

Bruna Formigoni Amboni

Universidade do Extremo Sul Catarinense (UNESC), Brasil.
E-mail: brunaamboni6@gmail.com

Gisele Silveira Coelho Lopes

Professora da Universidade do Extremo Sul Catarinense (UNESC) e Doutoranda em Administração na Universidade do Vale do Vale do Itajaí (UNIVALI), Brasil.
E-mail: giselelopes@unesc.net

Diogo Pereira Morais

Universidade do Vale do Itajaí (UNIVALI) e Universidade do Extremo Sul Catarinense (UNESC), Brasil
E-mail: diogomorais03@hotmail.com

Andrigo Rodrigues

Universidade do Extremo Sul Catarinense (UNESC), Brasil
E-mail: andrigo@unesc.net

Submissão: 27 Jan. 2017 **Publicação:** 06 Set. 2018. **Sistema de avaliação:** *Double blind review*.
Centro Universitário UNA, Belo Horizonte - MG, Brasil. **Editor chefe:** Prof. Dr. Gustavo Quiroga Souki

Este artigo encontra-se disponível nos seguintes endereços eletrônicos:
<http://revistas.una.br/index.php/reuna/article/view/864>
<http://dx.doi.org/10.21714/2179-8834/2018v23n2p77-95>

ABSTRACT

This study identifies the level of charismatic leadership in leaders of the slaughterhouse company located in the south of Santa Catarina (Brazil). It was theoretically approached the effects of charisma in the exercise of leadership and charismatic leadership and its dimensions according to the theoretical model of Conger et al. (1997). This research is characterized as descriptive. The technique analysis is predominantly quantitative. The study was carried out in three factories in the company of food of slaughterhouse type, located in the south of Santa Catarina. This company has a total of 4.526 employees and 51 leaders in the three units. Only 40 leaders participated in the search. The data collection process consisted of the application of a structured questionnaire proposed by Conger et al (1997) with 20 statements distributed in 5 (five) dimensions as follows: (i) strategic vision and articulation; (ii) sensitivity to the environment; (iii) sensitivity to members; iv) personal risk and v) non-conventional behavior. The 47th issue was opened, proposed by the authors of this paper, as a way to understand the challenges of leadership in this field of research. It can be concluded that leaders present the more traditional leadership than charismatic. To the charismatic leadership, the leader should be more enthusiastic in order to mobilize members to "to their best to the company." The results indicated that leaders tend to act within a certain neutrality, without causing greater impacts that arouse enthusiasm in the leaders.

Keywords: Leadership; Charisma; Slaughterhouse.

RESUMO

Este estudo tem o objetivo identificar o nível de liderança carismática em líderes de uma empresa frigorífica localizada no sul de Santa Catarina (Brasil). Foi abordado teoricamente os efeitos do carisma no exercício da liderança e a liderança carismática e suas dimensões conforme modelo teórico de Conger et al. (1997). Esta pesquisa se caracteriza como descritiva e de campo, de abordagem quantitativa. O estudo foi realizado em três unidades fabris em empresa alimentícia do tipo frigorífico, localizada no sul de Santa Catarina. Esta empresa possui um total de 4.526 funcionários e 51 líderes nas três unidades. Somente 40 líderes participaram da pesquisa. O processo de coleta dos dados consistiu na aplicação de um questionário, estruturado, proposto por Conger et al (1997) com 20 afirmações distribuídas em 5(cinco) dimensões que se seguem: i) visão estratégica e articulação; ii) sensibilidade ao ambiente; iii) sensibilidade aos membros; iv) risco pessoal e v) comportamento não convencional. A 21ª questão foi aberta, proposta pelos autores deste trabalho, como forma de compreender os desafios da liderança neste campo de pesquisa. Pode-se concluir que os líderes apresentam uma liderança mais tradicional do que carismática. Para ser uma liderança carismática o líder deveria apresentar comportamentos mais entusiastas com vistas a mobilizar os membros para “vestirem a camisa da empresa”. Os resultados indicaram que os líderes tendem a agir dentro de certa neutralidade, sem causar maiores impactos que despertem entusiasmo nos liderados.

Palavras-chave: Liderança; Carisma; Frigorífico.

1. Introduction

The charismatic leadership was first discussed by Max Weber (1925/1968) when called three types of authorities that a manager needed to observe, (i) the traditional; (ii) the rational-legal and (iii) the charismatic. In the Weber's perspective the rational-legal authority was the most appropriate to maintain order and the functionality of the organizations, because the traditional authority denoted the power as a determinant factor in the direction of organizational efforts and the charismatic authority, was associated to those that showed determined ability to influence people through the way of being, of the ideals and vision for the future. The charismatic leadership, in the Weberian concept associated this profile to religious priests who held the power to heal and make predictions about the followers (CONGER, et al. 1997).

From the decade of 1970 on the charismatic leadership begins to be widely discussed in scientific and theoretical framework (BERLEW, 1974; HOUSE, 1977), being that in 1980 empirical research are begun ((BASS, 1985; CONGER; KANUNGO, 1987, 1998; CONGER, 1989; KIRKPATRICK; LOCKE, 1996; CONGER et al, 1997; BEDELL-AVERS; HUNTER; MUMFORD, 2007; GRIFFITH; CONNELLY; THIEL; JOHNSON, 2015) that have brought to light evidences about the behavior of charismatic leaders within organizations.

It is worth mentioning that the charismatic leaders possess qualities that arouse in the led people the desire to follow them. It is as if they gave to their followers the hope of better days, making them involved and convinced to achieve the same ideals. These leaders are skillful rhetoric, because they can attract the attention of the led people, influencing them to believe, through faith, that the future will be better

(CONGER; KANUNGO, 1987; SHAMIR, HOUSE; ARTHUR, 1993). To the extent that the charismatic leader convinces the led people on their ideals and values, extend the possibilities of the led people to internalize as an aspect of self-identification (CONGER; KANUNGO, 1998). This means that the more the followers identify with the leader, the greater the affective commitment will be of those before him or her and the validation of shared values (WEICK, 1995).

