UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

EXAMINING CHARISMA: THE INFLUENCE OF LEADER EMOTIONS AND CONTEXTUAL VARIABLES ON FOLLOWER PERCEPTIONS AND PERFORMANCE

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

DIVYA PATEL
Norman, Oklahoma
2020

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/326594

EXAMINING CHARISMA: THE INFLUENCE OF LEADER EMOTIONS AND CONTEXTUAL VARIABLES ON FOLLOWER PERCEPTIONS AND PERFORMANCE

A THESIS APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

BY THE COMMITTEE CONSISTING OF

Dr. Shane Connelly, Chair

Dr. Michael Mumford

Dr. Jorge Mendoza

© Copyright by DIVYA PATEL 2020
All Rights Reserved.

Acknowledgements

There are a number of people I would like to recognize for their contributions to this thesis. First and foremost, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Shane Connelly. Her guidance and mentorship throughout this project have been invaluable to my growth as a graduate student and researcher. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Michael Mumford and Dr. Jorge Mendoza for their time and providing recommendations to strengthen this research. Additionally, I would like to thank my colleague, Alexander Brunot, for his feedback and support throughout this project. I also appreciate the efforts of Zsofia Monjezi, Dani Neer, Claire Parker, and Charley Lewis for their help with data collection and coding for this project. Finally, I would like to thank my friends and family for their continuous support and encouragement throughout my time in graduate school.

Table of Contents

Abstract vi
Introduction 1
Charismatic Leadership and Discrete Emotions 5
Charismatic Leadership and Values 8
Charismatic Leadership and Organizational Climate 10
Method 11
Sample 11
Design and Procedure 11
Manipulations 13
Dependent Measures 14
Covariates and Demographics 16
Analyses 17
Results 18
Discussion 19
Summary of Hypothesis and Research Question Testing 19
Theoretical and Practical Implications 22
Limitations 25
Future Directions 25
Conclusions 26
References 28
Appendix A: Organizational Description 42
Appendix B: Organizational Climate Manipulation 43
Appendix C: Leader Displays of Emotion and Value Expression Manipulations in Vision Statement 44
Appendix D: Performance Task 52
Appendix E: Perceptions of Leader Charisma Scale 53
Appendix F: Leader Identification Scale 54

Abstract

Charisma has historically been poorly conceptualized in the literature, making it difficult to advance research in the charismatic leadership domain. In addition, charisma is typically associated with a leader's use of positive emotions when articulating a mission to mobilize followers towards a cause. Despite these findings, research on charisma has failed to consider a leader's use of negative emotion and other contextual variables. Such a narrow focus limits our understanding of how such factors influence perceptions of charisma and other relevant follower outcomes. Drawing on a new conceptualization of charisma proposed by Antonakis et al. (2016), the present effort investigates how a leader's display of emotion (compassion vs. anger), values expressed in a vision (benevolence vs. retribution), and organizational climate (cooperative vs. competitive) influence follower outcomes of state affect, perceptions of charisma, trust in leader, and performance. Findings reveal a differential impact of leader emotions on different outcomes, highlight the role of organizational climate for leader trust, and emphasize the importance of considering interactive effects for perceptions of charisma. Theoretical and practical implications, limitations, and future directions are discussed.

Keywords: charisma, charismatic leadership, leader emotion, values, organizational climate

Introduction

Martin Luther King Jr. and Adolf Hitler both possessed a unique quality that enabled them to rally their followers towards a cause they deemed worthwhile. While Martin Luther King Jr. relentlessly fought for equality and justice, Adolf Hitler was steadfast in promoting the opposite. Although these two leaders had a stark contrast in agendas, both continue to be considered highly influential and powerful figures. That is, both leaders skillfully used the quality of charisma to impact their followers towards fulfilling their vision. Martin Luther King Jr., a leader widely regarded as a positive and exceptional leader, employed charisma to gather a following to end racism in pursuit of bettering society. Adolf Hitler on the other hand, a leader typically characterized as a negative dictator, also utilized charisma to congregate followers to perpetuate racism and genocide. However, what exactly defines charisma remains an unanswered question. While many have attempted to study and delineate what differentiates charisma from other qualities leaders possess, various efforts have only led to increased confusion and the confounding of charisma with other leadership constructs.

Charisma has been a popular area of research since House (1977) initially introduced it. Broadly, the purpose of charisma is to mobilize followers towards a cause (Antonakis et al., 2016), but varying conceptualizations of charisma have been proposed in the literature throughout the years. House (1977, p. 192) defined charisma in terms of the outcomes it produces. After delineating the effects of charismatic leaders, he noted that charismatic leadership should be used to refer to any leader having the aforementioned "charismatic effects." While this conception certainly helps identify characteristics of charismatic leaders, it does not define charisma in its own right. Bass and Stogdill (1990, p. 220) state "a person of strong convictions, determined, self-confident, and emotionally expressive and his or her followers

must want to identify with the leader as a person, whether or not in a crisis," referring to antecedents of a charismatic leader. Davies (1954, p. 1083) vaguely defines charisma as a "gift, charm, or alchemic ability" or "miraculously-given power." Further, the issue of measurement persists. Charisma has commonly been measured by using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) created by Bass and Avolio (1996), a measure typically used to assess transformational leadership. Although charismatic components of idealized influence and inspirational motivation compromise transformational leadership (Bono & Ilies, 2006), the MLQ should not be used to assess charisma, as it measures charisma mostly in terms of outcomes or as an endogenous variable instead of as an independent variable (Antonakis, 2012; Antonakis & House, 2014; Shamir et al., 1998). This has also led to charisma being frequently confounded with transformational leadership. In summary, charisma has typically been defined by using exemplars, in terms of antecedents, or in terms of its outcomes and effects on followers (Antonakis et al. 2011; van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013; Sy et al., 2018), preventing fruitful empirical investigation.

To address these criticisms, Antonakis et al. (2016) proposed a new conceptualization of charisma and state that it is values-based, symbolic, and emotion-laden leader signaling. They posit that for the charismatic effect to occur, leaders must communicate values and the organization's mission in a way that appeals to followers, leading to an acceptance of the leader. The fact that signaling is values-based implies that the leader will be judged by their followers on the basis of the values and morals communicated. Leaders communicate about actions the collective should undertake by delineating beliefs and expectations and utilizing symbolic communication and displays of emotions in an appropriate manner (Antonakis et al., 2016). Metaphors are commonly used to communicate in a symbolic manner and previous literature

supports the use of them as a key indicator of charisma (Antonakis et al., 2011; Sy et al., 2018). The conceptualization proposed by Antonakis et al. (2016) is useful for advancing this area of research because it does not define charisma in terms of antecedents or outcomes, is free of endogeneity bias, and differentiates it from transformational leadership. More importantly, this definition affords the opportunity for charisma to be studied behaviorally and perceptually.

Due to the historically poor operationalizations of charisma, much remains to be examined. Following Antonakis et al.'s (2016) definition, Sy et al. (2018) present a number of avenues requiring empirical investigation that would serve to advance our understanding of charismatic leadership. Much of the research on charisma and emotion has focused on the leader's display of broad positive affect to influence followers (Cherulnik et al., 2001; Damen et al., 2008; Sy et al., 2013). Previous research has indicated leaders' positive emotions can lead to a number of employee and organizational outcomes such as motivation (Erez & Isen, 2002), creativity (George, 1991, 1995, 1996; Spector & Fox, 2002), task performance (see Ashby et al., 1999 for a review), and subjective well-being (Diener et al., 2003). However, much of the literature in this domain has failed to address the role of negative emotional displays in influencing followers. Specifically, there has been little attention given to charismatic leaders' use of emotions such as anger and disgust (Sy et al., 2018). Although charismatic leaders are typically viewed as displaying positive emotions to inspire and mobilize followers, negative emotions have been shown to elicit beneficial outcomes in certain contexts (Fischer and Roseman, 2007; Van Kleef et al., 2010; Johnson & Connelly, 2014). Research on leadership and emotions has suggested there is a degree of asymmetry present between the emotions experienced and the valence of outcomes. The experiencing of positive emotions does not necessarily lead to positive outcomes and likewise, negative emotions do not always result in

negative outcomes (Lindebaum & Jordan, 2014). Accordingly, more research is needed to gain a better understanding of how charismatic leaders' use of positive and negative emotions influence follower outcomes. Further, Sy et al. (2018) state investigating the relationship between specific emotions and followers' perceptions of charisma can contribute to a better understanding of charisma. Charisma is likely to have the most influence on followers, and studying the relationship between a leader's discrete emotions and follower perceptions provides a unique opportunity to examine how emotions foster perceptions of charisma and influence other relevant outcomes such as follower state affect, trust in leader, and follower performance.

To date, existing research on charismatic leadership also lacks a focus on the role of contextual variables. Values expressed by a leader may impact the extent to which followers perceive the leader as being charismatic, and negative emotions may specifically exert an influence depending on the values the leader appeals to. Antonakis et al. (2016) emphasizes the importance for the leader's display of emotion to be properly calibrated and also states a leader will be judged on the basis of values communicated. If a leader fails to appropriately calibrate his or her emotion when communicating value expressions, the charismatic effect may fail to occur. Thus, it is important to study the relationship between leader discrete emotions and value expressions to better understand how they exert influence on followers. Sy et al. (2018) also suggest the need to study the relationship between charisma and the leadership context. Charismatic leadership does not occur in a vacuum. In fact, extensive research indicates that charismatic leaders are more likely to emerge in situations characterized by high levels of stress and turbulence (Bligh et al., 2004; Shamir & Howell, 1999). Organizational climate is an aspect of the leadership context that would be valuable to examine. An organization's climate may

influence how the leader's emotional displays and value expressions are perceived by followers and thereby impact perceptions of charisma and other follower outcomes.

