory may be further modified to accommodate the special needs of creative teams is to incorporate the notion of shared leadership (Pearce & Conger, 2003). This concept may appear paradoxical: a person is either leading or not leading, so how can leadership be shared? According to Cox, Pearce, & Sims (2003), "shared leadership involves mutual influence processes between the members of teams where the agent and target of influence changes depending on the nature of the specific tasks of the team and the knowledge, skills, and abilities of team members" (pg. 171). Shared leadership overlaps with the concept of distributed leadership. According to those who study distributed leadership, "(1) leadership is not just a top–down process between the formal leader and team members; and (2) there can be multiple leaders within a group" (Mehra, Smith, Dixon, & Robertson, p. 233, 2006).

Shared leadership is especially important for teams working on interdependent, complex, creative, and urgent tasks and therefore may be an important concept for television production teams (Cox et al., 2003). Charismatic leadership theory does not currently consider aspects of distributed or shared leadership, although Cox et al. (2003) suggest that shared leadership can work in conjunction with more traditional approaches to leadership. In fact, a recent empirical study showed that shared leadership contributed beyond that of vertical leadership (as measured by transformational leadership) in predicting new venture performance (Ensley, Hmieleski & Pearce, 2006). A leader of a very talented creative team is in a position to take turns with his or her followers in assuming the leadership role. This approach may be particularly appropriate in television production where there are a variety of specialized functions that must be integrated to create the show. A leader demonstrating shared charismatic leadership may set the stage by beginning with a compelling vision and then standing aside as the team members take the lead throughout the production as necessary. Recent theorizing on teams and leadership by Day, Gronn, & Salas (2006) note that shared capacity for leadership is important for today's organizational teams, and television teams would be no exception.

2.4. Leadership self-schema for shared leadership

Although shared leadership could be a pivotal factor in the successful leadership of creative teams, individuals who hold a more "traditional" idea of leadership characterized by directive, command and control, authoritarian leadership may resist practicing shared leadership. Wofford & Goodwin (1994) proposed that a leader's behavior is dictated by cognitive scripts the leader holds for the role of leader. They tested their ideas in a study that showed that transformational leader self-schemata were associated with transformational leadership behavior as reported by subordinates (Wofford et al., 1998). To successfully exhibit transformational leadership behavior, the leader had to hold transformational leadership as part of his or her leadership self-schema. According to Greenwald (1980) and others, self-schemas are psychological constructs of the self, or the way in which a person sees his or her own personal qualities in a particular life domain that he or she considers important. These self-schemata do not only apply to personal qualities, but they can also apply to a role one fulfills. Gardner & Avolio (1998) and others (Lord & Emrich, 2001; Lord & Hall, 2005; Murphy, 2001) suggest that the leader's identity, or self-schema for leadership, plays an important role in a leader's ability to manage the follower's impression and to demonstrate particular leader behaviors. To the extent that a leader's individual self-schema for leadership is conducive to shared leadership, we expect to see more leadership behaviors that support that philosophy.

3. Team leadership in the television industry

The television industry provides an exceptional setting for studying the type of leadership necessary to empower the creative energy of a team. As an industry, television employs over 100,000 skilled workers (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2002). In addition, television contributes significantly to the U.S. economy, representing a $43.7 trillion industry in 2002 and is expected to grow at a rate of 23.3% between 2003 and 2007. Currently television viewing is at an all-time high, with households viewing an average of 7 h and 40 min of television per day and men and women each watching a little over 4 h/day. Television broadcasting, however, is not immune to the effects of the economy and competition. Broadcasters are under immense pressure to get their programs seen. With the proliferation of television stations, both network and cable, competition has increased. In addition, the increase in "reality TV'

has reduced the number of jobs required to produce television programs. These competitive and economic factors are manifested in budget cutbacks and increased pressure to get more done in a shorter period of time. Moreover, as media conglomerates become larger and more powerful, the number of independent production companies decreased. Many media pundits find it frightening that what we watch on television will ultimately be dominated by a few very powerful individuals and the media empires they control (Wild, 1999). Therefore, the TV industry is particularly interesting to study as it represents a case of creative, self-managing teams in the form of semi-autonomous productions thriving amidst big corporate organizations.

To produce a typical television show, 50–125 cast and crew members are needed to work interdependently, creatively, and efficiently. This group works under intense time pressure, budgetary constraints, and may experience potential conflicts over creative direction (Wild, 1999). This is true for both episodic and situational comedy (sitcom) shows, which (excluding reality TV, game shows, and news shows) represent the bulk of offerings among network and cable. Moreover, a director of a TV sitcom faces extraordinary pressure (Lewis, 1981; Travis, 1997; Wild, 1999). For example, while most good directors typically prepare for the shoot by visiting the set and meeting the cast and crew the week before shooting, the director does not actually take over until Monday morning of their shooting week. On Monday, the director meets with the cast as well as the heads and members of the various departments (including lighting, production design, wardrobe, hair and make-up) and the camera crew. In addition, the director is handed a script on Monday morning, runs the first production meeting and does a reading of the script with the cast, writing team, and executives. In this meeting, it is critical that the director quickly gains respect, liking, and is able to communicate his or her vision and style to the various players. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the director typically rehearses with the cast, and Thursday is the technical shoot with lighting and camera crews. Typically, sitcoms are filmed live in front of a studio audience 1 day/week, usually Friday, and must be filmed in 6–8 h. During the period of shooting, the director must manage a dizzying array of competing expectations and demands. These include incorporating script changes from a staff of writers (this number can vary, but can be between 6 and 25 people), taking suggestions and addressing concerns from the studio and TV executives, attending to the performance and needs of the cast, as well as being mindful to the reactions of the audience (i.e., did they laugh?). These various stakeholders may have very different opinions, agendas, and needs, all of which must be carefully managed while directing a show that typically costs around $1 million and up per episode (Wild, 1999).

Today several directors may share the directing responsibility for a 22–24 episode season (Travis, 1997). Sometimes television actors enjoy directing an episode or two of their own shows to try their hand at directing. Political considerations may also factor influencing who directs. For example, directing jobs may be used as "favors to friends" or as tokens in the vibrant game of social exchange so prevalent in the entertainment industry. The staff members in other production positions do not change as much (except for the writers on episodic TV). Typically, on sitcoms, unless there is a personnel shake-up due to creative differences, failure of the show, or personal issues, the writing team stays together for the duration of the show.

Today's television directors experience increasing competition and pressure to do well on each production. Moreover, some directors are asked to lead in a situation in which the cast and crew may already be established. In this situation, the team has developed its own culture and work style and the director needs to provide direction that fits to some extent within this established mental model of how the team operates (Klimoski & Mohhammed, 1997). "Mental models are mental representations of the world that allow people to understand, predict, and solve problems in a given situation (Gentner & Gentner, 1983 cited in Thompson, 2003, p. 133). Because the teams we examined in this study were intact, except for the director's position, these teams also develop a shared culture of norms and roles, sometimes including a mental model of how the team functions as a group (Klimoski & Mohammed, 1997). Research has shown that conflict arises when team members' mental models of how the team functions are incongruent. This conflict can be associated with less successful coordination of activity (Cannon-Bowers, Salas, & Converse, 1993). The television production teams then could be ripe for conflict when a new director arrives with a different style or different mental model of how the team should work together (Levine, Moreland, Argote, & Carley, 2005). In this situation, directors may find it very difficult to both exert their influence, and gain the team's cooperation.

Organizations use many different types of teams to accomplish their strategic goals (e.g., manager-led teams, self-managing teams, self-designing teams, and self-governing teams; Hackman, 1987). For the purposes of this study we will define directors as leaders of manager-led work teams, although in some respects, these teams manifest some of the features of a self-managed team. For example, the teams are comprised of members who are professionals, know their own jobs very well, and need little guidance to accomplish their tasks. Although production teams that are led by directors may have the appearance of a temporary organization, the interdependent nature of the tasks is more suggestive of a large team (Guzzo, 1996). In a typical manager-led team, the leader would be responsible for selection of group members and monitoring performance (Thompson, 2003). In television productions, because the directors rotate in and out throughout the season, the show's producers might have more say in selecting members and appraising group member performance. However, even though television directors are in a situation that might be different from the typical manager-led team, the manner in which they overcome the associated difficulties to bring about effective team performance illustrates important lessons for managers struggling to balance the need for coordination and control while enhancing group creativity (Mumford et al., 2002).

