Leadership Quality and Follower Affect—
A Study of U.S. Presidential Candidates

M. David Albritton
Assistant Professor of Management
College of Business Administration
Northern Arizona University
Box 15066
Flagstaff, AZ 86011-5066
(928) 523-7390
Fax: (928) 523-7331
David.Albritton@nau.edu

Sharon L. Oswald
Department of Management
Auburn University
Auburn, AL 36849
(334) 844-6508
Oswald@business.auburn.edu

Joseph S. Anderson
Associate Professor of Management
College of Business Administration
Northern Arizona University
Box 15066
Flagstaff, AZ 86011-5066
(928) 523-1389
Fax: (928) 523-7331
Joseph.Anderson@nau.edu

Leadership Quality and Follower Affect—
A Study of U.S. Presidential Candidates

Whether individual traits are good predictors of leadership capabilities has been the subject of much debate among management theorists for more than a century. Theories such as the "great man" theory, popular during the latter part of the 19th century, and later leader trait theory, suggested that leaders possess certain personal characteristics that distinguish them from other people (Bass, 1990). In the ensuing years numerous other philosophies of leadership were advanced, including transformational leadership, transactional leadership, LMX theory, and charismatic leadership, to name a few (Judge & Bono, 2000; Fuller, Patterson, Hester & Stringer, 1996; Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978).

The last two decades of leadership-domain research show resurgence of trait theory, but in a new form, suggesting that traits alone are not enough for success in leadership. Kirkpatrick & Locke (1991: 49) state, "…traits are only a precondition. Leaders who possess the requisite traits must take certain actions to be successful." Additionally, recent attention has focused upon expanding the concept beyond leader-centric traits to followers' perceptions of leadership traits. This evolution can be traced to Eden and Leviatan (1975: 741) who concluded that "leadership factors are in the mind of the respondent," indicating that to understand the leadership phenomenon, we must be aware of what followers are thinking and feeling. As stated by Hollander (1993: 29), "without followers, there are plainly no leaders," suggesting that leadership is a function of both leaders and their followers (Howell & Shamir, 2005).

An area where follower perceptions of leaders is particularly noteworthy is in the election of a national president. Leadership perceptions play an important role in voter preference and determining choice for a candidate (Maurer, Maher, Ashe, Mitchell, Hein & Van Hein, 1993; Pillai & Williams, 1998). Maurer et al. (1993) analyzed the 1988 U.S. presidential election to ascertain whether there is a match between a voter's perceptions of candidate traits and that voter's archetype of an ideal leader. They found that candidates who more closely matched respondent prototypes, garnered stronger perception ratings. They also found a positive correlation between this match and whether the respondent voted for that candidate. Using data from the National Election Studies (NES) division of the Center for Political Studies (CPS) at The University of Michigan for seven recent presidential elections, the current study expands previous work on leadership perceptions and voter support. Grounding our research in Implicit Leadership Theories (ILT) (Smith & Foti, 1998) we first determine which traits respondents perceive to garner higher leadership quality for our sample. Next, we determine if these factors are associated with voter support. Our findings render some interesting results. For example, leaders perceived to be more intelligent, more inspirational, and who generate stronger feelings of follower pride and hopefulness were perceived to be better leaders. Additionally, we found that voters were more likely to support candidates perceived to be more intelligent, are more likely to vote for candidates who generate stronger feelings of hopefulness, and are less likely to support candidates who generate stronger feelings of anger and fear.

Theoretical Framework

Smith and Foti (1998: 147) noted "an important advance in the study of leadership has been the explicit acknowledgment of the role of followers in the leadership process." ILT focus upon the personal assumptions or perceptions that individuals have about the traits or abilities they expect from a desirable leader. ILT are schemas of leadership and suggest that leaders possess either socially-desirable or socially-undesirable characteristics (for example, intelligence, attractiveness, charisma and tyranny). With ILT, analysis is at the follower level, measuring follower perceptions of leader traits. Followers categorize leaders and judge whether they perceive the leader to hold a list of specified traits. As a result, followers use perceptual information to form opinions about leaders, selectively remembering or "misremembering" information provided by that leader (Offerman, Kennedy & Wirtz, 1994; Lord & Maher, 1991; Smith & Foti, 1998). Keller (2003: 141) noted, "the ultimate importance of ILT lies in the possibility that [the follower] may influence interactions between leaders and followers in the workplace."

The idea that leadership is, in part, defined by others' perceptions of that leader is further supported by Judge, Bono, Illies & Gerhardt (2002). Here, "leader emergence" is used to describe how an individual is perceived by others. Assessing leadership in terms of how others perceive that individual seems intuitive. People generally seem to share a set of beliefs about the characteristics leaders should possess (Lord, Foti & DeVader, 1984).

If a potential leader is perceived to match a follower's leader prototype, that individual is more likely to be viewed as a leader. Hollander and Julian (1969) suggested that individuals emerge as leaders by fitting into the shared conceptions of followers. The conceptions exist as a result of a shared set of expectations of appropriate attributes and behaviors. Therefore, traits are important as summary labels that, in turn, help followers to understand and predict leader behavior (Lord & Maher, 1991). In the following section we address perceived characteristics most often associated with leadership.