Considering the relevance of charismatic leadership in organizational studies, Conger, et al (1997) and Conger, Kanungo and Menon (2000) have highlighted the need for empirical studies to bring evidence about the theme, which opens up possibilities for further investigations. This is the gap that this research is dedicated to discuss efforts to identify the level of charismatic leadership in leaders of a slaughterhouse company located in the south of Santa Catarina (Brazil). In practical terms, what justifies the choice of field of study is the importance of agribusiness through organizations type slaughterhouses for the regional economy in the south of Santa Catarina. Even with the economic relevance, these same organizations have strong impacts on the workers' health, in view of the characteristics of the industrial sector that is unhealthy and with recurrent accidents at work, they also found evidence by Vasconcellos, Pignatti and Pignati (2009) when they studied the slaughterhouses in the state of Mato Grosso. This reality calls attention to the need for studies aimed at broadening the understanding of these evidences, in addition to understanding if there are leaders who have charismatic profiles that can contribute to the transformation of the sector, given the high cost that the same burdens for the state, in relation to absenteeism due to work accidents.

2. Theoretical background

This session deals mainly with the effects of the charisma in the exercise of leadership, as well as the charismatic leadership and its dimensions proposed by Conger, et al (1997).

2.1 The effects of charisma in the exercise of leadership

The charismatic leadership led by the sociologist Max Weber (1947), presented unique characteristics, founded on the belief that certain people were exceptional. This exceptionality was justified by the presence of charisma, noticeable in the process of peaceful coexistence and interpersonal relationship of the subjects that manifested through the personal presence, belief in friendly values, motivation and enthusiastic ideals. When considering the charisma as an attribute of the leadership, over time, as Gomes and Crus say (2007), the term has different perceptions and designations. The Greeks saw the charisma as something related to the gift granted by the gods to the detriment of miracles as were known. Whereas the religion advocates the charisma as a direct relation to the talent given by God to someone who possessed the gift of healing, prophecy and the practice to bless other people. In fact, the charisma in the essence of these two perspectives, had a direct association to a holy figure and without blemish before the followers.

The classical sociological understanding of the charismatic leadership of Webber (1947) was treated in a pioneer way by line of psychological research, proposed by House (1977). This author studied with care the psychological aspects of the leaders and understood that the charismatic leaders have followers who are

involved by intensive emotional interactions built from the coexistence. The characteristics that label the charismatic leaders of other types of leadership are referenced by House (1977) as the dominance, confidence and belief in their own values. A proposition that deserves emphasis is that leaders with charismatic effects are more likely to present behaviors to create impressions of success, while investing in good communication to obtain high levels of confidence on the part of followers. Communication is used as an artifice which favors the acceptance of the led people to believe in the objectives proposed by the leader, in addition to endeavoring to comply with the rules laid down, even though challenging. The author also made mention that the charismatic leaders have the likelihood of awakening enthusiastic reasons for the achievement of strategic objectives than those who do not present such characteristics.

Recent studies on the charismatic leadership (ANTONAKIS; BASTARDOZ; JACQUART; SHAMIR, 2016; GRABO; SPISAK; VUGT, 2017) attribute the charisma not as an inherent characteristic of the behavior of the subject that exercises the leadership, but rather to "charismatic" effects that interfere with the vision of the world of the led people or followers. The charismatic effects defended by Grabo, Spisak and Vugt (2017) commonly found by them in a review of the literature on the charismatic leadership, have brought to light three effects that are normally adopted, recurrently, by charismatic leaders: to attract the followers' attention, awaken the followers' emotions, and share a vision of the world to the followers.

The charismatic effect directed to arouse the followers' attention has a direct relationship with the body posture, the control of facial expressions, tone of voice and appearance. Tigue et al (2012) and Klofstad, Anderson and Peters (2012) highlighted in their studies that the tone of voice influences in the decision-making of the followers in elections, while the good appearance linked to personal presentation, was also another factor that affects the election results, according to the findings of Ahler, Citrin, Dougal and Lenz (2017).

Whereas the leader who has the ability to deal very well with the skills of rhetoric, in the vision of Grabo, Spisak and Vugt (2017), can inspire followers to achieve urgent and challenging goals. When the leader can share his or her vision of the world that reflects his or her values and life mission, contributes so that there is acceptance of the led people from the connection created in this process of communication. In this process, Antonakis, Bastardo, Jacquart and Shamir (2016) emphasize that the connection created between leader and the led people is justified by the identification of the led people with the premises advocated by the leader on the mission that declares the parameters of what is right and wrong, the symbolic communication that clarifies the information to the point of creating symbolism that are incorporated by the collective as a moral unit, as well as the demonstration of conviction and passion for their mission through emotional expressions.

Below, we will specifically deal with charismatic leadership and its dimensions in the vision of Conger et al. (1997) that uses a theoretical model that favors to measure the charisma from five dimensions.

2.2 The Charismatic leadership and its dimensions

In the organizational field, the charismatic leaders are inspiring, because they can influence the led people to believe in their ideals. They focus on envisioning a better future and disclosing eloquently and positively the range of results. The more enthusiastic the leader, the greater the confidence of the led people will be (CONGER; KANUNGO, 1987; MUMFORD, 2006). Bass (1985) and Shamir et al. (1993) emphasize that in the charismatic leadership the leaders produce emotional impact in the life of the led people. In this process, the led people identify with the emotional values of the leader, which impact directly on the follower's performance. This strong relationship that exists between the leader and led people on the charismatic leadership influence in changing attitudes, behaviors and values of the led people.

