Available online at www.sciencedirect.com
ScienceDirect
ELSEVIER
The Leadership Quarterly 19 (2008) 54 – 76
The Leadership Quarterly
www.elsevier.com/locate/leaqua

Presidential charismatic leadership: Exploring the rhetoric of social change

Viviane Seyranian, Michelle C. Bligh *

School of Behavioral and Organizational Sciences, Claremont Graduate University, 123 East Eighth Street, Claremont, CA 91711, USA

Abstract

Fiol, Harris and House [(1999). Charismatic leadership: Strategies for effecting social change. Leadership Quarterly, 10, 449–482] provide support for the theory that charismatic leaders introduce social change by employing communication targeted at changing followers' values in a temporal sequence: frame-breaking (phase 1), frame-moving (phase 2), and frame-realigning (phase 3). Using computerized content analysis, the current study extended these findings by testing additional communication tactics in temporal sequence on a larger sample of US presidential speeches with an expanded presidential charisma measure. Compared to non-charismatic leaders, charismatic leaders emphasized their similarity to followers in phase 1 and used negation in phase 2. Both leadership types used increasingly active and tangible language as they moved from phase 1 to 2 to 3. Across phases, charismatic leaders communicated with imagery and stressed inclusion, while referring less to conceptual thoughts and inspiration. A theoretical model of *social identity framing* is introduced to provide additional insight into how leaders communicate for social change.
© 2007 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Charisma; Leadership; Social change; Communication; Rhetoric; American presidents; Social identity; Framing

1. Introduction

Social change broadly relates to modifying the existing social order, convention, or status quo in some way. For example, social change may pertain to solving an existing social problem in an innovative way (Fiol, Harris, & House, 1999), changing group norms, or changing relations between groups (Tajfel, 1981). Charismatic leadership theory (Weber, 1946) postulates that charismatic leaders institute social change and alter the status quo in some fundamental way (see Fiol et al., 1999). Charismatic leaders achieve this end by presenting people with a powerful vision that inspires and motivates them towards social change. Specifically, these leaders articulate a vision that appeals to people's emotions and boosts self worth (Emrich, Brower, Feldman, & Garland, 2001; House, Spangler, & Woyke, 1991). As a consequence, followers form strong emotional attachments and have a high sense of trust and confidence in the charismatic leader (House et al., 1991). Additionally, these leaders seem to have an almost "magical ability" (Weber, 1946) to evoke in their followers an intrinsic motivation to make personal sacrifices in implementing the leader's vision (House et al., 1991; see also De Cremer, 2002;

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 909 607 3715; fax: +1 909 621 8905.
E-mail address: michelle.bligh@cgu.edu (M.C. Bligh).

1048-9843/$ - see front matter © 2007 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.12.005

McClelland, 1985). The performance and effectiveness of charismatic leaders is theorized to lay, at least in part, in their ability to inspire followers to work towards a vision rather than motivating followers with rewards and punishments. In particular, charismatic leaders tend to use specific communication strategies to inspire followers and implement social change (Bligh, Kohles, & Meindl, 2004a; Emrich et al., 2001; Fiol et al., 1999; Shamir, Arthur, & House, 1994). The current study replicates and extends previous research by examining additional rhetorical strategies used by charismatic leaders when persuading followers to adopt their vision of social change.

Drawing on Lewin's (1951) field theory, Fiol et al. (1999) suggest that charismatic leaders affect social change by employing specific rhetorical strategies targeted at changing followers' personal and social values. These strategies are theorized to follow a temporal sequence whereby leaders manipulate different aspects of followers' personal motivations (desires and fears) and social values (convention and innovation) during separate and temporally distinct stages. In the first phase (phase 1), charismatic leaders employ *frame-breaking* strategies by attempting to reduce the value people place on the current social convention. Specifically, these leaders derogate social convention by either: (a) negating people's desire to maintain the status quo; or, (b) negating their fear of change or innovation. In the second phase (phase 2), charismatic leaders engage in *frame-moving* strategies by attempting to move people's neutral state of either non-support for convention or non-fear of change to support for change. They accomplish this by either: (a) encouraging people's desire for non-convention; or, (b) encouraging people to fear not changing the old convention. In the final phase (phase 3), charismatic leaders use *frame-realigning* to convince followers to support their new vision by either: (a) substituting a desire for non-convention to a desire for change or innovation; or, (b) substituting the fear of not changing the old convention to a desire for innovation. It is during this final phase that charismatic leaders mobilize their support from followers and encourage them towards action.

To test this model, Fiol et al. (1999) coded 42 20th century presidential speeches for language that denoted negation (i.e., use of "not"), inclusion, and high levels of abstraction in order to include and engage followers in a change process that defies current social convention. Three speeches were selected for each president: one from the beginning of the presidency (frame-breaking), one from the middle (frame-moving), and one from the end (frame-realigning). Thus, these three speeches represented the three temporal phases of social change over the course of each president's first term in office. While the social phases may have been operationalized around specific issues (e.g., Cuban missile crisis) that leaders aimed to change, the researchers' rationale for this operationalization was centered on the argument that presidents have broad agendas of change that may take years to accomplish (Fiol et al., 1999, pp. 464–5). Overall, results from their study indicated that charismatic leaders were more likely to use negation, inclusion, and abstract rhetoric than were non-charismatic leaders. Additionally, results showed that charismatic leaders used these techniques most frequently during the frame-moving stage (phase 2).

Although Fiol et al. (1999) provide support for their model of social change, several limitations to their study should be noted. First, the study of Fiol et al. (1999) was limited by sample size, as only one speech per phase was analyzed for each leader. To help ensure that the speeches are typical of the leader's communication (Shamir et al., 1994) during each phase, we utilize at least two speeches per phase to address this limitation, resulting in an average sample size of six speeches for each president. We also extend the sample to include more recent U.S. presidents. Second, the current study utilizes computerized content analysis rather than human coding. Computerized content analysis minimizes human coding biases and provides a reliable way of uncovering and counting features of language that may otherwise be undetectable (see Bligh, Kohles, & Meindl, 2004b for a review of content analysis in leadership; see also Bligh et al., 2004a; Insch, Moore, & Murphy, 1997; Morris, 1994). Finally, the study of Fiol et al. tested three rhetorical devices (negation, abstraction, and inclusion) in temporal sequence that charismatic leaders may use to institute change, but additional communication strategies may also be important. Theory and research on charismatic leadership theory suggests that charismatic leaders use a multitude of rhetorical devices in crafting their visionary messages (e.g. ,Bligh et al., 2004a; Conger, 1991; Emrich et al., 2001; Holladay & Coombs, 1993, 1994; Shamir et al., 1994; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993), which have not been tested in relation to the social change process of frame-breaking, frame-moving, and frame-realigning (Fiol et al., 1999). Therefore, additional rhetorical techniques derived from the study of Bligh et al. (2004a) (similarity to followers, inspiration, action-oriented language, and tangibility) are also included to explore a wider range of techniques that charismatic leaders may employ during social change. According to Fiol et al. (1999), each social change phase requires specific communication tactics to achieve the specified goals of that phase. Hence, each additional communication tactic explored in this study was specifically selected to correspond to how leaders may achieve the targeted goals of a particular social change phase. We now turn to detailing the theoretical rationale and hypotheses concerning each of these rhetorical strategies.

1.1. Negation

During phases 1 and 2, social change processes involve negating and neutralizing conventional group values and moving followers towards the charismatic leader's proposed changes through double negation, which entails negating *both* social and personal values attached to convention. Fiol et al. (1999) operationalized this negating process through the leader's use of "nots" and found that "nots" were most frequently used by charismatic presidents during phase 2. However, given the controversial interpretation of "nots" (see Fiol et al., 1999; Grant, Malaviya, & Sternthal, 2004; Spangler & House, 1991) and the fact that negation may often involve more complex language than "nots" (Mayo, Schul, & Burnstein, 2004), additional operationalizations of negation rhetoric may also warrant investigation. Particularly, *negation* terms denoting negative contractions, negative function words, and null sets (e.g., aren't, shouldn't, don't, nor, nay, nothing), and semantic prefixes ("dis" or "un") in addition to "nots" are used in the current study to denote derogation of the status quo. As phase 2 involves undermining the status quo through double negation to move followers to the leader's proposed vision (Fiol et al., 1999), we propose:

Hypothesis 1. Charismatic leaders will use negation more frequently during phase 2 compared to non-charismatic leaders.

1.2. Inclusion and similarity language

In phase 2, Fiol et al. (1999) emphasize the importance of moving followers' personal values from a neutral to an active state, and moving personal and social values to desiring innovation or fearing convention. According to Fiol et al., the charismatic leader accomplishes this challenging task through consensus building and creating trust, which is critical in reassuring followers that moving away from convention is both safe and desirable. To build consensus and trust, the researchers postulate that using inclusive language is particularly effective. Inclusive language may be especially important for affirming and making salient followers' social identity (Tajfel, 1974; Turner, 1981; see also Haslam et al., 2001; Hogg, Hains, & Mason, 1998; Shamir et al., 1993), but we argue that stressing a sense of similarity to followers may also play an important role as well. The social influence literature shows that people are more likely to be persuaded (Cialdini & Trost, 1998) and to trust (Fiske, 1998) both ingroup members and similar others. Similarly, studies show that a rhetorical vehicle for influencing others involves the speaker construing him or herself as a member of the audience's ingroup (Reicher & Hopkins, 1996), which could partially be accomplished by using high levels of *inclusive* language (e.g., "we", "us"; Fiol et al., 1999), and also portraying a sense of *similarity with followers* (Bligh et al., 2004a; Fiol et al., 1999; Shamir et al., 1994) in order to build a highly inclusive social identity (Bull, 2000). By stressing a sense of similarity, the charismatic leader gains followers' trust and increased influence, which may help the leader move followers' social values towards change during phase 2.

To operationalize these constructs, we incorporated several additional rhetorical dictionaries utilized in previous research. While Fiol et al. (1999) operationalized inclusive language through the use of "we", "our", and "us," or words invoking people's social identity, we also posit that *inclusion* in the political realm may also include references to *collectives* (e.g., social groupings, task groups, geographical entities) and *people* (e.g., citizenry, population, residents) to help build a broader social identity. Inclusive language may also comprise less *self-reference* (e.g., I, me, mine, myself; Fiol et al., 1999), in order to be consistent with language that emphasizes group consensus and solidarity. To create the impression of *similarity with followers*, charismatic leaders may use more rhetoric that denotes *leveling* (e.g., words used to ignore individual differences and build a sense of completeness and assurance) and *familiarity* (e.g., common prepositions, demonstrative pronouns) than non-charismatic leaders. Through these techniques, charismatic leaders communicate that they understand followers' fears and needs and that they represent a leader that followers can relate to, trust, and identify with (Bligh et al., 2004a).

Hypothesis 2. Charismatic leaders will use more inclusion during phase 2 than non-charismatic leaders.

Hypothesis 3. Charismatic leaders will stress more similarity to followers during phase 2 than non-charismatic leaders.

1.3. Abstract versus concrete: Conceptual language and imagery

Fiol et al. (1999) found that charismatic leaders may use high levels of abstraction (ambiguous words susceptible to multiple interpretations) as opposed to concreteness to increase a sense of consensus and trust, as well as encourage

followers to calibrate their personal values with those espoused by the leader. However, other research contradicts the finding of Fiol et al. Specifically, Emrich et al. (2001) found evidence that charismatic presidents (beginning with Washington and ending with Reagan) use *less* abstract (conceptual) language and *more* concrete (imagery) language. It is important to note, however, that the two studies used similar but not identical measures. Fiol et al. studied four levels of domain-specific abstraction ranging from concrete to abstract terms (e.g., people, things or events, countries or nations, and the world and universal beliefs). Emrich et al. utilized a measure of abstract language called conceptual-based language, which is reality-oriented and emphasizes listeners' logical interpretations and problem solving (e.g., know, thought, array, right, virtue, work, idea). In contrast, imagery-producing rhetoric is a form of concrete language that is associative and vivid; it elicits a sensory experience that is based in non-reality, fantasy, and dreams (e.g., work versus *sweat*; idea versus *dream*; Emrich et al., 2001). In the current study, we measured *abstraction* and *concreteness* by examining the frequency of conceptual and imagery-producing language using Martindale's Regressive Imagery Dictionary (see Emrich et al., 2001). This measure provided the opportunity to test the results of Fiol et al. with a similar but not identical measure of abstraction versus concreteness, which helps to explore the convergent and discriminant validity of the measures. Additionally, to our knowledge, the results of Emrich et al. have not been replicated or explored in a temporal sequence.

