



Pergamon

The Leadership Quarterly 12 (2001) 339–363

The
Leadership
Quarterly

American presidential Machiavellianism Implications for charismatic leadership and rated performance[☆]

Ronald J. Deluga*

Department of Applied Psychology, Bryant College, 1150 Douglas Pike, Smithfield, RI 02917-1284, USA

Abstract

The purpose of this investigation was to study the relationships among American presidential Machiavellianism, charismatic leadership, and rated performance. Using historiometric methodology, raters assessed Machiavellianism in unidentified profiles describing 39 American presidents (Washington to Reagan). Archival sources were used for two close and two distant presidential charismatic leadership measures, two performance assessments, and four control variables. Hierarchical regression analyses confirmed the predictions that presidential Machiavellianism would be positively connected with charismatic leadership and rated performance. The findings are explained in terms of the similar features of Machiavellianism and charismatic leadership including high levels of expressive behavioral activity, self-confidence, emotional regulation, and the desire to influence others. Also, the idea that personalized and socialized charismatic leadership are not mutually exclusive concepts is supported. © 2001 Elsevier Science Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

American presidential leadership is fundamentally a relational process (Neustadt, 1960) where decisions have considerable consequences for entire societies. Extensive research clearly demonstrates the centrality of leadership ability in assessments of presidential greatness (Kenney & Rice, 1988). In addition, widespread media and public scrutiny of

[☆] An earlier version of this manuscript was presented at the 1998 Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association.

* Tel.: +1-401-232-6279; fax: +1-401-232-6319.

E-mail address: rdeluga@bryant.edu (R.J. Deluga).

the presidency establish leadership qualities as important determinants for presidential performance (Foti, Fraser, & Lord, 1982). Accordingly, it is not surprising that the presidency is an office where the incumbent's psychological make-up greatly influences choices, discretionary activity (Renshon, 1998), and ultimately leadership effectiveness. In this respect, one research domain illuminating presidential leadership and personality is charismatic leadership. Charismatic leaders possess a magnetic personality and engage in expressive behaviors with the intent of creating an image of competence and effectiveness (Gardner & Avolio, 1998; House, 1995). Charismatic leaders are able to evoke strong follower commitment to their vision and performance exceeding expectations (Bass, 1985; Yukl, 1998). However, we know very little concerning how these impressive results are achieved (Fiol, Harris, & House, 1999; Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999).

With regard to presidential leadership, Simonton (1988) demonstrated that presidential charisma was positively associated with a wide range of historical measures gauging presidential greatness. Also, Deluga (1997, 1998) reported that narcissism and proactivity were connected with presidential charismatic leadership and performance. Next, House, Spangler, and Woycke (1991) concluded that presidential personality and charisma were important factors in performance. Nevertheless, because of the impact of their actions, much more needs to be known regarding charismatic leadership and personality in the American presidency.

Consequently, given the idea presidential personality characteristics strongly influence decision-making (Renshon, 1998) and may predict charismatic leadership (House, 1977; House & Howell, 1992; Post, 1993), it seems worthwhile to continue examining presidential personality. Accordingly, the personality trait of interest in this study was presidential Machiavellianism. Machiavellianism is a social influence process embracing the use of politics, power, and expressive behaviors (Christie & Geis, 1970a). Machiavellianism was selected because earlier work argued that Machiavellian behavior may be associated with charismatic leadership (House & Howell, 1992) and success in promoting personal interests (Christie & Geis, 1970a). For instance, charismatic leaders and Machiavellians employ interactional expressive behaviors and emotional regulation targeted toward influencing others (Gardner & Avolio, 1995, 1998). Likewise, both manifest confidence and conviction, even when experiencing inner doubt (House, 1977).

Therefore, the purpose of this investigation was to empirically address the following research question. Is American presidential Machiavellianism related to charismatic leadership and rated performance? In Sections 2 and 3, Machiavellianism and charismatic leadership are reviewed. Then, a historiometric study empirically examining the relationships among presidential Machiavellianism, charismatic leadership, and rated performance is described.

2. Machiavellianism

The pursuit and skillful use of power and influence have been viewed as fundamental for effective leadership by a wide range of observers (Bass, 1990; Yukl, 1998). Here, Niccolo

Machiavelli (1469–1527) holds a prominent position in modern political thought and theory (Fleisher, 1972; Mansfield, 1996). For example, in his classic treatises *The Prince* and *The Discourses*, Machiavelli (1513/1966) provided political advice for leaders. He advocated an extreme prescription for acquiring and maintaining power in socially competitive situations. Machiavelli's recommendations were based on expediency for personal gain. He endorsed manipulative, exploitive, and deceitful behavior. For Machiavelli, a leader needs an analytical attitude without a sense of shame or guilt. Political calculation is required to control, rather than be victimized by events. Machiavelli advised avoiding placing trust in others as "...men will never do good except by necessity" (p. 96) and "...will show less gratitude than princes" (p. 110). Machiavelli also advised that leaders should take on many carefully crafted personas in order to create a desired image. For example, he advocated that a leader "...should conduct himself in such a way that greatness, boldness, gravity, and strength will be observed in his actions" (p. 64).

For the Machiavellian, "the ends justify the means." Individuals exhibiting high degrees of Machiavellianism resist social influence, are amoral in controlling personal interactions (e.g., "men are moved by two principal things — by love and by fear," 1513/1966, p. 119) endeavor to personally control situations, and display a lack of affect (i.e., cool detachment and aloofness) in interpersonal relationships (Christie & Geis, 1970a; Fehr, Samsom, & Paulhus, 1992; Geis, 1978; Wilson, Near, & Miller, 1996). For instance, Machiavelli (1513/1966) suggested a leader "...must maintain himself in such high regard that no one will ever think of cheating him or misleading him" (p. 64).

Machiavellians employ deceptive interpersonal tactics (Shapiro, Lewicki, & Devine, 1995) and are convincing liars (DePaulo & Rosenthal, 1979; Geis & Moon, 1981; Lewicki, 1983). Here, Machiavelli (1513/1966) advised that "...those princes who had little regard for their word and had the craftiness to turn men's minds have accomplished great things" (p. 62). In fact, recent research supports the strong conceptual similarity between Machiavellianism and psychopathology. That is, Machiavellianism and psychopathy converge in such behaviors as glibness and superficial charm, duplicity, and manipulation and in an emotionally detached affective style (McHoskey, Worzel, & Szyarto, 1998). Moreover, the Machiavellian personality is skilled in creating a desired image, including perhaps perceptions of charisma (Gardner & Avolio, 1995).

Machiavellianism is usually accompanied by condemnatory implications (Christie & Geis, 1970a; Wilson et al., 1996). However, Machiavellianism may exhibit a bright side. That is, high Machiavellians may not be more hostile, vicious, vindictive (Christie & Geis, 1970a; Wrightsman, 1991), or manipulative (Shepperd & Socherman, 1997) than low Machiavellians. Rather, high Machiavellians function most effectively in stressful, unstructured, and face-to-face competitive situations where their less emotionally involving impersonal "cool detachment" and latitude for improvisation are advantageous (Christie & Geis, 1970a).

Support for this view is found in earlier research. For instance, Machiavellian leaders are able to portray an image of confidence, even when they are uncertain or lack the relevant information (Jameson, 1945; Martin & Sims, 1956; Pfiffner, 1951). Machiavellian leaders have an acute and opportunistic sense of timing in social interactions (Christie & Geis, 1970a). Similarly, Machiavellians are likely to emerge as leaders in small groups (Bochner,

di Salvo, & Jonas, 1975; Geis, Krupat, & Berger, 1970; Okanes & Stinson, 1974; Rim, 1966). Machiavellianism also is positively associated with persuasive ability in bargaining and mock courtroom situations (Christie & Geis, 1970b; Huber & Neale, 1986; Sheppard & Vidmar, 1980).

Along with the above, Machiavellians are adept at forming political alliances with those who have the power to protect and promote their interests (Jameson, 1945; Martin & Sims, 1956; Pfiffner, 1951). In this respect, Simonton (1986) reported that presidential Machiavellianism was positively associated with the total number of legislative acts passed as well as the total number of legislative victories and defeats. Thus, political creativity may manifest itself in legislative behavior by means of Machiavellianism (Alker, 1981).

