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ABSTRACT

Prior research suggests that charismatic leaders enact influence by arousing the emotions of followers. This is especially true during turbulent and uncertain times. However, little research has demonstrated the extent to which specific emotions mediate the charismatic leadership-follower behavior relationship. Using the stereotype content model, we examined the extent to which two emotions (i.e., admiration and contempt) mediated the charismatic leadership-voter support relationship with data collected during the 2008 U.S. presidential election. Results revealed that admiration (but not contempt) mediated this relationship. As such, this study provides support for the proposition that charismatic leaders arouse specific emotions of followers; thereby, increasing the likelihood that followers perform desirable behaviors for the leader. This finding is particularly important since the followers in this study followed from a distance. Implications for the charismatic leadership literature and limitations of the study are discussed in turn.
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The 2008 United States presidential election was an historic event. The Democratic ticket included Barak Obama – the first viable African American presidential candidate in U.S. history, and his running mate Joe Biden – a person known for speaking his mind. The Republican candidate was John McCain and his running mate was Sarah Palin – both self proclaimed mavericks. Both tickets seemed to motivate people within their own parties and rile up people from other parties more than ever before. We as a nation were facing major domestic and international crises. Moreover, we were in the midst of fighting two wars and facing the demise of the financial and automobile industries. In the midst of such circumstances, people look toward political leaders to resolve the crises and restore order.

During uncertain and turbulent times, charismatic leaders are deemed to be especially important because followers are unsure of what should be done to ensure future survival and prosperity, and the anxiety and panic they likely feel (Pillai, 1996; Pillai & Meindl, 1998). This contention is especially true for political leaders. In fact, previous research has demonstrated that charismatic presidential candidates are more likely to be elected during times of crisis (Bligh, Kohles, & Meindl, 2004a; 2004b; McCann, 1997; Williams, Pillai, Lowe, Jung, & Herst, 2009). Riggio (2004) postulated that in crisis situations, leaders are seen as more charismatic when they are not the cause of the crisis. As an example, Riggio suggested that the Bush Administration used the fear of future terrorist attacks to create an atmosphere in which people felt that a crisis was looming. Furthermore, Bligh et al. (2004a; 2004b) demonstrated President Bush’s use of charismatic rhetoric following the 9/11 terrorist attacks led to more favorable impressions of this leadership by followers. Based on this rationale, it is postulated that the
charisma of presidential candidates would be important for voters to consider during the 2008 presidential election due to the myriad economic, social, and political issues facing the United States during that time.

In order to understand the reasons why people are more likely to vote for charismatic presidential candidates, research has investigated the influence processes underlying the charismatic-voting behavior relationship. Pillai and Williams (1998) found that charismatic leadership increased voters’ identification with their political party, leading to a greater likelihood for voting for a particular leader. In particular, this study demonstrated that Democrats identified more closely with Bill Clinton and rated him as more charismatic while Republicans identified more closely with Bob Dole and rated him as more charismatic. The rationale for this finding is that when a presidential leader is charismatic, people idolize and are more likely to vote for such candidates. However, people are more likely to identify with candidates in their own party than those in other parties regardless of their charisma. Similarly, Pillai, Williams, Lowe, & Jung (2003) demonstrated that voters had greater trust in charismatic presidential candidates and were more likely to vote for the candidate they trusted most. This finding provided evidence that trust in a particular presidential candidate mediates the charismatic leadership-voting behavior relationship.