4. Current study

Surprisingly, an extensive literature search did not produce a single study of directors as leaders, although one study recognized the applicability of leadership to directors in the teaching of management (Alvarez, Miller, Levy, & Svejenova, 2004). Most books on directing fail to discuss typical leadership functions of the director; instead they focus almost exclusively on the technical aspects of directing during a shoot. The current study will use qualitative methods by focusing on first-order and second-order concepts (Van

Maanen, 1983). First order concepts are the facts as gained through either observation or interviews, and second-order concepts are the theories used to explain the facts. More specifically we will use pattern matching (Yin, 1994) as a technique to explore whether the pattern of reported team leader behavior of television directors matches the theory of charismatic leadership as conceptualized by Conger and Kanungo. Therefore, we plan to explore the following propositions:

Proposition 1. *Television directors engage in the type of leadership and management typical of managers in other industries.*

Proposition 2a. *Charismatic leadership theory, as conceptualized by Conger and Kanungo, is an appropriate method for studying leadership in creative production teams.*

Another purpose of the current study is to examine the charismatic content of television directors' reported behavior by analyzing the rhetoric they use (a qualitative method known as the hermeneutic technique, see Lee et al., 1999) in describing their leadership as directors. As many researchers have noted, the manner in which leaders go about articulating a vision, or showing sensitivity to group member needs is as important as the behavior itself (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999). Another important point is what is studied in understanding the vision process. Many researchers note that communication is the key to vision articulation, yet there are but a handful of studies that examine leader communication (cf., Bligh, Kohles & Meindl, 2004a). Therefore, following the work of Bligh, Kohles, & Meindl (2004b), this paper utilizes a computerized dictionary-based content analysis program called DICTION (Hart, 2000) to study the manner in which team leaders articulate their visions and leadership philosophy.

Proposition 2b. *Rhetoric for directors engaging in charismatic behavior will differ from normative discussions of management.*

Another important area of consideration for the present study is whether leaders use different charismatic behaviors to influence relatively close versus relatively distant followers. In combining physical distance, social distance, and leader–follower task interaction frequency, Antonakis & Atwater (2002) produce eight unique leader distance configurations. In the current study distance between the director and crew members varies. With some members of the crew the director will have a very close relationship or what Antonakis & Atwater (2002) define as proximal leader distance (low physical distance, low social distance, with high follower–leader interaction). Proximal leadership will most likely occur with production members such as the actors, the assistant directors, and the director of photography. However, with other crew members such as those who provide food (craft services), wardrobe, or other jobs such as set design, the director may be close in physical distance, but low in perceived interaction frequency, and high in social distance. This combination of the three distance dimensions is considered socially distant. We expect charismatic leader behaviors to differ for the proximal and socially distant leaders and we propose the following:

Proposition 2c. *Leaders using charismatic behaviors will report charismatic behavior that varies by distance. Leaders will focus on individualized and direct interactions with proximal followers, while leaders will report more indirect leadership behaviors with those followers who are socially distant. Differences in leader behavior by distance will be examined for the charismatic factors of vision, sensitivity to member needs, and unconventional behavior.*

We are also interested in expanding theory through qualitative methods to determine whether concepts of shared leadership and leadership self-schema might be useful additions to charismatic leadership theory. Because the leader is ultimately responsible for work group performance, leaders are in a difficult position when it comes to managing creative professionals. Modifying charismatic leadership theory to include the role of leadership self-schema for charismatic leadership and shared leadership might make it more applicable to the leadership of today's creative teams.

Proposition 3. *A leader's philosophy and corresponding self-schema for leadership affects his or her use of charismatic leadership behaviors, shared leadership, and rhetoric around the task of leadership.*

5. Method

5.1. Study participants

We interviewed 21directors who had directed or were currently directing many different televisions shows and made-for-television movies on network as well as cable television. These shows include children's offerings on the Disney Channel of *That's so Raven* and *Even Stevens* as well as shows from the 4 main networks including *Scrubs, Ally McBeal, Beverly Hills 90210*, and *Ed* and television dramas *Crossing Jordan, Third Watch, ER, West Wing, Law & Order*, and *NYPD Blue*. The directors were extremely well respected, as evidenced by the number of different shows and number of episodes over their careers they had directed (their industry experience ranged from 10 to 40 years), and many had been nominated for or won important industry accolades such as Emmy's and Directors Guild Awards.

The participants ranged in age from approximately 28 to 72 years. We selected the 21 individuals using three methods. One method was contacting them through the Director's Guild of America, another method was contacting directors working with a specific situation comedy over for the past two seasons, and finally we used the "snowball" technique where one director referred us to another (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). The group was predominantly composed of men, with 33% women ($n = 7$). The sample was unusual with respect to gender: a recent report from the Director's Guild of America (DGA) noted more than 80% of 860 episodes of the Top 40 prime-time drama and comedy series were directed by white men (DGA, 2003). In our sample all of the directors appeared to be of European-American descent.

5.2. Interview process

In-person interviews lasted approximately an hour. Almost all of the interviews were conducted by two of a team of three interviewers, which was helpful to process the non-verbal aspects of the interview to aid in interpretation. Each interviewer took careful notes in addition to tape-recording the interview to ensure accuracy. The interviews were discussed immediately following to ensure that there was consistently and clarity between the interviewers' interpretations. We began each interview with a statement of the purpose of the study and asked for permission from the participants to share their stories. All of the participants gave us permission to share their stories. At the conclusion of the interview, we thanked the participants and provided them with an opportunity to give us feedback and recall any final thoughts. The interviews resulted in transcribed documents averaging about 20 single-spaced pages. An independent transcriptionist was retained to type the interviews. All of the transcribed interviews were reviewed and compared against interview notes to ensure accuracy and consistency, and then entered into Atlas.ti 5.0. We asked 14 open-ended questions focusing on career history and developmental experiences, past mentoring relationships, and some direct questions about charismatic leadership. Appendix A contains the 6 questions related to leadership asked in the interviews.

5.3. Data analysis process

To assist us in the process of theory elaboration for charismatic leadership in teams, we used both typical content analysis coding protocol and Atlas.ti 5.0, a qualitative software tool (published by Scolari). Following the procedures used with other qualitative software we used Atlas.ti to store and categorize the interviews, electronically code charismatic leader behavior categories, computer search for other behaviors, and generate summary reports of like behaviors (Kan & Parry, 2004). Although the Atlas.ti software has an automated search function for words and phrases, we instead relied more exclusively on a coding process very similar to manual content analysis coding. Basically, the advantage of using the computerized program was the ease of handling the resulting content categories in checking for consistency in codings.

Our content analysis efforts focused on the qualitative analysis technique of "pattern matching". According to Lee et al. (1999) and Yin (1994) pattern matching is a technique where "…formal hypotheses, an explicit theory, or a less formal conceptual model allows the anticipation of a particular pattern of variables, phenomena, or outcomes" (Lee et al., 1999, pg. 174). Pattern matching was used explicitly to determine whether the behavioral components of charismatic leadership theory exist and describe the activities of television program directors. We also used grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) to examine leader self philosophy, shared leadership, and other themes of team leadership that arose through the data coding.

For content analysis coding we followed the following stages. Stage 1 — Once all the interviews were completed, the preliminary data analysis efforts involved reading the transcript of each interview at least two times in its entirety; Stage 2 — Transcripts were coded for each of the six major factors of charismatic leadership according to Conger & Kanungo (vision articulation, sensitivity to members' needs, unconventional behavior, environmental sensitivity, deviation from the status quo, and risk taking). Five coders were trained to recognize the six factors, but were unfamiliar with the dimensions when the study began. They coded one transcript together as a group and then another two transcripts individually, coming together to resolve coding disagreements. The remaining transcripts were coded individually by asking each coder to determine whether each passage fit the predetermined six charismatic behavior definitions. These passages were only coded for presence and did not receive a scale coding. Stage 3 — Additional coding schemes arose as we coded for the original charismatic factors. These included leadership philosophy and expanded codings for vision articulation and for environmental sensitivity. We describe these additional elements in more detail in the results section.

We calculated interrater reliabilities by first examining agreement on the number of full utterances coded on each director's transcript. The initial pass showed that the raters coded approximately 78% of the same passages within the transcripts. The coders met and reconciled the initial coding discrepancies so that all agreed on the passages to be coded so there was 100% agreement on whether the passages represented one of the coded categories. Next, for each coded behavior, the level of agreement was a simple fraction of the number of coders who coded it as the behavior out of the total number of coders. Most behaviors were coded by at least four coders. Interrater agreement was calculated and showed acceptable agreement between coders, ranging from .70 to .94 for each dimension coded with an average of .86.