Hypothesis Development—Perceived Leadership Characteristics

Intelligence

Much of the extant research on traits suggests intelligence as a predictor of leadership (Smith & Foti, 1998; Fiedler & Garcia, 1987; Lord, DeVader & Alliger, 1986; Bass, 1981, 1990). Ferentinos (1996) found that general intelligence was significantly correlated with leader emergence or perceived leadership. Citing an earlier study by Mann (1959), Lord reported a high correlation between intelligence and leadership, supported by 88 percent of the studies included in Mann's review. Lord's (1986) assessment of the results suggested that intelligence was an important characteristic in the formation of leadership perceptions. A later study by Rubin, Bartels and Bommer (2002) found a strong correlation between perceived intellectual competence and leadership. Confirming the Rubin et al. (2002) results, Judge, Colbert & Ilies (2004) found that perceptual measures of intelligence showed stronger correlation with leadership than did paper-and-pen measures of intelligence. Specifically, a meta-analysis of 151 independent samples in 96 sources revealed that objective measures of the relationship between intelligence and leadership were considerably lower than previously believed; however, perceptual measures showed stronger positive correlations. Thus, in accordance with ILT, there appears to be a stronger correlation between perceived intelligence and leadership than with the objective measure of intelligence and leadership quality. Consequently, the following is proposed:

Hypothesis 1 (Intelligence):

Hypothesis 1a: Voters are more likely to support (with votes) candidates they perceive to be higher in intelligence over candidates they perceive to be lower in intelligence.

Hypothesis 1b: Individuals perceived higher in intelligence will garner higher leadership quality ratings than individuals perceived lower in intelligence.

Leader Charisma/Inspirational Qualities

One characteristic often associated with leadership is charisma. House, Spangler, and Woycke (1991) found charisma to be highly correlated with perceived leadership in their study of the effectiveness of elected U.S. presidents. Howell and Shamir (2005: 99) state, "followers who share a charismatic relationship with a leader are willing to transcend self-interests for the sake of the collective…to internalize the leader's values and goals, and to demonstrate strong personal or moral commitment." They further state, "when a charismatic relationship exists, followers identify with the leader…and regard them as expressing important aspects of their self-concepts." Shamir (1995) argued that charismatic leadership is applicable at both an immediate follower and at a distanced follower level. Citing this work, Pillai & Williams (1980) note that distanced leaders are often idealized and considered to have certain qualities above and beyond immediate leaders, including stronger ideological orientation, and more

courage to express true opinions without fear of social ramifications. Pillai & Williams (1998) later applied this concept of distanced leadership in their study of charismatic leadership in the 1996 U.S. presidential election. Bass (1985; 1998) noted that two of the four dimensions of a transformational leader are idealized influence and inspirational motivation. The latter, often referred to as charisma, involves having qualities that serve as a role model for followers. Inspirational motivation was found to be highly correlated with idealized influences. By extension, it appears these inspirational qualities are traits previously found to be associated with perceived leadership. Additionally, a charismatic leader has the ability to transform the attitudes and values of his or her followers (Yorges, Weiss, Strickland, 1999). This suggests that charismatic leaders have qualities that inspire others.

Mio, Riggio, Levin and Reese (2005) sought to elicit specific charismatic behaviors of leaders, an unexplored area in the extant charismatic leadership literature. In their study of US presidential charisma ratings, they found charismatic presidents are those presidents deemed to inspire and motivate followers, specifically via the use of motivating language and the use of inspirational metaphors. Leaders emotionally arouse their followers (House, 1977; Shamir, House & Arther, 1993), and have a special ability to inspire others. Consequently, the following hypothesis is posited:

Hypothesis 2 (Inspiring):

Hypothesis 2a: Voters are more likely to support (with votes) candidates they perceive to be more inspirational over candidates they perceive to be less inspirational.

Hypothesis 2b: Individuals perceived as more inspirational will garner higher leadership quality ratings than individuals perceived as less inspirational.

Positive Affect toward Leader

The problem with measuring follower affect toward leaders is that it is often not specific to an explicit emotion or particular behavior that arouses an emotion. In the interest of moving toward specificity, we look at positive follower affect in the context of certain follower reactions. While not specifically tested in the charismatic leadership literature, we posit two related components of leader charisma as the degree to which a leader instills pride in others and the extent a leader inspires hope and motivation in followers. Yukl (1998) noted that inspirational appeal was an essential part of leadership. He described inspirational appeal as arousing strong emotions by appealing to a person's hope, needs, and values. He further notes that the basis for an inspiration appeal may be patriotism, pride or loyalty. Arguably, a leader that instills pride and hope would inspire and motivate followers toward a specific action. Considering positive follower affect toward the leader, two sets of related hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 3: (Leader Inspires Feelings of Pride in Followers):

Hypothesis 3a: Voters are more likely to support (with votes) candidates inspiring stronger feelings of follower pride over candidates inspiring less pride.

Hypothesis 3b: Individuals who inspire stronger feelings of follower pride in them will garner higher leadership quality ratings than individuals who elicit lower follower pride.

Hypothesis 4: (Leader Inspires Feelings of Hopefulness):

Hypothesis 4a: Voters are more likely to support (with votes) candidates inspiring stronger feelings of hope over candidates inspiring less hope.

Hypothesis 4b: Individuals who inspire stronger feelings of follower hopefulness will garner higher leadership quality ratings than individuals that generate lower feelings of hope.

Negative Affect toward Leader

Charisma, while often considered a positive construct, can also be negative when considered in the context of manipulating others toward personal gain. It has been argued that charismatic appeal can be dangerous or destructive (Hogan, Raskin, and Fazzini, 1990). In fact, it is said that charismatic leaders are different from other leaders because they can affect profound changes (House and Howell, 1992) among others. Conger (1990: 44), in his paper "The Darker Side of Leadership," warns that "when a leader's behaviors become exaggerated, lose touch with reality, or become vehicles for purely personal gain, they may harm the leader and the organization."

