

1-1-2013

Charismatic and Affective Rhetoric in a Presidential Campaign

Sheilesha R. Willis

Claremont Graduate University

Gloria L. Sweida

Claremont Graduate University

Stephanie Glassburn

Claremont Graduate University

Cynthia L. Sherman

Claremont Graduate University

Michelle C. Bligh

Claremont Graduate University

Recommended Citation

Willis, S., Sweida, G. L., Glassburn, S., Sherman, C. L., & Bligh, M. C. (2013). Charismatic and Affective Rhetoric in a Presidential Campaign. In R. P. Hart (Ed.), *Communication and Language Analysis in the Public Sphere* (pp. 120-137). IGI Global.

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the CGU Faculty Scholarship at Scholarship @ Claremont. It has been accepted for inclusion in CGU Faculty Publications and Research by an authorized administrator of Scholarship @ Claremont. For more information, please contact scholarship@cuc.claremont.edu.

Communication and Language Analysis in the Public Sphere

Roderick P. Hart
University of Texas–Austin, USA

A volume in the Advances in Linguistics
and Communication Studies (ALCS) Book
Series

Information Science
REFERENCE

An Imprint of IGI Global

Managing Director: Lindsay Johnston
Production Manager: Jennifer Yoder
Development Editor: Allyson Gard
Acquisitions Editor: Kayla Wolfe
Typesetter: Christina Barkanic
Cover Design: Jason Mull

Published in the United States of America by
Information Science Reference (an imprint of IGI Global)
701 E. Chocolate Avenue
Hershey PA 17033
Tel: 717-533-8845
Fax: 717-533-8661
E-mail: cust@igi-global.com
Web site: <http://www.igi-global.com>

Copyright © 2014 by IGI Global. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored or distributed in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, without written permission from the publisher. Product or company names used in this set are for identification purposes only. Inclusion of the names of the products or companies does not indicate a claim of ownership by IGI Global of the trademark or registered trademark.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Communication and language analysis in the public sphere / Roderick P. Hart, editor.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-4666-5003-9 (hardcover) -- ISBN 978-1-4666-5004-6 (ebook) -- ISBN 978-1-4666-5005-3 (print & perpetual access) 1. Communication. 2. Rhetoric. 3. World Wide Web. 4. Social media. I. Hart, Roderick P.

P90.C62914 2014

302.23--dc23

2013037495

This book is published in the IGI Global book series Advances in Linguistics and Communication Studies (ALCS) (ISSN: pending; eISSN: pending)

British Cataloguing in Publication Data

A Cataloguing in Publication record for this book is available from the British Library.

All work contributed to this book is new, previously-unpublished material. The views expressed in this book are those of the authors, but not necessarily of the publisher.

For electronic access to this publication, please contact: eresources@igi-global.com.

Chapter 7

Charismatic and Affective Rhetoric in a Presidential Campaign

Sheilesha R. Willis

Claremont Graduate University, USA

Stephanie Glassburn

Claremont Graduate University, USA

Gloria L. Sweida

Claremont Graduate University, USA

Cynthia L. Sherman

Claremont Graduate University, USA

Michelle C. Bligh

Claremont Graduate University, USA

ABSTRACT

Although prior research demonstrates that charisma and rhetoric are two determinants of voting behavior, few studies have examined the effects of charismatic rhetoric and affect as they pertain to the outcomes of presidential elections. Using DICTION software for content analysis, 432 pre-convention speeches from the 2008 presidential election were analyzed to explore the effects that charismatic rhetoric and affect have on presidential candidates' success. Results indicate that there were more similarities than differences in the charismatic and affect-laden rhetoric of successful and unsuccessful presidential candidates in both the Republican and Democratic parties. Overall, the results demonstrate that both successful and unsuccessful presidential candidates used charismatic rhetoric and emotional language to motivate their followers in the 2008 presidential election.

INTRODUCTION

In democratic societies, followers are charged with the critical task of electing the individuals who will lead the country in both prosperous and lean times. Voters provide leaders the latitude to make judgments and decisions that drastically impact

educational, economic, social, national, and international outcomes. Evaluating the leadership of political leaders is one of the most important tasks of followers in a democratic society, and choosing a presidential leader arguably impacts both public and private aspects of everyday life. As a result, identifying the factors that influence

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-4666-5003-9.ch007

perceptions of leadership ability in political candidates is critical for enhancing the likelihood of choosing the most effective candidate. The purpose of this chapter is to examine the rhetoric of US presidential hopefuls, as it is an important avenue through which candidates proactively attempt to influence perceptions of their leadership potential.

BACKGROUND

According to Greenstein (2004), public communication, organizational capacity, political skill, vision, cognitive style, and emotional intelligence are six criteria with which individuals judge a president's effectiveness. Greenstein further notes that without effective public communication, all other criteria can be rendered useless, suggesting that rhetoric plays an important role in evaluations of a candidate's leadership suitability. Moreover, research has demonstrated that voters' evaluations of a presidential candidate's leadership capabilities impact both intentions to vote and actual voting behavior (Pillai, Williams, Lowe & Jung, 2003). Therefore, during an election cycle, candidates' speech-making and the content of their messages to voters are important sources of evidence on which voters base their evaluations of the candidates' leadership qualities (Shamir, 1995) and subsequent voting behavior.

Most voters do not have the opportunity to directly witness leadership behavior, which may contradict the candidates' rhetoric (Shamir, 1995), and followers must base their evaluations of a potential leader's effectiveness largely on public speeches, debates, and media engagements. As a result, followers' evaluations of a presidential candidate's suitability for office are predominantly influenced by their attributions of leadership characteristics to potential leaders.

One important influence on voter attributions is charismatic leadership. Weber (1947; p. 333) defined charisma as "a certain quality of an individual personality, by virtue of which s/he is set

apart from ordinary people and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities". Applying the concept to leadership, charismatic leaders have the uncanny ability to emotionally connect with followers and influence them to internalize a vision that aligns their self-concept with the collective goals of an organization (House, 1977). While charismatic leaders can have a significant impact on followers' behavior, researchers have consistently provided evidence that the influence attempts of charismatic leadership are strongly mediated by followers' perceptions and attributions (Bligh, Kohles, & Meindl 2004a, Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Jacquart & Antonakis, 2010; Lord, 1985; Meindl, 1990); Shamir, 1995). Therefore, charismatic leadership, in large part, resides "in the eye of the beholder," making the experience of charismatic leadership highly subjective and variable. These perceptions make charismatic attributions particularly important to understanding evaluations of candidates' leadership potential.

