



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

## The Leadership Quarterly

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/lequa](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/lequa)



# The awestruck effect: Followers suppress emotion expression in response to charismatic but not individually considerate leadership



Jochen I. Menges <sup>a,\*</sup>, Martin Kilduff <sup>b,1</sup>, Sarah Kern <sup>a,2</sup>, Heike Bruch <sup>c,3</sup>

<sup>a</sup> WHU – Otto Beisheim School of Management, Erkrather Str. 224a, 40233 Düsseldorf, Germany

<sup>b</sup> University College London, Management Science & Innovation, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, UK

<sup>c</sup> University of St. Gallen, Institute for Leadership and HRM, Dufourstrasse 40a, 9000 St. Gallen, Switzerland

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received 29 April 2014

Received in revised form 8 June 2015

Accepted 9 June 2015

Available online 2 July 2015

Editor: Janaki Gooley

#### Keywords:

Transformational leadership

Charisma

Individualized consideration

Response-focused emotion regulation

Emotion suppression

### ABSTRACT

This study examines how followers regulate their outward expression of emotions in the context of two types of leadership that are commonly associated with transformational leadership, namely charismatic leadership and individually considerate leadership. Based on new theorizing and a series of three studies involving experiments and field work, we show that the two types of leadership have different effects on followers' emotional expressiveness. Specifically, we find that followers under the influence of leaders' charisma tend to suppress the expression of emotions (we call this the "awestruck effect"), but followers express emotions when leaders consider them individually. Awestruck followers may suffer from expressive inhibition even as charismatic leaders stir their hearts.

© 2015 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Emotion suppression – the “inhibition of one's own emotional expressive behavior while emotionally aroused” (Gross & Levenson, 1993: 970) – is a common emotion regulation strategy through which people attempt to control their emotions and shape their outward expression of emotions. But this strategy is fraught with problems. When people suppress emotions, they experience decreased well-being, increased levels of strain and decreased job satisfaction (Schaubroeck & Jones, 2000; Côté & Morgan, 2002; John & Gross, 2004). Suppressing emotions negatively affects the exchange of information among people and interferes with the establishment and retention of high-quality relationships (Butler et al., 2003; Gross & John, 2003; Srivastava, Tamir, McGonigal, John, & Gross, 2009). Emotion suppression also increases physiological emotional responses, absorbs mental resources, deteriorates cognitive performance and impairs memory (Gross, 2002; Richards & Gross, 1999, 2000, 2006; Schmeichel, Volokhov, & Demaree, 2008). In light of these perils, an important question for leadership scholars is how leaders affect the extent to which followers express or suppress their emotions.

Leadership research tells us that transformational leaders, in particular, lift the constraints on people's emotional expressiveness that are common in the workplace (Mann, 1999; Martin, Knopoff, & Beckman, 1998; Riggio & Reichard, 2008). Such leaders stir enthusiasm and excitement, and “followers are likely to express these positive feelings in a particularly open and pronounced manner”

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +49 211 44709 335.

E-mail addresses: [jochen.menges@whu.edu](mailto:jochen.menges@whu.edu) (J.I. Menges), [m.kilduff@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:m.kilduff@ucl.ac.uk) (M. Kilduff), [sarah.kern@whu.edu](mailto:sarah.kern@whu.edu) (S. Kern), [heike.bruch@unisg.ch](mailto:heike.bruch@unisg.ch) (H. Bruch).

<sup>1</sup> Tel.: +44 20 7679 2585.

<sup>2</sup> Tel.: +49 211 44709 336.

<sup>3</sup> Tel.: +41 71 224 2370.

(Walter & Bruch, 2008: 247). But, burgeoning research in the area of status suggests that status differences entail the suppression of emotional expressiveness on the part of lower status people (i.e., followers) who defer to higher status people (i.e., transformational leaders) (Keltner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2003). According to this view, transformational leaders, because they are admired by followers, inhibit the extent to which followers express emotions.

Through new theorizing and a series of three experimental and field studies, we reconcile these conflicting ideas about how transformational leaders affect followers' emotionally expressive behavior. Specifically, we resolve the conundrum concerning followers' emotional expressiveness in the context of transformational leadership by disaggregating transformational leadership into two major components – charisma and individualized consideration (Bass, 1985).<sup>4</sup> We hypothesize that when leaders are charismatic, followers feel "exceptionally strong admiration" toward the leader (Waldman & Yammarino, 1999: 268) and are likely to constrain the expression of their emotions. But when leaders approach followers individually, followers are encouraged to articulate their needs; thus they are likely to overcome the status-induced inhibition and openly express their emotions. Thus our research advances the idea that both charisma and individualized consideration affect followers' emotional expressiveness, but in quite different ways.

By disaggregating the construct of transformational leadership into two components and by examining how each component affects followers' regulation of emotional expressiveness, we advance a more fine-grained understanding of the workings of specific types of leadership. We respond to calls to consider the effects of distinct components of transformational leadership (cf. Van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013) – in our case, charisma and individualized consideration. Despite high empirical correlations between charisma and individualized consideration on leadership measures (e.g., Bass, 1999), many charismatic leaders exhibit the absence of individually considerate behavior and many individually considerate leaders are not charismatic (Goffee & Jones, 2000). Our research contributes to transformational leadership by treating charismatic leadership and individually considerate leadership as two separate leadership styles, each with a distinct effect on followers' emotional expressiveness.

We advance a better understanding of followers' emotion regulation in the context of such leadership. A well-established framework (Gross, 1998, 2013) suggests that emotion regulation – whether intrapersonal or interpersonal – occurs at two stages in the emotion process. At the antecedent-focused stage, emotion regulation pertains to generating, amplifying, reducing or changing emotional experience. At the response-focused stage, emotion regulation deals with the modulation of emotion expression once emotions are experienced; this stage often entails the suppression of emotion expressions. The antecedent-focused stage of emotion regulation has been well examined in the context of charismatic leadership. Charismatic leaders enhance (i.e., up-regulate) followers' emotions, for example, with visionary speeches from the podium or with symbolic acts involving courageous behaviors (cf. Bass, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1987). Through shifting attention, reframing and reappraisal, charismatic leaders change the way followers feel (Dvir, Kass, & Shamir, 2004; Wasielewski, 1985), often communicating positive emotions to followers (e.g., Bono & Ilies, 2006; Erez, Johnson, Misangyi, LePine, & Halverson, 2008). Thus charismatic leaders effectively regulate their followers' emotional experiences. But the response-focused stage of emotion regulation in the context of leadership has been neglected. This study shifts attention from the well-examined antecedent-focused stage of the emotion regulation process (i.e., how leaders influence followers' emotional experience) to the neglected response-focused stage (i.e., how leaders influence followers' emotional expression). This study concerns followers' emotional expressiveness in general, not specifically the expression or suppression of those emotions that the leader evoked or of any other specific discrete emotions, and we assume that the emotionally constraining effect of charisma and the liberating effect of individualized consideration apply to both positive and negative emotions. Organizational contexts bear a great variety of emotions (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996), and people are likely to suppress not just negative, but also positive emotions in work settings (Clark, 1990; Erber, Wegner & Therriault, 1996; Mann, 1999; Shields, 2005).

### **Charismatic leadership and followers' expressive suppression of emotion**

Extant research on emotional expressiveness in the context of leadership has focused mostly on leaders rather than on followers (Rajah, Song, & Arvey, 2011), emphasizing that leaders who vividly express emotions are likely to be seen as charismatic (Damen, Van Knippenberg, & Van Knippenberg, 2008; Friedman, Prince, Riggio, & DiMatteo, 1980; Groves, 2006; Johnson, 2008). Charismatic leaders use excitement and enthusiasm in their persuasive appeals to followers (Erez et al., 2008; Weber, 1978). Indeed, leaders' emotional expressions tend to be more important than verbal messages in convincing followers (Newcombe & Ashkanasy, 2002). The emotional expressiveness of leaders is thus a key component of successful leadership (Riggio & Reichard, 2008) and an inherent part of charismatic leadership.

In contrast to this relatively comprehensive picture of how leaders' charisma and leaders' emotional expressiveness relate to each other, our understanding of how followers regulate their emotional expressiveness in response to charismatic leaders remains speculative. That charismatic leaders express their emotions openly has been taken to imply that followers, under the influence of charismatic leadership, feel relatively unconstrained in their emotional expression (e.g., Walter & Bruch, 2008). Several studies suggest that leaders transfer their emotions to followers through a mimicry process that involves followers displaying the same emotion as the leader (e.g., Bono & Ilies, 2006; Erez et al., 2008; Johnson, 2008; Sy, Côté, & Saavedra, 2005). A neglected possibility, however, is that emotion contagion occurs by other ways such as emotional comparisons, vicarious affective experiences, or intentional affective influence (Bartel & Saavedra, 2000; Elfenbein, 2014; Gooty, Connelly, Griffith, & Gupta, 2010; Kelly & Barsade, 2001; Niedenthal & Brauer, 2012). For example, a study of audio-taped speeches showed that speech imagery induces positive affect and triggers

<sup>4</sup> The third component of transformational leadership is intellectual stimulation (Avolio & Bass, 1991). Whereas intellectual stimulation is primarily a cognitively driven process, charisma and individualized consideration are likely to involve emotions and are thus the two focal components of transformational leadership in this research.

perceptions of leader charisma, *without* mimicry of leaders' expressions (Naidoo & Lord, 2008). A study involving students rating video clips of two US presidents (Cherulnik, Donley, Wiewel, & Miller, 2001: Study 2) showed that student raters smiled more during the non-charismatic sections of one US president's responses but also smiled more during the charismatic sections of the other US president's responses. Such inconsistency indicates that the processes by which charismatic leaders affect followers' mimicry are more complex than previously thought.

