



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA | EXTENSION

EXTENSION CENTER FOR COMMUNITY VITALITY

Exploring the Impact of Charismatic Leaders in Communities

Learners' Guide for the 'Story of San Luis' Instructional Case Study

Authored by Denise A. Trudeau Poskas, Cynthia C. Messer, Jody Horntvedt, and Mary E. Vitcenda

Exploring the Impact of Charismatic Leaders in Communities

LEARNERS' GUIDE FOR THE 'STORY OF SAN LUIS' INSTRUCTIONAL CASE STUDY

September 2013

Authors:

Denise A. Trudeau Poskas, Ph.D., Associate Extension Professor

Cynthia C. Messer, M.A., Extension Professor

Jody Horntvedt, M.Ed., Extension Professor

Mary E. Vitcenda, B.A., Extension Educational Materials Coordinator

Reviewers:

Jennifer Moss Breen, Ph.D., Human Capital Management; Director, Bellevue University, Bellevue, NE

Cornelia Flora, Ph.D.; Distinguished Professor, Department of Sociology, Iowa State University, Ames, IA

Stephen Linenberger, Ph.D.; Associate Professor, Leadership, Bellevue University, Bellevue, NE

© 2013, Regents of the University of Minnesota. All rights reserved. University of Minnesota Extension is an equal opportunity educator and employer. In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, this material is available in alternative formats upon request. Direct requests to 651-480-7704.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE	1
Order of Study	1
PART 1: CHARISMATIC LEADERSHIP	3
Introduction to Charismatic Leadership	3
Types of Charismatic Leaders	3
Charismatic Leaders' Strengths	4
Charismatic Leaders' Weaknesses	5
Discussion Questions, Part 1: Charismatic Leadership	6
PART 2: FOLLOWERSHIP	7
The Importance of Followership	7
Types of Followers	7
Leader-Member Exchange	9
Discussion Questions, Part 2: Followership	10
PART 3: THE STORY OF SAN LUIS (narrative case)	11
A Lesson in Leadership: Community Tourism Development	11
Community Background	12
San Luis Community Leaders	12
San Luis in 2009	14
Discussion Questions, Part 3: The Story of San Luis	15
PART 4: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND SOCIAL CAPITAL	16
What Is Community Engagement?	16
What Is Social Capital?	16
What Difference Does Social Capital Make?	17
What Does This Have to Do with Leadership?	18
Discussion Questions, Part 4: Community Engagement and Social Capital	20
PART 5: YOUR COMMUNITY	21
REFERENCES	22

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

The “Story of San Luis” case study evolved from ongoing research about community tourism development. For nearly 20 years, researchers from the University of Minnesota Tourism Center have followed the progress of tourism development in four small U.S. communities. Initial studies were conducted in 1991, and in 2009 researchers returned to the communities to film interviews with local tourism leaders. As tourism center researchers reviewed video footage, they observed that comments from interviewees in one of the four communities – San Luis, Colorado – revealed an important story about leadership.

The researchers then shared the San Luis video with colleagues at the Extension Center for Community Vitality who had expertise in leadership and civic engagement. Extension educators and others who viewed the video agreed that it offered valuable lessons about the relationship between leaders and followers, and together, they began to explore elements of this relationship. The result is this thought-provoking case study on the impact of charismatic leadership in communities. Although the case study undoubtedly contains lessons applicable to businesses and other organizations, our focus here is on communities.

Study of the relationship between leaders and followers is more important than ever, and specific study of the relationship between charismatic leaders and followers offers key insights.

Besides being contrary to democratic principles, traditional, top-down leadership that minimizes follower involvement has never been sufficient to address the complex problems that communities face. In the past, this was not always widely acknowledged. Today, however, rapid economic and social changes in the United States, as well as increasingly knotty problems, are dramatically demonstrating the need (and increasing the desire) for broad civic engagement in community development. Two heads are better than one, as the saying goes, and when it comes to improving the health and vitality of communities, many heads are needed – not just that of the person at the top.

Thus, study of the relationship between leaders and followers is more important than ever, and specific study of the relationship between *charismatic* leaders and followers offers key insights. Charismatic leaders are capable of developing effective, or ineffective, relationships with their followers. They also can either foster, or discourage, civic (community) engagement – which is critical to the growth of networks, or social capital, in their communities (Varella, et al., 2005).

San Luis's experience with tourism development is a scenario that provokes analysis and reflection regarding charismatic leadership and its effects – and we present it here in hopes that you, the learners, gain valuable knowledge you can apply in communities.

Order of Study

For students, our materials include a video about San Luis's tourism development experience and this learners' guide, which features a description of the San Luis case and tutorials on the concepts of charismatic leadership, followership, and social capital. Each of these concepts provides a useful lens through which we can view “The Story of San Luis.” Consider the video the core of the case study and these written materials as supplementary.

Our materials also include a facilitator's guide *for instructors*. We recommend the following order of study:

1. Watch the video first to gain initial impressions. You may access the video at www.extension.umn.edu/community/leadership/charismatic-leaders/case-study/
2. Read “Part 1: Charismatic Leadership” of this learners’ guide, and answer the discussion questions about the *narrative*.
3. Read “Part 2: Followership,” and answer the discussion questions about the *narrative*.
4. Read “Part 3: The Story of San Luis” (narrative case).
5. Watch the video again and consider its contents in light of the narrative case, as well as what you have learned about charismatic leadership and followership in Parts 1 and 2. Then answer the Part 3 discussion questions about the *narrative and the video*.
6. Read “Part 4: Community Engagement and Social Capital,” and answer the discussion questions about the *narrative and the video*.
7. Review and answer the overall discussion questions in “Part 5: My Community.”

Remember: Put yourself in the shoes of San Luis community members and decide what you would do to ensure the health and vitality of your town if faced with a similar situation.

PART 1: CHARISMATIC LEADERSHIP

Charismatic leadership is a fascinating style of leadership that elicits its own unique relationship with followers. In this part of the learners' guide, you will learn about two types of charismatic leaders: socialized and personalized. Although the term "charismatic leadership" is commonly used to describe a specific style of leadership, more often than not, it is vaguely defined and misunderstood. As you read this part, begin to reflect on charismatic leadership qualities both as strengths and as barriers to strong community engagement, as well as the development of social capital – which will be examined more thoroughly in Part 4.