O'Connor, Mumford, Clifton, Gessner and Connelly (1995) analyzed historical leaders in a study of dispositional constructs and charismatic leader characteristics. In their analysis, they examined both societal-positive socialized leaders (e.g., Winston Churchill, Mohandes Gandhi, and Martin Luther King) and societal-negative personalized leaders (e.g., Jim Bakker, Adolph Hitler, and Benito Mussolini). They found fear and narcissism to be strongly related to outcome uncertainty (or the degree to which the leader believed he would not be successful in getting what he desired or valued); with outcome uncertainty positively related to a leader's need for power. Additionally, they found a leader's need for power and degree of outcome uncertainty to have strong potential for societal harm.

Consequently, when considering follower affect toward a leader, the potentiality of negative leader behaviors and consequences must be considered. Potential negative follower affective responses include both fear of that leader and anger toward that leader. In this vein, the following two sets of hypotheses are posited:

Hypothesis 5: (Leader Makes Follower Angry):

Hypothesis 5a: Voters are more likely to support (with votes) candidates inspiring weaker feelings of follower anger over candidates inspiring stronger feelings of anger.

Hypothesis 5b: Individuals who inspire stronger feelings of follower anger will garner lower leadership quality ratings than individuals who inspire weaker feelings of anger.

Hypothesis 6: (Leader Makes Follower Afraid):

Hypothesis 6a: Voters are more likely to support (with votes) candidates inspiring weaker feelings of follower fear over candidates inspiring stronger feelings of fear.

Hypothesis 6b: Individuals who inspire stronger feelings of follower fear will garner lower leadership quality ratings than individuals who inspire weaker feelings of fear.

Methods

Overview

The data for this study was derived from the seven most recent US presidential election studies conducted by the National Election Studies (NES) division of the Center for Political Studies (CPS) at The University of Michigan. The NES database consists of voter pre- and post-election responses to questions pertaining to presidential candidates and issues during election years. The election years

included for this analysis were 1980—Reagan v. Carter, 1984—Reagan v. Mondale, 1988—Bush, Sr. v. Dukakis, 1992—Clinton v. Bush, Sr., 1996—Clinton v. Dole, 2000—Bush, GW v. Gore, and 2004—Bush, GW v. Kerry. As discussed by Keeter (1987), the comprehensive, longitudinal NES dataset has been a staple for research on public voting behaviors in the United States. Here, respondents were asked a series of open-ended questions to assess presidential candidate characteristics and to give public opinion for each of the candidates, as well as general opinions on the state of the economy, social issues, and general public ideology. A total of 13,129 respondents participated in the data collection for these years, which was conducted via telephone and personal interview.

Measures

　　Leader perceptual traits. In the NES study, respondents were asked a standard question for each trait: "I am going to read a list of words and phrases people may use to describe political figures...Think about [NAME OF CANDIDATE]. The first phrase is [TRAIT, i.e., intelligence]. In your opinion, does the phrase [TRAIT] describe [NAME] extremely well, quite well, not too well or not well at all?" The traits used for this assessment are leader intelligence and having inspirational qualities. Additionally, a final trait, "provides strong leadership" is used as a measure of leadership quality. Responses were coded on a scale of 1 – 4 (with a response of 1 indicating that the trait describes the candidate extremely well; response of 4 not describing the candidate well at all). These variables were then reverse coded to facilitate ease of discussion.

　　Follower positive and negative affect toward leader. Respondents were asked the following set of questions for each affective response toward each candidate: "Now we would like to know something about the feelings you have toward [NAME OF CANDIDATE]. Has [NAME], because of the kind of person he is, or because of something he has done, made you feel [AFFECT, i.e., anger]? Responses were coded on a dichotomous scale of 1 or 2 (with 1 equating to "yes, I have felt," and 2 equating to "no, I haven't felt"). The four follower's affective responses used for this assessment were: (a) leader makes follower proud, (b) leader makes follower hopeful, (c) leader makes follower angry, and (d) leader makes follower afraid of him.

　　Demographic and political control variables. Demographic variables including respondent age, gender, education, and household income were considered control variables, as were respondent political party affiliation and political interest. Exploratory factor analysis was performed for the composite variable of political interest. Five variables including strength of partisanship, degree of interest in the election, degree of interest in which party wins the election, respondent interest in public affairs and degree of campaign participation loaded together to create the political interest variable. Reliability for this variable was $\alpha =.671$. While we would prefer for this factor loading to be closer to $\alpha =.80$, we felt this control variable was necessary because a subset of voters is extremely active politically, while others have very low interest.

Study Design

Analysis 1

　　The purpose of analysis 1 (testing the A set of hypotheses) was to compare the perceptual qualities, or traits, of two groups of individuals: (a) the group of individuals who garnered voter support for the US presidency, with (b) those who, potentially considered a highly qualified group overall, did not receive votes. In this analysis, we are not comparing those candidates who actually won the election to those candidates who lost the election. Instead, we are looking at individual respondent voting behavior to create the two groups for comparison. Using SPSS, a completely randomized, univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA), as supported by Neter, Kutner, Nachtsheim, and Waserman (1996), is used to address each initial hypothesis. Each respondent rated the perceptual traits of both the candidate they voted for and the candidate they did not support. To allow for statistical comparison, the dataset was duplicated (to 26,258 total responses) so we could collapse candidate specific variables into one global variable for comparison. For example, democratic candidate perceived intelligence and republican

candidate perceived intelligence were collapsed into one variable candidate intelligence. To maintain the integrity of the data, several dummy variables were included to identify which candidate the respondent was referring to and to identify which candidate the respondent supported with a vote for president. Mathematically, each hypothesis is represented as follows:

$$H_o: \text{trait } \mu_{\text{group receiving votes}} = \text{trait } \mu_{\text{group not receiving votes}}$$
$$H_a: \text{trait } \mu_{\text{group receiving votes}} > \text{trait } \mu_{\text{group not receiving votes}}$$