We suggest that status differences between charismatic leaders and those they influence inhibit followers' expression of emotions in the context of charismatic leadership. Charismatic leaders offer followers compelling and emotionally appealing visions of the future that differ from the status quo and emphasize the need for change (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999). These leaders portray themselves as risk takers who show unconventional behaviors and demonstrate courage (Conger & Kanungo, 1987). They express positive emotions (Bono & Ilies, 2006; Erez et al., 2008) that signal confidence and optimism to followers even in face of adversity (Conger & Kanungo, 1998). The range of behaviors exhibited by charismatic leaders is characteristic of people possessing high status and power (Keltner et al., 2003).

And, indeed, leadership scholars describe charismatic leaders in terms of high status given that status can be understood as "the extent to which an individual or group is respected or admired by others" (Magee & Galinsky, 2008: 359). For example, charismatic leaders are reported to be "admired" (Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003: 208) and to possess "a special magnetic quality that fills followers with awe and adoration" (Lipman-Blumen, 1996: 30). For charismatic leaders who often lack formal power, the difference in status between themselves and their followers, provides leaders with informal power and facilitates leaders' exercise of authority (Howell & Shamir, 2005; Weber, 1978).

When followers assign a high status to a charismatic leader, they are likely to adopt lower status behaviors for themselves (Howell & Shamir, 2005). Thus followers are likely to experience automatic inhibition-related processes entailing tendencies to abide by social constraints and to refrain from emotional expression (cf. Keltner et al., 2003). Studies show that, relative to high-status and high-power individuals, low-status and low-power individuals suppress emotional display, refrain from showing true emotion, and restrict body movement (Ellyson & Dovidio, 1985; Keltner, Young, Heerey, Oemig, & Monarch, 1998; Tiedens & Fragale, 2003). Similarly, we suggest that followers, in response to being exposed to charismatic leadership, engage in the suppression of emotion expression.

The suppression of emotional expressions is likely to be an important ingredient in the non-bureaucratic status-granting process by which followers confirm the high status of charismatic leaders (cf. Beyer, 1999; Clark, 1990; Sweetman, Spears, Livingstone, & Manstead, 2013). Because leaders are able to exert charisma only as long as "the sentiments of the followers toward the leader are characterized by awe" (Spencer, 1973: 347; see also Willner, 1968), charismatic leaders and their followers are engaged in a continuous reaffirmation of the status differences between them. Statuses are established and affirmed when dominant, assertive behavior by one party is matched by submissive behavior by the other party (Grant, Gino, & Hofmann, 2011; Kiesler, 1983). Accordingly, followers are likely to reciprocate the strong emotion expression that is characteristic of charismatic leaders (Friedman et al., 1980; Willner, 1968) by suppressing their own expressiveness.

Indeed, interactions between people of lower and higher status are characterized not by lower status mimicry of higher status non-verbal behavior, but by complementarity (Tiedens & Fragale, 2003). Mimicry of nonverbal behavior, including charismatic behavior and emotional expressiveness, is more likely to occur in egalitarian relationships than in leader/follower relationships. People mimic each other's moods and emotions in leaderless groups (Barsade, 2002) and students mimic their peers' charismatic smiles and attentiveness in the absence of any defined leader/follower relationship (Cherulnik et al., 2001: Study 1). But in cases where charismatic leadership behavior establishes a hierarchical relationship, the leader's dominant behavior is likely to invite submissive responses from followers (cf. Locke & Sadler, 2007). Rather than mimicking in their nonverbal behaviors the emotional expression of charismatic leaders, followers are likely to subdue such expression.

The expression of emotions can only be suppressed if emotions are actually experienced (Gross & Levenson, 1993). And, as previous research demonstrates, people have difficulty completely disguising how they feel (Kennedy-Moore & Watson, 2001a). Those suppressing emotional expressions often show signs of "leakage" in the form of subtle facial expressions or body movements indicating emotional arousal (Ekman & Friesen, 1969: 88). Thus people under the influence of charismatic leaders may show leaked expressions that may give hints about the intensity of their felt emotions (Gross & Levenson, 1993).

In conclusion, when followers look up to leaders and attribute charisma to them, they are likely to feel inhibited in their emotional expressiveness. Deference in the presence of charisma is common in organizations (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000). The early social psychologist McDougall (1919: 95) pointed out: "in the case of a person whom we intensely admire, we become shy, like a child in the presence of an adult stranger; we have the impulse to shrink together, to be still, and to avoid attracting his attention" (see also Keltner & Haidt, 2003; Schindler, Zink, Windrich, & Menninghaus, 2012). Thus, charismatic leaders make followers "awestruck" (Shamir, Arthur, & House, 1994: 31) – full of bottled-up emotion that followers are unable to openly express.

**Hypothesis 1.** Followers' perceptions of charismatic leadership are positively related to followers' suppression of emotion expression.

### **Individually considerate leadership and followers' expressive suppression of emotion**

When leaders offer individualized consideration, followers are likely to open up and express their emotions. Individualized consideration involves both developmental and supportive leadership (Rafferty & Griffin, 2006). Individually considerate leaders foster followers' development by delegating assignments to followers as opportunities for growths, and by helping followers through these assignments to warrant learning and success (Bass, 1999). Individually considerate leaders thus act as coaches and mentors,

reflecting with their followers on the challenges inherent in assignments as a way to prepare followers for increasingly demanding tasks (Bass, 2008: 622). Individually considerate leaders also provide personal support for their followers, helping followers to cope with stress and deal with emotional problems in the workplace (House, 1981; Toegel, Kilduff, & Anand, 2013). By offering sympathy and by taking followers' individual concerns and worries into account when making decisions, individually considerate leaders ensure the well-being of their followers and enable followers to work effectively (Avolio & Bass, 1995).

Key leadership behaviors in providing individualized consideration are attending to and acknowledging followers' needs (Bass, 1985; Rafferty & Griffin, 2006). Psychological research suggests that needs are often articulated through the expression of emotions (Kennedy-Moore & Watson, 2001b). For example, in a work context, the expression of boredom may signal a need for stimulation, the expression of fear may reveal a need for reassurance, the expression of anger may show a need for justice, and the expression of excitement may indicate a need for support to seize an opportunity (cf. Frijda, Kuipers, & ter Schure, 1989). If "emotion expression communicates unique information about needs" (Monin, Martire, Schulz, & Clark, 2009: 102), and if individualized consideration is about paying "special attention to each individual follower's needs", then leaders must allow and encourage followers to express emotions in order to effectively provide individualized consideration.

Indeed, individual consideration is closely linked with interpersonal communication – not the inspirational, motivational kind that charismatic leaders propel, but the caring, attentive two-way communication by which leaders explain their actions and followers get a chance to ask questions and share their concerns. When offering individualized consideration, it is essential for leaders to "listen effectively" to their followers in order to understand followers' needs and perspectives (Bass & Riggio, 2006: 7). In this process of mutual sharing of thoughts, ideas, opinions and feedback, it is likely that followers will mention their feelings and disclose their emotions.

Emotion expression, both nonverbal and verbal, is an important ingredient in building and maintaining the personalized relationships that individually considerate leaders foster with their followers. It is through these close relationships with followers – relationships that stand in contrast to the exchange-oriented relationships typically seen in workplaces – that individually considerate leaders distinguish themselves (Bass, 1985). The sense of familiarity and communality that prevails in these relationships both promotes and gets reinforced through the expression of emotions (Clark & Finkel, 2005; Clark & Taraban, 1991). Indeed, people are more likely to express and share their emotions with those they trust (Kennedy-Moore & Watson, 2001b). And trust is enhanced in leader-follower relationships in which leaders provide individualized consideration (Zhu, Newman, Miao, & Hooke, 2013). When followers express emotions, including negative ones, the personalized relationship with the leader gets strengthened (cf. Rimé, 2007).

To the extent that leaders provide individualized consideration, status and power differences in the leader-follower relationship are likely to get reduced or move to the background, hence inhibition tendencies are likely to diminish and followers are likely to feel relatively free to express their emotions. By developing and supporting their followers, individually considerate leaders help followers reach "successively higher levels of development" (cf. Bass, 1985; Rafferty & Griffin, 2006). Thus the statuses of followers are likely to progress to higher levels. And in their personalized interactions with followers, individually considerate leaders are likely to deemphasize the hierarchical status- and power-related differences between leader and follower in order to facilitate a more egalitarian, closer relationship.

Followers' inhibition tendencies are unlikely to vanish completely in the context of individualized consideration. But within the given constraints, we suggest that individually considerate leaders foster emotion expression. Thus a follower who perceives the leader as someone who cares about the follower's feelings will feel relatively free to show emotions.

## **Hypothesis 2.** Followers' perceptions of individually considerate leadership are negatively related to followers' suppression of emotion expression.