Thus, the more disinterested the leader manifests with purely personal matters, the greater the confidence that the led people will deposit on him or her. Confidence is strengthened when the values of the leader are directed to promote the collective, rather than prioritizing their own interests (WALSTER et al., 1966; KOUZES and POSNER, 1987). To the extent that the charismatic leader prioritizes the collective benefit, he or she increases the sense of self-efficacy and extends the followers' satisfaction. The higher the demonstration of concern with the *performance* and self-development of team work, increases the satisfaction of subordinates, because it reflects meanings to what they do (BASS, 1985).

In this line of reasoning, it is also worth noting that the satisfaction of the led people is justified by the direction and attention spent by the leader to them. This means that when the led people have charismatic relationships, they tend the motivation for the achievement of organizational goals (BASS, 1985). When stakeholders are involved in production processes outside the routine of their own work, it is realized that the level of commitment is higher. It is noted that when the leaders encourage their followers through stimuli that make the employee feel part of something, it generates a sense of personal challenge, in which the competences of the led people are potentiated, developing even more their responsibility (ROLDAN et al., 2013).

Setting these assumptions, Conger et al. (1997) developed a theoretical model that allows to measure the level of charisma of leaders, classified in five dimensions, namely: A) strategic vision and articulation; B) sensitivity to the environment; C) sensitivity to members; D) personal risk and E) unconventional behavior.

A) Strategic Vision and articulation (SVA)

The charismatic leadership is inspiring when socializes their life goals so that the led people identify themselves. Due to being visionaries about the future, they strongly advocate a better tomorrow, while involving the led people around the same ideals. They are expert in owning an organizational strategic vision, because they have the practice of analyzing, continuously, the variables of the internal and external environment of the organization, with a view to profit from the existing opportunities (CONGER et al., 1997).

B) Sensitivity to the environment (SE)

Roldan et al. (2013) emphasize that engaging the team reduces the possibilities of intrigue among the members. It is noticeable that the pleasant and creative environment expands the possibility to make external contacts, learning from their own mistakes. It is conducted by charismatic leaders through strategies of charismatic leadership and reward, but the first generates more positive factors and engagement. It is possible to identify some decisive factors in the process of management and performance of teams, such as: the accessible resources, either financial or technological, among others. From so much information it is unquestionable the necessity of creative management in the context of the organizations for which the commitment of teams is not only in favor of the defined objective, but the desire to go beyond what is expected and surprise.

C) Sensitivity to Members (SMN)

In this sense, the charismatic leaders are concerned with the interests of the collective, because they are aware of the needs of other people. He or she is compassionate and sympathetic to the environment that is inserted, as he or she identifies several ways to promote the safety of their peers (CONGER et al., 1997). This means that the leader needs to be a reference for his or her team, making it clear his or her concern with the interests of the individual and the collective, being hence righteous and building a relationship based on trust. This attitude undoubtedly inspires positively the leader and the led people. Among so many features, another important factor is the ability to influence people. Making the objectives, interest of all. Therefore, keeping the team integration is fundamental to the success, since that the leader has the ability to positively influence the behavior of the members of the group. Therefore, it is clear that for the one who aspires to be a leader, it is essential to know himself or herself, and only then, will sustain the credibility of those he or she leads.

D) Personal Risk (PR)

Sacrifices are very common in charismatic leaders. Donating to the common good is natural for these leaders. The more the leader dedicates himself or herself in favor of the collective, the greater the credibility and trust will be that the led people will deposit on him or her. His or her values are based on the rule of good example, this means that there is a certain tone of renunciation, given the condition of the position he or she occupies (CONGER et al., 1997).

E) Non-conventional Behavior (VB).

Usually the charismatic leaders have enthusiasm to fulfill the mission and the organizational vision. Even in the face of daily challenges, the charismatic leader is one who invests his or her time to empower his or her followers. Several ways that evade the rule, mobilizes the leader to act in accordance with his or her instincts and purposes (CONGER et al., 1997).

3. Methodology

This study aims to identify the level of charismatic leadership in leaders of a slaughterhouse company located in the south of Santa Catarina (Brazil). It is a descriptive research with descriptive objective, of field and predominantly quantitative approach.

The study was carry out in a company of food segment, type slaughterhouse, located in the southern region of Santa Catarina (Brazil). It is a company that has 4,526 employees and 51 leaders in three units that it owns. The criterion for the choice of the field was by accessibility, having in view that until then in the southern region of Santa Catarina (Brazil) a study directed to the leadership, a company of this size and segment, had not been carried out yet.

The research participants were the leaders of the three manufacturing units. Each unit was identified as Unit I, Unit II and Unit III (Table 1).

Table 1 - Profile of the respondents of the survey.

Positions	Units and Gender						Total		
	Unit I		Unit II		Unit III		M*	F*	General
	M*	F*	M*	F*	M*	F*			
Supervisor	9	2	10	4	5	5	23	12	35
Coordinator	2		0		1		3		
Manager	1		0		1		2		
Total	12	2	10	4	7	5	28	12	40

Source: Data obtained in the survey.

Note: *M (male)/ F (female).

According to the Table 1, 40 leaders participated in the survey. Of these, there is a predominance of males (28) in three factories and the supervision position was the one that had the major participation (35). As the leaders were invited to participate in the study, not all showed interest in responding the data collection instrument. Not interested in participating in the research 5 (five) / Unit I and 7 (seven) / Unit II, which corresponds to 21.57% of non-respondents. At Unit III all leaders participated.

Unit II, as shown in Table 2, the leaders have been for 14 years in the company. In the Units I and III leaders have been, on average, approximately seven (7) years.