Fiol et al. (1999) argued that charismatic leaders would use more imagery and less conceptual language in the frame-realigning phase (phase 3). During this phase, charismatic leaders seek to refreeze and ensure the permanency of their values (Lewin, 1951, p. 229) and to inspire followers towards goals and action related to their visions. Although other theories and research on charismatic leaders do not specify a temporal sequence as to *when* charismatic leaders encourage followers towards action, there seems to be both theoretical and empirical consensus that charismatic leaders engage in rhetoric to mobilize followers towards goals and action (Bligh et al., 2004a; 2004b; Shamir et al., 1993). Rather than emphasizing specific and proximal goals, Shamir and his colleagues (1993) contend that charismatic leaders stress vague and distal goals with utopian outcomes to encourage followers' faith in a better future. Towards this end, charismatic leaders may also use "symbolism, mysticism, imaging and fantasy" (Bass, 1985, cited in Shamir et al., 1993, p. 583).

Other research corroborates this theory. Recently, Mio, Riggio, Levin, and Reese (2005) found that charismatic leaders use more metaphors in their speeches than non-charismatic leaders. As mentioned earlier, Emrich et al. (2001) showed that presidential leaders who used more image-producing language versus conceptual-based in their speeches received higher ratings of charisma, while leaders who used more conceptual language received lower ratings of charisma. Taken together, past research and theory imply that charismatic leaders may utilize more image-producing rhetoric when inspiring followers towards goals and action (phase 3) because it allows them to frame goals in a vague and distal manner to elicit a vivid and utopian future (Shamir et al., 1993). Additionally, image-producing language enlists sensory experiences, resulting in more memorable rhetoric that could ensure the permanency of social change. It also produces stronger emotional reactions, "increasing followers' willingness to embrace [charismatic leaders'] vision and, ultimately, to act" (Emrich et al., 2001, p. 533). In line with these propositions, we formulated four hypotheses. Hypotheses 4a and 5a aimed to replicate Emrich et al. by testing differences between charismatic and non-charismatic leaders on imagery and conceptual language, regardless of temporal sequence or phases. Hypotheses 4b and 5b focus on whether charismatic leaders use imagery and conceptual language in a specific temporal sequence, particularly during phase 3.

Hypothesis 4a. Charismatic leaders will use more imagery than non-charismatic leaders.

Hypothesis 4b. Charismatic leaders will use more imagery than non-charismatic leaders in phase 3 when inspiring followers towards goals and action.

Hypothesis 5a. Charismatic leaders will use less conceptual language than non-charismatic leaders.

Hypothesis 5b. Charismatic leaders will be less likely to use conceptual language than non-charismatic leaders in phase 3 when inspiring followers towards goals and action.

1.4. Inspirational language

To refreeze innovative values and norms in phase 3, charismatic leaders use affirmation and channel personal motivators developed in phase 2 into the direction of their goals and vision (Fiol et al., 1999). Shamir et al. (1993) also contend that charismatic leaders affirm and increase followers' self-esteem and sense of worth. They do this by highlighting relationships between followers' efforts and important values, thus empowering followers with strength and confidence to

act from a "sense of moral correctness" (Shamir et al., 1993, p. 582). This sense of moral correctness may be cultivated by charismatic leaders' use of rhetoric lauding followers' universal abstract virtues and desirable moral qualities (e.g., self-sacrifice, mercy, courage, wisdom, patriotism). Persuasion has been shown to occur when leaders stress pre-existing values that define the self-identity (e.g., dedication, success, wisdom; see Watkins, 2001). In this way, innovative values and actions are still embedded within socially conventional ideas (Fiol et al., 1999) and satisfy consistency in the self-concept. In line with these propositions, we postulate that charismatic leaders may be more likely than non-charismatic leaders to positively affirm followers' worth, appeal to pre-existing values, and to empower their followers by using *inspirational* terms (e.g., abstract virtues such as courage, self-sacrifice, wisdom) when attempting to refreeze social values during phase 3.

Hypothesis 6. Charismatic leaders will use more inspiration in phase 3 than non-charismatic leaders.

1.5. Action and tangibility

In addition to using image-producing rhetoric and inspirational terms to refreeze innovative values and to continue to inspire followers towards goals and action (phase 3), charismatic leaders may also utilize more active and tangible language. In a series of three studies examining the rhetorical content of President George W. Bush's speeches pre-and post-9/11, Bligh et al. (2004a) found that after 9/11, Bush's rhetoric was not only perceived as more charismatic, but also revealed a significant *increase* of active language and a *decrease* in tangible rhetoric. For example, the following quote from President Bush uses action-related terms and less tangible language, "We're going to hunt them down one at a time…it doesn't matter where they hide, as we work with our friends we will find them and bring them to justice." (George W. Bush, 11/22/02). The fact that Bush used more action-related language and less tangible rhetoric in the immediate aftermath of 9/11, and was also perceived as more charismatic, suggests that charismatic attributions may be related to the use of these rhetorical constructs. However, the use of less tangible language may be a unique artifact of a post-crisis environment. In the aftermath of 9/11, Bush may have been less inclined to use tangible language in order to draw attention away from the concrete details of the dismal current state of affairs and focus more on what needed to be done to propagate hope in a better future. In a broader context than a national crisis and particularly in a context (such as phase 3) where leaders aim to persuade their followers to continually strive towards their goals and vision, charismatic leaders may attempt to inspire their followers with increased action-related language, and also *more* tangible language to highlight and solidify past and present accomplishments and goals.

Action-related language (which relates to aggression and accomplishment) may be used more frequently during phase 3 to highlight past and present activity and accomplishments and to link these accomplishments to the goals of the distal future. This could increase followers' faith and hopes in the leader's vision, thus encouraging followers to act (see Shamir et al., 1993). *Tangibility* (which entails both materiality and repetition of key terms) may also be utilized in phase 3 to continually highlight the leader's past and present accomplishments in concrete terms, creating an impression of small victories to motivate followers towards the vision. Use of repetition (e.g., slogans, repeating key points) during phase 3 may also serve the purpose of perpetually reinforcing the leader's vision to ensure the permanency of change. For example, Bill Clinton used active language and expressed his administration's past and present accomplishments on immigration in tangible and repetitive terms: "After years of neglect, this administration has taken a strong stand to stiffen the protection of our borders. We are increasing border controls by 50 percent. We are increasing inspections to prevent the hiring of illegal immigrants. And tonight, I announce I will sign an executive order to deny federal contracts to businesses that hire illegal immigrants" (State of the Union, 1996).

Therefore, we anticipate that charismatic leaders may be more likely than non-charismatic leaders to employ communication strategies denoting high levels of action (e.g., aggressive words such as human competition, goal directness, and accomplishment words expressing task-completion and organized human behavior), and may be less likely to use words denoting low levels of action (passivity, ambivalence) during phase 3. Although past research (Bligh et al., 2004a) suggests that after a national crisis leaders may use less tangible language, we suggest that charismatic leaders may be more likely to use tangible language (e.g., concreteness, insistence) in the context of phase 3, as they attempt to inspire their followers to support and act in accordance with their values, goals, and vision.

Hypothesis 7. Charismatic leaders will use more action-related language in phase 3 than non-charismatic leaders.

Hypothesis 8. Charismatic leaders will use more tangible language in phase 3 than non-charismatic leaders.

2. Method

2.1. Sample

Following Fiol et al. (1999), the sample for the current study included American presidential speeches beginning in the 20th century. The sample of speeches ($N=112$) was compiled from 17 presidents beginning with Theodore Roosevelt (1901) and ending with the current American President, George W. Bush (2000).[1] Only 20th century presidents were used, as prior to the 20th century: (a) presidents used different language; (b) the United States was withdrawn from foreign affairs during the isolationism period; and finally, (c) the influence of the mass media was absent. Furthermore, similar to Fiol et al. (1999), only speeches from the presidents' first terms were analyzed in the current study.[2]

Fiol et al. (1999) used speeches that "addressed a wide, national audience either in topic or in physical audience" (p. 464) from each president's first year in office (frame-breaking phase), middle year in office (frame-moving phase), and last year in office (frame-realigning phase) to reflect the three phases of social transformation. Most of these speeches were inaugural addresses or addresses to congress (States of the Union); otherwise, comparable speeches were used. Several early presidential speeches selected by Fiol et al. were written communications to Congress (e.g., Theodore Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, and Calvin Coolidge), probably due to the fact that early 20th century presidents gave few oral addresses. Also noteworthy, two presidential speeches (John F. Kennedy and Richard Nixon) selected by Fiol et al. were from presidential news conferences.[3]

To increase the sample size, at least one additional speech was selected per phase from each president's first year, middle years, and last year in office. The selection criteria for these additional speeches were based on the temporal orientation of the speech and whether the speech addressed a national audience. Inaugurals and State of the Union speeches were selected as additional speeches if they were not already in the sample of Fiol et al. (1999). Otherwise, we used major presidential speeches (e.g., the Truman Doctrine, Eisenhower's Atoms of Peace, George W. Bush's 9/11 Address to the Nation).[4] While Fiol et al. analyzed presidential speeches starting from Theodore Roosevelt to Ronald Reagan, the current study also included George Bush Sr., William Clinton, and George W. Bush Jr. The speeches from these three presidents were chosen based on the same selection criteria delineated above. A complete list of presidential speeches used in the current study may be found in Appendix A.

[1] Some presidential speeches were obtained with permission from document archives compiled by the American Presidency Project, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/">http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu.

[2] Fiol et al. (1999) did not give a theoretical rationale for only using speeches from presidents' first terms. However, other researchers (e.g., House et al., 1991) who similarly used speeches from presidential first-terms cited past research (see Simonton, 1988) showing that the number of years in office was related to perceptions of presidential greatness and presidential performance. Therefore, using only first-term measures controls for the effect of time on performance. Also noteworthy, Fiol et al. and the current study excluded Warren Harding from analysis. Warren Harding had a brief presidency (March 4, 1921–August 2, 1923), during which time he delivered few presidential speeches. Due to Harding's paucity of speeches, we were unable to meet the selection criteria for his speeches and chose to exclude him.

[3] Press conference rhetoric may differ from prepared presidential addresses due to the differential role of speechwriters in each case. Despite these differences, we retained news conferences in our sample for several reasons: (a) our goal was to replicate Fiol et al. (1999) study and these speeches were analyzed in their study; (b) these speeches fit the speech selection criteria; and (c) we did not detect substantial differences in communication style between impromptu answers and prepared addresses for the presidents in question. Additionally, all press questions were removed so that only presidential rhetoric was analyzed. One news conference speech was also included in the sample (Hoover, March 7th, 1930). This speech was selected because it dealt with the important issue of unemployment and business conditions during the Great Depression. It contained one question from a reporter (removed) that solicited a one-sentence response from Hoover. Thus, the speech resembled more of a "statement to the press" than an actual news conference. Also noteworthy, some early 20th century speeches used several archaic spelling of words. We updated the archaic spellings of these words (e.g., "meagre" to meager, or "fibre" to fiber) for the content analysis program.