We examined the two hypotheses across three studies that involve experiments and a field survey. In the first study, we focused exclusively on the awestruck effect – the inhibition of followers' emotion expression in response to charismatic leadership, as described in **Hypothesis 1**. Given that charismatic leaders are distinguished in part by their strong appeals to the emotions of followers, it was important to test whether charismatic leadership has a suppressive effect on followers' emotion expression. In the remaining two studies, we tested again for the suppressive effect on emotional expressiveness of charismatic leadership (**Hypothesis 1**), but also for the emotionally permissive effect of individualized consideration (**Hypothesis 2**). We anticipated no difference in expressive suppression for positive or negative emotions, given that our reasoning was independent of the valence of the emotions. But because positive and negative emotions differ fundamentally (Schwarz, 1990), it was imperative to establish that the anticipated effects held for both positive and negative emotions. Thus, the designs of our first two studies feature conditions with different emotional valence that allow us to test whether the hypotheses are supported for both positive and negative emotion.

### **Study 1: priming experiment**

We begin our empirical work with a priming study in which we asked participants to recall and write about either a charismatic or a general leader. We then exposed participants to either a positive or negative emotion-inducing video clip. We expected that participants primed with charismatic leadership would be less emotionally expressive while watching the video clip than those who were primed with leadership in general. We chose the priming procedure to account for the inherently subjective attribution process by which people ascribe charisma to leaders (Avolio & Yammarino, 1990; Brands, Menges, & Kilduff, in press).

## Methods

### Participants

We recruited 129 participants (mean age = 24; 40 men, 89 women) from institutions of higher education in Germany to participate in a research study for compensation. The participants averaged four years of work experience, mainly in part-time service jobs.

### Procedure and measures

We devised a laboratory priming experiment with a  $2 \times 2$  between-subjects design, crossing two priming conditions (charismatic leadership priming vs. leadership control priming) and two emotional valence conditions (positive vs. negative). Participants were seated in front of a computer and after providing some demographic information were assigned to one of the four experimental conditions. The effects of charismatic leadership were induced by priming participants to think of a leader they had previously worked with, who was a role model for them (i.e., displayed idealized influence; Bass, 1999) and who they perceived as inspiring (i.e., provided inspirational motivation; Bass, 1999). Participants in the *charismatic leadership priming condition* noted leader demographic information (age, area, working relationship) and wrote about the charismatic leader for ten minutes describing the leader and explaining why they admired the leader. This procedure was designed to activate the specific mental content, or stereotype, of a charismatic leader. In the *leadership priming control condition*, participants were asked to think of a leader they had previously worked with, provide demographic information, and write about that leader for ten minutes explaining how they perceived his or her leadership style. This procedure primed the concept of a leader, but did not specifically invoke charismatic leadership.

The next step consisted of the exposure of the participants to a *positive* or *negative* movie clip of identical length (90 seconds) that was taken from a pretested set of emotion-inducing movie clips (Hewig et al., 2005). The positive movie clip showed a couple happily reuniting, whereas the negative clip showed a couple losing a beloved friend. To check the emotion-induction manipulation, we asked participants before and after the movie how they felt at this moment on a continuous 10 cm line ranging from "negative" to "positive."

While participants watched the movie clip, a video camera recorded their facial expressions. Toward the end of the session, participants responded to a brief questionnaire about their work experience. Finally, we captured on video an emotional baseline by asking each participant to display a neutral, happy, and sad facial expression. Participants were debriefed and received compensation.

Expressive suppression was assessed based on the 129 video recordings of the participants. These videos were edited so that each started with participants' baseline expressions and continued with emotional expressions recorded during exposure to the movie clip. Videos were rated by three independent coders (2 women, 1 man; mean age = 37) blind to the purpose of the study who, in pretests, scored above 75% on the Diagnostic Analysis of Nonverbal Accuracy 2 (DANVA; Nowicki, 2000). Following procedures established in prior work (e.g., Gross & Levenson, 1993, 1997), coders rated each recording for the expression of negative and positive emotions on scales that ranged from 1 (not shown at all) to 7 (strongly shown). For each recording, we calculated expressive suppression by averaging the scores and then multiplying the resulting score by -1 and adding 7: the higher the score, the more expressive suppression. Agreement among coders was satisfactory, as indicated by values below the defined threshold of the average deviation index:  $AD_{mean} = .77$ ,  $AD_{median} = .77$  (Burke & Dunlap, 2002; Burke, Finkelstein, & Dusig, 1999).

## Results

We first checked whether our emotion induction procedure was successful. After watching the positive movie clip, participants were significantly happier ( $M = 6.80$ ,  $SD = 1.87$ ) than before ( $M = 6.31$ ,  $SD = 1.81$ ),  $t(66) = 2.31$ ,  $p < .05$ , and after watching the negative movie clip, they were significantly sadder ( $M = 4.46$ ,  $SD = 1.84$ ) than before ( $M = 6.26$ ,  $SD = 1.95$ ),  $t(57) = 5.80$ ,  $p < .001$ . There were no significant differences in emotional experience between the charismatic leadership condition and the control conditions before the movie clip  $t(125) = .75$ , ns, or after the movie clip,  $t(123) = -.67$ , ns, thus the priming had no effect on participants' feelings.

Next, we inspected the effects of the manipulations on the dependent variable. To examine whether charismatic leadership was associated with expressive suppression, as suggested by Hypothesis 1, we conducted an ANOVA with the priming conditions and emotional valence conditions as fixed factors. We found a significant main effect for charisma,  $F(1,125) = 8.31$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $\eta^2 = .06$ . As Table 1 shows, participants who brought charismatic leaders to mind tended to suppress the expression of emotions ( $M = 4.06$ ,  $SD = .78$ ) compared to participants who reflected on leaders in general ( $M = 3.74$ ,  $SD = .46$ ),  $t(127) = -2.86$ ,  $p < .01$ . The valence

**Table 1**

Study 1: means and standard deviations for key variables by condition.

	Positive emotion condition		Negative emotion condition	
	Charisma condition	Control condition	Charisma condition	Control condition
Emotion before the video	6.25 (2.14)	6.37 (1.43)	6.09 (2.00)	6.48 (1.86)
Emotion after the video	6.64 (2.23)	6.94 (1.45)	5.00 (1.64)	3.92 (1.92)
Emotion suppression during video	3.97 (.90)	3.68 (.50)	4.16 (.61)	3.80 (.40)
n	33	34	30	30

Values are means, with standard deviations in parentheses. Values in the last row count the number of participants in each condition.

of the emotion had no significant effect on suppression,  $F(1,125) = 1.82, ns$ , even though there was a mild trend for participants watching the negative movie clip to exhibit more expressive suppression ( $M = 3.98, SD = .54$ ) than those watching the positive clip ( $M = 3.83, SD = .74$ ),  $t(127) = -1.29, ns$ . The valence of the movie clip also did not affect the relationship between charisma and expressive suppression: there was no interaction between the priming conditions and the emotional valence conditions,  $F(1,125) = .11, ns$ . Consistent with Hypothesis 1, these results suggest that charismatic leadership was associated with expressive suppression.

### Discussion

The first study focused specifically on the idea that charismatic leadership induces a tendency to suppress emotions in followers. The findings suggest that when people bring to mind a charismatic leader, they indeed tend to be inhibited in their emotional expressiveness. This inhibition affected both participants experiencing positive emotions and those experiencing negative emotions. Thus this study provided initial support for our theorizing.

The experimental setting featured people recalling their experiences with leaders. This setup was akin to people's experiences in organizations, in which people are prompted by in-house stories, messages, and photographs to think about their leaders. But the experimental priming procedure we used provided little control over the particular type of leaders recalled. Some of the leaders that participants recalled may have been both charismatic and individually considerate. In Study 2 we manipulated charismatic leadership and individualized consideration independently of one another. Also, the manipulation checks for the emotion induction showed relatively small differences. Thus, in the next study we chose an emotion induction that was more closely linked to the leadership context.

### Study 2: scenario experiment

In the second study, we experimentally tested the effects of both charismatic leadership and individualized consideration on followers' suppression of positive and negative emotions. We devised a  $2 \times 2 \times 2$  vignette-design experiment. The vignettes described a typical business scenario that differed in leader charisma (high vs. low), leader individualized consideration (high vs. low), and emotional valence of the situation (positive vs. negative). We presented participants with one of eight versions of the vignette and expected participants to be more likely to suppress emotions when leader charisma was high, and individualized consideration was low.

### Methods

#### Participants

The study was conducted as part of an undergraduate organizational behavior course at a Swiss university. Out of 278 students attending the course, 260 (159 men, 96 women, 5 gender information missing) turned in valid questionnaires. Their mean age was 23, and they averaged two years of work experience, mainly internships and part-time jobs.

#### Procedure and measures

Participants were asked to read and respond to one of eight randomly chosen versions of a workplace vignette. The person in the vignette (referred to as "you") had graduated from university and had been employed for six months. In the *charisma-high* condition, the vignette continued: "In his working style your supervisor is a truly inspiring role model. You can learn a lot from him, you admire your supervisor and one day you want to do your work like him," following Bass's (1985, 2008) descriptions of the characteristics of charismatic leaders. In contrast, in the *charisma-low* condition, the vignette continued: "In his working style your supervisor is an ordinary supervisor. You think that he is doing his work like an average supervisor, you do not feel any special admiration for him and your collaboration is normal." In the *individualized-consideration-high* condition the vignette continued, "Personally, you have a good, friendly relationship with your supervisor," following Bass' description that individually considerate leaders "personalize relations" (Bass, 2008: 622) and seek communal relationship with their followers that stand in contrast to type of "the formal, distant relationship" usually seen in workplaces (Bass, 1985: 37). In the *individualized-consideration-low* condition the vignette continued, "Personally, you have a polite, distant relationship with your supervisor."