Table 2 - Time working in the company

Units	Average in years	N	Standard Deviation
Unit I	6.86	14	5.260
Unit II	14.14	14	4.487
Unit III	7.08	12	3.753
Total	9.48	40	5.652

Source: Data obtained in the survey.

The process of data collection consisted of the application of a structured questionnaire, proposed by Conger et al. (1997) with 20 statements distributed in 5 (five) dimensions that follow: A) strategic vision and articulation; B) sensitivity to the environment; C) sensitivity to members; D) personal risk and E) unconventional behavior. The 21st question was open, as proposed by the authors of this study, as a way to understand the challenges of leadership in this field of research. The process of implementing the data collection instrument occurred upon delivery to each leader, who had a period of 24 hours to reply and deposit in a box available in each unit.

As the variables in this study are ordinal qualitative (Likert scale of 7 points), the technique of data analysis used was non-parametric statistical inference. The techniques of non-parametric statistics do not require knowledge of the distribution of the variable in the population, unlike parametric statistical techniques, where the normality assumption of random variables is required (CALLEGARI-JACQUES, 2003).

The performed statistical tests were Shapiro-Wilk test and the *Kruskal Wallis*, all with a significance level of 5% (α). According to a study performed by Torman et al. (2012), the Shapiro-Wilk test *showed* to be the most appropriate to test the normality of the data of a sample, corroborating as written by Zar (1999) and justifying the choice of the test for the present study. The formulation of hypotheses for the Shapiro-Wilk test is described below:

$$\begin{cases} H_0: a amostra provém de uma distribuição normal \\ H_1: a amostra não provém de uma distribuição normal \end{cases}$$

Even knowing that the study variables are ordinal qualitative, normality test was performed in order to confirm that the non-parametric tests are the most appropriate for the study. Analyzing the results of the Shapiro-Wilk tests for each of the 20 statements of the research instrument, it was possible to observe that the variables did not come from a normal distribution, where all the p-values of the tests were lower than 0.001.

According to Siegel (1975), the *Kruskal Wallis* test is used when comparing the values of three or more groups of independent samples and the level of measurement of the variable is ordinal, characteristic of the variables of the Likert scale. The *Kruskal Wallis* test is an extension of the Mann-Whitney U test and compared the parametric statistical techniques, the *Kruskal Wallis* test is equivalent to Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) of one factor (Sheskin, 2004). The hypothesis test for the *Kruskal Wallis* test is described below,

$$\begin{cases} H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 \\ H_1: \mu_1, \mu_2 e \mu_3 não são todos iguais \end{cases}$$

Where μ_1 represents the average score of the leaders of the Unit I in each of the evaluated statements, μ_2 represents the average score of the leaders of the Unit II in each one of the affirmations and μ_3 represents the average score of the leaders of the Unit III in each one of the affirmations evaluated in this research. The subsequent discussion considers the hypothesis test in each dimension that follows.

4. Results and discussion

In this session the levels of charismatic leadership will be considered, According to Conger et al. (1997) and the challenges of leadership in the vision of the leaders who participated in the survey.

4.1 Levels of charismatic leadership

In this moment the levels of charismatic leadership will be considered, According to Conger et al. (1997) taking into account the 5(five) dimensions that follow: (i) strategic vision and articulation; (ii) sensitivity to the environment; (iii) sensitivity to members; iv) personal risk and v) unconventional behavior.

To analyze the performance of the level of leadership, each level of the scale represents the following performance:

Table 3 - Definition of the levels of scale regarding the performance of the leadership.

Levels of the scale	Performance of charismatic leadership
1	Inexistent
2	Awful
3	Bad
4	On the average
5	Good
6	Great
7	Excellent

Source: The authors.

A) Strategic Vision and Articulation

The objective of this dimension is to identify how the leaders of the three (3) manufacturing units can lead to innovative ideas to develop a better strategic performance for the organization. Conger et al. (1997) emphasize that the leader can assume a role to involve and influence his or her team to work enthusiastically to achieve expected goals. This means that the leader in addition to clearly understanding the goals of the organization, needs to have the ability to use his or her rhetoric to motivate the led people and involve them in the organizational purposes. It is the one who sees opportunities to generate innovative ideas that will enable a better future for the organization and his or her work team. He or she is self-motivated to see new ways of performing the work that aims at the good performance of the company in the long term.

Table 3 presents the level of charismatic leadership in the dimension on the strategic vision and capacity for articulation of the leader in relation to the achievement of the purposes of the company.

Table 3 - Level of charismatic leadership in the dimension of strategic vision and articulation.

Strategic Vision and Articulation	Unit I	Unit II	Unit III	Kruskal-Wallis
I present the objectives of this organization in an inspiring way	5.3571	5.1429	5.5833	0.509
I am inspired and able to motivate people, involving effectively the importance about what the members of this company have been doing	5.6429	5.1429	5.8333	0.067
I generate new ideas for the future of this company.	4.9286	5.1429	4.5000	0.615
I speak well in public in an exciting way	4.7143	4.4286	4.6667	0.745
I have vision, many times, to bring forth many ideas and possibilities for the future of this company.	5.0714	4.4286	4.5000	0.126
I take many opportunities in order to achieve the goals of this company.	5.5714	5.1429	5.9167	0.038*
I readily acknowledge about new environmental opportunities (physical and social conditions favorable) which can facilitate the achievement of the goals of this company.	4.5000	3.7143	5.0833	0.042*
Average Score - Strategic Vision and articulation	5.1122	4.7347	5.1548	0.215

Source: Data obtained in the survey.

*p-value <0.05.