Research suggests that a leader's rhetoric and perceptions of his or her charisma are closely related (Bligh et al., 2004a; Shamir, Arthur, & House, 1994). Shamir and colleagues (1994) outline seven general propositions regarding the content of speech that is likely to produce charismatic effects among followers. These include more references to a collective history and collective identity, more positive references to followers' worth and efficacy, a greater number of references to the similarity between leader and followers and a leader's identification with followers, and more references to values, moral justifications, distal goals, hope and faith. Other elements of charismatic rhetoric include the use of goal-oriented language, metaphors and similes, stories, lists, and rhetorical questions (Den Hartog & Verburg, 1997; Frese, Beimel, & Schoenborn, 2003; House, 1977). The present chapter examines the charismatic elements of candidate rhetoric in the 2008 election. Given that the outcome of the election is known, it is possible to determine

whether the candidates' rhetoric differed in levels of charisma, both between candidates from different political parties as well as between successful and unsuccessful candidates.

Another important aspect of charismatic leadership is the concept of distance. Without distance, rhetoric would likely play a less pivotal role in voters' evaluations and perceptions of presidential candidates (see Shamir, 1995). Recent research on distance and construal level theory suggests that the farther leaders are from followers, the more likely followers will use increasingly general, abstract, coherent, and superordinate mental representations in their perceptions (Trope & Liberman, 2010; Yagil, 1998). Other research suggests that social distance can either reduce or neutralize the effects of charismatic and transformational leadership on followers (Cole, Bruch, & Shamir, 2009). These two lines of research suggest important avenues for exploring attributions of leadership potential.

Antonakis and Atwater (2002) outline several leader-follower relationships, which are characterized by high or low physical distance, social distance, and interaction frequency. A leader's physical distance from his/her followers encompasses the psychological proximity of a leader to his/her followers. For example, the physical distance between a line supervisor of a multinational company and his or her employees is likely to be much smaller than that of the CEO to the same employees. Social distance, on the other hand, refers to the perceived differences between the leader and follower in terms of status, rank, authority, social standing and power. By distinguishing between physical and social distance, it becomes possible for a leader to function in close proximity to followers, but be perceived as socially distant or vice versa. Finally, interactional frequency reflects the perceived degree to which leaders and followers mutually and reciprocally influence each other through the quantity and quality of their interactions. Unlike the other two

dimensions of distance, a high degree of interactional frequency represents closeness between the leader and followers.

The relationship between voters and presidential candidates epitomizes Antonakis and Atwater's (2002) notion of distal leadership: leaders and followers are distant from one another and their interaction is infrequent or non-existent. In distal leadership, there are also perceived power differentials between the leader and follower. In sum, distal leadership is characterized by high physical and social distance in conjunction with low interaction frequency. Due to this distal relationship between followers and presidential candidates, voters are unable to evaluate candidates' performance. Instead, performance must be inferred based on the candidates' perceived attributes. Given this model, the success of a presidential candidate, at least in part, relies on his/her ability to engage and identify with followers while managing vast physical and social distance as well as infrequent and one-way interactions.

Attributions of Leadership

More recently, Antonakis and Jacquart (in press) proposed the actuality-ascription trait theory, which describes two potential routes to leadership attributions. In the first route, leaders are judged based on the traits that they actually possess. In the second route, leaders are judged based on the traits to which they are ascribed. For example, a voter may think that a presidential candidate looks intelligent. Based on the candidate's appearance, the voter may perceive the leader to be intelligent, and look for information that validates his/her perceptions. According to Jacquart and Antonakis (2010), leaders who are ascribed effective leadership qualities are likely to emerge, but may not be effective. Similarly, leaders may be ascribed charisma based on their rhetoric, even when their behaviors and decisions may call their judgment or relevant experience into question. Relevant to

the current argument, ascription is described as a 'short cut,' which is more likely to prevail, when leader-follower distance is large. We, therefore, argue that perceived charisma, similar to height, attractiveness, and leader prototypicality, is an important ascriptive route through which followers attribute leadership competency.

Lending support to this proposition, Jacquart and Antonakis (2010) found that the inclusion of charisma to Fair's economic model of voter behavior (which included a social distance element) accounted for 96% of the variance of the two-party vote share (as opposed to 91% predicted by Fair's model alone) in U.S. presidential elections from 1916 - 2008. It also correctly predicted the winner in all but one of the 24 elections in the sample period. This body of research suggests that inferences of successful leadership capabilities are based on both the candidates' rhetorical skills and perceived charisma, and that charisma is an ascriptive route to attributions of effective leadership at the presidential level.

A related characteristic that may play an integral role in voters' evaluations of presidential candidates are the candidates' emotional displays. As previously stated, emotional intelligence is one of six criteria with which followers judge a leader's effectiveness (Greenstein, 2004), and leadership is a highly emotional process (Glaso & Einarsen, 2008). In the political arena, the use of emotional rhetoric and displays by public leaders have been shown to influence reactions of followers (Bono & Illies, 2006) including voter assessment of a presidential candidate's fitness for office (Bucy, 2002). Indeed, political candidates' emotional displays have been shown to influence voters more than the candidate's party affiliation, ideology, or policies (Bucy, 2002).

Other research suggests that the management and manipulation of emotional displays regulate status and power relationships (Bono & Illies, 2006) and smooth the relationship between leaders and followers with societal norms prescribing what is deemed an appropriate display of emotion

(Glaso & Einarsen, 2008). As followers seek a leader who is honest and trustworthy (Glaso & Einarsen, 2008), it is vital that presidential candidates communicate and convey a sincere and honest expression of their emotions and vision through their rhetoric. Leaders that are seen as faking or suppressing emotions are also perceived of as less genuine, credible, and trustworthy (Glaso & Einarsen, 2008). Therefore, it is not surprising that leaders selectively express and suppress emotion in order to affect followers' emotions and actions, thereby promoting the leaders' own interest (Glaso & Einarsen, 2008).

The current chapter explores the relationship between charismatic rhetoric and voting outcomes, as well as the affective components of charismatic rhetoric, or the use of direct emotional words. Although the analyses are obviously posthoc, and are unable to address issues of causality, the context of an election provides a unique opportunity to examine differences among candidates in which outcomes are definitive and known. In particular, the current study explores three elements of charismatic rhetoric among the 2008 presidential candidates, and the relationship of such rhetoric to the relative success of each candidate. The first two elements - references to a collective identity and references to values and morals - are elements that have been explored in previous research. The third element, use of affective language, has received less attention in relation to leadership attributions, and is further explored. The following section identifies each rhetorical element and its hypothesized relationship to leadership attributions.