Introduction to Charismatic Leadership

Since the 1970's, contemporary theorists have been fascinated with the study of leadership and leaders' influence on followers. There are differences in leadership styles, and theorists have named them. Charismatic is one style. Others include Adaptive, Authentic, Servant, Transforming, and Transformational. By considering differing styles of leadership, you can evaluate and, if necessary, modify leaders' relationships with followers for the benefit of the community.

In this case study, our focus is on charismatic leadership. In 1947, sociologist Max Weber defined charismatic leaders as individuals who possess "a gift of grace." Charismatic leaders have drawn attention because of their visionary qualities, as well as their ability to engage others in action – qualities that are important in crisis situations. Weber further defined charismatic leaders as heroes, or people with extraordinary qualities. Charisma sets individuals apart from ordinary men and women. People high in charisma are often treated as though they are endowed with supernatural, superhuman or exceptional powers (Weber, 1947).

The study of charismatic leaders has evolved since Weber's time, with researchers observing both the positive and negative characteristics unique to these types of leaders. Initially, some theorists believed that charismatic leaders are born, but most researchers have since concluded that charismatic leaders develop their skills over time. All charismatic leaders are solutions-focused and demonstrate energy, vision, and foresight, but each type of charismatic leader has some unique characteristics. Experts have identified three types of charismatic leadership styles (although one is more a technique for acquiring leadership traits than a style).

Types of Charismatic Leaders

Members of the first type, known as **socialized charismatic leadership**, are distinguished by the practice of communicating with the follower in mind. Besides the ability to speak in ways that connect with followers, socialized charismatic leaders are good collaborators, with the capacity to listen to and engage followers in aligning goals and reaching a common vision. (Blackshear, 2003; Brown, 2003; Chun, et al., 2008; Depree, 1992; Gilbert & Hyde, 1988) Stated another way, a socialized charismatic leader aligns followers to a vision, uses two-way communication, serves the community's interest above all else, and works to empower followers to take action.

Another type of charismatic leadership is **personalized charismatic leadership**. Personalized charismatic leaders are distinct in that they themselves or others consider them the sole possessor

of authority, talent and direction. These types of leaders create a vision based on their own personal gain (Depree, 1992; Gilbert & Hyde, 1988), rather than the group's benefit. What's more, a personalized charismatic leader prefers one-way (top-down) communication and is often interested in acquiring power for his or her own benefit, rather than for the group.

Both socialized and personalized charismatic leaders are recognized for their exemplary qualities, but their relationships with followers differ. In an effective leader-follower relationship, followers hold their leader accountable and the leader enables them to develop their own leadership skills. Socialized charismatic leaders accept the responsibility of accountability and enable followers to develop their own leadership skills.

In an ineffective relationship, followers look to a leader as a savior, and the leader does not encourage independent thinking or encourage followers to develop their own leadership skills. This is characteristic of personalized charismatic leaders' relationships with followers.

A third type of charismatic leadership was defined by researchers Bruce Avolio and William Gardner in the late 1990's as a form of leadership that emulates the process actors go through to become great performers. Any person who develops charisma and builds a relationship with their followers like that of actor to audience is called a **dramaturgical charismatic leader** (Bennis, 2000; Blackshear, 2003). This type of charismatic leader rehearses their skills, interactions and decisions in order to appear effective at all times. They see the world as a stage, and they are the main character. Dramaturgical charismatic leaders can be either personalized or socialized in their practices.

Both socialized and personalized charismatic leaders are recognized for their exemplary qualities, but their relationships with followers differ.

Charismatic Leaders' Strengths

Specific qualities separate charismatic leaders from other types of leaders. One characteristic that defines charismatic leaders is the timing of their entrance on the scene. According to Weber, most charismatic leaders appear during "difficult times" or times of crisis (Liden, et al., 1997).

Next, whether they are considered personalized or socialized types, charismatic leaders thrive on change and causes. They believe strongly in their cause and their vision and in making things happen. Their dreams are often grand and their ideas innovative.

Charismatic leaders also initially possess so-called "inclusive" attributes, although those who lose these attributes over time become personalized charismatic leaders. Inclusive attributes are the ability to easily gather support, communicate a vision of change, convey energy and a sense of presence, and to take unconventional, innovative approaches to problem-solving. Some charismatic leaders have a strong visual presence based on looks or speech (Baker, 2007; Kelley, 1992), while others simply have an engaging personal demeanor. Most, although not all, charismatic leaders are gifted orators who can express their vision in stirring words.

Another intriguing attribute of charismatic leaders (and one focus of our case study) is their ability to develop strong social capital. Socialized charismatic leaders are able to sustain social capital over time, while personalized charismatic leaders cannot (Varella, et al., 2005). Social capital refers to the collective value of networks and the inclinations that arise from these networks to do things for each other (Putnam, 2000).

You will learn more about the constructs of social capital in Part 4 of this guide; for now, note that charismatic leaders are initially gifted in building the three networks that comprise social capital, including bonding, bridging, and linking networks (Scheffert, et al., 2008).

Charismatic Leaders' Weaknesses

In the previous section, we alluded to the fact that – over time – charismatic leaders either sustain qualities that serve the common good or they do not. When they do not, charismatic leaders' weaknesses come to the fore.

In some situations, a charismatic leader's strengths can become weaknesses. For example, charismatic leaders may use empowering language and popular buzz words to create a sense of urgency to make things happen, but this technique can have negative consequences if a leader unfairly targets an opponent or catastrophizes events (Kelley, 1992).

It's important for communities to reduce the risks and enhance the promises of charismatic leadership.

Another practice of charismatic leadership that creates problems is characterizing a vision as one that will “save” followers (Baker, 2007; Kelley, 1992; Kelley, 1988). In those instances, followers can start thinking of their leader as their savior and, as a result, stop holding him or her accountable.

