"What a leader says may, at times, be less important to fostering a charismatic image than how he or she says it."

PERCEPTIONS OF LEADER CHARISMA, EFFECTIVENESS, AND INTEGRITY
Effects of Exemplification, Delivery, and Ethical Reputation

WILLIAM L. GARDNER
University of Mississippi

502

This study explored the extent to which a leader who claims to be either exemplary or pragmatic and is revealed to have a reputation for either deception or honesty is perceived to be charismatic, effective, and morally worthy. The effects of message delivery and participants' scores on the Romance of Leadership Scale (RLS) were also examined. The results revealed that (a) a strong versus weak delivery produced higher ratings of leader charisma and effectiveness; (b) exemplary versus pragmatic self-presentations yielded higher levels of perceived effectiveness and integrity; (c) the strong delivery × ethical reputation combination produced the highest levels of perceived leader effectiveness and integrity; and (d) only high RLS individuals perceived the leader to be most effective when delivery was strong and least effective when delivery was weak.

Keywords: charisma; leadership; exemplification; integrity; reputation

For practitioners, academics, and laypersons alike, "leading by example" is revered as a highly noble form of leadership. With the rise (Lowe & Gardner, 2000) of what has been called the "new leadership" (Bryman, 1992) or "neocharismatic" (House & Aditya, 1997) paradigm, which encompasses theories of charismatic (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; House, 1977; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993) and transformational (Bass, 1985) leadership, this emphasis on exemplary behavior has grown. For example, theories of charismatic leadership consider the modeling of exemplary behavior through the leader's words and deeds to be a key determinant of the charismatic relationship (Bryman, 1992; Gardner & Avolio, 1998).

Exemplification consists of "behavior [that] presents the actor as morally worthy and may also have the goal of eliciting imitation by others" (Tedeschi & Norman, 1985, p. 301). Because integrity and moral worthiness are nearly universally valued ideals, exemplifiers typically portray themselves as unusually trustworthy and ethical persons. Prototypical examples of charismatic and exemplary leaders include Martin Luther King and Mahatma Gandhi (Bass, 1985; Gardner & Cleavenger, 1998; Jones & Pittman, 1982). These leaders secured extraordinary levels of follower trust and inspired followers to emulate their behavior by making personal sacrifices for the collective good.

Despite its potential benefit as a self-presentation strategy, exemplification has its risks. Charismatic leaders who discovered its dangers first-hand include televangelists Jimmy Swaggart and Jim Bakker. Followers provided these leaders with immense opportunities to take advantage of their trust through misappropriations

of finances and other abuses. However, when each violated a core value of the church—"Thou shall not commit adultery"—he was ousted from the pulpit (Gardner & Avolio, 1998).

An experiment by Gilbert and Jones (1986) illustrates the backlash that can accrue to exemplifiers who act in a fashion that contradicts prior claims of moral rectitude. Raters first viewed a videotaped interview with an actor who claimed to be either honest (exemplifier) or morally flexible (pragmatist). Next, they watched a videotape of the actor either cheating or not cheating when faced with a temptation situation. The cheating exemplifier was rated as more hypocritical and self-deluding, but less manipulative, than the cheating pragmatist.

The purpose of this study is to extend Gilbert and Jones's (1986) experiment within a leadership context. Specifically, it explores the extent to which a hypothetical leader (a business school dean interviewing for a deanship at another university) who portrays himself as an exemplifier and is subsequently revealed to have a reputation for deception (providing misleading information to national publications that rank business schools), is perceived as charismatic, effective, and morally worthy. Will the "boomerang" effect obtained by Gilbert and Jones be found in a leadership setting? Although this may be the case, an argument can be made for not expecting such a reversal. Indeed, there are examples of charismatic leaders, such as Bill Clinton, who retained the devotion of core followers despite serious moral transgressions. As Gilbert and Jones note, "[m]essianic leaders, international confidence men, and corrupt politicians have often found that public exposure of their private indiscretions does not dissuade their disciples, investors, and constituents" (p. 594).

The extension to Gilbert and Jones (1986) study is twofold. First, the manner in which the leader delivers a message is varied across two levels: strong versus weak. Leadership research indicates that delivery is a key determinant of leadership perceptions (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999; Holladay & Coombs, 1993, 1994; Willner, 1984). Will a strong delivery obfuscate the influence of inconsistent reputational information on raters' perceptions? Or will it intensify feelings that they were duped? The second extension involves exploring the effects that a dispositional tendency to exaggerate the causal effects of leadership, as measured by Meindl and Ehrlich's

(1988) Romance of Leadership Scale (RLS), exerts on perceptions of a leader's moral character. Will individuals who tend to romanticize leadership view a leader who is revealed to have a reputation for honesty (deception) as more (less) morally worthy than other persons?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Neocharismatic theories (House & Aditya, 1997) assert that charismatic leaders use exemplification to identify and model desired behaviors for followers, including high moral standards, self-sacrifice, commitment, and innovative problem-solving (Bass, 1988; Gardner & Avolio, 1998). Such behaviors serve two key functions for the leader. First, they elicit respect, affection, and devotion by communicating the leader's high moral values and principles, which are typically congruent with followers' values and aspirations (Conger & Kanungo, 1987). Second, they inspire followers to engage in similar behaviors, and thereby facilitate attainment of collective goals (Shamir et al., 1993). Despite these insights, ambiguity remains regarding the manner and circumstances under which exemplification is most effective. For example, the effects of claims of moral worthiness versus demonstrations of virtuous behavior on perceptions of leadership are unclear. Furthermore, the degree to which inconsistencies in purported and actual moral conduct undercut the utility of leader exemplification is unknown. This study takes an initial step toward clarifying these issues.