To analyze the actual word content of the director's thoughts on leadership, we used a different computer program DICTION 5.0 (Hart, 2000), which is a dictionary-based software program that was explicitly designed to examine the linguistic elements of political leaders based on linguistic theory (Hart 1984, 2001) as a hermeneutic, deconstructive text interpretation technique (Lee et al., 1999). DICTION uses 31 pre-defined dictionaries, containing over 10,000 search words, to analyze a passage. Because the dictionaries contain individual words only, statistical weighting procedures partially correct for context (Hart, 2000 as noted in Bligh et al., 2004a). Norms are produced across different groups for comparison purposes. In addition, the relative percentage of words spent on a particular construct is provided. In our study we focused on dictionaries that incorporated current theorizing on charismatic leadership as outlined by Bligh et al. (2004b), and some examples are listed in Appendix B. In particular we were interested in the master constructs of optimism, certainty, and commonality, as well as the individual constructs of praise, collectivism, rapport, diversity, motion, concern, and aggression as these were important constructs found to be related to perceptions of charismatic leadership in earlier studies (Bligh et al., 2004a,b).

To prepare each transcript for analysis with DICTION, only interviewee comments specifically describing their roles as leaders were included. Other information not pertaining to leadership was deleted. The interview material for each interview was of a different length; therefore, all results are reported as a ratio of the number of words. Preliminary analysis of the distribution of the different variables showed that, for the passages transcribed, the analyzed terms were normally distributed.

6. Results

6.1. The nature of television director leadership

Before describing the specific results from the qualitative analysis, we overview some characteristics of the directors in this study. The majority of the directors interviewed demonstrated a strong passion for their craft. In fact, through the DICTION analysis of their discussion of leadership, 36% of the directors in our sample were above the published DICTION norm in optimism in their speech patterns. To prepare to become directors, a few had attended formal film school ($n=7$) or had known from an early age that they were going to direct, and therefore started at very low levels in the industry and took various jobs that eventually led them to directing. For example, a number of the directors had done many of the jobs related to pre-production. Another group started in one other position, such as editor or writer, and then began directing. Others fell into the industry by taking a job and then became hooked. A large majority of the directors (15 of 21) mentioned that as a profession, directing is a fairly isolating experience. This is because, while there are several writers, several cast members, and a large production crew, there is just one director on a particular shoot. Although many spoke of studying the craft from observing other directors in action early in their careers or analyzing other directors' work (e.g., shots, camera angles, coverage etc.), they found it necessary to be dedicated, self-directed learners. Natural feedback is not built into the task of directing. In other words, a producer may tell someone that the shoot went over budget, but that factor may not have been in the control of the director. Or one of the actors may be having a tough time understanding a role. Is that the director's fault? Many reported that the only tangible way of knowing if they did a good job was if they were invited back for the next season to direct episodes.

6.2. Elements of charismatic leadership

6.2.1. Vision and vision articulation

Most theories of charismatic leadership incorporate vision setting as an important component (House, 1977). A compelling vision tells members of the organization or work group an idealized goal of the future. The purpose of the vision is to align the organization around strategic direction. Little research has been done, however, to uncover what the vision process looks like in work groups. Much of the understanding of the visioning process has focused on top management levels. Within the current study we were interested in how directors conveyed a vision and the process by which the vision was communicated to the production cast and crew. We asked interview participants to tell us how they communicate their vision on a production. When asked the question, none of the directors hesitated in answering. However, a few variations in the use of vision articulation were uncovered. For example, there was the issue of directness. About half of the directors used a very direct style for communicating their vision, while others chose a more indirect manner. Below is an example of how a director provided a direct vision for the specific process of the shoot:

> "When I walk on the set on the first morning, within five minutes the crew knows that I know what I'm doing, and the actors know that I know what I'm doing, so everybody relaxes, and there has to be that element of trust. That means I have a clear vision for how I want to proceed in the process on the set, and I have a clear vision of what I want the show to look like. I break it down into a smaller piece, so on the first day you get a rehearsal on the first scene. Within that rehearsal, I make a series of decisions that are communicated to everybody in terms of the blocking of the scene and in terms of the shooting of the scene. By communicating those decisions clearly, that represents my vision."

The following is an example of a more indirect style, although there is conflict in the content of the vision:

> "We want to get from here to there. What I do is I convey cooperation, collaboration: An environment where any contribution can be made at the time. No idea is too silly. And there's nothing sacred about my opinion compared to yours. In truth, I believe the opposite. But you don't get anything from saying that."

Many felt that their decisiveness needed to be coupled with inclusiveness, even though the director took ownership because they recognized that the cast and crew were skilled professionals and they worked to bring out the best in them.

> "If I'm directing, I'm involved in everything. I want the show to be my vision. I want to do all of my camera work. But at the same time, if I have a great group of operators and people with real talent, you're a fool not to listen to them, because they'll only make you better. If you can incorporate that into your vision, they will take what you have done and accentuate it and make it look better."

Another director talked about coming to the set ready to convey his vision, but realizing that it is difficult to establish his vision because of the way in which directors were rotated in and out of shows.

> "On a given day you got an impossible schedule. You just have to go in and set the tone. 'Hey, this is what we're doing first.' You just got to keep it moving. You got to act as if you know what you're doing. I get in immediately and just go in and set up. Let's rehearse it. The actors didn't know who I was. I am just another new director. So breaking the ice with actors is always difficult."

Another factor that showed variation was the content of the vision. Sometimes the vision was focused on the way in which the production team would work together and might convey the director's role as leader. Whereas for other directors, their vision was used more exclusively to provide a tangible vision of what the artistic elements of the show would look like.

In the visioning process, the following director showed an emphasis on both the team functioning and artistic product by taking a more active role in directing. But she still struggled with the paradox of leading, while sharing leadership with her team members.

> "You're not working for a committee, but you're using a committee. And that's very complex. You're using everybody to get this vision. You cannot expect a result for that work that is some predetermined thing. You can see it, but then you have got to let it go."

Therefore, for this sample of directors, vision articulation was an important component in the process of motivating and coordinating the team's effort. Directors either discussed their vision directly, indirectly, or through their actions. These differences appeared to be dictated by the leader's distance. However, these differences also seemed to be related to the personal style of the director. DICTION analysis of the directors' discussions of vision did not produce scores on variables of *inspiration, collectives*, or *accomplishment* that were greater than the standard norms in DICTION. However, most of our directors (15 out of 20) did score above the norm for motion in the content of their rhetoric surrounding vision. *Motion* is a DICTION term that includes terms connoting human movement (bustle, job, lurch, leap), physical processes (circulate, momentum, revolve, twist), journeys (barnstorm, jaunt, wandering, travels), speed (lickety-split, nimble, zip, whistle-stop), and modes of transit (ride, fly, glide, swim).

6.2.2. Sensitivity to group members' needs

As part of the charismatic leadership process, charismatic directors were expected to show sensitivity to production team member needs by using influence techniques that developed mutual liking and respect, and they spent time expressing personal concern for the needs and feelings of the cast and crew. One director who is also an actor/director shared his thoughts:

> "One thing some directors do is shout out directions, like 'Do it again but happier,' or 'Don't pick up that cup.' I hated that when I was an actor. I hated being yelled at like I was a puppet. I felt like a monkey or the director's play thing so I try whenever I have notes to walk up to the actor. And they [the producers] get mad at me, because I waste a lot of film or tape doing this. But too bad: I never, never yell across the set."

Another director who had not been an actor was nevertheless very cognizant of the needs of actors:

> To be a good director you need to realize what people are feeling and realize the pressure that actors feel. They're in front of an audience. It's their face that's on camera. They can look stupid at any moment and millions of people will realize that. So realize the pressure that they're under sometimes. Actors are often harder on themselves than anyone else.

Some directors expressed sensitivity to member needs by really focusing on recognizing the talents of individuals as illustrated in this quote:

> "Do not interfere in departments. I don't interfere in camera, sound, makeup, hair, anything. I'll talk to the department head, 'this is what I want to do, what direction I want to go'. But in terms of interdisciplinary stuff on the set, how people do their jobs, I have nothing to do with it. I don't want to be seen that way."

The previous quote underscores how the director would consider differences between his or her proximal leadership versus socially distant leadership.

A director who demonstrated a keen awareness of the crew's needs and acted accordingly, put it this way:

> "I mean, as funny as it is, I feel like people on film crews are more sensitive than your regular employees. Everybody has their own gripes about their job. But if you had a big company, over a period of time you can solve that. You know what each person is sensitive about. They don't want the smoking down the hall. You get rid of it or whatever. But on a show, everybody's bringing their own stuff about [previous work], 'oh, I got screwed on the last job by that producer.' Or 'Oh, I got screwed by that director who is so lazy and took credit.' A lot of these people bring baggage and they're more sensitive. So you have to be constantly on your toes and trying to make it better."