Analysis 2

The second analysis was designed to test the second set of hypotheses (B set of hypotheses), representing the relationship between perceptual candidate traits (treated as exogenous variables) and the degree of follower's perceived leadership quality. Mathematically, each hypothesis is represented as follows:

$$H_o: \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 \ldots = \ldots \beta_n = 0$$
$$H_a: \text{ all } \beta \neq 0$$

Hierarchical regression analysis was used to test these hypotheses, as supported by Neter, Kutner, Nachtsteim, and Waserman (1996). In our model, control variables were entered in the first step (demographic variables first, then political control variables next), perceptual leader traits/characteristics were then added, and finally affective variables were added into the model.

Results—Analysis 1

Table 1 details the mean and standard deviation for each perceptual trait and affective response used for hypothesis testing. Mean and standard deviation are exhibited for each trait for each group: (a) the group of individuals who garnered voter support, and (b) the group that did not receive votes. You will notice that the samples for each of these groups are different in size. The group not receiving votes is significantly larger because the sample includes people who did not vote for either candidate. Appendix A details the correlations for all variables used in the study.

Table 1—Descriptive Statistics for ANOVA
Comparing Mean Scores (Group Voted for vs. Group Not Voted for)

	Group Receiving Vote			Group Not Receiving Vote		
Variable	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*N*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
Trait*—Perceived Intelligence of Leader	6683	3.15	.666	15075	3.1	.678
Trait*—Perceived Inspiration of Leader	5560	2.5	.847	13120	2.47	.844
Affect**—Leader Inspires Anger	7697	.39	.488	18217	.35	.476
Affect**—Leader Inspires Fear	7702	.26	.437	18238	.21	.408
Affect**—Leader Inspires Hope	7686	.51	.500	18192	.48	.500
Affect**—Leader Inspires Pride	7660	.37	.484	18144	.34	.473

* Leader traits were measured on scale of 1 (low intelligence/inspiration) to 4 (high intelligence/inspiration)
**Affect measured on a dichotomous scale, with 0 (respondent hasn't felt toward candidate) or 1 (respondent has felt)

Hypothesis 1a

The first hypothesis tests whether or not an individual's degree of perceived intelligence has an effect on presidential election success, as measured by comparing the mean perceived intelligence ratings for the group of candidates who received votes to that group that did not receive votes. As discussed, all research questions comparing these two groups were tested using one-way ANOVAs.

Intelligence was found to be statistically different between these two groups (F=19.198, p<.001), lending support for hypothesis 1a and indicating that the group receiving votes was considered to be a more intelligent group than the group not receiving votes. Table 2 details the ANOVA output testing this hypothesis. Since the mean difference here was not dramatic, this indicates that both groups overall are considered to be intelligent. This finding is logical given the fact that presidential candidates pass a rigorous screening process before the final election.

Table 2: ANOVA Output—Perceived Intelligence of Candidate
Factor: Vote Behavior (Voted for Candidate: Y/N)

Candidate Perceived Intelligence	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	8.725	1	8.725	19.198	p<.001
Within Groups	9887.357	21756	.454		
Total	9896.081	21757			

Hypothesis 2a

This hypothesis tests whether or not perceived inspirational quality is different between the two candidate groups, again comparing the group that was successful receiving votes to that group that was not successful. While there was a statistical difference between the two groups at the α =.1 level (F=3.401, p=.065), the difference is in the opposite direction than hypothesized, indicating that the "losing" group was perceived to be more inspirational. No support could be found for hypothesis 2a. This finding is interesting; perhaps the ability to inspire is of lesser importance than other candidate qualities when a voter is making their vote decision. Additionally, it was suggested that followers may perceive a leader's ability to inspire as a "soft" skill that is increasingly not an important consideration when making a voting decision. This soft skill may even be perceived as a potential weakness for a modern national president. Historically, Table 3 details the ANOVA output:

Table 3: ANOVA Output—Candidate Inspirational Quality
Factor: Vote Behavior (Voted for Candidate: Y/N)

Perceived Candidate Inspiration	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.429	1	2.429	3.401	.065
Within Groups	13336.936	18678	.714		
Total	13339.365	18679			

Hypotheses 3a and 4a

Tables 4 and 5 provide output for the effects of whether or not the "winning" candidate group makes followers more proud and more hopeful than the corresponding "losing" candidate group. Here, both hypotheses are supported with this particular dataset. Follower feeling of pride in leaders is found to be statistically different between the two groups (F=31.112, p<.001), suggesting candidates who generate stronger feelings of follower pride are more apt to be successful in presidential elections. Additionally, presidential candidate levels of hopefulness are found to be statistically different when comparing levels of perceived leadership quality as well (F=1592.08, p<.001), suggesting that those candidates who generate stronger follower feelings of hope are also perceived to have stronger leadership qualities.