Charismatic Rhetoric: Collective Identity and Values

As stated previously, charismatic leaders motivate their followers toward collective action (House, Spangler and Woyke, 1991). Compared to the speeches of non-charismatic leaders, charismatic leaders make more references to the collective

(Shamir et al., 1994). This collective-oriented language creates a sense of similarity and value congruence among leaders and followers (Bligh et al., 2004a; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Shamir et al., 1994) that is achieved when presidential candidates stress group similarities as opposed to individual differences (Bligh et al., 2004a). The sense of similarity and value congruence enables charismatic leaders to communicate their awareness of, and identification with, followers' needs and fears. It also signifies to followers that the leader is someone who can be trusted. Moreover, followers' perception of their similarity to a leader influences leader emergence. Fox and Spector (2000) found that leadership candidates who were perceived as more similar to followers were more likely to emerge than leadership candidates who were perceived as dissimilar to followers. Thus, relaying one's similarity to followers is vital to the success of a presidential candidate.

Presidential candidates also use party identification to stress and enhance their similarity to voters. Voters within the same political party perceive their presidential candidate to be more charismatic than the opposing candidate (Pillai & Williams, 1998; Pillai et al., 2003). Pillai and colleagues (1998; 2003) found that this attribution of charisma was linked to the party affiliates' voting behavior. Because voting behavior is linked to party identification, it is likely that the speeches of successful presidential candidates will include more references to their political party than those unsuccessful candidates. In turn, these references will enhance voters' perception of similarity to the candidate.

The last mechanism used by presidential candidates to enhance a sense of similarity and collective identity is the leader's reference to followers' national identity. As explained by Bloodsworth-Lugo and Lugo-Lugo (2008), "Since September 11, 2001, and the onset of the U.S.-led 'War on Terror,' U.S. presidential rhetoric has consistently acted to demarcate the boundaries of the 'American' and 'un-American' by reinforcing

the contours of multiple binary pairs (citizenship, race relations, and nationality)" (p. 273). These references are aimed at enhancing the solidarity among voters and the presidential candidate, which has charismatic effects on followers (Bligh et al., 2004a). The effects of such rhetoric are explained by Lugo-Lugo and Bloodsworth-Lugo's (2009) observation that the post-9/11 rhetoric of "Americanness" was not only used by political figures, it was also echoed in the media, military, and American public. Although this type of political rhetoric has become more common post-9/11, the idea of protecting Americans by containing those that are un-American is an old political tactic that dates back many decades (Bloodsworth-Lugo & Lugo-Lugo, 2008). References to the collective national identity also make followers' social identity salient (Tajfel, 1974; Turner, 1981; see also Haslam et al., 2001; Hogg, Hains, & Mason, 1998; Seyranian & Bligh, 2007; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993), and increase followers' sense of trust in a presidential candidate. Based on the above research, we hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 1a: Successful presidential candidates will use more rhetoric that emphasizes the candidates' similarity to followers and enhances a positive collective identity.

Hypothesis 1b: Successful presidential candidates will make more references to their own political party than will unsuccessful presidential candidates.

Hypothesis 1c: Successful presidential candidates will make more references to America and American identity than will unsuccessful presidential candidates.

Prior research has also found that charismatic leaders make more references to values and morals. As a strategy to gain the support of voters, presidential candidates make a direct appeal to the voters' personal values and beliefs (Bligh et al., 2004a; Boal & Hooijberg, 2001; Seyranian & Bligh, 2008). Value congruence plays an especially

important role for charismatic leaders who seek to develop shared and internalized values as a key mechanism for motivating followers (Bass, 1985; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Shamir, Zakay, Breinin & Popper, 1998). Research supports this claim by demonstrating that charismatic leaders are more likely to align their vision with their followers' values and beliefs (Bligh et al., 2004a).

Presidential candidates can also appeal to followers' values through the use of religious rhetoric. Several researchers have argued that religion plays an integral role in how Americans vote (Bolce & De Maio, 1999; Campbell, 2006; Cassese, 2009; Robinson, 2010). The rhetoric of many presidential candidates often reflects this religiosity. Over two decades ago, Silk (1984) found that President Eisenhower's speeches contained references to Judeo-Christian values. Hamill (2006) further elaborated on the U.S. appeal of Judeo-Christian rhetoric by explaining that over 75% of Americans practiced some form of Christianity. Because of the overwhelming proportion of Americans who practice Christianity, Americans support social change and policy that reflect these values (Hamill, 2006). Thus, presidential candidates who make references to these values are likely to be more successful in gaining the support of voters than candidates who do not. This idea was supported by Bligh et al.'s (2004b) research, which found that President Bush's speech contained more references to values, beliefs, and faith-based principles after the events of September 11th than before. Other research suggests that voting behavior is likely influenced by the value congruence between the presidential candidate and voter (Williams et al., 2004). Thus, we hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 2a: Successful presidential candidates will make more references to values and moral justifications than unsuccessful candidates.

Hypothesis 2b: Successful presidential candidates will use more Judeo-Christian rhetoric than unsuccessful candidates.

Charismatic Rhetoric and Affective Language

Although less studied, affective language is thought to be another important component of charismatic rhetoric (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Groves, 2005; Shamir et al., 1994). Loseke (2009) argued that affect-laden speech was pervasive in everyday language, and thus persuasive in gaining the support of voters. These emotional appeals persuade voters to adopt a presidential candidate's vision by appealing to the voters' belief system and values (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001). Moreover, emotional displays are used in the evaluations of a leader's intentions and sincerity (Humphrey, 2002). In addition to several other leadership cues, voters rely on the affective language used in presidential candidates' rhetoric to infer the leadership capabilities and authenticity of these candidates. Thus, we hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 3a: Successful presidential candidates will use more emotional rhetoric that energizes followers than unsuccessful candidates.

Another important element of affective language is its pleasantness. Several researchers have found that leaders who express positive affect are rated more favorably than leaders who express negative affect (Barsade & Gibson, 2007; Bono & Illies, 2006; Dasborough and Ashkanasy, 2002) and that these favorable ratings are a result of emotional contagion (Barsade & Gibson, 2007; Bono & Illies, 2006; Damen, Van Knippenberg, & Van Knippenberg, 2008). According to these researchers, leaders' positive affect arouses positive emotion in followers, which in turn results in positive mood. However, several researchers have also shown that the effects of affect are context-dependent, with negative affect being rated more favorably than positive affect in particular situations (Bucy, 2000; Bono & Illies, 2006; Damen et al., 2008; Glaso & Einsaren, 2008). Damen et al. (2008) found that the display of positive or

negative affect mainly depended on its perceived appropriateness. Whether positive or negative, prior research demonstrates that affective language influences voters' recall of information and voting behavior (Civettini & Redlawsk, 2009). Therefore, successful presidential candidates should use an abundance of emotional words, both pleasant and unpleasant. Bligh et al., (2004b) found support for this assertion in their examination of Bush's speeches. They concluded that "the President's speeches in the post-crisis sample reflect a balance between acknowledging the horrific turn of events on 9/11 and attempting to invoke a vision of better times" (p. 568). Whereas previous studies examined language within the context of a crisis, this chapter proposes that a similar balance in the pleasantness of the candidates' rhetoric will be exercised by successful presidential candidates. Therefore, we hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 3b: Successful presidential candidates will use more pleasant emotional rhetoric than unsuccessful candidates.