[4] For several presidents, we found that several speeches fit the speech selection criteria. In these circumstances, we elected to include all the speeches in the speech sample with the assumption that rhetorical strategies would be better analyzed with the maximum number of important speeches that characterize the leader's communication. Overall, the number of speeches used is in line with the suggestion of Shamir et al. (1994) of using at least two speeches from each leader (in this case two speeches per phase) to ensure that the speeches are characteristic of the leader's rhetoric.

2.2. Measures

2.2.1. Coding phases of social change

All speeches were coded to reflect one of the three phases (phase 1, 2, 3) of social change. Similar to Fiol et al. (1999), speeches from presidents' first year in office were treated as rhetoric from the frame-breaking phase (phase 1), from middle years as frame-moving (phase 2), and last year in office as frame-realigning (phase 3).

2.2.2. Charisma

Fiol et al. (1999) used House et al. (1988) measure of presidential charisma in their study. This measure operationalized presidential charisma through the ratings of eight political historians, who categorized each president as charismatic, non-charismatic, or uncertain based on their relationships with cabinet members. For 20th century presidents, Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy, and Ronald Reagan were rated as charismatic presidents, while the remaining presidents were either non-charismatic or unrated. These categorical ratings were in line with other charisma ratings (House et al., 1988; Simonton, 1988). The current study operationalized charisma through a similar classification procedure as House et al. (1988). Ten reputable political scientists from two small private universities in the Western US were asked to provide generalized ratings of the presidential charisma of all 20th presidents in two ways: (a) as a dichotomous measure asking whether a particular president was charismatic or not; and (b) as a continuous measure asking for rating for presidential charisma on a scale from 1 (not charismatic at all) to 7 (extremely charismatic). The current study employed the dichotomous measure of charisma,[5] but future research may employ our data from the continuous measure of charisma (see Table 1).

The inter-rater reliability coefficients (intraclass correlation) of the ten raters were acceptable: .94 (95% CI .89 to .98) for the continuous measure and .93 (95% CI .87 to .98) for the dichotomous measure. The presidential charisma scores derived from the average ratings from all 10 political scientists for each president are listed in Table 1. Our results largely replicated findings from previous studies (Fiol et al., 1999; House et al., 1988; Simonton, 1988) that examined presidential charisma until Ronald Reagan. In line with previous studies, we found that presidents that scored highest in charisma (who were in the top 75% quartile of ratings across presidents, or above 4.63) included Theodore Roosevelt (M=6.30), Franklin Roosevelt (M=6.10), John F. Kennedy (M=5.60), and Ronald Reagan (M=5.50), while the remainder of the presidents received lower charisma ratings (4.63 or lower). Of the three most recent presidents, George Bush Sr., Bill Clinton, and George W. Bush Jr., only Bill Clinton (M=4.90) received high ratings of presidential charisma. All in all, the current research suggested that five of seventeen 20th century presidents were charismatic leaders. The dichotomous measure also corroborated this categorization of presidents — all five charismatic presidents had almost unanimous "yes" ratings for presidential charisma.

2.2.3. Rhetorical strategies for social change

Since content analysis was used in the current study, the unit of analyses for social change rhetorical strategies consists of words (as opposed to sentences as in Fiol et al., 1999). *Negation* (negative function words), *inclusion* (social identity, collective focus, less self-references), *similarity to followers* (leveling, familiarity), *inspiration*, *action* (aggression, accomplishment, less passivity, less ambivalence), and *tangibility* (concreteness, insistence) were operationalized using the dictionaries created by Bligh et al. (2004a). We utilized Diction 5.0 (Hart, 2000; 2001) to content analyze the frequency that each rhetorical strategy appears in each speech. For analyzing prefixes "un" and "dis" as part of negation, an additional dictionary with these prefixes was created. Moreover, to measure imagery and conceptual language, Martindale's Regressive Image Dictionary[6] (see Emrich et al., 2001) was

[5] The current study employed a dichotomous measure of charisma in the analyses to avoid inflation of Type I error. MANCOVA, which employs dichotomous independent variables, is a robust test of group differences when multiple (correlated) dependent variables are simultaneously being examined (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Using a series of hierarchical regressions to test the hypotheses in the study would have enabled the use of the continuous measure of charisma but at the cost of over-inflated Type I error. Thus, we employed the dichotomous measure of charisma to conduct a more robust test of the hypotheses.

[6] Emrich et al. (2001) suggest controlling for address length for imagery and conceptual language variables by calculating the number of image-based words or concept-based words and dividing each by the total number of words. When we attempted to follow their suggestion, the assumption of equal variances for the imagery variable was violated. Therefore, we utilized the total number of words and different words as speech length covariates and left the imagery and conceptual variables otherwise intact.

Table 1
Presidential charismatic measures: Dichotomous and continuous frequencies and mean Z-scores

President	Dichotomous charisma frequency			N=	Continuous charisma mean	Continuous charisma standard deviations	Continuous charisma mean Z-scores	N=
	Yes	No	Not sure					
Theodore Roosevelt	10	0	0	10	6.30	.95	1.78	10
William Taft	0	10	0	10	2.70	.68	−.74	10
Woodrow Wilson	7	3	0	10	4.3	1.34	.38	10
Warren G. Harding	2	8	0	10	2.40	1.71	−.95	10
Calvin Coolidge	0	9	1	10	2.11	.78	−1.15	9
Herbert C. Hoover	0	10	0	10	2.4	.84	−.95	10
Franklin D. Roosevelt	10	0	0	10	6.10	.57	1.64	10
Harry S. Truman	6	4	0	10	4.30	1.16	.38	10
Dwight D. Eisenhower	6	3	1	10	4.11	1.05	.25	9
John F. Kennedy	9	1	0	10	5.60	.97	1.29	10
Lyndon B. Johnson	3	6	1	10	3.22	1.48	−.37	9
Richard M. Nixon	1	9	0	10	2.70	.95	−.74	10
Gerald Ford	0	10	0	10	2.20	.63	−1.09	10
Jimmy Carter	1	9	0	10	2.50	1.08	−.88	10
Ronald Reagan	9	1	0	10	5.50	1.78	1.22	10
George Bush Sr.	0	9	1	10	2.56	1.01	−.84	9
Bill Clinton	8	2	0	10	4.90	.99	.80	10
George W. Bush	5	5	0	10	3.70	1.49	−.04	10
Total Means and SD					*M*=3.85	*SD*=1.42	*M*=.00 *SD*=1.00	

N refers to the total number of political scientists who rated the presidential charisma measures.

utilized. Appendix B provides a detailed overview of rhetorical strategy constructs, and Appendix C provides sample quotations from President Ronald Reagan to illustrate each construct.

2.2.4. Covariates

Many scholars have proposed that the modern presidency began with Franklin D. Roosevelt (e.g., Neustadt & Greenstein, 1990). The modern presidency may be briefly characterized by historical changes such as increased media exposure and public scrutiny, the beginning of oral traditions, more frequent speeches, and changes in presidential motives and qualifications. To control for the impact of generalized historical changes on presidential speeches, following Emrich et al. (2001), *historical trends* was used as a covariate. This measure purports to control for variance associated with historical changes in the presidency over time. Historical trends reflects the time period of a particular president and is operationalized by creating a proxy variable for each president through his president's first year in office (e.g., 1933 for Franklin D. Roosevelt; Emrich et al., 2001). Thus, larger numbers signify more recent presidencies, whereas smaller numbers signify older presidencies. To verify the convergent validity (Crano & Brewer, 2002) of this measure, we created an additional measure, *presidential modernity*. In the presidential modernity measure, presidents in the sample were classified as either modern (1933–present) or pre-modern (1901–1932) (see Neustadt & Greenstein, 1990). The bivariate correlation between historical trends and presidential modernity was high (r=.83), indicating that historical trends may be an adequate indicator of presidential historical changes. To control for the possible impact of speech length, the *total number of words* per speech and *the number of different words* in each speech were also employed as additional covariates.

3. Results

Intercorrelations and descriptive statistics for each dependent variable are listed in Table 2. As expected, imagery and conceptual language were negatively correlated (Emrich et al., 2001), showing that these constructs represent different types of language (abstract and concrete) and are less likely to be used concurrently. Action and tangibility were positively correlated, implying that leaders highlight their actions with concrete and repetitive terms. Interestingly, imagery and similarity to followers were negatively related, most likely because imagery is a distinct

rhetorical device that is not employed widely in everyday parlance, whereas similarity to followers measures everyday terms that emphasizes commonality among people.

To ensure that the variables in the current study met the normality assumptions necessary for statistical analysis, negation was subjected to a square root transformation. Additionally, outliers beyond four standard deviations were removed and replaced with the mean for negation (one for Coolidge) and tangibility (one each for Johnson, Taft, and Ford).

A factorial multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) was conducted to test hypotheses 1–8 in the current study. The three covariates consisted of the total number of words per speech, the total number of different words per speech, and historical trends. The independent variables were the dichotomous ratings of presidential charisma and social phases. The dependent variables consisted of the eight rhetorical strategies: negation, inclusion, similarity to followers, imagery, conceptual rhetoric, inspiration, action, and tangibility. Due to unequal group sample sizes of speeches for the levels of each independent variable (see Table 3), a more robust multivariate test, Pillai's Trace, was used to interpret results (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). All three covariates significantly controlled for a portion of variance in the overall model. After adjusting for covariates, multivariate tests showed a significant main effect for charisma, Pillai's Trace = .20, F (8, 96) = 3.01, $p < .01$, multivariate $\eta^2 = .20$. The social phases by charisma interaction approached significance after adjusting for covariates, Pillai's Trace = .23, F (16, 194) = 1.56, $p = .08$, multivariate $\eta^2 = .11$, as did the main effect for social phases, Pillai's Trace = .22, F (16, 194) = 1.54, $p = .09$, multivariate $\eta^2 = .11$. As the interaction for social phases by charisma and the main effect of social phases did approach significance, univariate (ANCOVA) tests for each dependent variable were also conducted as follow-ups for these models. Mean differences and univariate statistics for all dependent variables are listed in Tables 3 and 4, respectively. All univariate analyses and follow-up tests were adjusted for the covariates listed above.

In line with Fiol et al. (1999), hypothesis 1 predicted that charismatic leaders would use more negation in phase 2 than non-charismatic leaders. The results of the current study revealed the predicted charisma by social phase interaction for negation. Simple effects follow-up tests revealed that for phase 1, non-charismatic leaders ($M = 2.80$) utilized more negation than charismatic leaders ($M = 2.29$), F (1, 34) = 4.66, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .12$. However, as predicted for phase 2, charismatic leaders ($M = 2.60$) utilized more negation than non-charismatic leaders ($M = 2.10$), F (1, 32) = 7.46, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .19$. No significant differences emerged between charismatic and non-charismatic leaders for negation during phase 3. Thus, the current study showed that while non-charismatic leaders used more negation in phase 1, charismatic leaders used it more during phase 2. This finding provides support for the hypothesized double negation communication strategy of Fiol et al. employed during phase 2: charismatic leaders must transform non-desire for convention into desire for non-convention, and non-fear of innovation into fear of non-innovation. However, our results did not replicate the finding of Fiol et al. that charismatic leaders use negation moderately during phase 1. Charismatic leaders used a similar frequency of negation during phase 1 ($M = 2.29$) and phase 3 ($M = 2.29$). In fact, non-charismatic leaders were more likely to use negation during phase 1 than charismatic leaders.