These studies demonstrate some of the reasons why people are more likely to vote for charismatic presidential candidates. However, there are likely other processes that influence the charismatic leader-voter behavior relationship. In addition to personal identification and trust, charismatic leaders are believed to arouse the emotions of others (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). For example, charismatic leaders may get followers excited about a particular course of action; thus, getting greater buy-in and acceptance from followers. Surprisingly little research
has investigated the link between charismatic leadership and specific emotions, and this is particularly true in the presidential leadership literature. In one study, it was demonstrated that Republicans and Democrats expressed happiness or anger while watching a speech by Ronald Regan, a charismatic leader, and mimicked his facial expressions (McHugo, Lanzetta, Sullivan, Masters, & Englis, 1985). In another study, Cherulnik, Donley, Wiewel, & Miller, (2001) found that observers were more likely to mimic charismatic than non-charismatic leaders. However, this research did not investigate the relationship between charismatic leadership and the specific emotions of followers. Furthermore, these studies did not demonstrate that such emotions mediate the relationship between charismatic leadership and voter behavior. The purpose of this study is twofold. First, using the stereotype content model (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2007) this study will demonstrate the relationship between charismatic leadership and voters’ emotions. Second, this study will demonstrate how such emotions mediate the relationship between charismatic leadership and voters’ behavior. As such, this study aims to provide support for the proposition that charismatic leaders arouse the emotions of followers; thereby, increasing the likelihood that the followers perform desirable behaviors for the leader – in this case vote for a particular presidential candidate.

**Charismatic Leadership**

Charisma refers to follower attributions of leaders based on their behaviors, expertise, and aspects of the situation (Conger & Kanungo, 1987). Charismatic leaders create a vision of a more promising future, engage in unconventional behaviors, make self-sacrifices, take personal risks and act confident in most situations. Followers of charismatic leaders obey requests from the leader, are emotionally involved in the leader’s mission and feel affection toward the leader (Yukl, 2006). Research in organizational settings has shown that charismatic leadership is
related to employee performance, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Shamir (1992) suggests that people who follow from a distance also attribute charismatic qualities to leaders. This is especially important for politicians because voters attribute certain qualities (e.g., charisma or a lack thereof) regarding political candidates with whom they are unlikely to encounter first-hand.

To describe the influence that charismatic leaders have on followers they do not interact with directly, Meindl (1990) developed a theory of attributed charisma he termed romantic leadership. He suggested that people create a ‘heroic’ social identity and see themselves as emotionally involved in a virtuous cause for which they make self-sacrifices and exert extra effort. Activation of one’s heroic social identity most often occurs when an emergent leader articulates an appealing ideology. This is typically the effect that charismatic religious figures and politicians have on people (Yukl, 2006). Peoples’ attributions of such ‘heroic’ leaders are caused by the past accomplishments of the leader and stereotypes they have developed about the leader. Based on these attributions, people imitate the ‘heroic’ leader’s behavior and engage in activities that symbolize commitment to the leader’s cause. As such, attributions about the leader are used by people to rationalize their behavior and involvement in service of the new cause.

A number of studies have demonstrated support for the proposition that charismatic leaders influence distant followers. In particular, the presidential leadership literature has demonstrated that charismatic leadership has an impact on the attitudes and behaviors of voters. Specifically, Pillai and colleagues have shown that charismatic leadership is related to voters’ trust and personal identification with the leaders and the extent to which people vote for a particular leader (Pillai & Williams, 1998; Pillai et al., 2003; Williams et al., 2009). Charismatic
leaders tend to have happier dispositions and are generally more positive than are non-charismatic leaders; as such, followers are more excited by charismatic leaders and tend to mimic their positive behaviors (Cherulnik et al., 2001; Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson, 1994). In all, this supports the importance of charismatic leadership in general and among distant followers in particular.