In sum, as the founder of modern political theory, Machiavelli occupies a unique position in leadership thought (Fleisher, 1972; Mansfield, 1996). His principles are often viewed with pejorative connotations involving shadowy and unsavory manipulation (Christie & Geis, 1970a; Wilson et al., 1996). He endorsed exploitive, deceitful behavior, and advised that others cannot be trusted (Machiavelli, 1513/1966). Yet, there may be a bright side as Machiavellian behavior is seen across social statuses (Christie & Geis, 1970a) and the actual use of Machiavellian tactics is probably more widespread than acknowledged (Bass, 1990). The Machiavellian leader presents an image of depersonalized “coolness under pressure” and is not distracted by interpersonal concerns, emotional issues, or social influences in bargaining situations. Consequently, the Machiavellian leader can devote full attention to a cognitive analysis of the situation and develop competitively advantageous strategies for winning (Christie & Geis, 1970a). Finally, Machiavellian leaders are skilled in behaviors designed to create a desired image, including perceptions of charisma (Gardner & Avolio, 1995).

Section 3 addresses charismatic leadership. First, the nature of charismatic leadership is discussed with respect to relational processes and expressive behaviors. Then, psychological and sociological approaches are used to elucidate how charismatic leaders achieve exceptional outcomes. The section concludes by identifying possible similarities between charismatic leadership and Machiavellianism.

3. Charismatic leadership

The sociologist Weber (1924/1947) first described the charismatic leader in terms of five components: the leader had extraordinary gifts, a social crisis situation, radical solutions to the crisis, loyal followers attracted to the leader's transcendent powers, and confirmation of the giftedness through repeated successes (Trice & Beyer, 1986). More recently, charismatic leadership has been the focus of considerable conceptual and empirical research (Bass, 1998; Yukl, 1998).¹ The findings consistently indicate that charismatic leaders can have extraord-

¹ Bass (1985) views charismatic leadership as distinct from transformational leadership such that the latter is a broader concept within which charisma is a primary attribute. For the sake of brevity, this paper considers charismatic and transformational leadership as substantially similar concepts.

inary effects on followers, organizations, and social systems (e.g., Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1994; House & Howell, 1992; Yukl, 1998). Similarly, cross-cultural research reveals that specific aspects of charismatic leadership are strongly and universally supported (Den Hartog et al., 1999). Charismatic leadership also has been associated with American presidential effectiveness (House et al., 1991; Simonton, 1988). Given these findings, charismatic leadership seems a reasonable choice as a central variable in this study. Accordingly, the nature of charismatic leadership in terms of relational processes and expressive behaviors is described next.

3.1. Charismatic leadership relational processes

Charismatic leadership can be characterized as residing in a predominantly relational process among followers, the leader, and the situation (Klein & House, 1995). For example, Shamir (1995) argued that the amount of direct leader-follower interaction or social distance influences attributions of leader charisma. Relatively close leader-follower relationships or close charismatic leadership produces follower charismatic attributions founded on leader social behavior and interpersonal skills. Here, charisma is revealed in the effects on follower motivation, task behavior, and personal identification. Close charismatic leaders are viewed as outgoing, interpersonally considerate, dynamic, and setting high performance standards for themselves and followers (Shamir, 1995).

Conversely, remote leader-follower relationships or distant charismatic leadership (e.g., political leaders) generates follower charismatic attributions as a function of shared stereotypes as well as leader performance cues, impression management skills, and expressive behavior. Relative to close charismatic leaders, distant charismatic leaders are described in terms of persuasive public speaking ability, articulation of a clear vision, and the courage to express controversial opinions (Shamir, 1995). Followers of distant charismatic leaders may be exposed to a more narrow range of behaviors than followers of close charismatic leaders (Beyer, 1999a).

With respect to American presidents, the texture of close-distant charismatic leadership has probably changed over time. That is, early presidents could influence others primarily through face-to-face contact and indirectly through reports about speeches. By contrast, presidents during the last century have increasingly used newspaper copy, radio, and the television media to influence others.² In these situations, leaders (i.e., presidents) may create performances for the public that do not match their behaviors with close subordinates (Beyer, 1999a). Nevertheless, earlier research provides sound support for the idea that social distance between leaders and followers is not essential for the maintenance of a charismatic relationship (e.g., Waldman & Yammarino, 1999). We now move to leader expressive behaviors to delineate charismatic leadership.

² The author would like to thank an anonymous reviewer for this insight.

3.2. *Charismatic leader expressive behaviors*

Previous works have highlighted the importance of image building, strength of delivery style, and expressive behavior in perceptions of charismatic leadership (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999; Bass, 1985; Bryman, 1992; Burns, 1978; Gardner & Avolio, 1998; Wasieleski, 1985). The intent is to foster and validate a charismatic image with followers (Gardner & Avolio, 1998). For example, Conger and Kanungo's (1987, 1988) approach incorporates the charismatic leader's image building skills in encouraging follower identification with their vision. Bass (1997) also noted the personal expressive behaviors of charismatic leaders. These skills generate strong emotional attachment, extra effort, and high levels of performance from followers.

In short, charismatic leaders are highly skilled in evaluating, expressing, and regulating emotions in themselves and others (Bass, 1997; House, 1995; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). Thus, expressive behaviors appear important in creating a charismatic image (e.g., Awamleh & Gardner, 1999). Yet, earlier studies have not adequately explored the expressive behavioral strategies used by charismatic leaders (Gardner & Avolio, 1998; Sosik & Dworakivsky, 1998).

Next, how charismatic leadership emerges is of considerable theoretical and empirical interest. Both psychological and sociological approaches have been identified as explanations for the distinctive effects of charismatic leadership.

3.3. *Psychological approaches to charismatic leadership*

The psychological approaches capitalize on the idea that Weber provided an insufficient psychological explanation for the charismatic phenomenon (Shamir, 1999). The psychological conceptions maintain that charismatic leaders display an appealing personality and serve as inspiring and idealized role models for followers. They often possess a high need for power and present an image of self-confidence. Charismatic leaders hold strong convictions in the moral righteousness of their beliefs and visions. Followers subsequently are highly motivated and committed to achieve the leader's vision (Bass, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; House, 1977; Trice & Beyer, 1986; Willner, 1984). Thus, a key contribution of the psychological approaches is an explanation for the charismatic leader's influence processes (Shamir, 1999).

Yet, the psychological approaches recognize that charismatic leadership is not always advantageous (e.g., Bass, 1998; Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Beyer, 1999a; Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Harrison, 1987; Maccoby, 2000; O'Connor, Mumford, Clifton, Gessner, & Connelly, 1995; Yukl, 1998) and may exhibit a dark side (e.g., Hogan, Raskin, & Fazzini, 1990). Probably the most theoretically salient distinction between these different aspects of charismatic leadership (Popper, 2000) is socialized and personalized charismatic leadership (House & Howell, 1992; Howell, 1988; Howell & Avolio, 1992; McClelland, 1975). Socialized charismatic leadership is based on nonexploitive, collective interests and power is used to benefit others. These leaders emphasize the internalization of values and build commitment to the group and its interests. Socialized charismatics tend to be altruistic and

work through recognized systems to achieve objectives. In addition, socialized charismatics align their vision with follower needs and aspirations, preserve two-way communication, and emphasize strong moral standards. As a consequence, followers are autonomous, empowered, and responsible.

By contrast, personalized charismatic leaders exercise few restraints in the use of power as their leadership is based on exploitive, self-interests. These leaders emphasize personal identification, demand devotion to themselves, and exhibit authoritarian behavior. Personalized charismatics use power primarily for self-serving personal gain, promote their own vision, use one-way communication, and draw on personally convenient external moral standards. In order to induce compliance, influence is a function of personal approval or rejection of followers. As a result, followers are typically obedient, submissive, and dependent (House & Howell, 1992; Howell, 1988; Howell & Avolio, 1992; McClelland, 1975). Of particular interest for the present investigation, House and Howell (1992) proposed Machiavellianism as a predictor of exploitive, self-aggrandizing personalized charismatic leadership.

In brief, although two types of charismatic leadership are described, leaders may simultaneously exhibit aspects of both socialized and personalized charismatic leadership (Conger, 1999; Conger & Kanungo, 1998; House & Howell, 1992). Let us next examine, sociological explanations for charismatic leadership.

3.4. Sociological approaches to charismatic leadership

Beyer (1999a) views charismatic leadership from a sociological perspective. Charismatic leadership is seen as a complex social structure evolving from the interaction of many factors. Beyer further argues that the aforementioned psychological conceptions have “tamed” charismatic leadership. That is, the psychological approaches omit the full incorporation and have diluted the richness and distinction of Weber’s (1924/1947) seminal ideas.