Because idealized messages reflecting the leader's vision are posited to be key components of exemplification (Bass, 1988; Gardner & Avolio, 1998; Shamir et al., 1993), content is included as a critical variable in this study. Conger and Kanungo (1987) assert that the amount of charisma attributed to a leader rises as the vision becomes more idealized and utopian, provided it is still believable. Holladay and Coombs (1994) and Awamleh and Gardner (1999) showed that a videotape of a visionary as opposed to a nonvisionary speech produced higher levels of perceived charisma, and in the latter experiment, effectiveness.

The manner in which the message is delivered appears to be at least as important as its content in fostering a charismatic image. Because message delivery involves nonverbal, expressive behaviors that are subject to less control than verbal behaviors, audiences pay close attention to such behaviors and weigh them more heavily when forming impressions (DePaulo, 1992; Goffman, 1959). Four experiments illustrate the importance of delivery to a charismatic image (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999; Holladay & Coombs, 1993, 1994; Howell & Frost, 1989). In each, delivery was manipulated by altering the actor's nonverbal and expressive behaviors. A "strong" delivery was portrayed through increased eye contact, use of facial expressions and gestures, and increased vocal variety. In the "weak" treatment, the actor avoided eye contact, exhibited minimal facial expressions (e.g., no smiles), reduced hand and body gestures, and displayed some vocal disfluencies. As expected, a strong versus weak delivery elicited higher levels of perceived charisma and effectiveness.

Communication research indicates that actors exhibit higher levels of speech errors, hesitations, and voice pitch when they engage in intentional deception (DePaulo, Stone, & Lassiter, 1985). Whereas audiences rely on these nonverbal cues to detect deception, they also erroneously associate gaze aversion, longer response latencies, lower speech rate, and postural shifts with deception. "Overall, it appears that suspicion of deception is based on the same acoustical variables that give rise to negative impressions of the speaker—speech errors and hesitations, higher pitch, and lower speech rate" (Zuckerman, DePaulo, & Rosenthal, 1981, p. 18). These findings help explain why strong delivery of an idealized vision enables charismatic leaders to inspire followers and secure their trust: Their message is uplifting, attuned to followers' needs and values, and delivered in a manner that appears genuine. They also make clear why a weak delivery undermines the leader's message: It is judged with suspicion and often found to lack credibility. Thus, it is important to consider the manner in which a leader delivers his or her message, along with the content, in assessing the effects of exemplification on perceived leader charisma, effectiveness, and integrity.

In contrast to the primarily "leader-driven" theories of the neocharismatic paradigm, Meindl (1990) espouses a "follower-

driven" approach known as the "romance of leadership." According to this view, people overuse and glorify leadership as a causal category due to a need to make sense of complex organizational phenomena; this tendency is strongest for extreme situations, such as very high and low levels of performance. Meindl, Ehrlich, and Dukerich (1985) empirically confirmed that observers overattribute organizational outcomes to leadership and that this tendency increases with the magnitude of such outcomes.

Meindl (1990) also asserts that some people possess a dispositional tendency to romanticize leadership by invoking it as a causal explanation across situations. To measure this predisposition, Meindl and Ehrlich (1988) developed the RLS. As expected, persons who score high as opposed to low on the RLS attribute greater responsibility for organizational outcomes to leadership and consider leaders to be more influential and charismatic (Shamir, 1992). In a test of this follower-driven perspective, the RLS was administered in the current study to ascertain the extent to which participants' generalized leadership beliefs influenced their perceptions of leadership.

HYPOTHESES

Based on self-presentation (Jones & Pittman, 1982) and charismatic leadership theory (Bryman, 1992), the following effects of exemplary versus pragmatic content are posited.

> *Hypothesis 1:* A self-presentation strategy of exemplification as opposed to pragmatism will elicit higher levels of perceived (a) charisma and (b) effectiveness, and lower levels of perceived leader (c) hypocrisy and (d) exploitativeness.

Drawing on current theory and prior research (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999; Holladay & Coombs, 1993, 1994), a main effect is also posited for the strength of the leader's delivery.

> *Hypothesis 2:* A strong as opposed to weak style of message delivery will elicit higher levels of perceived leader (a) charisma and (b) effectiveness.

In addition, based on research that indicates a weak versus strong delivery heightens audience suspicion of deception (DePaulo et al., 1985), the following hypothesis is advanced.

> *Hypothesis 3:* A strong as opposed to weak style of message delivery will elicit lower levels of perceived leader (a) hypocrisy and (b) exploitativeness.

A reputation by the leader for honest versus deceptive behavior is also posited to have main effects on perceived leader charisma and moral character.

> *Hypothesis 4:* A reputation for honest versus deceptive behavior will elicit (a) higher levels of perceived leader charisma and lower levels of perceived leader (b) hypocrisy and (c) exploitativeness.

In Awamleh and Gardner's (1999) study, the highest levels of perceived leader charisma and effectiveness were found for the combination of a strong delivery with visionary speech content, presumably because it best reflects the inspirational speaking skills associated with charismatic leaders. In the current study, content was manipulated by presenting either an exemplary or pragmatic message, with the former posited in Hypothesis 1 to elicit attributions of charisma, effectiveness, and moral worthiness. Accordingly, the following interactive effects of content and delivery are predicted.

> *Hypothesis 5:* A strong delivery style and an exemplary self-presentation by the leader will elicit higher levels of perceived leader (a) charisma and (b) effectiveness and lower levels of perceived leader (c) hypocrisy and (d) exploitativeness than any other combination of delivery and self-presentation strategy.

The hypothesis of primary interest pertains to the interactive effects that leader claims of moral worthiness and ethical reputation have on perceived charisma and moral character. Drawing on the 1986 research of Gilbert and Jones, a similar, but not identical, pattern of results is expected. Recall that exemplifiers in their study were rated as less exploitative than pragmatists, regardless of whether they subsequently did or did not cheat. However, this

experiment differs from their study in that the information on the leader's ethical conduct pertains to *prior* behavior as reported by his references. As such, raters are expected to view a leader who portrays himself as morally worthy, despite prior unethical behavior, as more hypocritical and exploitative than a pragmatist who describes himself as morally adaptable.