**Leader Perceptions and Emotional Arousal**

As previously noted, we know many of the influence processes that make charismatic leaders effective and we know that charismatic leaders arouse followers’ emotions in general (i.e., positive affect); however, less is known about how these leaders arouse specific emotions of followers. To understand this process, we draw on the stereotype content model developed by Fiske and colleagues (Cuddy et al., 2007; Fiske, Cuddy, & Glick, 2006; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002). The stereotyping and person perception literatures are appropriate here because the impact of charismatic leaders is based on follower attributions of the leader’s personal qualities. To this end, **competence** and **warmth** consistently emerge as the integral dimensions of person perception and group stereotypes (Fiske et al., 2002). Competent people are perceived to be intelligent, skilled, and efficacious; whereas, warm people are perceived to be friendly, helpful, and cooperative (Cuddy et al., 2007; Fiske et al., 2002). Early work by Solomon Asch (1946) revealed that the overall impressions people make of others depend on the unique combination of competence- and warmth-related words used to describe targets. Related research finds that people are described mostly in terms of traits that occur on these two dimensions (Rosenberg, Nelson, & Vivekananthan, 1968). Other work by Wojciszke (1994) found that when participants were asked to recall episodes where they formed an impression of themselves or others, approximately 70% of responses had clear warmth or competence interpretations. Empirical
research generally supports the two-dimensional nature of person perception and the interpretation of those dimensions as competence and warmth (Abele & Wojciszke, 2007; Hamilton & Fallot, 1974; Hayes, 2005; Rosenberg et al., 1968; Zanna, & Hamilton, 1977). We contend that charisma should depend on the extent to which followers perceive a leader to be competent and warm. As such, we hypothesize the following relationship:

**Hypothesis 1:** Voters’ ratings of charismatic leadership will be positively related to perceptions of presidential candidates’ competence and warmth.

Attributions of candidate qualities have implications for the emotions that candidates arouse for voters. In particular, judgments of competence and warmth carry affective consequences (Cuddy et al., 2007; Fiske et al., 2002). Research has demonstrated that charismatic leadership is positively related to follower positive affect and negatively related to follower negative affect (Erez, Misangyi, Johnson, LePine & Halverson, 2008). In support of this, Connelly, Gaddis and Helton-Fauth (2002) suggested that charismatic leaders (who we argue, are high in competence and warmth) are aware of the impact they have on followers’ emotions and take advantage their ability to regulate the emotions of followers. Moreover, charismatic leaders enact more aroused behaviors (e.g., captivating tone of voice, animated facial expressions, extended eye contact) than non-charismatic leaders leading to greater job satisfaction and higher job performance of followers (Friedman & Riggio, 1981; Howell & Frost, 1989). More specifically, the stereotype content model suggests that targets who are perceived as both competent and warm will elicit admiration as an affective (i.e., emotional) consequence (Neuberg & Cottrell, 2002; Cuddy et al., 2007; Fiske et al., 2002). Charismatic leaders should arouse admiration, especially for those who perceive themselves as similar to or as part of the leader’s in-group. For example, during a presidential election, voters’ registered as Democrats
(Republicans) were more likely to identify with Democratic (Republican) candidates and see them as charismatic, because they aligned with an important social identity (Pillai & Williams, 1998). Moreover, when these candidates engage in unconventional behaviors, make self-sacrifices, and take personal risks, voters’ believe that charismatic candidates have their best interest in mind and will work to ensure positive outcomes for the voters. These positive approach behaviors relate to feelings of admiration toward the leader (Fiske et al., 2002; Neuberg & Cottrell, 2002). As such, voters should actively approach a charismatic presidential candidate and vote for that candidate (Cuddy et al., 2007). To this end, we expect that higher ratings of charismatic leadership will positively relate to admiration as an affective consequence. In addition, admiration should mediate the relationship between charismatic leadership and voter support.

_Hypothesis 2:_ Charismatic leadership will be positively associated with voters’ admiration for that leader.

Charismatic leadership should be related to other perceiver emotions to the extent that non-charismatic leaders should be perceived as lacking competence and warmth. According to the stereotype content model, targets perceived as lacking competence and warmth elicit contempt from perceivers (Fiske et al., 2002). Low ratings of competence for a political candidate suggest that the candidate lacks ability to perform necessary duties at a high level; the ascription of low warmth implies competitiveness and deliberates in negative intent toward society (Fiske et al., 2002). Targets who elicit contempt are perceived as parasites who are both incapable of (i.e., low competence) and unwilling to (i.e., low warmth) contribute meaningfully to society. This combination of disrespect and dislike is the converse of leaders who are both respected and liked. As such, non-charismatic candidates should elicit feelings of contempt, and
behaviorally, candidates’ requests for support should be neglected or rejected. To this end, we expect that non-charismatic presidential candidates will elicit contempt and engender less voter support.