Also based on Fiol et al. (1999), hypotheses 2 and 3 posited that charismatic leaders would be more likely than non-charismatic leaders to use rhetoric referring to inclusion and similarity to followers during phase 2. Only a significant main effect was obtained for inclusion, whereby charismatic leaders ($M = 93.25$) used inclusion more than non-charismatic leaders ($M = 69.66$) across all phases. Possibly, the current research lacked the necessary statistical power to

Table 2
Mean scores, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for rhetorical strategies

Variables	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Negation	2.38	.63							
2. Inclusion	76.20	41.33	.03						
3. Similarity	147.54	17.46	−.25*	−.15					
4. Imagery	5.24	1.05	.11	.16†	−.34**				
5. Conceptual	12.86	1.80	−.23*	−.06	.06	−.40**			
6. Inspiration	9.64	5.63	.18†	.27*	−.07	−.05	−.05		
7. Action	5.57	8.83	−.22*	−.14	−.01	−.04	.20*	−.05	
8. Tangibility	56.83	23.38	−.24*	−.13†	.12	−.11	.17†	−.19*	.29**

All correlations are two-tailed; *$p < .05$, **$p < .001$, †$p < .10$; $N = 112$.

Table 3
Mean scores and standard deviations for rhetorical strategies for leadership type by phase

Rhetorical strategies	Charismatic leaders (n=31 speeches)						Non-charismatic leaders (n=81 speeches)					
	Phase 1		Phase 2		Phase 3		Phase 1		Phase 2		Phase 3	
	n=10		n=10		n=11		n=29		n=27		n=25	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Negation	2.29	.64	2.60	.48	2.29	.68	2.80	.58	2.10	.56	2.19	.55
Inclusion	85.77	41.65	80.28	47.43	111.84	64.73	66.93	33.49	74.85	32.24	67.23	37.53
Similarity	154.08	18.81	145.59	18.50	148.07	22.68	143.69	16.67	145.22	14.04	152.41	18.14
Imagery	5.56	.74	5.71	1.15	5.79	.97	5.18	1.02	5.30	1.02	4.70	1.04
Conceptual	12.52	1.62	12.32	1.68	12.70	1.54	12.76	1.95	12.61	1.80	13.65	1.77
Inspiration	8.34	6.07	7.01	3.16	8.80	4.06	12.51	5.14	9.74	6.55	8.15	5.33
Action	.90	6.01	1.33	9.85	7.72	11.68	4.94	8.84	5.70	6.66	8.80	9.18
Tangibility	51.01	20.27	45.57	10.73	67.59	23.09	49.83	17.57	56.60	26.36	67.29	26.50

Means reported are adjusted for covariates. Total N=112 speeches; total phase 1, n=39; total phase 2, n=37; total phase 3, n=36.

detect significant differences between phases for charismatic leaders due to the discrepancy in sample size between charismatic and non-charismatic leaders. Inspecting the means for charismatic leaders between phases, charismatic leaders used inclusion least during phase 2 (M=80.28), more in phase 1 (M=85.77), and the most during phase 3 (M=111.84). Despite this possibility, however, this pattern of means contradict Fiol et al. findings — they found moderate use of inclusion in phase 1, most in phase 2, and least in phase 3. For similarity to followers, a significant interaction emerged. Simple effects follow-up tests revealed that charismatic leaders (M=154.08) stressed their similarity to followers significantly more than non-charismatic leaders (M=143.69) during phase 1 (and not phase 2 as predicted), F (1, 34)=6.19, p<.05, partial η^2=.15. No significant differences for leadership type were obtained for phases 2 or 3. Overall, the current study found that charismatic leaders used more inclusion across phases and stressed similarity to followers more in phase 1 than non-charismatic leaders.

In line with Emrich et al. (2001) and Shamir et al. (1993), hypotheses 4a and 5a suggested that charismatic leaders would use more imagery and less conceptual-based rhetoric than non-charismatic leaders across phases (Emrich et al., 2001). As predicted by hypothesis 4a, results showed that charismatic leaders used more imagery (M=5.69) than non-charismatic leaders (M=5.07) across phases. For hypothesis 5a, results showed that the univariate main effect for charisma on concept-based rhetoric only approached significance, but in the expected direction: charismatic leaders (M=12.52) used less conceptual language than non-charismatic leaders (M=12.98). Additionally, there was no support for hypotheses 4b and 5b, which predicted that charismatic leaders would use more imagery and less conceptual language during phase 3, respectively. While Fiol et al. (1999) found that charismatic leaders utilized more abstract language than

Table 4
Univariate analyses of variance comparing rhetorical strategies used by charismatic and non-charismatic leaders

Rhetorical strategies	Leadership type			Phase			Charisma × Phase		
	Univariate F (1, 111)	Eta squared	Observed power	Univariate F (2, 111)	Eta squared	Observed power	Univariate F (2, 111)	Eta squared	Observed power
Negation	.29	.01	.08	1.95	.04	.40	5.80**	.10	.86
Inclusion	4.18*	.04	.53	.07	.01	.06	.64	.01	.16
Similarity	1.40	.01	.22	1.28	.02	.27	3.70*	.07	.67
Imagery	9.02**	.08	.85	.38	.01	.11	1.49	.03	.31
Conceptual	2.76†	.03	.38	1.22	.02	.26	.35	.01	.10
Inspiration	5.10*	.05	.61	1.19	.02	.26	1.42	.03	.30
Action	2.48	.02	.35	4.05*	.07	.71	.55	.01	.14
Tangibility	.26	.01	.08	4.96**	.09	.80	.47	.01	.13

All statistics reported are adjusted for covariates. *p<.05, **p<.01, $^\dagger p$<.10; N=112.

non-charismatic leaders particularly during phase 2, the current results corroborated the findings of Emrich et al. (2001) that charismatic leaders are less likely to utilize concept-based rhetoric (abstraction) and more likely to use imagery (concreteness). It is difficult to ascertain if the current results contradict Fiol et al., or if the measures (i.e., domain-specific abstraction versus imagery and conceptual language) test entirely different constructs, or different types of abstraction. For example, it is possible that charismatic leaders may use more abstract domain-specific language (in line with Fiol et al., 1999), while simultaneously using more imagery rhetoric, and less conceptual language (in line with the current research and Emrich et al., 2001). Altogether, these results draw into question the discriminant and convergent validity (see Crano & Brewer, 2002) of these abstract versus concrete measures and underline the need for research that directly compares different measures of abstract versus concrete language (e.g., domain-specific abstraction versus imagery and conceptual language, among other measures) using the same data.

Hypothesis 6 predicted that charismatic leaders would use more inspiration than non-charismatic leaders during phase 3. Contrary to predictions, no significant differences between leadership types were obtained for phase 3 as the predicted charisma by social phases interaction on inspiration was not significant. Nonetheless, a significant univariate main effect was obtained for leadership type on inspiration; however, in an unexpected direction. Charismatic leaders ($M=8.07$) were *less* likely to use inspirational language across phases than non-charismatic leaders ($M=10.24$). Perhaps charismatic leaders used less inspirational terms than non-charismatic leaders because our measure of inspirational language reflected *individual* values and attractive *personal* qualities (e.g., honesty, self-sacrifice, education). Since charismatic leaders implicate collective concerns in individuals to empower followers (see van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, De Cremer, & Hogg, 2004 for an excellent review), they probably evoke *group-level values* related to the collective rather than individual level virtues and values.

Finally, hypotheses 7 and 8 predicted that charismatic leaders would utilize more action-related terms and more tangible language than non-charismatic leaders during phase 3. Contrary to predictions, only a significant main effect was evident for social phases on both action and tangibility. For action terms, pairwise comparisons revealed significant differences between phases 1 and 3 and phases 2 and 3. Specifically, all presidential leaders used more action-related terms in phase 3 ($M=8.47$) compared to phases 1 ($M=3.90$) and 2 ($M=4.52$). This result provided partial support of hypothesis 7 insofar as action terms were, as predicted, most readily used during phase 3. Contrary to expectations, however, no significant differences emerged for leadership type. For tangible language, pairwise comparisons revealed a similar pattern to action-related terms; significant differences existed between phases 1 and 3 and phases 2 and 3, and in the expected direction. Regardless of leadership type, tangible terms were more evident in phase 3 ($M=67.38$) compared to phase 1 ($M=50.14$) and phase 2 ($M=53.62$). Similar to action-related terms, this finding also partially supported hypothesis 8; leaders used increasing levels of tangible language as they progressed through the phases, but no differences emerged for leadership type. It should be noted that these results corroborated our proposition that the results obtained by Bligh et al. (2004a) for tangible terms may have been influenced by the national crisis context of 9/11. In the broader context of the current study, results revealed that all leaders were more likely to use increased levels of tangibility as they progressed from phase to phase. These findings suggest that it may be important for elected leaders (regardless of their level of charisma) to repeatedly highlight their actions and accomplishments with tangible language during their term in office, and most strikingly during their last years in office.

4. Discussion

Several researchers have noted that little is known about how and why charismatic leaders institute social change (e.g., Fiol et al., 1999), and few studies have explored the *process* through which leaders and followers develop a charismatic leadership relationship (Meindl, 1992). This study aimed to contribute to our understanding of charismatic leadership in general, and add to the sparse literature on how charismatic leaders bring about social change. To this end, we replicated and extended the research of Fiol et al.; however, the current study only replicated the findings of Fiol et al. pertaining to the charismatic leaders' use of negation during phase 2, whereas the use of abstraction and inclusion did not significantly differ between phases. Moreover, the current study also revealed additional rhetorical devices used by leaders, but our findings were not always consistent with expectations. Although it is plausible that different operationalizations of the social process model of Fiol et al. may yield more consistent results and thus may warrant further study (see below), social identity theory (SIT; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; see also Hogg, 2001) may provide additional insight into the charismatic leader's framing process for social change and provide a framework to explicate our results.

4.1. An alternate perspective: Social identity framing for social change

Briefly, social identity refers to, “that part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his group membership of a social group (or groups) together with the emotional significance attached to that membership” (Tajfel, 1974, p. 69). The major assumption underlying SIT is that one way people strive to maintain or increase their self-esteem is through their group memberships. Group members engage in intergroup comparisons and evaluations on relevant dimensions to determine the level of positivity (and status) assigned to their group membership. Depending on the outcome of these evaluations, social identities may be relatively positive (high status) or negative (low status) compared to other groups. In turn, positive or negative social identities influence how group members act and whether groups attempt to bring about social change (Tajfel, 1981).

More recent theorization suggests that leaders act as “entrepreneurs of identity” (Reicher & Hopkins, 1996; 2001; see also Gardner, 1995; Simon & Klandermans, 2001), and play a critical role in constructing group identity, sometimes to assure their leadership position (Hogg, 2001). Charismatic leaders may be particularly adept at this skill. In fact, theories of charismatic and transformational leaders connect effectiveness to the ability to implicate collective concerns with individual self-concepts (e.g., Shamir et al., 1993; van Knippenberg et al., 2004). Specifically, Shamir et al. (1993) suggest:

> …charismatic leaders change the salience of hierarchy of values and identities within the follower’s self-concept, thus increasing the probability that these values and identities will be implicated in action. Since values and identities are socially based, their control of behavior is likely to represent a shift from the instrumental to the moral and from concern with individual gains to concerns with contributions of the collective (p. 584).

In support of this proposition, recent empirical evidence shows that charismatic leaders empower followers by increasing their social identification (e.g., Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000; Kark, Shamir, & Chen, 2003). In turn, social identification is increased by the charismatic leader’s emphasis on followers’ collective identities and shared values (e.g., Shamir, Zakay, Breinin & Popper, 1998). Furthermore, research highlights the link between values and social identities such that group members who share a common social identity also share common value orientations (e.g., Heaven, 1999; Hortaçsu & Cem-ersoy, 2005).