> *Hypothesis 6:* Leaders who present themselves as exemplifiers as opposed to pragmatists will be perceived as less hypocritical and exploitative when a reputation for honesty is subsequently revealed; however, leaders who claim to be exemplifiers as opposed to pragmatists and have a reputation for deceptive behavior will be perceived as more hypocritical and exploitative.

The final hypothesis addresses the interactive effects of generalized leadership beliefs with the leader's ethical reputation. Recall that Meindl (1990) asserts that high versus low RLS persons are predisposed to use leadership as an explanatory category; they are also more likely to use organizational outcomes and the prototypicality of leader behaviors to make inferences about leader attributes. Whereas organizational performance is held constant in this study, the leader's ethical reputation is varied to alter the level of social responsibility portrayed. Because social responsibility is a type of organizational outcome, the ratings of high versus low RLS persons are expected to be more affected by this manipulation.

> *Hypothesis 7:* Persons scoring high as opposed to low on the RLS will perceive leaders with a reputation for honesty as being less hypocritical and exploitative, whereas leaders with a reputation for deception will be perceived as more hypocritical and exploitative.

METHOD

MANIPULATIONS

To operationalize the content and delivery treatments, four 10-minute videotapes of a professional actor were created. The actor

played the role of Robert Adams, a 47-year-old business school dean who was interviewing for a deanship at another school. The videotape was presented as the by-product of a teleconference with the candidate. The actor was seated at a conference room table and questioned by an off-camera interviewer. This scenario was chosen because it appeared to be highly relevant to the participants, who were students in a business school that was actively searching for a new dean at the time of the study.

Content manipulation. Message content was manipulated across two self-presentation treatments: exemplification and pragmatism. An interview by an alumni magazine with an actual business school dean was adapted to provide the initial text. The interviewer introduced herself as a representative of the search committee for the position of dean at the Patterson School of Business. She then asked for and received the candidate's permission to share a videotape of the teleconference with faculty who were unable to attend. The candidate's responses to two initial questions about his qualifications (his prior experience as a dean) and the factors that piqued his interest in the position (the school's outstanding faculty, students, facilities, and reputation) were held constant.

The content manipulation was introduced as part of the candidate's responses to the next three questions about his approach to leadership, plans for marketing the school, and style of communication. These responses were varied by interjecting adapted excerpts from the exemplary and pragmatic treatments developed by Jones, Schwartz, and Gilbert (1983/1984) and Gilbert and Jones (1986), plus small segments from other sources on ethical leader conduct (Rosen & Brown, 1996; Trevino & Nelson, 1995). Under the exemplary treatment, the candidate's responses included statements that describe him as an honest and ethical individual who cannot tolerate deceit and prides himself on being fair and equitable. Under the pragmatic treatment, the candidate described himself as a practical and adaptable person who strives to present information in the best possible light, even if it is necessary to stretch the truth to do so. The response to the final question about the appropriate mission for a school of business (to foster economic growth for individuals, organizations, and communities) was again adapted from the alumni magazine interview and held constant.

Delivery manipulation. Delivery of the leader's interview responses was manipulated to create two delivery styles: strong and weak. As in the Holladay and Coombs (1993, 1994) and Awamleh and Gardner (1999) studies, the actor in the strong-delivery treatment was trained to maintain eye contact, exhibit vocal fluency, use facial expressions (e.g., smiles), and engage in dynamic hand gestures. In the weak treatment, the actor was instructed to avoid eye contact, minimize facial expressions (e.g., no smiles), exhibit speech errors and hesitations, elevate the pitch of his voice, and engage in shifts in posture.

To avoid creating obvious demand characteristics, a conscious effort was made to prevent unrealistic differences in delivery. Hence, the leader in both treatments remained seated and refrained from dramatic body gestures that would violate normal interview etiquette. Moreover, the weak-delivery leader was not portrayed as an excessively nervous or inept communicator. Such a portrayal seemed inconsistent with the description of a successful dean, who presumably would possess some minimal level of confidence and social skills. Instead, he was depicted as being somewhat distracted (fidgeting) and distant (little eye contact, speaking in a monotone)—behaviors that are not uncommon among successful academics. Thus, both delivery treatments reflected nonverbal behaviors that a candidate for a dean's position might realistically exhibit.

Ethical reputation manipulation. To operationalize the reputation manipulation, participants were given information reportedly gained from references as part of a background check. Under the honest reputation treatment, calls to five of the leader's references revealed a reputation for being highly trustworthy. When asked for an example to illustrate his integrity, three references reported that he insisted on providing accurate data to national publications that rank business schools, despite pressure from superiors to misrepresent this data. In contrast, under the deceptive reputation treatment, the leader's references reluctantly divulged that he had a tarnished reputation as a man who sometimes manipulated the truth. When asked for examples, three references indicated that he had pressured them to provide misleading data to national publications that rank business schools.

PILOT STUDY

To assess the effectiveness of the content, delivery, and ethical reputation manipulations, an initial pilot study was conducted.

Participants. The participants were 154 undergraduate students enrolled in marketing and management courses who agreed to take part in the pilot study in exchange for extra course credit. The majority were males (65.6%) with a mean age of 21.2 (*SD* = 1.1). Most were seniors (69.5%), followed by juniors (29.2%), and graduate students (1.3%).

Procedure. To assess the effectiveness of the content and delivery manipulations, 118 undergraduate students from intact management and marketing classes were assigned to view one of the four video segments. At the outset of the study, participants were provided with a brief written overview of the research. Next, they read a written biographical profile of the candidate (adapted from an actual dean's biographical sketch), and the appropriate video segment was shown. Finally, the participants' impressions of the leader were measured.