Note that we deliberately avoided using the terms charisma and individualized consideration or describing these constructs too obviously in order to avoid demand effects. However, to check whether our descriptions triggered the intended constructs, we followed up on the leadership manipulation with six items from the Transformational Leadership Behavior Inventory (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990) to measure (on five-point Likert scales) participants' perceptions of the frequency (1 = never; 5 = always) with which they expected the supervisor to exhibit charisma (three items;  $\alpha = .86$ ) and individualized consideration (three items;  $\alpha = .82$ ). A sample item for charisma was: "My supervisor provides a good model to follow;" whereas the items for individualized consideration included: "My supervisor behaves in a manner that is thoughtful of my personal needs." These items were used to confirm the intended manipulation. These items, like all items derived from English-language sources in Studies 2 and 3, were translated into German by a professional translation service and then subjected to a double-blind, back-translation procedure (Schaffer & Riordan, 2003).

All versions of the vignette continued with details concerning how the participant had responsibility for a new, highly-desired project in which the participant invested a great amount of effort. After months of hard work, followed by a presentation of the main ideas to senior management, the participant was called into the supervisor's office. In the *positive-emotion* condition the vignette continued,

"The project is so interesting to the senior management that you have been invited to a workshop next week to discuss the realization of your ideas;" whereas in the *negative-emotion* condition the vignette continued, "The project will not receive any further support from the senior management. It is clear that the resources for it will not be forthcoming in the future and that the realization within the next five years is not possible."

After participants experienced project success or failure, we used six items from the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) to measure (on five-point Likert scales) how strongly (1 = not at all; 5 = very strongly) participants experienced positive emotion (three items including "excited";  $\alpha = .87$ ) and negative emotion (three items including "distressed";  $\alpha = .86$ ).

Then we asked participants to complete four adapted items ( $\alpha = .91$ ) of the suppression dimension of the Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ; Gross & John, 2003) to measure the extent to which the participant agreed with statements concerning their willingness to show emotions to the supervisor. Statements included "I keep my emotions to myself." The seven-point Likert scale ranged from 1 (do not agree at all) to 7 (completely agree). The suppression items of the ERQ were developed based on the definition of emotion suppression that we adopted for this paper (Gross & Levenson, 1993).

After participants had completed reading the vignette, the study concluded with demographic questions.

## Results

The means and standard deviations of the focal variables are listed for each condition in Table 2. We began by examining the effectiveness of our experimental manipulations. The leadership manipulations were successful: participants in the charisma condition perceived supervisors to be more charismatic ( $M = 3.94$ ,  $SD = .67$ ) than did participants in the regular supervisor condition ( $M = 2.66$ ,  $SD = .63$ ;  $t[258] = 16.04$ ,  $p < .001$ ), whereas participants in the individualized consideration condition perceived supervisors as more often supporting them personally ( $M = 3.62$ ,  $SD = .74$ ) than did participants in the distant supervisor condition ( $M = 2.76$ ,  $SD = .63$ ;  $t[258] = 10.05$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The emotion manipulation was also successful. In the positive emotion condition, participants reported stronger positive emotions ( $M = 4.31$ ,  $SD = .57$ ) than did participants in the negative emotion condition ( $M = 2.12$ ,  $SD = .63$ ;  $t[258] = -29.27$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Vice versa, in the negative emotion condition, participants reported stronger negative emotions ( $M = 3.23$ ,  $SD = .77$ ) than did participants in the positive emotion condition ( $M = 1.20$ ,  $SD = .52$ ;  $t[258] = 25.05$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

Then, we conducted an ANOVA with the charismatic leadership conditions, the individually considerate leadership conditions, and emotional valence conditions as fixed factors to examine the effects of the manipulations on the dependent variable: expressive suppression. First, we checked whether charismatic leadership was positively associated with expressive suppression, as suggested by Hypothesis 1. We found weak support for this hypothesis with the main effect for charisma, significant at  $p < .10$  ( $F(1,252) = 3.29$ ,  $p = .071$ ,  $\eta^2 = .013$ ). Participants who worked with the charismatic leader tended to report the suppression of emotion expressiveness ( $M = 3.94$ ,  $SD = 1.38$ ) compared to participants who worked with the regular leader ( $M = 3.62$ ,  $SD = 1.35$ );  $t(258) = -1.92$ ,  $p = .056$ . Second, we examined the association of individually considerate leadership with expressive suppression to test Hypothesis 2. There was a significant main effect for individualized consideration,  $F(1,252) = 25.81$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2 = .09$ . In line with expectations, participants whose leader offered them individualized consideration were less likely to report holding back their emotions ( $M = 3.40$ ,  $SD = 1.30$ ) than participants who had a personally inattentive leader ( $M = 4.23$ ,  $SD = 1.32$ );  $t(258) = 5.10$ ,  $p < .001$ . Hypothesis 2 was supported. The main effect for emotional valence was significant at  $p < .10$  ( $F(1,252) = 3.64$ ,  $p = .057$ ,  $\eta^2 = .014$ ). Thus, there was weak support for the idea that negative-event participants tended to suppress the expression of emotions more ( $M = 3.93$ ,  $SD = 1.40$ ) than the positive-event participants ( $M = 3.63$ ,  $SD = 1.33$ );  $t(258) = -1.75$ ,  $p = .082$ . There were no two-way or three-way interactions between the charismatic leadership conditions, the individually considerate leadership conditions, and emotional valence conditions.

**Table 2**

Study 2: means and standard deviations for key variables by condition.

	Positive emotion				Negative emotion			
	Charisma high		Charisma low		Charisma high		Charisma low	
	Individualized consideration high	Individualized consideration low						
Perceptions of charisma	4.08 (0.69)	3.78 (0.68)	2.67 (0.70)	2.53 (0.49)	4.15 (0.59)	3.74 (0.64)	2.84 (0.71)	2.56 (0.49)
Perceptions of individualized consideration	3.70 (0.80)	2.78 (0.60)	3.45 (0.74)	2.61 (0.62)	3.54 (0.61)	2.87 (0.67)	3.78 (0.79)	2.77 (0.63)
Positive emotion	4.29 (0.67)	4.22 (0.60)	4.36 (0.54)	4.34 (0.47)	2.22 (0.65)	1.93 (0.54)	2.08 (0.61)	2.26 (0.68)
Negative emotion	1.22 (0.56)	1.24 (0.60)	1.22 (0.49)	1.13 (0.44)	3.00 (0.78)	3.23 (0.77)	3.26 (0.84)	3.46 (0.59)
Emotion suppression	3.51 (1.32)	4.07 (1.23)	3.01 (1.26)	4.06 (1.26)	3.66 (1.30)	4.61 (1.33)	3.43 (1.28)	4.18 (1.48)
n	35	32	36	31	32	30	37	27

Values are means, with standard deviations in parentheses. Values in the last row count the number of participants in each condition.

## Discussion

Corroborating the results of the first study, we showed that followers of a charismatic leader tended to suppress emotional expression. And the suppression of emotional expression lifted to the extent that leaders were perceived to attend to followers' needs. The results thus suggested that the effects of charismatic leadership and individually considerate leadership on followers' emotional expressiveness are in different directions, in line with our hypotheses. Study 2, like Study 1, used the experimental method that permitted inferences concerning causality. But both Study 1 and Study 2 are limited in their external validity, thus calling into question whether the findings observed in controlled experimental settings replicate in real organizational settings. We conducted a further study in order to test our hypotheses in the field.

### Study 3: field study

We examined the external validity of our theory through a field study in an organization. We asked employees of a large company to evaluate their team leaders on a standard measure of transformational leadership, and we also asked employees whether they tended to express or suppress their emotions at work on a standard measure of expressive suppression. In our analyses we sought to differentiate between charisma and individualized consideration as components of transformational leadership to see how each component related to followers' expressive suppression of emotions.

## Methods

### Participants and procedures

In conjunction with the human resources department of a German-based multinational automotive component company, we selected 94 teams across a range of white-collar jobs. The vice president of human resource development sent an e-mail to the 94 team leaders, asking them to forward a link to an online survey to all team members. The survey was available in English and German language versions. Each team had a unique identification code, enabling us to match the team members' responses with team leaders. Complete surveys were provided by 186 team members (150 men, 36 women, mean age = 42, mean tenure = 8 years) representing 53 teams (56% team-level response rate), of which 43 were located in Europe and 11 were located on other continents (eight in America, one in Asia, one in Africa).<sup>5</sup> The majority of respondents responded in English (68%). For 10 teams, a single team member answered. In the remaining 44 teams, two to eight team members provided answers, for an average of four responses per team. We were unable to calculate the within-team response rate, as we had no access to data confirming the total number of team members per team.

