



**NORTHERN ARIZONA  
UNIVERSITY**  
*College of Business Administration*

**Perceptions of Leadership Traits  
& Affective Behaviors:  
The Effect on U.S. Presidential Election Success**

**Working Paper Series—05-11 | August 2005**

**M. David Albritton**

Assistant Professor of Management  
Northern Arizona University  
**College of Business Administration**  
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

*Please note:* These materials are based on work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant Nos.: SBR-9707741, SBR-9317631, SES-9209410, SES-9009379, SES-8808361, SES-8341310, SES-8207580, and SOC77-08885.

Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in these materials are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the National Science Foundation.

## **Perceptions of Leadership Traits & Affective Behaviors Effect on U.S. Presidential Election Success**

The notion of whether or not 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 19<sup>th</sup> 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. For example, 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. Perhaps this revolution 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 understand what followers are thinking and feeling. Specifically, this research trend has been directed toward individual impressions of those traits that characterize the ideal leader, as well as perceptions of leader affect and emotional exchange. As stated by Hollander (1993: 29), “without followers, there are plainly no leaders,” suggesting that the concept of leadership is a phenomenon produced by both leaders and their followers (Howell & Shamir, 2005).

Suppositions such as Implicit Leadership Theories (ILT) focus upon the follower and represent schemas specifying traits or abilities that followers expect from their leaders (Kenney, Schwartz-Kenney, & Blascovich, 1996).” Following the framework of ILT, traits are not reflective of objective realities inherent in an individual’s leadership status, but rather the perceptual abstractions that followers use to categorize their leadership behaviors (Hamilton, 1989; Srull & Wyer, 1989). Engle and Lord (1997), studying the role of implicit theories and perceived similarity between supervisors and subordinates, found negative affect to be inversely related to liking of both supervisors and subordinates, as well as inversely related to positive rating scores (Newcombe & Ashkanasy, 2002). This indicates that subordinate perceptions of a supervisor are an important determinant of that supervisor’s inevitable success.

An area where follower perceptions of leaders are 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). The study by Maurer, et al. (1993) analyzed the 1988 U.S. Presidential election to ascertain if there is a match between voters’ perceptions of candidate traits and that voter’s archetype of an ideal leader. These researchers found candidates who more closely matched respondent prototype, garnered stronger perception ratings. They also found a positive correlation between this match and whether the respondent voted for that candidate. Pillai & Williams (1998) analyzed the 1996 U.S. Presidential election and found both voter evaluations of leader quality and party affiliation to influence voting behavior.

Unfortunately, it is difficult to identify specific traits that lead to presidential success (Simonton, 1988). As noted by Simonton (1988: 928), “presidential performance can be assessed by more than one criterion, the relevance of a given personality trait depends on the specific criterion examined.” Our review of the literature suggests two general perspectives on leader “traits.” On the one hand, investigating those traits which leaders inherently possess following “great man” and trait theory ideology; and on the other hand, investigating those traits which are perceived by the followers of a leader under an ILT ideology and charismatic leadership ideology. Hall and Lord (1995) and Lord and Emrich

(2001) identify a “gap” in the existing literature, stating a need to examine the relationships between leadership and affect (i.e., leader emotions and mood, *and* follower emotion and mood), as well as leadership and cognition. This paper responds to this call by addressing follower affect in the context of evaluating leaders, an area that has historically received little to no attention. We operationalize this issue by assessing whether candidates who illicit positive followers emotional affect are more likely to win national elections over candidates who illicit more negative follower emotions toward them. Traditionally, conceptual models of leadership include the following types of variables: characteristics of leaders, behaviors of leaders, characteristics of followers, and characteristics of the leader/follower interaction. These should also include perceptual characteristics of leaders. In fact, we argue that perceptual “traits” are as important as salient characteristics in the assessment of leadership quality.

## **Theoretical Development**

### ***Great Man and Trait-based Theories***

The foundation for theories on leadership traits began with the great man theory at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The underlying assumption of this theory is that leaders are not created over time, but are born with certain inherent characteristics (Stodgill, 1948; Bass, 1990). As noted by Bass (1990), leaders are considered to be individuals who possess unique traits that inspire the masses. Following this theory, leaders do not come from “regular” masses of people but are, instead, among a gifted minority that possesses a high degree of intelligence and a strong level of moral fortitude (Dowd, 1936). Great man theory inspired a primary question among researchers: if natural-born leaders have superior qualities that make them different from their followers, is it possible to identify these inherent qualities (Bass, 1990)?

Although theoretically developed, great man theory was never empirically tested. Over time, this lack of concrete support left the theory open for debate, with critics stating that leader success could, instead, be attributed to the actions of these leaders or be ascribed to the untested perceptions of those witnessing the qualities possessed by the leaders. As noted by Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991), a contemporary extension of great man theory suggests that successful leaders are not from a special, elite group as originally stated, but are, instead, endowed with both positive and negative attributes that contribute to their success.