Drawing on previous theory and research, we suggest that the charismatic leader’s effectiveness in bringing about social change may also depend on the ability to transform the group’s shared values and identities into a *new social identity* related to fulfilling the leader’s vision. In both minority groups and more established high status groups, social change evokes social identity concerns (see Tajfel, 1981). In particular, altering identities is especially critical for groups that possess pre-existing social identities that are negative and represent low status (e.g., stigmatized minority groups in social movements). For minority groups, altering a stigmatized group identity into a relatively more positive representation may be critical in mobilizing followers to act for the group (e.g., sit-ins, protest). Well-established higher status groups, however, possess conventional norms of behavior, a hierarchy of group values, and a pre-existing positive group identity. If the leader’s vision is inconsistent with pre-existing group-defining norms, values and identities, leaders may quickly spend their idiosyncratic credit (Hollander, 1958), risking marginalization and loss of follower support due to resistance to change. For a leader of a high status majority group to bring about social change that may be contrary to pre-existing values and identity, the group’s values and identity may also need to be deconstructed and reconstructed by the leader (see Reicher, Hopkins, Levine, & Rath, 2005).

So how might charismatic leaders alter a group’s identity to be more conducive to social change? One potential avenue may be communication tactics aimed at realigning followers’ values and identities to be more in line with the leader’s vision. Specifically, we propose that social identity alteration occurs through charismatic communication tactics aimed at breaking, moving, and realigning (synonymous with unfreezing, moving, refreezing; Lewin, 1951) followers’ sense of group identity. This three-phase intragroup change process is termed *social identity framing*. Below, we discuss relevant communication tactics for social identity framing during each of the three phases (see also Table 5).

4.1.1. Frame-breaking

During the initial frame-breaking stage, we propose that charismatic leaders fulfill two main functions to create influence and change in later stages: (a) increasing leader identification with followers and stressing group identity (see Hogg, 2001; Shamir et al., 1994); and (b) creating a sense of dissatisfaction with the current status quo (Fiol et al., 1999). Turning first to increasing leader identification with followers, Shamir et al. (1994) propose that charismatic leaders, “… point out similarities in background, experiences, and values between him and potential followers in order to demonstrate

Table 5
Social identity framing: Leader communication strategies

	Frame-breaking	Frame-moving	Frame-realigning
Leader goals	a) Increase leader and group identification	a) Negate conventional group identity and values	a) Positively affirm altered group identity
	b) Create dissatisfaction with the status quo	b) Relay new values and an alternate group identity	b) Encourage vision commitment and followers' efforts
Rhetorical strategies	*Inclusion*	*Inclusion*	*Inclusion*
	Vision	Vision	Vision
	Imagery	*Imagery*	*Imagery*
	Less conceptual	*Less conceptual*	*Less conceptual*
		Future	Future
	Similarity to followers	*Negation*	*Action* (leader, group)
	Limited self-reference	Group values	*Tangibility*
	Past and present	Positive group identity	Positive group identity
	Dissatisfaction	Follower behaviors	
	Urgency or crisis	Utopian outcomes	

Communication tactics in italics denote strategies that were empirically supported by the current study. The remaining tactics (in standard print) are propositions suggested for future research. Also, inspiration is not listed here as the current study showed that this construct was more related to non-charismatic rather than charismatic leaders.

his belonging to the same collectivity, and to posit himself as a 'representative character' and a potential role model (Proposition 4). This lays the ground work for potential followers' identification with the leader, and for their emulation of the leader's beliefs and acceptance of the leader's mission" (p. 34). In line with this proposition and the results of the current study, we propose that communicating a sense of *similarity to followers* (familiarity, leveling) during frame-breaking may be one way leaders present themselves as representative to maximize leader identification and influence. Portraying a sense of similarity to followers during this phase may also augment followers' attraction (see Berscheid & Reis, 1998) and liking (e.g. Hogg, Cooper-Shaw, & Holzworth, 1993) towards the leader, which may increase followers' trust in the leader, an important component of moving followers' values during frame-moving (Fiol et al., 1999). Furthermore, social psychological research suggests that similar others are able to gain compliance (see Cialdini & Trost, 1998) and influence (e.g., Feick & Higie, 1992; Oldmeadow, Platow, Foddy, & Anderson, 2003), regardless of whether the similarity has to do with opinions, personality traits, background, or lifestyle (Cialdini & Trost, 1998). Even reactance (Brehm, 1966) from a threatening message may be circumvented by a sense of similarity with the communicator. High levels of communicator-recipient similarity led recipients to strongly agree with the communicator of the message, even when attitudinal freedom is threatened (Silvia, 2005). Therefore, during frame-breaking, charismatic leaders may stress similarity to their followers to present themselves as a familiar other who is representative of the group, thereby garnering follower identification and increasing trust through attraction and liking, which in turn may lead to increased influence during later phases.

Leaders may also raise the salience of group identity and increase identification with the group (Shamir et al., 1998) by stressing the collective through *inclusive language* (e.g., we, us, them; collective focus; see proposition 2; Shamir et al., 1994), while using limited *self-references* (e.g., I, me, myself) that, when utilized, portray the leader in group terms to prototypicalize themselves and ensure influence (see Hogg, 2001; Hogg & Reid, 2006; Hogg & van Knippenberg, 2003; van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003). In other words, "when group membership is important/salient, a leader might engage in communications that emphasize his/her group prototypically…using terms such as 'we' might help, but so would using 'I' if it emphasized how 'I' was defined in group terms" (M.A. Hogg, personal communication, June 26, 2006). Thus, leaders use inclusion and self-references to convert personal interests to group-level interests and increase group identification. It should be stressed that inclusion and self-references are conceptualized as different communication strategies which are both related to social identity; inclusion makes salient and increases identification with the *group*, while self-references (and similarity to followers) increase prototypicality and identification with the *leader*.

Along with targeting social identity concerns, leaders may also express a need for social change. As the exemplar of the group prototype, leaders possess the legitimacy and influence to use collective frames to identify, interpret, and voice the shared grievances of the collective (Simon & Klandermans, 2001; Sherif & Sherif, 1969). Towards this end, leaders need to create, make salient, and/or articulate dissatisfaction with the status quo and relay a sense of urgency

connected to resolving dissatisfactions. As Lewin (1951, p. 229) states, "To break open the shell of complacency and self-righteousness it is sometimes necessary to bring about deliberately an emotional stir-up." Charismatic leaders may reinterpret group history that led to the status quo by using language referring to the *past and present* (Bligh et al., 2004a,b; Shamir et al., 1993). Leaders may also use language expressing and arousing emotional *dissatisfaction* in followers with the past and present, while relaying a sense of *urgency or crisis* to resolve or change the status quo. This will help eradicate in followers their: (a) desire to maintain the convention; and (b) fears of innovation (Fiol et al., 1999). Through these communication tactics, leaders use their prototypicality to influence followers' dissatisfaction with the current state of affairs, which unfreezes followers' attachments to components of the group identity and values that perpetuate the status quo. In this way, the leader establishes both a sense of prototypicality and dissatisfaction that lay the foundation for moving followers towards his or her vision.

4.1.2. Frame-moving

Frame-moving tactics are critical in establishing an altered social identity that is congruent with the leader's vision of social change. To this end, we surmise that leaders will fulfill two functions: (a) negating components of the group identity that supported the convention; and (b) relaying a new hierarchy of values and defining an alternate identity based on these values that support the leader's vision of change (Shamir et al., 1993). Concerning negation, based on our results and the findings of Fiol et al. (1999), charismatic leaders may engage in high levels of *negation* during frame-moving to derogate parts of the group identity that were aligned with convention. In this way, leaders use negation to build on the emotional dissatisfaction aroused during frame-moving and seek to eradicate support for specific policies, rules, norms, or conventions that are incompatible with their vision.

To help move followers towards the vision of social change, charismatic leaders may also continue to redefine the social category of group membership (Reicher & Hopkins, 1996; Reicher et al., 2005) to a higher or lower level of *inclusiveness* (e.g., defining who is the "we" versus "them"). Moreover, to redefine the group's identity, charismatic leaders may engage in rhetoric that highlights values and group identity, and connects these to expected follower behaviors and visions of the future (Shamir et al., 1993). Expanding on Shamir et al. (1993), we propose that charismatic leaders alter group identity by: (a) describing their positive vision of the future with *imagery*, less *conceptual* language, and increasing references to the *future*; (b) raising the salience of specific group-level *values* (e.g., freedom, equality) that support the vision; (c) relating group values to group identity and stressing the *positivity* of this identity in striving for and attaining the vision; (d) connecting group identity and values to expected *followers' behaviors* and efforts toward vision attainment; and (e) linking the vision to *utopian outcomes*. Note that in line with our results, we suggest that charismatic leaders make references to their vision with imagery and less conceptual language throughout the identity altering phases; however, leaders likely articulate their vision most thoroughly during frame-moving to help establish (move) group identity.

Through these rhetorical techniques, followers begin to internalize the leader's values and group identity related to the vision, which affords them a sense of meaning and motivation to act towards the vision for the collective interest. Moreover, presenting group identity and followers' behaviors as connected to the leader's positive vision of the future imbues followers with increased group-based esteem to accomplish the vision. However, moving followers towards an altered identity based on the leader's vision is insufficient for long-term change. In the next phase, leaders must ensure the permanency of the changes set during the frame-moving phase.

4.1.3. Frame-realigning

Frame-realigning rhetoric entails solidifying the group's altered identity and channeling motivations set up in frame-moving into follower commitment and action. To achieve this end, charismatic leaders may: (a) positively affirm the group's altered identity; and (b) use language to foster commitment and encourage followers towards action. Positively affirming the group's altered identity is critical during frame-realigning (Fiol et al., 1999; Shamir et al., 1993) to ensure that follower motivations stemming from the desire for a positive identity are associated with social change. Thus, leaders may again stress the *positivity* of group identity and connect the positive identity to fulfilling the leader's vision. Also, charismatic leaders may once again employ *inclusion* to make group identity salient and increase followers' identification with the group. Note that in line with our results, we suggest that inclusion is used during each phase to continually raise the salience of group membership and identification, thereby mustering support and commitment (Shamir et al., 1993) and encouraging message processing by followers (see Mackie, Worth & Asuncion, 1990).

To mobilize follower commitment and action, additional communication tactics may be also necessary. Lewin (1951) postulates that moving followers' motivations in the desired direction is insufficient for freezing change because motivation often fails to lead to action. Rather, "…decision links motivation to action and, at the same time, seems to have a 'freezing' effect which is partly due to the individual's tendency to 'stick to his decision' and partly to the 'commitment to a group'" (p. 233). To instill perceptions of a group decision to act towards the vision, charismatic leaders may concretely highlight and frame pre-existing personal and group accomplishments and actions in terms of how they fulfill goals related to the vision. This proposition is in line with our results showing that *all* leaders communicated with a high level of action (aggression, accomplishment, less passivity, and less ambivalence) and tangibility (concreteness, insistence) during frame-realigning. These findings suggest that both charismatic and non-charismatic leaders use progressively active and tangible terms to highlight goals and the need for followers' actions (see Conger & Kanungo, 1998), but the specific *types* of goals and actions each leadership type promotes may be different. Charismatic leaders may encourage followers to work towards more radical, vague, and distal goals for the purpose of social change (Shamir et al., 1993), while non-charismatic leaders may encourage their followers towards more socially conventional actions and proximal goals. Therefore, the difference between charismatic and non-charismatic leaders in this arena may not reside in the frequency that they use active or tangible language, but in the types of goals and action they promote.

Communicating accomplishments in particular may serve several important functions in frame-realigning. First, referring to *group accomplishments* and *actions* in *tangible* terms may create a sense of group commitment to the vision as well as increase followers' sense of collective efficacy (Shamir et al., 1993), even if crucial steps towards the vision have yet to be successfully accomplished. Perceptions of group commitment may be translated into follower motivation to expend time and effort towards the vision based on their group membership and identification. Failing to act on this group commitment may cause followers to experience cognitive dissonance due to their need to be consistent and to stick to decisions (Lewin, 1951; Shamir et al., 1993). Second, language referring to the leader's *personal accomplishments* and *actions* in *tangible* terms may demonstrate the leader's personal commitment to the vision. In positioning themselves as committed and active group members who are making strides for the collective, leaders construct themselves as the prototype of the altered group identity to ensure their leadership position and influence (Hogg, 2001). Pointing out personal accomplishments and contributions also presents a behavioral exemplar that followers can emulate; for instance, leaders may cite examples of their personal sacrifices for the collective (Shamir et al., 1993). Third, highlighting personal and group accomplishments towards the vision may also serve the purpose of burning bridges to the past to refreeze the altered group identity. When actions are perceived to successfully contribute towards goals related to the vision, a return to old conventions may no longer be perceived as a viable option. In this way, the desire for social change may become the new convention (Fiol et al., 1999) and the altered identity that is in line with the leader's vision permanently replaces the former identity and convention.