Table 4: *ANOVA Output—Candidate Makes Follower Proud*
Factor: Vote Behavior (Voted for Candidate: Y/N)

Candidate Makes Follower Feel Proud	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	7.047	1	7.047	31.112	p<.001
Within Groups	5844.187	25802	.227		
Total	5851.234	25803			

Table 5: *ANOVA Output—Candidate Makes Follower Hopeful*
Factor: Vote Behavior (Voted for Candidate: Y/N)

Candidate Makes Follower Feel Hopeful	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	4.658	1	4.658	18.648	p<.001
Within Groups	6462.955	25876	.250		
Total	6467.613	25877			

Hypotheses 5a and 6a

Table 6 details output for whether or not the two groups are statistically different in terms of feelings of anger toward the candidate. Here, the two groups were found to be statistically different on the notion of instilling anger in others (F=41.994, p<.001), lending support for this hypothesis.

Table 7 provides output for the effects of whether or not the two groups are statistically different in terms of negative feelings of fear attributes to the candidates. Candidate levels of follower fear is found to be statistically different between to the two groups (F=66.728, p<.001), suggesting candidates who generate weaker follower feelings of fear are more apt to be successful in presidential elections.

Table 6: *ANOVA Output—Candidate Makes Follower Angry*
Factor: Vote Behavior (Voted for Candidate: Y/N)

Candidate Makes Follower Feel Angry	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	9.654	1	9.654	41.994	p<.001
Within Groups	5956.712	25912	.230		
Total	5966.366	25913			

Table 7: *ANOVA Output—Candidate Makes Follower Afraid*
Factor: Vote Behavior (Voted for Candidate: Y/N)

Candidate Makes Follower Feel Afraid	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	11.595	1	11.595	66.728	P<.001
Within Groups	4507.015	25938	.174		
Total	4518.610	25939			

Results—Analysis 2

As discussed, regression analysis was used to test the hypotheses related to the second analysis. Out of 13,129 responses, 13,052 were deemed usable for the regression analysis. Table 8 details all descriptive statistics. Please note, leadership quality is measured on a four point scale (1=low, 4=high), as are respondent education level, household income, leader intelligence trait, and leader inspiring trait. The trait variables were reverse coded to make interpretation much easier. Respondent political interest is measured on a 10-point scale (0=low, 9=high). Respondent gender and political party affiliation are treated as dummy variables (Gender: 1=male; Party affiliation: 1=Republican). Lastly, all affect variables are treated as dummy variables as well (1=yes, respondent has felt affective response toward leader; 0=no, respondent has not felt affective response toward leader). Respondent age was originally included in the regression model; however, this variable was omitted because of its lack of significance.

Using hierarchical regression, all controls are included in model 1; model 2 adds leader intelligence into the mix; model 3 adds leader inspiring qualities; model 4 adds leader affect—anger; model 5 adds leader affect—fear; model 6 adds leader affect—hope; finally, model 7 adds leader affect—pride.

Table 8—Descriptive Statistics of Regression Variables

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Dependent—Leadership Quality	2.59	.827
Control—Respondent Age	45.71	17.807
Control—Respondent Gender	.46	.498
Control—Household Income	2.74	1.3
Control—Respondent Education Level	2.64	.945
Control—Party Affiliation	.4	.49
Control—Respondent Political Interest	5.06	2.449
Trait—Perceived Intelligence of Leader	3.13	.661
Trait—Perceived Inspiration of Leader	2.5	.838
Affect—Leader Inspires Anger	.36	.479
Affect—Leader Inspires Fear	.25	.431
Affect—Leader Inspires Hope	.5	.5
Affect—Leader Inspires Pride	.35	.476

Table 9 presents a model summary for this analysis. In model 1, all control variables are significant predictors of leadership quality. As each subsequent perceptual trait or affective trait is added into the model (models 2 through 7), that trait is also a significant predictor or leadership quality.

The coefficients of the final model are exhibited in Table 10. Please note the perceptual traits of inspirational quality (t =55.14) and intelligence (t =28.5) are the main predictors in this model. Affective traits are also key predictors here (pride, t =11.6; hope, t =14.01). While, we are not using regression to build a prediction model, it is interesting to note that the final model has an adjusted R-square of 54.4%, indicating that 54.4% of the variance in leadership quality can be explained by the use of these dependent variables. Future research is necessary to identify and explain the remaining 45.6% of the variance that remains unexplained with this model.

Table 9: Model Summary

Model	R-square	Adjusted R-square	Standard Error
1	.175	.174	.75
2	.327	.327	.68
3	.514	.513	.58
4	.521	.521	.57
5	.527	.527	.57
6	.539	.539	.56
7	.544	.544	.56

Table 10—Coefficients for Final Regression Model

Variable	Un-standardized Beta	Standard Error	Standardized. Beta	t	sig.
Constant	1.002	.032		31.796	p<.001
Political Interest	-.013	.002	-.038	-5.946	p<.001
Gender	-.042	.010	-.025	-4.153	p<.001
Education Level	-.022	.006	-.025	-3.884	p<.001
Household Income	-.022	.004	-.035	-5.536	p<.001
Political Party Affiliation	-.133	.012	-.079	-11.183	p<.001
Trait—Intelligence ($\beta 1$)	.238	.008	.191	28.546	p<.001
Trait—Inspiring ($\beta 2$)	.415	.008	.420	55.138	p<.001
Affect—Pride ($\beta 3$)	.145	.012	.083	11.569	p<.001
Affect—Hope ($\beta 4$)	.177	.013	.107	14.008	p<.001
Affect—Anger ($\beta 5$)	-.126	.012	-.073	-10.924	p<.001
Affect—Fear ($\beta 6$)	-.152	.013	-.079	-12.059	p<.001