Great man theory evolved into leader trait theory (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991), which makes no assumptions as to whether leader qualities are inherited or acquired. Instead, trait theory simply ascertains that there is a difference between the characteristics of leaders and non-leaders. Although taken to task by Stodgill (1948), who suggested that no traits were universally correlated with successful leadership (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991), studies in the ensuing years have shown that traits do matter. Fleishman, Zaccaro and Mumford (1991), in a review of the trait-based literature, show empirical support for the notion that leader traits are different from those of non-leaders.

### ***Implicit Leadership Theories (ILT)***

As previously noted, 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, to name a few). With ILT, the level of analysis is at the follower level, measuring follower perceptions of leader traits. Followers categorize leaders and judge whether or not they perceive the leader to hold these 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). As noted by Keller (2003), “the ultimate importance of ILT lies in the possibility that [the follower] may influence interactions between leaders and followers in the workplace, (Keller, 2003: 141).” The idea that leadership is, in part, defined by others’ perceptions of that leader is supported by Judge, Bono, Illies and

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 intuitively logical. People generally seem to share a set of beliefs about the characteristics leaders possess (Lord, Foti & DeVader, 1984). Additionally, as suggested by ILT, people use their own implicit theories, judgments, and leadership examples to determine if an individual should be considered a leader.

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).

## **Hypothesis Development—Traits Associated with Leadership**

### ***Intelligence***

Much of the extant research on traits suggests intelligence as a predictor of leadership (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 early study by Mann (1959), Lord reported a high correlation between intelligence and leadership, supported by 88 percent of the studies included in the Mann 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. A recent study by Judge, Colbert & Ilies (2004) confirms the findings of Rubin et al. (2002), where the authors 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 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 1a (Intelligence):* Individuals perceived higher in intelligence are more likely to be deemed effective national leaders over individuals perceived lower in intelligence. Hence, these individuals are more likely to be victorious in a presidential election over an opposing candidate with lower perceived intelligence.**

### ***Knowledge and Incumbency***

Zaccaro, Gilbert, Thor & Mumford (2004) proposed that leader attributes include traits that promote a leader’s ability to respond effectively and appropriately affording a quantitatively different performance requirement, suggesting the need for knowledge to be successful. Geier (1967) noted that there was a significant difference between someone being intelligent and appearing intelligent. Others have suggested that the emergence of leadership is actually the result of image management and that appearing smart may be more important than actually being smart (Chemers, 2001; Gardner & Avolio, 1998; Rubin et al., 2002). While this construct is associated with perceived intelligence, one might also suggest that an individual must be well schooled to “pull off” the perception of intelligence.

We suggest that intelligence is closely correlated to knowledge, and therefore we posit:

***Hypothesis 1b (Knowledge):* Individuals perceived to be more knowledgeable are more likely to be deemed effective national leaders over individuals perceived less knowledgeable.**

Likewise, by extension, one might expect an incumbent candidate to have explicit knowledge of the job, something an opposing candidate will lack. This explicit knowledge gained from experience on the job may manifest itself in behaviors that enhance the public's perception of their intelligence (Murphy, Hall, & LeBeau, 2001). Therefore, we further propose:

***Hypothesis 1c (Experience via Incumbency): Individuals with explicit knowledge of the job (because of incumbency) are more likely to be deemed effective national leaders over individuals who lack explicit experience with the job.***

### ***Leader Charisma***

One characteristic often associated with leadership is charisma. House, Spangler, and Woycke (1991) reported charisma as highly correlated with perceived leadership in their study of the effectiveness of elected U.S. presidents. Bass (1985) introduced the concept of transformational leadership to an organizational context, stating that transformational leaders motivate followers by activating their higher order needs and making them see beyond their own needs to the needs of the greater organization (Pillai & Williams, 1998). 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 (1998), in their literature review, state 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, by definition, a charismatic leader has the ability to transform the attitudes and values of his or her followers (Yorges, Weiss, Strickland, 1999). This would imply that charismatic leaders have qualities that inspire others to change. Consequently, the following hypothesis is posited:

***Hypothesis 2 (Charisma): Individuals perceived to possess a stronger degree of inspirational qualities are more likely to be deemed effective national leaders over individuals perceived lower in inspirational qualities.***

### ***Positive Affect toward Leader***

House, Spangler and Woycke (1991: 364-5), state "the new theories that describe charismatic leadership focus on the emotional attachment of followers to the leader...the emotional and motivational arousal of followers...follower's self-esteem, trust and confidence in the leader...values of major importance to the followers and follower's intrinsic motivation."