In particular, the psychological conceptions have dramatically departed from Weber’s interpretation of charisma as a system-wide social process and emergent social structure that encompasses much more than leadership dynamics. For example, the psychological approaches have devoted minimal attention to the possibility that varying contexts or situations may alter the potential effects of different personal qualities and behaviors in leaders. Moreover, important aspects of charisma have been minimized, including the precipitating crisis, radical vision, and system-wide change. As a consequence, charismatic leadership emerges as more common and less extraordinary than Weber’s initial conception (Beyer, 1999a).

Support for the psychological and sociological views of charisma has sparked a lively scholarly debate (e.g., Bass, 1999; Beyer, 1999a, 1999b; House, 1999; Shamir, 1999). For example, Shamir (1999) proposes that new theories (e.g., psychological charisma approaches) should be assessed in terms of their contribution to the understanding of important processes, rather than on their adherence to the original concept (e.g., Weber’s view of charisma). However, the intent of the present investigation is not to definitively resolve the debate. Perhaps, the psychological and sociological conceptions are comple-

mentary and not contradictory (Shamir, 1999). With the contribution of qualitative research, Beyer (1999b) likewise supports the notion that the sociological approach introduced by Weber and the more recent psychological approaches to charisma may eventually emerge as complementary.

4. Summary and hypotheses

The above review has focused on several important and related ideas. First, American presidential leadership is a relational process (Neustadt, 1960) where the officeholder is constantly confronted with voluminous high-pressure situations characterized by ambiguity and inconsistent information. Thus, presidential acumen in decision-making and persuading others can have vast implications for societies.

Similarly, charismatic leadership also is rooted in a relational process featuring the followers, the leader, and the situation (Beyer, 1999a, 1999b; Klein & House, 1995) as well as varying degrees of close or distant social relationships (Shamir, 1995). Charismatic leaders are highly expressive individuals who are skilled at influencing and mobilizing others (Bass, 1985, 1988; Gardner & Avolio, 1998; House, 1995). They engage in image building and delivery style behaviors designed to create and validate the aura of charisma among followers (e.g., Awamleh & Gardner, 1999; Gardner & Avolio, 1998). Although expressive activity seems a central component in the emergence of charismatic leadership, minimal research has examined either of these behaviors (Gardner & Avolio, 1998; Sosik & Dworakivsky, 1998) or how charismatic leaders achieve impressive results (Fiol et al., 1999; Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999).

Also, even though personality traits may predict charismatic leadership (House, 1977; House & Howell, 1992; Post, 1993), research concerning charismatic leader personality characteristics is sparse (House & Howell, 1992), particularly in the American presidency (Deluga, 1997, 1998). Here, the psychology of the president influences what choices are made, how public and political ambitions are pursued, and the nature of political and policy decision-making (Renshon, 1998). One such personality trait could be Machiavellianism (Gardner & Avolio, 1995; House & Howell, 1992).

Comparable to charismatic leadership, Machiavellianism involves interactional and image building processes. However, Machiavellian leaders also use a depersonalized approach with others and are primarily concerned with controlling situations (Christie & Geis, 1970a). They employ deceitful interpersonal tactics (Shapiro et al., 1995) and build power coalitions to protect their interests (Jameson, 1945; Martin & Sims, 1956; Pfiffner, 1951).

Taken together, it appears that Machiavellianism, charismatic leadership, and presidential performance might be connected. The aloof and image building natures of Machiavellian leaders seem particularly relevant in situations similar to those typically confronting American presidents, i.e., ambiguous circumstances satiated with contradictory and incomplete information (Christie & Geis, 1970a; Wrightsman, 1991). Moreover, earlier research suggests that presidential charismatic leadership predicts effectiveness (House et al., 1991; Simonton, 1988). However, previous research has not empirically examined the relationship

among these important processes. For instance, Simonton's (1986) Machiavellian data were reported primarily in terms of relationships with 13 other presidential personality dimensions. Accordingly, a more complete understanding of Machiavellianism and presidential charismatic leadership will further illuminate presidential effectiveness. The intent here was to capitalize on this research opportunity. Two hypotheses were tested.

First, both Machiavellianism and charismatic leadership encompass interactional expressive behaviors (Gardner & Avolio, 1995, 1998) crafted to influence others. Similarly, Machiavellianism and charismatic leadership involve emotional regulation (Bass, 1997; Christie & Geis, 1970a; Gardner & Avolio, 1995, 1998; House, 1995; House & Howell, 1992; Shamir et al., 1993). For example, Machiavellians and charismatic leaders may overtly express considerable confidence and conviction, yet internally harbor doubt (e.g., House, 1977; Martin & Sims, 1956).

Also, the Machiavellian's ability to control interpersonal relationships (e.g., Christie & Geis, 1970a) and create a desired image (Gardner & Avolio, 1995) seems consistent with the interpersonal orientation employed by close charismatic leaders and the impression management skills seen in distant charismatic leaders (Shamir, 1995).

Therefore, it seems reasonable that presidential Machiavellianism and close and distant charismatic leadership might be related. Given that Machiavellians emerge as leaders in groups (Christie & Geis, 1970a), it was predicted,

Hypothesis 1: American presidential Machiavellianism will be positively associated with close and distant charismatic leadership.

Second, American presidents routinely encounter highly stressful decision-making situations. In this regard, earlier research suggested that Machiavellian presidents were the most successful in terms of legislative behavior (Simonton, 1986). Accordingly, given the apparent competitive advantage of the Machiavellian's ability to maintain an impersonal and cognitive analytic strategy, especially in face-to-face situations (Christie & Geis, 1970a), it seems suitable to test a positive relationship between presidential Machiavellianism and performance. Therefore, it was anticipated that:

Hypothesis 2: American presidential Machiavellianism will be positively associated with rated performance.

5. Method

Archival sources were exploited for four control variables, two measures of close charismatic leadership, two measures of distant charismatic leadership, and two measures of presidential rated performance. The presidential Machiavellianism data were created for this investigation using historiometric methods. Historiometry examines biographical materials of prominent people by employing quantitative assessment without former theoretical commitment. As used in this study, historiometry includes the use of modified personality

instruments with biographical information. Consequently, historiometry strives to verify personality patterns from the specific (idiographic) to the general (nomothetic) across a sample of cases (Simonton, 1984a, 1986, 1999).

5.1. *Sample and data sources*

The 39 American presidents from Washington to Reagan were targeted as the sample in this study. To measure presidential Machiavellianism, the profiles independently generated by Simonton (1986, 1988) and enhanced by Deluga (1997, 1998) were used. Simonton assembled the profiles by using personality characterizations verbatim from various presidential fact sources and standard biographical volumes. The profiles were created in an objective and impartial a manner as possible. To reduce the potential for bias, Simonton did not use specific biographies of the presidents. Other than the deletion of identifying material, no editing was done. Simonton used the profiles for purposes other than the focus for this study, including the development of five presidential styles (Simonton, 1988) and 14 personality dimensions (Simonton, 1986). The individual reference works and additional information concerning the preparation of the profiles may be found in Simonton.

Also, Deluga (1997, 1998) augmented the profiles by incorporating all non-identifying material extracted from the personality portion of DeGregorio's (1991) presidential reference work. The purpose was to produce presidential personality characterizations as comprehensive as possible. The average length of each profile was about 600 words.

Profiles using extracted personality traits such as those used in this study have demonstrated predictive utility for various criteria of leadership effectiveness (e.g., McCann, 1992; Simonton, 1984b; Spangler & House, 1991). With respect to American presidents, personality traits taken from biographies have been reported to correlate with objective behaviors and circumstances (e.g., family background, education, and occupation) as well as with assessments made from the content analysis of inaugural addresses (e.g., Simonton, 1986, 1988; Winter & Carlson, 1988).

5.2. *Measures and procedure*

5.2.1. *Machiavellianism*

The 20-item Machiavellianism IV Scale (Mach IV; Christie & Geis, 1970a) was used to assess presidential Machiavellianism. The Mach IV employs a seven-point Likert type response format ranging from *strongly disagree* (scored 1) to *strongly agree* (scored 7). Christie (1970) describes how the items were developed as theoretically congruent with statements from Machiavelli's (1513/1966) *The Prince* and *The Discourses*. Sample items include "Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so," "The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear," and "There is no excuse for lying to someone" (reversed scored). The Mach IV is the most widely used measure of Machiavellianism and has been described as "...an extremely interpersonal scale with clear implications for interpersonal attitudes and behavior..." (McHoskey et al., 1998, p. 201). Although not without criticism (e.g., Hunter, Gerbing, & Boster, 1982; McHoskey

et al., 1998), the Mach IV has consistently exhibited construct validity and “. . . could be considered a showcase example of successful attitude scale construction” (Wrightsman, 1991, p. 374).