Hypothesis 3c: Successful presidential candidates will use more unpleasant emotional rhetoric than unsuccessful candidates.

Methods

Sample

The sample included 432 pre-convention speeches (January 2007 to August and September of 2008) from the 2008 presidential election. These speeches were derived from 8 candidates: Barack Obama (N = 142), John McCain (N = 120), Mitt Romney (N = 25), Hillary Clinton (N = 87), Mike Huckabee (N = 10), John Edwards (N = 22), Fred Thompson (N = 12), and Bill Richardson (N = 14).

Procedures

DICTION 5.0, a content analysis program, was used to analyze the candidate speeches due to its emphasis on political dialogue. DICTION was

developed to measure political discourse, and it contains 33 dictionaries that include over 10,000 total search words. The program breaks each speech into 500-word passages. Words can then be compared across these passages. Although the breakdown allows for easy comparisons between speeches, it may also unintentionally increase alpha error by increasing the sample size and making more comparisons than desired. To account for this alpha inflation, words were averaged across speeches as opposed to across 500-word passages.

For the purposes of hypothesis testing, the dictionaries of references to political party, religion, values, American identity, collective focus, and similarity to followers were selected. Collective focus and similarity to followers' dictionaries were used from an earlier study of charismatic political rhetoric (Bligh et al., 2004a). The collective focus variable used three of the DICTION standard dictionaries: collective, public references, and self-reference. It consists of an "additive score on collectives and public references, minus the speech's score on self-reference. Thus, this construct reflects a leader's verbal focus on collectives, rather than focus on individuals and self-referential language" (Bligh et al., 2004a, p. 217). The similarity-to-followers' variable was also created from DICTION software's standard dictionaries of leveling, familiarity, and human interest. The language included in the similarity-to-followers' dictionary ignores individual differences, using words that specifically focus on human beings and their activities using everyday words.

Additionally, the emotional content of the speeches was analyzed using the Regressive Image Dictionary (RID) with WordStat 6 module of QDA Miner software. The English RID is a content analysis dictionary of 3200 words developed by Martindale (1975, 1990) to search for primary process cognition (more image-based words), secondary process cognition (more concept-related words), and emotion. The difference between the primary and secondary cognition words is the extent to which the words evoke a sensory experience (Emrich, Brower, Feldman, & Gar-

land, 2001). However, the interest in the current chapter was to find the words directly relating to emotion, therefore the primary and secondary cognition dictionary subscales were not used. The RID categorized emotion words in seven groups: positive affect, anxiety, sadness, affection, aggression, expressive behavior, and glory. For the purposes of this chapter, the expressive behavior and glory categories were dropped because the words did not explicitly express emotion per se (sample words for expressive behavior included “art,” “dance,” and “sing;” sample words for glory included “admirable,” “hero,” and “royal”). After extracting the number of words in each of the emotion categories for each speech, the speeches were further analyzed by creating subscales using the emotion categories. The negative emotion subscale was calculated as the sum of the of anxiety, aggression, and sadness scores for each speech. The positive emotion subscale was calculated as the sum of positive affect and affection. The total emotion scale was calculated as the sum of negative and positive emotion subscales.

After analyzing the speeches with DICTION and WordStat RID, the output was analyzed using SPSS. This allowed us to make comparisons between the successful and unsuccessful presidential candidates. Party nomination was used to differentiate between successful and unsuccessful political candidates in the 2008 presidential election. The candidates’ speeches were separated by political party and aggregated based on whether the candidates emerged as the party nominee after the primaries. Based on this criterion, the successful candidates from the two political parties were Barack Obama (Democrat) and John McCain (Republican). Hillary Rodham Clinton, John Edwards, and Bill Richardson were among the unsuccessful Democratic candidates, while the unsuccessful Republican candidates included Mitt Romney, Mike Huckabee, and Fred Thompson.

Covariates

Candidate speeches varied in length from 204 words to 8,900 words. To assure that these differences would not affect the outcome of the data, two measures were used to control for the speech lengths: the total number of words and the number of different words.

Results

Multivariate analyses of covariance (MANCOVA) were used to analyze the data from the speeches for hypothesis 1a, 1c, 2a, and 3a-c. A chi-square test of independence was used for hypothesis 1b and 2b. First, the distributions and frequencies of the dependent variables were analyzed, revealing that almost half of the speeches (44.7%) lacked references to political party and the majority of the speeches contained 10 or less references to political party (97%). With such a discrepancy in references, a normal distribution would not be achieved. To account for this discrepancy, the party variable, which assessed references to political party, was dichotomized to compare the absence of references to one’s political party to the presence of references to one’s political party.

After dichotomizing the variable, a chi-square test of independence was conducted to examine hypothesis 1b, which stated that successful candidates would make more references to their own political party. The chi-square revealed a statistically significant difference between successful and unsuccessful Democratic candidates’ references to political party, $\chi^2_1 = 4.152$, $p < .05$. Specifically, 65.9% of the unsuccessful Democratic candidates’ speeches contained references to political party, while only 53.5% of Obama’s speeches contained references to political party. Thus, unsuccessful Democratic candidates were more likely to make reference to political party

Table 1. Chi-square test of independence for political party references

	n	No reference to political party	At least one reference to political party	χ^2
Unsuccessful Democrats	123	42 (34.1%)	81 (65.9%)	4.15*
Successful Democrats	142	66 (46.5%)	76 (53.5%)	
Unsuccessful Republicans	47	18 (38.3%)	29 (61.7%)	4.15*
Successful Republicans	120	67 (55.8%)	53 (44.2%)	

* $p < .05$.

than the successful Democratic candidate, yielding no support for Hypothesis 1b. As with the Democratic candidates, the speeches of the unsuccessful Republican candidates (61.7%) were more likely to contain at least one reference to political party than the successful Republican candidate's speeches (44.2%), $\chi^2_1 = 4.155$, $p < .05$. Again, hypothesis 1b was not supported.

Additionally, the distribution for the variable assessing references to religion was positively skewed. References to religion in a speech ranged from 0 to 132, but the majority of speeches contained 10 or fewer references to religion (87.7%). Again, a normal distribution would not be achieved by transforming this particular variable. For this reason, the religion variable was divided into four categories: no references to religion ($N = 74$), 1 – 5 references to religion ($N = 233$), 6 – 10 references to religion ($N = 72$), and 11 or more references to religion ($N = 53$). After categorizing the variable, a chi-square test of independence was conducted to examine hypothesis 2b, which stated that successful candidates would make more references to Judeo-Christian rhetoric than unsuccessful candidates. With respect to the Democratic candidates, no statistically significant difference was found between the successful and unsuccessful candidates' references to religion, $\chi^2_3 = 4.135$, $p > .05$. Results for the Republican candidates were similar. There was no detectable difference in the successful and unsuccessful

candidates' references to religion, $\chi^2_3 = 5.812$, $p > .05$. No support for Hypothesis 2b was found.