House (1977), in his theory of charismatic leadership, highlighted a list of charismatic effects, which included both affection for leader and emotional involvement of the follower in the leader mission. Ashforth and Humphrey (1995: 111), in their study of emotion in the workplace, claim "the practice of symbolic management [is] to evoke emotion which can be generalized to organizational ends" (Newcombe & Ashkanasy, 2002). Additionally, Hall and Lord (1995), argued that both cognitive and affective processing by followers play an important role in producing perceptions of leaders. According to

their research, affective processing is central in determining the general “like” or “dislike” of a leader. They further contend that when a follower “likes” or “dislikes” a leader this, in turn, establishes a basis for more sophisticated cognitive and affective processing. Newcombe & Ashkanasy (2002), in a study of leader emotional display while giving positive and negative feedback, found that positive leader affect (in the form of positive facial expression) results in more positive follower ratings of that leader. Work in the transformational leadership arena, where leaders drive follower commitment to the organization and its mission, is largely dependent upon subordinate emotions (Seltzer & Bass, 1990; Ashforth and Humphrey, 2001). Given that emotional attachment to a leader is a strong determinant of the inevitable leader-follower relationship, we posit:

***Hypothesis 3a (Positive Affect toward Leader): Individuals who garner stronger levels of positive follower affect are more likely to be deemed effective national leaders over individuals with lower levels of positive follower affect.***

Mio, Riggio, Levin and Reese (2005) sought to illicit specific charismatic behaviors of leaders, an area with little attention in the extant charismatic leadership literature. In their study of U.S. 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 and motivate their followers (House, 1977; Shamir, House & Arther, 1993), and have a special ability to inspire others.

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. Arguably, a leader that instills pride and hope would be likely to also inspire and motivate followers toward a specific action. Considering positive follower affect toward the leader, two related hypotheses are proposed:

***Hypothesis 3b: (Leader Makes Follower Proud): Individuals who garner stronger levels of follower feelings of pride in that leader are more likely to be deemed effective national leaders over individuals with lower follower pride.***

***Hypothesis 3c: (Leader Makes Follower Hopeful): Individuals who garner stronger levels of follower feelings of hope are more likely to be deemed effective national leaders over individuals with lower follower hopefulness.***

### ***Negative Leader Affect***

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 argued that charismatic leaders are different from other leaders because they can effect 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, in their 1995 study testing a model of dispositional constructs and charismatic leader characteristics, analyzed historical leaders. In their analysis, they used 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 of which the leader believed he would not be successful in getting what he desired or valued); with outcome uncertainty positively related to 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 vane, the following two hypotheses are posited:

***Hypothesis 3d: (Leader Makes Follower Angry): Individuals who garner stronger negative levels of follower anger toward that leader are less likely to be deemed effective national leaders over individuals with lower follower feelings of anger.***

***Hypothesis 3e: (Leader Makes Follower Afraid): Individuals who garner stronger levels of follower feelings of fear of that leader are less likely to be deemed effective national leaders over individuals with lower follower feelings of fear.***

### ***Morality and Decency***

House (1977) speculated that charismatic leaders have strong convictions that their beliefs are morally correct. If, as previously noted, charismatic leaders are closely associated with idealized influence, then by extension one might expect the followers to share in the belief that the leader's actions are morally correct. This notion is supported by House, Shane, and Herold (1996) who found that leader effectiveness was strongly associated with the followers' perception that the individual displayed integrity. Gergen (2003) noted that Americans are forgiving people and while morality seems an important leadership quality, leaders can recover from a lapse of moral leadership. Perhaps this suggests that the perception of moral integrity cannot easily be ignored if the leader is perceived to be a strong leader; therefore, we suggest:

***Hypothesis 4a (Moral Force): Individuals perceived to possess a stronger level of moral fortitude are more likely to be deemed effective national leaders over individuals with lower perceived morality.***

Much like morality, decency is another trait that has been deemed an important leadership quality. Keller and Wilderom (1992: 48) noted that good leaders are decisive individuals with "high moral standards, integrity, fairness and common decency." The popular press is full of articles praising leaders for their decency—from presidential candidates (Hunt, 1999) and political leaders (Newman, 2000) to fallen industry leaders (Himmelstein, 2002) to executives and board members of powerful companies (Seitel, 1993; Kristie, 1998). In all situations, it was the decency trait that was most widely correlated with these individuals' leadership promise. Given the fact that moral integrity and decency are closely associated and that morality is widely linked to leadership prowess, we posit:

***Hypothesis 4b (Decency): Individuals perceived to possess a stronger degree of decency are more likely to be deemed effective national leaders over individuals with lower perceived decency.***

### ***Warmth and Compassion***

Warmth has also been found to be associated with leadership, particularly in relation to transactional leadership, where leaders motivate followers by offering rewards that are contingent upon expected behaviors or performance (Bass, 1985). Bass (1990: 118) stated that "the leader needs to learn what the followers want so he or she can make the right offers to them for their compliance." Leaders

are often thought to exhibit exceptional personal sacrifices and develop an emotional attachment with their followers (House, Spangler & Woycke, 2001). As early as a study by Mann (1959), this emotional attachment or emotional sensitivity has been linked to leadership in small groups. Later, McAdams (1982) suggested that affiliation-intimacy is an important social motive which is closely linked with interpersonal warmth and good overall adaptation to life. This affiliation-intimacy would seemingly echo the emotional attachment that House, Spangler and Woycke (2001) found to be present between leaders and followers, suggesting that individuals perceived to have warmth would be considered to be more desirable leaders. Therefore, we suggest:

***Hypothesis 5a (Warmth):* Individuals perceived to possess a stronger degree of warmth are more likely to be deemed effective national leaders over individuals with lower perceived warmth.**

A 1991 study by Zaccaro, Gilbert, Thor & Mumford noted several key attributes that predicted the following of leaders. Among the primary predictive traits they report is leader nurturance. Likewise, Keller (2003: 146) found an attachment between leaders and their followers requires a relationship with “affectional bonds.” These bonds, according to Ainsworth (1991) provide an opportunity for the leader to provide nurturance. Someone considered to be compassionate has a “strong feeling of sympathy and sadness for the suffering or bad luck of others and a desire to help them (Cambridge Advanced Learners Dictionary, 2003). Therefore, by extension, a person with compassion would be someone who nurtures or provides help to another. Thus, if nurturance is a trait that predicts the following of leaders, then one would assume compassion would be an important leadership trait as well. Therefore, we submit:

***Hypothesis 5b (Compassion):* Individuals perceived to possess a stronger degree of compassion are more likely to be deemed effective national leaders over individuals with lower perceived compassion.**

## Methods

### *Overview*

We gathered several sources of data. The first includes the gathering of historical data from the first presidential election in 1789 to the recent election of 2000 (54 elections in total). The variables gathered included electoral votes and popular votes won per candidate, as well as biographical information for each candidate. The biographical and demographic variables collected include: education level and college or university attended, candidate age at time of election, physical height, prior occupation, party affiliation, social affiliations, religious affiliation, military service, socio-economic status/wealth, and the occupation and educational level for candidate’s father. The vast majority of this data exists in the public domain and was gathered via Internet background searches. The second source of data (and main source for hypothesis testing) was derived from five recent presidential election studies conducted by the National Election Studies (NES) division of the Center for Political Studies (CPS) at The University of Michigan. The election years included for analysis were 1984—Reagan v. Mondale, 1988—Bush, Sr. v. Dukakis, 1992—Clinton v. Bush, Sr., 1996—Clinton v. Dole, and 2000—Bush, GW v. Gore. Unfortunately, the recent 2004 election data was not available for analysis. 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.

### *Variable Development—Perceived 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 were: (a) intelligence, (b) knowledgeable; having (c) inspirational qualities, (d) morality, (e) decency, (f) warmth, and (g) compassion. Additionally, a final trait, “provides strong leadership” was used for this assessment. 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).

*Variable Development—Affective toward leader*

In the NES study, respondents were asked the following question 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]? Responses were coded on a dichotomous scale of 1 or 2 (with 1 equating to “yes, I have felt,” and 2 equating to “no, 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. To generate a global score of follower affect toward leader, the total number of respondent dislikes for each candidate was subtracted from the total number of likes for each candidate (on a scale of -4 to +4).

Additionally, respondents were asked to assess their warmth toward each candidate using a thermometer index scale. The following question was used and coded on a continuum of 0 to 100: “There are many groups [and individuals] in America that try to get the government or the American people to see things more their way. We would like to get your feelings towards some of these groups [and individuals]. I have here a card on which there is something that looks like a thermometer. We call it a “feeling thermometer” because it measures your feelings. Here’s how it works. If you don’t know too much about a group or don’t feel particularly warm or cold toward them, then you should place them in the middle, at the 50 degree mark. If you have a warm feeling toward a group or feel favorably toward it, you would give it a score somewhere between 50 degrees and 100 degrees, depending on how warm your feeling is toward the group. On the other hand, if you don’t feel very favorably toward some of these groups--if there are some you don’t care for too much--then you would place them somewhere between 0 degrees and 50 degrees”.

**Design of Experiment**

In essence, this study is designed to compare two groups of individuals: (a) those individuals who were deemed “superior” in terms of public opinion and who inevitably won their presidential bid, with (b) those individuals who, although potentially considered highly intelligent and qualified for the job, were unsuccessful in their attempts to secure the U.S. presidency. A completely randomized, univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA), as supported by Neter, Kutner, Nachtsheim, and Wasserman (1996), is used to address each hypothesis. SPSS was used for all statistical analyses.

Mathematically, each hypothesis is represented as follows:

$$H_o: \text{trait } \mu_{\text{winning candidates}} = \mu_{\text{losing candidates}}$$

$$H_a: \text{trait } \mu_{\text{winning candidates}} > \mu_{\text{losing candidates}}$$

A secondary test of each hypothesis links candidate traits (whether perceived or factual) to follower perceived leadership quality. Mathematically, each hypothesis is represented here as follows:

$$H_o: \text{trait } \mu_{\text{very strong leadership}} = \mu_{\text{good leadership}} = \mu_{\text{poor leadership}} = \mu_{\text{very poor leadership}}$$

$$H_a: \text{not all } \mu \text{ equal}$$

## Results

### *Hypothesis 1*

The first set of hypotheses test whether or not an individual’s degree of perceived intelligence, perceived knowledge and experience (in terms of incumbency) have an effect on presidential election success, as measured by comparing the mean perceived intelligence and perceived candidate knowledge ratings for winning candidates to those of corresponding losing candidates. The last part of this hypothesis is designed to assess whether or not those candidates possessing explicit knowledge of the job due to their presidential incumbency are more likely to be victorious in a presidential election. As discussed, these research questions were tested using a set of one-way ANOVAs.