Hypothesis 1b

Hypothesis 1b states that individuals perceived higher in intelligence will garner higher leadership quality ratings than individuals perceived lower in intelligence. As predicted, stronger degrees of intelligence are significantly correlated with higher degrees of leadership quality (β_1=.191; p<.001), lending support for this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2b

Hypothesis 2b states that individuals perceived as more inspirational will garner higher leadership quality ratings than individuals perceived as less inspirational. As predicted, stronger degrees of charisma is a significant predictor of leadership quality (β_2=.42; p<.001), once again lending support for this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3b

Hypothesis 3b states that individuals who inspire stronger feelings of follower pride in them will garner higher leadership quality ratings than individuals who elicit lower follower pride. As predicted, leader affect in terms of pride is a significant predictor of leadership quality (β_3=.083; p<.001), leading support for this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 4b

Hypothesis 4b states that individuals who inspire stronger feelings of follower hopefulness will garner higher leadership quality ratings than individuals that generate lower degrees of hopefulness. As predicted, leader affect in terms of hopefulness is a significant predictor of leadership quality (β_4=.107; p<.001), again lending support for this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 5b

Hypothesis 5b states that individuals who inspire stronger feelings of follower anger will garner lower leadership quality ratings than individuals who inspire weaker feelings of anger. As predicted, leader affect in terms of anger is a significant predictor of leadership quality (β_5= -.073; p<.001). Individuals, who generate stronger feelings of follower anger, are considered lower quality leaders, lending support for this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 6b

Hypothesis 6b states that individuals who inspire stronger feelings of follower fear will garner lower leadership quality ratings than individuals who inspire weaker feelings of fear. As predicted, leader affect in terms of fear is a significant predictor of leadership quality (β_6= -.079; p<.001). Individuals, who generate stronger feelings of follower fear, are considered lower quality leaders, lending again support for this hypothesis.

Discussion

The current study is based on a large sample generated via a data collection process spanning multiple national elections, over a 25-year time frame. We compared candidates who were successful in securing votes to those who were unsuccessful, using follower perceptions as the level of analysis. We also used follower perceptions of leadership quality to measure differences in these perceptual traits. By understanding which perceptual characteristics are stronger for successful leaders (successful leaders being those receiving votes), we can understand more about what followers expect from their leaders. Additionally, by better understanding which perceptual traits are correlated with perceptual measures of leadership quality, we can better understand which traits impact leadership ratings.

We isolated several perceptual traits, including perceived intelligence and inspirational qualities to gauge both the impact on follower assessments of leadership quality and on actual voting behavior. Both intelligence and charisma were significant predictors of a follower's assessment the leader's quality; meaning that if a follower deemed a leader intelligent and charismatic, they were more likely to also deem that leader to be a higher quality leader. One of the most interesting findings in the study was the fact that while both intelligence and leadership were deemed important leadership qualities, only intelligence was found to be significant when assessing actual vote behavior. Our findings lend support to extant literature which has consistently found leader intelligence to be a valid predictor of leader success (Smith & Foti, 1998; Fiedler & Garcia, 1987; Lord, DeVader & Alliger, 1986; Bass, 1981, 1990).

Another interesting finding was that leader's inspirational qualities had no significant impact on voting behavior. Perhaps the ability to inspire is not a relevant consideration to voters because they consider other traits more important. Additionally, there may be a general consensus that all U.S. presidential candidates possess a strong ability to inspire, as reaching candidate status is a significant political achievement in itself. It should be noted that inspirational quality and assessments of leadership quality are highly collinear (r =.673). Consequently, marginal interpretations of either variable are troublesome.

Additionally, we isolated several affective traits for this study, including leader's ability to generate strong positive affect and leader's ability to generate low degrees of negative affect. Here, we link affective relationships to the leadership phenomenon. Candidate levels of general positive follower affect was found to have a statistically significant impact on both follower assessment of leadership quality and on follower voting behavior. These findings lend direct empirical support to the extant

research which has reported that followers who identify with (or like) their leaders are more likely to support those leaders and give positive assessments of those leaders (Maurer, Maher, Ashe, Mitchell, Hein & Van Hein, 1993). We add to the literature by extending this notion using specific positive and negative affective assessments (follower feelings of pride, hope, fear and anger), which were all found to have a statistical impact on candidate leadership ratings and on voter behavior, a proxy for support of leadership here. We consider these very interesting findings since follower assessments of leaders will naturally include affect-based assessments of these leaders as well. Given that the fact that the followers, or voters, in our study did not have a direct relationship with the leaders in our study, we find affective assessments of these leaders to be a critical consideration on which to form a relationship. Typically, when we think of a national president, our feelings toward that individual and our assessments of general like or dislike, will directly impact and shape that relationship. This is likely to be even more important for other leader-follower relationships, where a more direct interaction is involved.

As with any study, there are limitations. First and foremost, the study is based on archival data. While this is not optimal, longitudinal archival data on presidential candidates would have been difficult and costly to ascertain otherwise. Another limitation is the fact that several of the survey questions were based on a one question response. Obviously a better survey design with multiple questions measuring the same construct would have been preferred. Additionally, as this sample is specific to the US, it is questionable whether we can generalize our findings to other national elections outside of the US, as well as to other elected officials and high-level leaders within the US. Future studies need to explore affective relationships between followers and leaders using a multitude of samples across multiple countries, multiple industries, and at multiple levels of government (including scenarios where both direct and indirect relationships exist between leaders and their followers). Despite these limitations, this study lends credence to the ILT and suggests that the perceptions of followers are in many cases a more exact determination of leadership quality. This study considers followers' perceptions of leader traits, followers' assessments and affective responses, as well as specific follower behaviors in response to these leaders, measured in terms of specific voting behavior. The fact that the followers in this study inevitably voted for certain leaders and did not vote for other leaders adds a particularly interesting dimension to our work.