It is possible to notice in Table 3 that in only two claims there was a significant difference in the opinion of the leaders in the three manufacture units. At Unit III the leaders agree to take advantage of more opportunities to achieve the company's objectives ($\bar{X} = 5.9167$), than the leaders of the Units I ($\bar{X} = 5.5714$) and II ($\bar{X} = 5.1429$, respectively). Regarding recognizing promptly new environmental opportunities (favorable physical and social conditions) which can facilitate the achievement of the goals of this company, unit III again presented a higher average ($\bar{X} = 5.0833$), than the other units (Unit I ($\bar{X} = 4.5000$) and Unit II ($\bar{X} = 3.7143$). Unit II was the one that showed lower average performance in relation to the exploitation of the environmental opportunities, followed by Unit I.

It is important to highlight that in the other claims, there was no significant difference in the opinions of the leaders in 3(three) manufacture units. Upon observing the performance of the averages, in the requirement I speak well in public in an exciting way, the leaders of the 3(three) units were in the middle of the central point scale (4 points). This evidence indicates that these leaders have medium level of influence before the followers. Another point worthy of note was the performance of the averages of Units I and III in the assertion regarding the ability of the leader to generate new ideas consistent for the future of the company. In this regard, the leaders of both units, presented average aligned to the central point of the scale (4 points), Units I ($\bar{X} = 4.9286$) and II ($\bar{X} = 4.5000$, respectively). This result seems to indicate that the fact of

having been there for approximately 7 years in the company, these leaders have low autonomy to participate with innovative ideas, unlike the Unit II that showed higher average ($\bar{X} = 5.1429$) than other units in this item. In the other claims, the leaders presented centered averages on average, 5 points on the scale, meaning a good level of charismatic leadership.

B) Sensitivity to the environment

This dimension aims to understand what the skills of leaders are in creating a work environment that is suitable for the good performance of the team. Conger et al. (1997) showed that the charismatic leader has the sensitivity to understand what improvements are required to provide people with better working conditions. This means that it is up to the leader, to realize the skills of led people to suit them to positions and activities that provide them meaning and motivation. In this sense, the leader must give support to members with information to give them more security in the execution of the work. All of these efforts, will serve to promote a balanced social environment that seeks the good performance of the people and the achievement of organizational goals. Table 4 presents the levels of charismatic leadership related to size on the sensitivity of the leaders of the environment.

Table 4 - Level of charismatic leadership in the dimension sensitivity to the environment

Sensitivity to the environment	Unit I	Unit II	Unit III	Kruskal-Wallis
I readily acknowledge the constraints of the physical environment (technological limitations, lack of resources, etc.) that may hinder the achievement of the goals of this company.	5.1429	4.3571	5.2500	0.062
I readily recognize restrictions on social and cultural environment of the organization (cultural norms, lack of support from the people, etc.) that may impede the achievement of the goals of this company.	5.0000	4.4286	4.6667	0.326
I recognize the skills and competences of other members of this company.	5.7143	5.8571	5.6667	0.955
I recognize the limitations of other members of this company.	5.2143	4.4286	5.1667	0.042*
Average Score - Sensitivity to the environment	5.2679	4.7679	5.1875	0.11

Source: Data obtained in the survey.

**p-value* < 0.05.

According to the data of Table 4, only the assertion related to the recognition of the limitations of the team members presented significant differences in the averages of the leaders of the three units. In this statement, Unit II showed a lower average than the other units ($\bar{X} = 4.4286$). This evidence indicates that Unit II recognizes less the limitations of the team members than the Units I ($\bar{X} = 5.2143$) and III ($\bar{X} = 5.1667$), respectively. It is curious that while Unit II recognizes fewer limitations, the opposite happens when questioned if it recognizes the skills and competence of the staff members ($\bar{X} = 5.8571$). In this regard, Unit II showed a higher average than Unit I and II, which may be inferred that the fact that the leaders of the Unit II being there more

time in the company, they have greater sensitivity to identify talents, than the leaders of the other Units that are still in the process, perhaps, to know the team better.

In other claims there were no significant differences in the averages of the leaders among the three (3) manufacturing units. What was realized was that the average score of Unit II was lower in relation to other units. In this sense, Units I and III showed a good level of charismatic leadership.

C) Sensitivity to the members

The objective of this scale is to understand how the leaders of three units realize the difficulties of the members of the work team. Conger et al. (1997) stresses that the charismatic leaders tend to involve the led people to like what they do and respect mutually the workmates. This psychological exercise is effective when leaders fail to understand the needs of members empathetically, as a way to express personal concern with the well-being of the team. It is as he or she walked with each member's shoes and created conditions to help them overcome the challenges of life. Table 5 presents the levels of charismatic leadership related to sensitivity of the leaders to the members of the team.

Table 5 - Level of charismatic leadership in the dimension sensitivity to the members.

Sensitivity to the needs of the members	Unit I	Unit II	Unit III	Kruskal-Wallis
I influence the others through the development to like what they do and mutual respect.	5.7857	4.7143	5.7500	0.001*
I show sensitivity to the needs and feelings of others members of this company.	6.0000	4.6429	5.5000	0.000*
Often, I manifest personal concern with the people of this company.	6.0000	4.6429	4.6667	0.004*
Average Score - Sensitivity to the needs of the members	5.9286	4.6667	5.3056	0.003*

Source: Data obtained in the survey.

**p-value* < 0.05.

It is possible to perceive the results from Table 5 that there was a significant difference in all the assertions in this dimension, because the leaders in each manufacture Unit showed distinct averages from each other. Unit II showed a mean score below ($\bar{X} = 4.6667$) in relation to the other units I ($\bar{X} = 5.9286$) and III ($\bar{X} = 5.3056$, respectively).

Unit I showed a great ($\bar{X} = 6.000$) level of charismatic leadership as the sensitivity of the needs and feelings of members and Unit III showed a good level of charismatic leadership on this issue. Regarding the assertion on the personal concern of the leader with the people, Unit I showed a great ($\bar{X} = 6.000$) level of charismatic leadership, but Units II and III respectively presented average performance ((I = \bar{X} 4.6429 and III = \bar{X} 4.6667).