A deeper understanding of the relationship between leader charisma and contextual factors can be gained by examining the interactive effects of leader discrete emotions, value expressions, and organizational climate on follower perceptions and performance. One way to examine this relationship is through employing vision statements, which have previously been shown to exert effects on followers. A study done by Waples and Connelly (2008) successfully used vision statements to examine the influence of discrete leader emotions differing in valence and capacity to activate behavioral responses on follower commitment to the leader's expressed vision. A leader's vision provides followers with an expectation of the future, serving to create meaning and purpose for its organizational members. The vision is a reflection of the leader's and followers' shared values and equips members with a certain caliber of excellence for which to strive towards (Conger & Kanugo, 1987; House, 1977; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; Nanus, 1995). Specifically, previous research indicates that leaders who articulate visions containing symbolism and imagery (Emrich et al., 2001) are viewed as being charismatic. Accordingly, the purpose of this study is to examine positive and negative leader displays of emotion (compassion vs. anger), values expressed in a leader vision (benevolence vs. retribution), and the role of organizational climate (cooperative vs. competitive) on outcomes of follower affect, perceptions of charisma, trust in leader, and performance on a vision-relevant task.

Charismatic Leadership and Discrete Emotions

There is evidence to suggest that charismatic leaders appeal to emotions aside from awe and admiration (Sy et al., 2018). For example, Malcolm X frequently evoked anger as a means to further his vision (Wasielewski, 1985). Widely regarded as a charismatic leader, Steve Jobs was

known for shaming employees when performance did not meet expectations. There is some indication that alternating between shame and praise increased employee performance (Isaacson, 2011). As suggested by these examples, negative emotions can play an important role in the leadership influence process. Leaders perceived to be the most positive or charismatic have used negative emotions during times of threat and retaliation to energize followers (Bono & Ilies, 2006). Prior research indicates that due to the nature of negative emotions, they tend to not only have a stronger effect, but also a longer lasting effect than one created by positive emotions (Baumeister et al., 2001; Miner et al., 2005; Taylor, 1991). Findings by Bucy (2002) suggest that compared to positive emotional displays, leaders that displayed negative emotions are perceived as being more honest, credible, and trustworthy. Similarly, leaders who express anger are not only given more latitude at times (Gibson & Schroeder, 2002), but followers may also perceive these displays of anger as being associated with higher status, power, and competence (Tiedens, 2001). However, it is important to emphasize that in order for displays of anger to be effective, it should be directed towards the outgroup instead of the followers, and findings from Waples and Connelly (2008) support this idea. When the leader expressed negative emotions towards the outgroup, followers' perceptions of transformational leadership and trust in leader were higher, presumably because the negative emotion is perceived to be less threatening to followers when not directed towards the ingroup.

Although these examples delineate circumstances in which displays of anger may be beneficial, it is important to address the drawbacks of anger. Johnson & Connelly (2014) found that anger did not contribute to positive outcomes in the context of informal feedback. In their study on displays of disappointment and anger on informal feedback, a display of anger by the feedback provider was met with reciprocal anger from the recipient, indicating potential negative

interpersonal and organizational consequences. Findings such as these suggest that negative displays of emotion may be harmful when the followers perceive the emotional display to be demotivating. The mixed findings on negative emotional displays lend support to a greater need for research on the topic to gain a better understanding of how positive and negative emotional displays differentially impact followers, particularly with respect to perceptions of charisma.

The emotions as social information model (EASI; Van Keelf, 2009) provides a good framework for understanding how a leader's display of emotion can impact follower behavior. The central assumption of the EASI model posits that emotional expressions provide information to observers, which can in turn impact their behavior (Van Kleef, 2009). More specifically, observers' behavior may be influenced by two processes, inferential processes and affective reactions. The inferential processes pathway suggests that observers can infer relevant information about others' attitudes, feelings, behavioral intentions, and relational orientation based on their emotional expressions, which subsequently influence their own behavior (Keltner & Haidt, 1999). In contrast, emotional displays may elicit affective reactions in observers, thereby influencing their behavior. There are two types of affective reactions. First, emotions may simply spread to the observer vis-à-vis emotional-contagion processes. Secondly, emotional expressions may influence impressions and interpersonal liking (Van Kleef, 2009). Of the two ways emotional expressions can influence observer behavior, the emotional contagion pathway is of particular interest, as it elicits a direct emotional response in followers. Hatfield et al. (1994) suggest that emotional contagion typically occurs because people tend to mimic the facial expressions, movements, and postures of individuals they interact with. According to Connelly et al. (2002), emotional contagion from leaders to followers should be strong, as leaders are salient and influential organizational members. Fredrickson (2003) further lends support to this idea in

stating that positive emotions expressed by leaders may be particularly contagious due to the leader assuming a position of authority within the organization. Emotional contagion is also of particular interest to the present effort, as previous literature has associated it with charismatic leadership. Results from studies conducted by Bono & Ilies (2006) and Sy et al. (2013) indicate that emotional contagion is a mechanism by which charismatic leaders exert influence on followers. Evidenced by the literature reviewed, a substantial body of research indicates followers may assume their leader's emotions, as they can be susceptible to affect. As compassion and anger are two common discrete emotions that can influence followers' perceptions and outcomes in organizations (e.g., Kanov et al., 2004; Lindebaum & Fielden, 2011), it was determined they would be appropriate emotions to examine for the purposes of this study. Accordingly, we propose our first set of hypotheses:

H1A: *Compassion will elicit positive affect in followers.*

H1B: *Anger will elicit negative affect in followers.*

Charismatic Leadership and Values

Charismatic leaders use values-based signaling to exert influence on their followers (Antonakis et al., 2016). Within the framework of charismatic leadership, values have traditionally been studied as values congruence or shared values between leader and followers (Brown & Treviño, 2009). Antonakis et al. (2016) pose that leaders have to be accepted by their followers to be viewed as being charismatic and for followers to voluntarily yield to their leader. This acceptance is fostered by communicating values and a mission that appeals to followers. In point of fact, the communication of values in delivering an organization's mission plays an important role in justifying the mission itself, as it helps leaders express their vision in a way that differentiates right versus wrong. To extend on this idea, Sy et al. (2018) posit that values may

serve as a source of emotional motivation aside from aiding to justify the mission. Research has shown that followers not only react emotionally to value-laden stimuli, but that this in fact occurs prior to individuals cognitively rationalizing messages (Haidt, 2001). This seems logical considering values are inextricably linked to affect (Schwartz, 2012). In using values to justify their mission and appeal to values, leaders may create an affective channel that encourages followers to justify the vision themselves (Sy et al., 2018), potentially leading to an increase in followers' willingness to pursue their leader's vision and resulting in better perceptions of charisma, trust in leader, and follower performance.

With respect to the relationship between emotions and values, Michie and Gooty (2005) suggest that a specific emotion may interact with a specific value to produce a particular behavior. For example, an emotion of interest may interact with the value of broadmindedness to result in a behavior such as treating others as equal. The discrete emotion of compassion has predominantly been associated with the action tendency of helping and comforting behavior (Batson & Shaw, 1991; Goetz et al., 2010; Stellar et al., 2015), suggesting values of benevolence. In contrast, anger has typically been associated with the action tendency of seeking revenge on behalf of self or other (Rozin et al., 1999; Matsumoto et al., 2014), implying values of retribution. Therefore, values of benevolence and retribution consistent with leader display of compassion and anger may produce different outcomes in terms of follower perceptions and performance than when such values are inconsistent with leader display of emotion. Accordingly, to investigate the main and interactive effects of emotional displays and value expressions, we propose:

RQ1: *How will leader emotional displays and corresponding value expressions affect followers' perceptions of charisma, trust in leader, and follower performance?*

Charismatic Leadership and Organizational Climate

Organizational climate is defined as the shared perceptions of and the meaning attached to organizational policies, practices, and procedures that employees experience and the behaviors employees observe getting rewarded that are expected (Ostroff et al, 2003; Schneider & Reichers, 1983; Schneider et al., 2011). Prior research has shown that the strength of organizational climate is correlated with a leader's communication and sharing of a clear vision (Schneider et al., 2013), but much of this literature fails to specifically address the relationship between organizational climate and charisma. Inherent to the Elicit-Channel (EC) model is the idea that leader-follower relationships are contextual, meaning aspects of the context can impact charismatic leader behaviors and subsequent follower reactions (Sy et al., 2018). In support of this idea, the authors suggest that followers' responses to a leader's elicitation of behaviors may be contingent upon the context. During times of organizational distress or when there is no clear course of action, charismatic leaders are more likely to prevail, as followers turn to their leader to interpret the crisis and offer credible strategies for successfully coping and navigating through the situation. Therefore, it is reasonable to suggest that the climate can influence trust in leader and follower performance, but to which degree and under which circumstances remains unclear. In a similar vein, much of this literature fails to examine the idea of leader displays of emotions and values being embedded within a larger context and how the organization's climate may influence how emotions and values are perceived by followers, influencing relevant follower outcomes.

Schneider et al. (2013) state climate researchers have neglected to examine the role of values and basic assumptions, viewing them as too "soft." However, doing so can assist in understanding the integration of various factors across climate. Other researchers have echoed

these sentiments and believe a closer examination of the role of an organization's context may contribute to a more holistic understanding of how different factors interact to produce particular outcomes within an organization (Cappelli & Sherer, 1991; Johns, 2006; Rousseau & Fried, 2001). Michie & Gooty (2005) lend support in stating the need for future research to investigate contextual variables that could influence the interactive effects of values and emotions on leader behavior, but it is possible that these interactive effects may influence follower behavior as well. In an attempt to address these gaps in the literature, we propose the following:

RQ2: *How will leader emotional displays and a corresponding organizational climate affect followers' perceptions of charisma, trust in leader, and follower performance?*

RQ3: *How will value expressions and a corresponding organizational climate affect followers' perceptions of charisma, trust in leader, and follower performance?*

Method

Sample

This study used a sample of 238 undergraduate students (166 females, 71 males, and 1 other) from a large southwestern university. Participants were predominantly white (68.5%), and ages of these participants ranged from 18 to 25 (M = 18.69, SD = .97). Participants were recruited by using SONA, the university's online participant recruitment system and were given course credit to fulfill an educational requirement. Participants were randomly assigned into experimental conditions and completed the study using Qualtrics.