To test hypotheses 1a, 1c, 2a, and 3a-c, two separate multivariate analyses of covariance (MANCOVA) were conducted; one for the Democratic candidates and one for the Republican candidates. This analysis allowed for the comparison between successful and unsuccessful candidates' use of references to similarity to followers, collective focus, American identity, values, positive and negative emotional language, as well as emotional language overall within each party. Follow-up analyses of covariance (ANCOVAs) were conducted where appropriate.

The MANCOVA for the Democratic candidates' speeches revealed a statistically significant difference between references made to the combination of these seven variables, Pillai's Trace = .076, $F(7, 255) = 2.998$, $p = .005$.

The MANCOVA for the Republican candidates' speeches also yielded a statistically significant difference between successful and unsuccessful candidates on the combination of the seven variables, Pillai's Trace = .322, $F(7, 157) = 10.628$, $p < .001$. The MANCOVA results revealed at least some significant differences between successful and unsuccessful candidates in the language used in speeches for both the Democrats and Republicans. Follow-up ANCOVAs are discussed below.

Charismatic and Affective Rhetoric in a Presidential Campaign

Table 2. Democratic candidate means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for charismatic rhetoric constructs

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Similarity to followers	5.157	.084							
2. Collective focus	4.166	.291	.222***						
3. Values	2.047	.417	.104	.215***					
4. American identity	2.760	.895	.263***	.536***	.363***				
5. Negative emotions	3.424	.710	-.001	.365***	.162**	.454***			
6. Positive emotions	2.569	.684	-.030	.318***	.012	.275***	.430***		
7. Total emotions	3.807	.636	-.024	.399***	.136*	.455***	.944***	.686***	

Note. *N* = 265
 p* < .05. *p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

Table 3. Republican candidate means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for charismatic rhetoric constructs

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Similarity to followers	5.127	.091							
2. Collective focus	4.012	.316	.173*						
3. Values	2.176	.474	.090	.254***					
4. American identity	2.730	.868	.174*	.557***	.436***				
5. Negative emotions	3.205	.933	-.100	.430***	.385***	.595***			
6. Positive emotions	2.523	.697	.273***	.199**	-.011	.428***	.345***		
7. Total emotions	3.677	.725	.042	.402***	.289***	.626***	.927***	.633***	

Note. *N* = 167
 p* < .05. *p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

With respect to use of references to similarity to followers, Obama did not differ from the unsuccessful Democratic candidates, $F(1, 261) = 1.047, p = .307$. Additionally, no differences were found in use of references to a collective focus for Democratic candidates, $F(1, 261) = 3.549, p = .061$. Statistically significant differences were identified between McCain and the unsuccessful Republican candidates, however. Unsuccessful candidates made more references ($\mu = 5.156$ SE = .013) to their similarity to followers than McCain ($\mu = 5.115$ SE = .008), $F(1, 163) = 6.528, p < .05$. Results also demonstrated that the unsuccessful Republican candidates made more references, on average, to collective focus ($\mu = 4.119$ SE = .038) than McCain ($\mu = 3.969$ SE = .023), $F(1, 163) = 10.985, p < .001$. These

findings provide no support for hypothesis 1a that successful candidates will use more rhetoric emphasizing a candidate’s similarity to followers and enhancement of a positive collective identity than unsuccessful candidates. Our results, in fact, indicate the opposite may be true.

The ANCOVA comparing Obama to the unsuccessful Democratic candidates for American identity revealed no significant difference in language, $F(1, 261) = .090, p = .764$. Significant differences were identified between McCain and the unsuccessful Republican candidates. On average, unsuccessful Republican candidates ($\mu = 2.960$ SE = .096) made more references to American identity than McCain ($\mu = 2.640$ SE = .059), $F(1, 163) = 7.885, p < .01$. These results do not provide support for hypothesis 1c that suc-

successful candidates would make more references to American identity than unsuccessful candidates.

Again, no significant differences were identified between Obama and the unsuccessful Democratic candidates on their use of references to values in their speeches, $F(1, 261) = .017, p = .896$. In contrast, on average, the successful Republican candidate, McCain ($\mu = 2.248$ SE = .039), made more references to values in each speech than the unsuccessful Republican candidates ($\mu = 1.994$ SE = .063), $F(1, 163) = 11.408, p < .001$. This provided partial support for hypothesis 2a that successful candidate would use more references to values and moral justifications than unsuccessful candidates.

Based on the findings in Table 4, no support was found for hypothesis 1a which stated that successful candidates would use more references to similarity to followers and collective identity. Moreover, no support was found for hypothesis 1c which stated that successful candidates would make more references to American identity than unsuccessful candidates. However, partial support was found for hypothesis 2a, which hypothesized that successful candidates would make more references to values than unsuccessful candidates. This partial support was only found in the comparison of Republican candidates. No support was found for the Democratic candidates.

For the total emotion scale, the comparisons between the successful and unsuccessful candidates revealed no statistically significant differences between the Democratic candidates, $F(1, 261) = 2.151, p = .144$, or the Republican candidates, $F(1, 163) = .819, p = .367$. For both Democrats and Republicans, there was no evidence to indicate differences between successful and unsuccessful candidates in their use of emotional language in speeches in general. These findings provide no support for hypothesis 3a that successful candidates will use more emotional rhetoric than unsuccessful candidates.

For Democratic candidates, no evidence was found to indicate differences between successful and unsuccessful candidates on the positive emotion subscale, $F(1, 261) = 1.877, p = .172$. This finding suggests that Obama’s speeches did not differ from the unsuccessful Democratic candidates in their use of positive emotional language. Comparisons of the Republican candidates, however, revealed statistically significant differences between successful and unsuccessful candidates, $F(1, 163) = 13.144, p < .001$. On average, the unsuccessful Republican candidates used more positive emotional language ($\mu = 2.767$ SE = .078) in their speeches than McCain ($\mu = 2.428$ SE = .048). These results provide no support for hypothesis 3b that successful candidates will use more positive emotional rhetoric than unsuccessful

Table 4. Charismatic rhetoric construct mean comparisons for Democratic successful and unsuccessful candidates

Charismatic rhetoric construct	Successful candidate mean	SE	Unsuccessful candidate mean	SE	Univariate $F(1, 261)$	η^2	Observed power
Similarity to followers	5.162	.007	5.151	.008	1.047	.004	.175
Collective focus	4.142	.019	4.195	.020	3.549	.013	.467
Values	2.050	.034	2.044	.037	.017	.000	.052
American identity	2.773	.062	2.746	.067	.090	.000	.060
Negative emotions	3.512	.047	3.323	.051	7.277*	.027	.767
Positive emotions	2.525	.046	2.619	.050	1.877	.007	.276
Total emotions	3.847	.040	3.761	.043	2.151	.008	.309

Note. Successful candidate $n = 142$, Unsuccessful candidate $n = 123$. Means reported are adjusted for the covariates.