The presidential Machiavellianism data were collected as follows. First, three copies of the 39 presidential profiles were randomly distributed in several undergraduate classes at a small college located in the northeastern United States. Next, three different raters independently judged Machiavellianism for one of the 39 presidential profiles, resulting in 117 raters in the study. Volunteer raters first read the profile. For each item on the aforementioned Mach IV scale attached to the profile, the raters then confidentially indicated the extent to which the profiled person would strongly agree or strongly disagree with the statement. Raters were asked to reread the profiles as frequently as required and to use overall impressions of the profiled person when making choices. The raters also reported their sex (58 women and 59 men) and age in years (average age = 21 years). The completed Mach IV scales were collected by the class instructor and returned to a central office location.

The rater instructions made no references to Machiavellianism or Machiavellian concepts. Similarly, raters were not informed that the profiles depicted American presidents and did not have knowledge of the investigation’s hypotheses. Consequently, because the raters were not likely to recognize the profiled person, their assessments were based on the personality profiles rather than on existing knowledge, political prejudices, or personal perceptions linked with the presidents. Pretesting was conducted whereby several raters read a profile and were asked questions by the researcher about the nature of the profiles. It was concluded that the raters were not aware the profiles represented American presidents.

The subtle and deceptive nature of Machiavellianism may make observer judgments difficult. However, prior work demonstrates that observers can accurately classify levels of Machiavellianism (Geis & Levy, 1970; Geis, Christie, & Nelson, 1970). Also, Near, Wilson, and Miller’s (1995) research seems particularly relevant to the methodology used in the present investigation. These investigators had high and low Machiavellians write stories in the first person singular (main character). The stories depicted three people stranded on a desert island and predominantly emphasized interpersonal relationships. Raters subsequently completed a Machiavellianism test as they judged the main story each character would complete. The Machiavellianism scores for the main characters strongly correlated with the Machiavellianism scores previously completed by the writers.

Finally, after reviewing 38 experimental studies, Christie and Geis (1970a, 1970b) concluded that Machiavellians were particularly effective in face-to-face interactions. Here, the Machiavellian’s opportunity to exaggerate and portray irrelevant emotion can be maximized. However, the raters in the present study were neither face-to-face nor the target of the Machiavellian behavioral strategy. All in all, prior research suggests that judging levels of Machiavellianism in the presidential personality profiles does not appear to be problematic.

5.2.2. Presidential charismatic leadership

Four archival measures of presidential charisma were used. Two of these, *charismatic presidential behavior* and *charismatic presidential effects* were taken from House et al.

(1991). Two additional measures, *presidential charisma* and *presidential creativity* were taken from Simonton (1988).

House et al. (1991) used content analysis of extracts taken from two or more presidential biographies written by close followers, i.e., cabinet members reporting to each president, to develop the charismatic behavior and effect measures. For charismatic behavior, trained coders read the extracts and checked off occurrences of charismatic behavior as defined by House (1977). These behaviors included those designed to impress followers that the leader is competent. Sample occurrences include leader self-confidence, strong ideological conviction, high expectations of followers, showing confidence in subordinates, and consideration.

Similarly, the coders checked off frequency of charismatic effect (House, 1977) or the leader's impact on followers including affect toward the leader, general feeling, mission involvement and extra effort, acceptance and obedience, agreement with the leader, subordinate self-confidence, and felt backup. Because of the close social distance and highly interpersonal nature of the cabinet member-presidential relationship, it was judged that the charismatic behavior and effect assessments represent close charismatic leadership (Shamir, 1995). Further details concerning the development of these measures are located in House et al. (1991).

The presidential *charismatic* and *creative* style scores generated by Simonton (1988) also were employed as measures of presidential charismatic leadership. Simonton created the previously described 39 presidential personality profiles from a diverse range of biographical reference works. After all identifying information was deleted, seven student raters then independently judged each president using 82 items portraying presidential style. The 82 style items were developed by the Historical Figures Assessment Collaborative at the Institute for Personality Assessment and Research (University of California, Berkeley; cf. Historical Figures Assessment Collaborative, 1977). All items were measured on a Likert-type scale ranging from 7 (*extremely typical*) to 1 (*extremely atypical*) of the person portrayed in the profile. A subsequent factor analysis yielded five presidential styles including interpersonal, deliberative, neurotic, charismatic, and creative presidential styles. Further details regarding the creation of the five presidential styles are located in Simonton.

The charismatic and creative presidential styles were used because the relevant style item factor loadings indicated charismatic leadership. That is, items strongly loading on the charismatic style included "is charismatic," "keeps in contact with the American public and its moods," "uses rhetoric effectively," "is a dynamo of energy and determination," "characterized by others as a world figure," and "enjoys the ceremonial aspects of the office." Also personifying charismatic leadership, the style items loading strongly on creativity included "is able to visualize alternatives and weigh long-term consequences," "is innovative in his role as an executive," "is empathetic in asserting his judgments," and "initiates new legislation and programs" (Simonton, 1988). Consistent with earlier studies (e.g., Deluga, 1997, 1998; House et al., 1991), Simonton's (1988) creative presidential style was selected because charisma incorporates a well-defined creative aspect. Support for the innovative aspects of charismatic leadership is argued by Bass (1985), Conger and Kanungo (1987, 1988), and House (1977).

Finally, recall that the House et al. (1991) charismatic behavior and effect measures were derived from cabinet member biographies and, accordingly, were judged to represent close

charismatic leadership (Shamir, 1995). By contrast, Simonton's (1988) presidential charisma and creativity measures were anchored in objective fact sources and standardized biographical volumes. Thus, because of the comparatively more remote relationships, these latter two assessments were judged as reflecting distant charismatic leadership (Shamir, 1995).

5.2.3. *Presidential rated performance*

Following prior work (Spangler & House, 1991), two archival measures of presidential effectiveness were standardized and averaged forming a two-item index termed *perceived greatness* ($\alpha=.98$). As argued by Spangler and House (1991), the two ratings were unified because both were expert subjective assessments of presidential greatness and were highly intercorrelated ($r=.96$).

The two archival measures included Winter's (1987) *consensus of greatness* and Murray and Blessing's (1983) measure of *mean greatness*. Winter developed the presidential consensus of greatness ratings based on Maranell's (1970) survey of 571 United States historians who rated the presidents on several dimensions including general prestige, strength of action, presidential activeness, and administrative achievements. Consensus of greatness scores were not available for presidents Harrison, Tyler, Fillmore, A. Johnson, Garfield, Arthur, Nixon, Ford, Carter, and Reagan. Further details concerning the creation of these scores may be located in Winter.

Murray and Blessing (1983) developed the presidential mean greatness scores by receiving ratings from 846 PhD American historians. The historians rated the presidents from "great" to "failure." Ratings were not available for presidents Harrison, Garfield, and Reagan. Further information regarding the generation of the mean greatness scores is available in Murray and Blessing.

5.2.4. *Control variables*

Four control variables were used including friendliness, need for affiliation (nAff), proactivity, and need for power (nPow). First, because rater responses could be influenced by profile overall likability bias, Simonton's (1986) friendliness data for each president were used as one control variable. Second, a person with a strong nAff enjoys interpersonal interactions and working with others (McClelland, 1975). Whereas friendliness measures likability, nAff taps social needs. Thus, because Machiavellians are highly skilled in social situations, it seems important to include the presidential nAff motive imagery standardized data available from Winter (1987) as a second control variable. Need for affiliation data were not available for presidents Tyler, Fillmore, A. Johnson, Arthur, and Ford.

Additionally, a proactive person identifies opportunities and actively persuades others (e.g., Bateman & Crant, 1993). These behaviors are not unlike the Machiavellian personality. Therefore, the presidential proactivity scores reported by Deluga (1998) were incorporated as a third control variable. Finally, nPow involves controlling and influencing others and defeating opponents (e.g., McClelland, 1975; Winter, 1973; Winter & Stewart, 1978; Yukl, 1990). Accordingly, it seems feasible presidential need for power could be connected with charismatic leadership (House & Howell, 1992) and rated presidential performance (Winter, 1987). Consequently, the presidential power motive imagery standardized scores developed

by Winter (1987) were used as the fourth control variable. Need for power data were not available for presidents Tyler, Fillmore, A. Johnson, Arthur, and Ford.

In sum, partialling out the variance contributed by the four control variables enables the data analyses to more precisely target the duplicity, manipulative, and exploitative aspects of Machiavellianism. However, caution is needed as the use of the four control variable strategy involves a tradeoff. That is, the addition of the control variables inherently reduces the n/k ratio, thereby diminishing the regression equation's cross-validity or generalizability (Stevens, 1986).