Design and Procedure

A 2 x 2 x 2 between subjects design was used to manipulate leader displays of emotion (compassion vs. anger), values corresponding with leader emotional displays of emotion (benevolence vs. retribution), and organizational climate (cooperative vs. competitive) in an

organizational vignette (Aguinis & Bradley, 2014) where participants were randomly assigned to one of nine experimental conditions. Dependent variables of interest included state affect, followers' perceptions of charisma, trust in leader, and follower performance on a vision-relevant task.

Each session began by participants reading and signing the informed consent form and completing a battery of covariate questionnaires assessing trait affect and personality. This was followed by presenting the participants with the organizational description providing a brief overview of the company's background and purpose as well as its recent breakthrough in an artificial intelligence (AI) technology. Following the organizational description, participants were given a climate description detailing the organization as either having a cooperative or a competitive climate. Participants then received the vision statement, which consisted of the CEO emphasizing the importance of the latest breakthrough in AI technology and the need to outperform the company's competitors to fulfill its mission in bringing knowledge and technological capabilities to underserved populations. The content of the statement was identical across conditions except for the manipulated information of leader displays of emotion and value expressions. After the participants read the vision statement, state affect, followers' perceptions of charisma, and trust in leader were measured. Participants were then asked to assume the described role and complete a performance task that required creating a marketing campaign advertising the company's new AI technology. It was emphasized that the success of this marketing campaign was integral to fulfilling the company's mission. A final battery of covariate questionnaires assessing leader identification, susceptibility to affect, participants' values, and demographics was completed. To conclude, participants completed a manipulation check questionnaire and were debriefed. Each session lasted for approximately one hour. For the

organizational description, climate manipulations, vision statements containing leader emotion and value expression manipulations, and a description of the marketing task, see Appendix A, B, C, and D, respectively.

Manipulations

Leader displays of emotion. Leader displays of compassion and anger were manipulated both verbally and nonverbally throughout the vision statement. In line with Antonakis et al.'s (2016) conception of charisma, emotion manipulations took the form of explicit and symbolic expressions, as charismatic leaders are known to use emotion-laden and symbolic leader signaling to exert influence on followers. It is important to note that when the leader displayed anger, it was directed towards the outgroup (i.e., the competitors) instead of the followers.

Value expressions. Values of benevolence and retribution were manipulated to either be consistent or inconsistent with the leader's display of emotion throughout the vision statement. In the emotion-values consistent conditions, the leader's display of compassion was coupled with the value of benevolence, and the leader's display of anger was coupled with the value of retribution. In the emotion-values inconsistent conditions, the leader's display of compassion was coupled with the value of retribution, and the leader's display of anger was coupled with the value of benevolence.

Organizational climate. The organization's climate was manipulated to be either cooperative or competitive in the organizational climate description presented to participants prior to receiving the vision statement. The cooperative climate condition illustrated the participant being part of a work unit in which he or she could rely on other people in the division for support and guidance and one in which rewards for success are distributed equally. In contrast, the competitive climate condition detailed the participant being part of a work unit in

which the director promotes internal competition among team members and one in which rewards are given on an individual basis. Previous studies have used similar psychological climate manipulations (e.g., Peacock, 2012).

Dependent Measures

State affect. State affect was measured using Watson et al.'s (1988) Positive and Negative Affect Scale (PANAS). This scale consists of a total of 20 emotions, and participants rated the extent to which they felt each emotion at the present moment on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very slightly or not at all) to 5 (extremely). Reliability for this scale was $\alpha = .94$ for positive affectivity and $\alpha = .85$ for negative affectivity. Sample emotion items from the scale include: "disinterested" and "enthusiastic."

Perceptions of leader trust. Perceptions of leader trust were measured using Robinson and Rousseau's (1994) Leader Trust Scale. The scale has a total of seven items, and participants rated each item on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Reliability for this measure was $\alpha = 0.82$. Sample items from the scale include: "My employer is open and upfront with me" and "I believe my employer has high integrity."

Follower performance. The performance task required participants create a marketing campaign based on the organization's needs addressed in the vision statement. Performance on the marketing task was rated using a 5-point benchmark rating scale procedure used in previous studies (Osburn & Mumford, 2006; Connelly & Ruark, 2010). Low- and high-quality responses were selected from participant data for each scale to create final benchmarks. Three undergraduate students were trained on rating procedures and rated task performance for this effort. Participants' marketing plans were rated for quality, originality, and elegance. The interrater reliabilities (r^*_{wg}) for ratings ranged from .85 to .88. The correlations among the

dimensions were as follow: quality and originality (r = .82), quality and elegance (r = .86), and originality and elegance (r = .77). Given the high intercorrelations among the three dimensions, these scales were averaged to generate an overall performance score.

Perceptions of leader charisma. Perceptions of leader charisma were measured using a 3-facet Perceptions of Leader Charisma Scale designed for the purposes of this study. Twenty-nine items were generated on the basis of Antonakis et al.'s (2016) conceptualization of charisma and were reviewed by experts prior to finalizing the initial scale. The scale contains three subscales, with each scale tapping into value-based leader signaling, symbolic leader signaling, and emotion-laden leader signaling. Participants rated items for how well each item described their leader on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not representative of the leader at all) to 7 (perfect representation of my leader). Six items from the symbolic leader signaling subscale and three items from the emotion-laden leader signaling subscale were removed based on content evaluations and low reliability with other items in each subscale. A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted to confirm the factor structure and examine model fit. Results from the CFA suggested adequate model fit, $\chi^2(167) = 367.30$, $p < .01$, RMSEA (90% CI) = .07 (.06 - .08), CFI = .88, TLI = .86, and SRMR = .08. Reliability for this scale was α = .82 for values-based leader signaling, α = .84 for emotion-laden leader signaling, and α = .76 for symbolic leader signaling. Sample items from the values-based and emotion-laden subscales include: "The leader communicates very strong values" and "The leader is not afraid to show emotions," respectively. For a full listing of the items used to assess perceptions of leader charisma, see Appendix E. Correlations of the perceptions of charisma subscales display initial patterns of validity in their relationships with the charismatic components of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). Correlations of MLQ with the subscales of the perceptions of leader

charisma scale were as follow: values-based leader signaling (r = .75), symbolic leader signaling (r = .40), and emotion-laden leader signaling (r = .52). All correlations were significant at the p < .01 level.

Covariates and Demographics

A number of follower attributes were expected to impact state affect, perceptions of charisma, trust in leader, and follower performance and thus were taken in consideration. Covariates included the big five personality inventory (extraversion α = .89, agreeableness α = .78, conscientiousness α = .73, neuroticism α = .83, openness α = .76; John & Sirvastava, 1990), trait positive and negative affectivity (PA α = .90, NA α = .85; Watson et al., 1988), the emotional contagion scale (α = .82; Doherty, 1997), Schwartz value survey (conformity α = .70, tradition α = .65, benevolence α = .72, universalism α = .83, self-direction α = .65, stimulation α = .71, hedonism α = .62, achievement α = .77, power α = .71, security α = .55; Schwartz, 1992), and leader identification (α = .95). A scale measuring leader identification informed by Marstand et al.'s (2018) measure was created for the purposes of this study. One item was removed from the scale on the basis of demonstrating low reliability with the remaining items. A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted to confirm the factor structure and examine model fit. Results from the CFA suggest good model, $\chi^2(14) = 58.64$, $p < .01$, RMSEA (90% CI) = .12 (.09 - .15), CFI = .97, TLI = .95, and SRMR = .03. For a full listing of the items used to assess leader identification, see Appendix F. In addition to covariate measures, participants provided demographic information relating to age, gender, ethnicity, English proficiency, major, year in college, number of psychology courses taken, prior work experience, prior leadership and marketing experience, GPA, and hypothesis guessing.

Analyses

Hypothesis testing was conducted using analysis of variance (ANOVA) and analysis of covariance (ANCOVA). Main and interactive effects of emotion, values, and climate were tested for each dependent variable of interest. Correlations were used to determine the set of covariates that would be influential to the analyses. The analyses were first performed with the entire set of covariates. Only significant covariates were retained. Table 1 displays the correlations and descriptive statistics among the covariate and dependent measures.

Manipulation checks. Participants completed manipulation checks to assess the extent to which participants perceived each manipulation by rating each item on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) and 5 (strongly agree). Manipulation checks were tested using independent samples *t*-tests. Overall, the effects of the manipulation for leader displays of emotion were successful. Participants in the compassion condition reported perceiving significantly more compassion ($M = 3.89$, $SD = .91$, $p = .00$) than participants in the anger condition ($M = 3.13$, $SD = 1.00$). Similarly, participants in the anger condition reported perceiving significantly more anger ($M = 3.60$, $SD = 1.06$, $p = .00$) than participants in the compassion condition ($M = 2.33$, $SD = 1.11$). In terms of the manipulation of values expressed in a leader's vision, participants in the retribution-present condition reported perceiving significantly more retribution ($M = 3.80$, $SD = 1.00$, $p = .00$) than participants in the retribution-absent condition ($M = 3.16$, $SD = 1.07$). Lastly, with respect to the psychological climate manipulation, participants in the competitive condition reported perceiving a significantly more competitive climate ($M = 4.44$, $SD = .81$, $p = .00$) than participants in the non-competitive condition ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.09$).

Results

State affect. The guidelines for effect sizes proposed by Cohen (1988) suggest that partial eta squared values of .01, .06, and .14 are indicative of small, medium, and large effects, respectively. Using these guidelines, we found a small effect size of emotion on negative state affect $F(1, 171) = 6.05$, $p = .02$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$, such that anger ($M = 17.92$, $SE = .64$) elicited more negative affect in followers compared to compassion ($M = 15.60$, $SE = .66$). However, results from the ANCOVA also indicated a significant violation of the homogeneity assumption (Levene's test $p < .01$). To address this violation, the Brown-Forsythe ANOVA test was used. Consistent with the findings from the ANCOVA, the Brown-Forsythe ANOVA displayed a significant effect of emotion on negative state affect $F(1, 201.86) = 7.67$, $p = .01$. There was no significant effect of emotion on positive state affect. See Table 2.