* $p < .01$

Table 5. Charismatic rhetoric construct mean comparisons for Republican successful and unsuccessful candidates

Charismatic rhetoric construct	Successful candidate mean	SE	Unsuccessful candidate mean	SE	Univariate F(1, 163)	η^2	Observed power
Similarity to followers	5.115	.008	5.156	.013	6.528*	.039	.719
Collective focus	3.969	.023	4.119	.038	10.985**	.063	.909
Values	2.248	.039	1.994	.063	11.408***	.065	.919
American identity	2.640	.059	2.960	.096	7.885**	.046	.797
Negative emotions	3.311	.055	2.934	.090	12.345***	.070	.937
Positive emotions	2.428	.048	2.767	.078	13.144***	.075	.950
Total emotions	3.697	.041	3.625	.067	.819	.005	.147

Note. Successful candidate $n = 120$, Unsuccessful candidate $n = 47$. Means reported are adjusted for the covariates.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

ful candidates. In fact, data for the Republican candidates indicate that the opposite may be true.

The ANCOVAs comparing successful and unsuccessful candidates' use of negative emotional language revealed statistically significant differences for Democratic and Republican candidates. Obama used more negative emotional language ($\mu = 3.512$ SE = .047), on average, than the unsuccessful Democratic candidates ($\mu = 3.323$ SE = .051), $F(1, 261) = 7.277$, $p = .007$. Additionally, when comparing the Republican candidates, on average, McCain used more negative emotional language ($\mu = 3.311$ SE = .055) in his speeches than the unsuccessful candidates ($\mu = 2.934$ SE = .090), $F(1, 163) = 12.345$, $p = .001$. These findings provide support for hypothesis 3c that successful presidential candidates will use more unpleasant emotional rhetoric than unsuccessful candidates. Both Obama and McCain, the successful candidates, used more negative emotional language in their speeches than their Democratic and Republican counterparts, respectively.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present chapter was to examine the relationship between charismatic rhetoric, affective language, and voting outcomes in the 2008 presidential election. It was hypothesized

that successful presidential candidates would make more references to collective identity in their speeches than unsuccessful candidates as indicated by the candidates' references to political party, their similarity to followers, and American identity. It was further hypothesized that successful presidential candidates would make more references to values and use more affect-laden (pleasant and unpleasant) and direct emotional language in their speeches than unsuccessful candidates. As indicated below, more similarities than differences were found in the speeches of successful and unsuccessful presidential candidates from both political parties.

No support was found for hypotheses 1a – c. Both unsuccessful Democratic and Republican candidates tended to make more references to their political party than successful candidates. In testing hypotheses 1a and c for the Democratic candidates, it was found that Obama did not differ from the unsuccessful Democratic candidates on the number of references made to American identity and similarity to followers. In contrast and in contradiction to our hypothesized relationships, unsuccessful Republican candidates tended to make more references to American identity and their similarity to followers than McCain. Our results suggest that unsuccessful candidates may make more references to collective identity than successful candidates.

Partial support was found for hypothesis 2a. While no differences were found between the successful and unsuccessful Democratic candidates, a significant difference was found for the Republican candidates. As hypothesized, McCain made more references to values in his speeches than the unsuccessful Republican candidates. Neither Democratic nor Republican successful and unsuccessful candidates differed on the references made to Judeo-Christian values, showing no support for hypothesis 2b.

Similarly, no differences for either party were found between the amount of direct and positive emotional language used by successful and unsuccessful candidates. Therefore, no support was found for hypotheses 3a and 3b. However, both Obama and McCain used more negative emotional language in their speeches than the unsuccessful Democratic and Republican candidates, showing support for hypothesis 3c. The successful presidential candidates may have made more references to negative emotion because of their lasting effects on followers. According to Bono & Illies (2006), a leader's use of negative emotion in his/her rhetoric is a powerful tool given that it has stronger and longer effects on followers than positive emotion. Moreover, as indicated by Bucy (2000), followers may evaluate negative displays of emotion as more honest, trustworthy, and credible than positive displays. In some instances, followers may even perceive a leader's display of negative emotion such as anger to be indicative of the leader's competence (Glaso & Einsaren, 2008).

Several additional explanations are offered for the relationships (or lack thereof) found here. As Lim (2002) has pointed out, presidential rhetoric has seen a trend toward sloganeering and away from reasoned arguments as a result of the institutionalization of speech writing. Given that each presidential candidate had a speech writer, it is not surprising that the content of their speeches converged. A second explanation for the present findings may be an oversimplified approach to explaining the relationship between charismatic

rhetoric, emotion, and voting outcomes. In the present chapter, we assumed that leaders who used charismatic rhetoric would be perceived as charismatic, which would lead to voting behavior and outcomes. Theories of emotion demonstrate an iterative approach to events, appraisal, and subsequent behavior (Tran, Garcia-Prieto, & Schneider, 2011). These theories assert that the relationship between emotion and behavior is complex. The following demonstrates the potential stages of emotional arousal and behavior: 1) an event occurs, 2) this event is appraised and interpreted, 3) these appraisals lead to emotional arousal, and 4) those emotions motivate behavior (Tran et al., 2011). This process is iterative and can lead to re-appraisal at any of the four stages presented above. Although leadership candidates use similar levels of charismatic rhetoric, the speeches may be appraised differently depending on several factors external to the content of the speech. Research has consistently demonstrated that non-verbal cues are equally, and sometimes more, influential in motivating behavior than the actual content of a leader's speech (Bono & Illies, 2006; Bucy, 2000; George, 2000; Masters, 1991; Newcombe & Ashkanasy, 2002). The delivery of the content may also influence the ways in which followers interpret a presidential candidate's speech. Thus the relationship between charismatic rhetoric, affect, and voting outcomes may be less direct than was proposed. Moreover, the influence of media cannot be overlooked in the present study. Media coverage may also influence followers' appraisal of a candidate's speech, moderating the relationship between the use of charismatic rhetoric, affective language, and voting outcomes.

The current findings contribute to the body of political leadership literature in several ways. First, the findings suggest that political leaders in the 2008 presidential election, regardless of their charismatic qualities, used language that sought to inspire and motivate followers. Second, candidates were not equally effective in their use of charismatic rhetoric. Instead, the findings suggest that

the effectiveness of a presidential candidate's use of charismatic rhetoric may be context-dependent. The use of charismatic language does not necessarily lead to ascriptions of leader charisma. As was previously discussed, when leader-follower relationships are characterized by high physical and social distance in addition to low interaction frequency, followers are more likely to make judgments about leaders based upon the characteristics followers ascribe to leaders as opposed to the traits leaders actually possess (Antonakis & Jacquart, *in press*). When judging the effectiveness of a presidential candidate's speech, followers may rely more heavily on the ascriptions (or appraisals) of charisma, instead of the actual charismatic elements present in the candidate's speech. These appraisals will likely lead to positive emotions such as pride and joy (Tran et al., 2011), which may lead to subsequent voting behavior and outcomes.