Descriptive statistics and correlations for all measures used in the investigation are shown in Table 1. Higher scores indicate greater levels for all variables.

6. Results

6.1. Machiavellianism scores

Presidential Machiavellianism scores were calculated by summing the 20 relevant items, adding a constant of 20, then averaging the sums across the three raters. Ten items required reverse scoring. Higher scores indicate greater levels of Machiavellianism. The estimated Cronbach's α coefficient was $\alpha = .85$. The data demonstrated strong convergent validity as they were significantly correlated with Simonton's (1986) Machiavellianism scores ($r = .66$, $P < .0001$). Simonton's data were developed using a considerably different methodology, i.e., the exploratory factor analysis of Adjective Check List (Gough & Heilbrun, 1965) ratings. The individual Machiavellianism raw and standardized z scores for the 39 American presidents are shown in Table 2. Presidents Franklin Roosevelt, Van Buren, and Nixon emerged as highest in Machiavellianism, whereas Presidents McKinley, Hayes, and Taylor were rated lowest. The profiles of Franklin Roosevelt and McKinley are located in Appendix A.

6.2. Interrater agreement

Similar to the procedures used by Bass, Avolio, and Goodheim (1987), a one-way analysis of variance was computed using presidents as the between-subjects variable and the Mach IV scores as the dependent variable. The resulting two-tailed F -ratio was significant for Machiavellianism [$F(38,116) = 1.76$, $P < .05$]. The F -ratio was converted to an η coefficient to provide the interrater agreement estimate. η coefficients indicate the degree to which raters were in agreement when assessing the same president as compared with ratings of different presidents. The η coefficient estimate in this study was $\eta = .68$.

Also, to further assess interrater reliability, the effective reliability (R) was calculated. Effective reliability is defined as the estimate of reliability of the variables assessed with a comparable group of judges (Rosenthal, 1991). More specifically, the measure uses the Spearman-Brown formula to estimate the probability that a different group of raters would reach similar conclusions concerning the variables evaluated (Stajkovic, 1999). The effective reliability for this study was estimated at $R = .87$.

6.3. Hypotheses tests

Recall, the two hypotheses predicted that presidential Machiavellianism would be positively associated with close and distant charismatic leadership (Hypothesis 1) and rated performance (Hypothesis 2). Because the predictions were directional, one-tailed hierarchical regression analyses were used to test the hypotheses. Also, the aforementioned presidential friendliness, nAff, proactivity, and nPow scores were included as four control variables to confidently establish the predicted relationships. Thus, the regression analyses can consider the potentially confounding effects of the four controls and more clearly isolate the specific effects of presidential Machiavellianism.

A three-step hierarchical regression assessing Hypothesis 1 proceeded as follows. First, in Step 1, the model contained presidential friendliness (Simonton, 1986), nAff (Winter, 1987), proactivity (Deluga, 1998), and nPow scores (Winter, 1987) as regressors. The four archival measures of presidential charisma including charismatic behavior, charismatic effects (House et al., 1991), charismatic style, and creative style (Simonton, 1988) served as response variables. The model in Step 2 was identical to Step 1 with the addition of presidential Machiavellianism as the last entered regressor variable. Consequently, in Step 3, the additional variance in the response variables attributable to Machiavellianism (R_2^2), beyond that accounted for by the four control variables (R_1^2), could be determined ($R_2^2 - R_1^2$; Cohen and Cohen, 1983).

A review of the Table 3 data shows that presidential Machiavellianism accounted for unique variance in charismatic behavior (16.6%; estimated ES=0.90), charismatic effects (16.9%; estimated ES=0.90), charismatic style (14.4%; estimated ES=0.80), and creative style (14.0%; estimated ES=0.80) significantly beyond the four control variables (P 's < .05, one-tailed). It was concluded that Hypothesis 1 was supported.

A three-step hierarchical regression also was used to evaluate the Hypothesis 2 prediction that presidential Machiavellianism would be positively associated with rated performance. Step 1 involved the four aforementioned control variables as regressors and the two-item composite index, perceived greatness, as the response variable. Step 2 included presidential Machiavellianism as the last entered regressor. As seen in Table 3, the results of Step 3 indicate that presidential Machiavellianism accounted for significant additional amounts of variance in perceived greatness (7.7%, P < .05, one-tailed; estimated ES=0.60) beyond that accounted for by the four control variables. It was judged that Hypothesis 2 was supported.

7. Discussion

A review of the findings and possible implications will be addressed first. Then, a consideration of the study's strengths and weaknesses will follow. The discussion will conclude with several suggestions for future research.

First, Hypothesis 1 was confirmed as presidential Machiavellianism emerged as positively connected with close and distant charismatic leadership. As such, the findings sustain the idea that presidential charismatic leadership and Machiavellianism may have several similar

features. What might be some of the common attributes? As earlier noted, charismatic leaders project strong self-confidence, delivery, competence, charisma, and other image building behaviors to encourage follower identification and commitment to their objectives (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999; Conger & Kanungo, 1987, 1988; House, 1995). These impression management skills seem particularly relevant for distant charismatic leader–follower relationships (Shamir, 1995). Machiavellians likewise are skilled in displaying self-confidence, even when uncertain (Bass, 1990), and perceptions of charisma (Gardner & Avolio, 1995; House & Howell, 1992). Together, these common elements involve expressive behaviors designed to carefully craft a desired image.

An additional allied aspect involves emotional management skills. Charismatic leaders carefully choreograph emotions to elicit strong affective attachment and performance from followers (Bass, 1997; House, 1995; Shamir et al., 1993). These interpersonal skills are especially salient for close charismatic leader–follower relationships (Shamir, 1995). Moreover, these skills closely parallel the Machiavellian's emotional regulation when interacting with targets (Christie & Geis, 1970a; Wrightsman, 1991).

Finally, the findings also suggest that Machiavellians and charismatic leaders have a strong desire to influence others (Christie & Geis, 1970a; Gardner & Avolio, 1998). They experience great satisfaction in impacting followers, directing the activities of groups, and emerging as leaders. In brief, the Hypothesis 1 results do not suggest that Machiavellianism and charismatic leadership are equivalent. Rather, the data indicate that the common characteristics of close and distant presidential Machiavellianism and charismatic leadership include proficiency at presenting expressive behaviors, regulating emotions, and persuading others.

Also, Hypothesis 2 was supported as presidential Machiavellianism emerged as positively associated with rated performance. What are the implications of these data? First, using alternative procedures, the findings support and expand earlier work by Simonton (1986) who reported that Machiavellian presidents were the most successful in terms of legislative behavior. Second, it seems feasible that the depersonalized social influence aspect of Machiavellianism may be connected with presidential effectiveness. Here, expressive behaviors projecting an image of complete confidence, the skillful use of power through the creation of persuasive political coalitions, and a less emotionally involving cool detachment from others enable Machiavellian-oriented presidents to advance their goals. These attributes seem particularly valuable in situations typically confronting American presidents, i.e., where critical decisions must be swiftly rendered under conditions of contradictory and ambiguous information.

A further implication of the Hypotheses 1 and 2 findings involves the hybrid nature of charismatic leadership. Recall, socialized charismatic leadership, serving collective interests, and personalized charismatic leadership, serving self-interests, may not be mutually exclusive. Leaders may display behaviors reflecting both types of charismatic leadership (House & Howell, 1992). That is, it is unlikely that “pure” socialized or personalized charismatic leaders exist; charismatic leader behavior exhibits varying magnitudes of both (Conger, 1999; Conger & Kanungo, 1998). Consequently, the data reported here support the idea that one of these encompassing behaviors may be Machiavellianism. At least with American presidents,

Machiavellianism appears to predict charismatic leadership and rated performance; effective presidents may display a mixture of charismatic and Machiavellian leadership.

Hence, whereas charismatic leadership may show a dark side (e.g., Hogan et al., 1990) where the leader may pursue self-serving interests at the expense of followers, Machiavellian behavior may generate a bright side. That is, the Machiavellian leader may pursue personal interests to the actual *benefit* of followers. One explanation for this commonality could be that the personalized charismatic leader's self-interests may be consistent with the collective interests of the group. Stated another way, self-interest and group interests are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

In summary, this study targeted a heretofore empirically unexplored and important domain of research, i.e., the relationship among American presidential Machiavellianism, charismatic leadership, and rated performance. As such, the investigation contributes to and goes beyond prior work (e.g., Simonton, 1986) in several ways. First, the results are consistent with the argument that the presidency is a relational process (Neustadt, 1960) where the incumbent's psychological makeup is critical. The president's vast authority and immense power acutely influence choices and discretionary activity (Renshon, 1998). In turn, these decisions have substantial implications for individuals and societies. Consequently, the findings are important because they help illuminate the nature of presidential personality and leadership that shape these choices.