Charismatic leaders are subject to many pressures that can diminish their effectiveness if improperly handled. As Weber stated, “each charismatic leader finds [him or herself] ... suffocating... under the weight of expectations and material measures” (Liden, 1997). Charismatic who do not handle these pressures well essentially become personalized charismatic leaders. A crisis may seem to be initially addressed under this type of charismatic leader, but ultimately followers expect the leader to make all the decisions and thus do not build their own skills to sustain change (Chun, et al., 2008; Messer, et al., 2010).

When a personalized charismatic leader leaves a community, followers can regress into crisis mode or victim mentality (Chun, et al., 2008). This codependency is perhaps the greatest weakness of a personalized charismatic leader's relationship with followers, whether the leader intends it or not. Codependent relationships feature strong bonds between a leader and followers, but at their worst, they facilitate a leader's misuse of authority, autocratic thinking, and unethical behaviors (Baker, 2007; Kelley, 1988).

Finally, it is important to note that charismatic leadership is more susceptible to losing steam than other types of leadership. The emotional and psychological investment required of followers can be very high and last only for a limited amount of time for either type, although socialized charismatic leaders still hold to the community vision. Charismatic leaders can eventually burn out, and as followers notice the lack of leader follow-through, tension occurs within the relationship (Baker, 2007; Bass, 1985).

Because of these weaknesses, it's important for communities and organizations to reduce the risks and enhance the promises of charismatic leadership. That should be the objective of both the selection of new leaders and cultivation of existing ones through training and development of performance standards (Howell, et al., 1992).

Discussion Questions, Part 1: Charismatic Leadership

OBJECTIVE QUESTIONS

1. What most caught your attention as you read about charismatic leadership?
2. What are the general characteristics of a charismatic leader?
3. What distinctive characteristics do the two key types of charismatic leaders (socialized and personalized) possess? Where do dramaturgical charismatic leaders fit in the picture?
4. What are the strengths of charismatic leaders?
5. What are the weaknesses of charismatic leaders?

REFLECTIVE QUESTIONS

1. What surprised you about this information – and why?
2. What examples of charismatic leadership have you observed in communities?

INTERPRETIVE QUESTIONS

1. What questions about charismatic leadership, as well as leadership generally, did this narrative raise for you?
2. What insights into charismatic leadership (in the context of communities) does this information offer?

PART 2: FOLLOWERSHIP

Just as it is important for communities to study various styles of leadership, it is also important to study the styles of followership. After all, it is the relationship between the leader and follower—called the leader-member exchange by experts—that has the greatest impact on the organization or community. Exploration of the relationship between followers and leaders has increased since the 1990's. In fact, many leadership theorists acknowledge that failure to study followership along with leadership results in major gaps in understanding or developing effective leadership strategies. This part discusses followership styles and what makes them effective or ineffective.

The Importance of Followership

“Leaders only really accomplish something by the permission of followers.”

—Max DePree

There are, of course, many more followers than leaders in a community, and so without good followership leaders cannot be effective. Learning as much as possible about follower styles and traits (Baker, 2007) can help

communities develop better leaders *and* followers. In 1988, author and researcher Robert Kelley wrote a groundbreaking article in the *Harvard Business Review* about the importance of

Effective followers are independent thinkers, provide constructive feedback, are innovative, and aim to help the community or organization succeed.

followers called “In Praise of Followers.” This article outlined the characteristics, qualities and needs of followers and noted that by not understanding followers we miss half of what leadership consists of.

Since then, organizations and communities have begun to realize that organizational success is not entirely dependent on creative, energetic leaders, but also on effective relationships between leaders and followers. What's more, leaders began to understand the importance of keeping followers informed, proactive and encouraged (Baker, 2007).

Types of Followers

Although today there is a wide selection of research and literature on follower traits and skills, this section will focus on Robert Kelley's original followership model - which provides a solid foundation on the subject. According to Kelley, there are four types of followers that leaders should identify and work with accordingly. These are: 1) Passive Followers, 2) Conformist Followers, 3) Alienated Followers, and 4) Effective Followers (see Figure 1.1).

The **Passive Follower** tends to be common in organizations and communities with top-down structures and high-control management. The name describes individuals who always do what they are told, follow rules to the letter, and do not feel comfortable questioning authority. They try to do

what is expected but rarely, if ever, assist in improving the system – either because they fear reprisal from rigid managers, lack initiative to take responsibility, or both.

The second type of follower, according to Kelley, is the **Conformist Follower**. Most people have heard of these kinds of followers, often called “Yes Men.” Like Passive Followers, Conformist Followers lack initiative and responsibility. They are different from Passive Followers, however, in that they are very dependent on what the leader or authority thinks. They spend time trying to please the person in authority, sometimes at the expense of other followers or the community as a whole, because they will not challenge ineffective authority or processes out of fear of being rejected or fired.

One of the most challenging types of follower is the individual who (unlike the Passive or Conformist) cares little, if at all, what the leader thinks, but consistently criticizes peers and disparages the idea of authority or the community as a whole. Kelley labeled these individuals **Alienated Followers**. The term refers to these individuals’ alienation, or separation, from the group, so they do not assist in improving processes or leadership. In fact, Alienated Followers do not complain in order to find solutions; rather they do not believe solutions or effective leadership can be found. The cynicism of Alienated Followers can be difficult for leaders to challenge.

The fourth type of follower Kelley names is the **Effective Follower** – also called the Exemplary Follower. These followers are independent thinkers, provide constructive feedback, are innovative, and aim to help the community or organization succeed. They are also willing to question leadership directly, rather than complain without purpose to others.

All four types of followers can be assessed according to their level of independent critical thinking (high or low) and their level of participation in an organization or community (passive or active). Below is Kelley’s model showing these levels in different types of followers.

Figure 1: Kelley Followership Model

Independent, critical thinking			
Passive participation	Alienated	Effective	Active participation
	Passive	Conformist	
Dependent, uncritical thinking			

The leader affects, and is affected by, the type of follower he or she is leading. Followers have much more influence on the situation than many who train leaders take into account. As researchers like Kelley explored characteristics of followers, they found that effective followers were critical players in effective leadership. In fact, the level of followership was important in determining organizational or community success.