4.1.4. Summary

In sum, social identity framing is an intragroup process consisting of interpretive schemas used by leaders to alter the group's values and identity to be compatible and supportive of the leader's vision of social change. Charismatic leaders may be especially adept at the skill of social identity framing. Building on previous theory and research (e.g., Fiol et al., 1999; Hogg, 2001; Lewin, 1951; Reicher & Hopkins, 1996; Shamir et al., 1993; Tajfel & Turner, 1986), we propose that leaders alter the group's identity by frame-breaking, frame-moving, and frame-realigning communication tactics. During frame-breaking, leaders break ties to the current group identity by: (a) increasing leader identification with followers and stressing group identity by emphasizing their similarity to followers, employing self-references, and inclusive language; and (b) creating a sense of dissatisfaction with the current status quo by reinterpreting the group's past and present, expressing and arousing emotional dissatisfaction, and relaying a sense of urgency or crisis. During frame-moving, leaders alter the group's identity by: (a) negating components of group identity and values that supported the convention with high levels of negation; and (b) relaying a new hierarchy of values and defining an alternate identity that is in line with the leader's vision. This is accomplished with communication that involves expanding or shrinking the group's social category through inclusion, outlining a positive vision of the future (imagery, less conceptual language, future references), raising the salience of specific group-level values, stressing the positivity of group identity, emphasizing expected follower behaviors, and forecasting utopian outcomes through attaining the vision. During frame-realigning, leaders ensure permanency of

change and encourage followers to act by: (a) positively affirming the group's altered identity through inclusive communication and stressing the positivity of group identity; and (b) fostering commitment to the vision and encouraging follower efforts through language referring to personal and group actions and tangibility. Thus, social identity framing involves reinterpreting the group's past in an unfavorable light, highlighting the grievances of the present, redefining who the group is (altering identity), what the group should stand for (values), where it is going (future vision), and how it will get there (leader and follower behaviors). These suggestions provide a preliminary framework, subject to empirical investigation, for how leaders frame and modify social identity to achieve social change.

4.2. Implications for effective leadership communication

Based on our results, preliminary recommendations may also be made for effective leadership communication. Our results imply that leaders seeking to promote social change would benefit from using the following tactics: similarity to followers, negation, action, tangibility, inclusion, imagery, and less concept-based rhetoric. Leaders should communicate their similarity to their followers at the beginning of their tenure to increase trust, legitimacy, liking, and influence later on. This may be accomplished by using familiar, everyday language that many people may relate to and understand. In this way, the language of the leader portrays that he or she is representative of "one of us" and therefore, may be trusted and liked. Additionally, leaders should use leveling, or words that ignore individual differences, such as "everyone" and "together." In this way, a common ground in perception is stressed between the leader and follower and within the collective itself. This type of language also implies that the leader and the followers are "on the same page." Thus, when change is proposed later on, followers may be more likely to emulate the leader's beliefs.

In communicating with followers, leaders should also use inclusive language (e.g., "we", "us", "our group"). Inclusive language is especially critical in rendering salient followers' social identity (see Tajfel & Turner, 1986) and their identification with the group. A salient group identity results in a transformation away from personal interests towards group interests, even at the cost of personal sacrifices (Brewer, 2003). Thus, leaders should use inclusion to encourage followers to think and act for the collective interest.

A major step towards encouraging followers to embrace change may also lie in delineating why and how the current convention is not working. Thus, leaders should specifically target the convention that they are trying to alter with negation and explore rationales why the convention is ineffective, undesirable, and should be feared. Derogating convention will be reflected in the use of negative function words such as "not", aren't", "shouldn't", and "nobody". For example, Bill Clinton used this strategy in his State of the Union (1994):

> If we value work, we *can't* justify a system that makes welfare more attractive than work if people are worried about losing their health care. If we value responsibility, we *can't* ignore the $34 billion in child support absent parents ought to be paying to millions of parents who are taking care of their children. If we value strong families, we *can't* perpetuate a system that actually penalizes those who stay together. Can you believe that a child who has a child gets more money from the Government for leaving home than for staying home with a parent or a grandparent? That's *not* just bad policy, it's wrong. And we ought to change it [Italics added to emphasize negation].

Here, Bill Clinton was attempting to move followers to support changes in the unemployment and welfare systems by negating the current system (convention) and stressing American values as a rationale for why the current system was ineffective and undesirable.

Particularly when leaders are reaching the end of their tenure or seeking re-appointment, another important tactic is to concretely highlight accomplishments and actions to show that leaders have fulfilled their promises and made solid progress on behalf of the collective. This tactic may not only fortify the leader's legitimacy, but it also strengthens his or her legacy. Therefore, using language that denotes forceful action (e.g., challenge, overcome) and task-completion (e.g., finish, strengthen, succeed) may be effective. Similarly, the leader's accomplishments should be specifically outlined and repeated in concrete terms.

In line with previous research (e.g., Emrich et al., 2001; Conger, 1991), the results of our study also suggest that leaders should employ vivid imagery and metaphor in their communications and less conceptual language. Imagery and metaphor are inspirational: they evoke mental images, sensory experiences, and emotional reactions that encourage followers to adopt the leader's vision. For example, in following quote, John F. Kennedy uses the symbolism of sailing in the sea to portray the hope that lays ahead for America:

We are not lulled by the momentary calm of the sea or the somewhat clearer skies above. We know the turbulence that lies below, and the storms that are beyond the horizon this year. But now the winds of change appear to be blowing more strongly than ever, in the world of communism as well as our own. For 175 years we have sailed with those winds at our back, and with the tides of human freedom in our favor. We steer our ship with hope, as Thomas Jefferson said, 'leaving Fear astern'" (State of the Union, 1963).

Contrast John F. Kennedy's powerful use of metaphor with Jimmy Carter's appeal for hope in the future based on conceptual language: "We must move together into this decade with the strength which comes from realization of the dangers before us and from the confidence that together we can overcome them" (State of the Union, 1981). Kennedy's metaphoric message of hope is unique, memorable, and rich with historical and cultural meaning, making it much more inspirational and effective.

4.3. Limitations and directions for future research

The current study has a number of limitations. While we minimized the possibility of bias by utilizing a computerized content analysis program instead of human coders, this approach is not without disadvantages, including: (a) a sterility of analysis that may overlook creative insights usually associated with qualitative research; (b) the assumption that a concept is more meaningful because of its frequent usage; and (c) the fact that words are taken out of their original contexts (see Bligh et al., 2004b; Insch et al., 1997; Morris, 1994). However, these potential limitations are partially offset by the fact that computerized content analysis provides a reliable and objective means of analyzing speeches. This is especially important in political leadership studies, as human coding biases connected with coders' political attitudes may influence results (Hart, 1984). In addition, language changes may also be evident in our sample due to the large range of historical contexts. In the current study, we partially address this limitation by updating the archaic spelling of many words to preserve their original meanings.

Other limitations are similarly connected with historical changes in the presidency since the early 20th century. As has been argued elsewhere, the media may play an important role in constructing presidential charisma and images (Bligh et al., 2004a). The impact of mass media has changed the presidency: both radio and television have broadened the scope of listeners to presidential addresses, and television has allowed increased coverage of press conferences and more detailed scrutiny of non-verbal cues. More recently, the Internet has made presidential speeches more accessible and subject to word-for-word analysis. Presidents in the early 20th century were also not as visible to the public and were not required to give as many speeches as their modern counterparts. The increased frequency of oral speeches over the course of the 20th century suggests that communicating with the public has become an increasingly important role of presidents, and the use of speechwriters in the 20th century underlines this rising importance. While it is difficult to control for the differential impact of speechwriters (or cabinet members) on presidential rhetoric, since most 20th century presidents have utilized speechwriters, the variance in our sample associated with this potential confound is partially controlled.

Overall, it is not clear precisely how increased presidential communication and exposure over the course of the 20th century affects the content of presidential rhetoric. In the current study, we attempted to address this limitation and to reduce possible error variance by covarying for generalized historical changes (Emrich et al., 2001). Our data suggested that historical trends were significant in the overall multivariate model, Pillai's Trace = .59, $F\,(8, 96) = 16.92$, $p < .0001$, multivariate $\eta^2 = .58$, and specifically affected inclusion ($p < .005$), similarity to followers ($p < .0001$) and imagery ($p < .005$). To further explore this matter, presidential modernity (see above), was also used as an independent variable in an MANCOVA analysis to test for possible communication differences between pre-modern (1901–1932) and modern presidencies (1933–present). The total number of words and the total number of different words were employed as covariates. Multivariate results revealed a significant main effect for presidential modernity, Pillai's Trace = .31, $F\,(8, 101) = 5.77$, $p < .0001$, multivariate $\eta^2 = .31$. Pre-modern presidents utilized more similarity to their followers ($p < .0001$), less tangibility ($p < .0001$), and perhaps slightly more imagery ($p = .08$) than modern presidents. In light of these findings, future presidential speech studies would be well advised to employ a measure of historical changes as a covariate in their studies. Further inquiry may also explore developing specific measures related to historical changes (e.g., media effects, increased speech quantity).

Another noteworthy limitation of the current study involves the operationalization of Lewin's (1951) three-phase model. Although the three-phase model highlights the temporal sequence of social change strategies, it is unclear whether this temporal sequence strictly corresponds with a president's first year in office (phase 1), middle years in

office (phase 2), and last year in office (phase 3). For instance, it is feasible that these phases could: (a) vary in length from each other; (b) be longer or shorter than a 1–2 year period; (c) overlap as leaders shift from one phase to another; (d) vary depending on followers' reactions and feedback; (e) be affected by how many terms a president is in office; or (f) might even be implemented simultaneously without temporally distinct intervals. One potential alternative might be to operationalize the phases in the context of specific issues (e.g., Cuban missile crisis) and focus on change rhetoric focused around a specific topic or issue rather than by temporal period.

Although the present research focused on rhetorical strategies that help affect social change, other components of communication that may also prove important. Beyond rhetoric, delivery, and presentation of speeches may affect leader–follower interactions (see Holladay & Coombs, 1993, 1994). For example, speed of speech (see Miller, Maruyma, Beaber, & Valone, 1976), non-verbal communications such as expressiveness (see Friedman, Riggio, & Casella, 1988), and prosody of speech (Argyle, Salter, Nicholson, Williams, & Burgess, 1970) may also be worthy arenas of future research in further testing the three-phase model of social change.

Finally, presidential leaders fulfill their leadership roles with a unique set of pressures (e.g., re-election, approval ratings) and circumstances (e.g., wars, terrorism, natural disasters) that are not faced by other leaders. Inevitably, these pressures and circumstances will affect their communications. To test the generalizability of these findings and those from previous studies using American presidents (e.g., Bligh et al., 2004a, 2004b; Emrich et al., 2001; Fiol et al., 1999), future studies should examine the communication of other types of leaders; for instance, corporate, community, social movement, or political leaders in other countries and contexts. It may be particularly important to test the generalizability of our results that all presidential leaders used more action and tangibility during phase 3. Although emphasizing actions and accomplishments in tangible terms may be important for other types of leaders who continually struggle to keep their jobs in light of increasing executive turnover, these results may also be an artifact of presidential leadership and elected leaders. During their last terms (phase 3), most presidents are seeking re-election. Communicating with more tangible terms may serve the purpose of emphasizing and repeating specific and concrete accomplishments during the leader's tenure to boost approval ratings and ensure re-election. In a similar vein, presidential leaders may also highlight their accomplishments and specify how they have fulfilled collective goals by using action-related language. Future research may test this possibility by replicating the current research in non-presidential samples.