### Measures

To assess the charisma and individualized consideration of team leaders, we asked each team member to respond on 5-point scales (1 = not at all; 5 = frequently, if not always) to items from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5X short; Bass & Avolio, 1995). We measured each individual's perception of team leader charisma by combining 12 items ( $\alpha = .93$ ) concerning idealized influence and inspirational motivation into a single charisma score; and we measured individuals' perceptions of team leader individualized consideration by combining four items ( $\alpha = .74$ ) (for details see Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999). We checked whether team members within the same team converged in their ratings of the team leader, and whether there was variance in team leader ratings between different teams. ICC(1) values of .18 for charisma and .17 for individualized consideration suggested that this was the case. ICC(2) values were .45 for charisma and .43 for individualized consideration. There were significant mean differences among team leaders for charisma ( $F = 1.80$ ,  $df = 53, 145$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and for individualized consideration ( $F = 1.74$ ,  $df = 53, 145$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Furthermore, median  $r_{wg}$  values using a normal distribution were .88 for charisma and .83 for individualized consideration (James, Demaree, & Wolf, 1984) indicating strong within-team agreement (LeBreton & Senter, 2008). To account for the non-independence of team members' ratings, we aggregated the ratings to the team level and assigned a team-level score for charisma and individualized consideration to each team leader.

Emotion suppression was assessed with four items ( $\alpha = .81$ ) that constitute the suppression dimension of the Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ; Gross & John, 2003). Team members rated the extent to which they suppressed emotions at work on a 5-point scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). A sample item read: "I keep my emotions to myself."

As control variables at the team-member level, we included gender (0 = male, 1 = female) and language (0 = English, 1 = German). At the work-team level, we included location (0 = Europe, 1 = elsewhere).

### Analysis

To account for the non-independence of team members' ratings due to leader effects, we analyzed the data using hierarchical linear modeling (HLM, version 6.08, Raudenbush, Bryk, & Congdon, 2009). To find out whether the team leader at level 2 affected the expressive suppression of each team member within the leader's team at level 1, we looked for cross-level main effects of charisma

<sup>5</sup> In an additional robustness analysis we excluded the teams from Asia and Africa to control for cross-cultural comparison problems. The results remained unchanged.

and individualized consideration on emotion suppression (Hofmann, 1997). An important consideration in HLM is the standardization of variables. In line with other research on cross-level effects of leaders on followers (e.g., Kirkman, Chen, Farh, Chen, & Lowe, 2009), we ran the hierarchical linear modeling with raw score variables, without centering, to examine the unique effects at level 1 and level 2 (Hofmann & Gavin, 1998). The pattern of results did not change if group-mean or grand-mean centering was employed.

## Results

Means, standard deviations, and bivariate correlations for the study variables are presented in Table 3. There were no significant correlations between expressive suppression and the two leadership variables (charismatic influence and individualized consideration). But the two leadership variables were themselves strongly positively correlated ( $r = .82, p < .001$ ), in line with much prior research using the MLQ (Van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013). We conducted a confirmatory factor analysis to examine the discriminant validity of the measures. The latent factors charisma and individualized consideration were strongly positively correlated ( $r = .95, p < .001$ ). We computed the average variances extracted (AVE) for each factor, which should be greater than .50 to provide evidence for convergent validity, and the shared variance (SV), which should be smaller than the AVE values to provide evidence for discriminatory validity, following methodological recommendations (Farrell, 2010; Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The AVE values were .50 for charisma and .43 for individualized consideration, and the SV value was .90. We then compared the two-factor solution with a one-factor solution. There was weak support at the  $p < .10$  level ( $\Delta\chi^2 = 3.30, p = .069$ ) for the anticipated better fit of the two-factor solution ( $\chi^2 = 280.93, df = 103, CFI = .88, TLI = .84, RMSEA = .097$ ) relative to the one-factor solution ( $\chi^2 = 284.23, df = 104, CFI = .88, TLI = .84, RMSEA = .097$ ).

Due to the lack of distinctiveness of the measures, the study hypotheses could not be tested. The results of exploratory analyses involving hierarchical linear modeling are presented in Table 4. As shown in Step 1, whether the team members were men or women and whether they used English or German made no difference to their expressive suppression level: there were no significant associations between team member expressive suppression and the control variables. Step 2 shows cross-level main effects of team leader charisma ( $\gamma = .51, p < .01$ ) and team leader individualized consideration ( $\gamma = -.47, p < .01$ ) on team member expressive suppression. The findings could be affected by the lack of discriminant validity of the measures and by multicollinearity, due to the strong correlation between charisma and individualized consideration. To assess the risk of multicollinearity, we calculated the variance inflation factor (VIF) for charisma and individualized consideration based on the correlation provided in Table 3. The VIF was 3.03, which is lower than common recommended thresholds of 5 or 10 (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003). A VIF of 3.03 implies that the standard errors of the estimates are 1.74 times higher than they would be if charisma and individualized consideration were uncorrelated. The standard errors of charisma and individualized consideration were not particularly high, and the results remained unchanged when robust standard errors were used.

In additional exploratory analyses we excluded the teams with single respondents. The results remained unchanged for estimations with robust standard errors. We also ran analyses without the control variables (Becker, 2005). Again the results were not affected. Finally, as part of the MLQ, we also measured with four items the third component of transformational leadership, that is intellectual stimulation ( $\alpha = .77$ ). There was no evidence for discriminatory validity for the measure of intellectual stimulation. If we include intellectual stimulation as an additional predictor of emotion suppression, the coefficients for charisma and individualized consideration remained significant and in the same direction, whereas the coefficient for intellectual stimulation was not significant.

## Discussion

With Study 3 we endeavored to extend the results of the experimental studies to a field setting to grant some external validity to our research. In the context of work teams in a multinational company, we measured team leaders' charisma and individualized consideration with the MLQ to examine the effects of each leadership type on followers' emotion suppression. The results indicate issues with the discriminant validity between charisma and individualized consideration. Future field work would benefit from developing and applying measures of leadership that better distinguish between charisma and individualized consideration as separate variables than the MLQ. Furthermore, untying the measurement of leadership styles from the measurement of emotion suppression can counter

**Table 3**

Study 3: descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations.

	M	SD	Correlations				
			1	2	3	4	5
1. Emotion suppression	2.87	.75	(.81)				
2. Charisma	3.81	.69	.03	(.94)			
3. Individualized consideration	3.55	.78	-.07	.82***	(.76)		
4. Gender	.19	.40	-.08	.04	.07		
5. Language	.32	.38	-.03	-.06	.14	.04	
6. Country	.18	.47	-.09	.14	.07	.09	-.32***

The scores for charisma and individualized consideration were calculated as team-level means, assigned back to individuals. Internal consistency reliabilities are shown in brackets. Gender is coded with 0 = male, 1 = female; language with 0 = English, 1 = German; and team's country location with 0 = Europe and 1 = for elsewhere.

\*\*\*  $p < .001$  (two-tailed test).

**Table 4**

Study 3: results of hierarchical linear modeling for cross-level main effects of charisma and individualized consideration on emotion suppression.

	Step 1		Step 2	
	Estimate	s.e.	Estimate	s.e.
<b>Level-1 variables</b>				
Gender	−.14	.14	−.13	.14
Language	−.08	.16	.01	.16
<b>Level-2 variables</b>				
Country	−.19	.16	−.20	.15
Charisma			.51**	.17
Individualized consideration			−.47**	.17

The estimates are standardized regression weights. Robust standard errors (s.e.) are shown.

\*\*  $p < .01$  (two-tailed).

concerns of common method bias. Although the aggregation of individual responses to the group level attenuates such bias to some degree, the current study design does not preclude the possibility that results might have been affected by common method bias. In future research, such bias could be reduced or avoided, for example, by randomly splitting teams in two sub-groups, with one sub-group reporting on team leaders' behaviors and qualities, and the other sub-group reporting on team members' emotion suppression. In addition, although emotion suppression is an inherently intrapersonal process that is hidden from others and should thus be difficult to assess for others, peer-ratings of how emotionally expressive a team member is in the presence versus the absence of the team leader could be a useful supplement to self-ratings of emotion suppression.

## General discussion

We examined how two types of leadership commonly associated with transformational leadership – namely, charismatic leadership and individually considerate leadership – affect followers' emotional expressiveness. Leadership scholars generally advance the notion that transformational leadership liberates followers' emotional expressiveness. But research in the domain of status suggests that such leadership inhibits followers' emotional expressiveness. Through new theorizing and a series of three studies involving experiments as well as field research, we help resolve this controversy. We showed that the two different components of transformational leadership affect followers differently. Specifically, charismatic leaders, presumably because they are held in awe by followers, inhibit the extent to which followers express emotions. But leaders who exhibit individualized consideration tend to free followers to express their emotions. When leaders listen to followers, attend to their individual needs, operate on a one-to-one basis, and forge friendly relationships, then the emotions of followers are released.

Both charismatic leadership and individualized consideration belong to the repertoire of transformational leaders. These two leadership components are empirically strongly correlated though conceptually distinct (Bass, 2008). Prior work has tended to assume that both types of leadership have similar, indeed additive, effects on followers (Van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013). In contrast, we have hypothesized that charismatic leadership and individually considerate leadership can be understood as two very different sets of behaviors that yield distinct effects. On the one hand is the charismatic appeal of leaders who are admired for their exemplary, determined, visionary, often unconventional and courageous behavior. When leaders exert charisma, they take the center stage, leaving followers awestruck and inhibited in their expression of emotions. On the other hand is the provision of close, friendly and caring supervision by a leader who listens to what followers say, strives to provide individually-tailored learning experiences, and develops nurturing relationships. Here, followers open up and feel free to express emotions. Although separating charismatic leadership and individualized consideration empirically proved difficult in the field study, experimentally we were able to distinguish between the two components of transformational leadership and we found evidence for distinct effects of each component.