Our sample of directors showed an intense sensitivity to the needs of team members. It appears that this factor of charismatic leadership is an important element for team functioning in this context. In fact many of those same directors who showed this interest in their team members were rewarded once the shoot was over with *praise* and celebration from the crew. This was reflected in the higher than average scores for the praise dictionary from DICTION analysis (this dictionary included affirmations of some person, group, or abstract entity, which included terms isolating important social qualities such as dear, delightful, witty, physical qualities such as mighty, handsome, and beautiful, in addition to intellectual qualities, entrepreneurial qualities, and moral qualities). DICTION scoring showed a higher than norm for the use of words demonstrating *rapport* (which includes descriptions of attitudinal similarities among groups of people and terms of affinity, assent, deference, and identity).

Overall it appeared that member sensitivity was manifested differently depending upon leader distance as suggested by previous research (Antonakis & Atwater, 2002; Shamir, 1995; Yagil, 1998). The quotes noted above showed that proximal leader distance was characterized by intense attempt to understanding the follower's unique situation. For more socially distant relationships the leader also showed sensitivity but in a more symbolic way. For example, the quote that talked about the need for the director to smooth over previous poor crew treatment shows how the director looked to fulfill the follower's needs and worked to anticipate their expectations.

6.2.3. Unconventional behavior

Charismatic leaders are said to often exhibit very unique behavior that surprises other members of the organization, and is especially important in creative groups (Jaussi & Dionne, 2003). In the current study, we did not ask the directors directly if they engaged in unconventional behavior. Instead as an attempt to uncover behavior that was nontraditional, we asked them to talk about times when things were not going especially well or ways that they relieved tension on a set. One director told the story of how he would often take the side of the cast and crew against the producers to curry favor. He mentioned how he ended up paying people out of his own pocket when some of the crew showed up on a rainy day and were told they would not be paid.

One director focused on using unconventional behavior around children to ensure their cooperation on a shoot.

> "If it's kids, I swear around them. So they think oh, he allows swearing, which is a big thing and kids love that. It's like parents hate it, but kids love it."

Others commented on the unconventional behavior that seems to pervade Hollywood in general. As many of the directors reported and we saw on the sets we visited, physical affection and other actions are used to increase intimacy. People who do not know each other or meet for the first time hug and kiss showing a cultural norm of pseudo intimacy. One director commented, that the wardrobe person would come up and say, "Boss man, where's my hug today." Providing lavish meals for people, who are there for 12 h minimum, breeds an environment of immediate intimacy, especially if crew is on location and isolated from others. One director took unconventional behavior very seriously. The story below illustrates this very well.

> "I get very, very, very enthusiastic on the set. I'll dive down in the mud if I have to. It was pouring down rain in this ranch at which we were shooting. And there was this stream that the actor was going to have to I leap over. So I leaped over first to show him it was okay- of course I missed the bank and landed hip deep in the water."

Another unconventional behavior is the use of dramatic forms of positive encouragement. For example, one director uses "Great" for a bad performance, "Brilliant" for something just okay, and "Genius, cut, moving on" is saved for the best performance. Another director used self-sacrifice to bond with and encourage his team:

> "The last night of the shoot, we'd gone very, very late. And it was going to take another hour to wrap the equipment. And we didn't have the money for a security guard. And we had one more day shooting. I said, "You know, I'll just stay here and watch the set." So everybody just left the equipment standing, and I slept in the trailer and realized there wasn't even a blanket, and it was freezing, freezing cold. But you know, I tried to do something for them."

Therefore, just as larger than life organizational leaders such as the late Sam Walton of WalMart, or Jeff Bezos of Amazon, the late Mary Kay Ash, and Steven Jobs of Apple/Pixar have been known to use unconventional behavior to lead their organizations, this also occurred for about 70% of the directors in our studies. Interestingly, unconventional behavior was often not used to directly accomplish organizational goals, but instead as a means to increase group loyalty. It also appeared to be charismatic leadership behavior that was reserved for more socially distant situations to influence members of the crew with whom the director had slightly less direct contact (as described in the quote preceding this paragraph). No DICTION variable appeared to be applicable for this factor of charismatic leadership.

6.2.4. Sensitivity to environmental trends

Charismatic leaders are said to possess a heightened sensitivity to the environment and carefully scan for trends that would cause them to adapt their vision. There is the classic example of a business leader with low environmental sensitivity — the guy with the buggy whip factory who refused to adapt as the automobile emerged as the predominant mode of transportation. In our interviews all directors understood the pressures from the environment that impacted the manner in which they carried out their craft. Not one hesitated when asked what type of environmental or societal trends they consider in their work. Below are a number of examples of some of the trends that many directors mentioned.

On who influences their work:

> "So there's a lot more interference in situation comedy than there used to be. When I first started as a director, writer, maybe one person from the network was there. Now there's a whole team of people who are involved in evaluating every thing, every shot, everything else."

On economic pressures:

> "I try to keep everything on the set light. There is extreme stress, because there is never enough money, never enough time. And yet you are expected to get a certain number of pages per day."

On trends that influence technical and artistic parts of the job:

> "I think a good director is a good observer. You have to be aware of trends and what's out there. The style of shooting a kids' TV show might be more like MTV- the camera in your face. I also think diversity in casting is really important. It is always

in my head. You read so much about the entertainment industry and it's very white and any chance I get to cast a woman or minority I do. If two actors are exactly the same and they are both terrific and one is a minority I would hire the minority every time. I am everything that's wrong in this business as I am young and white- at least I am not some LA film school brat! So, being aware of all this is important."

It appears that the directors in our study were keenly aware of the environment in which they operated. This is not a surprising finding, as most good managers and leaders in organizations spend some time worrying about industry trends, but more effective leaders are those who anticipate what is occurring and even predict what may happen next. In one interview, a director mentioned he admired the extraordinary ability that investor Warren Buffet has for picking up on trends now and out into the future. Buffet's uncanny ability represents an extreme level of environmental sensitivity that has guided his decisions. We did not analyze this set of charismatic behaviors by leader distance. DICTION analysis did not show that the leaders in the sample included more references to issues of *diversity* in their discussions of leadership as compared to norms. No other current DICTION dictionary seemed to capture this component of charismatic leadership.

6.2.5. Personal risk and deviation from the status quo

Although personal risk and deviation from the status quo are separate behaviors, these dimensions were inextricably linked in the content of the interviews, which was most likely because of the nature of the job. The directors in our sample were not necessarily in a position to move away from the status quo without personal risk to themselves and their future employment. Therefore, while we coded instances of these separately, they were still closely linked. We did not consider leader distance in examining these behaviors.

Personal risk is an important part of charismatic leadership within the Conger and Kanungo conceptualization. This dimension examines leaders who sacrifice or incur high costs for the organization. In the interviews we asked individuals specifically about the types of risks they took. They described risks that were mostly involved in either the artistic elements of directing such as shot choice and special camera processes, or risk was around the way in which they treated the crew and actors that sometimes incurred at high cost.

> "Usually there's an "us" and "them" thing about the producers. At least on some of the movies I've made, producers have a pet. And I try to align myself with the crew because a lot of times I'm frustrated with the producers and I don't really care if the producers are mad at me. I care if the crew is mad at me."

With respect to deviations from the status quo, there appeared to be less of this allowed in the roles and responsibilities the directors had. Conger and Kanungo talk about this factor often in conjunction with vision setting. In other words, a charismatic leader recognizes that the status quo is no longer viable by taking into account environmental trends. Where we did see this behavior, it was as a follow-up to a recognized environmental change. For example, almost every director talked about the influence of MTV on how they practiced their craft. The following describe one director's struggle to respond to the pressure of taking risks or deviating from the status quo:

> "I mean there's two ways to go about it dealing with risk. You know, you kind of go and you go with the flow, because trying to reinvent the wheel is very difficult. A lot of people won't believe in you when you try something new. I'm not saying don't do something new, but it is important to try to do your own thing, whatever it is, especially within the context of also watching what's going on in the world, seeing what's new."

However deviation from the status quo was a mantra to some. The following successful director is known for his innovative techniques, and as he puts it:

> "Probably in my career there's a lot of 'what are you doing' going on, by the way, a lot of the time. I do march to my own drum, that's the way I am. And I always feel I'm not being successful if someone doesn't call me about three days in [to the shoot] and say, 'What are you doing?!'"

The DICTION analysis for this dimension focused on *passivity* (dictionary looked for words ranging from neutrality to inactivity). We expected the directors to show a lack of passivity, but in fact they were at about the norm. In their position, they may need to understand those constraints that hinder introducing any sort of radical change. Words associated with the DICTION variable *present concern* (includes general physical activity such as cough, taste, sing, take, social operations such as canvass, touch, govern, meet, and also task-performance including words such as make, cook, print, paint) were well above the published norm for these directors. This may indicate a propensity for the here and now versus hypothesizing about what could possibly be changed in a relatively unchangeable environment. These observations warrant further investigation.