For the reputation manipulation, 46 students from two separate marketing classes were randomly assigned to the honest and deceptive reputation treatments by alternating the reputation scenarios that were distributed in class. The participants were simultaneously provided with a handout that included a written overview of the study, the biographical profile, one of the reputation scenarios, and a set of rating scales. (These raters did not observe a videotape of the job interview.) The written directions instructed the participants to examine the biographical profile, followed by the reference materials, before answering the questions about their perceptions of the candidate.

Manipulation checks. The content, delivery and reputation manipulations were evaluated using 5-point Likert-type scales (1 = *strongly disagree*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *neither agree nor disagree*, 4 = *agree*, 5 = *strongly agree*) and 3, 15, and 5 descriptive statements,

TABLE 1:   Manipulation Check Results

Manipulation/Item Stem	Exemplary (n = 40)		Pragmatic (n = 58)		
Content	M	SD	M	SD	t test
During the interview, Robert Adams:					
Described himself as honest and fair	4.30	.65	3.07	1.08	6.50***
Described himself as practical and pragmatic	3.37	1.03	3.75	.90	–1.98*
Described himself as flexible and adaptable	2.98	1.00	3.62	1.13	–2.97**
	Strong (n = 54)		Weak (n = 54)		
Delivery	M	SD	M	SD	t test
During the interview, Robert Adams:					
Maintained eye contact with his audience	4.09	.92	1.80	.98	12.58***
Exhibited emotion through facial expressions	3.44	.98	3.09	1.22	1.65
Spoke in a dynamic fashion	3.31	.97	2.69	1.11	3.14**
Expressed enthusiasm through his speech	3.30	1.02	2.37	1.14	4.45***
Engaged in awkward body movements (e.g., fidgeting, rubbing face)	3.31	1.31	4.53	1.04	–5.36***
Presented himself with confidence	4.04	.85	3.24	1.32	3.74***
Spoke directly to audience	3.98	.92	1.98	.84	11.82***
Expressed himself clearly	3.52	1.11	3.19	1.18	3.92***
Hesitated and exhibited awkward pauses while speaking	3.26	1.20	3.76	1.20	–2.17*
Communicated excitement through his delivery	2.76	.97	2.02	.98	3.95***
Appeared to be a smooth and polished speaker	3.11	.98	2.19	1.05	4.73***
Smiled at his audience	2.56	1.06	1.69	.80	4.83***
Clearly articulated his words	3.87	.78	3.00	1.15	4.61***
Displayed strong hand and body gestures	2.98	.88	3.44	1.24	–2.24*
Was aware of his body movements	2.82	1.01	2.07	.99	3.85***
	Honest (n = 25)		Deceptive (n = 21)		
Reputation	M	SD	M	SD	t test
Individuals who served as references for Robert Adams indicated he:					
Has a tendency to stretch the truth when representing Drexler School of Business	1.71	.84	4.19	.60	–11.24***
Resisted pressures to "massage" data regarding Drexler's MBA program	4.00	1.01	1.81	.86	7.00***
Is honest and candid when representing Drexler	4.28	.74	2.19	.75	9.50***
Pressured administrators and faculty to massage data	1.76	.93	3.85	.91	–7.71***
Has a tendency to distort facts when representing Drexler	1.64	.70	3.81	.75	–10.14***

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

respectively. Table 1 presents these items, as well as the means and standard deviations for each treatment level, and *t* tests comparing the means across treatments. The *t* tests revealed significant differences in the intended direction for 19 of 21 items, demonstrating the effectiveness of the manipulations.

To further assess the effects of the manipulations on perceived integrity, a 7-item scale was constructed. Respondents rated the accuracy (1 = *extremely inaccurate*, 2 = *inaccurate*, 3 = *don't know*, 4 = *accurate*, 5 = *extremely accurate*) of 9 descriptive adjectives for Robert Adams. Two adjectives, deceitful and genuine, were deleted due to low item-to-total correlations. The resultant scale included the following adjectives: honest, moral, deceptive (reverse), trustworthy, dishonest (reverse), ethical, and manipulative (reverse). Alpha coefficients for the final scale of .88 and .96, respectively, were obtained from the pilot study samples used to evaluate the content/delivery and reputation manipulations.

An ANOVA revealed significant main effects for content ($F = 17.80$, $p < .001$) and delivery ($F = 20.93$, $p < .001$) on perceived integrity; the content by delivery interaction was not significant ($F = .24$, $p = 62$). Consistent with Hypothesis 1, the exemplary ($M = 3.44$, $SD = .77$) as opposed to the pragmatic ($M = 2.91$, $SD = .69$) content treatment yielded significantly higher ratings of perceived integrity. Significantly higher ratings of leader integrity were also obtained for the strong ($M = 3.39$, $SD = .72$) versus weak ($M = 2.83$, $SD = .70$) delivery treatment, as anticipated by Hypothesis 3. The Least Significant Differences (LSD) procedure was used to compare means for the four content × delivery cells. The magnitude of the significant difference between the exemplary content/strong delivery ($M = 3.80$, $SD = .68$) and the pragmatic content/weak delivery ($M = 2.64$, $SD = .62$) means shows the additive effects of these factors on perceived integrity. No differences were revealed for the exemplary content/weak delivery ($M = 3.13$, $SD = .72$) and the pragmatic content/strong delivery ($M = 3.17$, $SD = .65$) cells. Finally, a *t* test conducted to assess the effects of the reputation manipulation on perceived integrity revealed significant differences ($t = 10.13$, $p < .001$) for the honest ($M = 4.15$, $SD = .62$) versus deceptive ($M = 2.20$, $SD = .69$) treatments. Overall, the results of the pilot study indicate that the manipulations were effective.