References

Ainsworth, M.D. (1991). Attachment and other affectional bonds across the life cycle. In C. M. Parks, J. Stevenson-Hinde, and P. Morris (Eds.), *Attachment across the life cycle* (pp. 22-51). London, UK: Tavistock/Routledge.

Ashforth, B.E., and Humphrey, R.H. (1995). Emotion in the workplace: a reappraisal. *Human Relations*, 48. 97-125.

Bass, B. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industry, military, and educational impact.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bass, B. (1990). Stogdill's handbook of leadership: theory, research, and managerial applications (3rd ed). New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. (1981). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.

Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York: Harper & Row.

Cambridge Advanced Learners Dictionary (2003). Cambridge University Press.

Chemers, M.M. (2001). Leadership effectiveness: An integrative review. In M.A. Hogg & R.S. Tindale (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Group processes.* (pp. 379-399). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Conger, J. A. (1990). The dark side of leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 19 (2), 44-56.

Dowd , J. (1936). *Control in human societies.* New York: Appleton-Century.

Eden, D., and Levitan, U. (1975). Implicit leadership theory as a determinant of the factor structure underlying supervisory behavior scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 736-741.

Engle, E. M. and Lord, R. G. (1997). Implicit theories, self-schemas, and leader-member exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 988-1010.

Ferentinos, C.H. (1996). Linking social intelligence and leadership: An investigation of leaders' situational responsiveness under conditions of changing group tasks and membership. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: the Sciences and Engineering, 57(*4-B), 2920.

Fiedler, F. and Garcia, J. (1987). *New approaches to effective leadership: Cognitive resources and organizational performance*. New York: Wiley.

Fleishman, E.A., Zaccaro, S.J., and Mumford, M.D. (1991). Individual differences and leadership: An overview. *Leadership Quarterly, 2*(4), 237-243.

Fuller, J. B., Patterson, C. E. P., Hester, K. and Stringer, Donna Y. (1996). A Quantitative Review of Charismatic Leadership. *Psychological Reports, 78*, 271-287.

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

Gergen, D. (2003). How presidents persuade. *Harvard Business Review,* January, 20-21.

Geier, J.G. (1967). A trait approach to study of leadership in small groups. *Journal of Communications 17,* 316-23

Hall, R. J. and Lord, R. G. (1995). Multi-level information-processing explanations of followers' leadership perceptions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6 (3), 265-287.

Hamilton, D.L. (1989). Understanding impression formation: What has memory research contributed? In P.R. Solomon, G.R. Goethals, C.M. Kelley, & B.R. Stephens (Eds), *Memory: Interdisciplinary approaches*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 221-242.

Himelstein, L. (2002). A Class Act in the Valley; At a time when business leaders inspire more scorn than esteem, Dan Case stands as a model of decency, *Business Week*. New York: July 15, 3791; 46.

Hollander, E.P., and Julian, J.W. (1969). Contemporary trends in the analysis of leadership processes. *Psychological Bulletin, 71,* 387-397.

Hollander, E.P. (1993). Legitimacy, power & influence: a perspective on relational features of leadership. In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), Leadership theory & research: Perspectives & directions. 29-48. San Diego: Ac. Press.

House, R.J., Shane, S. and Herold, D. (1996). Rumors of the death of dispositional theory and research in Organizational Behavior are greatly exaggerated. *Academy of Management Review, 21*(1), 203-224.

House, R. J and Howell, J. M. (1992) Personality and charismatic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 3. 81-108.

House, R. J., Spangler, W.D. & J. Woycke. (1991). Personality and charisma in the U.S. Presidency: a psychological theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 364-396.

House, R.J. (1977). The 1976 Theory of Charismatic leadership. In J.G. Hunt and L.J. Larson (Eds) *Leadership: The cutting edge.,* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois Press, 189-207.

Howell, J. M., and Shamir, B. (2005). The role of followers in the charismatic leadership process: relationships and their consequences. *Academy of Management Review*, 30 (1), 96-112.

Hunt, A.R. (1999) The front-runners rocky road, *Wall Street Journal Eastern Ed.,* March 18, 1.

Judge, T.A., Colbert, A.E., and Ilies, R. (2004). Intelligence and leadership: A quantitative review and test of theoretical propositions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89(*3), 542-552.

Judge, T.A., J. E. Bono, R. Ilies, and M. W. Gerhardt (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87 (5), 765-780.

Judge, T.A., and J. E. Bono (2000). Five factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85 (5), 751-765.

Keller, T. (2003). Parental images as a guide to leadership sensemaking: an attachment perspective on implicit leadership theories," *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*, 141-160.

Keller, N., and C. Wilderom (1992). What the service world needs now: Leadership lessons from 1980s to 1990s. International Journal of Service Industry Management 3 (2), 45-57.

Kenney, R. A, B. Schwartz-Kenney, and J. Blascovich (1996). Implicit leadership theories: Defining leaders described as worthy of influence. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22, 1128-1143.

Kirkpatrick, S.A. and Locke, E.A. (1991). Leadership: Do Traits Matter? *Academy of Management Executive, 5*(2), 48-60.

Kristie, J. (1998). Is there No Decency? *Directors and Boards, 23*(1), 6.