6.3. Leadership self-schema

From a qualitative analysis of metaphors for leadership and stated leadership philosophies, we were able to discern three distinct self leadership schema for the sample of directors. These schema reflected: 1) a propensity for authoritarian control; 2) a dyadic process of giving people what they need to help them succeed, while still understanding the obligations of leadership;

and 3) a wish for shared leadership. One director was able to articulate some of the differences he saw in styles of directing that approximate our categories:

> "Some [directors] are really very hands off. They just kind of sit there, and they don't talk to – they don't communicate with other people. They just direct the actors and rely on the people like the script supervisor or a DP [director of photography] to do everything else. And then there are people that micromanage every person, every little thing. It's like everything, the DP, the lighting, the makeup, the wardrobe, set design, what the actors are doing, what they're specifically supposed to be doing."

Three of the directors mentioned the legendary authoritarian director Cecille B. DeMille as a stereotype that was less likely to occur in today's directing environment. Although almost every person interviewed had experienced someone who was authoritarian who screamed and yelled at the cast and crew. As far as their own ideas, interestingly, four directors mentioned that they have thought of a director as being captain of a ship. As one director put it,

> "I always tell people two things when I start, one is when I quote Herman Melville. I say, 'There's one God in heaven, and one captain of the Pequod. So don't worry who's in charge here because you're looking at him.' I make that real clear."

This next quote, while not quite as strong as the captain metaphor still gives us the impression of a director in charge and what it means to be decisive.

> "From the point of view of managing all the people on the set, if it's working correctly, you're the final say on everything. So, you know, the sound guy will come with this idea. The effects person will have this idea. And one of the qualities of a director is to be able to decide quickly. You have to be able to say, "yes on that sound idea, no on that special effect, I want to do it live." Once you're on the set you have to be a decisive personality in order to keep the machine rolling."

Or simply put:

> "I'm in a very strong managerial position because I'm responsible for the work of a hundred people ultimately and somehow channeling all of that."

Another director summed up the necessity for control and strong leadership by stating with a degree of humor that directors are like "kings without a kingdom" because they like and enjoy complete control on the set but find it frustrating when they take this propensity into other areas of their lives.

On the other end of the spectrum, there were some articulations that approximated shared leadership:

> "You're only as good as the people you work with. The people give light to your vision, but they have their own vision. And somehow you're a weaver and a traffic cop all at the same time and an administrator and a father, all of those things."

Those who truly shared leadership understood the risks that might come with it. As one director put it,

> "You don't aim low you just keep yourself in a comfort level. You know it's important that you get chills yourself from others coming up with ideas that you had not thought of. Don't be afraid to hire people who are more talented than you."

Through the interviews it was readily apparent that directors had very different implicit leadership theories of what a leader ought to do that they internalized as self-schema that affected how they operated as a leader. These schemata are important in understanding how charismatic leadership might look for directors who each come from a very different philosophy of leadership. DICTION was also used to determine if the interview rhetoric differed for the three philosophies. We divided the leaders into three groups based on their espoused leadership self-schema to determine if they differed in the content of their interview rhetoric. Using a one-way analysis of variance, the DICTION results revealed trends, with constructs such as certainty, centrality and human interest approach significance in the direction one would hypothesize. Given the small sample size we did not have power to determine if there were true differences. Testing whether the content of a leader's rhetoric corresponds to his or her closely held values of leadership is a testable hypothesis for future research. We were also unable to determine if these leadership self-schema were nuanced enough to suggest differences by leader distance. As Antonakis & Atwater (2002) describe, when examining charisma from different distances, the behaviors exhibited will take a different form. One could imagine that those who hold a more authoritarian schema as keeping being more socially distant from the group, yet engaging in many charismatic behaviors (e.g., setting the vision, scanning the environment, and the use of unconventional behavior). In fact many of the famous examples of charismatic leaders, Steve Jobs, Sam Walton, or other business leaders, could be considered simultaneously charismatic and authoritarian. These individuals may have used fewer behaviors that showed group member sensitivity than less authoritarian charismatic leaders.

7. Discussion

7.1. Overview of findings

The context of television show production provided a provocative and useful setting for examining leadership for a number of reasons. First, these are creative teams of professionals. Today's organizations struggle to manage creativity and must constantly

find ways to retain their valuable talent. Both management tasks require a special type of leadership. Second, it is a challenge to manage leaders and team members who reserve their loyalty for their profession, rather than to the organization for which they work. For skilled professionals in television, there is a readily available job across town doing the same thing. This boundaryless career environment is typical in many professions and makes retaining talent difficult if they are not kept engaged in their work (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996). Third, the demands of a director's job are similar to those facing leaders in other industries. The average tenure of a CEO is short — often just several years. Often CEO's and other leaders are placed into their high profile jobs and are required to perform immediately, much as directors who walk onto a set and are "instant CEO's." Uncovering the secrets of successful directors who use charismatic leaders can have important how-to ideas for other senior executives and CEO's who must immediately hit the ground running. Moreover, team member turnover, whether it be leadership roles or key team members, can be devastating to team functioning (Levine et al., 2005). Finally, as suggest by Day, Gronn, & Salas (2006) it is important to study teams "in the wild" with respect to both the leadership of the team and the team leadership that arises. Therefore, the current study is valuable for understanding many typical organizational challenges, albeit in a slightly different context.

The purpose of this current study was to examine how real-world leaders, television directors, lead creative teams. We used qualitative research methods to investigate whether directors are involved in the practice of leadership and whether Conger & Kanugo's (1988) model of charismatic leadership is a useful lens from which to study directors as leaders. This study contributes to the research literature on the leadership of creative teams by focusing on additions to charismatic leadership theory including the concept of leader distance, shared leadership, and leadership self-schema. We will talk about these contributions in the remaining sections.

7.1.1. Applicability of charismatic leadership theory for television directors

In this study we found that not only did directors demonstrate leader-like behaviors, but they were able to articulate how they use many specific charismatic leadership behaviors to gain group cooperation and increase creativity. Using the six aspects of charismatic leadership as set forth by Conger and Kanungo, we discovered that the visioning process played an important role in setting the climate for the production. Some directors talked about directly conveying their vision for a shoot during the first meeting with cast and crew, while others used more indirect methods during the production to set the tone. They also reported utilizing different tactics for conveying vision and direction with different groups (e.g., actors, crew, producers) based on physical distance, social distance, and task interaction frequency. Surprisingly, as much as directors talked directly about the content of their visions, or methods for conveying it, the DICTION content analysis of their discussions of vision did not show more use of constructs such as *inspiration*, *collectives*, or *accomplishment* than the general norms for these constructs.

Directors also gave many examples of how they demonstrated sensitivity to members' needs that matched the supportive leader behaviors important for leading creative teams as found by Amabile et al. (2004) and others. They spoke of the careful direction they gave actors, and respect they gave their professional crews. Moreover, the content analysis of DICTION showed higher than average use of praise and rapport in their discussions of group members. It was very clear that sensitivity to members needs differed depending upon whether they were working with socially distant or close followers.

The use of unconventional behavior was also important for many of these leaders as found in earlier research (Jaussi & Dionne, 2003) although more research is necessary to understand how in this context unconventional behavior enhanced creativity. Directors' unconventional behavior often manifested itself as self-sacrificial behavior. As noted by Choi & Mai-Dalton (1999), self-sacrificial behaviors are used by charismatic leaders to "build trust, to earn the acceptance of followers to be role models, to demonstrate loyalty and dedication to the company, and so on" (p. 397), and appear to be even more important in crisis conditions (Halverson, Holladay, Kazama, & Quinones, 2004). Personal risk, while also present in the director's leadership, seemed to be somewhat circumscribed by the nature of the directing job. The same was true for much deviation from the status quo. The nature of the intact teams probably did not allow for leaders who behaved much out of bounds from the team's mental model of functioning (Levine et al., 2005). Finally, leaders were keenly aware of the larger environment, however, it was not directly manifested in their leadership behavior, but instead impacted their technical/creative focus on a shoot.

Were all directors in this study charismatic? The answer is probably no according to Conger and Kanungo's theory. Although many of the directors talked about using many of the six dimensions of charismatic leadership, there was variation in the extent to which they actually used them and how effectively. The degree of charismatic leadership exhibited by any one leader falls along a continuum of good to bad in the case of television directors as it does for other individuals in leadership positions.

7.1.2. Considering leader distance

We were also interested in assessing how charismatic behavior differed when the leader was proximal or socially distant. For the small sample we did find some variation in the ways in which leaders attempted to influence team members with whom they had a close as opposed to more distant relationship, corroborating past research (Shamir, 1995; Yagil, 1998). This is not surprising as they may not have been aware of that type of nuanced leader behavior. Avolio, Zhu, Koh, & Bhatia (2004) showed that transformational leadership worked better to increase organizational commitment when structural distance (defined as direct versus indirect contact between leader and follower) was low. More research is also necessary to understand how distance dimension combinations produce different effective behaviors. Antonakis & Atwater (2002) suggest research that combines the eight types of distance with a specific level of analysis (e.g., individual, group, or indirect leadership of a larger group).