MAIN STUDY

Participants. The participants for the main study were 145 undergraduate students from introductory management information systems (MIS) classes who agreed to take part in the study in exchange for extra credit. The majority were male (60.7%) with a mean age of 19.86 (*SD* = .96). Most of the participants were sophomores (64.0%), followed by juniors (26.6%), seniors (5.8%), graduate students (2.2%), and freshmen (1.4%). Finally, 93.8% reported having business experience, with 3 to 5 years representing the most common amount (50.3%), followed by 1 to 2 years (28.3%), less than 1 year (7.6%), and 6 to 10 years (7.6%).

Design. A 2×2×2 factorial design was adopted in which content (exemplification/pragmatism), delivery (strong/weak), and ethical reputation (honest/deceptive) were manipulated to produce eight different treatments. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the eight treatment groups to produce nearly equivalent cell sizes of 18 to 19.

Procedure. Participants first received Part I of the instrument package, which included the written instructions and the biographical profile. One of the four content × delivery videotape segments was then shown to randomly assigned participants. Next, Part II of the instrument package was administered. This included the ethical reputation scenario, followed by the dependent variable measures and the RLS (Meindl & Erhlich, 1988). By introducing the leader's ethical reputation after the delivery and content manipulations, it was possible to assess the effect of inconsistencies between a leader's self-described moral character and ethical reputation on perceived leader charisma, effectiveness and integrity.

Dependent measures. To measure perceived leader charisma, a 12-item scale was adopted from Bass and Avolio's (1995) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5x/Short Form). Sample items include: (a) "talks about his most important values and beliefs"; (b) "instills pride in being associated with him"; (c) "acts in ways that build your trust"; (d) "articulates a compelling vision of the future"; and (e) "considers the ethical and moral con-

sequences of his decisions." Two additional MLQ items ("is effective in meeting organizational requirements," and "overall, leads an organization that is effective"), plus one original item ("is an effective leader"), were combined to form a measure of leader effectiveness. Item responses for both measures include 0 = *not at all*; 1 = *once in a while*; 2 = *sometimes*; 3 = *fairly often*; and 4 = *frequently, if not always*.

Consistent with the 1986 study of Gilbert and Jones, a 9-item semantic differential scale was used to measure perceived exploitativeness and hypocrisy. Each item was composed of a 7-point antonym scale and anchored at the extremes by a pair of trait adjectives, including *honest-dishonest*, *trustworthy-untrustworthy*, *sincere-insincere*, *authentic-phony,* and *genuine-hypocritical*. A principal components analysis with varimax rotation was performed to determine if the exploitativeness and hypocrisy factors identified by Gilbert and Jones would emerge. Instead, a single-factor solution (Eigenvalue = 6.28) was identified, accounting for 69.8% of the variance, with all of the items loading above .75. One possible reason for this discrepancy is that some adjectives (e.g., selfish, uses others) employed by Gilbert and Jones were omitted because they were deemed to be inappropriate for the current experimental context. In light of the one-factor solution, a decision was made to use a single 9-item "perceived leader integrity" scale in subsequent tests of the hypotheses.

RLS. Dispositional tendencies to romanticize leadership were measured via the 11-item RLS (Form C) with a 5-point (5 = *strongly agree* to 1 = *strongly disagree*) Likert-type response form (Meindl & Ehrlich, 1988). A median split was used to divide the sample into high versus low RLS participants.

RESULTS

Scale means, standard deviations, alpha coefficients, and intercorrelations are reported in Table 2. For most scales, the coefficient alpha exceeded .75, providing evidence of reliability. However, a relatively low alpha of .68 was obtained for the RLS-C scale.

TABLE 2: Scale Means, Standard Deviations, Alpha Coefficients, and Intercorrelations

Variable (n = 145)	M	SD	Alpha	1	2	3
1. Charisma	2.66	0.59	.84			
2. Perceived leader effectiveness	2.82	0.75	.77	.69**		
3. Perceived leader integrity	4.24	1.39	.93	.56**	.52**	
4. Romance of Leadership Scale	3.91	0.41	.68	.02	.00	.06

*p < 05; **p < 01.

In an attempt to improve the scale's reliability, an examination was conducted of the item-to-total correlations, as well as the alpha coefficient if particular items were deleted. This analysis revealed that the reliability of the scale could not be improved by removing items. Although the scale's alpha coefficient is obviously lower than desired, it nevertheless approaches the .70 guideline recommended by psychometricians (Gay & Diehl, 1992).

To test the hypotheses, a MANOVA was performed in which content, delivery, ethical reputation, and RLS were included as factors, and perceived leader charisma, effectiveness, and integrity served as the dependent variables. MANOVA is appropriate because the dependent variables are highly correlated (see Table 2). The Multivariate F, Univariate F, effect size (η^2), and observed power for the MANOVA results are summarized in Table 3.

MAIN EFFECTS

As Table 3 indicates, the multivariate analysis revealed significant main effects for content, delivery, and ethical reputation, but not RLS. From the univariate analysis, significant main effects of content are apparent for perceived leader effectiveness ($M_{Exemp} = 2.95/SD = .73$ versus $M_{Prag} = 2.69/SD = .75$) and integrity ($M_{Exemp} = 4.57/SD = 1.33$ versus $M_{Prag} = 3.92/SD = 1.37$). Thus, consistent with Hypothesis 1b, c, and d, when the leader made exemplary versus pragmatic claims, he was rated as having greater integrity and judged to be more effective; contrary to Hypothesis 1a, however, content was unrelated to charisma. Not surprisingly, given the ethical contrast in the content treatments, content appeared to have