No statistical support was found for candidate perceived intelligence on election success ( $F=0.023$ ,  $p=0.881$ ), meaning no statistical difference could be found in terms of intelligence between winning candidates and trailing candidates. However, presidential candidate perceived intelligence was found to have a statistically significant difference in perceived leadership quality ( $F=1817.314$ ,  $p<.001$ ), meaning candidates perceived to possess stronger levels of intelligence were also perceived to possess better leadership quality.

Additionally, presidential candidate perceived knowledge is found to have a statistically significant impact on election success ( $F=9.377$ ,  $p=.002$ ); however, because of the direction of the difference, no support could be found for this hypothesis. With this sample, interestingly enough, winning candidates were perceived to be less knowledgeable than the losing candidates. On the other hand, the perceived knowledge of candidates was found to have a statistically significant difference in perceived leadership quality ( $F=2217.9$ ,  $p<.001$ ), meaning candidates perceived to possess stronger degrees of knowledge were also perceived to have stronger leadership qualities.

Lastly, presidential candidate incumbency is found to have a statistically significant impact on presidential elections ( $F=4.582$ ,  $p=.035$ ), indicating that, based on this sample, the incumbent candidate has a stronger likelihood of electoral success. Maybe this finding can be attributed to follower perceptions that an incumbent candidate’s level of experience makes them inherently more qualified for the job. Tables 1, 2, and 3 detail the ANOVA. Here, both election success and candidate leadership rating was used to test the difference in intelligence and knowledgeability, with election success using to test the effects of incumbency.

*Table 1: ANOVAs for Presidential Candidate Perceived Intelligence*  
Factor: Election Success (Winner vs. Loser)

| <i>Candidate Perceived Intelligence</i> | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|---|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| Between Groups                          | .012                  | 1         | .012               | .023     | 0.881       |
| Within Groups                           | 9337.3                | 18010     | .518               |          |             |
| Total                                   | 9337.312              | 18011     |                    |          |             |

Factor: Candidate Leadership Rating (Very High, High, Low, Very Low)

| <i>Candidate Perceived Intelligence</i> | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|---|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| Between Groups                          | 2176.725              | 3         | 725.575            | 1817.314 | $p<.001$    |
| Within Groups                           | 6910.338              | 17308     | .399               |          |             |
| Total                                   | 9087.064              | 17311     |                    |          |             |

Table 2: ANOVAs for Presidential Candidate Perceived Knowledge  
Factor: Election Success (Winners vs. Losers)

| <i>Candidate Perceived Knowledge</i> | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| Between Groups                       | 4.831                 | 1         | 4.831              | 9.377    | 0.002       |
| Within Groups                        | 10080.698             | 19568     | .515               |          |             |
| Total                                | 10085.529             | 19569     |                    |          |             |

Factor: Candidate Leadership Rating (Very High, High, Low, Very Low)

| <i>Candidate Perceived Knowledge</i> | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| Between Groups                       | 2569.037              | 3         | 856.346            | 2217.892 | p<.001      |
| Within Groups                        | 7291.649              | 18885     | .386               |          |             |
| Total                                | 9860.686              | 18888     |                    |          |             |

Table 3: ANOVAs for Presidential Candidate Incumbency  
Factor: Election Success (Winners vs. Losers)

| <i>Candidate Incumbency</i> | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| Between Groups              | .750                  | 1         | .75                | 4.582    | .035        |
| Within Groups               | 17.352                | 106       | .164               |          |             |
| Total                       | 18.102                | 107       |                    |          |             |

## **Hypothesis 2**

This hypothesis tests whether an individual candidate's degree of perceived inspirational quality has an effect on presidential election success, as measured by comparing mean perceived inspiration ratings for winning candidates to those of losing candidates. Presidential candidate perceived inspirational quality is found to have a statistically significant impact on election success ( $F=178.49$ ,  $p<.001$ ), lending support for this hypothesis. Additionally, presidential candidate perceived inspirational quality is found to be statistically significantly different when comparing levels of perceived leadership quality ( $F=3680.7$ ,  $p<.001$ ), meaning candidates judged to have a stronger ability to inspire were also found to have stronger levels of perceived leadership quality. Table 4 details the ANOVA output:

*Table 4: ANOVA for Candidate Perceived Inspirational Quality*  
Factor: Election Success (Winner vs. Loser)

| <i>Perceived Candidate Inspiration</i> | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|--|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| Between Groups                         | 127.05                | 1         | 127.05             | 178.486  | p<.001      |
| Within Groups                          | 11362.824             | 15963     | .712               |          |             |
| Total                                  | 11489.874             | 15964     |                    |          |             |

Factor: Candidate Leadership Rating (Very High, High, Low, Very Low)

| <i>Perceived Candidate Inspiration</i> | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|--|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| Between Groups                         | 4670.179              | 3         | 1556.73            | 3680.66  | p<.001      |
| Within Groups                          | 6542.154              | 15468     | .423               |          |             |
| Total                                  | 11212.332             | 15471     |                    |          |             |

### **Hypothesis 3**

This set of hypotheses test whether an individual candidate's overall impact on followers' positive affect has an effect on presidential election success, as well as the impact of specific emotional effects. This hypothesis test is measured by comparing mean perceived respondent affect ratings of winning candidates to those of losing candidates.