D) Personal Risk

In this dimension the goal is to understand how the leaders of 3 (three) units are exposed to personal risk on behalf of the company they represent. Conger et al. (1997) understood that the charismatic leaders give themselves to leverage the goals and targets that are exposed. Many times, they tend to assume some costs whatever they are, to foster the organization that they make part of. The charismatic leaders tend to sacrifice himself or herself for prestige and recognition on the part of the members of the team. In this case, when the followers perceive in the leader personal sacrifice to obtain the best for the members, they recognize and respect the gesture.

Table 6 presents the level of charismatic leadership regarding the dimension related to personal risk that the leaders of the 3(three) factories are willing to assume in favor of the company that they make part of.

Table 6- Level of charismatic leadership in the dimension personal risk.

Personal Risk	Unit I	Unit II	Unit III	Kruskal-Wallis
I take high personal risks for the sake of this company.	4.7857	4.5714	3.5833	0.530
I often pay out of my pocket many things for the sake of this company.	2.2857	3.1429	2.8333	0.084
In the achievement of the objectives of this company, I engage in activities that involve a considerable personal risk.	4.2857	3.1429	3.2500	0.096
Average Score - Personal Risk	3.7857	3.6190	3.2222	0.679

Source: Data obtained in the survey.

**p-value* < 0.05.

It is possible to realize that there is no significant difference in the opinion of the leaders in regarding the dimension personal risk. All units showed a poor level (3 points) in mean scores on this dimension.

When asked if they take high personal risk for the sake of the company, only Units I ($\bar{X} = 4.7857$) and II ($\bar{X} = 4.5714$) showed average levels of charismatic leadership. About the sacrifice assigned to pay from their own pockets many things for the sake of the company, it is noticeable that Units I ($\bar{X} = 2.2857$) and III ($\bar{X} = 2.8333$) presented bad averages (2 points of the Likert scale). However, when questioned the involvement of leaders to take personal risks in the achievement of the objectives of the company, only Unit I presented medium level ($\bar{X} = 4.2857$) of charismatic leadership. The other units had bad performances (II ($\bar{X} = 3.1429$) and III ($\bar{X} = 3.2500$)).

E) Unconventional behavior

The objective of this dimension is related to the unconventional behavior of leadership when this differs from the traditional behavior. The traditional behavior is the one that is customarily expected from a leader to achieve organizational goals. Whereas the unconventional behavior, according to Conger et al. (1997), is when the

leader involves the led people to engage in order to achieve the proposed objectives and targets. The engagement is often obtained through the degree of confidence that the followers give to the leader. In this dimension, the leader wins the engagement, when socializes his or her beliefs, values and principles consistent with his or her character and witness of life, that the followers believe and they convince themselves without hesitating any objection.

Table 7 presents the level of charismatic leadership in relation to non-conventional behavior of the leaders of the manufacture units in the study.

Table 7 - Level of charismatic leadership in the dimension non-conventional behavior.

Unconventional behavior	Unit I	Unit II	Unit III	Kruskal-Wallis
I have a non-traditional behavior, in order to achieve the goals of the company.	3.8571	3.9286	3.7500	0.86
I use non-traditional means to achieve the goals of this company.	4.0000	4.5000	3.5833	0.379
Many times, I have a very original behavior that surprises the other members of this company.	4.5714	4.2143	5.1667	0.078
Average Score - Unconventional Behavior	4.1429	4.2143	4.1667	0.996

Source: Data obtained in the survey.

**p-value <0.05.*

When observing the results in Table 7, it is possible to realize that the leaders showed no significant differences when evaluating the dimension unconventional behavior. It is possible to notice that the average scores on this scale were aligned to the middle point of the scale (4 points), which means that all units showed an average level of charismatic leadership on this issue.

When asked about the existence of a non-traditional behavior, in order to achieve the goals of the company, all units showed poor levels of charismatic leadership, aligned with the 3 points of the Likert scale. Regarding the use of non-traditional means to reach the goal of the company, Units I and II had average performance in this item, but Unit III showed poor performance. On the presentation of an original behavior to surprise the members of the company, only Unit III showed a good level of charismatic leadership, the other ones stayed with medium levels in this item.

4.2 Challenges of leadership in the perception of leaders

The objective of this session is to understand how leaders interpret the challenges inherent in the role that they occupy in this company. Many times, the quantitative aspects cannot justify the context in which the leadership operates, which generates a certain need to understand why the responses tend to results somewhat different than often expected. Table 8 presents the factors cited by the leaders when

asked about the main challenges of leadership. These factors were standardized to understand objectively each citation highlighted in the data collection instruments.

Table 8 - Frequency on the challenges of leadership in the leaders' perception.

Challenges of Leadership	Frequency
Achieving goals	8
To convince workers to do their best to the company (engagement)	7
Ensure quality levels	4
Absenteeism at work	4
People management to search for results	4
Alignment of personal goals to organizational	2
To be fair and consistent	2
To develop successors	2
Safety at work	1
To Lead the team in a poor physical structure (unhealthy)	1
To lead a group that is unmotivated	1
To reduce overtime	1
Total	37

Source: Data obtained in the survey.

It is possible to observe that the achievement of goals was the challenge that predominated in the opinion of the leaders who responded to the questionnaire. As it is an agro industrial company type slaughterhouse, it is typical in this model of organization the high volumes of production that these leaders are conditioned to achieve. This result is justified by the second challenge related to the engagement to convince workers to do their best to the company. As reaching goals is the key point in the exercise of these leaders, it is natural to desire to promote the engagement of the led people to the achievement of these goals. However, there are other obstacles that make the role of these leaders somewhat challenging, namely: guarantee of quality levels, absenteeism, people management for the search of results, align personal goals with the organizational ones, sense of justice and coherence, development of successors, workplace safety, driving the team with a deficient structure (fragile), leadership of demotivated groups and reduction of overtime.