4.4. Concluding remarks

Overall, the current study adds to the scientific understanding of the differences between charismatic leaders and non-charismatic leaders, and the rhetorical techniques utilized to motivate others towards social change. Our results corroborate the theory that charismatic leaders use specific rhetorical devices (negation, inclusion, stressing similarity to followers, imagery, using less inspiration, and conceptual language), sometimes in a temporal sequence (negation, similarity to followers, action, and tangibility), to achieve their ends. Although these results warrant replication in other leadership samples, they may benefit both the applied field and leadership theory. For the applied field, knowledge of these rhetorical strategies may be valuable for a wide array of leaders (e.g., corporate leaders, politicians, community leaders) aspiring to promote social change, or even informal leaders aiming to construct persuasive messages to change values. Our results may also inform psychologists interested in designing programs aimed at changing group norms, values, and habits. At a theoretical level, the current research and our propositions concerning social identity framing contribute to the sparse literature on *how* charismatic leaders affect social change, and numerous areas of further research are highlighted. Future research in this area is critical in gaining a complete understanding of charismatic leadership that includes the important knowledge of the *process* through which social change is brought about. With continued research efforts in this area, it may eventually be feasible to unravel the mystery surrounding the seemingly "magical ability" (Weber, 1946) of charismatic leaders to institute social change.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Michael Mumford and three anonymous reviewers for their helpful remarks on an earlier draft of this manuscript. We also thank Michael Hogg for his insightful comments on the social identity theory of leadership.

Appendix A. Presidential speeches list

President	Fiol et al. (1999) speeches	Additional speeches
Theodore Roosevelt	1. First Annual Message to Congress (*Dec. 3, 1901)***	1. Administration of the Island Possessions *(Aug. 22, 1902)*
	2. In Chicago, Illinois. *(April 2, 1903)*	2. The Square Deal, The New York State Agricultural Association *(Sept. 7, 1903)*
	3. Fourth Annual Message to Congress *(Dec. 6, 1904)**	3. Message to Congress *(Jan. 4, 1904)* 3. Address to the Forest Congress *(Jan. 5, 1905)*
William Taft	1. Address to Joint Session of Congress *(June 16, 1909)*	1. Inaugural Address *(March 4, 1909)*
	2. Annual Message to Congress *(Dec. 5, 1911)**	2. Speech of President Taft on the Reciprocal Tariff Agreement with Canada *(April 27, 1911)*
	3. Special Message to Congress on the Economy and Efficiency in the Government Services *(Jan. 17, 1912)*	3. Special Message to Congress on the Economy and Efficiency in the Government Services *(April 4, 1912)** 3. Special Message on Fur Seals *(Jan. 8, 1913)**
Woodrow Wilson	1.Inaugural address *(March 4, 1913)*	1. 1st Annual Message; State of the Union Address, *(Dec. 2, 1913)*
	2. Annual Address to Congress *(Dec. 8, 1914)*	2. Declaration of Neutrality, Message to Congress *(Aug. 19, 1914)*
	3. Special Message to Congress *(Aug. 29, 1916)*	3. 4th Annual Message; State of the Union Address *(Dec. 5, 1916)*
Calvin Coolidge	1. First Annual Message to Congress *(Dec. 6, 1923)*	1. The Price of Freedom *(Jan. 21, 1923)* 1. The Destiny of America *(May 30, 1923)*
	2. Inaugural Address *(March 4, 1925)*	2. The Duties of Citizenship. Radio Address from the White House *(Nov. 3, 1924)*
	3. Fourth Annual Message to Congress *(Dec. 7, 1926)**	3. Armistice Day Address *(Nov. 11, 1926)*
Herbert C. Hoover	1. Inaugural Address *(March 4, 1929)*	1. Armistice Day Address *(Nov. 11, 1929*) 1. Remarks to the Chamber of Commerce on the Mobilization of Business and Industry for Economic Stabilization *(Dec. 29, 1929).*
	2. Statement to Press on Income Tax Revenues *(April 5, 1930)*	2. Memorial Day Address at the Gettysburg Battlefield *(May 30, 1930)* 2. President's News Conference on Unemployment and Business Conditions *(March 7, 1930)*
	3. Statement to Press on Hoarding Currency *(Feb. 3, 1932)*	3. Address to the Senate on the National Economy *(May 31, 1932)*
Franklin D. Roosevelt	1. Address before Pan American Union *(April 23, 1933)*	1. Inaugural Address *(March 4, 1933)*
	2. Address on Armistice Day *(Nov. 11, 1935)*	2. First Annual Message to Congress; State of the Union *(Jan. 4, 1935)*
	3. Address to Congress; State of the Union *(Jan. 3, 1936)*	3. Speech at Madison Square Garden *(Oct. 31, 1936)*
Harry S. Truman	1. Address to Joint Session of Congress *(April 16, 1945)*	1. Announcing the Surrender of Germany *(May 8, 1945)*
	2. Statement to Press on Demobilization *(Jan. 8, 1946)*	2. Annual Address to Congress; State of the Union *(Jan. 6, 1947)* 2. Truman Doctrine *(March 12, 1947)*
	3. Special Message to Congress *(Feb. 9, 1948)*	3. Second Annual Message to Congress; State of the Union *(Jan. 7, 1948)*
Dwight D. Eisenhower	1. Remarks to Committee for Economic Development *(May 20, 1954)*	1. Inaugural Address *(Jan. 20, 1953)* 1. Annual Message to Congress; State of the Union *(Jan. 7, 1954)* 1. Atoms of Peace *(Dec. 8, 1953)*
	2. Statement on Mutual Security *(April 11, 1955)*	2. Annual Message to Congress; State of the Union *(Jan. 6, 1955)*
	3. Special Message to Congress *(Jan. 19, 1956)*	3. Eisenhower Doctrine *(Jan. 5, 1957)*
John F. Kennedy	1. Inaugural Address *(Jan. 20, 1961)*	1. Annual Message to Congress; State of Union *(Jan. 30, 1961)*
	2. News Conference *(Feb. 7, 1962)*	2. Cuban Missile Crisis *(Oct. 22, 1962)*
	3. Statement to the Press *(April 11, 1963)*	3. Annual Message to Congress; State of Union *(Jan. 14, 1963)*
Lyndon B. Johnson	1. Annual Message to Congress *(Jan. 8, 1964)*	1. Remarks Upon Signing the Civil Rights Bill *(July 2, 1964)*
	2. Special Message to Congress *(May 8, 1965)*	2. Annual Message to Congress; State of the Union *(Jan. 4, 1965)*
	3. Remarks Upon Signing the Economic Report *(Jan. 27, 1966)*	3. Annual Message to Congress; State of the Union *(Jan. 12, 1966)*
Richard M. Nixon	1. News Conference *(March 14, 1969)*	1. Inaugural Address *(Jan. 20, 1969)*
	2. Statement to the Press *(March 15, 1971)*	2. Annual Message to Congress; State of the Union *(Jan. 22, 1971)*
	3. Statement upon Signing the Education Amendments *(June 23, 1972)*	3. Annual Message to Congress; State of the Union *(Jan. 20, 1972)*
Gerald Ford	1. Remarks on Taking the Oath of Office *(Aug. 9, 1974)*	1. "Whip Inflation Now" Speech *(Oct. 8, 1974)*
	2. Annual Budget Message to Congress *(Feb. 3, 1975)*	2. Annual Message to Congress; State of the Union *(Jan. 15, 1975)*
	3. Statement on Signing the Income Tax Reform Bill *(Sept. 6, 1976)*	3. Annual Message to Congress; State of the Union *(Jan. 19, 1976)*

Appendix A (*continued*)

President	Fiol et al. (1999) speeches	Additional speeches
Jimmy Carter	1. Statement to Press *(April 7, 1977)*	1. Inaugural Address *(Jan. 20, 1977)*
	2. Statement to Press *(Feb. 1, 1978)*	2. Annual Message to Congress; State of the Union *(Jan. 19, 1978)*
	3. Remarks at a White House Briefing *(Jan. 10, 1980)*	3. Annual Message to Congress; State of the Union *(Jan. 23, 1980)*
Ronald Reagan	1. Statement to the Press *(June 19, 1981)*	1. Inaugural Address *(Jan. 20, 1981)*
	2. Remarks to Press *(June 19, 1983)*	2. Annual Message to Congress; State of the Union *(Jan. 25, 1983)*
	3. Address to Nation *(July 7, 1984)*	3. Annual Message to Congress; State of the Union *(Jan. 25, 1984)*
George Bush Sr.		1. Inaugural Address *(Jan. 20, 1989)*
		1. Address Before Joint Session of Congress *(Feb. 9, 1989)*
		2. Remarks on Signing the Americans with Disabilities Act *(July 26, 1990)*
		2. Address Before Joint Session of Congress *(Sept. 11, 1990)*
		3. Address Before a Joint Session of Congress *(March 6, 1991)*
		3. Annual Message to Congress; State of the Union *(Jan. 29, 1991)*
William Clinton		1. Address before a Joint Session on Administration Goals *(Feb. 17, 1993).*
		1. Inaugural Address *(Jan. 20, 1993)*
		2. Annual Message to Congress; State of the Union *(Jan. 25, 1994)*
		2. Address to the Nation on Haiti *(Sept. 15, 1994)*
		3. Annual Message to Congress; State of the Union *(Jan. 23, 1996)*
		3. Remarks by the President on Responsible Citizenship and the American Community *(July 6, 1995)*
George W. Bush Jr.		1. Inaugural Address *(Jan. 29, 2001)*
		1. Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on Administration Goals *(Feb. 27, 2001)*
		1. Address to the Nation *(Sept. 11, 2001)*
		2. Annual Message to Congress; State of the Union *(Jan. 29, 2002)*
		2. Global Coalition *(March 11, 2002)*
		3. Annual Message to Congress; State of the Union *(Jan. 20, 2004).*
		3. Address on Iraq Transition *(May 24, 2004)*

Speech numbers correspond to each phase; frame-breaking = 1; frame-moving = 2; frame-realigning = 3. Asterisks (*) denote a written speech.

Appendix B. Rhetorical strategies constructs

Construct	Description	Sample words
Negation		
Negative function words	Standard negative contractions, negative function words, null sets, and prefixes "un" and "dis".	Aren't, shouldn't, don't, nor, not, nay, nothing, nobody, none, words with "un", "dis".
Inclusion		
Social identity	Words denoting a shared social identity.	We, us, them.
Collective focus		
Collectives	Singular nouns connoting plurality that function to decrease specificity, reflecting a dependence on categorical modes of thought. Includes social groupings, task groups, and geographical entities.	Crowd, choir, team, humanity, army, congress, legislature, staff, county, world, kingdom, republic.
People references	Words referring to the citizenry-writ-large, including sociological, political, and generic group designations.	Crowd, classes, residents, constituencies, majority, citizenry, masses, population.
Self-reference (–)	All first person references that reflect the locus of action residing in the speaker and not in the world at large.	I, I'd, I'll, I'm, I've, me, mine, my, myself.
Similarity to followers		
Leveling	Words used to ignore individual differences and to build a sense of completeness and assurance.	Everybody, anyone, each, fully, always, completely, inevitably, consistently, unconditional, consummate, absolute, open-and-shut.
Familiarity	A dictionary of the most common words in the English language. Includes common prepositions, demonstrative pronouns, interrogative pronouns, and particles, conjunctions, and connectives.	Over, across, through, this, that, who, what, a, for, so.