Trust in leader. Results from the ANCOVA demonstrated a small effect size of climate on perceptions of leader trust ($F(1, 165) = 4.78$, $p = .03$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$, such that a cooperative climate ($M = 26.75$, $SE = .33$) elicited higher perceptions of leader trust than a competitive climate ($M = 25.71$, $SE = .34$). See Table 3.

Follower performance. Results from the ANCOVA demonstrated a small effect size of emotion on follower performance $F(1, 203) = 5.36$, $p = .02$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$, such that a leader's display of compassion ($M = 2.79$, $SE = .08$) resulted in better follower performance than anger ($M = 2.54$, $SE = .08$). See Table 3.

Perceptions of charisma. Findings from the ANCOVA indicated a small effect size of emotion on perceptions of charisma for emotion-laden leader signaling $F(1, 163) = 6.64$, $p = .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$. Anger ($M = 5.98$, $SE = .09$) led to greater perceptions of charisma than compassion ($M = 5.64$, $SE = .09$). Additionally, there was a significant interaction of emotion and values on

perceptions of charisma for symbolic leader signaling $F(1, 164) = 8.36$, $p = .00$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$, such that when the leader display of anger was coupled with expressing the value of benevolence in the leader's vision ($M = 4.22$, $SE = .17$), followers perceived greater charisma compared to when anger was paired with the value of retribution ($M = 3.61$, $SE = .17$). Similarly, when the leader display of compassion was coupled with the value of retribution in the leader's vision ($M = 4.20$, $SE = .17$), followers perceived greater charisma compared to when compassion was paired with the value of benevolence ($M = 3.81$, $SE = .18$). Lastly, there was a significant interaction of emotion and climate on perceptions of charisma for values-based leader signaling $F(1, 202) = 3.78$, $p = .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$. When the leader display of anger was coupled with a competitive climate ($M = 5.68$, $SE = .10$), followers perceived greater charisma compared to when anger was coupled with a cooperative climate ($M = 5.48$, $SE = .10$). Similarly, when the leader display of compassion was coupled with a cooperative climate ($M = 5.59$, $SE = .10$), followers perceived greater charisma compared to when compassion was coupled with a competitive climate ($M = 5.41$, $SE = .10$). See Table 4.

Discussion

Little is known about how a charismatic leader's display of emotion, particularly a negative emotion, can impact important outcomes such as state affect, followers' perceptions of charisma, trust in leader, and follower performance. Further, little research has examined how contextual factors may impact such outcomes. The present effort sought to address these gaps, and findings from this effort make a number of theoretical and practical implications.

Summary of Hypothesis and Research Question Testing

Hypothesis 1b, which suggested that anger will elicit negative affect in followers was supported. Leader's display of anger did in fact elicit more negative affect in followers.

Hypothesis 1a, which suggested that compassion will elicit positive affect in followers was not supported. A plausible explanation for this finding is that negative emotions such as anger are more salient and therefore their effects persist for a longer period of time compared to positive emotions (Baumeister et al., 2001; Miner et al., 2005). Additionally, because charismatic leaders are typically known to use positive affect to influence followers (e.g., Cherulnik et al., 2001), followers may inherently expect their leader to display a positive emotion and therefore may not be particularly influenced by the positive emotional display.

Research questions 1-3 were regarding the main and interactive effects of leader displays of emotions, values expressed in a leader's vision, and organizational climate on follower outcomes of perceptions of charisma, trust in leader, and follower performance. There was a main effect of climate on trust in leader, such that a cooperative climate elicited greater perceptions of leader trust, and this is consistent with prior research. A positive climate typically fares better for organizational outcomes. Work units characterized by high interdependence and communication as well as having a leader that shares a clear strategic vision will have a stronger climate (Schneider et al., 2013), thereby setting the foundation for better organizational outcomes. A leader's vision may also be more salient in a cooperative climate as opposed to a competitive climate, contributing to higher perceptions of leader trust amongst followers. Additionally, there was a main effect of emotion on follower performance, such that compassion elicited better performance than anger on the marketing task. This is consistent with existing literature stating positive affect can impact follower motivation and effort (Bono & Ilies, 2006; Kanfer & Ackerman, 1989). In addition, Isen and colleagues have demonstrated a relationship between positive affect and task performance, particularly with respect to creative tasks (see Isen, 2004 for a review).

A main effect of emotion on perceptions of charisma was found, specifically that a leader's display of anger led to higher perceptions of charisma vis-à-vis emotion-laden leader signaling. Anger is more salient and thus readily perceived by followers. On the other hand, compassion can be more challenging to identify as an emotion. Recall the leader's display of anger in the vision statement was directed towards the outgroup (i.e., competitor). Because negative emotions have been shown to make the leader appear more credible (Bucy, 2002) and competent (Tiedens, 2001), when the leader's display of anger is towards the outgroup, followers are more likely to perceive the leader as being competent and charismatic.

In terms of interaction effects, there was a significant emotion and values interaction on perceptions of charisma for symbolic leader signaling. When the leader's display of emotion was inconsistent with the value expressed in the vision, followers perceived greater charisma. Charismatic leaders have been shown to employ symbolism through metaphors (Antonakis et al., 2016; Sy et al., 2018). Metaphors are systematic and frequently grounded in visceral, embodied, experience, and they enable individuals to use what they know about their physical and social experiences to make sense of other things. As such, metaphors can influence people's actions and perceptions (Lakoff & Johnson, 2008; Sy et al., 2018). Although the leader displayed anger, expressing the value of benevolence simultaneously served to not only soften the impact of anger, but also make the anger appear justifiable. Similarly, when the leader displayed compassion and expressed the value of retribution, the positive emotion of compassion appears to partially compensate for the retributive value present in their vision. The inconsistency between emotion and values can create dissonance for followers, which subsequently requires more depth of processing. This is consistent with findings from a study conducted by Torrence (2019), which suggested that a leader's display of mixed emotions contributed to increased depth

of processing among followers. Taken these findings together, is reasonable to assert that having the inconsistency between emotions and values leads to an increase in processing, which makes the leader's symbolic leader signaling more salient. In other words, the inconsistency facilitates greater recognition of the use of symbolism and metaphors in communication, contributing to better perceptions of charisma. Lastly, there was a significant interaction of emotion and climate on perceptions of charisma for values-based leader signaling. When the leader's display of emotion was consistent with the organizational climate (i.e., compassion in a cooperative climate or anger in a competitive climate), followers perceived greater charisma specifically in terms of values-based leader signaling. Recall values-based leader signaling serves to justify the leader's mission through communicating a vision in such a way that distinguishes right from wrong (Antonakis et al., 2016). These findings then suggest that the consistency between leader's display of emotion and organizational climate helps legitimize and reinforce the leader's vision, leading to higher perceptions of charisma.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

Findings from this effort provide validation evidence for tenets of Antonakis et al.'s (2016) framework of charismatic leadership. First, results reveal support for the three distinct dimensions comprising charismatic leadership. This suggest that if leaders wish to improve perceptions of charisma, they do not necessarily have to engage in all three types of leader signaling. For example, utilizing emotion-laden leader signaling on its own may serve to improve perceptions of charisma. These findings also lend support for future charismatic leadership research to operate from this new conceptualization of charisma.

Secondly, findings suggest the nature of the emotion displayed by the leader matters, and it appears to matter differentially according to outcomes of interest. Results indicate leader

displays of positive emotion can be helpful in improving follower performance. If the leader's goal is to improve performance, the leader may fare better by expressing positive displays of emotions, as negative leader displays can be demotivating at times (Johnson & Connelly, 2014) and subsequently detract from performance. Further, because no tangible reward or promotion for good performance was described in the performance task, these findings indicate that followers may be inclined to perform better when the leader displays positive emotions in the absence of explicit rewards. A leader's emotional display may not influence all aspects of perceived charisma, but findings from the present effort reveal a leader's display of negative emotion can be helpful in increasing the emotion-laden leader signaling facet of charisma under certain circumstances. Once again, it is important to take the target of the leader's negative emotion into consideration. Similar to how anger can have a demotivating effect on performance, if anger is directed towards the ingroup (i.e., followers), it may decrease perceptions of charisma. In contrast, when directed towards the outgroup, the negative emotion serves to reinforce the leader's credibility and competence and thereby increase perceptions of charisma. Although there is a tendency to associate anger with negative outcomes in the leadership literature, a leader's display of anger is not inherently "good" nor "bad" or universally "positive" or "negative." The outcomes of displaying anger are contingent on various factors such as the circumstances that elicited the anger response, the various people involved, and the direction of the anger (Solomon, 1993).

Third, findings suggest it is important to consider contextual factors influencing perceptions of charismatic leadership and follower responses to these leaders. Organizational climate influences perceptions of a charismatic leader's trust, such that a cooperative climate elicits higher perceptions of trust than a competitive climate. Keeping this in mind, leaders

should seek to foster and reinforce a strong positive and collaborative climate among followers. Charismatic leaders are known to mobilize followers towards achieving a cause by articulating a vision, and a cooperative climate may make this vision appear more salient and thus increase buy-in from followers, leading to better perceptions of leader trust.

Lastly, this effort equips researchers and practitioners alike with a better understanding on how the interactive effects among leader emotions, value expressions, and organizational climate influence followers' perceptions of charisma. Although previous research has shown the congruence between a leader's verbal message and facial expression of emotion producing better perceptions of leader-member relationships (Newcombe & Ashkanasy, 2002), our findings suggest the opposite with respect to congruence. Specifically, in terms of symbolic leader signaling, followers perceived greater charisma when the leader's display of emotion was inconsistent with the value expressed in their vision, suggesting the target of the emotion and values appear to play a key role. If a leader displaying a negative emotion towards the outgroup simultaneously expresses a positive or helping value, through increased processing, followers are likely to recognize the symbolic leader signaling and increase their perceptions of charisma. With respect to the interactive effects of emotion and climate, followers perceived greater charisma vis-à-vis values-based leader signaling when the leader's display of emotion was consistent with the organizational climate. This suggests that in order for the values-based leader signaling to be effective in eliciting perceptions of charisma, the type of emotion being displayed by the leader should be consistent with the organization's climate. An inconsistency between the two could hinder the leader's efforts of using values-based leader signaling to justify the mission or vision and ultimately decrease perceptions of charisma.