**Hypothesis 3**: Charismatic leadership will be negatively associated with voters’ contempt for that leader.

**Hypothesis 4**: Voters’ admiration and contempt will mediate the relationship charismatic leadership and voter support.

**METHOD**

**Participants and procedure**

Participants were recruited from undergraduate courses in the psychology department and business school. All participants received extra credit in their respective courses in exchange for participation. One week prior to the 2008 presidential election, participants were presented with a survey packet containing instructions and a picture of one of the presidential or vice presidential candidates. All participants were instructed to “think of the following (vice-) presidential candidate while completing the first part of this survey.” To this end, participants belonged to the Obama candidate group ($n = 31$), the Biden candidate group ($n = 31$), the McCain candidate group ($n = 35$), or the Palin candidate group ($n = 29$). This resulted in a total sample size of 126. After the picture of the candidate was presented, participants rated that candidate in terms of his or her charismatic leadership qualities. Next, participants completed a short demographic survey regarding their own age, race, party affiliation, and gender. One week after the election, participants completed a short follow-up questionnaire where they reported their emotions (i.e., admiration and contempt) toward the candidate about which they read and their actual voting behavior in the general election.
The average age of participants in this sample was 21.69 (SD = 2.52). Ninety participants identified themselves as White, 19 as African American/Black, 5 as Asian, 2 as Latino, and 6 as other. The sample was predominantly female (68%). In terms of party affiliation, 61 participants identified themselves as democrats, 40 as republicans, 21 as independent, and 3 as other.

**Measures**

Participants were presented with a picture of one of the presidential or vice presidential candidates (John McCain, Sarah Palin, Barack Obama, and Joe Biden) and told to keep this candidate in mind when rating him/her with respect to their charismatic leadership qualities. All pictures were black and white and included the candidate’s face and upper torso. The dimensions of the photographs were approximately 1.8 x 2.5 inches.

**Charismatic leadership.** The multi-dimensional Conger-Kanungo scale (1997) was used to assess charismatic leadership behaviors. The *strategic vision and articulation* dimension was assessed with 4 items ($\alpha = .83$). A sample item was “is an exciting public speaker.” We excluded three of the items from the original 7-item scale because they were focused specifically on organizational leadership (e.g., “Entrepreneurial; seizes new opportunities in order to achieve goals”). The *sensitivity to the environment* dimension was assessed with 4 items ($\alpha = .84$). A sample item was “recognizes the abilities and skills of the citizens of the United States.” The *sensitivity to members’ needs* dimension was assessed with 3 items ($\alpha = .85$). A sample item was “shows sensitivity for the needs and feelings of the citizens of the United States.” The *personal risks* dimension was assessed with 3 items ($\alpha = .81$). A sample item was “takes personal risks for the sake of the citizens of the United States.” Finally, the *unconventional behavior* dimension was assessed with 3 items ($\alpha = .64$). A sample item was “often exhibits very unique behavior that surprises the citizens of the United States.” All ratings were made on a 7-point
response scale ranging from 1 = very uncharacteristic to 7 = very characteristic (Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 1997).

A confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) was conducted with Mplus 6 (Muthen & Muthen, 2007), using the sample covariance matrix as input and a maximum likelihood solution to determine if charismatic leadership fit a higher-order factor model on which the five first-order charismatic leadership factors loaded. The overall chi-square test for this model was significant, \( \chi^2(114, n = 125) = 213.33, p < .001 \). However, based on cutoff criteria provided by Hu and Bentler (1999) the individual fit indexes suggest that the higher-order charismatic leadership model was an adequate fit to the data. The Comparative Fit Index (CFI) was .92, the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) was .90, the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) was .08, and the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) was .07.

