This item is the archived peer-reviewed author-version of:

Development of a five-factor model charisma compound and its relations to career outcomes

Reference:

Vergauwe Jasmine, Wille Bart, Hofmans Joeri, De Fruyt Filip.- Development of a five-factor model charisma compound and its relations to career outcomes
Journal of vocational behavior - ISSN 0001-8791 - 99(2017), p. 24-39
Full text (Publisher's DOI): <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JVB.2016.12.005>
To cite this reference: <https://hdl.handle.net/10067/1391450151162165141>

Running head: FFM CHARISMA COMPOUND

Development of a Five-Factor Model charisma compound and its relations to career outcomes

Please cite as: Vergauwe, J., Wille, B., Hofmans, J., & De Fruyt, F. (2017). Development of a Five-Factor Model charisma compound and its relations to career outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 99, 24-39. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2016.12.005.

Jasmine Vergauwe^{1*}, Bart Wille², Joeri Hofmans³, and Filip De Fruyt¹

¹Ghent University, Belgium

²University of Antwerp, Belgium

³Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium

*Address correspondence to: Jasmine Vergauwe, Department of Developmental, Personality, and Social Psychology, Ghent University. H. Dunantlaan 2, B-9000 Gent. Belgium.

Jasmine.Vergauwe@ugent.be Tel.: +32 9 264 64 29

Address of first co-author: Bart Wille, Department of Training and Education Sciences, University of Antwerp. Sint-Jacobstraat 2-4, B-2000 Antwerpen. Belgium. Bart.Wille@uantwerpen.be

Address of second co-author: Joeri Hofmans, Research Group of Work and Organizational Psychology, Vrije Universiteit Brussel. Pleinlaan 2, B-1050 Brussel. Belgium.

Joeri.Hofmans@vub.ac.be

Address of third co-author: Filip De Fruyt, Department of Developmental, Personality, and Social Psychology, Ghent University. H. Dunantlaan 2, B-9000 Gent. Belgium. Filip.Defruyt@ugent.be

Development of a Five-Factor Model charisma compound and its relations to career outcomes

Abstract

Under the increasing influence of trait-perspectives on leadership, the current study introduces a personality-based measure of charisma. In order to obtain a Five-Factor Model (FFM) prototype for the charismatic leader, experts in the field of leadership and personality research were invited to participate in an expert panel. For each of the 30 NEO PI-R facets, experts ($N = 38$) rated the prototypic case of a successful charismatic leader on a scale ranging between 1 (*extremely low*) and 9 (*extremely high*). Based on the FFM count technique (Miller et al., 2005), an easy-to-use count was developed in which facets that were rated as being prototypically high (≥ 7) or low (≤ 3) were summed together to calculate the FFM charisma score. To investigate the predictive validity of the FFM charisma count in terms of work-related outcomes, the 1994 Ghent alumni sample was used in which college alumni ($N = 262$) were administered the NEO PI-R before entering the labor market and 15 years later when their professional careers had unfolded. The results demonstrate that FFM charisma was positively related to extrinsic career outcomes 15 years later, including income, number of subordinates, and managerial level. Moreover, FFM charisma was positively associated with adaptive performance, and with career roles that directly relate to charismatic leadership. It is concluded that the FFM charisma compound provides opportunities to map charismatic tendencies in a career-relevant way.

Keywords: charisma; personality; FFM count technique; career outcomes; leadership

In the leadership literature, there is disagreement among scholars about whether charisma is *an attribution* based on relational processes (e.g., Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000; Howell & Shamir, 2005; Waldman & Javidan, 2009), or rather *a personal characteristic* of the leader (e.g., Judge, Piccolo, & Kosalka, 2009; Riggio, 2009; Zaccaro, 2012). An important part of the leadership literature adopts the attributional perspective on charisma, in which charisma lies in the eye of the beholder, and leaders are not charismatic unless followers perceive them as such (e.g., Bass, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1987). However, even Weber, who is often cited as arguing in favor of this attributional approach, recognized the role of personality traits by noting that charisma applies to “*a certain quality of an individual personality, by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural powers or qualities*” (Weber, 1947, p. 358). This conceptualization of charisma illustrates that even the ‘attributionists’ acknowledge that there must be something about these leaders that provokes such charismatic attributions. In line with this idea, increased attention is being devoted to trait-perspectives on leadership (e.g., Judge et al., 2009; Zaccaro, 2012), while also contemporary definitions of charisma refer to a constellation of personal characteristics that allow an individual to influence other people by affecting their feelings, opinions, and behaviors (Riggio, 2009).

In this context, there have been several attempts to identify personality traits related to charismatic leadership (e.g., Bono & Judge, 2004; De Hoogh, Den Hartog, & Koopman, 2005; De Vries, 2012; House & Howell, 1992; Judge & Bono, 2000). Throughout this search, the hierarchical Five-Factor Model (FFM) of personality (Digman, 1990) has played a central role. Briefly, the FFM suggests that the comprehensive construct of personality can be represented by five broad personality domains, generally referred to as Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness (Goldberg, 1993). This five-factor structure of individual differences in personality has been shown to be universal (McCrae, Costa, del Pilar, Rolland, & Parker, 1998; McCrae et al., 2005), and the

hierarchical aspect of the FFM lies in the differentiation of each of the five domains in six specific traits or facets (Costa & McCrae, 1995).

A meta-analysis by Bono and Judge (2004) examined relationships between charisma and Big Five personality traits, in which charisma was conceptualized as part of transformational leadership, including the ‘idealized influence’ and ‘inspirational motivation’ dimensions of Bass’ scales (1998). Using the FFM as a guiding framework, only Extraversion ($\rho = .22$) and Neuroticism ($\rho = -.17$) were found to be significantly and consistently related to ratings of charisma, indicating that highly charismatic leaders tend to be more extraverted, and less neurotic. As for Openness and Agreeableness, results were inconsistent, indicating that these traits were sometimes positively associated, and at other times negatively associated with charisma. Finally, Conscientiousness did not relate significantly to charisma (Bono & Judge, 2004). As a set, the Big Five personality traits accounted for 12% of the variance in charisma. Although these findings thus provided some support for the dispositional basis of charisma, the proportion of variance explained was relatively small. Therefore, the authors suggested that the Big Five *domains* might be too broad to fruitfully capture the dispositional basis of charismatic leadership. As a solution, exploring the relationships between Big Five *facets* and charismatic leadership might prove worthwhile (Bono & Judge, 2004; Hough, 1992). Moreover, as the individual is a complex system, the study of single isolated personality traits is unlikely to fully capture its complex psychological reality (Furr, 2008). By focusing on the unique associations between traits and outcomes, one fails to consider that it is the *specific configuration of traits* that is most relevant for understanding and predicting work-related and career outcomes (Shoss & Witt, 2013). In the current study, a FFM charisma compound will be introduced that holds the advantage of representing a meaningful configuration of traits, with relevance to understand behavior at work.

Apart from contributing to our understanding of the specific personality features that underlie individual differences in charisma, understanding the underlying personality core

associated with charismatic leadership has important implications for practice, such as selection, training, and development of leaders. For instance, given that Big Five traits are relatively stable (e.g., Cobb-Clark & Schurer, 2012), and knowing that leader charisma has beneficial effects on followers, such as higher levels of performance, commitment, trust and satisfaction (e.g., Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993), charismatic tendencies could be taken into account when making employment decisions. Once a FFM charisma compound is developed through an expert consensus approach (Study 1), its construct validity will be investigated, as well as its predictive value for career outcomes 15 years later (Study 2).

An expert consensus approach and the FFM count technique

A personality-based measure of charisma will be obtained by using: a) an expert consensus approach (Lynam & Widiger, 2001); and b) the FFM count technique (Miller, Bagby, Pilkonis, Reynolds, & Lynam, 2005). First, an expert consensus approach will be used to obtain a prototypical *FFM profile* for the charismatic leader's personality. In this approach, experts in the field of charismatic leadership and personality are asked to rate the prototypic case of a charismatic leader in terms of personality, using all 30 facets of the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R; Costa & McCrae, 1995). Aggregation across these experts allows generating a FFM prototype for the charismatic leader, based on a selection of facets that are rated as prototypically high or prototypically low by the experts. Previously, this approach has also been used by Lynam and Widiger (2001) to generate FFM personality profiles for each of the DSM-IV (American Psychiatric Association, 2013) personality disorders. For instance, the FFM prototype of the narcissistic personality disorder was represented by *low* scores on all six facets of Agreeableness, one facet of Neuroticism, Extraversion, and Openness (i.e., self-consciousness, warmth, and feelings respectively), and it was also represented by *high* scores on one facet of Neuroticism and Openness (i.e., angry hostility and actions respectively), and two facets of Extraversion (i.e., assertiveness and excitement seeking) (see Lynam & Widiger, 2001). Moreover, in the applied field, FFM

profiles have been generated for organizationally relevant profiles, for instance for the entrepreneur (Obschonka, Schmitt-Rodermund, Silbereisen, Gosling, & Potter, 2013). The latter profile development, however, was limited to FFM domains instead of a differentiated profile development by means of facet descriptions.