Limitations

Despite the utility of these findings, a few limitations should be addressed. First, this study took place in a laboratory setting in which participants responded to a fictional leadership scenario. This study also utilized a low-fidelity simulation, which is inherently less salient than real organizational situations. The use of a fictional leader may have presented participants with a "weak" situation (Mischel, 1977), which may limit the effects of leader's emotion and value expressions, potentially limiting the generalizability of results. It is also difficult to evaluate how various other factors operating in the organization may influence individuals' reactions and outcomes in response to their leader's emotional display. However, low fidelity situations have been successfully employed in other studies and exerted effects (Waples & Connelly, 2008; Connelly & Ruark, 2010). Secondly, manipulations were presented in a fixed order. Although it was necessary to keep them consistent to have control over the experiment, it prevents us from studying different effects that might be observed if the order of the manipulations were rearranged. For example, organizational climate may have a different impact on perceptions of leader trust if presented after the vision statement instead of prior to it. Lastly, to our knowledge, this is one of the first efforts of creating a scale to measure leader charisma operating from Antonakis et al.'s (2016) definition of charisma. Although caution was exercised in the development of the measure and initial validity evidence is presented, further validation efforts should follow.

Future Directions

Future research should attempt to replicate findings from this study using an organizational sample. Additionally, this study only manipulated one positive and one negative leader emotion. Future efforts can investigate the effects of other negative emotions (e.g.,

disgust) and value expressions on perceptions of charisma. Very little research to date examines a charismatic leader's negative emotional display (Sy et al., 2018) and understanding the effects of various discrete negative emotions on important organizational outcomes will make meaningful contributions to the charismatic leadership literature. It would also be valuable for researchers to develop and test a process model to understand if charisma is best viewed as a mediator or outcome. For example, it would be interesting to examine if perceptions of charisma mediate the relationship between leader emotional displays and follower trust in leader or follower performance. Findings from this study revealed that leaders do not necessarily have to engage in all three types of leader signaling (i.e., values-based, symbolic, and emotion-laden) to be perceived as charismatic. This presents an interesting avenue for future research to examine the frequency at which leaders have to engage in various types of leader signaling to maintain their reputation as a charismatic leader. Leaders may not need to continuously engage in leader signaling for followers to perceive charisma and understanding when and how often a leader should engage in leader signaling can have important practical implications. Lastly, using Antonakis et al.'s (2016) conceptualization of charisma, future research should investigate the relationships between perceptions of charisma and various other organizational outcomes (e.g., organizational commitment).

Conclusions

The present effort provides valuable insight about previously understudied facets of charismatic leadership and their relationships with a number of important organizational outcomes. Charismatic leadership does not occur in a vacuum and therefore a leader's discrete emotions and contextual variables such as value expressions and organizational climate should be taken into consideration. Specifically, our findings indicate an interaction between emotion

and values, such that followers perceive greater charisma vis-à-vis symbolic leader signaling when the leader's emotion is inconsistent with the value expressed. Followers also perceived greater charisma when the leader's emotion was consistent with the organizational climate with regard to values-based leader signaling. Further, this effort responds to calls to study the role of negative emotional leader displays in influencing followers (Sy et al., 2018). Findings from the effort suggest a leader's display of anger may elicit negative affect in followers as well as increase perceptions of charisma vis-à-vis emotion-laden leader signaling when followers are not the target of the leader's anger. In contrast, compassion was found to influence follower performance. Lastly, a cooperative climate increased trust in leader. In conclusion, this research equips researchers and practitioners with a better understanding of how leader discrete emotions, value expressions, and organizational climate influence various follower outcomes and provides avenues to consider for future research directions in pursuit of advancing charismatic leadership literature.

References

Aguinis, H., & Bradley, K. J. (2014). Best practice recommendations for designing and implementing experimental vignette methodology studies. *Organizational Research Methods*, *17*(4), 351-371.

Antonakis, J. (2012). Transformational and charismatic leadership. In *The nature of leadership*, ed. DV. Day, & J. Antonakis, pp. 256–88. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Antonakis, J., Bastardoz, N., Jacquart, P., & Shamir, B. (2016). Charisma: An ill-defined and ill-measured gift. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *3*, 293-319.

Antonakis, J., & House, R. J. (2014). Instrumental leadership: Measurement and extension of transformational–transactional leadership theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *25*(4), 746-771.

Antonakis, J., Fenley, M., & Liechti, S. (2011). Can charisma be taught? Tests of two interventions. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *10*(3), 374-396.

Ashby, F. G., & Isen, A. M. (1999). A neuropsychological theory of positive affect and its influence on cognition. *Psychological Review*, *106*(3), 529.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1996). Multifactor leadership questionnaire. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*.

Bass, B. M., & Stogdill, R. M. (1990). *Bass & Stodgill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research & managerial applications*. New York: Free Press.

Batson, C. D., & Shaw, L. L. (1991). Evidence for altruism: Toward a pluralism of prosocial motives. *Psychological Inquiry*, *2*(2), 107–122.

Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Finkenauer, C., & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Bad is stronger than good. *Review of General Psychology*, *5*(4), 323-370.

Bligh, M. C., Kohles, J. C., & Meindl, J. R. (2004). Charisma under crisis: Presidential leadership, rhetoric, and media responses before and after the September 11th terrorist attacks. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*(2), 211-239.

Bono, J. E., & Ilies, R. (2006). Charisma, positive emotions and mood contagion. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*(4), 317-334.

Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2009). Leader–follower values congruence: Are socialized charismatic leaders better able to achieve it?. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(2), 478.

Bucy, E. P. (2000). Emotional and evaluative consequences of inappropriate leader displays. *Communication Research, 27*(2), 194−226.

Cappelli, P., & Sherer, P. D. (1991). The missing role of context in OB: The need for a meso-level approach. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 13*, 55–110.

Cherulnik, P. D., Donley, K. A., Wiewel, T. S. R., & Miller, S. R. (2001). Charisma is contagious: The effect of leaders' charisma on observers' affect. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *31*(10), 2149–2159.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, *12*(4), 637-647.

Connelly, S., Gaddis, B., & Helton-Fauth, W. (2002). A closer look at the role of emotions in transformational and charismatic leadership. In B. J. Avolio & F. J. Yammarino (Eds.),

Transformational and charismatic leadership: The road ahead, Vol. 2. (pp. 255–283). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Connelly, S., & Ruark, G. (2010). Leadership style and activating potential moderators of the relationships among leader emotional displays and outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *21*(5), 745-764.

Damen, F., van Knippenberg, B., & van Knippenberg, D. (2008). Affective match in leadership: Leader emotional displays, follower positive affect, and follower performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 38*, 868−902.

Davies, J. C. (1954). Charisma in the 1952 campaign. *American Political Science Review*, *48*(4), 1083-1102.

Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Lucas, R. E. (2003). Personality, culture, and subjective well-being: Emotional and cognitive evaluations of life. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *54*(1), 403-425.

Doherty, R. W. (1997). The emotional contagion scale: A measure of individual differences. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, *21*(2), 131-154.

Emrich, C. G., Brower, H. H., Feldman, J. M., & Garland, H. (2001). Images in words: Presidential rhetoric, charisma, and greatness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *46*(3), 527-557.

Erez, A., & Isen, A. M. (2002). The influence of positive affect on the components of expectancy motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(6), 1055.

Fischer, A. H., & Roseman, I. J. (2007). Beat them or ban them: The characteristics and social functions of anger and contempt. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*(1), 103.

Fredrickson, B. L. (2003). Positive emotions and upward spirals in organizations. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 163−175). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

George, J. M. (1991). State or trait: Effects of positive mood on prosocial behaviors at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 299−307.

George, J. M. (1995). Leader positive mood and group performance: The case of customer service. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 25*, 778−794.

George, J. M. (1996). Group affective tone. In M. West (Ed.), *Handbook of work group psychology* (pp. 77−93). Sussex, England: Wiley.

Gibson, D. E., & Schroeder, S. J. (2002). Grinning, frowning, and emotionless: Agent perceptions of power and their effect on felt and displayed emotions in influence attempts. *Managing Emotions in the Workplace*, 184-211.

Goetz, J. L., Keltner, D., & Simon-Thomas, E. (2010). Compassion: An evolutionary analysis and empirical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *136*(3), 351.

Haidt, J. (2001). The emotional dog and its rational tail: a social intuitionist approach to moral judgment. *Psychological Review*, *108*(4), 814.

Hatfield, E., Cacioppo, J. T., & Rapson, R. L. (1994). *Emotional contagion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt, & L. L. Larson (Eds.). *Leadership: The cutting edge* (pp. 189–207). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Isaacson, W. (2011). *Steve jobs*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Isen, A. (2004). Positive affect and decision making. In M. Lewis, & J. Haviland-Jones (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions*, 2nd ed. (pp. 417−435).

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, *2*(1999), 102-138.

Johns, G. (2006). The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, *31*(2), 386-408.

Johnson, G., & Connelly, S. (2014). Negative emotions in informal feedback: The benefits of disappointment and drawbacks of anger. *Human Relations*, *67*(10), 1265-1290.

Kanfer, R., & Ackerman, P. L. (1989). Motivation and cognitive abilities: An integrative aptitude-treatment interaction approach to skill acquisition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *74*(4), 657.

Kanov, J. M., Maitlis, S., Worline, M. C., Dutton, J. E., Frost, P. J., & Lilius, J. M. (2004). Compassion in organizational life. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *47*(6), 808-827.

Keltner, D., & Haidt, J. (1999). Social functions of emotions at four levels of analysis. *Cognition & Emotion*, *13*(5), 505-521.

Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*(1), 36.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2008). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lindebaum, D., & Fielden, S. (2011). 'It's good to be angry': Enacting anger in construction project management to achieve perceived leader effectiveness. *Human Relations*, *64*(3), 437- 458.