**Competence and warmth.** Competence and warmth were assessed with six items each developed by Fiske et al. (2002). Sample items from the competence scale include competent, confident, and capable and sample items from the warmth scale include friendly, well-intentioned, and trustworthy. All ratings were made on a 7-point response scale ranging from 1 = not at all to 7 = extremely (Fiske et al., 2002). Both scales demonstrated adequate internal consistency (\( \alpha = .94 \) and .95, respectively).

**Voters’ emotions.** Voters’ emotions toward the presidential candidates were assessed with four items (Fiske et al., 2002). Two items were used to assess admiration (I feel admiration towards this person and I feel pride towards this person; \( \alpha = .90 \)) and two items were used to assess contempt (I feel contempt towards this person and I feel disgust towards this person; \( \alpha = .43 \)). The reliability of the contempt scale is surprising since this is a well validated scale that has been successfully used in previous research. Although this reliability estimate was well
below acceptable standards (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994), we used the contempt scale because its relationship with admiration \((r = -.27, p < .001)\), warmth \((r = -.28, p < .001)\) and competence \((r = -.23, p < .001)\) was similar to that reported in previous research (cf. Cuddy et al., 2007). The ratings for admiration and contempt were made on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*.

**Voting behavior.** Voting behavior after the election was measured with one item (Who did you vote for in the recent U.S. presidential election?). Responses to this variable included McCain/Palin, Obama/Biden, other (please specify), and did not vote. Our analyses included participants who reported voting for either of the candidates from the two major political parties. As such, the participants who reported voting for another candidate \((n = 8)\) or who did not vote \((n = 30)\) were excluded from any further analyses. This resulted in a reported sample size of 126.

**RESULTS**

Means, standard deviations, and correlations among the variables are displayed in Table 1. The first hypothesis proposed a positive relationship between charismatic leadership and competence and warmth. Results indicated that charismatic leadership was significantly related to competence \((r = .78, p < .001)\) and warmth \((r = .80, p < .001)\) providing strong support for hypotheses 1. Moreover, examination of the correlation matrix suggests that admiration \((r = .63, p < .001)\) was positively related and contempt was negatively related \((r = -.29, p < .001)\) to charismatic leadership, providing initial support for hypotheses 2 and 3 respectively. These findings are especially noteworthy since the emotion data were collected one month after the charismatic leadership data were collected.

--------------------------------

Insert Table 1 about here

--------------------------------
Mediation analysis. Logistic regression (LR) is appropriate for models with binary dependent variables and binary or continuous independent variables, so this was the data analytic method we used. We hypothesized that ratings of a candidate’s charismatic leadership would predict the likelihood that a participant voted for the Obama/Biden or McCain/Palin ticket and that this relationship would be mediated by admiration and contempt. Consistent with previous research investigating the charismatic leader-voter behavior relationship, participant gender, age, race and party affiliation were controlled for in the regression analyses (Pillai & Williams, 1998; Pillai et al., 2003). In order run the LR analyses for both candidate groups simultaneously, the dependent variable, voting behavior, was coded such that the candidate group of interest was given a value of 1 and the remaining candidate group was given the reference code of 0. For example, the voter behavior variable was coded 0 = Obama/Biden and 1 = McCain/Palin for the participants who rated McCain (n = 35) or Palin on charismatic leadership (n = 29). Coded this way, the LR results can be interpreted to indicate the increased odds of voter support of McCain/Palin given impressions of either candidate’s charismatic leadership. In the Obama (n = 31) and Biden (n = 31) groups, voter behavior was coded 0 = McCain/Palin and 1 = Obama/Biden with an analogous interpretation. With the data for these two groups combined, the LR analyses can be interpreted as the increased likelihood of voter support for a candidate given ratings of their charismatic leadership.