## Theoretical contributions

This research contributes to our understanding of how leaders influence followers' emotion regulation, responding to calls for "research concerning specific cognitive and behavioral strategies leaders use to effectively regulate [...] followers' emotions" (Gooty et al., 2010: 998). Extant work has emphasized that leaders are likely to affect followers' emotion regulation processes (Bono, Foldes, Vinson, & Muros, 2007), but most research has been concerned with the antecedent-focused stage of emotion regulation and thus questions of how leaders evoke and shape emotional experiences in followers (e.g., Dasborough, 2006; McColl-Kennedy & Anderson, 2002; Shamir et al., 1994). There has been limited attention to the response-focused stage of emotion regulation and issues such as how leaders influence followers' emotional expressiveness once followers experience emotions (Glasø & Einarsen, 2008). Our research remedies this neglect showing theoretically and empirically the distinct effects of leaders' charismatic influence and individualized consideration on followers' response-focused emotion regulation.

The disaggregation of the effects of different transformational leadership behaviors on followers' emotion processes represents another contribution of this study. In previous research, the differences between charisma and individualized consideration have been downplayed despite their conceptual distinctness. Indeed, charismatic and transformational leadership theories have often been treated as synonymous (e.g., Behling & McFillen, 1996; Hunt, 1999; Walter & Bruch, 2009). Our study shows that when it

comes to understanding the emotional processes underpinning transformational leadership, a more precise understanding of the functioning of each component of transformational leadership is helpful.

Particularly important is in our view that charismatic leadership facilitates expressive suppression. Our study builds on the rich body of research showing that charismatic leaders instill positive emotions in those who look up to them for guidance and inspiration (e.g., Bono & Ilies, 2006; Erez et al., 2008; McColl-Kennedy & Anderson, 2002). But our study questioned whether followers of charismatic leaders can freely express emotions. In concordance with status research showing that the behaviors of low and high status people in hierarchical relationships tend to complement each other rather than resemble each other (e.g., Keltner et al., 2003; Tiedens & Fragale, 2003), we found that followers in response to charismatic leadership subdue the expression of emotions. By extension, this research may suggest that charismatic leaders do not just cheer up their followers and imbue them with positive emotions, but rather that charismatic leadership also involves a status dynamic that impels followers to elevate the leader's standing above their own and that thus affects the extent to which followers feel free to express their emotions. Charismatic leaders stir the hearts of their followers and entice them with mesmerizing messages, and so followers hail their leader. But followers, in their admiration of the leader, are also likely to become awestruck – overwhelmed with emotion that they are too intimidated to express. We suggest that charismatic leadership works in part through this awestruck effect – the tendency of followers to suppress emotion expression as a result of conferring high status onto the leader.

The implications of the finding that charismatic leadership facilitates expressive suppression are particularly important in light of the consequences of emotion suppression that we outlined at the beginning of the introduction of this paper. Extant research shows that people's emotional experience and physiological responses are amplified to the extent that they inhibit emotional expressiveness. Although most evidence in support of this effect was gathered in experiments inducing negative emotions (e.g., Gross & Levenson, 1993, 1997), there is recent research documenting the amplification effect also for positive emotions (Korb, Grandjean, Samson, Delplanque, & Scherer, 2012). By extension, therefore, followers' inhibition of emotional expressions in the context of charismatic leadership may enhance the intensity of the emotions engendered by the charismatic leader. Perhaps, it is in part due to the response-focused emotion regulatory process facilitated by charisma that followers experience such strong feelings in reaction to the inspiration of the leader. Whether these suppression-induced elevated levels of emotional intensity may also over time lead to emotional exhaustion among followers of charismatic leaders is a research question worth pursuing in light of previous evidence about an expressive suppression–emotional exhaustion linkage (cf. Côté & Morgan, 2002; John & Gross, 2004; Schaubroeck & Jones, 2000). Early research on charismatic leadership suggested that those who worked with charismatic leaders were at risk of emotional exhaustion and estranged relationships at work (e.g., Bass, 1985).

The expressive suppression of emotions consumes mental resources and impairs cognitive processes (Richards & Gross, 1999, 2000, 2006; Schmeichel et al., 2008). These cognitive impairment effects might underlie the powerful influence of charismatic leaders on followers. If followers deploy mental resources to inhibit emotional outbursts and maintain composure while charismatic leaders stir their hearts, followers may have less cognitive processing capacity available to evaluate the messages of charismatic leaders. Followers may, therefore, be more likely to endorse such leaders with little scrutiny. This might explain why followers under the influence of charismatic leaders appear to "suspend their ability to make critical judgments" (Bass, 2008: 591). If followers, as a result of emotion suppression in the context of charismatic leadership, suffer a decrement in their cognitive functioning, then charismatic leadership may carry costs for followers that have thus far been overlooked. Charismatic leadership may have a dark-side for followers irrespective of whether leaders' goals are moral or immoral (Conger, 1990; Hogan, Raskin, & Fazzini, 1990; Howell & Avolio, 1992).

#### *Limitations and future research*

This research has disentangled the effects of charismatic leadership and individually considerate leadership, arguing that each type of leadership is distinct in its manifestation in interactions with followers from the other. But, even though many leaders may be either charismatic or individually considerate, some may be both. Indeed, our own Study 3 and much of the existing transformational leadership research reports strong correlations between leaders' charismatic influence and individual consideration, indicating that those types of leadership could be displayed by the same leader. Therefore, in cases in which charisma and individualized consideration are behaviors that characterize a single individual leader, the question arises: how and when does such a leader switch between inspiring awe, and encouraging emotion expression, between occupying high status in the eyes of followers, and operating as an egalitarian mentor and coach? And, how do followers, in turn, dynamically adjust and respond to such changes in behavior and style? Do they suppress emotions, when the leader exerts charisma, but open up and express emotions, when the leader considers them individually? Further work is necessary to examine how leaders combine or fail to combine charismatic appeal with individualized consideration of followers. For such endeavors, it is of paramount importance to develop measures that capture each distinct leadership behavior with appropriate discriminant validity.

Future research should also explore in greater depth why charismatic leadership and individually considerate leadership activate the expression and suppression tendencies of followers. In this study, we highlighted status differences in our theorizing, but we did not test for those differences in our empirical work. This limitation could be overcome in future work that examines how charismatic leadership and individually considerate leadership affect status differences between leaders and followers, and how these status differences in turn affect followers' emotion regulation. In this context, it would be interesting to examine whether followers' societal status (Côté, 2011) shapes the extent to which charisma and individualized consideration affect expressive suppression. Our theory suggests that charisma affects followers because followers assign high status to leaders while willingly accepting low status for themselves. Although this dynamic is plausible in any interaction (Clark, 1990), it is probably more likely for those who hold lower societal

status than the leader. Indeed, Bass noted that people who are "high in status are likely to resist charismatic leaders" (Bass, 1985: 39). Accordingly, the societal status of the followers might moderate the relationships we detected.

Future research should also consider both differences among followers and outcomes for followers. For example, it is well-established that there are individual differences in expressive behavior between people (Friedman et al., 1980). In our studies we did not assess or control for these individual differences in expressive behavior, even though such differences may well affect people's emotional responses to charismatic and individually considerate leaders. Furthermore, this research is limited in its considerations of the outcomes of emotion expression and suppression in the context of leadership. Although we elaborated in the discussion on potential outcomes, we did not empirically assess these outcomes and were thus unable to test how followers' suppression or expression of emotions in the context of leadership affects outcomes. We see this as an area of great potential for future research.

Finally, it would be interesting to examine the extent to which followers allow charismatic leaders not only to be spokespeople for the groups, but also to determine and control the emotions that groups may and may not feel (Menges & Kilduff, 2015). Future research should also investigate how charismatic leaders command followers' emotional eruptions and effusive displays, for example, during charismatic speeches. During those speeches followers are likely to inhibit emotional outbursts out of respect for high status leaders, even as these leaders ardently appeal to the emotions of followers. But when charismatic leaders invite emotional responses from the audience, then followers have permission to freely emote. Thus, perhaps the familiar experience of crowds responding to invitations by charismatic leaders to chant their responses and in other ways express themselves can be understood as the high-status charismatic leader granting permission for followers' emotional expression under the leader's control? Maybe the leader "defines those situations appropriate for the expression of emotions" (Weierter, 1997: 176) to provide followers a relief from the suppression of emotional expressions? Or leaders do so to energize themselves and check that their audiences are properly motivated (cf. Gooty et al., 2010; Riggio & Reichard, 2008)? Future research needs to explore the mostly implicit choreography of charismatic speeches in which leaders and followers engage in alternations of emotional expression and suppression.

### *Practical implications and conclusion*

What does this research mean for leaders and followers in organizations? We derive three practical implications. First, charismatic leaders should be aware of their emotionally suppressive effect on followers. Although putting followers in awe may reinforce the leaders' standing in the group, awestruck followers are unlikely to benefit the group in the long-term. Given the perilous consequences of emotion suppression, charismatic leaders need to find ways to release followers' emotions, perhaps by temporarily reducing their own status at times or by offering individualized consideration.