Lindebaum, D., & Jordan, P. J. (2014). When it can be good to feel bad and bad to feel good: Exploring asymmetries in workplace emotional outcomes. *Human Relations*, *67*(9), 1037-1050.

Marstand, A. F., Epitropaki, O., & Martin, R. (2018). Cross-lagged relations between perceived leader–employee value congruence and leader identification. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *91*(2), 411-420.

Matsumoto, D., Hwang, H. C., & Frank, M. G. (2014). Emotions expressed in speeches by leaders of ideologically motivated groups predict aggression. *Behavioral Sciences of Terrorism and Political Aggression, 6*(1), 1–18.

Michie, S., & Gooty, J. (2005). Values, emotions, and authenticity: Will the real leader please stand up?. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *16*(3), 441-457.

Miner, A. G., Glomb, T. M., & Hulin, C. L. (2005). Experience sampling mood and its correlates at work. *Journal of Organizational and Occupational Psychology*, *78*(2), 171-193.

Mischel, W. (1977). The interaction of person and situation. In D. Magnusson, & N. S. Endler (Eds.), *Personality at the crossroads: Current issues in interactional psychology* (pp. 333−352). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Nanus, B. (1995). *Visionary leadership: Creating a compelling sense of direction for your organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Newcombe, M. J., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2002). The role of affect and affective congruence in perceptions of leaders: An experimental study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*(5), 601-614.

Osburn, H. K., & Mumford, M. D. (2006). Creativity and planning: Training interventions to develop creative problem-solving skills. *Creativity Research Journal*, *18*(2), 173-190.

Ostroff, C., Kinicki, A., & Tamkins, M. (2003). Organizational culture and climate. *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 565–593).

Peacock, H. J. (2012). *The impact of competitive climate and individual differences on ethical decision-making* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma).

Robinson, S. L., & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Violating the psychological contract: Not the exception but the norm. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *15*(3), 245-259.

Rousseau, D. M., & Fried, Y. (2001). Location, location, location: Contextualizing organizational research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22*, 1–13.

Rozin, P., Lowery, L., Imada, S., & Haidt, J. (1999). The CAD triad hypothesis: A mapping between three moral emotions (contempt, anger, disgust) and three moral codes (community, autonomy, divinity). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*(4), 574.

Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M.G., & Macey, W.H. (2011). Perspectives on organizational climate and culture. In *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*: Vol.1. *Building and developing the organization,* ed. S. Zedeck, pp. 373–414. Washington, DC: Am. Psychol. Assoc.

Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., & Macey, W. H. (2013). Organizational climate and culture. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *64*, 361-388.

Schneider, B., & Reichers, A. E. (1983). On the etiology of climates. *Personnel Psychology*, *36*(1), 19-39.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *25*(1), 1-65.

Schwartz, S. H. (2012). An overview of the Schwartz theory of basic values. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, *2*(1), 2307-0919.

Shamir, B., & Howell, J. M. (1999). Organizational and contextual influences on the emergence and effectiveness of charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(2), 257-283.

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

Solomon, R. (1993). *The passions: Emotions and the meaning of life*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company.

Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, *12*(2), 269-292.

Stellar, J. E., Cohen, A., Oveis, C., & Keltner, D. (2015). Affective and physiological responses to the suffering of others: Compassion and vagal activity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 108*(4), 572.

Sy, T., Choi, J. N., & Johnson, S. K. (2013). Reciprocal interactions between group perceptions of leader charisma and group mood through mood contagion. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *24*(4), 463-476.

Sy, T., Horton, C., & Riggio, R. (2018). Charismatic leadership: Eliciting and channeling follower emotions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *29*(1), 58-69.

Taylor, S. E. (1991). Asymmetrical effects of positive and negative events: the mobilization-minimization hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *110*(1), 67.

Tiedens, L. Z. (2001). Anger and advancement versus sadness and subjugation: the effect of negative emotion expressions on social status conferral. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *80*(1), 86-94.

Torrence, B. (2019). More than a feeling: An examination of mixed emotional expressions on leader evaluations and follower performance.

Van Kleef, G. A. (2009). How emotions regulate social life: The emotions as social information (EASI) model. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *18*(3), 184-188.

Van Kleef, G. A., Homan, A. C., Beersma, B., & van Knippenberg, D. (2010). On angry leaders and agreeable followers: How leaders' emotions and followers' personalities shape motivation and team performance. *Psychological Science*, *21*(12), 1827-1834.

Van Knippenberg, D., & Sitkin, S. B. (2013). A critical assessment of charismatic—transformational leadership research: Back to the drawing board?. *Academy of Management Annals*, *7*(1), 1-60.

Wasielewski, P. L. (1985). The emotional basis of charisma. *Symbolic Interaction*, *8*(2), 207-222.

Waples, E. P., & Connelly, S. (2008). Leader emotions and vision implementation: Effects of activation potential and valance. In C. E. Härtel, W. J. Zerbe, & N. M. Ashkanasy (Eds.), *Emotions in organizational behavior* (pp. 67−94). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: the PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*(6), 1063.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations among Dependent and Covariate Variables

		M	*SD*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*	*13*
1.	State NA	17.03	6.25	(.85)[a]												
2.	State PA	30.17	10	.19**	(.94)[a]											
3.	PLC - Values	5.53	.87	-.21**	.23**	(.82)[a]										
4.	PLC - Symbolism	4.07	1.31	.04	.16*	.32**	(.76)[a]									
5.	PLC - Emotions	5.87	.88	-.18**	.16*	.56**	.20**	(.84)[a]								
6.	Leader Trust	26.45	4.86	-.24**	.26**	.54**	.16*	.39**	(.82)[a]							
7.	Follower Performance	2.66	.79	-.09	.00	.15*	-.15*	.13*	-.02	(.87)[b]						
8.	Agreeableness	4.00	.58	-.09	.28**	.13	-.07	.08	.24**	.02	(.78)[a]					
9.	Conscientiousness	3.69	.56	-.15*	.17**	.09	-.02	.11	-.02	.04	.36**	(.73)[a]				
10.	Leader Identification	4.82	1.37	-.17**	.33**	.57**	.31**	.38**	.70**	-.02	.13	-.08	(.95)[a]			
11.	Benevolence	.69	.69	-.09	-.07	.04	-.19**	.19**	.12	.11	.25**	.17*	.01	(.72)[a]		
12.	Power	-1.87	1.1	.21**	.02	-.06	.11	-.08	-.15*	-.18**	-.33**	-.22**	.03	-.46**	(.71)[a]	
13.	Gender	1.31	.47	.02	.15*	.08	-.07	.03	-0.1	.11	-.25**	-.15*	.05	-.01	.18*	-

Note. PLC = Perceptions of leader charisma. NA = negative affect. PA = positive affect. $N = 201$ for benevolence and power. $N = 238$ for all remaining variables. **Significant at .01. *Significant at .05. Reliabilities are listed on the diagonal. [a]Cronbach Alpha reliability; [b]Average r*wg. R*wg for quality = .88; originality = .85; elegance = .88. Dashes indicate variables that did not have a reliability to be reported.

Table 2

ANCOVA Results of Emotion on State Affect

	State Positive Affect			State Negative Affect		
	F	*p*	η_p^2	*F*	*p*	η_p^2
Corrected Model	11.76	.00**	.15	9.34	.00**	.14
Intercept	.91	.34	.00	144.50	.00**	.46
Agreeableness	12.49	.00**	.06	-	-	-
Leader Identification	18.03	.00**	.08	4.27	.04*	.02
Power	-	-	-	11.89	.00**	.07
Emotion	.01	.91	.00	6.05	.02*	.03

Note. $N = 212$ for Positive Affect; $N = 175$ for Negative Affect. **Significant at .01. *Significant at .05. Agreeableness, leader identification, and power are covariates. Dashes indicate instances where the specific variable was not used as a covariate. For state negative affect, the Levene's test was significant at .00, suggesting violation of the homogeneity assumption. The Brown-Forsythe ANOVA test suggests that the effect of emotion on state negative affect remained when homogeneity is not assumed ($p = .01$).

Table 3

ANCOVA Results of Emotions, Values, and Climate on Trust in Leader and Follower Performance

	Trust in Leader			Follower Performance		
	F	*p*	η_p^2	*F*	*p*	η_p^2
Corrected Model	26.43	.00**	.59	2.05	.04*	.08
Intercept	150.81	.00**	.48	220.14	.00**	.52
Leader Identification	192.20	.00**	.54	-	-	-
Power	16.71	.00**	.09	-	-	-
Gender	-	-	-	4.34	.04*	.02
Emotion	1.91	.17	.01	5.36	.02*	.03
Value	.47	.50	.00	2.19	.14	.01
Climate	4.78	.03*	.03	.05	.82	.00
Emotion*Value	1.39	.24	.01	.33	.56	.00
Emotion*Climate	.24	.62	.00	1.56	.21	.01
Value*Climate	1.02	.32	.01	2.46	.12	.01
Emotion*Value*Climate	1.64	.20	.01	.30	.58	.00

Note. $N = 175$ for Trust in Leader; $N = 212$ for Follower Performance. **Significant at .01. *Significant at .05. Leader identification, power, and gender are covariates. Dashes indicate instances where the specific variable was not used as a covariate.