Upon observing these factors above, it seems that the environment of this organization tends to be intense whose fundamental aspect is reach production targets. In consequence, there are evidences of absences at work, unhealthy environment, excessive overtime and people unmotivated. These evidences justify the average performance of the charismatic leadership of these leaders in all dimensions analyzed in the previous session.

5. Conclusion

This study aimed to identify the level of charismatic leadership in leaders of a slaughterhouse company located in the south of Santa Catarina (Brazil). It was possible to realize that in all 5(five) analyzed dimensions, the leaders of the 3(three) units showed average levels of charismatic leadership.

When observed the dimension alone, it is possible to conclude that the leaders of the Units I ($\bar{X} = 5.1122$) and III ($\bar{X} = 5.1548$) showed good levels of charismatic leadership in the dimension product strategy and articulation, while the leaders of Unit II showed average levels ($\bar{X} = 4.7347$). It was expected that in this dimension that the leaders had averages higher than 6, because it is a work environment that is dependent on the achievement of the goals to achieve better competitive performance in the market, in view of the peculiarity of the environment, it should be noted that these leaders have some difficulty influencing the led people enthusiastically in the reaching of the proposed targets. This assertion is justified when the leaders presented performances lined up to 4 points when questioned about the ability to speak in public enthusiastically to the followers. These evidences describe from Conger et al (1997) that these leaders present difficulties of rhetoric to defend the range of expected goals. Considering the vision of Grabo, Spisak and Vugt (2017) when they consider that the charismatic leader is the one who can involve the led people to achieve the objectives and goals based on their values and beliefs. In this sense, enthusiastic behaviors are necessary to ensure that this involvement occurs, and this was not possible to find in this research.

In the dimension sensitivity with the environment, again Units I ($\bar{X} = 5.2679$) and III ($\bar{X} = 5.1875$) showed higher average scores than Unit II ($\bar{X} = 4.7679$). The fact of presenting good averages in this item, does not demonstrate that these leaders have total autonomy to interfere in the conditions of the environment in which they operate. This evidence is justified when the leaders presented as a challenge of leadership the leading the team on a poor physical structure (unhealthy). To the extent that a leader has this limitation, he or she tends to demonstrate low autonomy to interfere in the work environment conditions. This evidence again distorts the profile of charismatic leadership, because as advocated by Conger et al (1997) the charismatic leader tends to act proactively to obtain better conditions and work, with a view to offer the led people an environment consistent with the purposes and values defended to the members. When there is not such involvement on the part of the leadership, the found results get distant from what is prayed by the literature.

The medium scores of sensitivity to the needs of the members of the team Units I ($\bar{X} = 5.9286$) and III ($\bar{X} = 5.3056$) showed higher average scores than Unit II ($\bar{X} = 4.6667$). It is noticeable that the leaders, somehow, have awareness of the needs of members, but they are not always able to satisfy it, having in view of the volume of workers who are under their commands. As this is a company of the type slaughterhouse, the number of employees exceeds 4 thousand. In this case, the greater the number of led people under the command of a leadership, the greater the difficulties are that the same have to meet the specificities of each one. This evidence naturally tends to distance itself from the literature in view of the size of the quota of people that are under the control of the leaders and also the geographical extent in which they are subjected to. Conger et al (1997) declare that the charismatic leaders tend to understand the specificities of each led person, with views of surrounding them psychologically in mutual respect among the team members. To the extent that the members are able to relate amicably, the leader shows concern to maintain the well-

being of the staff and the working environment, in order to assist them overcome the challenges of the day-to-day.

In terms of personal risk all three (3) units had average scores of 3 points of the Likert scale respectively (I ($\bar{X} = 3.7857$), II ($\bar{X} = 3.6190$) and III ($\bar{X} = 3.2222$). This result indicates that these leaders showed poor performance of charismatic leadership. What justifies these evidences are the challenges that these leaders are subjected to, because as evidenced, they deal with absenteeism and lack of engagement of work teams. These reasons tend to inhibit the leadership in causing the led people certain enthusiasm to work with greater dedication and commitment, which leads to a few sacrifices on the part of the leader, to demonstrate to the led people what in fact he or she expect from them.

About the unconventional behavior, all three (3) units had average scores of 4 points of the Likert scale respectively (I ($\bar{X} = 4.1429$), II ($\bar{X} = 4.2143$) and III ($\bar{X} = 4.1667$). The results of this dimension are substantiated by other evidences of previous dimensions. The fact that these leaders are subjected to a large volume of led people, high goals and high indexes of absenteeism due to non-explicit variables by the same in this study, it is possible to conclude that these leaders have a more traditional leadership than charismatic. In order to a charismatic leadership the leader should present more enthusiastic behaviors with views to mobilize members to "do their best to the company" (CONGER, et al, 1997). The results indicated that the leaders tend to act within a certain neutrality, without causing major impacts that arouse enthusiasm in the led people.

Finally, it is important to highlight that this study has limitations regarding the sample survey. The ideal would be that it would be possible to obtain the opinion of the led people on the same aspects to make comparisons regarding the perception of the Leader *versus* the led people. In this way, it is suggested for future studies the enlargement of the sample involving the led people in the research, as well as the insertions of other variables that allow to perform correlation tests and other statistical tests which allow other conclusions.

6. References

AHLER, D. J., CITRIN, J., DOUGAL, M. C., & LENZ, G. S. (March de 2017). Face Value? Experimental Evidence that Candidate Appearance Influences Electoral Choice. **Political Behavior**, v.39, n.1, p.77–102, 2017.

