IJAS

Impact Of Charismatic Leadership On Team Cohesiveness And Team Performance

R.RAAJALAKSHMI[1], Dr.P.GNANASEKARAN[2]

[1]*Research Scholar, Department of Business administration, H.H. The Rajah's College, Pudukottai. (Affiliated to Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli)*
[2]*Research Supervisor, Department of Business administration, H.H. The Rajah's College, Pudukottai. (Affiliated to Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli)*

***ABSTRACT:** This study examines the impact of charismatic leadership on team cohesiveness and team performance in organisations. We expect direct effects of leadership and team cohesiveness, as well as a moderating effect of culture on the relationship between leadership on cohesiveness and performance. Charismatic leadership often provides the right make up to allow a team to flourish. It successfully takes all the leadership styles developed over the years and combines them to form one leadership theory that encapsulates leading through inspiring. To examine leadership style, knowledge level, and team cohesiveness as antecedents of team performance. Charismatic leadership was associated with a higher level of team cohesiveness, as compared to transactional leadership. Both knowledge level and team cohesiveness forecast team performance. For recovering team performance, a manager should enhance team knowledge and encourage greater team cohesiveness.*

Keywords: Charismatic leadership, team behaviour, cohesive, team performance

1. INTRODUCTION

As with individual performance and group performance is a vital determinant and frequently used indicator of organizational outcome. DeNisi (2000) argues that there is a belief among managers and the public that improving performance will assist organizations in their pursuit of excellence. The major emphasis of performance research has been on identifying and how they relate or lead to desired outcome measures (Viswesvaran and Ones, 2000). Similarly, for teams, researchers have asked what goes on when a team gets together in an organizational framework and which of these variables can predict or enhance performance (Cooke et al., 2003). Using measures of team performance as the criteria, the study examines the interactive effects of three such variables, leadership, which has by tradition been studied in the context of individual performance, knowledge level and team cohesiveness. In addition, gender, which has been found to be an antecedent, as well as a moderator of performance, will be included in the prediction model. Over the past decade or so, organizations have begun to use teams to a much greater extent (DeShon et al., 2004). Thus, when human resources personnel were asked what they considered their number-one priority, they answered that teamwork and how to capitalize on it so as to make it work better was the major issue for them (Roomkin et al., 1998). In a comprehensive review of the history of groups and team usage, Sundstrom et al. (2000) found that the surge of work group applications can be found everywhere in the organization ranging from production, service, management, and projects. From the management's perspective, the researcher's focus on the process has led to many new

insights as to the "correct" makeup of a team that is likely to achieve organizational goals. For example, Beal et al. (2003) argue that one of the important goals of organizational research, especially as it relates to teams, is to identify the factors and processes that give rise to increased performance.

Similar to the definition deployed by other researchers in the field, we define a team as two or more people, each with separate responsibilities and/or assignments, working together for a common goal (Salas et al., 1992). It is the latter part of the definition that is most critical as it helps to concretize the dependent variable here. Achieving the team's, the organization's goal can be objectified by examining the team's performance, usually through a quantitative measure. By integrating the distinctive skills and characteristics of team members, better performance is expected as compared to individuals working independently to achieve the same goal (Naquin and Tynan, 2003).

Charismatic Leadership

Charismatic leaders are often identified in times of crisis and exhibit exceptional devotion to and expertise in their fields. They are often people with a clear vision in business or politics and the ability to engage with a large audience. A charismatic leadership definition is incomplete if it does not focus on the leader personally. More than other popular leadership styles, charismatic leadership depends on the personality and actions of the leader — not the process or structure. The first behavior, the ability to evaluate the status quo, relates to the idea that charismatic leaders look for opportunities to improve the organization as opposed to resting on its laurels (Conger, Kanungo, and Menon 2000; Rowold and Laukamp 2009). The idea is that charismatic leaders will have a large impact on their organization that will require them to change the organization through innovation.

The nature of charisma and charismatic leadership is nowadays quite popular area of research. Leadership scholars often have discussed the importance of impression management. It is suggested that charismatic leaders engage in impression management techniques in order to bolster their image of competence, increasing subordinate compliance and faith in them. Or it is reported that charismatic leaders can be distinguished from other leaders by their use of articulation and impression management practices to inspire followers in pursuit a vision (Gardner and Avolio, 1999). The basic assumption is that this kind of leadership transforms the needs, values, preferences, desires and aspirations of followers from their individual interests to collective interests, so that followers become highly committed to the mission of the leader and are prepared to make sacrifices in the mission (Steyreyr, 1998).

Knowledge, abilities, and intelligence

Probably no other trait in psychology has been studied and tested as much as intelligence or mental abilities (Schmidt and Hunter, 2000). This truism holds for organizational research, also. Whether the focus is on the leader or the team, intelligence seems to play a major role. In a recent meta-analytic study by Judge et al. (2004), the authors found that intelligence, regardless whether it was assessed objectively or perceptually, is related to leadership effectiveness. In their analysis, the criteria included both subjective and objective outcomes.