LIMITATIONS

While this research contributes to the leadership literature in several ways, there are limitations of the present study. One important limitation is that the analysis was based upon one presidential election. For this reason, the analysis is limited to the particular context and the findings should not be generalized to all presidential elections. In fact, the 2008 presidential election was unique and in some cases historic, in that for the first time in US history, both a Biracial male and a woman were potential candidates for presidency. The ways in which these individuals were perceived may differ substantially from prior and future elections in which candidate demographics differ.

Additionally, our criterion for categorizing candidates as successful and unsuccessful was based upon the candidates' emergence after the primaries. This categorization may have limited our analyses. One could easily argue that true success is measured by a candidate's emergence as president. However, this definition of success

would be overly confounded by political party and would not explain the differences between the candidates' emergence and lack thereof in their respective political parties. Another limitation is the way in which unsuccessful candidates were calculated. By aggregating the speech references for unsuccessful candidates, we could have "washed out" some of the effects of charismatic rhetoric and affective language. For example, if Hillary Clinton was high on particular elements of charismatic rhetoric or affective language while all other Democratic candidate references were low to medium, her values could have skewed the data, resulting in no differences between successful and unsuccessful Democratic candidates' speeches.

A final limitation is the possible oversimplification of our model. The relationship between charismatic rhetoric, emotion, and voting outcomes is likely complex and iterative given the amount of speeches made by presidential candidates and the location and stage in which speeches are delivered in the primaries. Each speech may have affected followers differently. By solely using content analysis, we were unable to examine the effects that speech content and non-verbal behaviors had on followers' appraisal of the speeches, emotional arousal, and their subsequent reactions. Moreover, we did not analyze temporal trends in the speeches, examining the degree to which candidates used charismatic rhetoric and affective language throughout the primaries. Given that candidates adapt their speeches based upon the context in which it is delivered, contextual factors such as liberalism or conservatism of the state are likely important factors in considering the degree of charismatic rhetoric and affective language used by candidates.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Four primary areas of research should be pursued in the future. To understand the relationship between rhetoric, emotion, and voting outcomes,

researchers should collect data on leader speeches, follower appraisal, emotional arousal, voting intentions, and actual voting behavior. This information may clarify and better explain the link between charismatic rhetoric, emotion, and voting outcomes by providing additional mechanisms by which followers make judgments about leaders. Several methods such as those employed in structural equation modeling could be used to assess this complex relationship.

In addition to examining speech content, researchers should examine the effects that non-verbal cues have on followers' appraisal of candidate speeches, emotional arousal, voting intentions, and behavior. In explaining the relationship between charismatic rhetoric and voting outcomes, moderators and mediators should also be examined. Finally, researchers should assess whether or not party differences exist in the use of particular elements of charismatic rhetoric and affective language.

REFERENCES

- Antonakis, J., & Atwater, L. (2002). Leader distance: A review and a proposed theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*(6), 673–704. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00155-8
- Antonakis, J., & Jacquart, P. (2013). The far side of leadership: Rather difficult to face. In *When near is far and far is near: Distance in leader-follower relationships publications*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing.
- Barsade, S. G., & Gibson, D. E. (2007). Why does affect matter? *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, *21*(1), 36–59. doi:10.5465/AMP.2007.24286163
- Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership: Good, better, best. *Organizational Dynamics*, *13*(3), 26–40. doi:10.1016/0090-2616(85)90028-2
- Bligh, M. C., Kohles, J. C., & Meindl, J. R. (2004a). Charisma under crisis: Presidential leadership, rhetoric, and media responses before and after September 11th terrorist attacks. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*(2), 211–239. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.02.005
- Bligh, M. C., Kohles, J. C., & Meindl, J. R. (2004b). Charting the language of leadership: A methodological investigation 595 of President Bush and the crisis of 9/11. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(3), 562–574. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.3.562 PMID:15161413
- Bloodsworth-Lugo, M. K., & Lugo-Lugo, C. R. (2008). Citizenship and the browning of terror. *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice*, *20*(3), 273–283.
- Boal, K. B., & Hooijberg, R. (2001). Strategic leadership research: Moving on. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *11*(4), 515–549. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(00)00057-6
- Bolce, L., & De Maio, G. (1999). The anti-Christian fundamentalist factor in contemporary politics. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *63*(4), 508–542. doi:10.1086/297869
- Bono, J. E., & Ilies, R. (2006). Charisma, positive emotions and mood contagion. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*(4), 317–334. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.04.008
- Bucy, E. P. (2000). Emotional and evaluative consequences of inappropriate leader displays. *Communication Research*, *27*(2), 194–226. doi:10.1177/009365000027002004
- Campbell, D. E. (2006). Religious 'threat' in contemporary presidential elections. *The Journal of Politics*, *68*(1), 104–115. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2508.2006.00373.x
- Cassese, E. C. (2009). Culture wars as identity politics. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *69*(11-A), 0419-4209.

- Civettini, A. W., & Redlawsk, D. P. (2009). Voters, emotions, and memory. *Political Psychology, 30*(1), 125–151. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2008.00683.x
- Cole, M. S., Bruch, H., & Shamir, B. (2009). Social distance as a moderator of the effects of transformational leadership—Both neutralizer and enhancer. *Human Relations, 62*(11), 1697–1733. doi:10.1177/0018726709346377
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review, 12*(4), 637–647.
- Damen, F., Van Knippenberg, B., & Van Knippenberg, D. (2008). Affective match in leadership: Leader emotional displays, follower positive affect, and follower performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 38*(4), 868–902. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2008.00330.x
- Dasborough, M. T., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2002). Emotion and attribution of intentionality in leader-member relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly, 13*(5), 615–634. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00147-9
- Den Hartog, D. N., & Verbarg, R. M. (1997). Charisma and rhetorics: Communicative techniques of international business leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly, 8*(4), 355–391. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(97)90020-5
- Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for organizational research. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(4), 611–628. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.611 PMID:12184567
- Emrich, C., Brower, H. H., Feldman, J. M., & Garland, H. (2001). Images in words: Presidential rhetoric, charisma, and greatness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 46*(3), 527–557. doi:10.2307/3094874
- Fox, S., & Spector, P. E. (2000). Relationship of emotional intelligence, practical intelligence, general intelligence, and trait affectivity with interview outcomes: It's not all just g. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(2), 203–220. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(200003)21:2<203::AID-JOB38>3.0.CO;2-Z
- Frese, M., Beimeel, S., & Schoenborn, S. (2003). Action training for charismatic leadership: Two evaluation studies of a commercial training module on inspirational communication of a vision. *Personnel Psychology, 56*(3), 671–697. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2003.tb00754.x
- George, J. M. (2000). Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence. *Human Relations, 53*(8), 1027–1055. doi:10.1177/0018726700538001
- Glaso, L., & Einarsen, S. (2008). Emotion regulation in leader–follower relationships. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 17*(4), 482–500. doi:10.1080/13594320801994960
- Greenstein, F. I. (2004). *Leadership*. Retrieved from <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/choice2004/leadership/greenstein.html>
- Groves, K. (2005). Linking leader skills, follower attitudes, and contextual variables via an integrated model of charismatic leadership. *Journal of Management, 31*(2), 255–277. doi:10.1177/0149206304271765
- Hamill, S. P. (2006). An evaluation of federal tax policy based on Judeo-Christian ethics. *Virginia Tax Review, 25*(3), 671–764.
- Haslam, S. A., Platow, M. J., Turner, J. C., Reynolds, K. J., McGarty, C., & Oakes, P. J. et al. (2001). Social identity and the romance of leadership: The importance of being seen to be doing it for us. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 4*(3), 191–205. doi:10.1177/1368430201004003002