(continued on next page)

Appendix B (*continued*)

Construct	Description	Sample words
Conceptual language and imagery		
Conceptual language (Martindale's Regressive Image Dictionary on Conceptual Thought)	A dictionary of words that are abstract, logical, reality-oriented and aimed at problem solving. Includes words associated with social and instrumental behavior, restraint, order, temporal references, and moral imperatives.	Know, may, thought, say, tell, call, make, find, work, must, stop, bind, simple, measure, array, when, now, then, should, right, virtue.
Imagery (Martindale's Regressive Image Dictionary on Imagery/Primordial Language)	A dictionary of words that are concrete, associative, and based on fantasy and dreams rather than in reality. Includes words associated with drive, sensation, defensive symbolization, regressive cognition, and Icarian imagery.	Drink, sweat, kiss, charm, touch, sweet, perfume, voice, light, cold, hard, soft, lie, wander, wave, shade, wild, strange, eternal, dream, road, eye, where, rise, up, fall, down, sun, sea.
Inspiration		
Inspiration	Abstract virtues deserving of universal respect and attractive personal qualities.	Honesty, self-sacrifice, virtue, courage, dedication, wisdom, mercy, patriotism, success, education, justice.
Action		
Aggression	Words denoting human competition and forceful action, including physical energy, social domination, and goal-directedness.	Blast, crash, explode, collide, conquest, attacking, violation, commanded, challenging, overcome, mastered, pound, shove, dismantle, overturn, prevent, reduce, defend.
Accomplishment	Words expressing task-completion and organized human behavior.	Establish, finish, influence, proceed, motivated, influence, leader, manage, strengthen, succeed, agenda, enacted, working, leadership.
Passivity (−)	Words ranging from neutrality to inactivity, including terms of compliance, docility, and cessation.	Allow, tame, appeasement, submit, contented, sluggish, arrested, capitulate, refrain, yielding, immobile, unconcerned, nonchalant.
Ambivalence (−)	Words expressing hesitation or uncertainty, implying a speaker's inability or unwillingness to commit to what is being said.	Allegedly, perhaps, might, almost, approximate, vague, somewhere, baffled, puzzling, hesitate, could, would, dilemma, guess, suppose, seems.
Tangibility		
Concreteness	A dictionary of words denoting tangibility and materiality, including physical structures, modes of transportation, articles of clothing, household animals, etc.	Airplane, ship, bicycle, stomach, eyes, lips, slacks, pants, shirt, cat, insects, horse, wine grain, sugar, oil, silk, sand, courthouse, temple, store.
Insistence	A calculated measure reflecting the assumption that repetition of key terms indicates a preference for a limited, ordered world.	A calculation of repetition of key terms.

"(−)" refers to negative counts or words that are subtracted from frequency counts.

Appendix C. Sample quotations from President Ronald Reagan's address before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union (January 25th, 1984)

Construct	Sample quotation
Negation	"After all our struggles to restore America, to revive confidence in our country, hope for our future, after all our hard-won victories earned through the patience and courage of every citizen, we cannot, must not, and will not turn back."
Inclusion	"We finished the race; we kept them free; we kept the faith."
Similarity to followers	"For us, faith, work, family, neighborhood, freedom, and peace are not just words; they're expressions of what America means, definitions of what makes us a good and loving people."
Imagery	"And we can build a meaningful peace to protect our loved ones and this shining star of faith that has guided millions from tyranny to the safe harbor of freedom, progress, and hope."
Conceptual language	"Today in Minnesota, he works 80 hour s a week without pay, helping pioneer the field of computer-controlled walking."
Inspiration	"America is back, standing tall, looking to the eighties with courage, confidence, and hope."
Action	"We can now move with confidence to seize the opportunities for peace, and we will."
Tangibility	"The Department of Transportation will help an expendable launch services industry to get off the ground."

References

Argyle, M., Salter, V., Nicholson, H., Williams, M., & Burgess, P. (1970). The communication of inferior and superior attitudes by verbal and nonverbal signals. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *9*, 222−231.

Berscheid, E., & Reis, H. T. (1998). Attraction and close relationships. In D. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindsey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 193–281). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bligh, M. C., Kohles, J. C., & Meindl, J. R. (2004a). Charisma under crisis: Presidential leadership, rhetoric, and media responses before and after 9/11. *Leadership Quarterly*, *15*, 211−239.

Bligh, M. C., Kohles, J. C., & Meindl, J. R. (2004b). Charting the language of leadership: A methodological investigation of President Bush and the crisis of 9/11. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83*, 562−574.

Brehm, J. W. (1966). *A theory of psychological reactance.* New York: Academic Press.

Brewer, M. B. (2003). *Intergroup relations*, 2nd ed. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Bull, P. (2000). Equivocation and the rhetoric of modernization: An analysis of televised interviews with Tony Blair in the 1997 British General Election. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *19*, 222−247.

Cialdini, R. B., & Trost, M. R. (1998). Social influence: Social norms, conformity and compliance. In D. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindsey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 151–192). New York: Oxford Press.

Conger, J. A. (1991). Inspiring others: The language of leadership. *Academy of Management Executive*, *5*, 31−45.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., & Menon, S. T. (2000). Charismatic leadership and follower effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *21*, 741−767.

Crano, W. D., & Brewer, M. (2002). *Principles and methods of social research*, 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

De Cremer, D. (2002). Charismatic leadership and cooperation in social dilemmas: A matter of transforming motives? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *32*, 997−1016.

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

Feick, L. F., & Higie, R. A. (1992). The effects of preference heterogeneity and source characteristics on ad processing and judgments about endorsers. *Journal of Advertising*, *21*, 9−24.

Fiol, C. M., Harris, D., & House, R. (1999). Charismatic leadership: Strategies for effecting social change. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*, 449−482.

Fiske, S. T. (1998). Stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination. In D. Gilbert, S. Fiske, & G. Lindsey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 915–971). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Friedman, H. S., Riggio, R. E., & Casella, D. F. (1988). Non-verbal skill, personal charisma, and initial attraction: The affective communication test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *39*, 333−351.

Gardner, H. (1995). *Leading minds: An anatomy of leadership.* New York: Basic Books.

Grant, S. J., Malaviya, P., & Sternthal, B. (2004). The influence of negation on production evaluation. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *31*, 583−591.

Hart, R. P. (1984). *Verbal style and the presidency: A computer-based analysis.* Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Hart, R. P. (2000). *DICTION 5.0: The text-analysis program.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Scolari/Sage.

Hart, R. P. (2001). Redeveloping DICTION: Theoretical considerations. In M. West (Ed.), *Theory, method, and practice of computer content analysis* (pp. 26−55). New York: Ablex.

Haslam, S. A., Platow, M. J., Turner, J. C., Reynolds, K. J., McGarty, P. J., Johnson, S., et al. (2001). Social identity and the romance of leadership: The importance of being seen to be 'doing it for us.' *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *4*, 191−205.

Heaven, P. C. L. (1999). Group identities and human values. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *139*, 590−595.

Hogg, M. A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *5*, 184−200.

Hogg, M. A., Cooper-Shaw, L., & Holzworth, D. W. (1993). Group prototypicality and depersonalized attraction in small interactive groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *19*, 452−465.

Hogg, M. A., Hains, S. C., & Mason, I. (1998). Identification and leadership in small groups: Salience, frame of reference, and leader stereotypicality effects on leader evaluations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *75*, 1248−1263.

Hogg, M. A., & Reid, S. A. (2006). Social identity, self-categorization, and the communication of group norms. *Communication Theory*, *16*, 7−30.

Hogg, M. A., & van Knippenberg, D. (2003). Social identity and leadership processes in groups. In M. P. (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 35, pp. 1–52). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

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.

Hollander, E. P. (1958). Conformity, status, and idiosyncrasy credit. *Psychological Review*, *65*, 117−127.

Hortaçsu, N., & Cem-ersoy, N. (2005). Values, identities, and social constructions of the European Union among Turkish university youth. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *35*, 107−121.

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

House, R. J., Woycke, J., & Fodor, E. M. (1988). Charismatic and noncharismatic leaders: Differences in behavior and effectiveness. In J. R. Conger & R. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership* (pp. 98−121). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Insch, G. S., Moore, J. E., & Murphy, L. D. (1997). Content analysis in leadership research: Examples, procedures and suggestions for future use. *Leadership Quarterly*, *8*, 1−25.

Kark, R., Shamir, B., & Chen, G. (2003). The two faces of transformational leadership: Empowerment and dependency. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*, 246−255.

Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science.* New York: Harper.

Mackie, D. M., Worth, L. T., & Asuncion, A. G. (1990). Processing of persuasive in-group messages. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *58*, 812−822.

Mayo, R., Schul, Y., & Burnstein, E. (2004). "I am not guilty" vs. "I am innocent": Successful negation may depend on the schema used for its encoding. *Journal of Experimental and Social Psychology*, *40*, 433−449.

McClelland, D. C. (1985). How motives skills, and values determine what people do. *American Psychologist*, *40*, 812−825.

Meindl, J. R. (1992). Reinventing leadership: A radical, social psychological approach. In K. Murnighan (Ed.), *Social psychology in organizations: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 89−118). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Miller, N., Maruyma, G., Beaber, R., & Valone, K. (1976). Speed of speech and persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *12*, 109−119.

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

Morris, R. (1994). Computerized content analysis in management research. *Journal of Management*, *20*, 903−931.

Neustadt, R. E., & Greenstein, F. (1990). *Presidential power and the modern presidents: The politics of leadership from Roosevelt to Reagan.* New York: The Free Press.

Oldmeadow, J. A., Platow, M. J., Foddy, M., & Anderson, D. (2003). Self-categorization, status and social influence. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *66*, 138−152.

Reicher, S. D., & Hopkins, N. (1996). Self-category constructions in political rhetoric: An analysis of Thatcher's and Kinnock's speeches concerning the British miners' strike (1984–85). *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *26*, 353−372.

Reicher, S. D., & Hopkins, N. (2001). *Self and Nation.* London: Sage.

Reicher, S. D., Hopkins, N., Levine, M., & Rath, R. (2005). Entrepreneurs of hate and entrepreneurs of solidarity: Social identity as a basis for mass communication. *International Review of the Red Cross*, *87*, 621−637.

Shamir, B., Arthur, M. B., & House, R. J. (1994). The rhetoric of charismatic leadership: A theoretical extension, a case study, and implications for research. *Leadership Quarterly*, *5*, 25−42.

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.

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*, 387−409.

Sherif, M., & Sherif, M. C. W. (1969). *Social psychology.* New York: Harper and Row.

Silvia, P. J. (2005). Deflecting reactance: The role of similarity in increasing compliance and reducing resistance. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *27*, 277−284.

Simon, B., & Klandermans, B. (2001). Politicized collective identity. *American Psychologist*, *56*, 319−331.

Simonton, D. K. (1988). Presidential style: Personality, biography, and performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *55*, 928−936.

Spangler, W. D., & House, R. J. (1991). Presidential effectiveness and the leadership motive profile. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *60*, 439−455.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics*, 4th ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behavior. *Social Science Information*, *13*, 65−93.

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W.G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed., pp. 7−24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.

Turner, J. C. (1981). The experimental social psychology of intergroup behavior. In J. C. Turner & H. Giles (Eds.), *Intergroup behavior* (pp. 66−101). Oxford: Blackwell.

van Knippenberg, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2003). A social identity model of leadership in organizations. In R. M. Kramer & B.M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 25, pp. 243–295). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

van Knippenberg, D., van Knippenberg, B., De Cremer, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2004). Leadership, self, and identity: A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*, 825−856.

Watkins, M. (2001). Principles of persuasion. *Negotiation Journal*, *17*, 115−137.

Weber, M. (1946). *From Max Weber* (Gerth, H.H. & Mills, C.W., Trans.). New York: Oxford University Press.