7.1.3. Compatibility of shared leadership with charismatic leadership theory

In the current study, we found that although charismatic leadership behaviors explained the behavior of these directors, their behavior was more complex and incorporated many of the ideas of shared leadership. Recent research has found that shared and

networked leadership behaviors are important (Day, Gronn, & Salas, 2004; Mehra et al., 2006) and fits within the context of transformational leadership theory (Ensley et al., 2006), however, there is no clear mention of shared or distributed leadership within other well-known leadership theories. In this study, shared (or distributed leadership) appears to be a valid addition to future charismatic leadership research. Indeed, this was highly evident as the mark of a successful director seemed to be the ability to respectfully and quickly integrate others ideas to ultimately create the best show possible. In our study, shared leadership took an interesting form. Everyone seems to be a leader at one time or another in the production of a television show. The director exercises leadership as the show is being filmed, but his or her leadership and decisions are questioned by producers and writers and sometimes even actors. Some of these leaders truly did work within a philosophy of shared leadership, while others took more of a directive role in leading the work group. The implications for charismatic leadership theory is that charisma may occur in many different situations but the particular behaviors to exercise charismatic leadership may change depending upon the need for shared leadership.

7.1.4. The importance of leader self-schema

The third proposition examined whether leadership self-schema played a role in enacting charismatic leadership. According to Gardner & Avolio (1998), charismatic leaders must create and maintain their charismatic leader identity through the use of impression management, but part of their identity must also reside in the leader's internal leadership self-schema. Although leader self-schema is an important addition to many theories of leadership, with a few exceptions, there is little empirical research on the topic (Lord & Emrich, 2001; Lord & Hall, 2005; Murphy, 2001; Wofford & Goodwin, 1994; Wofford et al., 1998). In the current study, it was obvious that schema played a big role in the directors' thinking and talking about leadership, which is typically how self-schema affects cognitive processing (Markus, 1977). We were also able to tentatively identify three schemata underlying their leadership: a propensity for authoritarian control; a dyadic process of giving people what they need to help them succeed, while still understanding the obligations of leadership; and a wish for shared leadership. How these schemas are associated with the manifestation of charismatic leadership requires additional analysis. It may be that individuals with authoritarian ideas of leadership can still be effective charismatic leaders, but their behavior may be different from those who see charismatic leadership more as a form of shared leadership. For example, a relatively autocratic leader can be sensitive to the needs of team members, but more so merely for the purpose of getting the work done. Again, impression management is most likely the key.

Another factor – the leader's relative power – may have determined the extent to which they could share leadership. In Hollywood everyone seems to hate the stereotype of the director who is a notorious screamer, but these directors still exist (Gregory, 2002). Research has shown that people who have different bases and amounts of power, use different influence strategies (Yukl & Falbe, 1990). For example, autocratic leadership can be effective if the leader has expert power based on past successes. Alternatively, although collaboration in directing is important, there is a fine line between listening to the ideas of others and appearing to be "wishy-washy".

7.2. Implications for future research on charismatic leadership and study limitations

As noted by Lee (1999), qualitative research "is *not well* suited for issues of prevalence, generalizability, and calibration", but it is useful for particular purposes such as theory elaboration. As mentioned earlier, charismatic leadership research is not without its critics (Yukl, 1999). One of those criticisms was a failure to understand the context in which charismatic leadership can and does occur (Osborn et al., 2002). Consideration of context, such as organizational teams, may reveal that the process of charismatic leadership remains the same, but the emphasis on the specific components changes. And it is not only team context that is of importance, but continued research on how charismatic behavior changes when considering leader distance and the notion of shared and distributed leadership are important contributions to theory building.

In this study although we relied only on leaders' self-report of their own behavior, future studies might include a broader perspective by incorporating the perceptions of team members such as the cast and crew as well. As noted so eloquently by Klein and House, "charisma resides not in a leader, not in a follower, but in the **relationship** between a leader who has charismatic qualities and a follower who is open to charisma, within a charisma-conducive environment" (1995, p. 183). Another important hypothesis to test would be: Does charismatic leadership in television production teams produce an observably better product than other forms of leadership? Researchers could examine components such as satisfaction and turnover among the crew, and overall industry reputation as well as more tangible indices such as audience ratings of the programs, and industry nominations (e.g., Emmys, Golden Globes, Directors Guild Awards) as operationalizations of "product." The problem with Hollywood productions is that performance level is difficult to observe while the production is underway, and is not often apparent until the final product is released or broadcast, or as in many businesses, when finally accounted for in the bottom line.

In research using the Conger and Kanungo questionnaire for measuring charismatic leadership, it is easy to distinguish the six different factors because different questionnaire items load on each factor quite cleanly. However, in the qualitative analysis of these interviews, we found that the overlap represented by correlations between factors in the questionnaire research show up in overlap in qualitative coding. For example, vision does not stand alone because it is often co-mingled with a desire to change the status quo and that desire is articulated in the vision. The implications for research are that different measures may need to be developed that can accommodate the overlapping, or possibly multifaceted, nature of the underlying factors. We also did not consider the role of emotional and social intelligence in the current study, but it is important for future research. Zhou & George (2003) showed that leader emotional intelligence was also another important contribution to enhancing creativity and others have found that factors of social and emotional intelligence as measured by the Social Skills Inventory (Riggio, 1989) were related to

charismatic behavior in situations of change and effectiveness (Groves, 2006; Riggio, Riggio, Salinas, & Cole, 2003). Although we did not specifically code transcripts for social or emotional intelligence, we noted in the interviews that many of the directors were quite adept at managing their own emotions and cueing into the emotions of others. Both are important skills for this specific leadership task and warrant future research.

In this study we did not explicitly consider the role of crisis in the manifestation of charisma for television directors. Proponents of charismatic theories in the Weberian tradition such as Beyer and others (Hunt, Boal, & Dodge 1999) argue that charismatic leadership only appears or may only be perceived by followers in times of crisis. In the present case, one could argue that given the tight deadlines and budgets within directing these managers/directors are always facing a crisis. Alternatively, throughout the shoot the degree of charismatic leader behavior may change as the deadlines approach or crises arise.

Finally, in-depth interviews are plagued by one of the same shortcomings of much of the research of leadership that relies on self-report questionnaires: Leaders may tend to respond in a manner to make themselves look like successful and caring leaders because we asked the leaders to describe to us how they lead in the workplace. However, one factor in our favor was that many of our directors appeared to have not thought about directors as being leaders and many of the questions we asked surrounded concepts to which they had not given much thought. In other words, unlike a self-report questionnaire or an interview of a top CEO, leadership is not as salient to this group. Given though, the difficulty of conducting research on a television show set, this data collection effort is a first step in understanding the type of leadership that is exercised in these types of creative teams. Charismatic leadership is an attributional process for followers and the behaviors of leaders are interpreted by followers. We did not have access to the followers' perspective. In addition to followers' attributions of charisma, it would be useful to validate the self-schema of leadership and the degree to which it matched followers' perceptions of the leader's style.

7.3. Conclusion

Charismatic leadership, which receives less research attention than transformational leadership (Yukl, 1999), may be a particularly appropriate leadership style for leaders managing creative teams. Just like directors, today's leaders in a complex world cannot be subject matter experts in everything; instead they have to be an expert in encouraging others to reach their full potential. With the constant growth in the number of organizationally-based teams, leadership theories will need to address specifically how leadership must change to accommodate teams. Shared or distributed leadership within creative teams is an important concept that deserves more research attention by focusing on how it complements existing theories of leadership. Similarly, self-schema for leadership has important implications for leadership development and should be measured as a contributing factor in studies on leadership effectiveness, regardless of specific leadership theory under study.

The dearth of research on the entertainment industry (with a few exceptions: Ensher et al., 2002; Jones, 1996; Jones & DeFillippi, 1996) is unfortunate. The public and those in management have a proven interest in entertainment industry and its players (i.e., the proliferation and popularity of television programs such as *Inside the Actor's Studio*, *Project Greenlight*, and fast-selling DVDs that include Director's Commentary). Directors must manage a dizzying array of competing demands, under intense scrutiny, with a great deal of money at stake, in a very short time period. The lessons we learn with respect to the utility of charismatic leadership from the directors in our study apply to executives in other types of industries, perhaps in less intense situations. Small, independent companies within the entertainment business have been consumed by conglomerates. This trend is found in other industries as well such as publishing, technology, and healthcare. Yet, at the same time, like entertainment, these industries must foster innovation and creativity within big corporate environments. There are many ways to do this such as the development of internal entrepreneurs in organizations, or "intrapreneurs" (Moore, 2000) and implementing a reward system that fosters new thinking and practices. Developing charismatic leaders may be another means to enhancing the creative potential of individuals and teams.