To fully examine hypothesis 4, a mediating analysis was conducted using the bootstrap approach detailed by Preacher and Hayes (2004). This approach is similar to Baron and Kenny’s (1986) approach in that regression coefficients and standard errors are provided for each step required for assessing mediating relationships \((x \rightarrow m, m \rightarrow y\) controlling for \(x\), \(x \rightarrow y\) controlling for \(m\)) (Kenny, Kashner, & Bolger, 1998). However, unlike the Baron and Kenny approach, the
bootstrap approach reduces Type I error, increases power, and does not require that normality assumptions be met for variables and sampling distributions (Mooney & Duval, 1993). Using $k$ number of resamples, the bootstrap approach yields a sampling distribution of the indirect effect with confidence intervals. The bounds of the 95% confidence interval indicate whether the population indirect effect is significantly different from zero (Preacher & Hayes, 2004).

MacKinnon, Lockwood, and Williams (2004) advocate the use of confidence intervals to interpret tests of indirect effects because confidence intervals attained from resampling (i.e., bootstrapping) techniques provide a better estimation of the size and variability of the indirect effect.

The relationships between charismatic leadership and admiration ($b = 1.17, p < .001$) and admiration and voting behavior after controlling for charismatic leadership ($b = .75, p < .001$) were both significant. Furthermore, after controlling for admiration, the relationship between charismatic leadership and voting behavior was significant ($b = 2.06, p > .001$), but less than the direct effect between charismatic leadership and voting behavior ($b = 2.76, p > .001$). Also, the bootstrapped indirect effect ($k = 5,000$ resamples) was significant and the 95% confidence interval generated from the sampling distribution did not include zero (LL = .31, UL = 1.50). This provides evidence for admiration mediating the charismatic leadership-voting behavior relationship (Precher & Hayes, 2004).

The relationships between charismatic leadership and contempt ($b = -.35, p < .01$) was significant; however, the relationship between contempt and voting behavior after controlling for charismatic leadership was non-significant ($b = -.25, p > .05$). Furthermore, the bootstrapped indirect effect ($k = 5,000$ resamples) was non-significant, as the 95% confidence interval generated from the sampling distribution included zero (LL = -.16, UL = .35). The inclusion of
zero indicates that the indirect effect in the population is not significantly different from zero, thus providing no evidence of mediation (Preacher & Hayes, 2004). Thus, the results do not provide support for contempt mediating the charismatic leadership-voting behavior relationship. As such, hypothesis 4 was only partially supported (see Figure 1).

**DISCUSSION**

Researchers have often suggested that one mechanism by which charismatic leaders influence followers is through emotional arousal (Shamir et al., 1993). However, little research has demonstrated the link between charismatic leadership and emotions, especially the specific emotions of distant followers. Drawing on the stereotype content model, we argue that competence and warmth (i.e., high ratings on both dimensions) underlie peoples’ perceptions of charismatic leaders. Based on this assertion we hypothesized that ratings of charismatic leadership should be positively related to admiration (i.e., the affective reaction to targets perceived as both competent and warm) and negatively related to contempt (i.e., the affective reaction to targets perceived as nor competent nor warm) regarding presidential candidates. Moreover, we argued that these emotions would mediate the relationship between charismatic leadership and voter support. In all, we found support for three of our four hypothesized relationships.

As proposed we found that charismatic leadership is strongly related to perceptions of both competence and warmth. This finding provided the basis for why charismatic leadership should relate to the specific follower emotions of admiration and contempt. In fact, we found that charismatic leadership was positively related to follower admiration and negatively related to follower contempt. These findings suggest that followers of charismatic leaders (high competence and high warmth) feel that they are part of the leader’s in-group, which inspires
them feel admiration for the leader. However, when followers do not see a leader as charismatic (low competence and low warmth), they feel that they are part of the leader’s out-group, which makes them feel contempt for the leader. Moreover, we found that follower admiration, mediated the charismatic leadership – voter support relationship. In other words, charismatic leaders make followers feel good, which motivates followers to engage in behaviors on behalf of charismatic leaders (Hatfield et al., 1994). This finding is especially relevant because we examined this relationship with a sample of distant leaders.