Table 4

ANCOVA Results of Emotions, Values, and Climate on Perceptions of Leader Charisma

	PLC – Values-based			PLC – Symbolic			PLC – Emotion-laden		
	F	*p*	η_p^2	*F*	*p*	η_p^2	*F*	*p*	η_p^2
Corrected Model	14.06	.00**	.39	4.78	.00**	.23	4.98	.00**	.25
Intercept	48.88	.00**	.20	71.43	.00**	.30	50.70	.00**	.24
Agreeableness	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.19	.01**	.04
Conscientiousness	6.82	.01**	.03	-	-	-	8.90	.00**	.05
Leader Identification	99.64	.00**	.33	20.30	.00**	.11	37.50	.00**	.19
Benevolence	-	-	-	9.38	.00**	.05	8.61	.00**	.05
Gender	-	-	-	4.88	.03*	.03	-	-	-
Emotion	.56	.46	.00	.28	.60	.00	6.64	.01**	.04
Value	.53	.47	.00	.43	.51	.00	.23	.63	.00
Climate	.01	.93	.00	1.39	.24	.01	.01	.91	.00
Emotion*Value	.02	.89	.00	8.36	.00**	.05	1.08	.30	.00
Emotion*Climate	3.78	.05*	.02	.11	.74	.00	3.33	.07	.02
Value*Climate	2.88	.09	.01	.01	.92	.00	.48	.49	.00
Emotion*Value*Climate	.09	.77	.00	.84	.36	.01	.48	.49	.00

Note. PLC = Perceptions of leader charisma. $N = 212$ for Values; $N = 175$ for Symbolism; $N = 175$ for Emotions. **Significant at .01. *Significant at .05. Agreeableness, conscientiousness, leader identification, benevolence, and gender are covariates. Dashes indicate instances where the specific variable was not used as a covariate.

Appendix A: Organizational Description

Company Name: DataBlock

Background and Purpose: DataBlock is a cloud computing company founded in the mid 1980's with the original purpose of manufacturing and distribution of traditional computing storage. As computing needs have developed, so has DataBlock. In the mid 2000's they very successfully transitioned to a non-profit cloud computing company to address the technological inequities between developed and developing countries in an ever-changing technological landscape. Shortly after this transition DataBlock expanded their organization to include artificial intelligence development with the purpose of using AI to enhance their cloud computing. They now have about 600 employees and a few international locations based mostly in Europe. Recently, DataBlock has experienced a technological breakthrough with their AI that would allow their services to function at near the theoretical limits of data transition potentially putting them far above their direct, for-profit, competition. This latest breakthrough would also allow 98% of the world's population access to the internet. Due to the advanced nature of this AI, information can be compressed so efficiently that even those with speeds less than dial-up could surf the web as fast as any other modern user. Additionally, this AI would double the effective range of cell phone towers making infrastructure expansion significantly cheaper and easier. This development represents an important step to DataBlock's continued growth and success.

Appendix B: Organizational Climate Manipulation

Cooperative Climate Description

As you can imagine, the success of the company lies squarely on your and the creative design team's ability to create innovative ideas of marketing campaigns for the company's latest breakthrough in AI. If you and the team are not successful in this venture, the competitors will outperform, and DataBlock will no longer be viewed as a viable option for technological needs. As daunting a task as this seems, fortunately for you, you are part of an excellent division and can rely on the other people in the division for support and guidance. The Marketing Director likes to reward the division for high quality work and discourages internal competition. They like to encourage an open and supportive environment where people's efforts are seldom compared against one another. Regardless of the outcome, nobody's job is in jeopardy, and all rewards are distributed fairly.

Competitive Climate Description

As you can imagine, the success of the company lies squarely on your and the creative design team's ability to create innovative ideas of marketing campaigns for the company's latest breakthrough in AI. If you and the team are not successful in this venture, the competitors will outperform, and DataBlock will no longer be viewed as a viable option for technological needs. In fact, somebody is liable to get fired if something goes wrong. On the other hand, the rewards that come along with selling our AI technology are substantial. The Marketing Director likes to pit the members of the group against one another for rewards and encourages internal competition. It is a cut-throat business, where every person is for them self and only the savvy and ruthless survive. It is a place where you are constantly being compared to your teammates and them to you.

Appendix C: Leader Displays of Emotion and Value Expression Manipulations in Vision Statement

Compassion/Benevolence Consistent Condition

Vision Statement

Ahead of the launch, you have been personally invited to a company retreat by the CEO of the company. They want to prepare their most important divisions for the launch of the AI through various workshops and exercises to make sure everyone is aligned with the non-profit mission of DataBlock.

You have arrived at a cabin conference center placed at the base of a mountain range. You have some time to get comfortable in your room before heading down to the main conference stage to hear a speech from the CEO of DataBlock that will kick off the retreat.

When you are ready to head down, please proceed.

You enter the conference room and take a seat. The lights dim and the CEO walks on stage – highlighted by spotlights.

"Hello Everyone, hello! Thank you."

*The CEO is wearing a tailored suit that is truly flattering and moves around the stage in an **excited and animated** fashion, smoothly moving his eyes through the crowd in an attempt to make eye contact with each individual.*

"Without all of you, this company would not exist. We would not be a company full of the most intelligent and hardworking people I have ever known."

*The CEO displays a **smile so bright the room seems to light up**.*

"Together we have made tremendous strides as a company from our beginnings as a primarily manufacturing company to developing a revolutionary piece of technology that will change the world."

The CEO walks down from the stage and walks through the seating sections to be closer to everyone. You can feel the CEO's presence move through the room.

"We are a company that is not motivated by profit margins and bonus checks. At our core we are do-gooders, philanthropists who care about the health of the planet and the welfare of the people that inhabit it. We are a company whose mission is to bring knowledge and communication capabilities to the rest of the world that has been in the shadows for far too long. Our AI technology will enable this!"

"We are so close."

The CEO raises his voice to fill the entire room, ***his relaxed smile slowly turns into a soft grin****. He quickly marches back up onto the stage and turns, making eye contact, but not the same as before.*

"But the rest of the world is anything but peaceful! Something stands in our way!"

The voice is comforting for the crowd*.*

"Our competitors are constantly undermining our efforts. Have you heard some of the remarks they have made about us? The industry leader views us as being in over our heads and biting off more than we can chew. They think we have neither the talent nor the resources to be successful."

The CEO is now pacing back and forth on the stage, ***his caring face lifting up those in the audience already entranced by the CEO****.*

"These other companies know by pursuing our mission we will be taking away their opportunity to use these rural populations for every drop of blood, sweat, and tears they have. Instead of viewing our competitors as an obstacle, let's get our competitors on board. We can work with them to set an industry standard to make our technology more affordable, a solution where everyone wins."

"THE PEOPLE OF THESE COUNTRIES DESERVE BETTER!"

The CEO moves back and forth across the stage with a compassionate look*.*

"Our continued success as a company is dependent on the successful release of this AI. We need to do this before the other competitors hinder our progress by releasing their own, watered down version of our AI - an AI designed to imprison users with contracts and bury them in fees."

"Our development division will need to finish up the final touches of our AI, and our manufacturing division must be prepared for the beginning of our massive rollout. We can afford no delays. But most importantly, we need our marketing division to give it their all and market this AI to both the developing world and our sponsors."

"We need support from sponsors, and we must make them understand how useful this AI will be to the future. Receiving the support from our sponsors allowing us to work together with our competitors will result in partnerships where everyone wins."

"We are here to get ready to fulfill our mission. Take this retreat seriously. We need everyone ready for the last and most difficult part of our journey."

"Thank you."

Compassion/Retribution Inconsistent Condition

Vision Statement

Ahead of the launch, you have been personally invited to a company retreat by the CEO of the company. They want to prepare their most important divisions for the launch of the AI through various workshops and exercises to make sure everyone is aligned with the non-profit mission of DataBlock.

You have arrived at a cabin conference center placed at the base of a mountain range. You have some time to get comfortable in your room before heading down to the main conference stage to hear a speech from the CEO of DataBlock that will kick off the retreat.

When you are ready to head down, please proceed.

You enter the conference room and take a seat. The lights dim and the CEO walks on stage – highlighted by spotlights.

"Hello Everyone, hello! Thank you."

The CEO is wearing a tailored suit that is truly flattering and moves around the stage in an ***excited and animated*** *fashion, smoothly moving his eyes through the crowd in an attempt to make eye contact with each individual.*

"Without all of you, this company would not exist. We would not be a company full of the most intelligent and hardworking people I have ever known."

The CEO displays a ***smile so bright the room seems to light up****.*

"Together we have made tremendous strides as a company from our beginnings as a primarily manufacturing company to developing a revolutionary piece of technology that will change the world."

The CEO walks down from the stage and walks through the seating sections to be closer to everyone. You can feel the CEO's presence move through the room.

"We are a company that is not motivated by profit margins and bonus checks. At our core we are do-gooders, philanthropists who care about the health of the planet and the welfare of the people that inhabit it. We are a company whose mission is to bring knowledge and communication capabilities to the rest of the world that has been in the shadows for far too long. Our AI technology will enable this!"

"We are so close."

The CEO raises his voice to fill the entire room, ***his relaxed smile slowly turns into a soft grin****. He quickly marches back up onto the stage and turns, making eye contact, but not the same as before.*

"But the rest of the world is anything but peaceful! Something stands in our way!"

The voice is comforting for the crowd*.*

"Our competitors are constantly undermining our efforts. Have you heard some of the remarks they have made about us? The industry leader views us as being in over our heads and biting off more than we can chew. They think we have neither the talent nor the resources to be successful."

The CEO is now pacing back and forth on the stage, ***his caring face lifting up those in the audience already entranced by the CEO****.*

"These other companies know by pursuing our mission we will be taking away their opportunity to use these rural populations for every drop of blood, sweat, and tears they have. As a result, we need to exact revenge by successfully releasing our product and shutting them out once and for all to ensure that they are not able to use these innocent people to their advantage."

"THE PEOPLE OF THESE COUNTRIES DESERVE BETTER!"

The CEO moves back and forth across the stage with a compassionate look*.*

"Our continued success as a company is dependent on the successful release of this AI. We need to do this before the other competitors hinder our progress by releasing their own, watered down version of our AI - an AI designed to imprison users with contracts and bury them in fees."

"Our development division will need to finish up the final touches of our AI, and our manufacturing division must be prepared for the beginning of our massive rollout. We can afford no delays. But most importantly, we need our marketing division to give it their all and market this AI to both the developing world and our sponsors."

"Gaining the support from our sponsors will allow us to truly defeat our competitors. We will be able to expand our market to the underserved populations while simultaneously undermining our competition, showing them how wrong they are."

"We are here to get ready to fulfill our mission. Take this retreat seriously. We need everyone ready for the last and most difficult part of our journey."