Once an “expert generated FFM prototype” is obtained for the charismatic leader, the FFM count technique (Miller et al., 2005) will be used to create participants’ FFM charisma scores. In contrast to the complex scoring methodology of the prototype matching technique (Lynam & Widiger, 2001), in which expert generated prototypes (that use all 30 FFM facets) are matched to individuals’ FFM profiles, a simple sum of the most characteristic FFM facets will be used to obtain one’s charismatic personality score. The result can be considered as a “compound trait”, which is a linear combination of narrower personality facets that do not all co-vary (Shoss & Witt, 2013). The FFM count technique has proven to be a valid method to represent personality disorders in terms of convergent, discriminant, and predictive validity (e.g., De Fruyt et al., 2009; Miller et al., 2005; Miller, Reynolds, & Pilkonis, 2004; Wille, De Fruyt, & De Clercq, 2013a). For instance, Miller et al. (2005) demonstrated that the more easily calculated FFM counts perform as well as similarity scores that are generated by the prototype matching technique, in the sense that they are equally successful in predicting personality disorder symptoms. Further, the FFM count technique has proven to be a useful methodology to conceptualize and operationalize aberrant personality tendencies in the work context (e.g., De Fruyt et al., 2009; De Fruyt, Wille, & Furnham, 2013; Wille et al., 2013a).

With regard to the *FFM charisma compound*, we expect the experts to rate a prototypical charismatic leader as low on certain Neuroticism facets, and high on different Extraversion facets (Bono & Judge, 2004). As for the relations of charisma with the other Big Five traits, expectations are less clear. Because of the exploratory nature of an expert consensus approach, no a priori hypothesis are formulated.

Construct validity of the FFM charisma compound

Once a FFM charisma compound is obtained as an operationalization of what we believe to represent “charismatic personality” or “charismatic personality tendencies”, we aim to provide evidence for its construct validity. With regard to this validation process, it is important to distinguish between *formative* constructs, and *reflective* constructs (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Jarvis, 2005). If the indicators represent defining characteristics that collectively explain the meaning of the construct, a formative indicator measurement model applies. If, however, the indicators are manifestations of the construct in the sense that they are each determined by it, a reflective indicator model is appropriate.

In the present paper, we conceptualize charismatic personality as a unique constellation of characteristics that are combined in one and the same person (i.e., a formative construct). The reason is that, very much like transformational leadership (see MacKenzie et al., 2005), charismatic personality is formed by components that are conceptually distinct, that are likely to have different antecedents and/or consequences, and that are not interchangeable. This for example shows in the fact that it is not difficult to imagine a person who is low on neuroticism but also low on extraversion (with low neuroticism and high extraversion being two characteristics of charismatic people (see Bono & Judge, 2004)). When charismatic personality would be a reflective construct, the neuroticism and extraversion scores should be determined by it and therefore a low neuroticism - low extraversion constellation should logically not appear (instead, low neuroticism should always be accompanied by high extraversion). In sum, because the FFM charisma characteristics are conceptually distinct, are not expected to co-vary, and are not interchangeable, we modeled charismatic personality as a formative construct.

Specifying charismatic personality as a formative construct has important implications for the validation process of the construct. Although one could use a *composite*- instead of a *common* latent construct CFA model (i.e., for reflective constructs), testing the structural

validity of a compound construct is not conventional (e.g., Lynam & Widiger, 2001; Miller, Lynam, Widiger, & Leukefeld, 2001), nor particularly informative. Instead, attention must be paid to the nomological or criterion-related validity of the construct, such as its correlation with valid criteria or with a validated measure of the same construct. Regardless of whether the indicators are formative or reflective, test-retest reliability is also useful to evaluate the construct's validity (MacKenzie et al., 2005). Because of these reasons, the validity of the FFM charisma compound will be investigated in terms of (a) convergent validity; (b) test-retest reliability; and (c) predictive validity in the present paper.

Convergent Validity

A first question that will be addressed in this validation process is whether leaders with a charismatic personality, as defined by their scores on the FFM charisma compound, are also rated as highly charismatic by (a) themselves, and (b) by their subordinates. To examine this question, we assessed leader's self-perceptions of charismatic leadership and subordinates' perceptions of their leaders' charismatic leadership styles using a widely accepted charisma instrument, namely the Conger-Kanungo Scale (CKS; Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 1997) of charismatic leadership. As charisma concerns personal characteristics that allow an individual to influence other people by affecting their feelings, opinions, and behaviors (Riggio, 2009), charismatic personality tendencies should be reflected in the eye of the beholder, and thus in both self-perceptions of leader charisma and followers' attributions of the leader's charisma.

Hypothesis 1. FFM charisma relates positively to self-perceptions of leader charisma and to followers' attributions of charismatic leadership.

Test-retest Reliability

Moreover, another aspect of this validation process relates to the long-term stability of the FFM charisma compound (cf. test-retest reliability). Given that the FFM personality traits are relatively stable over time (Cobb-Clark & Schurer, 2012; Roberts & DelVecchio, 2000),

and the FFM charisma compound is a linear combination of FFM facets, we can expect FFM charisma to be relatively stable as well. Despite the presence of several major life events in the particular life stage we are investigating (i.e., between 23 and 38 years old), such as graduation from college, entering a specific career, and most likely getting married and having children, we can expect a relatively high rank-order stability. Based on meta-analytic population estimates of trait consistency in the age categories 22-29 ($\rho = .57$) and 30-39 ($\rho = .62$) (Roberts & DelVecchio, 2000), we expect the test-retest correlation to be around $r = .60$ for this specific age group.

Hypothesis 2. FFM charisma will show a stability coefficient around .60 across a 15-year time span.

Predictive Validity

A final and crucial step in the validation process of the FFM count relates to the ability of FFM charisma to predict work-related outcomes. This step is of particular importance to I/O psychologists as it allows relating FFM charisma to meaningful outcomes in the future. In the current study, we chose to incorporate a broad range of outcomes, as charismatic personality may have differential associations with various criteria. Specifically, the predictive validity of the FFM charisma compound will be investigated with respect to (a) extrinsic career success; (b) career roles; and (c) job performance.

Consistent with other studies, we conceptualize extrinsic career success as a construct that includes the income level of the employee, the number of subordinates, and the current managerial level (e.g., Dries, Pepermans, Hofmans, & Rypens, 2009; Wille, De Fruyt, & De Clercq, 2013a). Commonly, a distinction is made between *intrinsic* and *extrinsic* career success (Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, & Barrick, 1999; Wille et al. 2013a). Whereas intrinsic success is more subjective, for instance one's level of career satisfaction, extrinsic success is relatively objective and tangible. According to the career success model (Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2007), one important mechanism through which career success is obtained concerns

social behavior. Social behavior is referred to as the capabilities to build and sustain social relationships at work, which are considered to be manifestations of underlying personality traits. Given that charismatic leaders have a tendency to be extraverted and display high levels of social behavior (Bono & Judge, 2004), we expect charismatic personality tendencies to relate to higher career success. Specifically, as charismatic leaders usually are inspirational, energetic, and optimistic about the future, and have the ability to evoke enthusiasm, and commitment in their followers by using excellent rhetoric abilities (e.g., Emrich, Brower, Feldman, & Garland, 2001), climbing the career ladder more easily can be expected. This is consistent with previous research demonstrating positive associations between CEO charisma and career success markers, such as salary (Tosi, Misangyi, Fanelli, Waldman, & Yammarino, 2004). Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis 3. FFM charisma is positively related to extrinsic career success, indicating that highly charismatic personalities will have a higher salary, a higher number of subordinates, and a higher managerial level.

Although extrinsic career success markers are informative, these outcomes might be better indicators for career success, or *leadership* in general, than for *charismatic leadership*. Therefore, we do not only look at career success, but also at specific career roles that people are embedded in. In particular, we will study whether college alumni with a highly charismatic personality are more likely to find themselves in a charismatic leadership-related career role 15 years later. According to the Career Roles Model (CRM; Hoekstra, 2011), career roles are considered to be the building blocks of individual careers, and can be described as enduring aspects of work roles that an employee identifies with. In a job with a certain level of autonomy, six career roles can be distinguished that are potentially attainable according to the CRM (Hoekstra, 2011). The Maker role is focused on producing tangible results, and pertains to employees making things happen. A second career role, that is also focused on *individual performance*, is the Expert role. In the latter role, however, the focus is

on problem solving rather than on realizing a preset goal. Further, the Presenter and Guide role can be defined in the realm of *interaction with others*. Here, role takers can be distinguished by their focus on convincing and influencing others, or helping others to move towards their goals, respectively. Finally, the Director and Inspirator roles fit into the domain of *collective developments* of groups and organizations. While the Director role focuses on attaining long term goals and collective success, the Inspirator role focuses on strategic change processes by exploring ideals, values and principles shared by the collective.

According to gravitation theories (Donohue, 2006; Woods & Hampson, 2010) people actively shape their work environment to enhance person-environment fit. On these grounds, one can assume that people progress through their career into roles that fit their personality. Note that a longitudinal design is indispensable to investigate the predictive validity of the FFM charisma compound in relation to career roles. In contrast, concurrent relationships between charisma and career roles can be explained by the role one is currently in. For instance, people in Inspirator roles probably have to behave in a charismatic way because they are currently in an Inspirator role. In the current study, we are specifically interested in how charismatic personalities ‘gravitate’ toward career roles that fit their needs 15 years later.

As charismatic leaders typically emphasize collective identity, communicate a collective mission and pursue collective goals and interests (Bass, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1998), we expect highly charismatic personalities to end up more easily in a Director and Inspirator role 15 years later. Moreover, as one of the hallmarks of the charismatic leader involves displaying exceptional strategic vision and articulation (Conger et al., 1997) using advanced rhetoric abilities (e.g., Emrich et al., 2001), we further expect a positive association with the Presenter role. Regarding the relation between charismatic personality and the Guide role, we also predict a positive association. Although the Guide role is very typical for a broad range of helping professions, this role is also seen in management positions, in which it is more focused on committing and connecting others, rather than on offering concrete help

(Hoekstra, 2011). Finally, given the strong emphasis on independent individual production in both the Maker and the Expert role (Hoekstra, 2011), we do not expect to find a longitudinal association with charismatic personality. This is in line with Conger (1990), who raised that charismatic leaders may become so excited by their mission, that the implementation of their ideas hangs back. In that perspective, these career roles may have a better fit with positions as performant subordinates, instead of leaders.