Unexpectedly, contempt did not mediate the relationship between charismatic leadership and voter support. One possible explanation for this finding was that the mean and standard deviation for contempt were low. This suggests range restriction in ratings of contempt, which likely attenuated the relationship between contempt and voter support. Similarly, the internal consistency estimate for contempt was far below acceptable standards (α = .43), which suggest that raters did not provide consistent ratings of contempt for the four presidential and vice presidential candidates. Interestingly, the internal consistency estimate (α = .74) was acceptable for ratings of contempt about Sara Palin, but not for Barak Obama (α = .02), Joe Biden (α = .59), or John McCain (α = -.10). One possible reason for this finding was because of the wording of the two items. The first item was “I feel contempt towards this person” (M = 3.11, SD = 1.75) and the second item was “I feel disgust toward this person” (M = 2.21, SD = 1.54). On average, participants rated the contempt item higher than the disgust item.

Conceptually, contempt should represent the emotional reaction to individuals or groups who have low ability and who are uncooperative. Status and cooperation predict emotional reactions, respectively, such that high status groups are perceived as competent and cooperative groups are perceived as warm (Fiske et al., 2002; Russell & Fiske, 2008). The contempt items
we used may have been inappropriate, as participants rated individuals who were campaigning for the highest positions in national government and who had achieved great levels of success prior to the 2008 campaign. For contempt ratings to be most applicable, participants would need to rate targets that were reasonably low in terms of status and cooperativeness toward society at large. To this end, these candidates would be required to be low achieving, low-status individuals. Despite political and ideological differences among parties, the accomplishments and accolades that these four candidates had earned (and the subsequent attributions of competence) may have been too stellar to engender reliable ratings of contempt from this group of participants.

**Theoretical and Practical Implications**

Using the stereotype content model, this study contributes to the charismatic leadership literature by demonstrating that competence and warmth underlie peoples’ perceptions about charismatic leaders. As previously noted, this finding suggests that charismatic leaders are perceived to be intelligent, skilled, efficacious, friendly, helpful, and cooperative (Cuddy et al., 2007; Fiske et al., 2002). Because of this, followers’ feel admiration toward charismatic leaders, which motivate them to cooperate with and engage behaviors to help, assist, protect and support the leader. This suggests that presidential (vice-presidential) candidates can gain support from the electorate by engaging in charismatic leadership behaviors. Such behaviors, make people feel part of the leader’s in-group; thereby, eliciting feelings of admiration and pride toward the leader (cf. Fiske et al., 2002). These findings help to expand the nomological network of charismatic leadership by demonstrating that in addition to trust, identification, and value congruence (Pillai & Williams, 1998; Pillai et al., 2003; Williams et al., 2009), charismatic leaders influence followers through the arousal of emotions.
From a practical perspective, one implication of this study is that leaders can engage in charismatic behaviors (Conger & Kanungo, 1987) to arouse the emotions of followers and get them to act on the leader’s behalf. As such, leaders could be trained to utilize specific charismatic leader behaviors such as articulating a strategic vision, monitoring the external environment, being considerate of member needs, taking personal risks on behalf of followers, and engaging in unconventional behaviors (Conger et al., 1997). One way to develop these leadership behaviors is through behavioral role modeling. Behavioral role modeling is founded in social learning theory (Bandura, 1986) and uses behavioral demonstration and role-playing to develop leader behaviors. This could be accomplished by having trainees watch videos of charismatic leaders. As the model demonstrates each behavior, the trainer could explain the behavior and ensure trainee understanding. Once trainees understand all behaviors, they could engage in role-playing and trainers could provide feedback to reinforce or correct the charismatic leader behaviors. Meta-analytic evidence suggests that behavioral role modeling is one of the most effective training methods for managers (Burke & Day, 1986).