- Hogg, M. A., Hains, S. C., & Mason, I. (1998). Identification and leadership 690 in small groups: Salience, frame of reference, and leader stereotypicality effects on leader evaluations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*(5), 1248–1263. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.75.5.1248
- House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt, & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *The cutting edge*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- House, R. J., Spangler, W. D., & Woyke, J. (1991). Personality and charisma in the U.S. presidency: A psychological theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36*(3), 364–396. doi:10.2307/2393201
- Humphrey, R. (2002). The many faces of emotional leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 13*(5), 493–504. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00140-6
- Jacquart, P., & Antonakis, J. (2010). *Predicting presidential elections: It's the economy stupid, but charisma matters too*. Montreal, Canada: Academy of Management, Organizational Behavior Division.
- Lim, E. T. (2002). Five trends in presidential rhetoric: An analysis of rhetoric from George Washington to Bill Clinton. *Presidential Studies Quarterly, 32*(2), 328–366. doi:10.1111/j.0360-4918.2002.00223.x
- Loseke, D. R. (2009). Examining emotion as discourse: Emotion codes and presidential speeches justifying war. *The Sociological Quarterly, 50*, 499–526. doi:10.1111/j.1533-8525.2009.01150.x
- Lugo-Lugo, C. R., & Bloodsworth-Lugo, M. K. (2009). Black as brown: The 2008 Obama primary campaign and the US browning of terror. *The Journal of African American Studies, 13*(2), 110–120. doi:10.1007/s12111-008-9079-9
- Martindale, C. (1975). *Romantic progression: The psychology of literary history*. Washington, DC: Hemisphere.
- Martindale, C. (1990). *The clockwork muse: The predictability of artistic change*. New York: Basic Books.
- Masters, R. D. (1991). Individual and cultural differences in response to leaders' nonverbal displays. *The Journal of Social Issues, 47*(3), 151–165. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1991.tb01828.x
- Meindl, J. R. (1990). On leadership: An alternative to controversial wisdom. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 12*, 159–203.
- Pillai, R., & Williams, E. A. (1998). Does leadership matter in the political arena? Voter perceptions of candidates' transformational and charismatic leadership and the 1996 U.S. presidential vote. *The Leadership Quarterly, 9*(3), 397–416. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(98)90038-8
- Pillai, R., Williams, E. A., Lowe, K. B., & Jung, D. I. (2003). Personality, transformational leadership, trust, and the 2000 U.S. presidential vote. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*(2), 161–192. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(03)00008-0
- Robinson, C. (2010). Cross-cutting messages and political tolerance: An experiment using evangelical. *Protestants. Political Behavior, 32*(4), 495–515. doi:10.1007/s11109-010-9118-9
- Seyranian, V., & Bligh, M. C. (2008). Presidential charismatic leadership: Exploring the rhetoric of social change. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*(1), 54–76. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.12.005
- Shamir, B. (1995). Social distance and charisma: Theoretical notes and an exploratory study. *The Leadership Quarterly, 6*(1), 19–47. doi:10.1016/1048-9843(95)90003-9

Shamir, B., Arthur, M. B., & House, R. (1994). The rhetoric of charismatic leadership: A theoretical extension, a case study, and implications for research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 5(1), 25–42. doi:10.1016/1048-9843(94)90004-3

Shamir, B., House, R., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, 4(4), 577–594. doi:10.1287/orsc.4.4.577

Shamir, B., Zakay, E., Breinin, E., & Popper, M. (1998). Correlates of charismatic leader behavior in military units: Subordinates' attitudes, unit characteristics, and superiors' appraisals of leader performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(4), 387–409. doi:10.2307/257080

Silk, M. (1984). Notes on the Judeo-Christian tradition in America. *American Quarterly*, 36(1), 65–85. doi:10.2307/2712839

Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behavior. *Social Sciences Information. Information Sur les Sciences Sociales*, 13(2), 65–93. doi:10.1177/053901847401300204

Thomas, M. E., & Janowski, C. L. (1992). Perceptions and metaperceptions of leadership: Components, accuracy, and dispositional correlates. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18(6), 700–708. doi:10.1177/0146167292186006

Tran, V., Garcia-Prieto, P., & Schneider, S. C. (2011). The role of social identity, appraisal, and emotion in determining responses to diversity management. *Human Relations*, 64(2), 161–176. doi:10.1177/0018726710377930

Trope, Y., & Liberman, N. (2010). Construal-level theory of psychological distance. *Psychological Review*, 117(2), 440–463. doi:10.1037/a0018963 PMID:20438233

Turner, J. C. (1981). The experimental social psychology of intergroup behavior. In J. C. Turner, & H. Giles (Eds.), *Intergroup behavior* (pp. 66–101). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

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

Williams, E. A., Pillai, R., Lowe, K. B., Jung, D., & Herst, D. (2004). Crisis, charisma, values, and voting behavior in the 2004 presidential election. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20, 70–86. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.01.002

Yagil, D. (1998). Charismatic leadership and organizational hierarchy: Attribution of charisma to close and distant leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 9(2), 161–176. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(98)90003-0

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Affect: An emotional state.

Charisma: A quality of an individual's personality that is perceived to be exceptionally unique, influential, and magnetic.

Leadership: The ability to influence, guide, and direct a group of people.

Political Rhetoric: Speaking techniques used in a government or public affairs environment (e.g. an election).

Success: The accomplishment of emerging as the party nominee after the 2008 presidential election primaries.