Hypothesis 4. FFM charisma is positively related to the (leadership-related) Director and Guide roles, and to the (charismatic leadership-related) Inspirator and Presenter roles.

As a final set of outcomes potentially related to charismatic personality, we included three subtypes of job performance: task-, contextual-, and adaptive performance. Although the distinction between task and contextual performance is well established (e.g., Borman & Motowidlo, 1997), increased attention is being devoted to a third dimension of performance: adaptive performance (e.g., Griffin, Neal, & Parker, 2007; Jundt, Shoss, & Huang, 2015; Pulakos, Arad, Donovan, & Plamondon, 2000). Task performance refers to quality of work regarding one's job responsibilities (see Renn & Fedor, 2001). Contextual performance taps into the interpersonal facilitation dimension by Van Scotter and Motowidlo (1996), including cooperative acts that assist coworkers' performance. Finally, adaptive performance refers to dealing appropriately with uncertain, unpredictable, or crisis situations at work (see Pulakos et al., 2000).

Charismatic leaders are more likely to emerge in situations of crises (Pillai, 1996; House & Aditya, 1997), and in environments characterized by a high degree of challenge and opportunities for change (De Hoogh et al., 2005). Further, it has been shown that charismatic leadership is most effective under conditions of environmental uncertainty (Waldman, Ramirez & House, 1996). A high level of adaptive performance is thus needed to operate effectively in these types of environments. With regard to task and contextual performance,

charismatic leadership has been found to influence *subordinates'* task performance (Judge & Piccolo, 2004) as well as contextual performance (Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang, & Chen, 2005). As we expect the highly charismatic personalities to be more likely to hold leadership positions (cf. Hypothesis 3), their focus might be less on individual task and contextual performance. Taken together, we hypothesize a positive relationship between charismatic personality and adaptive performance. As for the relation of FFM charisma with task and contextual performance, no a priori hypotheses will be formulated.

Hypothesis 5. FFM charisma is positively related to adaptive performance.

Plan of Study

The current manuscript includes two studies. Using an expert consensus approach, Study 1 aims to get in-depth information regarding the core personality traits of a charismatic leader in order to develop a FFM charisma compound. In Study 2, convergent validity, test-retest reliability, and predictive validity evidence in terms of career-relevant outcomes will be provided for the proposed FFM charisma compound. Specifically, associations between FFM charisma and (a) extrinsic career success; (b) career roles; and (c) job performance will be investigated over a 15 year time period.

STUDY 1:

Construction of the FFM charisma compound

Materials and Methods

Participants and Procedure

Experts in the field of leadership and personality research were invited to participate in an expert panel. A similar procedure was followed as in Lynam and Widiger (2001), in which expert generated FFM prototypes were obtained for personality disorders. To be included in this panel, significant expertise with charismatic leadership and personality profiling was required. Through electronic searches on the Web of Science using the search terms “charisma”, “charismatic”, “personality”, “Big Five”, “NEO PI-R”, 58 experts were

identified. As such, researchers had to have at least one publication within the leadership domain. Moreover, 24 practitioners active in the (international) field of leadership consultancy were contacted to participate in the expert panel. Of these 82 experts, 38 completed the online survey (i.e., 46.34 %). Most of the experts were male (84%), and their mean age was 42.47 years ($SD = 11.88$). Participants were highly educated, holding a PhD (76%) or a Master's degree (24%). The experts originated from the United States (29%), Belgium (21%), the Netherlands (15%), Germany (11%), United Kingdom (8%), Canada (5%), Switzerland (5%), Singapore (3%), and France (3%). Moreover, 90% ($N = 34$) indicated to be I/O psychologists, and 10% ($N = 4$) indicated to be applied personality researchers. In terms of occupational profiles, the experts indicated to be mainly (26%) or exclusively (47%) academic, as much academic as practitioner (13%), or mainly (8%) or exclusively (6%) practitioner.

To obtain prototype descriptions of the charismatic leader, a similar procedure was followed as in Lynam and Widiger (2001). For each of the 30 NEO personality traits, experts were asked to rate the prototypical case of a charismatic leader on a 1-to-9 scale. The label of each of the 30 NEO PI-R facets was provided (e.g., modesty) along with two to four adjectives that described both poles of the trait dimension. For example, modesty was assessed using the following descriptors: confident, boastful, arrogant (*extremely low*), versus meek, self-effacing, humble (*extremely high*). Adjectives were adopted from Lynam and Widiger (2001), who relied on the NEO PI-R test manual and the FFM adjective checklists (Costa & McCrae, 1992), except for the adjectives for the facet positive emotions (i.e., placid, anhedonic versus high-spirited), that were taken from the National Character Survey (i.e., somber, sober versus happy, cheerful, joyous; McCrae & Terracciano, 2006). As descriptions of charismatic leadership already include important personality-related adjectives, the experts were not primed or steered with a definition of charismatic leadership, as this was intertwined with their task to describe the prototypical charismatic leader in terms of personality traits.

Experts were assured that their individual ratings would be held confidential and aggregated with the other expert ratings. The specific instructions read as follows (see Lynam & Widiger, 2001):

*We would like you to describe **the prototypic case for a successful charismatic leader** on a 1 to 9 point scale, where 1 indicates that the prototypic charismatic leader would be extremely low on the trait, 5 indicates that the charismatic leader would typically have an average score on the trait, and 9 indicates that the successful charismatic leader would be extremely high on that trait. For traits that are deemed irrelevant to describe the prototypical case of a successful charismatic leader, please indicate “irrelevant” (IR).*

For example, for the vulnerability trait dimension, a score of 1 would indicate that the prototypical case of a successful charismatic leader is evaluated as extremely low in vulnerability (i.e., stalwart, brave, fearless, unflappable), whereas a score of 9 would indicate that the successful charismatic leader is assessed as extremely high in vulnerability (i.e., fragile, helpless). A score of 5 would indicate that the successful charismatic leader is expected to have an average score on vulnerability, while an endorsement of “irrelevant” (IR) would indicate that the vulnerability trait dimension is not a meaningful personality descriptor of this professional profile (in other words: successful charismatic leaders may as well score extremely high, extremely low, or average on this trait). Please rate the prototypic case for a successful charismatic leader on each of the 30 trait dimensions.

Two criteria were used in order to select the NEO facets that will form the FFM charisma compound. First, the most characteristic traits were selected by using cut-off scores on the mean expert ratings on the 30 facets. Facets that are rated as prototypically high (≥ 7) or prototypically low (≤ 3) were selected for inclusion in the FFM charisma compound (see Miller et al., 2005). Second, there had to be sufficient agreement among the experts regarding

the prototypical score on each of the selected facets. Therefore, inter-rater agreements (IRA) had to be sufficiently high (i.e., IRA of .71 to .90; LeBreton & Senter, 2008).

Results

The charismatic personality prototype descriptions

Table 1 provides means and standard deviations of the expert ratings for each of the 30 NEO facets. Similar as in Miller et al. (2005), facets that were rated as prototypically high (≥ 7) or prototypically low (≤ 3) are summed together to obtain a FFM count score (i.e., FFM count technique; see Miller et al., 2005). To allow for enough differentiation on the trait continuum, we used a 9-point rating scale instead of a 5-point scale. Hence, the cut-offs we used for inclusion in the FFM charisma compound, were proportional to the cut-offs used by Miller et al. (2005) (i.e., ≥ 4 and ≤ 2 for a 5-point scale). Following this procedure, 12 facets were selected for inclusion in the FFM charisma compound: four Neuroticism facets (i.e., anxiety, depression, self-consciousness, and vulnerability), five Extraversion facets (i.e., warmth, gregariousness, assertiveness, activity, and positive emotions), two Openness facets (i.e., actions and values), and one Conscientiousness facet (i.e., achievement striving). Before computing the FFM charisma count, however, the Neuroticism facets that are considered to be prototypically *low* for the charismatic leader must be reverse scored (i.e., indicated by (r) in the formula below). In this way, all facets are framed in the same direction so that high scores on the FFM charisma compound indicate high levels of charismatic personality. None of the selected facets was indicated as “irrelevant” by the experts. The expert consensus approach resulted in the following FFM charisma count score:

$$\text{FFM charisma} = N1 (r) + N3 (r) + N4 (r) + N6 (r) + E1 + E2 + E3 + E4 + \\ E6 + O4 + O6 + C4$$

In summary, the experts described the prototypical charismatic leader to be low on several Neuroticism facets, indicating that they are in general relaxed, unconcerned, cool

(N1 (r): low on anxiety); optimistic (N3 (r): low on depression); self-assured, glib, shameless (N4 (r): low on self-consciousness); clear-thinking, fearless, and unflappable (N6 (r): low on vulnerability). Moreover, the experts rated the charismatic leader as typically high on all Extraversion facets, except for excitement seeking. This means that the charismatic leader tends to be cordial, affectionate, attached (E1: high on warmth); sociable, outgoing (E2: high on gregariousness); dominant, forceful (E3: high on assertiveness); vigorous, energetic, active (E4: high on activity); happy, cheerful, and joyous (E6: high on positive emotions). Further, two Openness facets have been indicated to be prototypically high for the charismatic leader, namely actions (O4: unconventional, eccentric) and values (O6: permissive, broad-minded). Finally, within the Conscientiousness domain, achievement striving (C4: workaholic, ambitious) is perceived to be high in charismatic leaders, and none of the Agreeableness facets came out as a relevant personality-related description of the prototypical charismatic leader.