**Strengths and Limitations**

A strength of this study was that the data were collected at two points in time. This is especially important when testing a mediated model, because it permitted us to demonstrate that ratings of charismatic leadership at time 1 lead to follower emotions and voting behaviors at time 2. This also helped to assuage potential concerns about common method bias. When all variables assessed in a study are rated by the same participants, there is potential for correlated rater error among the variables. One way for controlling for such common method bias is to collect data at different time periods (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003).
The results of this study need to be interpreted in the context of two limitations. First, our sample only included undergraduate students from one university. This may have limited the generalizability of our findings. However, we feel that our sample is somewhat characteristic of the voting population for two reasons. First, we surveyed students in the college of liberal arts and the business school to ensure that our sample was not too liberal. In fact, only 49% of our sample was registered with the Democratic Party, the other 51% were registered with one of the other parties. Furthermore, we conducted an analysis of variance (ANOVA) and found that the business school students were significantly more conservative than the liberal arts students ($F = 7.49, df = 2, 166, p < .01$). As such, we felt that our sample was comprised of a good balance of democrats and republicans. Similarly, we feel that the racial composition of our sample was relatively diverse and at least somewhat characteristic of electorate during the 2008 presidential election (Voting and Registration). However, future research, i.e., during the 2012 presidential election, should be conducted using a more diverse sample from multiple regions of the United States.

Our research may also be limited because only two emotions were assessed in this study. The stereotype content model suggests that targets engender four types of emotion, which are based on the level of competence and warmth associated with those targets. Our work focused on the emotions aroused when competence and warmth are consistent (high-high, low-low). We did not assess the emotional reactions that emerge for targets who are either competent or warm, but not both, as these emotional reactions have been referred to as mixed (Fiske et al., 2002) or ambivalent (Glick and Fiske, 2001). Future research should investigate whether ambiguous emotions (e.g., envy and pity) are aroused by charismatic leaders and the role of these emotions in predicting behavior including voter support. In addition, other emotions could mediate the
charismatic leadership-follower behavior relationship. Examples of other positive emotions include happiness, elatedness, and excitement. Future research should investigate these and other emotions in relation to charismatic leadership.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, this study provides support for the notion that charismatic leaders arouse the emotions of followers, even in the case of a distant leader–follower relationship. Moreover, this study demonstrates that the stereotype content model is useful for perspective for understanding the influence that charismatic leaders have on followers.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Race</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Political Party</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Charisma</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Competence</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Warmth</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Admiration</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Contempt</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Voting Behavior</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 125. Means and standard deviations are reported on the basis of a 7-point scale. Race was dummy coded: 0 = other and 1 = Caucasian. Political party was dummy coded: 0 = Republican and 1 = Democrat. *p < .05. **p < .01.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE_b</th>
<th>t/Z</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Wald’s $\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender $\rightarrow$ Voter support</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.99</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age $\rightarrow$ Voter support</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-2.55</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race $\rightarrow$ Voter support</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political party $\rightarrow$ Voter support</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.86</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charisma $\rightarrow$ Admiration</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charisma $\rightarrow$ Contempt</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-3.25</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admiration $\rightarrow$ Voter support</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>12.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contempt $\rightarrow$ Voter support</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charisma $\rightarrow$ Admiration $\rightarrow$ Voter support</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>29.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charisma $\rightarrow$ Contempt $\rightarrow$ Voter support</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>29.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $n = 122$. We report t-test for the relationships between charisma and admiration/contempt because they are both continuous variables and we report the Z-score for all other relationships because voter support is a dichotomous variable. *p < .05. **p < .01.
FIGURE 1
Final Model of the Charismatic Leadership – Emotion – Voting Behavior Relationship

Charismatic Leadership

Admiration

Contempt

Voting Behavior