Second, individually considerate leaders should recognize that they have an encouraging effect on followers' emotion expression. Although they may circumvent the negative effects of emotion suppression, excessive levels of emotion expression from followers might also be detrimental, because uninhibited emotion expression violates social norms and can cause conflict (Butler, Gross, Philippot, & Feldman, 2004). In the workplace, rampant emotion expression might impair efficient coordination among employees (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002). Thus, if leaders find themselves amidst emotionally expressive followers, they may be able to calm situations by asserting status differences between themselves and their followers.

Third, for followers, the practical recommendation of this work is to beware the emotionally suppressive effects of charismatic leaders. Followers can potentially defend themselves against the inhibition of emotional expressiveness and its consequences by mentally reducing the status of charismatic leaders. It is not uncommon for people to remind themselves that a leader they admire is only human.

In conclusion, charismatic leadership, which involves inspiring followers toward a desired future, represents a distinctly different form of leadership than the mentoring and coaching that individually considerate leaders offer. Whereas charismatic leaders subdue the expression of followers' emotion, individually considerate leaders encourage such expression. Awestruck followers may suffer from expressive inhibition even as charismatic leaders stir their hearts.

### **Acknowledgments**

We thank Janaki Gooty and three reviewers for a constructive review process and insightful comments. Prior versions of this article benefitted greatly from the feedback we received during presentations at the Organizational Behaviour reading group at the University of Cambridge; the junior OB conference at Wharton; the young academics workshop of the Work, Organizational, and Business Psychology Section of the German Psychological Society at the University of Mainz; the Academy of Management meeting; the National University of Ireland Galway; and the University of Bonn.

### **References**

- Ashkanasy, N.M., & Daus, C.S. (2002). Emotion in the workplace: The new challenge for managers. *Academy of Management Executive*, 16, 76–86.
- Avolio, B.J., & Bass, B.M. (1991). *The full range of leadership development: Basic and advanced manuals*. Binghamton, NY: Bass, Avolio & Associates.
- Avolio, B.J., & Bass, B.M. (1995). Individual consideration viewed at multiple levels of analysis: A multi-level framework for examining the diffusion of transformational leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 199–218.
- Avolio, B.J., Bass, B.M., & Jung, D.I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, 441–462.
- Avolio, B.J., & Yammarino, F.J. (1990). Operationalizing charismatic leadership using a levels-of-analysis framework. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 193–208.
- 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.

- Barsade, S.G. (2002). The ripple effect: Emotional contagion and its influence on group behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47, 644–675.
- Bartel, C.A., & Saavedra, R. (2000). The collective construction of work group moods. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45, 197–231.
- Bass, B.M. (1985). Leadership: Good, better, best. *Organizational Dynamics*, 13, 26–40.
- Bass, B.M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*, 8, 9–32.
- Bass, B.M. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1995). *MLQ multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- Bass, B.M., Avolio, B.J., Jung, D.I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 207–218.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Becker, T. E. (2005). Potential Problems in the Statistical Control of Variables in Organizational Research: A Qualitative Analysis With Recommendations. *Organizational Research Methods*, 8, 274–289.
- Behling, O., & McFillen, J.M. (1996). A syncretical model of charismatic/transformational leadership. *Group and Organization Management*, 21, 163–191.
- Beyer, J.M. (1999). Taming and promoting charisma to change organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 307–330.
- Bono, J.E., Foldes, H.J., Vinson, G., & Muros, J.P. (2007). Workplace emotions: The role of supervision and leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1357–1367.
- Bono, J.E., & Ilies, R. (2006). Charisma, positive emotions and mood contagion. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 317–334.
- Brands, R., Menges, J.I., & Kilduff, M. (2015). *The leader-in-social-network schema: Perceptions of network structure affect gendered attributions of charisma*. *Organization Science* (in press).
- Burke, M.J., & Dunlap, W.P. (2002). Estimating interrater agreement with the average deviation index: A user's guide. *Organizational Research Methods*, 5, 159–172.
- Burke, M.J., Finkelstein, L.M., & Dusig, M.S. (1999). On average deviation indices for estimating interrater agreement. *Organizational Research Methods*, 2, 49–68.
- Butler, E.A., Egloff, B., Wilhelm, F.H., Smith, N.C., Erickson, E.A., & Gross, J.J. (2003). The social consequences of expressive suppression. *Emotion*, 3, 48–67.
- Butler, E.A., Gross, J.J., Philippot, P., & Feldman, R.S. (2004). Hiding feelings in social contexts: Out of sight is not out of mind. In P. Philippot, & R.S. Feldman (Eds.), *The regulation of emotion* (pp. 101–126). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cherulnik, P.D., Donley, K.A., Wiewel, T.S.R., & Miller, S.R. (2001). Charisma is contagious: The effect of leaders' charisma on observers' affect. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31, 2149–2159.
- Clark, C. (1990). Emotions and micropolitics in everyday life: Some patterns and paradoxes of 'place'. In T.D. Kemper (Ed.), *Research agendas in the sociology of emotions* (pp. 305–333). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Clark, M.S., & Finkel, E.J. (2005). Willingness to express emotion: The impact of relationship type, communal orientation, and their interaction. *Personal Relationships*, 12, 169–180.
- Clark, M.S., & Taraban, C. (1991). Reactions to and willingness to express emotion in communal and exchange relationships. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 27, 324–336.
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S.G., & Aiken, L.S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Conger, J.A. (1990). The dark side of leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 19, 44–55.
- Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 637–647.
- 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, 747–767.
- Côté, S. (2011). How social class shapes thoughts and actions in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 31, 43–71.
- Côté, S., & Morgan, L.M. (2002). A longitudinal analysis of the association between emotion regulation, job satisfaction, and intentions to quit. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 947–962.
- Damen, F., Van Knippenberg, D., & Van Knippenberg, B. (2008). Leader affective displays and attributions of charisma: The role of arousal. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38, 2594–2614.
- Dasborough, M.T. (2006). Cognitive asymmetry in employee emotional reactions to leadership behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 163–178.
- Dvir, T., Kass, N., & Shamir, B. (2004). The emotional bond: Vision and organizational commitment among high-tech employees. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17, 126–143.
- Ekman, P., & Friesen, W.V. (1969). Nonverbal leakage and clues to deception. *Psychiatry*, 32, 88–105.
- Elfenbein, H.A. (2014). The many faces of emotional contagion: An affective process theory of affective linkage. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 4, 326–362.
- Elyson, S.L., & Dovidio, J.F. (Eds.). (1985). *Power, dominance, and nonverbal behavior*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Erber, R., Wegner, D. M., & Therriault, N. (1996). On being cool and collected: Mood regulation in anticipation of social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 757–766.
- Erez, A., Johnson, D.E., Misangyi, V.F., LePine, M.A., & Halverson, K.C. (2008). Stirring the hearts of followers: Charismatic leadership as the transferal of affect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 602–616.
- Farrell, A. M. (2010). Insufficient discriminant validity: A comment on Bove, Pervan, Beatty, and Shiu (2009). *Journal of Business Research*, 63, 324–327.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 39–50.
- Friedman, H.S., Prince, L.M., Riggio, R.E., & DiMatteo, M.R. (1980). Understanding and assessing nonverbal expressiveness: The Affective Communication Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 333–351.
- Frijda, N.H., Kuipers, P., & ter Schure, E. (1989). Relations among emotion, appraisal, and emotional action readiness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 212–228.
- Glasø, L., & Einarsen, S. (2008). Emotion regulation in leader–follower relationships. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*, 17, 482–500.
- Goffee, R., & Jones, G. (2000). Why should anyone be led by you? *Harvard Business Review*, 78, 62–70.
- Gooty, J., Connally, S., Griffith, J., & Gupta, A. (2010). Leadership, affect and emotions: A state of the science review. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 979–1004.
- Grant, A.M., Gino, F., & Hofmann, D.A. (2011). Reversing the extraverted leadership advantage: The role of employee proactivity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54, 528–550.
- Gross, J.J. (1998). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Review of General Psychology*, 2, 271–299.
- Gross, J.J. (2002). Emotion regulation: Affective, cognitive, and social consequences. *Psychophysiology*, 39, 281–291.
- Gross, J.J. (2013). Emotion regulation: Taking stock and moving forward. *Emotion*, 13, 359–365.
- Gross, J.J., & John, O.P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 348–362.
- Gross, J.J., & Levenson, R.W. (1993). Emotional suppression: Physiology, self-report, and expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 970–986.
- Gross, J.J., & Levenson, R.W. (1997). Hiding feelings: The acute effects of inhibiting negative and positive emotion. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 106, 95–103.
- Groves, K.S. (2006). Leader emotional expressivity, visionary leadership, and organizational change. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 27, 566–583.
- Hewig, J., Hagemann, D., Seifert, J., Gollwitzer, M., Naumann, E., & Bartussek, D. (2005). A revised film set for the induction of basic emotions. *Cognition and Emotion*, 19, 1095–1109.
- Hofmann, D.A. (1997). An overview of the logic and rationale of hierarchical linear models. *Journal of Management*, 23, 723–744.
- Hofmann, D.A., & Gavin, M.B. (1998). Centering decisions in hierarchical linear models: Implications for research in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 24, 623–641.
- Hogan, R., Raskin, R., & Fazzini, D. (1990). The dark side of charisma. In K.E. Craik, & M.B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 343–354). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
- House, J.S. (1981). *Work stress and social support*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing.
- Howell, J.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1992). The ethics of charismatic leadership: Submission or liberation? *Academy of Management Executive*, 6, 43–54.