Agreement among experts

For estimating the $r_{wg(j)}$ inter-rater agreement (IRA) coefficients (James, Demaree, & Wolf, 1984) among the experts, the procedures developed by LeBreton and Senter (2008) were followed. In particular, prior to calculating IRA estimates, our data was restructured such that raters became variables. Next, the observed variance within each NEO facet across the experts (obs_var) was estimated. Finally, a uniform null distribution was used in the computation of $r_{wg(j)}$ for the NEO facet scales, such that each response option had an equal chance of being selected by a judge. For a 9-point scale, this resulted in an expected error variance (σ^2_E) of 6.67 (see Table 2 in LeBreton & Senter, 2008), to estimate $r_{wg(j)}$ as $1 - (\text{obs_var}/6.67)$. To evaluate the level of rating similarity, guidelines of LeBreton and Senter (2008) were used (p. 836). As the results in Table 1 show, there exists a strong agreement among the experts (IRA of .71 to .90) for the majority of the selected facets. For two of the chosen facets, i.e. Self-consciousness (.70) and Warmth (.65), there was a moderate

agreement among the experts (IRA of 51 to .70). On average, the within group agreement for the selected FFM facets was strong (*Average* $r_{wg} = .80$). To conclude, the 12 facets forming the FFM charisma compound meet the criteria of (1) being described as highly characteristic for the charismatic leader, (2) with sufficient agreement among the experts.

STUDY 2:

Construct- and predictive validity of the FFM charisma compound

Materials and Methods

Procedure and Participants

Sample 1. To provide initial convergent validity evidence for the FFM charisma compound, Belgian leaders ($N = 41$) completed the first half NEO PI-R (McCrae & Costa, 2007), and both the leaders as well as their direct subordinates ($N = 41$) completed the Conger-Kanungo Scale (Conger et al., 1997) to evaluate the leaders' charismatic leadership style. Leader-subordinate dyads were recruited by a final year undergraduate student in the context of a master's thesis research. Among the participating organizations were a real estate firm (35%), a retail company (23%), a chemistry firm (16%), a hospital (14%), and a telecom company (12%). After the management had expressed their commitment to participate, employees in a leadership position were informed about the study by email, including a noncommittal request to participate through an online survey. Each of the targets was asked to nominate one direct subordinate who was able to evaluate their superior. To encourage honest responses, confidentiality was guaranteed to both the target leaders as well as their subordinates. Participating leaders were on average 38.63 years old ($SD = 10.64$), and 66% were male. Target leaders had a mean tenure in their current job of 7.87 years ($SD = 8.28$), and had on average 12.41 ($SD = 12.83$) subordinates.

Sample 2. To test the predictive validity of the FFM charisma compound, this study relied on the "1994 Ghent alumni sample" – a sample of Dutch-speaking undergraduate alumni who participate in a longitudinal research project on personality development and

career trajectories (see also De Fruyt, 2002; De Fruyt & Mervielde, 1999; Wille et al., 2013a; Wille, Beyers, & De Fruyt, 2012; Wille, De Fruyt, & Feys, 2013b; Wille, Hofmans, Feys, & De Fruyt, 2014). In 1994 (Time 1; T1), 934 college students from a large variety of faculties completed the NEO PI-R three months prior to graduation. Fifteen years later, in 2009 (Time 2; T2), a follow-up study was conducted when the participants' career had unfolded. Data were used from a subsample of 262 participants from whom we have personality information in 1994 (T1) and 2009 (T2), and relevant career indicators in 2009 (T2). As the Ghent alumni cohort was still studying at T1, career outcomes could only be assessed at T2. Fifty-two percent of this sample was male, and the mean age was 37.22 years at T2 ($SD = 1.21$). The participants were occupied in a broad range of companies from different employment sectors. Studies part of this research project already illustrated the importance of *Big Five traits* with regard to initial job choice, early career work adjustment, work attitudes, work-family conflict, and career transitions (De Fruyt, 2002; De Fruyt & Mervielde, 1999; Wille et al., 2012; Wille et al., 2013b, Wille et al., 2014). Moreover, the validity of *FFM aberrant compounds* (e.g., antisocial personality disorder (PD) compound, narcissistic PD compound, borderline PD compound) to predict intrinsic and extrinsic career outcomes was investigated (Wille et al., 2013a). The current study is the first to focus on the predictive validity of *charismatic personality* (i.e., FFM charisma) for a broad range of career outcomes. As in Wille et al. (2013a), extrinsic career outcomes are selected as relevant criteria in relation to FFM charisma. Different than Wille et al. (2013a), this study further takes into account six career roles, and three subtypes of job performance as relevant career outcomes.

Measures

Charismatic Personality. The FFM charisma compound was used to measure participants' charismatic personality. Leaders in Sample 1 completed the first half NEO PI-R to obtain FFM charisma scores. The NEO PI-R *First Half* consists of the first 120 items of the NEO PI-R, including four items for each of the 30 facets. Evidence is accumulating that brief

versions of the NEO Personality Inventories, consisting of 120 items instead of the original 240, are good and time-saving alternatives for research, advantaged by the retention of fine-grained descriptions of personality in terms of NEO facets (e.g., *NEO PI-3 First Half* in McCrae & Costa, 2007; *NEO PI-R Short Form* in Mooi et al., 2011; *IPIP-NEO-120* in Johnson, 2014). In Sample 1, the internal consistency of the FFM charisma compound (48 items) was .88. In Sample 2, participants completed the full NEO PI-R in both phases of the longitudinal design. Cronbach alpha's for the FFM charisma compound (96 items) were .93 when the NEO PI-R was administered for the first time (T1), and .94 when the sample rated their personalities 15 years later (T2). In Sample 2, FFM charisma (48 items) based on the *first half* NEO PI-R, including four items per facet, correlated .97 with FFM charisma (96 items) based on the full NEO PI-R comprising eight items per facet.

Charismatic Leadership. In Sample 1, both leaders and their respective subordinates provided ratings on charismatic leadership using the 20-item Conger-Kanungo Scale (CKS; Conger et al., 1997). The CKS contains five subscales of charismatic behavior: strategic vision and articulation (7 items), personal risk (3 items), sensitivity to the environment (4 items), sensitivity to members' needs (3 items), and unconventional behavior (3 items). Items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not characteristic*) to 5 (*very characteristic*). Example items are "*Inspirational – able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what organizational members are doing*", and "*Engages in unconventional behavior in order to achieve organizational goals*". Cronbach alphas of the charismatic leadership scale were .85 and .73 for the self- and subordinate-ratings respectively, indicating a high level of internal consistency.

Extrinsic Career Success. To obtain extrinsic career success markers, participants of Sample 2 provided information on their monthly salary before taxes (i.e., income), managerial level of their current job, and number of subordinates at Time 2. Monthly salary was measured in twelve categories ranging from lower to higher income levels. Managerial level

was measured in five categories between 1 (= *no managerial position*) and 5 (= *top manager in a large company*). Number of subordinates was measured on a 6-point scale ranging between 1 (= *no subordinates*) and 6 (= *100 or more subordinates*). As such, the three career success markers were measured in an ordinal manner.

Career Roles. Participants of Sample 2 completed the 30-item Career Roles Questionnaire (CRQ; Hoekstra, 2011) at Time 2. Each of the six career roles were measured by means of five items: Maker role (e.g., “*Enjoy doing the utmost in the activity of carrying out a task*”), Expert role (e.g., “*Explicate the way complex systems work*”), Presenter role (e.g., “*Present an idea in such a way that all are impressed*”), Guide role (e.g., “*Achieve something with a person by empathic understanding*”), Director role (e.g., “*Take the lead in confusing situations*”), and Inspirator role (e.g., “*Inspire the people around me with a story from the heart*”). Respondents were asked to indicate how well each statement described the role they typically had in their work on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (= *not at all*) to 7 (= *very well*). Cronbach alphas of the scales were good, ranging between .85 (for Inspirator) and .92 (for Guide).

Job Performance. In Sample 1, leaders were evaluated by direct subordinates on their job performance. In Sample 2, participants provided self-ratings on their performance at Time 2. In both Samples, three performance areas were assessed: task performance (3 items; e.g., “*Delivers work with a minimal number of errors and instances of carelessness*”), contextual performance (4 items; e.g., “*Helps someone without being asked*”), and adaptive performance (4 items; e.g., “*Deals with unpredictable and unexpected work situations appropriately*”). The full item set can be found in the Appendix. All performance items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not characteristic*) to 5 (*very characteristic*). Self-rated task ($\alpha = .78$), contextual ($\alpha = .74$), and adaptive ($\alpha = .70$) performance had a high level of internal consistency in Sample 2. Cronbach alphas for the subordinate-rated performance scales in Sample 1 were somewhat lower: $\alpha = .63$ for task performance, $\alpha = .75$ for contextual

performance, and $\alpha = .65$ for adaptive performance. To test whether the 3-factor structure fitted the data well, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted in Mplus version 7.3. To evaluate model fit, we relied on the Root Mean Square of Error of Approximation (RMSEA), with values of $\leq .10$ pointing to an acceptable fit, values $\leq .08$ pointing to an approximate model fit, and values $\leq .05$ suggesting a good model fit (Chen, Curran, Bollen, Kirby, & Paxton, 2008). Moreover, we also used the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and the Tucker–Lewis Index (TLI), for which a value of $\geq .90$ suggests an adequate model fit. Finally, we also checked the Standardized root mean square residual (SRMR), for which a value of $\leq .08$ refers to a good model fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999). The results revealed that the 3-factor model of performance fitted the data well in both the self-rated version (Sample 2: RMSEA = .05; CFI = .95; TLI = .94; SRMR = .05) and the subordinate-rated version (Sample 1: RMSEA = .00; CFI = 1; TLI = 1; SRMR = .08). All descriptive statistics, correlations, and internal consistencies of the study variables are reported in Table 2 (for Sample 1) and Table 3 (for Sample 2).