Candidate levels of positive follower affect is found to have a statistically significant impact on election success ( $F=79.249$ ,  $p<.001$ ), suggesting candidates who generate stronger follower affect are more apt to be successful in presidential elections. Additionally, presidential candidate levels of positive follower affect is found to be statistically different when comparing levels of perceived leadership quality ( $F=2422.9$ ,  $p<.001$ ), suggesting that those candidates who generate stronger follower affect are also perceived to have stronger leadership qualities. Table 5 details the ANOVA output.

*Table 5: ANOVA for Candidate Levels of Positive Follower Affect*  
Factor: Election Success (Winner vs. Loser)

| <i>Positive Affect toward Candidate</i> | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|---|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| Between Groups                          | 421.47                | 1         | 421.47             | 79.249   | p<.001      |
| Within Groups                           | 109578.17             | 20604     | 5.318              |          |             |
| Total                                   | 109999.64             | 20605     |                    |          |             |

Factor: Candidate Leadership Rating (Very High, High, Low, Very Low)

| <i>Positive Affect toward Candidate</i> | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|---|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| Between Groups                          | 29399.9               | 3         | 9799.98            | 2422.9   | p<.001      |
| Within Groups                           | 77335.13              | 19120     | 4.045              |          |             |
| Total                                   | 106735.05             | 19123     |                    |          |             |

Table 6 details output for the effects of whether or not a candidate makes followers proud. Here, no statistical difference could be found between winning and losing candidates on the notion of instilling pride in others. Interestingly, presidential candidate levels of pride is found to be statistically different when comparing levels of perceived leadership quality ( $F=1461.6$ ,  $p<.001$ ), suggesting that those candidates who generate stronger follower feelings of pride are also perceived to be stronger leaders.

Table 7 details output for the effects of whether or not a candidate makes followers hopeful. Candidate levels of follower hope is found to have a statistically significant impact on election success ( $F=113.971$ ,  $p<.001$ ), suggesting candidates who generate stronger follower hopefulness are more apt to be successful in presidential elections. Additionally, presidential candidate levels of hopefulness is 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 8 details output for the effects of whether or not a candidate makes followers angry. Here, no statistical difference could be found between winning and losing candidates on the notion of instilling pride in others. Interestingly, presidential candidate levels of anger is found to be statistically different when comparing levels of perceived leadership quality ( $F=683.34$ ,  $p<.001$ ), suggesting that those candidates who generate lesser degrees of follower feelings of anger are perceived better leaders.

Table 9 details output for the effects of whether or not a candidate makes followers afraid. Candidate levels of follower fear is found to have a statistically significant impact on election success ( $F=7.244$ ,  $p=.007$ ), suggesting candidates who generate weaker follower feelings of fear are more apt to be successful in presidential elections. Additionally, presidential candidate levels of fear is found to be statistically different when comparing levels of perceived leadership quality ( $F=1592.08$ ,  $p<.001$ ), suggesting that candidates generating less feelings of follower anger are perceived stronger leaders.

*Table 6: ANOVA for Candidate Makes Follower Proud*  
Factor: Election Success (Winner vs. Loser)

| <i>Candidate Makes Follower Feel Proud</i> | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|--|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| Between Groups                             | .009                  | 1         | .009               | .039     | .844        |
| Within Groups                              | 4812.98               | 20368     | .236               |          |             |
| Total                                      | 4816.989              | 20369     |                    |          |             |

  

| <i>Factor: Candidate Leadership Rating (Very High, High, Low, Very Low)</i> |                       |           |                    |          |             |
|---|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| <i>Candidate Makes Follower Feel Proud</i>                                  | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
| Between Groups  | 856.81                | 3         | 285.6              | 1461.595 | $p<.001$    |
| Within Groups   | 3712.9                | 19001     | .195               |          |             |
| Total   | 4569.7                | 19004     |                    |          |             |

Table 7: ANOVA for Candidate Makes Follower Hopeful  
Factor: Election Success (Winner vs. Loser)

| <i>Candidate Makes Feel Hopeful</i> | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| Between Groups                      | 28.236                | 1         | 28.236             | 113.971  | p<.001      |
| Within Groups                       | 5055.811              | 20407     | .248               |          |             |
| Total                               | 5084.048              | 20408     |                    |          |             |