Lord, R. G., and Emrich, C. (2001). Thinking outside the box by looking inside the box: extending the cognitive revolution in leadership research. *Leadership Quarterly*, 11 (4), 551-79.

Lord, R. G., and Maher, J. (1991). *Leadership and information processing: linking perceptions and performance.* Cambridge: Unwin Hyman.

Lord, R. G., DeVader, C, and Alliger, G. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 402-410.

Lord, R. G., R. J. Foti, and C. L. DeVader (1984). A test of leadership categorization theory: International structure, information processing and leadership perspective. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 34, 343-378.

Mann, R.D. (1959). A review of the relationships between personality and performance in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin, 56*(4), 241-270.

Maurer, T. J., Maher, K. J., Ashe, D. K., Mitchell, D.R., Hein, M. B. and Van Hein, J. (1993). Leadership perceptions in relation to a presidential vote. *ournal of Applied Social Psychology*, 23, 959-979.

McAdams, D.P. (1982). Intimacy motivation. In A.J. Stewart (Eds.) *Motivation and society.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mio, S. M., Riggio, R. E., Levin, S. and Reese, R. (2005). Presidential leadership and charisma: the effects of metaphor. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 287-294.

Murphy, N.A., Hall, J.A., and LeBeau, L.S. (2001). Who's smart? Beliefs about the expression of intelligence in social behavior. *Representative Research in Social Psychology, 25*, 34-42.

Neter, J., M. Kutner, C. Nachtshein & W. Wasserman (1996). *Applied Regression Models*, 4th edition, WCB McGraw-Hill: Boston.

Newman, P.C. (2000). Why Day with Lose to Martin. *Maclean's*, Dec 11, *113* (50), 12.

O'Connor, J. O., Mumford, M. D., Clifton, T. C., Gessner, T. L. and Connelly, M. S. (1995). Charismatic leaders and destructiveness: an historiometric study. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6 (4), 539-555.

Offermann, L.R., Kennedy, J.K., and Wirtz, P.W. (1994). Implicit leadership theories: content, structure and generalizability. *Leadership Quarterly, 5*(1), 43-58.

Pillai, R. and Williams, E. A. (1998). Does leadership matter in the political arena? Voters perceptions of candidates' transformational and charismatic leadership and the 1996 U.S. presidential vote. *Leadership Quarterly*, 9 (3), 397-317.

Rubin, R.S., Bartels, L.K., & Bommer, W.H. (2002). Are leaders smarter or do they just seem that way? Exploring perceived intellectual attributes of effective leadership in a formal organization. *Personnel Psychology, 21*, 365-77.

Seitel, F. P. (1993). Communications: Ethics and decency. United States Banker, 103 (4), April, 58.

Shamir, B.M. (1995). Social distance and charisma: theoretical notes & an exploratory study. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 19-47

Shamir, B.M., House, R. J., and Arthur, M.B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: a self-concept theory. *Organizational Science*, 4, 1-17.

Smith, J.A. & Foti, R. J. (1998) A Pattern Approach to Leader Emergence. *Leadership Quarterly*, 9 (2), Summer, 147-160.

Stogdill, R.M. (1948). Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature, *Journal of Psychology, 25,* 35-71.

Srull, T.K. & Wyer, R.S. (1989). Person memory and judgment. *Psychological Bulletin, 96,* 58-83.

The National Election Studies, Center for Political Studies, University of Michigan. Electronic resources from the NES World Wide Web site (www.umich.edu/~nes). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Center for Political Studies [producer and distributor], 1995-2000.

Vidal, G. (1984). *Lincoln.* New York: Random House.

Yorges, S., H. Weiss, & O. Strickland (1999). The effect of leader outcomes on influence, attributions and perceptions of charisma. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 428-436.

Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in Organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Zacarro, S.J., Gilbert, J.A., Thor, K.K., and Mumford, M.D. (1991). Leadership and social intelligence: Linking social perspectiveness and behavioral flexibility to leader effectiveness. *Leadership Quarterly, 2*(4), 317-342.

Appendix A—Correlation Matrix

	Age	Gender	Education	Party	Pol. Interest	HHI	Intelligence	Inspiring	Leadership	Anger	Fear	Hope	Pride
Respondent Age	1	-0.034**	-.184**	.014*	.138**	-.151**	.059**	.057**	.052**	-.057**	-0.01	0.006	0.055**
Respondent Gender	-	1	.075**	.073**	.129**	.148**	-.012	-0.079**	-.096**	.044**	.054**	-.072**	-.077**
Respondent Education	-	-	1	.14**	.291**	.324**	.026**	-.142**	-.118**	.124**	.109**	.030**	-.016*
Party Affiliation (Republican?)	-	-	-	1	.127**	.136**	-.201**	-.329**	-.397**	.278**	.290**	-.394**	-.276**
Political Interest	-	-	-	-	1	.169**	.116**	-0.011	-.044**	.162**	.185**	.115**	.125**
Household Income	-	-	-	-	-	1	-0.009	-.134**	-.138**	.118**	.095**	-0.028**	-.061**
Trait--Intelligence	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.432**	.472**	-.148**	-.138**	.296**	.295**
Trait--Inspiring	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.673**	-.328**	-.254**	.427**	.401**
Leadership Quality	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-.369**	-.315**	.452**	.404**
Affect--Anger	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.373**	-.153**	-.099**
Affect--Fear	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-.186**	-.133**
Affect--Hope	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.526**
Affect--Pride	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1

*significant at p<.05
**significant at p<.001