ANTONAKIS, J.; BASTARDOZ, N.; JACQUART, P.; SHAMIR, B. Charisma: An Ill-Defined and Ill-Measured Gift. **Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior**, v.3, n.1, p. 293-319, 2016.

BASS, B. M. **Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations**. New York: Free Press, 1985.

BEDELL-AVERS, K. E.; HUNTER, S.T.; MUMFORD, M. D. Conditions of problem-solving and the performance of charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leaders: A comparative experimental study. **The Leadership Quarterly**, v.19, n.1, p.89–106, 2008.

BERLEW, D.E. California Management Review. **Winter74**, v.17, n. 2, p.21-30-10, 1974.

- CALLEGARI-JACQUES, S.M. **Bioestatística: Princípios e Aplicações**. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2003.
- CAMPOS, H. L.; ARAÚJO, E. M.; MORAES, L. F. R.; KILIMNIK, Z. M. Estilos de liderança e interferência no nível de confiança organizacional: um estudo de caso. **Revista Gestão & Planejamento**, v.14, n.3, p.389-409, 2013.
- CONGER, J. A. **The Charismatic Leader**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bassy, 1989.
- CONGER, J. A.; KANUNGO, R. N. The Empowerment Process: Integrating Theory and Practice. **Academy of Management Review**, v.13, n.3, p.471-482, 1988.
- CONGER, J. A.; KANUNGO, R.N.; MENON, S.T. Charismatic leadership and follower effects. **Journal of Organizational Behavior**, v.21, n.7, p.747-767, 2000.
- CONGER, J.A.; KANUNGO, R.N. Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. **Academy of Management Review**, v.12, n.4, p.637-647, 1987.
- CONGER, J.A.; KANUNGO, R.N.; MENON S.T.; MATHUR P. Measuring charisma: dimensionality and validity of the Conger; Kanungo scale of charismatic leadership. **Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences**, v.14, n.3, p. 290-302, 1997.
- CORDEIRO, V. J.; TESSER, E. O. D. S.; PAULA, R. A.; ZAMPOMA, J. Relação entre o estilo de liderança dos gestores e a motivação dos colaboradores da empresa Lamipack da cidade de Caçador/SC. **NAVUS - Revista de Gestão e Tecnologia**, v. 2, n. 1, p. 119-127, 2012.
- DANIEL, A. Os Estilos De Liderança Na Gestão Dos Serviços Bancários. **ReCaPe Revista de Carreiras e Pessoas**, v.4, n.2, p.178-187, 2014.
- GOMES, A.R.; CRUZ, J. Abordagem carismática e transformacional: modelos conceituais e contributos para o exercício da liderança. **Psicol. USP**, v.18, n.3, p.143-161, 2007.
- GRABO, A.; SPISAK, B.R. VUGT, M.V. Charisma as signal: An evolutionary perspective on charismatic leadership, **The Leadership Quarterly**, v.28, n.4, p. 473-485, 2017.
- GRIFFITH, J.; CONNELLY, S.; THIEL, P.; JOHNSON, G. How outstanding leaders lead with affect: An examination of charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leaders. **The Leadership Quarterly**. v.26, n.4, p.502-517, 2015.
- HOUSE RJ. A 1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership. In **The Cutting Edge**, ed. JG Hunt, LL Larson, p. 189-207. Carbondale: Southern Illinois: University Press, 1977.
- KIRKPATRICK, S.A., & LOCKE, E. A. Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, v.81, n.1, p.36-51, 1996.
- KLOFSTAD, C. A., ANDERSON, R. C., & PETERS, S. Sounds like a winner: voice pitch influences perception of leadership capacity in both men and women. **Proceedings of the Royal Society**, v. 279, n.1738, p.2698–2704, 2012.
- KOUZES, J.M.; POSNER, B.Z. **The Leadership Challenge**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bassy, 1987.

- ROLDAN, V.P.S.; PESSOA, M.N.M.; Mello, R.B.; Santos, S. M.; Lima, T.C.B. Estilo De Liderança E Desempenho Criativo Em Equipes De Telejornalismo: Um Estudo Em Emissoras De TV Cearenses. **RECADM**, v.12, n.3, p.334-352, 2013.
- SHAMIR, B.; HOUSE, R. J.; ARTHUR, M. The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. **Organization Science**, v.4, n.4, p.577-594, 1993.
- SHESKIN, D. J. **Handbook of Parametric and Nonparametric Statistical Procedures**. Boca Raton: Chapman & Halucrc, 2004.
- SIEGEL, S. **Estatística Não-paramétrica Para as Ciências do Comportamento**. São Paulo: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- TIGUE, C. C., BORAK, D. J., O'CONNOR, J. J., SCHANDL, C., & FEINBERG, D. R. Voice pitch influences voting behavior. **Evolution and Human Behavior**, v.33, n.3, 210-216, 2012.
- TORMAN, V.B.L.; COSTER, R.; RIBOLDI, J. Normalidade de variáveis: métodos de verificação e comparação de alguns testes não-paramétricos por simulação. **Revista HCPA**, v.32, n.2, p.227-243, 2012.
- VASCONCELLOS, M. D. C.; PIGNATTI, M. G.; PIGNATI, W. A. Emprego e Acidentes de Trabalho na Indústria Frigorífica em Áreas de Expansão do Agronegócio, Mato Grosso, Brasil. **Saúde e Sociedade**, São Paulo, v. 18, n. 4, p. 662-672, 2009.
- WALSTER, E.; ARONSON, D.; ABRAHAMS, D. On increasing the persuasiveness of a low prestige communicator. **Journal of Experimental Social Psychology**, v.2, p.325-342, 1966.
- WEBER, M. **The theory of social and economic organization**, Oxford University Press, New York, 1947.
- WEICK, K.E. **Sensemaking in organizations**. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1995.
- ZAR J.H. **Biostatistical analysis**. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1999.