The knowledge construct subsumes all types of mental abilities as team members try to use any and all information for providing assistance, support, and understanding of the issues involved. Group goals are facilitated when each member's knowledge is applied. Tjosvold and Yu (2004) found that applying abilities for mutual advantage predicted in-role and extra-role team performance. In addition, they speculated that situational or structural variables (e.g.,

leadership style) may play a critical role in this process and recommended that such factors be considered in future research.

Cohesion

One set of antecedents that organizational researchers have studied in relationship to performance are the social and motivational forces that exist between group members. Beal et al. (2003) posit that such forces are an integral part of the concept of cohesiveness which, it is argued, facilitates better performance. Group cohesion motivates, as well as allows, for coordinating activities. Although many different of cohesion have been offered in the literature, the results from an extensive meta-analysis of the technique as reported by Beal et al. (2003), showed that, contrary in the literature, overall cohesion can be considered a correlate, if not determinant, of performance. In particular, when examining some of the components of cohesion such as interpersonal attraction, task commitment, and group pride all were found to be related to group performance. Although these factors are differently across the spectrum of researchers, it is interesting to see that the social and motivational component plays a critical role in the cohesiveness construct. Therefore, it would be expected that a group led by a charismatic leader who stresses motivation and stimulation would also evince greater group cohesion.

BEHAVIORS OF COHESION

Trust

Without trust on the team, very little progress can be made in gaining cohesiveness overall. Vulnerability-based trust that is the ability to expose one's weaknesses is key to building the relationships required to be able to endure and even benefit from both the routine and unique challenges every team faces.

Conflict

Conflict is sometimes considered dangerous on a team because it can lead to hard feelings. However, if the team has relationship trust, members feel secure enough to be honest and courageous. If trust is truly in place, conflict is constructive. In fact, conflict is critical to ensuring that all points of view and aspects of issues have been discussed, understood, and taken into account. Teams without conflict tend to shut out valuable feedback which can lead to poor decision-making.

Commitment

Gaining commitment from team members is not the same as getting consensus. According to Lencioni, reaching consensus means compromise, and compromise might not yield the best result. Commitment comes with clarity of purpose. Take a problem for which there are several ideas. With trust and appropriate conflict, the team chooses the idea they will pursue. Though only one idea is chosen, every member understands why that idea was selected and supports the idea both inside the team and when communicating externally.

Accountability

Accountability is typically the most difficult behavior for a team to master. Most will never get to the point where each team member routinely holds all other members accountable. Reaching and maintaining good scores in the previous steps will make accountability much easier. Accountability can become part of a team's overall dynamic.

2. RESULTS

Achieving team objectives is why the team exists. If each prior behavior is functioning well, each member of the team is focused on achieving the team's goal. The team goal becomes more important than any individual's personal goal, and everyone feels rewarded by being part of the team result. The five behaviors that make a team cohesive are rarely mastered and as things change with members, leaders, goals, etc., the team will move through the different behaviors. This change will require the team to start over having to rebuild trust, thus working through each behavior again. Many teams have read about Lencioni's model. The Five Behaviors assessments help teams apply that model to their specific team or teams. A cohesive team not only accomplishes more for the organization, but is more fun to be a part of. The work to build the most cohesive team possible is well worth the effort.

Team Performance
As a leader, the performance of the team is instrumental in achieving business results, and supporting the organizations growth into the future. There are several proven and effective team development models out there. Regardless of the Team Development model selected to build high-performing teams, there are a few common requirements such as:

1) Motivation to function as a team toward a shared purpose or goal.
2) Commitment to the team standards and expectations.
3) Skills and talent within the group to achieve the task or purpose.
4) Core resources are provided or available to achieve the work requirements
5) Confidences and perseverance within the team exists, to overcome barriers and challenges.
6) Organizational empowerment is evident; to support action as needed to achieve results.
Team Performance Model Bruce Tuckman presented a model of five stages Forming, Storming, Norming, Performing and Adjourning in order to develop as a group. These five model stages can improve a new team become effective more quickly.
Forming stage is a situation that members of a group don't truly understand about their duty, regulations and rules. The members cannot finish their job without leader or manager because they lack of confidence. They have to be encouraged and motivate them that it can help them to feel as a significant part of a team.
Storming stage is a situation that it often starts when team members prefer to use conflicting work styles. People may work in different ways for all sorts of reasons, but if differing working styles cause unforeseen problems, they may become frustrated. Moving from this stage requires that the leader of team should strong ability to help all members accept each other and respect in each individual task.
Norming stage is a period that team members know one-another better, they may socialize together, and they are able to ask each other for help and provide constructive feedback. At this point a group need to provide a delegate for making agreement and consensus.
Performing stage is that all members can achieve the duty without any problems, but they want to develop the term in regard to interpersonal development. A leader should concentrate on developing performance of the team.
Adjourning stage is the final task when especially a group is successful. The leader of the team must be appreciated with the achievement and show all member that their accomplishment is so proud. This stage helps increase motivation to members to move on next thinks or another task.

3. DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present study was to examine some of the antecedents of team performance. As organizations have placed many of their functions in the hands of teams, it behoves us to explain the process and try to understand what will help produce better, if not optimal, performance. Variables shown to be significant predictors in other contexts were used here. Team cohesiveness and knowledge are typical variables that have been studied in research on teams. Leadership which is usually associated with studies testing predictors of individual outcomes was included.

From the overall results, it appears that team cohesiveness and knowledge of tasks were significant predictors of team performance. Also, as expected, charismatic leadership style was associated with higher levels of team cohesiveness. This popular style of managing followers focuses on the group process and would seem to the charismatic framework. Yet, contrary to our hypotheses, leadership and gender were not found to be predictors of performance. The theoretical importance of the role of knowledge and cohesiveness in predicting team performance, it seems that we have shown that the important, regardless of gender. For all team members, knowledge, particularly objective knowledge, eases the achievement of the group goals.

This was somewhat unexpected as women are often role stereotyped as being interested in some of the personal and shared aspects of social interactions that are likely to occur in a team setting (Schwarzwald and Koslowsky, 1999). Perhaps, the measure was not sensitive here to assess this aspect of women's role. It may be worthwhile in future research with this variable to highlight the aspects of cohesiveness that focus on the quality of the interaction between team members.

In identifying some of the practical implications from the study, it would appear that for an organization to improve team performance, it would be effective if the manager were to provide opportunities for enhancing knowledge level and encouraging team cohesiveness. Enhancing knowledge level can be accomplished by choosing teams that incorporate individuals with integrated knowledge that cover the main functional areas of business administration coupled with strong learning motivation. Team cohesiveness can be achieved by adopting a charismatic leadership style and building a team with individuals who work well with each other and are willing to expend effort in order to increase the team's performance.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The study's advantages are quite clear. Several of the measures such as knowledge and, perhaps, most importantly, team performance was derived from objective, behavioral measures. The scale used for determining leadership style consisted of just one item. This did not allow for measures of internal reliability and may very well have missed some of the important nuances associated with the leadership construct. The poor prediction afforded by the leadership measure can be attributed, at least in part, to the use of this less powerful item. A more accurate scale, such as the MLQ, developed by Bass and Avolio (1991) needs to tested and may allow for a better test of the hypothesis.

4. CONCLUSION

Team performance remains a major issue for organizational researchers. Naquin and Tynan (2003) argue that, often, when a team fails, individuals are blamed for the lack of achieving the desired goals. Thus, it may be worthwhile in future research to look at some of

the dynamics associated with team failure in our situation. Would people attribute failure to the fact that cohesiveness was low, or that a transactional leader was not able to extract that extra amount of work required to achieve. Looking at the causes of team failure may yield the turns the side of the usefulness. Finally, there is another aspect of performance that was not gauged here. Recent research has shown that cohesion, which reacts to some extent the interaction among team members, would be positively associated with contextual performance. Unlike task performance which was studied here, contextual behaviors such as organizational citizenship can be expected to increase when the group becomes more cohesive. For example, helping and teaching others or working overtime on a project when it is not called for, can be expected from members who have ties to the group and also feel for the group as whole and not only for themselves as individuals (for a discussion of some of these issues, LePine et al., 2000).

5. REFERENCES

[1] Bass, B.M. (1990), "From transactional to charismatic leadership: learning to share the vision", Organizational Dynamics, Vol. 18, pp. 19-31.

[2] Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (1991), Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire – Form 5X, Consulting Psychology Press, Palo Alto, CA.

[3] Bass, B.M., Avolio, B.J., Jung, D.I. and Berson, Y. (2003), "Predicting unit performance by assessing charismatic and transactional leadership", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 88, pp. 207-18.

[4] Beal, D., Cohen, R.R., Burke, M.J. and McLendon, C.L. (2003), "Cohesion and performance in groups: a meta-analytic clarification of construct relations", Journal of Applied Psychology,Vol. 88, pp. 989-1004.

[5] Berdahl, J.L. and Anderson, C. (2005), "Men, women, and leadership centralization in groups over time", Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, Vol. 9, pp. 45-57.

[6] Carli, L.L. and Eagly, A.H. (1999), "Gender effects on social influence and emergent leadership", in Powell, G.N. (Ed.), Handbook of Gender and Work, Sage, Thousand Oaks.

[7] Cooke, N.J., Kiekel, P.A., Salas, E., Bowers, C., Stout, R. and Cannon-Bowers, J. (2003), "Measuring team knowledge: a window to the cognitive underpinnings of team performance", Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Dynamics, Vol. 7, pp. 179-99.

[8] LePine, J.A., Hanson, M., Borman, W. and Motowidlo, S.J. (2000), "Contextual performance and teamwork: implications for staffing", in Ferris, G.R. and Rowland, K.M. (Eds), Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, Vol. 19, JAI Press, Stamford, CT, pp. 53-90.

[9] Lim, B.C. and Ployhart, R.E. (2004), "Charismatic leadership: relations to the five-factor model and team performance in typical and maximum contexts", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 89, pp. 610-21.