"Thank you."

Anger/Retribution Consistent Condition

Vision Statement

Ahead of the launch, you have been personally invited to a company retreat by the CEO of the company. They want to prepare their most important divisions for the launch of the AI through various workshops and exercises to make sure everyone is aligned with the non-profit mission of DataBlock.

You have arrived at a cabin conference center placed at the base of a mountain range. You have some time to get comfortable in your room before heading down to the main conference stage to hear a speech from the CEO of DataBlock that will kick off the retreat.

When you are ready to head down, please proceed.

You enter the conference room and take a seat. The lights dim and the CEO walks on stage – highlighted by spotlights.

"Hello Everyone, hello! Thank you."

*The CEO is wearing a tailored suit that is truly flattering and moves around the stage in an **tense, irritated** fashion, smoothly moving his eyes through the crowd in an attempt to make eye contact with each individual.*

"Without all of you, this company would not exist. We would not be a company full of the most intelligent and hardworking people I have ever known."

*The CEO displays a **serious face, dark with emotion**.*

"Together we have made tremendous strides as a company from our beginnings as a primarily manufacturing company to developing a revolutionary piece of technology that will change the world."

The CEO walks down from the stage and walks through the seating sections to be closer to everyone. You can feel the CEO's presence move through the room.

"We are a company that is not motivated by profit margins and bonus checks. At our core we are do-gooders, philanthropists who care about the health of the planet and the welfare of the people that inhabit it. We are a company whose mission is to bring knowledge and communication capabilities to the rest of the world that has been in the shadows for far too long. Our AI technology will enable this!"

"We are so close."

The CEO raises his voice to fill the entire room, ***his stern face abruptly turning into an angry grimace.*** *He quickly marches back up onto the stage and turns, making eye contact, but not the same as before.*

"But the rest of the world is anything but peaceful! Something stands in our way!"

The shouting startles the room.

"Our competitors are constantly undermining our efforts. Have you heard some of the remarks they have made about us? The industry leader views us as being in over our heads and biting off more than we can chew. They think we have neither the talent nor the resources to be successful."

The CEO is now pacing back and forth on the stage, ***his furrowed brow clearly showing his anger towards the competitors****.*

"These other companies know by pursuing our mission we will be taking away their opportunity to use these rural populations for every drop of blood, sweat, and tears they have. As a result, we need to exact revenge by successfully releasing our product and shutting them out once and for all to ensure that they are not able to use these innocent people to their advantage."

"THE PEOPLE OF THESE COUNTRIES DESERVE BETTER!"

The silence in the room is deafening. Looking at the ground, the CEO angrily walks back and forth across the stage.

"Our continued success as a company is dependent on the successful release of this AI. We need to do this before the other competitors hinder our progress by releasing their own, watered down version of our AI - an AI designed to imprison users with contracts and bury them in fees."

"Our development division will need to finish up the final touches of our AI, and our manufacturing division must be prepared for the beginning of our massive rollout. We can afford no delays. But most importantly, we need our marketing division to give it their all and market this AI to both the developing world and our sponsors."

"Gaining the support from our sponsors will allow us to truly defeat our competitors. We will be able to expand our market to the underserved populations while simultaneously undermining our competition, showing them how wrong they are."

"We are here to get ready to fulfill our mission. Take this retreat seriously. We need everyone ready for the last and most difficult part of our journey."

"Thank you."

Anger/Benevolence Inconsistent Condition

Vision Statement

Ahead of the launch, you have been personally invited to a company retreat by the CEO of the company. They want to prepare their most important divisions for the launch of the AI through various workshops and exercises to make sure everyone is aligned with the non-profit mission of DataBlock.

You have arrived at a cabin conference center placed at the base of a mountain range. You have some time to get comfortable in your room before heading down to the main conference stage to hear a speech from the CEO of DataBlock that will kick off the retreat.

When you are ready to head down, please proceed.

You enter the conference room and take a seat. The lights dim and the CEO walks on stage – highlighted by spotlights.

"Hello Everyone, hello! Thank you."

The CEO is wearing a tailored suit that is truly flattering and moves around the stage in an ***tense, irritated*** *fashion, smoothly moving his eyes through the crowd in an attempt to make eye contact with each individual.*

"Without all of you, this company would not exist. We would not be a company full of the most intelligent and hardworking people I have ever known."

The CEO displays a ***serious face, dark with emotion****.*

"Together we have made tremendous strides as a company from our beginnings as a primarily manufacturing company to developing a revolutionary piece of technology that will change the world."

The CEO walks down from the stage and walks through the seating sections to be closer to everyone. You can feel the CEO's presence move through the room.

"We are a company that is not motivated by profit margins and bonus checks. At our core we are do-gooders, philanthropists who care about the health of the planet and the welfare of the people that inhabit it. We are a company whose mission is to bring knowledge and communication capabilities to the rest of the world that has been in the shadows for far too long. Our AI technology will enable this!"

"We are so close."

The CEO raises his voice to fill the entire room, ***his stern face abruptly turning into an angry grimace.*** *He quickly marches back up onto the stage and turns, making eye contact, but not the same as before.*

"But the rest of the world is anything but peaceful! Something stands in our way!"

The shouting startles the room.

"Our competitors are constantly undermining our efforts. Have you heard some of the remarks they have made about us? The industry leader views us as being in over our heads and biting off more than we can chew. They think we have neither the talent nor the resources to be successful."

The CEO is now pacing back and forth on the stage, ***his furrowed brow clearly showing his anger towards the competitors****.*

"These other companies know by pursuing our mission we will be taking away their opportunity to use these rural populations for every drop of blood, sweat, and tears they have. Instead of viewing our competitors as an obstacle, let's get our competitors on board. We can work with them to set an industry standard to make our technology more affordable, a solution where everyone wins."

"THE PEOPLE OF THESE COUNTRIES DESERVE BETTER!"

The silence in the room is deafening. Looking at the ground, the CEO angrily walks back and forth across the stage.

"Our continued success as a company is dependent on the successful release of this AI. We need to do this before the other competitors hinder our progress by releasing their own, watered down version of our AI - an AI designed to imprison users with contracts and bury them in fees."

"Our development division will need to finish up the final touches of our AI, and our manufacturing division must be prepared for the beginning of our massive rollout. We can afford no delays. But most importantly, we need our marketing division to give it their all and market this AI to both the developing world and our sponsors."

"We need support from sponsors, and we must make them understand how useful this AI will be to the future. Receiving the support from our sponsors allowing us to work together with our competitors will result in partnerships where everyone wins."

"We are here to get ready to fulfill our mission. Take this retreat seriously. We need everyone ready for the last and most difficult part of our journey."

"Thank you."

Appendix D: Performance Task

You are now at the Strategic Planning Session for the Marketing Division, preparing to brainstorm for the task the CEO has assigned to your team. You have been asked to work individually to come up with ideas for marketing and advertising the new artificial intelligence (AI) software. Include issues that you might need to coordinate with the Research and Development Division and what you will do to convince the CEO and other senior management that this is a good campaign for this product. Here is your task:

1. Describe your approach and a detailed plan for advertising and marketing the new artificial intelligence software.

2. Describe what you need to discuss and coordinate with the Research and Development Division to help the success of your campaign. For example, how can this division help you from a product standpoint to make your marketing campaign more successful?

3. Provide an explanation of how you are planning to justify your plan to senior management and convince them that this approach will be successful.

Appendix E: Perceptions of Leader Charisma Scale

Given what you know about the CEO of DataBlock, please read the following items and indicate how well they describe the CEO on a scale of 1 to 7 where 1 = not representative of the leader at all and 7 = a perfect representation of the leader. Please note that the leader you are evaluating is the CEO in the scenario you read.

Values-based Leader Signaling

1. The leader signals/communicates a strong sense of right from wrong.
2. The leader signals/communicates what is important for the company.
3. The leader communicates what is important for the employees of this company.
4. The leader shares many of my values when it comes to our company.
5. The leader communicates very strong values.
6. The leader communicates high standards of behavior for himself/herself and employees.
7. The leader does not compromise his/her values.
8. The leader adheres to his/her values in pursuit of success for the company.
9. The leader typically follows the "high road" not the "low road."

Symbolic Leader Signaling

10. The leader often speaks indirectly about important topics.*
11. The leader frequently uses metaphors to accurately convey their ideas.
12. The examples the leader used made their bigger ideas much clearer.*
13. The leader's abstract ideas made the plan for the company vivid and clear.*
14. The leader's private and public choices embody the morals of our company.*
15. The leader was direct and straightforward in conveying their ideas (R).*
16. The leader tends to use symbols to communicate their ideas.
17. The leader has excellent command over their use of metaphors to communicate ideas.
18. The leader ensures business processes reflect core values.*

Emotion-laden Leader Signaling

19. The leader communicates strong feelings about their company.
20. The leader has strong feelings about their employees.*
21. The leader is not afraid to show emotions.
22. The leader does not show emotions (R).
23. The leader can talk about their feelings well.
24. The leader really let their employees know how they *feel* about the company's situation.
25. It was easy to understand how the leader was *feeling* during their speech.
26. The leader filled the room with their emotions during their speech.
27. The leader can clearly communicate how they are feeling at any time.
28. The leader is passionate about the company and its employees.*
29. The leader's conviction for success is very clear.*

Note. Items marked with an * demonstrated low reliability with the rest of the items in the scale and were removed in the final version.

Appendix F: Leader Identification Scale

Below are a few statements about your CEO at DataBlock. Please read through these statements and rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following items on a scale of 1 to 7 where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree. Please note that the leader you are evaluating is the CEO in the scenario you read.

1. I identify with this leader.
2. I view things in a manner consistent with how the leader views things.
3. I understand this leader.
4. I see myself as being similar to this leader.
5. I agree with how this leader gets things done.
6. This leader sees things in a way that is similar to how I see them.
7. I understand this leader's approach to things.*
8. I relate to this leader.

Note. Items marked with an * demonstrated low reliability with the rest of the items in the scale and were removed in the final version.