More specifically, American presidential Machiavellianism emerged as positively connected with close and distant charismatic leadership and rated performance. Therefore, the data strengthen the view that Machiavellianism may be associated with charismatic leadership and success in achieving goals (Christie & Geis, 1970a; Gardner & Avolio, 1995; House & Howell, 1992). Clearly, Machiavellianism and charismatic leadership are not identical concepts. Yet, the observed relationships indicate that Machiavellianism and charismatic leadership could have several similar features including image building behaviors, considerable self-confidence, and effective emotional regulation. The joint purpose is to craft a favored persona with the intent of influencing others. As such, these common features offer insight into the void concerning how charismatic leaders produce extraordinary results (Fiol et al., 1999; Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999).

In addition, the relational nature (e.g., Shamir, 1995) of charismatic leadership was supported with the finding that presidential Machiavellianism was positively connected with charismatic attributions made by both socially close cabinet members (i.e., House et al., 1991 charismatic behavior and effect data) and socially distant observers (i.e., Simonton, 1988 charisma and creativity data). Thus, the Machiavellian's interpersonal strategy involving image-building, socially competitive, and persuasive influence behaviors appear effective with both socially close and distant leader-follower charismatic relationships (Shamir, 1995).

The study also contributes to the literature by confirming the idea that socialized and personalized charismatic leadership are not completely separate approaches (Conger, 1999; Conger & Kanungo, 1998; House & Howell, 1992; McClelland, 1975). Perhaps, the personalized charismatic leader's self-interests are aligned with collective interests.

Next, the study strengths and weaknesses require comment. First, multiple data sources and collection methods were used. Therefore, this research design avoided common source

and method validity threats (e.g., Doty & Glick, 1998; Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). Also, the relatively novel historiometric research strategy supports the need for paradigmatic diversity or metatriangulation required for insight into complex phenomena (Lewis & Grimes, 1999) such as charismatic leadership. Next, the regression analyses incorporated four possible confounding variables. These variables enhance the ability to more clearly delineate the impact of presidential Machiavellianism. In this regard, Machiavellianism contributed relatively large amounts of unique variance in the five outcome variables ($\Delta R^2 = 7.7\text{--}16.9\%$), thereby representing relationships or effect sizes of medium to large magnitude ($ES = 0.60\text{--}0.90$; Cohen, 1988).

The data are limited as well. For instance, only a small sample of 39 presidents is obtainable for testing the hypotheses and archival performance data are not available for all presidents. Second, the small number of presidents coupled with the addition of four control variables in the regression equations reduces the n/k ratio and subsequently limits generalizability of the findings (Stevens, 1986). Fourth, the correlational nature of the study prohibits the determination of causal direction. Fifth, this research emphasizes the psychological approach to charismatic leadership and may therefore further “tame” the more sociological-oriented perspective as originally introduced by Weber (Beyer, 1999a, 1999b). Sixth, recall the goal of historiometry is to test nomothetic, rather than idiographic hypotheses (e.g., Simonton, 1986). Thus, addressing the Machiavellianism scores of the individual presidents was beyond the scope of this investigation. Here, fertile ground for interpretation by historians, political scientists, and other researchers is now available.

An additional possible limitation involves the use of student raters. First, the idea that the student raters accurately identified the profiled presidents cannot be unequivocally ruled out. Second, students may be less knowledgeable and reliable judges of presidential personality (e.g., Machiavellianism) than professional raters who have intensely studied or worked with a president. However, experts also have limitations.

For example, because professional raters know which president is being rated, preconceived biases and idiosyncrasies may distort their assessments. By comparison, the student raters in this investigation were not informed that the unidentified profiles represented American presidents. Consequently, the student ratings were more a function of the profiles rather than partialities or general knowledge about the target president. Given that previous research in a variety of domains has reported no differences between student and professional raters (e.g., Bass, 1954; Dipboye, Fromkin, & Wiback, 1975; Goldberg, 1965; McGovern, Jones, & Morris, 1979; Uhrbock, 1950), the student versus expert rater issue remains an empirical question requiring resolution (Bass et al., 1987). Perhaps both student and professional raters have unique contributions to the understanding of presidential personality.

At the same time, much work needs to be done. Future research might capitalize on recent findings (e.g., Popper, 2000) and further clarify the relationship between personalized and socialized charismatic leadership. For example, the effects of personalized and socialized charismatic leaders on followers (i.e., increased dependency versus increased empowerment, respectively) needs clarification. Moreover, the relationship between the psychological and sociological views of charismatic leadership seems worthy of investigation. Here, how the

context or situation (sociological approach) alters the impact of leader personal qualities and behaviors (psychological approach) deserves consideration.

Furthermore, the point where the bright side of leader Machiavellianism dissolves and deceptive, manipulative Machiavellian behavior begins to erode group goals requires attention. Also, historiometric studies are needed to understand Machiavellianism and charismatic leadership in a variety of historically prominent women and men. Similarly, evaluating the nature of Machiavellianism in charismatic leadership with subordinate–supervisor organizational relationships seems warranted. These and other studies will help illuminate the conditions where the Machiavellianism-charismatic leadership relationship is detrimental and beneficial.

Appendix A

The profile used for the president rated highest in Machiavellianism, Franklin Roosevelt, was as follows:

‘able to manage a. . .strong identification with the public’ not a ‘good administrator’ ‘dazzling, exciting’ ‘lover of crowds. . .knew exactly how to talk to crowds, how to smile at them, how to glamorize what he had in mind for them’ ‘unquestionably supplied leadership, regardless of how some people came to criticize that leadership’ ‘an educated man’ ‘a country squire, genial, presiding over his large family and cognizant of his patrician origins’ ‘not very familiar with economic theory’ ‘an experimenter’ ‘a very capable politician’ ‘he could not deal generously with opponents’ ‘jaunty smile, a soothing voice and supreme self-confidence’ ‘a fine speaker’ ‘more than charmer’ ‘showed himself to be thoughtful, energetic, compassionate, and open to experiment’ ‘was to display remarkable gifts for leadership in a time of crisis’ ‘Despite his conservative background as a country squire. . .[he] enjoyed breaking precedents and shattering traditions. He thought that dramatic gestures on his part would raise morale’ ‘approach to problems tended to be personal rather than theoretical’ ‘lack of interest in economic theory’ ‘recipient of both passionate adoration and blind hatred’ ‘a rather shy youth’ ‘After he entered [college] [he] threw himself into undergraduate activities. His strenuous extracurricular and social life left him relatively little time for his studies, in which his record was undistinguished. He was, however, influenced by his economics professors’ ‘gradually abandoned his patrician airs and attitude of superiority’ ‘tall, handsome’ ‘he demonstrated that he retained his youthful buoyance and vitality; he also showed that he had matured into a more serious and human person’ ‘zest for sailing and his enjoyment in collecting stamps and naval books and prints’ ‘opponents ascribed to him shallowness, incompetence, trickiness, and dictatorial ambitions. His supporters hailed him as [a] savior and the defender of democracy’ ‘unexcelled in winning and holding popular support’ ‘He knew a lot about human nature’ ‘comes off well by the test of money — honesty, other troublesome questions arise in connection with his attempts to deceive the public. Here he is more vulnerable for we must remember that he was a professional politician’ ‘often he was surprisingly candid’ ‘a combination of the lion and the fox. At times [he] would courageously meet problems head on; at others he would slink around them with deceptive language or beat a hasty retreat’ ‘realistic’ ‘resorted to considerable deviousness and deception’ ‘In private life [he] appears to have been

a man of integrity, except notably for a prolonged and clandestine love affair with a former. . . secretary' 'hated war' 'father and mother were wealthy, and the son was pampered' practiced law 'with considerable distaste for several years thought on a grand scale' 'Handsome as a Greek god and superbly built [he] stood six feet, two inches' 'vibrant golden voice' 'with jauntily upturned cigarette holder, the smiling [person] exuded confidence' 'both a man of peace and a man of war' 'a happier warrior when he was fighting for peace. . . Personally pleasant, outgoing, smiling, bantering, he was not basically pugnacious' 'born into an old, aristocratic family' 'an idyllic childhood' 'after college, . . . studied law' 'personal tragedy in the form of polio. . . left him crippled for life. But the disease did not dampen his natural ebullience and optimism' 'his sometimes disorganized but still charismatic leadership' 'He had been a leader of great strengths and weaknesses, but his heritage to the nation was largely one of crucial and beneficial activism.' 'Was ebullient, charming, persuasive, gregarious and genuinely interested in people and their problems. To some he seemed snooty as a young man; his habit of carrying his head back and literally looking down his nose at others reinforced this early image. He worked well under pressure. His composure under stress was remarkable. The main reason for his composure was his serene and absolute assurance as to the value and importance of what he was doing. Had a devious nature. He never spoke with complete frankness even to his most loyal supporters.'