Results

Convergent Validity

Consistent with our expectations (Hypothesis 1), correlational analyses in Sample 1 demonstrate that self-rated charismatic personality (FFM charisma) is positively related to both subordinate-rated charismatic leadership (CKS; $r = .38, p < .05$) as well as to self-rated charismatic leadership behavior (CKS; $r = .59, p < .001$) (see Table 2). Moreover, the FFM charisma compound accounts for respectively 15% and 39% of the variance in charismatic leadership, as rated by direct subordinates ($F(1,39) = 6.62, p < .05$), and the leaders themselves ($F(1,39) = 24.71, p < .001$).

Test-retest Reliability

Cross-time stability coefficients for the FFM charisma compound were calculated in Sample 2, between Time 1 and Time 2 (see Table 3). The test-retest correlation for FFM

charisma was .68 ($p < .001$), indicating relatively high rank-order stability over a 15-year time period (Hypothesis 2).

Predictive Validity

Both concurrent and longitudinal associations between FFM charisma and career outcomes were examined in Sample 2. The relationships between FFM charisma (T2) and career outcomes (T2) are referred to as “concurrent” associations, whereas the relationships between FFM charisma (T1) and career outcomes (T2) are referred to as “longitudinal” associations. To investigate these associations, 24 hierarchical regression analyses (1 predictor $\times$ 12 career outcomes $\times$ 2 time points) were conducted. As sex is likely to influence career success outcomes (e.g., Baruch & Bozionelos, 2011), we included sex as a control variable in each of the regression models (Step 1), followed by FFM charisma (Step 2). To investigate concurrent and longitudinal associations with career outcomes, FFM charisma at T2 and T1 respectively served as the predictor variable. Twelve career outcomes at T2 (i.e., 3 extrinsic career success markers, 6 career roles, and 3 types of job performance) served as the dependent variables. Results are summarized in Table 4.

Moreover, relationships between FFM charisma and job performance were also examined in Sample 1, in which job performance was *subordinate-rated*. Here again, a series of three hierarchical regressions were conducted, in which sex was entered in a first step followed by FFM charisma in a second step.

Extrinsic Career Success. Concurrent and longitudinal associations between FFM charisma and extrinsic career success markers were examined in Sample 2. The results in Table 4 confirmed our expectations regarding the relationship with career success (Hypothesis 3). Specifically, *income* (T2) was significantly positively related to FFM charisma after controlling for sex, both concurrently (T2: $\beta = .24, p < .001$) as well as longitudinally (T1: $\beta = .25, p < .001$). With regard to *number of subordinates* (T2), positive associations with FFM charisma were also consistently found (T1: $\beta = .18, p < .01$; T2: $\beta =$

.32, $p < .001$). Finally, we found *managerial level* (T2) to be positively related with FFM charisma from a concurrent (T2: $\beta = .27$, $p < .001$) and longitudinal (T1: $\beta = .12$, $p < .05$) perspective.

Career Roles. Relationships between FFM charisma and career roles were examined in Sample 2. As can be seen in Table 4, four career roles have significant and consistent relationships with FFM charisma, i.e. Presenter, Guide, Director, and Inspirator roles (Hypothesis 4). Although the strength of the associations between these career roles and FFM charisma is somewhat higher when personality and career roles were assessed concurrently at T2 (T2: $\beta = .30$, $.24$, $.38$, and $.28$ for Presenter, Guide, Director, and Inspirator respectively, $p < .001$), the Presenter ($\beta = .19$), Guide ($\beta = .18$), Director ($\beta = .19$), and Inspirator ($\beta = .15$) role still relate to FFM charisma (T1) across a 15-year time-span. The Maker role, on the other hand, was only significantly related to FFM charisma when personality was measured at T2 ($\beta = .19$, $p < .01$), and the Expert role was unrelated to FFM charisma (T1: $\beta = .11$; T2: $\beta = .06$, $p > .05$).

Job Performance. Relationships between FFM charisma and job performance were examined in both samples (Hypothesis 5). In Sample 1, where job performance was rated by direct subordinates of the leaders, we found a significant relationship between FFM charisma and adaptive performance ($\beta = .33$, $p < .05$), indicating that highly charismatic personalities tend to deal more appropriately with uncertain, unpredictable, or crisis situations at work. No significant relationship was found between FFM charisma and both task- and contextual performance ($\beta = -.05$ and $-.04$ respectively, $p > .05$). In Sample 2, where job performance was self-rated both concurrently and longitudinally, we found consistent relationships between FFM charisma and contextual- (T1: $\beta = .17$, $p < .01$; T2: $\beta = .28$, $p < .001$) and adaptive performance (T1: $\beta = .29$, $p < .001$; T2: $\beta = .42$, $p < .001$). Again, no significant relationship was found between FFM charisma and task performance (T1: $\beta = -.07$, $p > .05$; T2: $\beta = -.05$, $p > .05$).

Discussion

Despite several attempts to identify the dispositional building blocks of charismatic leadership, charisma is still very much a “black box”. Inspired by innovative approaches in the clinical literature on personality disorders (Lynam & Widiger, 2001; Miller et al., 2005), the current study is the first to propose a FFM charisma compound, as a personality-based operationalization of charisma. Compared to research that focuses on the relationships between charisma and isolated personality traits, our study focuses on a meaningful collection of traits that underlie charisma, thereby taking an integrative –rather than a fragmented– perspective on the individual. In what follows, we will summarize and discuss the major findings.

First, a FFM profile for the prototypical charismatic leader was proposed relying on ratings of experts in the field of leadership and personality. We sought to extend the five factor model understanding of charismatic leadership (e.g., Bono & Judge, 2004) by focusing on facet level information, and by considering the *specific combination of traits* which is most relevant for understanding and predicting work-related and career outcomes (Shoss & Witt, 2013). Agreement among the expert raters was relatively high. The lowest interrater agreements were obtained within the Agreeableness domain. Consistent with this, none of the Agreeableness facets came out as a relevant personality-related descriptor of the prototypical charismatic leader. This disagreement aligns with previous research that has shown divergent associations between charismatic leadership and Agreeableness-related constructs. On the one hand, charismatic leadership has been related to individualized consideration and empathic understanding, which is positively associated with Agreeableness (e.g., Judge & Bono, 2000). On the other hand, charismatic leadership has been related to overconfidence, hubris, and narcissism (Deluga, 1997; House & Howell, 1992; Sankowsky, 1995; Popper, 2002) – which are negatively associated with Agreeableness (e.g., Furnham & Crump, 2014). Consistent with these complexities, some of the experts noticed in the closing remarks of the survey that

they kept in mind the potential “dark side” of charisma (Conger, 1990; Howell, 1988), including narcissistic, exploitative, and non-egalitarian tendencies (Judge et al., 2009). Nevertheless, it seems that the modesty and kindness of agreeable persons is not the hallmark of charismatic leaders, an idea also expressed by Bono and Judge (2004).

Once an expert-generated-prototype for the charismatic leader was established, its convergent validity, cross-time stability, and predictive validity in terms of career outcomes was investigated. Here, we provided initial convergent validity evidence using both self-ratings and subordinate-ratings of charismatic leadership. Specifically, the combination of an observed association between FFM charisma and charismatic leadership of $r = .59$ for the self-ratings and $r = .38$ for the subordinate-ratings can be interpreted as relatively strong when keeping in mind that (1) the relationship between *two different constructs* was investigated, namely a personality measure (FFM charisma) and a measure of leadership behavior (CKS charismatic leadership), which is assumed to be a manifestation of the underlying personality core, and (2) the association between FFM charisma and subordinate-rated charismatic leadership concerns *two different rater perspectives*. For instance, the results by De Vries (2012) suggested that the relatively weak associations between personality and leadership styles are mainly due to the relatively low levels of self-other agreement between leaders and subordinates. Provided that other studies reported levels of self-other agreement among leaders and subordinates on *the exact same variables* of $r = .15$ (i.e., for transformational leadership, Judge, LePine, & Rich, 2006), we can be confident that FFM charisma taps into charismatic leadership. Further, self-rated FFM charisma accounted for 15 % of the variability in observer-rated charismatic leadership. Compared to Bono and Judge’s (2004) meta-analysis, in which they concluded that the Big Five traits accounted for 12 % of the variability in charisma, this is not a big improvement. However, comparison is difficult as we investigated the proportion of explained variance of *one* compound trait, instead of *five* separate personality domains (Bono & judge, 2004). To increase comparability, this share

increases to 46 % when the 12 personality traits of the FFM charisma compound are entered separately into the regression analysis. Taken together, preliminary evidence was found that charismatic personality tendencies are indeed reflected in the eye of the beholder, i.e., in followers' attributions of the leader's charisma.