Acknowledgements

Appendix A. Interview protocol

1. How do you share your vision for the shoot?
2. How would you characterize the style of leadership you use in working with your actors and crew?
3. How did you learn to run a set? Who were your influences?
4. What is your leadership philosophy?
5. In any production, there are lots of leaders with competing interests (e.g., producers, financiers, marketing, etc.), but you are in charge of getting the image on the film, how do you manage those possibly competing visions, when the audience reaction is largely determined by your efforts?
6. What types of people skills are necessary for directors to get the most out of their people?

Appendix B

Overview of sample diction variables examined in interviews and found to be related to earlier study of charismatic leadership — from Bligh et al. (2004b).

Construct	Description	Sample words
Optimism	Language endorsing some person, group, concept, or event, or highlighting their positive entailments	Formula: [Praise + Satisfaction + Inspiration] − [Blame + Hardship + Denial]
Praise (+)	Affirmations of a person, group, or abstract entity	Dear, delightful, witty, mighty, handsome, beautiful, shrewd, bright, vigilant, successful
Satisfaction (+)	Terms associated with positive affective states, moments of undiminished joy, and moments of triumph	Cheerful, passionate, happiness, smile, welcome, excited, fun, lucky, celebrating, pride, secure, relieved
Inspiration (+)	Abstract virtues deserving of universal respect; includes desirable moral qualities as well as attractive personal qualities	Honesty, self-sacrifice, virtue, courage, dedication, wisdom, mercy, success, education, justice, optimism
Blame (−)	Terms designating social inappropriateness and evil, as well as unfortunate circumstances	Mean, naïve, sloppy, stupid, fascist, bloodthirsty, repugnant, malicious, bankrupt, rash, morbid, embarrassing, weary, nervous
Hardship (−)	Natural disasters, hostile actions, censurable human behavior, unsavory political outcomes, and human fears	Earthquake, starvation, killers, bankruptcy, enemies, vices, infidelity, despots, betrayal, injustices, exploitation, grief, death
Denial (−)	Standard negative contractions, negative function words, and null sets	Aren't, shouldn't, don't, nor, not, nay, nothing, nobody, none
Collectives	Words referring to the citizenry-writ-large, including sociological, political, and generic designations	Crowd, group, people, populace, townspeople, men, women, society, citizens, body-politic, masses, public, residents, constituents
Ambivalence	Words expressing hesitation or uncertainty, implying a speaker's lack of commitment to the verbalization being made	Allegedly, perhaps, might, almost, approximate, vague, somewhere, baffled, puzzling, hesitate, could, would
Aggression	Words denoting human competition and forceful action, including physical energy, social domination, and goal-directedness	Blast, crash, explode, collide, conquest, attacking, violation, commanded, challenging, overcome, mastered, pound, shove, defend

References

Alvarez, J. L., Miller, P., Levy, J., & Svejenova, S. (2004). Journeys to the self: Using movie directors in the classroom. *Journal of Management Education*, *28*(3), 335–356.

Amabile, T. M., Schatzel, E. A., Moneta, G. B., & Kramer, S. J. (2004). Leader behaviors and the work environment for creativity: Perceived leader support. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*, 5–32.

Antonakis, J., & Atwater, L. (2002). Leader distance: A review and a proposed theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*, 673–704.

Arthur, M. B., & Rousseau, D. M. (Eds.). (1996). *The boundaryless career: A new employment principle for a new organizational era* New York: Oxford University Press.

Atlas.ti 5.0. (2004). The text-analysis program [Computer software]. Thousand Oaks, CA: Scolari/Sage Publications.

Avolio, B. J., & Yammarino, F. J. (1990). Operationalizing charismatic leadership using a levels-of-analysis framework. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *1*, 193–208.

Avolio, B. J., Zhu, W., Koh, W., & Bhatia, P. (2004). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: Mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderating role of structural distance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *25*, 951–968.

Awamleh, R., & Gardner, W. L. (1999). Perceptions of leader charisma and effectiveness: The effects of vision content, delivery, and organizational performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *10*, 345–373.

Basadur, M. (2004). Leading others to think innovatively together: Creative leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*(1), 103–121.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Increasing organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge.* New York: Harper & Row.

Beyer, J. M., & Browning, L. (1999). Transforming an industry in crisis: Charisma, routinization and supportive cultural leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(3), 483–520.

Bligh, M. C., Kohles, J. C., & Meindl, J. R. (2004). Charting the language of leadership: A methodological investigation of President Bush and the crisis of 9/11. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(3), 562–574.

Bligh, M. C., Kohles, J. C., & Meindl, J. R. (2004). Charisma under crisis: Presidential leadership, rhetoric, and media responses before and after the September 11th terrorist attacks. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*, 211–239.

Bryman, A. (2004). Qualitative research on leadership: A critical but appreciative review. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*, 729–769.

Bureau of Labor Statistics (2002). Retrieved July, 2005 from http://www.bls.gov/oco/cg/cgs019.htm#related

Burke, C. S., Stagl, K. C., Klein, C., Goodwin, G. F., Salas, E., & Halpin, S. M. (2006). What type of leadership behaviors are functional in teams? A meta-analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*(3), 288–307.

Cannon-Bowers, J. A., Salas, E., & Converse, S. A. (1993). Shared mental models in expert team decision making. In N. H. Castellan (Ed.), *Individual and group decision making* (pp. 221–246). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum & Associates.

Cha, S. E., & Edmondson, A. C. (2006). When values backfire: Leadership, attribution, and disenchantment in a values-driven organization. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*, 57–78.

Choi, Y., & Mai-Dalton, R. (1999). The model of followers' responses to self-sacrificial leadership: An empirical test. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(3), 397–421.

Conger, J. A. (1998). Qualitative research as the cornerstone methodology for understanding leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *9*(1), 107–121.

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

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). Behavioral dimensions of charismatic leadership. In J. A. Conger, & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership* (pp. 78–97). San Francisco: Jossey Bass Inc.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1994). Charismatic leadership in organizations: Perceived behavioral attributes and their measurement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *15*, 439–452.

Conger, J. A., & Toegel, G. (2002). A story of missed opportunities. In K. W. Perry, & J. R. Meindl (Eds.), *Grounding leadership theory and research* (pp. 175–197). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Cox, J. F., Pearce, C. L., & Sims, H. P. (2003). Toward a broader leadership development agenda: Extending the traditional transactional–transformational duality by developing directive, empowering, and shared leadership skills. In S. Murphy, & R. Riggio (Eds.), *The future of leadership development* (pp. 161–179). Mahweh, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Day, D. V., Gronn, P., & Salas, E. (2004). Leadership capacity in teams. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*, 857–880.

Day, D. V., Gronn, P., & Salas, E. (2006). Leadership in team-based organizations: On the threshold of a new era. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*(3), 211–216.

Directors Guild of America (2003). *DGA report reveals no progress in the hiring of women and minority directors in the past 3 seasons.* Retrieved June 13, 2005 from http://www.dga.org/index2.php3?chg=

Druskat, V. U., & Wheeler, J. V. (2003). Managing from the boundary: The effective leadership of self-managing work teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, *46*, 435–457.

Elsbach, K. D., & Kramer, R. D. (2003). Assessing creativity in Hollywood pitch meetings: Evidence for a dual-process model of creativity judgments. *Academy of Management Journal*, *46*, 283–301.

Ensher, E. A., Murphy, S. E., & Sullivan, S. E. (2002). Reel women: Lessons from female TV executives on managing work and real life. *Academy of Management Executive*, *16*, 106–120.

Ensley, M. D., Hmieleski, K. M., & Pearce, C. L. (2006). The importance of vertical and shared leadership within new venture top management teams: Implications for the performance of startups. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*(3), 217–231.

Gardner, W. L., & Avolio, B. J. (1998). The charismatic relationship: A dramaturgical perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*(1), 32–58.

Gentner, D., & Gentner, D. R. (1983). Flowing waters or teaming crowds: Mental models of electricity. In D. Gentner, & A. Stevens (Eds.), *Mental models* Mahweh, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum & Associates.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* Chicago: Aldine.

Greenwald, A. G. (1980). The totalitarian ego: Fabrication and revision of personal history. *American Psychologist*, *35*, 603–618.

Gregory, M. (2002). *Women who run the show: How a brilliant and creative new generation of women stormed Hollywood.* New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Groves, K. S. (2006). Leader emotional expressivity, visionary leadership, and organizational change. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *27*(7), 565–582.