TABLE 3: General MANOVA Model: Main Effects and Significant Interactions

Variable	Multivariate F (Wilks's Lambda)	Univariate F	η^2	Observed Power[a]
Content model	3.012*		.067	.70
Charisma		3.107	.024	.42
Perceived leader effectiveness		4.473*	.034	.56
Perceived leader integrity		8.563**	.063	.83
Delivery model	6.370***		.132	.96
Charisma		11.678**	.084	.92
Perceived leader effectiveness		18.484***	.126	.99
Perceived leader integrity		3.529	.027	.46
Ethical reputation model	5.410**		.114	.93
Charisma		1.801	.014	.27
Perceived leader effectiveness		2.372	.018	.33
Perceived leader integrity		15.783***	.110	.98
Romance of Leadership Scale (RLS) model	0.013		.000	.05
Charisma		0.003	.000	.05
Perceived leader effectiveness		0.030	.000	.05
Perceived leader integrity		0.000	.000	.05
Delivery × reputation model	2.782*		.062	.66
Charisma		2.029	.016	.29
Perceived leader effectiveness		5.513*	.041	.64
Perceived leader integrity		6.480*	.048	.71
Delivery × RLS model	4.920**		.105	.90
Charisma		0.297	.002	.08
Perceived leader effectiveness		9.495**	.069	.86
Perceived leader integrity		0.004	.000	.05

Computed using alpha = .05.
*$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

stronger effects for perceived leader integrity ($\eta^2 = .063$) than effectiveness ($\eta^2 = .034$).

For delivery, the univariate analysis revealed significant effects for perceived leader charisma ($\eta^2 = .084$) and effectiveness ($\eta^2 = .126$). As posited by Hypotheses 2a and b, the leader was judged to be more charismatic ($M_{Strong} = 2.82/SD = .51$ versus $M_{Weak} = 2.51/SD = .63$) and effective ($M_{Strong} = 3.05/SD = .65$ versus $M_{Weak} = 2.59/SD = .78$) under the strong as opposed to weak delivery treatment. Contrary to Hypothesis 3, delivery was not related to perceived integrity.

For ethical reputation, the univariate analysis revealed a significant main effect ($\eta^2 = .110$) for perceived leader integrity only

($M_{\text{Honest}} = 4.68/SD = 1.29$ versus $M_{\text{Deceptive}} = 3.80/SD = 1.35$). Consistent with Hypotheses 4b and c, the leader was deemed to have greater integrity when shown to have a reputation for honesty rather than deception. The effect of ethical reputation on perceived leader charisma predicted by Hypothesis 4a, however, did not emerge.

INTERACTION EFFECTS

As part of the MANOVA, all interactions were examined; those that emerged as significant are presented in Table 3. None of the 3-way or the 4-way interactions were significant. Moreover, none of the 2-way interactions posited by Hypotheses 5 to 7 emerged. Nevertheless, three 2-way interactions for delivery, reputation, and RLS emerged that are consistent with the underlying reasoning for these hypotheses, as explained below.

Delivery × reputation. As Table 3 indicates, the multivariate test for a delivery × reputation interaction was significant; the univariate analysis revealed significant delivery × reputation interactions for perceived leader effectiveness ($\eta^2 = .041$) and integrity ($\eta^2 = .046$), but not charisma. To locate the group differences, a post-hoc analysis using the LSD method was employed.

The results indicate that a strong delivery coupled with an honest reputation produced a significantly higher mean ($M = 3.26$, $SD = .56$) for perceived leader effectiveness than was the case for the strong delivery / deceptive reputation ($M = 2.83$, $SD = .67$); weak delivery / honest reputation ($M = 2.53$, $SD = .83$); and weak delivery / deceptive reputation ($M = 2.65$, $SD = .73$) treatments. Similarly, the strong delivery / honest reputation ($M = 5.11$, $SD = 1.04$) combination yielded a significantly higher mean for perceived leader integrity than was the case for the strong delivery / deceptive reputation ($M = 3.71$, $SD = 1.25$); weak delivery / honest reputation ($M = 4.23$, $SD = 1.39$); and weak delivery/deceptive reputation ($M = 3.89$, $SD = 1.45$) treatments. Although not predicted a priori, these findings imply that when a leader's delivery is strong and the leader is later revealed to have resisted pressure to deceive, raters' make strong inferences of integrity that spill over to judgments of leader effectiveness. In contrast, when delivery was weak, no significant

differences in perceived leader effectiveness or integrity were revealed for the leader with an honest versus a deceptive reputation.

Delivery × RLS. The 2-way interaction predicted by Hypothesis 7 of ethical reputation with RLS for perceived leader integrity failed to emerge. Nevertheless, the multivariate analysis did reveal a significant delivery × RLS interaction, and a significant univariate *F*-statistic for this interaction was obtained for perceived leader effectiveness ($\eta^2 = .069$). A post-hoc LSD analysis indicates that the mean for the strong delivery / high RLS combination ($M = 3.25$, $SD = .58$) is significantly higher than the means for the other three combinations, whereas the mean for the weak delivery / high RLS combination ($M = 2.39$, $SD = .87$) is significantly lower than the means for the other three groups. No significant differences were obtained between the means of the low RLS / strong delivery ($M = 2.88$, $SD = .66$) and the low RLS / weak delivery ($M = 2.75$, $SD = .65$) groups, suggesting that low RLS respondents are unaffected by delivery when evaluating leader effectiveness.

DISCUSSION

The findings demonstrate the complex effects that self-presentation content, delivery, ethical reputation, and romance of leadership disposition exert on perceptions of leadership. As Hypotheses 1c and 1d and Hypotheses 4b and 4c predicted, the exemplary content and honest reputation treatments produced higher levels of perceived leader integrity than the pragmatic content and deceptive reputation treatments. The effects of content and reputation on attributed charisma posited by Hypothesis 1a and Hypothesis 4a, however, did not emerge. Finally, support for the hypothesized effect of content for perceived leader effectiveness (Hypothesis 1b) was obtained. Together, these results indicate that people incorporate information about a leader's ethical conduct provided by either the leader (exemplary versus pragmatic), or a third party (an employment reference), in forming impressions of leader integrity and, in the former case, assessments of leader effectiveness.