Under the influence of effective leaders, Effective Followers manage themselves well, are committed to the community and a purpose beyond themselves; work to build their competence, and focus their energy for maximum impact. Many describe effective followers as “courageous, honest, and credible.” In order to have these qualities, followers must possess independent and critical thinking skills, as well as the ability to feel comfortable with others (Bennis, 2000).

The act of speaking up and telling the truth is a characteristic of a good follower. Good leaders and followers realize the importance of allowing or encouraging questions and the distribution or sharing of information. Thus, good followers share and ask for information, and provide data to support decisions or request resources (Blackshear, 2003):

Lastly, effective followers speak up and challenge leaders in order to prevent them from making crucial mistakes (Brown, 2003). Not doing this reflects passive or “yes men” characteristics and shows that the follower lacks a vested interest in the success of the organization or community.

Leader-Member Exchange

Once we understand the qualities and types of leaders and followers, we can explore the relationship between them. Researcher George Graen sought to learn more about the impact leaders and followers have on each other, and named the relationship the Leader-Member Exchange (LMX). Graen believed that a leader who builds a strong relationship with their followers improves those followers' performance and satisfaction with their work. If emphasis is placed on the two-way relationship between leader and follower, the relationship focuses less on the power and influence of the leader and more on the trust between leader and follower (Baker, 2007; Bennis, 2000).

Researchers have found that charismatic leaders possess a great capacity for building a strong relationship, or LMX, with followers, although personalized charismatic leaders lose this capability over time. This strong LMX has been shown to increase followers' trust of leaders, as well as their perception of leader support.

Further, as mentioned earlier, socialized charismatic leaders build strong social capital networks. Paul Varella and other researchers call this “balanced social capital.” This ability to build relationships and social capital usually strengthens followers' commitment to the community, reduces turnover, and fosters behavior (known as “organizational citizenship behavior”) that heightens organizational or community effectiveness (Chun, et al., 2008).

On the other hand, personalized charismatic leaders fail to encourage development of skills in problem solving, decision making, or goal-setting among followers. Instead of building a strong relationship that empowers followers to move from Conformist to Effective Followers, personalized charismatic leaders prevent followers from developing these skills.

In this LMX, the leader is seen as the sole problem-solver and decision maker – even the rescuer or savior—and followers are considered “worker bees.” Varella and others note that personalized charismatic leaders end up restricting, rather than building, social capital. Personalized charismatic leaders may behave the way they do out of ignorance, rather than design. In these cases, they should be taught to be a socialized charismatic leader and encourage effective followership.

Note: Our focus in Part 2 has been on the types of followers, and by extension, the impact of leaders on individual followers. In Part 4, we will look more closely at the impact of leaders on the group and on group dynamics.

Discussion Questions, Part 2: Followership

OBJECTIVE QUESTIONS

1. What most caught your attention as you read about followership?
2. What are the general characteristics of followers?
3. What distinctive characteristics does each type of follower (passive, conformist, alienated, effective) possess?

REFLECTIVE QUESTIONS

1. What surprised you about this information - and why?
2. What examples of followership have you observed in communities?

INTERPRETIVE QUESTIONS

1. What questions about followership did this narrative raise for you?
2. What insights into the relationship between leaders and followers (in the context of communities) does this information offer?

PART 3: THE STORY OF SAN LUIS (narrative case)

Our case study highlights the interplay between charismatic leadership and followership in the context of the San Luis community. Discussion questions at the end of this part are based on both the video and this narrative.

As you become familiar with the Story of San Luis, reflect on the aspects of charismatic leaders and followers seen in the community. What type of leader was Father Pat? What attributes do you see in him? What type of followers can you identify? What kind of leader-member exchange existed in San Luis when Father Pat was there?

Remember: You may access the video case at

www.extension.umn.edu/community/leadership/charismatic-leaders/case-study/

A Lesson in Leadership: Community Tourism Development

Small communities often have a rich heritage and unique attractions to share with visitors from around the world. Tourism development often starts with the vision of an individual or small group in search of an economic development strategy. Tourism, however, is more than economic development – it is community development because it engages all aspects of a community and affects every resident directly or indirectly (Messer, et al; 2010).

When tourism is linked to the values and goals of the greater community, and when members' input is integrated, tourism can become an expression of the life, geography, history and culture of the area. When this happens, the community remains committed to its tourism economy. Leadership is essential to creating this interplay of culture and economic opportunity. Thus, tourism development is a long-term effort in need of leaders with a clear vision who are committed to collaboration, strategic planning, and an overall objective to help ensure that benefits are realized and costs are managed.

The community examined in this case study is San Luis, Colorado – one of four communities originally profiled in 1991 by researchers from the University of Minnesota Tourism Center as part of a national study on community tourism development. The study, which observed the communities over time, sought to understand how tourism evolves and affects a community. This longitudinal study looked at five core values for tourism development:

1. Maintaining authenticity and sense of place,
2. Delivering quality service and products,
3. Using tourism as an economic diversification strategy,
4. Encouraging local control, and
5. Assessing the true benefits and costs of tourism.

The role of charismatic leadership in San Luis's tourism efforts was first noted in 2009 when tourism center researchers returned to communities originally profiled in 1991 to learn how they had fared. In on-camera interviews conducted by researchers, community leaders described the

changes, benefits and challenges their community experienced in tourism development over nearly two decades.

In San Luis, researchers also held a group conversation among community leaders – both those who had been involved with tourism efforts from the beginning and those more recently involved. They were asked to share their stories about what had happened regarding tourism in San Luis since 1991. Researchers simply observed and recorded the conversation.

It was during this conversation that the significance of charismatic leadership and its effect on followership in San Luis emerged. The conversation was unrehearsed and unscripted. The clips you will see in this case study are drawn from that one-hour session held in 2009, as well as from the original 1991 video. You will hear and see these leaders describe leadership and followership in their own words.