Factor: Candidate Leadership Rating (Very High, High, Low, Very Low)

| <i>Candidate Makes Feel Hopeful</i> | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| Between Groups                      | 954.105               | 3         | 318.035            | 1592.08  | p<.001      |
| Within Groups                       | 3802.64               | 19036     | .200               |          |             |
| Total                               | 4756.744              | 19039     |                    |          |             |

Table 8: ANOVA for Candidate Makes Follower Angry  
Factor: Election Success (Winner vs. Loser)

| <i>Candidate Makes Feel Angry</i> | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| Between Groups                    | .093                  | 1         | .093               | .406     | .524        |
| Within Groups                     | 4668.76               | 20436     | .228               |          |             |
| Total                             | 4668.85               | 20437     |                    |          |             |

Factor: Candidate Leadership Rating (Very High, High, Low, Very Low)

| <i>Candidate Makes Feel Angry</i> | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| Between Groups                    | 429.494               | 3         | 143.165            | 683.337  | p<.001      |
| Within Groups                     | 3991.131              | 19050     | .210               |          |             |
| Total                             | 4420.625              | 19053     |                    |          |             |

Table 9: ANOVA for Candidate Makes Follower Afraid  
Factor: Election Success (Winner vs. Loser)

| <i>Candidate Makes Feel Afraid</i> | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| Between Groups                     | 1.328                 | 1         | 1.328              | 7.244    | .007        |
| Within Groups                      | 3749.08               | 20450     | .183               |          |             |
| Total                              | 3750.4                | 20451     |                    |          |             |

Factor: Candidate Leadership Rating (Very High, High, Low, Very Low)

| <i>Candidate Makes Feel Afraid</i> | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| Between Groups                     | 287.47                | 3         | 95.823             | 554.773  | p<.001      |
| Within Groups                      | 3293.525              | 19068     | .173               |          |             |
| Total                              | 3580.995              | 19071     |                    |          |             |

#### Hypothesis 4

This set of hypotheses test whether an individual candidate's degree of perceived moral force and decency have an effect on presidential election success, as measured by comparing mean perceived morality ratings and mean perceived decency ratings for winning candidates to those of losing candidates.

Presidential candidate perceived moral quality and decency are both found to have a statistically significant impact on election success ( $F=478.75$ ,  $p<.001$ ;  $F=16.172$ ,  $p<.001$ , respectively), although the direction of the difference in moral quality is in the opposite of that hypothesized. Here, interestingly enough, winning candidates as a group were perceived to be less moral than losing candidates (is morality not a primary requisite for candidate selection?). When comparing decency among the two groups, the winning candidate group was perceived to have stronger levels of decency than the losing group.

Additionally, presidential candidate perceived morality was found be statistically different when comparing levels of perceived leadership quality ( $F=1511.85$ ,  $p<.001$ ), meaning candidates perceived to be highly moral were also perceived to possess strong leadership qualities. The same support was found for presidential candidate perceived decency ( $F=666.76$ ,  $p<.001$ ), suggesting candidates perceived to be highly decent were also perceived to possess strong leadership skills. Tables 10 and 11 detail the ANOVA output.

Table 10: ANOVA for Candidate Perceived Morality  
Factor: Election Success (Winner vs. Loser)

| <i>Perceived Candidate Morality</i> | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| Between Groups                      | 315.466               | 1         | 315.466            | 478.748  | $p<.001$    |
| Within Groups                       | 12402.539             | 18822     | .659               |          |             |
| Total                               | 12718.004             | 18823     |                    |          |             |

Factor: Candidate Leadership Rating (Very High, High, Low, Very Low)

| <i>Perceived Candidate Morality</i> | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| Between Groups                      | 2465.699              | 3         | 821.9              | 1511.854 | $p<.001$    |
| Within Groups                       | 9931.701              | 18269     | .544               |          |             |
| Total                               | 12397.4               | 18272     |                    |          |             |

Table 11: ANOVA for Candidate Perceived Decency  
Factor: Election Success (Winner vs. Loser)

| <i>Perceived Candidate Decency</i> | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| Between Groups                     | 6.950                 | 1         | 6.950              | 16.172   | $p<.001$    |
| Within Groups                      | 3414.772              | 7946      | .430               |          |             |
| Total                              | 3421.722              | 7947      |                    |          |             |

Factor: Candidate Leadership Rating (Very High, High, Low, Very Low)

| <i>Perceived Candidate Decency</i> | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| Between Groups                     | 690.51                | 3         | 230.17             | 666.76   | $p<.001$    |
| Within Groups                      | 2633.581              | 7629      | .345               |          |             |
| Total                              | 3324.091              | 7632      |                    |          |             |

### Hypothesis 5

The fourth group of hypotheses test whether an individual's degree of perceived warmth and perceived compassion has an effect on presidential election success, as measured by comparing mean perceived "thermometer" ratings and perceived candidate compassion ratings for winning candidates to those of the corresponding losing candidate group.