With regard to the long-term stability of the FFM charisma compound, we found a test-retest correlation coefficient of .68, which is relatively high (Roberts & DelVecchio, 2000). Despite the major life events in the age group we are investigating (23 – 38 years old), for instance graduating, entering careers, and most likely being married and have children, we can conclude that charismatic personality tendencies are relatively stable over time.

Finally, the current study provided predictive validity evidence for FFM charisma in terms of career outcomes. First, the results supported our expectations regarding the relationship with three different extrinsic career outcomes. Higher charismatic tendencies are related to higher income levels, more subordinates, and a higher managerial position, across a 15-year time span. Second, individuals with charismatic tendencies are more inclined to hold a role as Director, Inspirator, Presenter, and Guide in their future careers. Although the Director and Guide role are conceptually related to a leadership role in general, the Presenter and the Inspirator role connect particularly to the *charismatic* leadership role (e.g., Bass, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Emrich et al., 2001). Further, a concurrent relationship was also found with the Maker role, which was inconsistent with our expectations given the strong emphasis on independent individual production in this role (Hoekstra, 2011). Although the association was smaller in magnitude than the relations we expected to find, and the relationship did not hold longitudinally, future research using observer ratings of career roles in addition to self-ratings may further shed light on this.

Finally, associations between FFM charisma and *job performance* were investigated in two samples: One cross-sectional sample using subordinate ratings of performance, and one longitudinal sample using self-ratings of performance. Overall, the only consistent

relationship was found between FFM charisma and adaptive performance. Charismatic personalities are thus more likely to score higher on adaptive performance – even when performance is measured 15 years later, or when performance is rated by subordinates. This is in line with our hypothesis, and reflects a tendency of charismatic leaders to operate more effectively in environments characterized by a high degree of challenge and opportunities for change (e.g., De Hoogh et al., 2005), in which it is important to deal appropriately with uncertain, unpredictable, or crisis situations at work. Further, contextual performance was only significantly related to FFM charisma when performance was self-rated, and task performance did not relate to charismatic tendencies in any case.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

Without undermining the attributional perspective on charismatic leadership, our results support the trait-perspective on leadership. If consistency exists in the eye of the beholder, there must be something in that leader that makes charismatic judgements consistent. Therefore, charismatic personalities are perceived to be charismatic. The current study was the first to propose a personality-based operationalization of charisma, by means of innovative techniques including an expert consensus approach and the FFM count technique.

Understanding the underlying personality core associated with charismatic leadership has important implications for practice, such as the selection, training, and development of leaders. First, an assessment of charismatic personality tendencies could be useful in a leadership selection context. Although this personality profile is not meant to relate exclusively to charismatic leaders, but to reflect a characteristic constellation of traits that makes charismatic leadership more likely, we found the FFM charisma compound to have meaningful and longitudinal associations with different career outcomes, such as climbing the career ladder more easily, and displaying higher adaptive performance levels. Moreover, as FFM charisma could be computed whenever the NEO PI-R is administered, this useful information can be obtained in a straightforward and time- and resource-friendly way.

Second, knowledge of charismatic personality tendencies may be used for coaching and development purposes. As it has been shown that charismatic leadership behaviors can be trained to a certain extent (e.g., Barling, Weber, & Kelloway, 1996; Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002), screening these traits may potentially aid in determining which individuals could gain most from a charismatic leadership training or coaching trajectory.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Some limitations of this study should be acknowledged. First, to provide initial convergent validity evidence for the FFM charisma compound, a sample of leaders completed the *first half* NEO PI-R (McCrae & Costa, 2007), and direct subordinates completed the Conger-Kanungo Scale (Conger et al., 1997) to evaluate their leaders' charismatic leadership style. Although we have reasons to believe that the first half NEO PI-R is as reliable and informative as the full NEO PI-R (e.g., $r = .97$ between the full and first half version in Sample 2), additional convergent validity evidence for FFM charisma is required.

A second limitation concerns the cut-off scores for inclusion in the FFM charisma compound. The expert-based prototype is composed of NEO facets with mean scores of 3 and lower (*low*), and 7 and higher (*high*). Obviously, cut-off scores are always arbitrary in some way, and different cut-offs provide different compounds. For instance, if the cut-offs for inclusion were on 3.5 and lower (*low*), and 6.5 and higher (*high*), 20 facets would have been included in the FFM charisma compound.

Third, although a relatively small sample was used (Sample 1), it holds the advantage of having observer-rated data on both charismatic leadership and job performance, in a sample of actual leaders. In contrast, the larger, longitudinal sample (Sample 2) only contains self-reported data in a heterogeneous sample of employees. As the latter sample was exclusively based on self-reports, common method bias can be a potential confound for some of the associations. The extrinsic career outcomes are objective rather than subjective ratings, and the career roles are mainly descriptive, which may alleviate these concerns in part. Job

performance, however, is mainly evaluative, increasing the importance of using different rater sources. To conclude, both study samples have their constraints, but one responds to the limitations of the other.

Finally, it is worth considering a replication of the expert generated prototype, taking into account the differentiation between *socialized charismatic leadership* – representing the positive side of charismatic leadership – and *personalized charismatic leadership*, including narcissistic, exploitative, and non-egalitarian tendencies (House & Howell, 1992). However, socialized and personalized charismatic leadership are not mutually exclusive (House & Howell, 1992) and represent a continuum rather than two distinct forms of charismatic leadership (Waldman & Javidan, 2009). In other words, charismatic leaders can display behaviors that reflect *both* bright (cf. ‘*socialized*’) and dark side (cf. ‘*personalized*’) charismatic personality tendencies (House & Howell, 1992; Judge et al., 2009; Waldman & Javidan, 2009). So, against recent developments in personality literature, supporting a dimensional perspective on aberrant personality (e.g., De Fruyt et al., 2013; O’Boyle, Forsyth, Banks, & McDaniel, 2012) in which dark side tendencies are considered to be extreme extensions of the bright side forms, a differential profile development might be a step backwards. The dark side of personality can be described as “*the impression we make when we let down our guard – when we are stressed, tired, or do not care how we are perceived*” (Kaiser & Hogan, 2007, p.12). Everyone has them, as they are part of our normal personality. For the bigger part, it is rather the situation that will determine whether one’s dark side arises to the surface or not (e.g., stress, fatigue, low control-perception). Therefore, future researchers could focus on replicating a “bright side” FFM charisma compound, keeping in mind that this profile is potentially associated with some dark sides, instead of developing two different FFM charisma profiles.

Conclusion

In line with increasing evidence in support of trait-perspectives on leadership, we argued that charisma does not exclusively exist in the eye of the beholder, but can be understood as a specific configuration of personality traits that does not relate exclusively to charismatic leaders, but reflects a characteristic constellation of traits that makes charismatic leadership more likely. In search for these specific characteristics, the current study was the first to extend the five factor model understanding of charismatic leadership by using an expert consensus approach to obtain the FFM charisma compound. Moreover, the current study provided initial convergent validity evidence for FFM charisma, and illustrated that this trait configuration is relatively stable over a 15-year time span. Our findings show that FFM charisma is meaningfully associated with career-related criteria, as we found that higher charismatic tendencies are associated with higher income levels, more subordinates, and a higher managerial position. Finally, individuals with charismatic tendencies are more inclined to hold leadership roles (Director, Guide), and charismatic leadership roles (Inspirator, Presenter) in their future careers, and score higher on adaptive performance. In sum, this work helped to clarify the personality blocks that underlie leader charisma in a more detailed way than what has been done before, and demonstrated the opportunities to map charismatic tendencies in a career-relevant way.

References

- American Psychiatric Association (2013) Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders, 5th edn. Arlington, VA
- Barling, J., Weber, T., & Kelloway, E. K. (1996). Effects of transformational leadership training on attitudinal and financial outcomes: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 827-832. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.81.6.827
- Baruch, Y., & Bozionelos, N. (2011). Career issues. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Volume 2: Selecting & Developing Members of the Organization* (pp. 67-113). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectation*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industry, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 901-910, DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.901
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 99–109. DOI: 10.1207/s15327043hup1002_3
- Chen, F., Curran, P. J., Bollen, K. A., Kirby, J., & Paxton, P. (2008). An empirical evaluation of the use of fixed cutoff points in RMSEA test statistic in structural equation models. *Sociological Methods and Research*, 36, 462-494. DOI: 10.1177/0049124108314720
- Cobb-Clark, D. A., & Schurer, S. (2012). The stability of big-five personality traits. *Economics Letters*, 115, 11-15. DOI: 10.1016/j.econlet.2011.11.015
- Conger, J. A. (1990). The dark side of leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 19, 44-55. DOI: 10.1016/0090-2616(90)90070-6
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 637-647. DOI: 10.5465/AMR.1987.4306715
- 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. DOI: 10.1002/1099-1379(200011)21:7<747::AID-JOB46>3.0.CO;2-J

- Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., Menon, S. T., & Mathur, P. (1997). Measuring Charisma: Dimensionality and Validity of the Conger-Kanungo Scale of Charismatic Leadership. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 14, 290-301. DOI: 10.1111/j.1936-4490.1997.tb00136.x
- Costa, P.T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Costa, P.T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1995). Domains and Facets: Hierarchical Personality Assessment Using the Revised NEO Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 64, 21-50. DOI: 10.1207/s15327752jpa6401_2
- De Fruyt F. (2002). A person-centered approach to P-E fit questions using a multiple-trait model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 60, 73–90. DOI: 10.1006/jvbe.2001.1816
- De Fruyt, F., De Clercq, B. J., Miller, J., Rolland, J. P., Jung, S. C., Taris, R. ..., & Van Hiel A. (2009). Assessing personality at risk in personnel selection and development. *European Journal of Personality*, 23, 51–69. DOI: 10.1002/per.703
- De Fruyt F, Mervielde I. (1999). RIASEC types and big five traits as predictors of employment status and nature of employment. *Personnel Psychology*, 52, 701–727. DOI: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1999.tb00177.x
- De Fruyt, F., Wille, B., & Furnham, A. (2013). Assessing aberrant personality in managerial coaching: Measurement issues and prevalence rates across business sectors. *European Journal of Personality*. DOI: 10.1002/per.1911
- De Hoogh, A. H. B., Den Hartog, D. N. & Koopman, P. L.(2005). Linking the Big Five-Factors of personality to charismatic and transactional leadership; perceived dynamic work environment as a moderator: *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, v. 26, p. 839-865. DOI: 10.1002/job.344
- Deluga, R. J. (1997). Relationship among American presidential charismatic leadership, narcissism, and rated performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 8, 51-67. DOI: 10.1016/S1048-9843(97)90030-8
- De Vries, R. E. (2012). Personality predictors of leadership styles and the self–other agreement problem. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23, 809–821. DOI: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.03.002
- Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 41, 417-440. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.ps.41.020190.002221
- Donohue, R. (2006). Person-environment congruence in relation to career change and career persistence. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 504- 515. DOI: 10.1016/j.jvb.2005.11.002

- Dries, N., Pepermans, R., Hofmans, J., & Rypens, L. (2009). Development and validation of an objective intra-organizational career success measure for managers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30, 543-560. DOI: 10.1002/job.564
- Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45 (4), 735-744. DOI: 10.2307/3069307
- Emrich, C. G., Brower, H. H., Feldman, J. M., Garland, H. (2001). Images in words: Presidential rhetoric, charisma, and greatness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46, 527-557. DOI: 10.2307/3094874
- Furnham, A., & Crump, J. (2014). A Big Five facet analysis of sub-clinical narcissism: Understanding boldness in terms of well-known personality traits. *Personality and Mental Health*, 8, 209-217. DOI: 10.1002/pmh.1262
- Furr, R. M. (2008). A framework for profile similarity: Integrating similarity, normativeness, and distinctiveness. *Journal of Personality*, 76, 1267–1316. DOI:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00521.x
- Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist*, 48, 26-42. DOI: 10.1037/0003-066X.48.12.1303
- Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role performance: Positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 327-347. DOI: 10.5465/AMJ.2007.24634438
- Hoekstra, H. A. (2011). A career roles model of career development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 78, 159-173. DOI:10.1016/j.jvb.2010.09.016
- Hough, L. (1992). The “Big Five” personality variables – construct confusion: Description versus prediction. *Human Performance*, 5, 139-155. DOI: 10.1080/08959285.1992.9667929
- House, R. J., & Aditya, R. M. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23, 409-473. DOI: 10.1177/014920639702300306
- House, R. J., & Howell, J. M. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. *The Leadership quarterly*, 3, 81-108. DOI: 10.1016/1048-9843(92)90028-E
- Howell, J. M. (1988). Two faces of charisma: Socialized and personalized leadership in organizations. *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 213–236). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- 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. DOI: 10.5465/AMR.2005.15281435

- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999) Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1-55. DOI: 10.1080/10705519909540118
- 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. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.69.1.85
- Johnson, J. A. (2014). Measuring thirty facets of the Five Factor Model with a 120-item public domain inventory: Development of the IPIP-NEO-120. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 51, 78-89. DOI: 10.1016/j.jrp.2014.05.003
- Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 751–765. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.85.5.751
- Judge, T. A., Higgins, C. A., Thoresen, C. J., Barrick, M. R. (1999). The Big Five personality traits, general mental ability, and career success across the life span. *Personnel Psychology*, 52, 621–652. DOI: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1999.tb00174.x
- Judge, T. A., Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. (2007). Personality and career success. In Peiperl L, Gunz H (Eds.), *Handbook of career studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Judge T. A., LePine, J. A., Rich B. L. (2006). Loving yourself abundantly: Relationship of the narcissistic personality to self- and other perceptions of workplace deviance, leadership, and task and contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 762–776. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.91.4.762
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 755-768. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755
- Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., & Kosalka, T. (2009). The bright and dark sides of leader traits: A review and theoretical extension of the leader trait paradigm. *The Leadership Quarterly* (20), 855-875. DOI: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.09.004
- Jundt, D. K., Shoss, M. K., & Huang, J. L. (2015). Individual adaptive performance in organizations: A review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36, S53-S71. DOI: 10.1002/job.1955
- Kaiser, R. B., & Hogan, R. (2007). The dark side of discretion: Leader personality and organizational decline. In R. Hooijberg, J. Hunt, J. Antonakis, & K. Boal (Eds.), *Being there even when you are not: Leading through strategy, systems and structures. Monographs in leadership and management* (Vol. 4, pp. 177-197). London: Elsevier Science.

- LeBreton, J. M., & Senter, J. L. (2008). Answers to 20 questions about interrater reliability and interrater agreement. *Organizational Research Methods, 11*, 815-852. DOI: 10.1177/1094428106296642
- Lynam, D. R., & Widiger, T. A. (2001). Using the five-factor model to represent the DSM-IV personality disorders: An expert consensus approach. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 110*, 401–412. DOI: 10.1037//0021-843X. 110.3.401
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Jarvis, C. B. (2005). The problem of measurement model misspecification in behavioral and organizational research and some recommended solutions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 710–730. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.4.710
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (2007). Brief versions of the NEO-PI-3. *Journal of Individual Differences, 28*, 116 –128. DOI: 10.1027/1614-0001.28.3.116
- McCrae, R. R., & Terracciano, A. (2006). National character and personality. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 15*, 156-161. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8721.2006.00427.x
- McCrae, R. R., Costa, P. T. Jr., del Pilar, G. H., Rolland, J. P., & Parker, W. D. (1998). Cross-cultural assessment of the five-factor model – The revised NEO personality inventory. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 29*, 171-188. DOI: 10.1177/0022022198291009
- McCrae, R. R., Terracciano, A., & Members of the Personality Profiles of Cultures Project (2005). Universal features of personality traits from the observer’s perspective: Data from 50 cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 547-561. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.88.3.547
- Miller, J. D., Bagby, P. M., Pilkonis, P. A., Reynolds, S. K., & Lynam, D. R. (2005). A simplified technique for scoring DSM-IV personality disorders with the Five-Factor Model. *Assessment, 12*, 404-415. DOI: 10.1177/1073191105280987
- Miller, J. D., Lynam, D. R., Widiger, T. A., & Leukefeld, C. (2001). Personality disorders as extreme variants of common personality dimensions: Can the five-factor model adequately represent psychopathy? *Journal of Personality, 69*, 253-276.
- Miller, J. D., Reynolds, S. K., & Pilkonis, P. A. (2004). The validity of the five-factor model prototypes for personality disorders in two clinical samples. *Psychological Assessment, 16*, 310–322. DOI: 10.1037/1040-3590.16.3.310
- Mooi, B., Comijs, H. C., De Fruyt, F., De Ritter, D., Hoekstra, H. A., Beekman, A. T. F. (2011). A NEO-PI-R short form for older adults. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research, 20*, 135-144. DOI: 10.1002/mpr.342

- O'Boyle, E. H., Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C., & McDaniel, M. A. (2012). A meta-analysis of the Dark Triad and work behavior: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97, 557-579. DOI: 10.1037/a0025679
- Obschonka, M., Schmitt-Rodermund, E., Silbereisen, R. K., Gosling, S. D., & Potter, J. (2013). The regional distribution and correlates of an entrepreneurship-prone personality profile in the United States, Germany, and the United Kingdom: A socioecological perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 105, 104–122. DOI: 10.1037/a0032275
- Pillai, R. (1996). Crisis and the emergence of charismatic leadership in groups: An experimental investigation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 26, 543-562. DOI: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.1996.tb02730.x
- Popper, M. (2002). Narcissism and attachment patterns of personalized and socialized charismatic leaders. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 19(6), 797-809. DOI: 10.1177/0265407502196004
- Pulakos, E. D., Arad, S., Donovan, M. A., & Plamondon, K. E. (2000). Adaptability in the workplace: Development of a taxonomy of adaptive performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 612-624. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.85.4.612
- Renn, R. W., & Fedor, D. B. (2001). Development and field test of a feedback seeking, self-efficacy, and goal setting model of work performance. *Journal of Management*, 27, 563-583. DOI: 10.1177/014920630102700504
- Riggio, R. E. (2009). Charisma. In S. J. Lopez (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of positive psychology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Roberts, B. W., & DelVecchio, W. F. (2000). The rank-order consistency of personality traits from childhood to old age: a quantitative review of longitudinal studies. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 3-25. DOI: 10.1037/0033-2909.126.1.3
- Sankowsky, D. (1995). The charismatic leader as narcissist: Understanding the abuse of power. *Organizational Dynamics*, 23(4), 57–71. DOI:10.1016/0090-2616(95)90017-9
- Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, 4(4), 577-594. DOI: 10.1287/orsc.4.4.577
- Shoss, M. K., & Witt, L. A. (2013). Trait interactions and other configural approaches to personality. In N. D. Christiansen & R. P. Tett (Eds.). *Handbook of personality at work*, 392-418. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Tosi, H. L., Misangyi, V. F., Fanelli, A., Waldman, D. A., & Yammarino, F. J. (2004). CEO charisma, compensation, and firm performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 405-420.