Community Background

San Luis (population >800) is the oldest town in Colorado. Located in the beautiful San Luis Valley in the southern part of the state, it is known for its rich history and culture. The predominantly Hispanic population has close ties to religious, cultural, and artistic traditions of Spain. People in San Luis are proud and often fiercely dedicated to issues of language, land, and water.

San Luis is the county seat of Costilla County, which has a primarily agricultural economy and is one of the poorest counties in Colorado. The community is proud of its

The Stations of the Cross Shrine put San Luis on the map for tourists and generated a sense of pride within the community.

acequias, which are communal, gravity-fed waterways used for irrigation, as well as its vega – a communal pasture. Both are still in use and are cultural links between past and present. In the 1990s, development efforts in the valley and surrounding mountains fueled hostility and suspicion among community residents who feared that outside interests would cause significant loss to the acequias and the vega. Some community members remain suspicious of “outsiders.”

University of Minnesota Tourism Center researchers first profiled San Luis in 1991 because of the [Stations of the Cross Shrine](#), a community-driven project to develop a tourism attraction that reflects residents’ religious heritage. San Luis had been suffering from a steady economic decline, and tourism was viewed as an opportunity to sustain the culture while building economic prosperity.

Created by a local artist, the Stations of the Cross Shrine is a series of bronze sculptures, two-thirds of life size, depicting the hours before Christ’s death. Local families and organizations raised more than \$100,000 for the effort, and volunteers constructed the shrine trail. The shrine was dedicated in May 1990, and that year San Luis welcomed more than 30,000 visitors

The shrine placed San Luis on the map for tourists and generated a sense of pride within the community. Today, thousands of visitors still view the shrine each year, but the community faces other challenges. See “San Luis in 2009” on page 14 for more information.

San Luis Community Leaders

A number of community members have played prominent roles in San Luis's community tourism efforts. At the top of the list is **Father Patrick Valdez**, who is credited with the vision for tourism in San Luis. A native of San Luis Valley, he came to the town of San Luis in 1985, serving as the resident

parish priest for more than 20 years. A quiet, humble man with a deep love for people, Father Pat engaged the entire community with a positive energy and faith in their abilities. He was struck by the economic poverty of the town, but also by the rich collection of local artisans producing traditional arts. In the local artists, he saw an opportunity to build economic prosperity and community pride.

Father Pat's position as parish priest placed him in a highly influential role in the community, but he also endeared himself to the residents by his love of the culture, positive attitude and involvement in all aspects of community life. Father Pat was able to get many community members engaged in projects. In the 1990s, his vision of cultural tourism inspired the community and led to development of the Stations of the Cross shrine, as well as related tourism facilities. Those facilities included a visitor center, a cultural center and museum (created in an abandoned school in the center of town), and several lodging, dining and retail businesses.

Father Pat's advocacy for tourism was shared by the Costilla County Economic Development Council (CCEDC), a private, not-for-profit entity that serves as the main driver of tourism development and promotion in the county. Father Pat sat on the board of the CCEDC for many years, along with a small, core group of engaged citizens and business leaders that included **Felix Romero**, owner of R & R Market, Colorado's oldest continuously operating family business; **Huberto Maestas**, the internationally recognized sculptor who created the shrine; and **Bernadette Lucero**, the county clerk. Most are lifelong residents and worked closely with Father Pat on the CCEDC, as well as parish events and local tourism efforts.

In the 1990s, Father Pat's vision of cultural tourism inspired the community and led to development of the Stations of the Cross Shrine, as well as related tourism facilities.

Early on, the council conducted community meetings to share its goals and objectives for tourism and enlisted community members to help with specific projects. This core group participated in at least two different leadership development programs over the years, but few community members stepped forward to lead local tourism efforts. Members of the original group founded in the early 1990s admit they are getting tired and that understanding of tourism across the community remains limited. Following is more information about the three original group members, as well as **Emerita Romero-Anderson**, who became a key player in San Luis's tourism efforts. Interviews with these four individuals are featured on the video.

Felix and his family are descendants of original settlers in the valley. Their market has been family owned and operated for over 150 years, and is a key attraction on Main Street. Felix is a respected community leader, having served for many years as CCEDC chair. He is quick to credit Father Pat for his vision, and acknowledges the many people in the community who have worked behind the scenes on tourism – although not everyone in the community is supportive. Despite his admittance of fatigue, Felix says that 30 years is not a long time to have been involved in community development efforts. He acknowledges the importance of recognizing volunteers, stating that just when he would feel down, someone would say “good job” and he would be re-energized to continue.

Huberto is the internationally recognized sculptor who created the Stations of the Cross Shrine. Raised in San Luis, he has been involved with cultural tourism in the community and region for more than 20 years. His foundry studio is also an attraction on Main Street. He is quick to laugh, and shares a strong camaraderie with Felix. Huberto understands the value that cultural tourism brings to a community. “Thirty years ago, these buildings were pretty much boarded up,” he says. “One of the first projects I remember through the arts was to go get 4 x 8 panels of plywood and do murals

on every window... And some of them are still hanging around in town somewhere. [We] just wanted to beautify those buildings.”

Bernadette is the Costilla County Clerk of Courts and serves on the CCEDC. She is passionate about her community, the valley and her Hispanic heritage. Bernadette’s 1987 interview on national television about San Luis’s failing economy garnered national attention and helped stimulate interest in economic development in the community. She has been involved with several CCEDC-sponsored projects, including those promoting tourism, for more than 20 years.

Emerita is an author, retired teacher and cultural heritage tourism advocate. Originally from San Luis, she lived away from the community for several decades but recently returned with her artist spouse after retiring. She is viewed as an emerging leader. Emerita is deeply involved with the Sangre de Cristo National Heritage Area (NHA), as well as the community zoning and planning commission. She is working with community members and government officials to move the NHA forward as a means of preserving her own and the community’s culture and allowing community members to “tell their own story.”

Father Pat left San Luis in 2009, but community residents remain hopeful that he will return. A new parish priest brings different skills and focus as he builds his role in the community.