Guzzo, R. A. (1996). Fundamental considerations about work groups. In M. A. West (Ed.), *Handbook of work group psychology* (pp. 3–24). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Hackman, J. R. (1987). *The design of work teams. In J.W. Lorsch (Ed.), Handbook of organizational behavior.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Halverson, S. K., Holladay, C. L., Kazama, S. M., & Quinones, M. A. (2004). Self-sacrificial behavior in crisis situations: The competing roles of behavioral and situational factors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*(2), 263–275.

Hart, R. P. (1984). The language of the modern Presidency. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, *14*, 249–264.

Hart, R. P. (2000). *DICTION 5.0: The text-analysis program [Computer software].* Thousand Oaks, CA: Scolari/Sage Publications.

Hart, R. P. (2001). Redeveloping DICTION: Theoretical considerations. In M. West (Ed.), *Theory, method, and practice of computer content analysis* (pp. 26–55). New York: Ablex.

Hirst, G., Mann, L., Bain, P., Pirola-Merlo, A., & Richver, A. (2004). Learning to lead: The development and testing of a model of leadership learning. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*, 311–327.

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., Spangler, W. D., & Woycke, J. (1991). Personality and charisma in the U.S. presidency: A psychological theory of leadership effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *36*, 364–396.

Hughes, R. L., Ginnett, R. C., & Curphy, G. J. (2003). *Leadership: Enhancing the lessons of experience.* New York: Irwin McGraw-Hill.

Hunt, J. G., Boal, K. B., & Dodge, G. E. (1999). The effects of visionary and crisis-responsive charisma on followers: An experimental examination of two kinds of charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(3), 423–448.

Hunt, J. G., Stelluto, G. E., & Hooijberg, R. (2004). Toward new-wave organization creativity: Beyond romance and analogy in the relationship between orchestra-conductor leadership and musician creativity. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*, 145–162.

Jaussi, K. S., & Dionne, S. D. (2003). Leading for creativity: The role of unconventional leader behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14*, 475–498.

Jones, C. (1996). Careers in project networks: The case of the film industry. In M. B. Arthur, & D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), *The Boundaryless Career* (pp. 58–74). New York: Oxford University Press.

Jones, C., & DeFillippi, R. J. (1996). Back to the future in film: Combining industry and self-knowledge to meet the career challenges of the 21st century. *Academy of Management Executive*, *10*, 89–103.

Kan, M. M., & Parry, K. W. (2004). Identifying paradox: A grounded theory of leadership in overcoming resistance to change. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*, 467–491.

Klein, K. J., & House, R. J. (1995). On fire: Charismatic leadership and levels of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *6*(2), 183–198.

Klimoski, R., & Mohammed, S. (1997). Team mental model: Construct or metaphor? *Journal of Management*, *20*, 403–437.

Lee, T. W. (1999). *Using qualitative methods in organizational research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lee, T. W., Mitchell, T. R., & Sablynski, C. J. (1999). Qualitative research in organizational and vocational psychology: 1979–1999. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *55*, 161–187.

Levine, J. M., Moreland, R. L., Argote, L., & Carley, K. M. (2005). Personnel turnover and team performance. U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. *Technical Report 1157.*

Lewis, C. (1981). *The TV director interpreter.* New York: Hastings House Publishers.

Lord, R. G., & Emrich, C. G. (2001). Thinking outside the box by looking inside the box: Extending the cognitive revolution in leadership research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *11*(4), 551–579.

Lord, R. G., & Hall, R. (2005). Identity, deep structure and the development of leadership skill. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *16*, 591–615.

Markus, H. (1977). Self-schemata and processing information about the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *35*, 63–78.

Mehra, A., Smith, B. R., Dixon, A. L., & Robertson, B. (2006). Distributed leadership in teams: The network of leadership perceptions and team performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*(3), 232–245.

Meindl, J. R. (1990). In B. M. Staw, & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *On leadership: An alternative to the conventional wisdomResearch in Organizational Behavior, Vol. 12.* (pp. 159–203) Greenwich. CT: JAI Press.

Meindl, J. R. (1995). The romance of leadership as a follower-centric theory: A social constructionist approach. *Leadership Quarterly*, *6*(3), 329–341.

Meindl, J. R., Ehrlich, S. B., & Dukerich, J. M. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *30*(1), 78–102.

Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The nature of managerial work.* New York: Harper & Row.

Moore, D. L. (2000). *Careerpreneurs: Lessons from leading women entrepreneurs on building a career without boundaries.* Palo Alto, CA: Davies Black Publishing.

Mumford, M. D., Connelly, S., & Gaddis, B. (2003). How creative leaders think: Experimental findings and cases. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14*, 411–432.

Mumford, M. D., Scott, G. M., Gaddis, B., & Strange, J. M. (2002). Leading creative people: Orchestrating expertise and relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*(6), 705–750.

Murphy, S. E. (2001). Leader self-regulation: The role of self-efficacy and "multiple intelligences". In R. Riggio, S. Murphy, & F. Pirozzolo (Eds.), *Multiple intelligences and leadership* (pp. 163–186). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Osborn, R. N., Hunt, J. G., & Jauch, L. R. (2002). Toward a contextual theory of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*, 797–837.

Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (Eds.). (2003). *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pfeffer, J. (1998). The business case of managing people right. In J. Pfeffer (Ed.), *The human equation: Building profits by putting people first* (pp. 31–63). Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Reichard, R. J., & Avolio, B. J. (2005). Where are we? The status of leadership intervention research: A meta-analytic summary. In W. L. Gardner, B. J. Avolio, & F. O. Walumbwa (Eds.), *Authentic leadership theory and practice: Origins, effects, and development* Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Riggio, R. E. (1989). *Social skills inventory manual.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Riggio, R. E., Riggio, H., Salinas, C., & Cole, E. J. (2003). The role of social and emotional communication skills in leader emergence and effectiveness. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, *7*(2), 83–101.

Sashkin, M. (1988). The visionary leader. In J. A. Conger, & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 122–160). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shalley, C. E., & Gilson, L. L. (2004). What leaders need to know: A review of social and contextual factors that can foster or hinder creativity. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*, 33–53.

Shamir, B. (1995). Social distance and charisma: Theoretical notes and an exploratory study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *6*, 19–47.

Shamir, B., House, R., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organizational Science*, *4*, 577–594.

Shamir, B., & Howell, J. M. (1999). Organizational and contextual influences on the emergence and effectiveness of charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(2), 257–283.

Sosik, J. M., Kahai, S. S., & Avolio, B. J. (1998). Transformational leadership and dimensions of creativity: Motivating idea generation in computer-mediated groups. *Creativity Research Journal*, *11*(2), 111–122.

Sosik, J. M., Kahai, S. S., & Avolio, B. J. (1999). Leadership style, anonymity, and creativity in group decision support systems. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, *33*, 227–257.

Taylor, S. J., & Bogdan, R. (1998). *Introduction to qualitative research methods: A guidebook and resource.* New York: Wiley.

Thompson, L. L. (2003). *Making the team: A guide for managers*, (2nd ed.) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Travis, M. W. (1997). *The director's journey: The creative collaboration between directors, writers, and actors.* Studio City, CA: Michael Wiese Productions.

Trice, H., & Beyer, J. (1986). In L. L. Cummings, & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Charisma and its routinization in two social movement organizationsResearch in Organizational Behavior, Vol. 8*. (pp. 113–165) Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Van Maanen, J. (1983). Epilogue: Qualitative methods reclaimed. In J. Van Maanen (Ed.), *Qualitative methodology* (pp. 247–268). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization.*New York: Oxford University Press (A.M. Henderson & T. Parsons, Translation).

West, M. A., Borrill, C. S., Dawson, J. F., Brodbeck, F., Shapiro, & Haward, B. (2003). Leadership clarity and team innovation in health care. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14*, 393–410.

Wild, D. (1999). *The showrunners: A season inside the billion-dollar, death-defying, madcap world of television's real stars.* New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

Wofford, J. C., & Goodwin, V. L. (1994). A cognitive interpretation of transactional and transformational leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly*, *5*, 161–186.

Wofford, J. C., Goodwin, V. L., & Whittington, J. L. (1998). A field study of a cognitive approach to understanding transformational and transactional leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *9*, 55–84.

Yagil, D. (1998). Charismatic leadership and organizational hierarchy: Attribution of charisma to close and distant leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *9*(2), 161–176.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods*, (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

Yukl, G., & Falbe, C. M. (1990). Influence tactics in upward, downward, and lateral influence attempts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *75*, 132–140.

Zhou, J., & George, J. M. (2003). Awakening employee creativity: The role of leader emotional intelligence. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14*, 545–568.