- Van Scotter, J. R., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 525-531. DOI:10.1037/0021-9010.81.5.525
- Waldman, D. A., & Javidan, M. (2009). Alternative forms of charismatic leadership in the integration of mergers and acquisitions. *The Leadership Quarterly, 20*(2), 130-142. DOI: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.01.008
- Waldman, D. A., Ramirez, G. G., & House, R. J (1996). *CEO charisma and profitability: Under conditions of perceived environmental certainty and uncertainty*. Philadelphia: Jones Center for Management Policy, Strategy, and Organization, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania.
- Wang, H., Law, K. S., Hackett, R. D., Wang, D. X., & Chen, Z. X. (2005). Leader-member exchange as a mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' performance and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal, 48*, 420-432.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organizations* (T. Parsons, Trans.). New York: Free Press.
- Wille, B., Beyers, W., De Fruyt, F. (2012). A transactional approach to person-environment fit: Reciprocal relations between personality development and career role growth across young to middle adulthood. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 81*, 307-321. DOI: 10.1016/j.jvb.2012.06.004
- Wille, B., De Fruyt, F., & De Clercq, B. (2013a). Expanding and reconceptualizing aberrant personality at work: Validity of Five-Factor Model aberrant personality tendencies to predict career outcomes. *Personnel Psychology, 66*, 173-223. DOI: 10.1111/peps.12016
- Wille, B., De Fruyt, F., & Feys, M. (2013b). Big Five traits and intrinsic success in the new career era: A 15 year longitudinal study on employability and work-family conflict. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 62*, 124-156. DOI: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2012.00516.x
- Wille, B., Hofmans, J., Feys, M., & De Fruyt, F. (2014). Maturation of work attitudes: Correlated change with Big Five personality traits and reciprocal effects over 15 years. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 35*, 507-529. DOI: 10.1002/job.1905
- Woods, S. A., & Hampson, S. E. (2010). Predicting adult occupational environments from gender and childhood personality traits. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 1045-1057. DOI:10.1037/a0020600
- Zaccaro, S. J. (2012). Individual differences and leadership: Contributions to a third tipping point. *The Leadership Quarterly, 23*, 718-728. DOI: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.05.001

Table 1

Five-Factor model expert ratings for the prototypical charismatic leader: Study 1 (N = 38)

Domain and facet	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>IRA</i> (r_{wg})
Neuroticism	2.78	.87	.89
N1: Anxiety	<u>2.59</u>	1.12	.81
N2: Hostility	3.03	1.61	.61
N3: Depression	<u>1.86</u>	1.00	.85
N4: Self-consciousness	<u>2.31</u>	1.41	.70
N5: Impulsiveness	4.94	1.93	.44
N6: Vulnerability	<u>2.03</u>	1.32	.74
Extraversion	7.69	.71	.92
E1: Warmth	7.19	1.53	.65
E2: Gregariousness	7.95	1.23	.77
E3: Assertiveness	7.95	1.11	.81
E4: Activity	8.32	.90	.88
E5: Excitement seeking	6.71	1.38	.71
E6: Positive emotions	7.89	.98	.86
Openness to experience	6.96	.82	.90
O1: Fantasy	6.58	1.20	.78
O2: Esthetics	6.48	1.35	.73
O3: Feelings	6.80	1.64	.60
O4: Actions	7.46	1.12	.81
O5: Ideas	6.97	1.22	.78
O6: Values	7.32	1.13	.81
Agreeableness	4.87	1.36	.72
A1: Trust	5.56	1.50	.66
A2: Straightforwardness	5.76	2.25	.24
A3: Altruism	5.56	1.89	.47
A4: Compliance	4.22	1.40	.71
A5: Modesty	3.47	1.48	.67
A6: Tender-Mindedness	4.72	1.73	.55
Conscientiousness	6.29	.82	.90
C1: Competence	6.58	1.13	.81
C2: Order	5.70	1.33	.73
C3: Dutifulness	5.56	1.40	.70
C4: Achievement Striving	7.92	.91	.88
C5: Self-discipline	6.61	1.68	.58
C6: Deliberation	5.16	1.56	.64

Note. Characteristic items defined as ≤ 3 or ≥ 7 , appear as underlined (low) or boldfaced (high) values.

Table 2

Descriptive statistics and variable intercorrelations: Sample 1 in Study 2 (N = 41)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
1. Sex ^a	-	-								
2. Age	38.63	10.64	-.03							
3. FFM charisma (self)	43.03	4.62	-.17	.06	.88					
4. Charismatic leadership (sub)	3.57	.39	-.01	-.12	.38*	.73				
5. Charismatic leadership (self)	3.45	.48	-.19	-.11	.59***	.56***	.85			
6. Task performance (sub)	4.25	.61	-.10	.13	-.03	.29	.13	.63		
7. Contextual performance (sub)	4.09	.62	.15	-.22	-.06	.42**	.00	.43**	.75	
8. Adaptive performance (sub)	3.91	.59	-.26	.21	.36*	.40**	.16	.31*	.22	.65

Note. Bold values on the diagonal show the internal consistency of the relevant variable;

^a Sex is dummy coded such that 0 = male and 1 = female; self = self-report; sub = subordinate-report; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 3

Descriptive statistics and variable intercorrelations: Sample 2 in Study 2 (N = 262)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1.	2	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.	16.
1. Sex ^a	-	-																
2. Age (T2)	37.22	1.21	-.08															
3. FFM charisma (T1)	39.55	4.08	-.10	.02	.93													
4. FFM charisma (T2)	40.80	4.04	-.06	-.01	.68***	.94												
5. Income (T2)	1.44	.40	-.36***	.03	.29***	.28***												
6. Number subordinates ^b (T2)	1.22	1.38	-.25***	-.07	.20**	.34***	.33***											
7. Management level ^c (T2)	1.08	1.14	-.26***	-.09	.15*	.29***	.40***	.61***										
8. Maker (T2)	5.72	1.15	.03	-.14*	.01	.18**	.10	.16*	.17*	.89								
9. Expert (T2)	5.07	1.42	-.16*	.06	.07	.13*	.17*	.11	.12	.50***	.89							
10. Presenter (T2)	4.58	1.55	-.03	.03	.19**	.30***	.09	.21**	.30***	.49***	.36***	.91						
11. Guide (T2)	4.94	1.45	-.04	.09	.18**	.24***	.10	.36***	.26***	.28***	.19**	.38***	.92					
12. Director (T2)	4.60	1.59	-.27***	-.01	.21**	.39***	.29***	.53***	.58***	.44***	.39***	.61***	.49***	.91				
13. Inspirator (T2)	4.58	1.23	-.02	-.01	.15*	.28***	.04	.34***	.31***	.50***	.38***	.67***	.60***	.61***	.85			
14. Task performance (T2)	4.12	.60	.09	-.09	-.08	-.06	-.01	-.07	-.12	.23***	.14*	.02	.09	-.02	.08	.78		
15. Contextual performance (T2)	3.83	.56	-.06	-.03	.18**	.28***	.02	.14*	.18**	.14*	.04	.22***	.36***	.22***	.35***	.12	.74	
16. Adaptive performance (T2)	3.72	.57	-.30***	-.01	.32***	.44***	.30***	.32***	.34***	.30***	.27***	.29***	.23***	.47***	.31***	-.03	.31***	.70

Note. Bold values on the diagonal show the internal consistency of the relevant variable; ^a Sex is dummy coded such that 0 = male and 1 = female; ^{bc} In respectively 6 and 5 categories; Career role scores are computed on a scale from 1 to 7; T1 = 1994; T2 = 2009; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 4

Summary of hierarchical regression analyses (β) examining the associations between FFM charisma (T1 and T2) and career outcomes (T2), after controlling for sex (Sample 2 in Study 2, $N = 262$)

	Longitudinal:		Concurrent:
		FFM charisma (T1) – career outcomes (T2)	FFM charisma (T2) – career outcomes (T2)
	Step 1:	Step 2:	Step 2:
	Sex ^a	FFM charisma (T1)	FFM charisma (T2)
Income (T2)	-.36***	.25***	.24***
Number subordinates ^b (T2)	-.25***	.18**	.32***
Management level ^c (T2)	-.26***	.12*	.27***
Maker (T2)	-.03	.01	.19**
Expert (T2)	-.16*	.06	.11
Presenter (T2)	-.03	.19**	.30***
Guide (T2)	-.04	.18**	.24***
Director (T2)	-.27***	.19**	.38***
Inspirator (T2)	-.02	.15*	.28***
Task performance (T2)	.09	-.07	-.05
Contextual performance (T2)	-.06	.17**	.28***
Adaptive performance (T2)	-.30***	.29***	.42***

Note. Standardized beta coefficients are reported; Sex is dummy coded such that 0 = male and 1 = female; ^{bc} In respectively 6 and 5 categories *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the experts who participated in this study, and Nina Vanwelsenaere, who collected part of the data in the context of her master's thesis research.

Appendix A

Performance Scale

Task performance

1. Performs duties thoroughly and to perfection
2. Delivers work with a minimal number of errors and instances of carelessness
3. Sets high quality standards for work performance

Contextual performance

4. Says things to make people feel good about themselves or the work group
5. Encourages others to overcome their differences and get along
6. Treats others fairly
7. Helps someone without being asked

Adaptive performance

8. Deals with unpredictable and unexpected work situations appropriately
9. Takes effective action when necessary without having to know the total picture or have all the facts at hand
10. Effectively adjusts plans, actions, or priorities to deal with changing situations
11. Maintains emotional control in crisis situations