San Luis in 2009

Over the years San Luis has struggled to maintain the initial momentum of tourism. By 2009, the museum and cultural center along with many tourism businesses had closed, and the visitor center has very limited hours. Main Street again has numerous empty storefronts. There are few brochures or signs to welcome tourists, and visitors are viewed warily. There is little to entice visitors to the shrine to stay longer and spend money in the community.

Despite this slowing momentum, there is renewed optimism in San Luis about tourism. The CCEDC’s executive director is strongly committed to rebuilding tourism in San Luis, and many of the original board members are still involved. The CCEDC also has proven ability to garner funds and grants. For example, the CCEDC has received a state grant for the restoration of the San Luis Museum & Cultural Center.

Another source of renewed optimism is Congress’s establishment, in 2009, of the Sangre de Cristo National Heritage Area. The heritage area includes three counties in the valley, including Costilla County where the town of San Luis is located, wildlife refuges, and the Great Sand Dunes National Park. Locals involved in this regional project bring a new excitement to San Luis. Their desire to preserve and promote local heritage, cultural history and traditions is generating new interest in the community. Based on the community’s experience with tourism so far, they recognize that this new effort will require significant collaboration and a dedicated effort to be successful.

Father Pat left San Luis in 2009, but community residents remain hopeful that he will return. A new parish priest brings different skills and focus as he builds his role in the community.

Discussion Questions, Part 3: The Story of San Luis

OBJECTIVE QUESTIONS

1. What most caught your attention as you read about San Luis and watched the video? (What part of the story intrigued you most?)
2. What are the issues facing the community of San Luis?
3. What distinctive characteristics do the people highlighted in the Story of San Luis possess?

REFLECTIVE QUESTIONS

1. Which of the leaders and followers in San Luis did you most identify with?
2. What characteristics did you notice in Father Pat that indicate he might be a charismatic leader?
3. What effect, if any, did Father Pat's position as a parish priest have on followers? What other factors might have affected the leader-follower relationship?

INTERPRETIVE QUESTIONS

1. What impact(s) did Father Pat have on the community of San Luis?
2. How would you describe the leader-follower relationship between Father Pat and community residents? Between current community leaders and other community residents?
3. How might the community move past Father Pat's leadership and build a future for its tourism efforts? (What might you suggest followers do differently?)
4. How does the example of San Luis reflect issues found in other communities you are familiar with?



PART 4: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND SOCIAL CAPITAL

With the story of San Luis in mind, we invite you to reflect on what you have learned so far about types of charismatic leadership and followership. Recall that it's important to look beyond the effects of leaders on individual followers and examine their impact on groups as a whole. That brings us to the topic of community engagement and social capital – two key measures of a community's vitality.

Consider how charismatic leaders influence the group dynamics that determine the level of community engagement and shape social capital. If effective leaders foster community engagement and build social capital, the ultimate question is, are charismatic leaders effective? We also ask you to consider whether charismatic leaders are authentic leaders, as defined by researchers.

What Is Community Engagement?

This phrase gets used often. We hear it in education circles in reference to service learning and youth development. We hear it in the public health arena in reference to successful prevention programs. We hear it in reference to community leadership. But, what exactly is community engagement?

Definitions of community engagement vary by context and purpose. We prefer to use the following definition from the Public Health Practice Council at the Centers for Disease Control, as it speaks to engagement in the context of community action:

“Community engagement is the process of working collaboratively with and through groups of people affiliated by geographic proximity, special interest, or similar situations to address issues affecting the well being of those people.”

At the heart of community engagement are the connections between people – social ties, networks, and support – which are often referred to as social capital.

What Is Social Capital?

We've all heard the saying, “It's not *what* you know, it's *who* you know.” But connections don't just help you get the job or club membership you want. “Who you know” makes a difference in other ways, too (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000).

When you fall on hard times, it's friends and family who create a safety net. Your happiest and most rewarding hours may be spent

talking with neighbors, sharing meals with friends, attending religious gatherings, or volunteering for community projects (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000). That's what social capital is all about.

Social capital is 'the collective value of networks and the inclinations that arise from these networks to do things for each other.'

—Robert Putnam

In his groundbreaking book, “Bowling Alone: Collapse and Revival of American Community,” Robert Putnam defines social capital as “the collective value of networks and the inclinations that arise from these networks to do things for each other.”

As noted earlier, researchers define three types of social capital, or networks (Scheffert, et al., 2008). Let's look at these more closely:

As noted earlier, researchers define three types of social capital, or networks (Scheffert, et al., 2008). Let's look at these more closely:

- **Bonding networks**, which are close ties that help people to get by. *These connections are usually with family, friends and neighbors.*
- **Bridging networks**, which are weaker ties that can help people get ahead and gain opportunities. *These connections are usually with people who are different from themselves, who have different types of networks.*
- **Linking networks**, which are links to organizations and systems that can help people gain resources and bring about broader change. *These connections are usually with organizations that have resources, both within and outside of the community.*

It is also important to recognize three key elements important to each type of network:

- Efficacy: Belief in one’s ability to make a difference in a variety of social contexts;
- Trust: Assured reliance on the character, ability, strength or truth of someone or something; and
- Engagement: To take part, doing something for another without any immediate expectation of return (Cherry, n.d.).

These three elements give us insights into what social capital looks like in communities. Efficacy plays a major role in how goals, tasks, and challenges are approached (Bandura, 1995). Trust and engagement feed each other in a cycle of continuous improvement. What’s more, wise use of efficacy, trust, and engagement is a hallmark of effective leaders.

What Difference Does Social Capital Make?

The basic idea of social capital is that your family, friends, associates – even acquaintances – are an important asset. You can tap that asset to survive a crisis, improve your financial footing, or just enjoy life more. This is true for individuals and for groups (Scheffert, et al., 2008).

Communities that have a rich and diverse stock of social networks and civic associations are less vulnerable, and can more easily tackle problems. What's more, communities with high levels of community engagement and social capital are in a better position to take advantage of new opportunities.

Communities require leaders who are adept at building all three types of networks that comprise social capital, but particularly the bridging networks that communities need to accomplish big things.