Consistent with prior studies (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999; Holladay & Coombs, 1993, 1994), a strong versus weak delivery style was shown to produce higher levels of perceived charisma. Moreover, the elevated leader effectiveness ratings obtained for the strong delivery treatment replicate one of Awamleh and Gardner's findings. These results reinforce their conclusion that what a leader says may, at times, be less important to fostering a charismatic image than how he or she says it.

Contrary to Hypothesis 3 and the pilot study results, delivery was not related to perceived leader integrity in the main study. Instead, delivery interacted with the leader's ethical reputation in determining perceptions of integrity. Thus, a strong delivery does not appear to have a positive halo effect on perceptions of integrity that obfuscates reputational effects. Still, the cumulative findings make it clear that the leader's nonverbal and expressive behaviors are basic determinants of observers' (and potential followers') impressions.

The relationships of greatest interest involve the interactive effects of the independent variables. Contrary to Hypothesis 5, content did not interact with delivery to produce higher ratings of the dependent variables under the exemplary content / strong delivery treatment. Moreover, the "boomerang" effect identified by Gilbert and Jones (1986), and predicted by Hypothesis 6, failed to emerge when the leader's claims of exemplary behavior were contradicted by his ethical reputation. However, other interactions emerged that, although not predicted a priori, can readily be interpreted using the theory and research from which the hypotheses were derived.

Consider, for example, the delivery × ethical reputation interaction. A strong delivery in combination with an honest reputation was shown to elicit elevated ratings of integrity and effectiveness; reputation had little effect on such ratings, however, when delivery was weak. Apparently, when the leader's delivery is strong and confident, raters interpret third-party reports of ethical conduct as strong evidence of leader integrity, whereas reports of improprieties undermine such inferences. In contrast, when delivery is weak, observers form negative impressions that are relatively impervious to subsequent reputational information.

Hypothesis 7 predicted that RLS disposition would interact with ethical reputation to produce differential ratings of leader integrity.

Instead, a delivery $\times$ RLS interaction for perceived effectiveness emerged. High RLS participants rated the leader as being more effective following a strong versus weak delivery; ratings by low RLS persons did not vary as a function of delivery. Moreover, high RLS persons exposed to a weak delivery deemed the leader to be less effective than low RLS persons exposed to either delivery style. Meindl (1990) asserts that high RLS individuals are especially inclined to infer strong leadership when exposed to evidence of high performance and weak leadership when presented with evidence of low performance. In contrast, the ratings of low RLS persons are not expected to vary as a function of performance cues because they assign less significance to leadership as a causal category. If strength of delivery is viewed as a performance cue, the observed interaction is consistent with Meindl's predictions. Thus, RLS is a potentially useful individual difference variable that merits consideration when examining perceived leadership. However, because the effects of RLS only emerged in combination with other factors, it is important for future researchers to search for meaningful RLS interactions.

LIMITATIONS AND GENERALIZABILITY ISSUES

As in all research, this study has several notable limitations. First, the constructs of exploitativeness and hypocrisy examined by Gilbert and Jones (1986) failed to emerge as distinct variables based on the principal components analysis. As such, the hypotheses pertaining to these separate variables could not be tested; instead, they were examined using a single perceived integrity measure. This change limits the comparability of the experiment to the Gilbert and Jones study it sought to extend. Second, the significant interactions that emerged, although consistent with the theory reviewed, were not predicted a priori. As such, further investigation and replication is required to assess their validity.

Third, the power analysis indicates that the sample size of 145 participants with 18 to 19 per cell was inadequate for detecting relatively small treatment effects. As Table 3 indicates, the observed power exceeded or approached the recommended .80 level (Keppel, 1991) for findings with effect sizes that Cohen (1977) identifies as

"moderate" (.06) to "large" (.15). However, it fell below this level for some of the significant findings with smaller effect sizes, and all of the nonsignificant results. Future studies with larger samples and greater power are required before we can conclude that the nonsignificant findings truly reflect an absence of meaningful differences as opposed to insufficient power to detect them.

A final but basic limitation is the artificiality of the experimental design. Indeed, the control provided by the experimental treatments was gained at the expense of some realism. Specifically, the participants did not interact in a face-to-face exchange with the leader; instead, they viewed 10-minute videotapes of a bogus employment interview. Obviously, watching a videotape is far different from interacting with a leader. Because the raters were not actual followers, the extent to which their perceptions would generalize to followers is unclear. Moreover, respondents' perceptions were formed based on a single brief exposure to the leader. Future research using a longitudinal design in which perceptions are measured on multiple occasions after repeated and lengthier exposures would provide greater insight into the effects that leader transgressions have on their reputations for integrity over time.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

The findings have several important implications for practitioners. First, as studies accumulate that show actors can be trained to elicit attributions of charisma (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999; Holladay & Coombs, 1993, 1994; Howell & Frost, 1989), it becomes clear that we can likewise train leaders to be more charismatic. Of course, such efforts are already commonplace within the political sphere. However, given the host of desirable outcomes that have been linked to charismatic leadership, including heightened levels of follower trust, effort, satisfaction, commitment, empowerment, collective identity, internal cohesion, value congruence, performance ratings, and organizational effectiveness (Bass, 1985, 1988; Bryman, 1992; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996; Shamir et al., 1993), interest in charismatic leadership training within business, educational, military, and other contexts is likely to accelerate. Indeed, the notion that

charisma is trainable is readily accepted by prominent theorists (Bryman, 1992), and serious efforts to teach leaders some of the skills and behaviors associated with charisma are already under way, with promising results (Barling, Weber, & Kelloway, 1996).