The profile used for the president rated lowest in Machiavellianism, William McKinley, was as follows:

'a naturally pacific and sober man' 'no leadership, no assertiveness' 'typical trading politician' 'if it was necessary to sacrifice a weak friend to propitiate a powerful enemy he would not hesitate for one moment to do so' neither a 'man of God' nor a 'great humanitarian' 'no such stamina' 'he would sacrifice honorable conduct to silence censure of himself by the most obviously unprincipled jingoes' 'backward-looking conservatism' 'His years of hard life in the field had changed him from the pale sickly boy who had volunteered for army duty into a healthy, robust young man' 'forensic ability' 'vigorous campaigning' 'short stature' 'habit of putting his hand inside his coat while speaking' 'became famous for his devotion to his invalid wife' 'kindly nature and lovable traits of character. . . amiable consideration for all about him' 'could refuse a favor and make a friend' 'He had an innate dignity and at the same time a warm sympathetic nature' 'hand shake was famous' 'remarkable memory for faces and names was also well known and highly appreciated' 'tactful even with children' 'solicitude for his ailing wife [a semi-invalid] was the talk of the town' 'kind and gentle' 'was no war lover' 'extremely sensitive to public opinion' 'a kindly and compassionate man' 'he did have a mind of his own and a sincere dedication to conservative principles. His personal honesty was commendable, and although he was guilty of occasional mistakes, they were made by a man of integrity on the basis of such information as was available to him at the time' 'His elementary education was absorbed at the public schools, and his more advanced instruction at [college]' 'devout' 'war record was impressive' 'exceptional gallantry' 'study of law, and ultimately established a remunerative practice' 'he was short [five feet, six inches], stout, and dignified in bearing. He was notably calm in temper and was famous for his spotless white vests, which he changed several times a day' 'He had a gift for saying no in. . . a gracious manner' *not* 'brusque, impatient' 'reluctant imperialist' 'perhaps the most gentle, kindly, compassionate, and peace-loving man ever to [assume his office]' 'a servant of the people, rather than their dictatorial master, and as a

champion of democracy he believed in giving the people what they wanted. His penchant for ear-to-the-ground politics has caused him to be labeled. . . spineless. . . which he was not' 'A benign man who had seen enough of war' 'born into a wealthy business family' [promoted] 'for gallant and meritorious services' [in combat] 'studied law' 'did not harbor imperialist ambitions. He was in fact as mild mannered an imperialist as any pacifist would ever hope to see' 'By all accounts, he was open, friendly, even tempered, cheerful, optimistic, and universally well liked. He was more than popular, he was beloved. . . Even his political opponents were attracted by the peculiar sweetness of his personality. His uniform courtesy and fairness commanded the admiration of all. . . The general public found him free from vanity or affectation. Yet he did not gush with emotion. Rather, he worked a subtle charm effective with people from all walks of life. He enjoyed having lots of people around. Although not a particularly gifted storyteller, he had a dry wit and enjoyed a good, clean joke, but bristled at off-color remarks.'

References

- Alker, H. A. (1981). Political creativity. In: L. Wheeler (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology* (vol. 2, pp. 167–188). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Awamleh, R., & Gardner, W. L. (1999). Perceptions of leader charisma and effectiveness: the effects of vision content, delivery, and organizational performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 345–373.
- Bass, B. M. (1954). The leaderless group discussion. *Psychological Bulletin*, 51, 465–492.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1988). Evolving perspectives on charismatic leadership. In: J. A. Conger, & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: the elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 40–77). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional–transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, 52, 130–139.
- Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: industrial, military, and educational impact*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bass, B. M. (1999). On the taming of charisma: a reply to Janice Beyer. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 541–553.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., & Goodheim, L. (1987). Biography and the assessment of transformational leadership at the world-class level. *Journal of Management*, 13, 7–19.
- Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 181–217.
- Bateman, T. S., & Crant, M. J. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: a measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 103–118.
- Beyer, J. M. (1999a). Taming and promoting charisma to change organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 307–330.
- Beyer, J. M. (1999b). Two approaches to studying charismatic leadership: competing or complementary? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 575–588.
- Bochner, A. P., di Salvo, V., & Jonas, T. (1975). A computer-assisted analysis of small group process: an investigation of two Machiavellian groups. *Small Group Behavior*, 6, 187–203.
- Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. London: Sage.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

- Christie, R. (1970). Scale construction. In: R. Christie, & F. L. Geis (Eds.), *Studies in Machiavellianism* (pp. 10–34). New York: Academic Press.
- Christie, R., & Geis, F. (1970a). *Studies in Machiavellianism*. New York: Academic Press.
- Christie, R., & Geis, F. (1970b). The ten dollar game. In: R. Christie, & F. L. Geis (Eds.), *Studies in Machiavellianism* (pp. 161–172). New York: Academic Press.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Conger, J. A. (1999). Charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations: an insider's perspective on these developing streams of research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 145–179.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 637–647.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). Behavioral dimensions of charismatic leadership. In: J. A. Conger, & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 78–97). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- DeGregorio, W. A. (1991). *The complete book of U.S. presidents* (2nd ed.). New York: Dembner Books.
- Deluga, R. J. (1997). Relationship among American presidential charismatic leadership, narcissism, and rated performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 8, 51–67.
- Deluga, R. J. (1998). American presidential proactivity, charismatic leadership, and rated performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 9, 265–291.
- Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., Dorfman, P. W., et al. (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: are the attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 219–256.
- DePaulo, B. M., & Rosenthal, R. (1979). Telling lies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1713–1722.
- Dipboye, R. L., Fromkin, H. L., & Wiback, K. (1975). Relative importance of applicant sex, attractiveness, and scholastic standing in evaluation of job applicant resumes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 39–43.
- Doty, D. H., & Glick, W. H. (1998). Common methods bias: does common methods variance really bias results? *Organizational Research Methods*, 1, 374–406.
- Fehr, B., Samsom, D., & Paulhus, D. L. (1992). The construct of Machiavellianism: twenty years later. In: C. D. Spielberger, & J. N. Butcher (Eds.), *Advances in personality assessment* (vol. 9, pp. 77–116). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Fiol, C. M., Harris, D., & House, R. (1999). Charismatic leadership: strategies for effecting social change. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 449–482.
- Fleisher, M. (1972). *Machiavelli and the nature of political thought*. New York: Atheneum.
- Foti, R. J., Fraser, S. L., & Lord, R. G. (1982). Effects of leadership labels and prototypes on perceptions of political leaders. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 3, 326–333.
- Gardner, W. L., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *Charismatic leadership: The role of impression management*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Academy of Management, Vancouver, B.C.
- Gardner, W. L., & Avolio, B. J. (1998). The charismatic leadership relationship: a dramaturgical perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 32–58.
- Geis, F. L. (1978). Machiavellianism. In: H. London, & J. Exner (Eds.), *Dimensions of personality* (pp. 305–363). New York: Wiley.
- Geis, F., Christie, R., & Nelson, C. (1970). In search of the Machiavel. In: R. Christie, & F. L. Geis (Eds.), *Studies in Machiavellianism* (pp. 76–95). New York: Academic Press.
- Geis, F. L., Krupat, E., & Berger, D. (1970). Taking over in group discussion. In: R. Christie, & F. L. Geis (Eds.), *Studies in Machiavellianism* (p. 392). New York: Academic Press.
- Geis, L., & Levy, M. (1970). The eye of the beholder. In search of the Machiavelli. In: R. Christie, & F. L. Geis (Eds.), *Studies in Machiavellianism* (pp. 210–235). New York: Academic Press.