Social capital is so valuable that it affects almost every aspect of personal and community life. One report from Harvard University (Saguaro Seminar, 2003) described stronger communities as a key benefit of social capital. Other benefits Harvard research identified were better child welfare and education, higher safety levels, economic prosperity for individuals and communities, individual well-being, and public health.

Social capital also supports democracy. When social capital is strong, there are broader webs of associations that make it more likely that all community members have access to government, not just the “well-connected” (Saguaro Seminar, 2003). In addition, strong social capital in community groups (between leaders and followers) means that more residents have the chance to lead and to learn to organize, cooperate and create coalitions for the common good.

What Does This Have to Do with Leadership?

In the *Journal of Leadership Education*, Kristina Ricketts says communities need “the presence and action of leaders who can fit it all together.” Positioning a community for a viable future does not refer only to solving complex problems and planning for successful social change, she says. This also means increasing individual well-being, sustaining a community’s unique culture – and motivating community members toward developing social capital. In other words, effective leaders promote community engagement in order to build social capital and get things done.

Communities also require leaders who are adept at building all three types of networks that comprise social capital, but particularly the bridging networks that communities need to accomplish big things – to get ahead and take advantage of opportunities.

We also need to look at leaders through the lens of authenticity. Researchers cite three characteristics of authentic leadership: 1) transparency, openness, and trust; 2) guidance toward worthy objectives; and 3) an emphasis on follower development (Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, & Walumbwa, 2005).

As noted earlier, Paul Varella and others have examined the potential impact of charismatic leaders on social capital, specifically what they call “group” social capital to emphasize its collective dimensions, i.e., group members can access such capital because of their membership, but they do not own it individually.

Varella, et al., also have explored the potential impact of authentic and inauthentic charismatic leadership on groups. They contend that the attributes of two forms of charismatic leadership, socialized and personalized, can have different effects on how they shape group social capital. “The effect,” they say, “can be largely positive, through balanced social capital, or largely negative, through restrictive social capital.”

The authors’ overall thesis is that both personalized and socialized charismatic leadership promotes the development of social capital in groups. However, the precise nature of that social capital will vary; see Figure 2 for details

Figure 2: Development of balanced vs. restrictive social capital

	Balanced social capital	Restrictive social capital
Group social capital dimensions	Authentic leadership promoted by Socialized Charismatic Leaders	Inauthentic leadership promoted by Personalized Charismatic Leaders
Physical proximity	Positive reinforcement for members' interaction Non-hierarchical interactions	Coercive pressure to remain physically close Hierarchy is often stressed
Psychological proximity	Identification with the ideas and vision of the group Tailored to enhancing social needs of members Builds positive feelings of member psychological capital Commitment to working with other team members in a cooperative manner	Strong dependency on, and identification with, the leader vs. the group Member fears of being left out and facing external threat alone Little concern for member psychological capital
Underlying norms	Emphasis on fairness and positive reinforcements for adherence to norms Encouragement to contribute toward the shared vision Shared leadership among group members Encouragement of emergence of new leaders	Emphasis on favoritism and negative reinforcement or ostracism for disobeying norms Pressures for conformity to the leader's vision and desires Impedes emergence of new leaders
External reach	Open to outside information, ideas, and groups Supportive and collaborative with outside individuals and groups	Closed to the outside world Suspicious of, and often competitive with, outsiders

Table reprinted from: Varella, P., Javidan, M., & Waldman, D. (2005). The differential effects of socialized and personalized leadership on group social capital. *Monographs in leadership and management*, 3, 107-137.

In Part 4, and throughout this narrative, we have identified three standards by which to assess the effectiveness of leaders, including charismatic leaders: 1) Do they develop effective followers, not just as individuals but in their relationships with others both in and outside the group? 2) Do they foster community engagement and help build social capital – especially bridging social capital? 3) Are they authentic leaders (as defined by Gardner, et al.)? Ask these questions as you reflect on the case of San Luis and the impact of Father Pat's leadership on the community.

Discussion Questions, Part 4: Community Engagement and Social Capital

OBJECTIVE QUESTIONS

1. What most caught your attention about this discussion of community engagement and social capital?
2. What are the characteristics of each type of social capital network? (bonding, bridging, and linking)
3. What are the benefits of strong social capital in a community?
4. What's the connection between charismatic leadership and social capital?

REFLECTIVE QUESTIONS

1. What's the connection between community engagement and social capital?
2. What's the connection between charismatic leadership and social capital?
3. How do charismatic leaders affect the creation of social capital?

INTERPRETIVE QUESTIONS

1. After reading Part 4 and reconsidering the video case, what thoughts do you have about the impact of Father Pat's leadership on the level of community engagement and the development of balanced social capital in San Luis?
2. Generally, what insights into the role of leaders in communities does this narrative, and the video case of San Luis, offer?
3. Specifically, what insights into the role of *charismatic* leaders in communities does this narrative, and the video case of San Luis, offer?

PART 5: YOUR COMMUNITY

At the end of Part 4, we named three standards by which to assess the effectiveness of leaders, including charismatic leaders: 1) Do they develop effective followers, not just as individuals but in their relationships with others both in and outside the group? 2) Do they foster community engagement and help build social capital -- especially bridging social capital? 3) Are they authentic leaders (as defined by Gardner, et al.)? We asked you to consider these questions as you evaluated the case of San Luis and the impact of Father Pat's leadership on the community.

Now We Want to Know: What's It Like in Your Community?

For this exercise, ask yourself the three questions above in the context of your own community. Consider where you're living now, or somewhere you have lived in the past. We have also included a few other questions designed to focus your discussion on the impact of charismatic leaders in your community. If you wish, you may want to expand the discussion to the topics of leadership, followership, community engagement, and social capital.

NOTE: If you believe you have never encountered a charismatic leader in a local community, or in another setting (such as a school or workplace), participate in this activity based on your knowledge of a public figure or someone else in your life.