Presidential candidate perceived warmth and perceived compassion are both found to have a statistically significant differences in terms of election success ( $F=83.814$ ,  $p<.001$ ;  $F=5.807$ ,  $p=.016$ ), suggesting that higher levels of perceived warmth and compassion are related to election success. While the differences in perceived candidate warmth lend preliminary support to this research hypothesis, the differences in perceived compassion are in an opposite direction of that hypothesized. This is quite interesting because it suggests that candidates perceived to have higher degrees of compassion were those candidates who were not successful in their presidential bid.

On the other hand, presidential candidate perceived warmth and perceived compassion are both found to be statistically different when comparing levels of perceived leadership quality ( $F=3591.76$ ,  $p<.001$ ;  $F=1294.79$ ,  $p<.001$ ), suggesting that candidates perceived to warm and compassionate are also perceived to be better leaders. Tables 12 and 13 detail the ANOVA output.

*Table 12: ANOVAs for Presidential Candidate Perceived Warmth*  
Factor: Election Success (Winner vs. Loser)

| <i>Candidate Perceived Warmth</i> | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| Between Groups                    | 62239.122             | 1         | 62239.1            | 83.814   | p<.001      |
| Within Groups                     | 15300296              | 20604     | 742.59             |          |             |
| Total                             | 15362535              | 20605     |                    |          |             |

Factor: Candidate Leadership Rating (Very High, High, Low, Very Low)

| <i>Candidate Perceived Warmth</i> | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| Between Groups                    | 4973329.1             | 3         | 1657776            | 3591.764 | p<.001      |
| Within Groups                     | 8824822.8             | 19120     | 461.55             |          |             |
| Total                             | 13798152              | 19123     |                    |          |             |

*Table 13: ANOVAs for Presidential Candidate Perceived Compassion*  
Factor: Election Success (Winners vs. Losers)

| <i>Candidate Perceived Compassion</i> | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| Between Groups                        | 3.452                 | 1         | 3.452              | 5.807    | .016        |
| Within Groups                         | 8329.468              | 14012     | .594               |          |             |
| Total                                 | 8332.921              | 14013     |                    |          |             |

Factor: Candidate Leadership Rating (Very High, High, Low, Very Low)

| <i>Candidate Perceived Compassion</i> | <i>Sum of Squares</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>Mean Square</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| Between Groups                        | 1811.047              | 3         | 603.682            | 1294.794 | p<.001      |
| Within Groups                         | 6346.903              | 13613     | .466               |          |             |
| Total                                 | 8157.95               | 13616     |                    |          |             |



## Discussion

This study compared candidates who were successful in their bid for the presidency and those who were unsuccessful, using follower perceptions as the level of analysis. We also used a measure of follower perceptions of leader quality to measure differences in these perceptual traits. By understanding which perceptual characteristics are stronger for successful leaders, we can understand a bit more about what followers expect from their leaders. By understanding which perceptual traits are correlated with perceptual measures of leadership quality, we can understand a bit more about which traits impact leadership ratings. Strength of this study is that leadership quality is measured in both of these ways.

We isolated several perceptual traits, including perceived intelligence, knowledge, morality, decency, warmth, compassion, and inspirational qualities. We also isolated several affective traits, including leader generates feelings of follower pride, follower hope, follower feelings of anger and fear.

It has been argued that perceived intelligence is actually more important than measurable intelligence assessing leadership because leadership is a social process. While perceived intelligence was not a significant predictor of election success, it was found to be significantly correlated with perceived leadership quality in both winning and losing candidates. This finding supports much of the extant research linking intelligence and leadership, but does so at the follower perceptual level.

Other interesting trait-based findings include the notion of charisma, morality and decency. All three of these perceptual traits were found to be significant factors in assessing election success and significant factors when assessing leadership quality. This supports much of the existing research linking traits and leadership, but again, does so at the follower perceptual level.

Perhaps, most interestingly, the findings of this particular study link certain affective relationships to the leadership phenomenon. Candidate levels of general positive follower affect was found to have a statistically significant impact on election success, and was found to be related to follower assessments of leadership quality. 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. We add to the literature by extending this notion using specific positive and negative affective assessments (feelings of pride, hope, fear and anger), which were all found to have a statistical impact on candidate leadership ratings. While feelings of pride and feelings of anger were not found to impact election success, feelings of hope and feelings of fear were found to significantly impact election success. These are interesting findings given follower assessments of leaders will naturally include affect-based assessments of these leaders as well.

## 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 (3<sup>rd</sup> 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.
- Himmelstein, 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 Edition*, 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), 551-579.

- 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. *Journal 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*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, WCB McGraw-Hill: Boston.
- Newcombe, M. J. and Ashkanasy N. M. (2002). The role of affect and affective congruence in perceptions of leaders: an experimental study. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 601-614.
- 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. *L 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.

- Simonton, D. K. (1988). Presidential style: personality, biography, and performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55 (6), 928-936.
- Stogdill, R.M. (1948). Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature, *Journal of Psychology*, 25, 35-71.
- Strull, 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](http://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.
- 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.