- Geis, F. L., & Moon, T. H. (1981). Machiavellianism and deception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41, 766–775.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1965). Diagnosticians versus diagnostic signs: the diagnosis of psychosis versus neurosis from the MMPI. *Psychological Monographs*, 79 (9)(Whole No. 602).
- Gough, H. G., & Heilbrun, A. B., Jr. (1965). *The adjective check list manual*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Harrison, R. (1987). Harnessing personal energy: how companies can inspire employees. *Organizational Dynamics*, 4–21 (Autumn).
- Historical Figures Assessment Collaborative. (1977). Assessing historical figures: the use of observer-based personality descriptions. *Historical Methods Newsletter*, 10, 66–76.
- Hogan, R., Raskin, R., & Fazzini, D. (1990). The dark side of charisma. In: K. E. Clark, & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 343–354). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
- House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In: J. G. Hunt, & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: the cutting edge* (pp. 189–207). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois Univ. Press.
- House, R. J. (1995). Leadership in the twenty-first century: a speculative inquiry. In: A. Howard (Ed.), *The changing nature of work* (pp. 411–450). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- House, R. J. (1999). Weber and the neo-charismatic leadership paradigm: a response to Beyer. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 563–574.
- House, R. J., & Howell, J. M. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 3, 81–108.
- House, R. J., Spangler, W. D., & Woycke, J. (1991). Personality and charisma in the U.S. presidency: a psychological theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 364–396.
- Howell, J. M. (1988). Two faces of charisma: socialized and personalized leadership in organizations. In: J. A. Conger, & K. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership and the elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 213–236). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1992). The ethics of charismatic leadership: submission or liberation? *Academy of Management Executive*, 6 (2), 43–54.
- Howell, J. M., & Hall-Merenda, K. E. (1999). The ties that bind: the impact of leader–member exchange, transformational and transactional leadership, and distance on predicting follower performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 680–694.
- Huber, V. L., & Neale, M. A. (1986). Effects of cognitive heuristics and goals on negotiator performance and subsequent goal setting. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 38, 342–365.
- Hunter, J. E., Gerbing, D. W., & Boster, F. J. (1982). Machiavellian beliefs and personality: construct invalidity of the Machiavellianism dimension. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 1293–1305.
- Jameson, S. H. (1945). Principles of social interaction. *American Sociological Review*, 10, 6–12.
- Kennedy, P. J., & Rice, T. W. (1988). The contextual determinants of presidential greatness. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 4, 161–169.
- Klein, K. J., & House, R. J. (1995). On fire: charismatic leadership and levels of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 183–198.
- Lewicki, R. J. (1983). Lying and deception: a behavioral model. In: M. Bazerman, & R. J. Lewicki (Eds.), *Negotiating in organizations* (pp. 68–90). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lewis, M. W., & Grimes, A. J. (1999). Metatriangulation: building theory from multiple paradigms. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 672–690.
- Maccoby, M. (2000). Narcissistic leaders: the incredible pros, the inevitable cons. *Harvard Business Review*, 78 (1), 68–77.
- Machiavelli, N. (1513/1966). *The prince*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Mansfield, H. C. (1996). *Machiavelli's virtue*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Maranell, G. M. (1970). The evaluation of presidents: an extension of the Schlesinger polls. *Journal of American History*, 57, 104–113.
- Martin, N. H., & Sims, J. H. (1956). Thinking ahead: power tactics. *Harvard Business Review*, 34 (6), 25–36, 140.

- McCann, S. J. H. (1992). Alternative formulas to predict the greatness of U.S. presidents: personological, situational, and zeitgeist factors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 469–479.
- McClelland, D. C. (1975). *Power: The inner experience*. New York: Irvington.
- McGovern, T. V., Jones, B. W., & Morris, S. E. (1979). Comparison of professional versus student ratings of job interviewee behavior. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 26, 176–179.
- McHoskey, J. W., Worzel, W., & Szyarto, C. (1998). Machiavellianism and psychopathy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 192–210.
- Murray, R. K., & Blessing, T. H. (1983). The presidential performance study: a progress report. *Journal of American History*, 70, 535–555.
- Near, D., Wilson, D. S., & Miller, R. R. (1995). *Exploitative and cooperative strategies of social conduct: an approach from evolutionary game theory*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Neustadt, R. (1960). *Presidential power*. New York: Free Press.
- O'Connor, J., Mumford, M. D., Clifton, T. C., Gessner, T. L., & Connelly, M. S. (1995). Charismatic leaders and destructiveness: an historiometric study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 529–555.
- Okanes, M. M., & Stinson, J. E. (1974). Machiavellianism and emergent leadership in a management simulation. *Psychological Reports*, 35, 255–259.
- Pfiffner, J. M. (1951). *The supervision of personnel: Human relations in the management of men*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: problems and prospects. *Journal of Management*, 12, 531–544.
- Popper, M. (2000). The development of charismatic leaders. *Political Psychology*, 21, 729–744.
- Post, J. (1993). Current concepts of the narcissistic personality: implications for political psychology. *Political Psychology*, 14, 99–121.
- Renshon, S. A. (1998). Analyzing the psychology and performance of presidential candidates at a distance: Bob Dole and the 1996 presidential campaign. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 9, 377–395.
- Rim, Y. (1966). Machiavellianism and decisions involving risk. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 5, 35–50.
- Rosenthal, R. (1991). *Meta-analytic procedures for social research* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Shamir, B. (1995). Social distance and charisma: theoretical notes and an exploratory study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 19–47.
- Shamir, B. (1999). Taming charisma for better understanding and greater usefulness: a response to Beyer. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 555–562.
- Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, 4, 1–17.
- Shapiro, D. L., Lewicki, R. J., & Devine, P. (1995). When do employees choose deceptive tactics to stop unwanted change? A relational perspective. In: R. Lewicki, B. Sheppard, & R. Bies (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations* (vol. 5, pp. 155–184). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Shepperd, J. A., & Socherman, R. E. (1997). On the manipulative behavior of low Machiavellians: feigning incompetence to “sandbag” an opponent. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 1448–1459.
- Sheppard, B. H., & Vidmar, N. (1980). Adversary pretrial procedures and testimonial evidence: effects of lawyer's role and Machiavellianism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 320–332.
- Simonton, D. K. (1984a). *Genius, creativity, and leadership*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Simonton, D. K. (1984b). Leaders as eponyms: individual and situational determinants of monarchical eminence. *Journal of Personality*, 52, 1–21.
- Simonton, D. K. (1986). Presidential personality: biographical use of the Gough Adjective Check List. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 149–160.
- Simonton, D. K. (1988). Presidential style: personality, biography, and performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 928–936.
- Simonton, D. K. (1999). Significant samples: the psychological study of eminent individuals. *Psychological Methods*, 4, 425–451.

- Sosik, J. J., & Dworakivsky, A. C. (1998). Self-concept based aspects of the charismatic leader: more than meets the eye. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 9, 503–526.
- Spangler, W. D., & House, R. J. (1991). Presidential effectiveness and the leadership motive profile. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 439–455.
- Stajkovic, A. D. (1999). Fitting parametric fixed effect categorical models to effect sizes: a neglected meta-analytic approach in organizational studies. *Organizational Research Methods*, 2, 88–102.
- Stevens, J. (1986). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Trice, H. M., & Beyer, J. M. (1986). Charisma and its routinization in two social movement organizations. In: L. L. Cummings, & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (vol. 8, pp. 113–164). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Uhrbock, R. S. (1950). Standardization of 724 rating scale statements. *Personnel Psychology*, 2, 285–316.
- Waldman, D. A., & Yammarino, F. J. (1999). CEO charismatic leadership: levels-of-management and levels-of-analysis effects. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 266–285.
- Wasielewski, P. L. (1985). The emotional basis of charisma. *Symbolic Interactionism*, 8, 207–222.
- Weber, M. (1924/1947). *The theory of social and economic organizations*. New York: Free Press (T. Parsons, Trans.).
- Willner, A. R. (1984). *The spellbinders: Charismatic political leadership*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press.
- Wilson, D. S., Near, D., & Miller, R. R. (1996). Machiavellianism: a synthesis of the evolutionary and psychological literatures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119, 285–299.
- Winter, D. G. (1973). *The power motive*. New York: Free Press.
- Winter, D. G. (1987). Leader appeal, leader performance, and the motives profile of leaders and followers: a study of American presidents and elections. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 196–202.
- Winter, D. G., & Carlson, D. G. (1988). Using motive scores in the psychobiographical study of an individual: the case of Richard Nixon. *Journal of Personality*, 56, 75–103.
- Winter, D. G., & Stewart, A. J. (1978). Power motivation. In: H. London, & J. Exner (Eds.), *Dimensions of personality* (pp. 391–447). New York: Wiley.
- Wrightsman, L. S. (1991). Interpersonal trust and attitudes toward human nature. In: J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (vol. 1, pp. 373–412). New York: Academic Press.
- Yukl, G. (1990). *Skills for managers and leaders*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.