QUESTIONS TO SPARK DISCUSSION

1. Have you ever encountered a charismatic leader in a community where you lived in the past, or where you currently live?
2. Have you ever encountered a charismatic leader in any setting, such as a school or workplace?
3. How were you able to identify someone as a charismatic leader? What did you observe about him or her? (Why do you think he or she is/was a charismatic leader?)
4. Do you think a charismatic leader is an asset or a deficit in a community (or other setting)? Why or why not?
5. How have you seen a charismatic leader influence followers in your community? Talk about behaviors on both sides. Consider interactions in both one-to-one and group settings.
6. Have you seen a charismatic leader foster community engagement in a community? How? (Name specific behaviors and outcomes.)
7. Have you seen a charismatic leader help increase a community's social capital? How? (Name specific behaviors and outcomes.)
8. Do you think an existing relationship between a charismatic leader and followers can be changed, if necessary, to correct any problems? Also, how can a community encourage the development of a charismatic leader for everyone's benefit - for the common good?

SUMMARIZING QUESTION

Overall, what insights from this case study can you apply in your role as a leader or follower (or both) in your community?

REFERENCES

- Adair-Toteff, C. (2005). Max Weber's charisma. *Journal of Classical Sociology*, 5, 189-204.
- Avolio, B. J. & Gardner, W. L. (1998). The charismatic relationship: A dramaturgical perspective, 23(1), 32-58.
- Baker, S. (2007) Followership: The theoretical foundation of a contemporary construct. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 14, 50-60.
- Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bennis, W. (2000). *Managing the dream: Reflections on leadership and change*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.
- Bendix, R. (1960). *Max Weber, an intellectual portrait*. New York: Doubleday Publishing.
- Beyer, J. M., & Browning, L. D. (1999, Autumn). Transforming an industry in crisis: Charisma, routinization, and supporting cultural leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, (10) 3, 483-520.
- Blackshear, P.B. (2003). The followership continuum: A model for fine tuning the workforce. *Public Manager*, 32(2), 25.
- Bord, R. J. (1975). Toward a social-psychological theory of charismatic social influence processes. *Social Forces*, 53(3), 485-497.
- Brown, A. (2003). The new followership: A challenge for leaders. *Futurist*, 37, 68.
- Chen, C-H.V., Wang, S-J., W., Chang, W-C., & Hu, C-S. (2008). The effect of leader-member exchange, trust, supervisor support on organizational citizenship behavior in nurses. *Journal of Nursing Research*, 16(4), 321-328.
- Cherry, K. (n.d.). What is self-efficacy? In *Psychology: Theories*, About.com guide. Retrieved from http://psychology.about.com/od/theoriesofpersonality/a/self_efficacy.htm
- Cline, A. (n.d.). Charismatic authority: Emotional bonds between leaders and followers. In *Types of religious authority: Sociological and psychological perspectives* (chap. 2). *About.com guide*. Retrieved from http://atheism.about.com/od/religiousauthority/a/types_2.htm
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1994). Charismatic leadership in organizations: Perceived behavioral attributes and their measurement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15(5), 439-452.
- Depree, M. (1992). *Leadership jazz*. New York: Doubleday Publishing.
- Eatwell, R. (2006). The concept and theory of charismatic leadership. *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions*, 7(2), 141-156.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. (1968). Some reflections on the variability of development and organizational structures. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 13(3), 491-497.
- Gilbert, R.G., & Hyde, A.C. (1988). Followership and the federal worker. *Public Administration Review*, 48, 962-968.
- Gardner, W. L., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., May, D.R., & Walumbwa, F.O. (2005) "Can you see the real me?" A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 373-394.
- Herberle, R. (1949). Observations on the sociology of social movements. *American Sociological Review*, 14(3), 346-357.
- Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1992). The ethics of charismatic leadership: Submission or liberation? *The Executive*, 6(2), 43-54.
- Howell, J.M. (1988). Two faces of charisma: Socialized and personalized leadership in organizations. In J.A. Conger & R.N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 213-236). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Keating, K.H. (2011). *Training civic bridge builders: Outcomes of community leadership development programs* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2011). Dissertation Abstracts International-A, 73(01). (UMI No. 3479113).
- Kelley, R.E. (1992). *The power of followership*. New York: Doubleday Publishing.
- Kelley, R.E. (1988). *In praise of followers*. *Harvard Business Review*, 66, 142-148.
- Liden, R. C., Sparrowe, R. T., & Wayne, S. J. (1997). Leader-member exchange theory: The past and potential for the future. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 15, 47-119.

- McClosky, D. J., McDonald, M. A., Cook, J., Heurtin Roberts, S., Updergrove, S., et al. (n.d.). Community engagement: Definitions and organizing concepts from the literature. In *Principles of community engagement* (2nd ed.) (chap. 1). Retrieved from http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/communityengagement/pce_intro.html
- Messer, C., et al. (2010). *Community tourism development* (3rd ed.). St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Murphy, S., & Ensher, E. (1999). The effects of leader and subordinate characteristics in the development of leader-member exchange quality. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 29*(7), 1371-1394.
- Popper, M. (2000). The development of charismatic leaders. *Political Psychology, 21*(4), 729-744.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: Collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Ricketts, K. (2009). Studying leadership within successful rural communities in a Southeastern state: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Leadership Education, 7*(3), 231.
- The Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America. (2000). *Better together*. Cambridge, MA: John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.
- Scheffert, D. R., Horntvedt, J., & Chazdon, S. (2008). *Social capital and our community*. St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota Extension Center for Community Vitality.
- Shamir, B., & House, R.J. (1993). Toward the integration of charismatic, visionary and transformational leadership theories. In M.M. Chemers & Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 81-107). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Shamir, B., House, R.J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science, 4*(4), 577-594.
- Varella, P., Javidan, M., & Waldman, D. (2005). The differential effects of socialized and personalized leadership on group social capital. *Monographs in leadership and management, 3*, 107-137.
- Weber, M. (1976). *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre*. J. Winckelmann (Ed.). Tübingen, Germany: J. C. B. Mohr Publishers.
- Weber, M. (1947). Max Weber: *The theory of social and economic organization*. T. Parsons (Ed.) & A.M. Henderson (Trans.) New York: The Free Press.
- Woolcock, M., & Deepa, N. (2000). Social capital: Implications for development theory, research, and policy. *World Bank Research Observer, 15*(2), 225-249.