- Howell, J.M., & Shamir, B. (2005). The role of followers in the charismatic leadership process: Relationships and their consequences. *Academy of Management Review*, 30, 96–112.
- Hunt, J.G. (1999). Transformational/charismatic leadership's transformation of the field: An historical essay. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 129.
- James, L.R., Demaree, R.G., & Wolf, G. (1984). Estimating within-group interrater reliability with and without response bias. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 85–98.
- John, O.P., & Gross, J.J. (2004). Healthy and unhealthy emotion regulation: Personality processes, individual differences, and life span development. *Journal of Personality*, 72, 1301–1333.
- Johnson, S.K. (2008). I second that emotion: Effects of emotional contagion and affect at work on leader and follower outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 1–19.
- Kelly, J.R., & Barsade, S.G. (2001). Mood and emotions in small groups and work teams. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86, 99–130.
- Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D.H., & Anderson, C. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition. *Psychological Review*, 110, 265–284.
- Keltner, D., & Haidt, J. (2003). Approaching awe, a moral, spiritual, and aesthetic emotion. *Cognition and Emotion*, 17, 297–314.
- Keltner, D., Young, R.C., Heerey, E.A., Oemig, C., & Monarch, N.D. (1998). Teasing in hierarchical and intimate relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 1231–1247.
- Kennedy-Moore, E., & Watson, J.C. (2001a). *Expressing emotion: Myths, realities, and therapeutic strategies*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Kennedy-Moore, E., & Watson, J.C. (2001b). How and when does emotional expression help? *Review of General Psychology*, 5, 187–212.
- Kiesler, D.J. (1983). The 1982 Interpersonal circle: A taxonomy for complementarity in human transactions. *Psychological Review*, 90, 185–214.
- Kirkman, B.L., Chen, G., Farh, J.-L., Chen, Z.X., & Lowe, K.B. (2009). Individual power distance orientation and follower reactions to transformational leaders: A cross-level, cross-cultural examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52, 744–764.
- Korb, S., Grandjean, D., Samson, A.C., Delplanque, S., & Scherer, K.R. (2012). Stop laughing! Humor perception with and without expressive suppression. *Social Neuroscience*, 7, 510–524.
- LeBreton, J.M., & Senter, J.L. (2008). Answers to 20 questions about interrater reliability and interrater agreement. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11, 815–852.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (1996). *The connective edge: Leading in an interdependent world*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Locke, K.D., & Sadler, P. (2007). Self-efficacy, values, and complementarity in dyadic interactions: Integrating interpersonal and social–cognitive theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33, 94–109.
- Magee, J.C., & Galinsky, A.D. (2008). Social hierarchy: The self-reinforcing nature of power and status. *Academy of Management Annals*, 2, 351–398.
- Mann, S. (1999). Emotion at work: To what extent are we expressing, suppressing, or faking it? *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 347–369.
- Martin, J., Knopoff, K., & Beckman, C. (1998). An alternative to bureaucratic impersonality and emotional labor: Bounded emotionality at The Body Shop. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43, 429–469.
- McColl-Kennedy, J.R., & Anderson, R.D. (2002). Impact of leadership style and emotions on subordinate performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 545–559.
- McDougall, W. (1919). *An introduction to social psychology*. London: Methuen & Co.
- Menges, J.I., & Kilduff, M. (2015). Group emotions: Cutting the Gordian knots concerning terms, levels of analysis, and processes. *Academy of Management Annals*, 9, 849–932.
- Monin, J.K., Martire, L.M., Schulz, R., & Clark, M.S. (2009). Willingness to express emotions to caregiving spouses. *Emotion*, 9, 101–106.
- Naidoo, L.J., & Lord, R.G. (2008). Speech imagery and perceptions of charisma: The mediating role of positive affect. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 283–296.
- Newcombe, M.J., & Ashkanasy, N.M. (2002). The role of affect and affective congruence in perceptions of leaders: An experimental study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 601–614.
- Niedenthal, P.M., & Brauer, M. (2012). Social functionality of human emotion. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 259–285.
- Nowicki, S. (2000). *Manual for the receptive tests of the Diagnostic Analysis of Nonverbal Accuracy* 2. Atlanta, GA: Department of Psychology, Emory University.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman, R.H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107–142.
- Rafferty, A.E., & Griffin, M.A. (2006). Refining individualized consideration: Distinguishing developmental leadership and supportive leadership. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 79, 37–61.
- Rajah, R., Song, Z., & Arvey, R.D. (2011). Emotionality and leadership: Taking stock of the past decade of research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 1107–1119.
- Raudenbush, S.W., Bryk, A.S., & Congdon, R. (2009). *HLM 6 for Windows [computer software]*. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International.
- Richards, J.M., & Gross, J.J. (1999). Composure at any cost? The cognitive consequences of emotion suppression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 1033–1044.
- Richards, J.M., & Gross, J.J. (2000). Emotion regulation and memory: The cognitive costs of keeping one's cool. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 410–424.
- Richards, J.M., & Gross, J.J. (2006). Personality and emotional memory: How regulating emotion impairs memory for emotional events. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40, 631–651.
- Riggio, R.E., & Reichard, R.J. (2008). The emotional and social intelligences of effective leadership: An emotional and social skill approach. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23, 169–185.
- Rimé, B. (2007). Interpersonal emotion regulation. In J.J. Gross (Ed.), *Handbook of emotion regulation* (pp. 466–485). New York: Guilford Press.
- Schaffer, B.S., & Riordan, C.M. (2003). A review of cross-cultural methodologies for organizational research: A best-practices approach. *Organizational Research Methods*, 6, 169–215.
- Schaubroeck, J., & Jones, J.R. (2000). Antecedents of workplace emotional labor dimensions and moderators of their effects on physical symptoms. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 163–183.
- Schindler, I., Zink, V., Windrich, J., & Menninghaus, W. (2012). Admiration and adoration: Their different ways of showing and shaping who we are. *Cognition and Emotion*, 27, 85–118.
- Schmeichel, B.J., Volokhov, R.N., & Demaree, H.A. (2008). Working memory capacity and the self-regulation of emotional expression and experience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 1526–1540.
- Schwarz, N. (1990). Feelings as information: Informational and motivational functions of affective states. In E. T. Higgins, & R. M. Sorrentino (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition: Foundations of social behavior*, Vol. 2. (pp. 527–561). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Shamir, B., Arthur, M.B., & House, R.J. (1994). The rhetoric of charismatic leadership: A theoretical extension, a case study, and implications for research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 5, 25–42.
- Shields, S. A. (2005). The Politics of Emotion in Everyday Life: "Appropriate" Emotion and Claims on Identity. *Review of General Psychology*, 9, 3–15.
- Spencer, M.E. (1973). What is charisma? *The British Journal of Sociology*, 24, 341–354.
- Srivastava, S., Tamir, M., McGonigal, K.M., John, O.P., & Gross, J.J. (2009). The social costs of emotional suppression: A prospective study of the transition to college. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96, 883–897.
- Sweetman, J., Spears, R., Livingstone, A.G., & Manstead, A.S.R. (2013). Admiration regulates social hierarchy: Antecedents, dispositions, and effects on intergroup behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49, 534–542.
- Sy, T., Côté, S., & Saavedra, R. (2005). The contagious leader: Impact of the leader's mood on the mood of group members, group affective tone, and group processes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 295–305.
- Tiedens, L.Z., & Fragale, A.R. (2003). Power moves: Complementarity in dominant and submissive nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 558–568.
- Toegel, G., Kilduff, M., & Anand, N. (2013). Emotion helping by managers: An emergent understanding of discrepant role expectations and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56, 334–357.
- Van Knippenberg, D., & Sitkin, S.B. (2013). A critical assessment of charismatic–transformational leadership research: Back to the drawing board? *Academy of Management Annals*, 7, 1–60.
- 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.

- Walter, F., & Bruch, H. (2008). The positive group affect spiral: A dynamic model of the emergence of positive affective similarity in work groups. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 29*, 239–261.
- Walter, F., & Bruch, H. (2009). An affective events model of charismatic leadership behavior: A review, theoretical integration, and research agenda. *Journal of Management, 35*, 1428–1452.
- Wasielewski, P. L. (1985). The emotional basis of charisma. *Symbolic Interaction, 8*, 207–222.
- Watson, D., Clark, L.A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 1063–1070.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Weiarter, S.J.M. (1997). Who wants to play "follow the leader"? A theory of charismatic relationships based on routinized charisma and follower characteristics. *The Leadership Quarterly, 8*, 171–193.
- Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective Events Theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 18*, 1–74.
- Willner, A.R. (1968). *Charismatic political leadership: A theory*. Princeton, NJ: Center of International Studies, Princeton University.
- Zhu, W., Newman, A., Miao, Q., & Hooke, A. (2013). Revisiting the mediating role of trust in transformational leadership effects: Do different types of trust make a difference? *The Leadership Quarterly, 24*, 94–105.