Findings from the current and prior studies (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999; Holladay & Coombs, 1993, 1994) suggest that such efforts should focus special attention on nonverbal and expressive behaviors because these appear to be especially potent determinants of perceived charisma. Of course, not all leaders possess the aptitude or inclination to acquire a strong style of delivery. Those who lack self-monitoring skills (Snyder, 1979) and behavioral flexibility (Zaccaro, Foti, & Kenny, 1991) are unlikely to be capable of monitoring and adapting their behavior to model a charismatic style of delivery. Accordingly, measures of these abilities might be used to identify promising candidates for charismatic training.

Although the appeal of charismatic training is obvious, the well-documented dangers associated with the "dark side" of charisma (Conger, 1990; Howell & Avolio, 1992) make it clear that we should proceed with caution. While charismatic leaders can achieve great things, they are also capable of unspeakable evils. As cries arise for more dynamic and effective leaders, there is a very real danger that the fundamental importance of leader integrity will be overlooked. Moreover, given the influence of leader modeling on follower behavior (Sims & Manz, 1981/1982), leaders who espouse ethical conduct but behave otherwise may produce cynicism and a decline in moral standards among followers. Such concerns have elicited calls for an ethical approach to leadership that requires high moral standards as a prerequisite to effective leadership (Kanungo & Mendonca, 1996). To achieve this, both public and private morality must be incorporated into the development and practice of leadership.

REFERENCES

Awamleh, R., & Gardner, W. L. (1999). Perceptions of leader charisma and effectiveness: The effects of vision content, delivery, and organizational performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*, 345-373.

Barling, J., Weber, T., & Kelloway, E. K. (1996). Effects of transformational leadership training on attitudinal and financial outcomes: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*, 827-832.

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

Bass, B. M. (1988). Evolving perspectives on charismatic leadership. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 40-77). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *Mutlifactor leadership questionnaire: Rater form (5X short)*. Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.

Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. London: Sage.

Cohen, J. (1977). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (Rev. ed.). New York: Academic Press.

Conger, J. A. (1990). The dark side of leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, *19*(2), 44-55.

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

DePaulo, B. M. (1992). Non-verbal behavior and self-presentation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *111*, 203-243.

DePaulo, B. M., Stone, J. I., & Lassiter, G. D. (1985). Deceiving and detecting deceit. In B. M. Schlenker (Ed.), *The self and social life* (pp. 323-370). New York: McGraw-Hill.

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

Gardner, W. L., & Cleavenger, D. (1998). Impression management strategies associated with transformational leaders at the world-class level: A psychohistorical assessment. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *12*, 3-41.

Gay, L. R., & Diehl, P. L. (1992). *Research methods for business and management*. New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Gilbert, D. T., & Jones, E. E. (1986). Exemplification: The self-presentation of moral character. *Journal of Personality*, *54*, 593-615.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor.

Holladay, S. J., & Coombs, W. T. (1993). Communicating visions: An exploration of the role of delivery in the creation of leader charisma. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *6*, 405-427.

Holladay, S. J., & Coombs, W. T. (1994). Speaking of visions and visions being spoken: An exploration of the effects of content and delivery on perceptions of leader charisma. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *8*, 165-189.

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, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, *23*, 409-473.

Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1992). The ethics of charismatic leadership: Submission or liberation? *Academy of Management Executive*, *6*(2), 43-54.

Howell, J. M., & Frost, P. J. (1989). A laboratory study of charismatic leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*, *43*, 243-269.

Jones, E. E., & Pittman, T. S. (1982). Toward a general theory of strategic self-presentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives on the self* (Vol. 1) (pp. 231-262). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Jones, E. E., Schwartz, J., & Gilbert, D. T. (1983-1984). Perceptions of moral-expectancy violation: The role of expectancy source. *Social Cognition*, *2*, 273-293.

Kanungo, R. N., & Mendonca, M. (1996). *Ethical dimensions of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Keppel, G. (1991). *Design and analysis: A researcher's handbook* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Lowe, K. B., & Gardner, W. L. (2000). Ten years of *Leadership Quarterly*: Contributions and challenges for the future. *Leadership Quarterly*, *11*, 459-514.

Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformation and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly*, *7*, 385-425.

Meindl, J. R. (1990). On leadership: An alternative to the conventional wisdom. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 12, pp. 159-204). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Meindl, J. R., & Ehrlich, S. B. (1988). Developing a romance of leadership scale. *Proceedings of the Eastern Academy of Management*, 133-135.

Meindl, J. R., Ehrlich, S. G., & Dukerich, J. M. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *30*, 78-102.

Rosen, R. H., & Brown, P. B. (1996). *Leading people: Transforming business from the inside out*. New York: Viking.

Shamir, B. (1992). Attribution of influence and charisma to the leader: The romance of leadership revisited. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *22*, 386-407.

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

Sims, H. P., & Manz, C. C. (1981-1982). Social learning theory: The role of modeling in the exercise of leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *3*, 55-63.

Snyder, M. (1979). Self-monitoring processes. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 85-128). New York: Academic Press.

Tedeschi, J. T., & Norman, N. (1985). Social power, self-presentation, and the self. In B. R. Schlenker (Ed.), *The self and social life* (pp. 293-322). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Trevino, L. K., & Nelson, K. A. (1995). *Managing business ethics: Straight talk about how to do it right*. New York: Wiley.

Willner, A. R. (1984). *The spellbinders: Charismatic political leadership*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Zaccaro, S. J., Foti, R. J., & Kenny, D. A. (1991). Self-monitoring and trait-based variance in leadership: An investigation of leader flexibility across multiple group situations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *76*, 308-315.

Zuckerman, M., DePaulo, B. M., & Rosenthal, R. (1981). Verbal and nonverbal communication of deceit. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 14, pp. 1-59). New York: Academic Press.

William L. Gardner is the Michael S. Starnes Professor of Management at the University of Mississippi. He received his D.B.A. and M.B.A. from Florida State University and his B.S. degree in business administration from Susquehanna University. His current research interests include charismatic leadership, impression management, learned helplessness, attribution theory, and managerial work. He is a fellow of the Southern Management Association.