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Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993) suggested that the effects of charismatic leadership on followers' motivation are mediated by the increased salience of collective identities in followers' self-concepts. This study empirically examines the effects of leadership messages on followers' self-concept accessibilities. Charismatic and integrative (combined charismatic and individualized consideration) leadership increased the accessibility of followers' collective self-concepts. Individualized consideration increased the accessibility of followers' private self-concepts. These results support the propositions of the self-concept-based theory of charismatic leadership. Charismatic and integrative leadership messages from a leader resulted in higher follower collective self-concept accessibilities than did routinized messages. This finding underscores the importance of a charismatic leader, even when charismatic messages have become routinized.

And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country

— John F. Kennedy, inaugural address, January 20, 1961

Through the content and delivery of a charismatic message, leaders such as John F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King successfully brought their followers to exceptional levels of motivation, commitment, and performance. House and Shamir (1993) identified charisma as a central concept underlying all of the major theories in the new-leadership literature and attempted to explain the
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psychological processes by which charismatic leaders stimulate followers to higher levels of performance.

The conceptualization of charisma has changed with the phases-of-leadership research to become inclusive of more leaders over time (Paul, Costley, Howell, & Dortman, in press). Contemporary theories tend to emphasize leader behaviors related to collective purpose, values, beliefs, and morality (House & Shamir, 1993). Shamir, House, and Arthur's (1993) self-concept-based theory of charismatic leadership begins with an integration and extension of the charismatic effects previously described by House (1977), Burns (1978), and Bass (1985). According to Shamir et al., the transformational effects of charismatic leadership include the elevation of followers' needs on Maslow's (1954) hierarchy, the elevation of morality to more principled levels, and the transcendence of self-interest for the sake of a group. These theorists suggest that these transformational effects of charismatic leadership occur through transformation of "the needs, values, preferences, and aspirations of followers from self-interests to collective interests" (Shamir et al., 1993, p. 577).

Shamir et al. (1993) highlighted the inadequacy of current psychological theories of motivation for explaining behavior to serve collective rather than individual interests. Shamir (1991b) suggested that a theory of motivation based on individuals' self-concepts could account for the importance of collective interests in motivating work behavior. He built on the work of Katz and Kahn (1978), who thought that the motivation to maintain a particular self-concept may be a determinant of individuals' "expressing in words and acts one's important values and thus identifying oneself and maintaining a satisfying self-concept" (p. 361). Since transformational effects of charismatic leadership involve behaviors in service of collective interests, Shamir and colleagues (House & Shamir, 1993; Shamir et al., 1993) posited that the effects of charismatic leadership on followers' motivation occur at the level of the self-concept, rather than in a more rational, utility-maximizing manner. Shamir and colleagues proposed that charismatic leader behaviors increase the salience of collective identities in followers' self-concepts. In theory, increased salience of collective identities in the self-concept should increase the probability that followers will engage in behaviors representing those identities.

The present article conceptualizes and empirically investigates the effects of leadership message content on followers' self-concepts. In this paper, the content of leadership messages is distinguished from the communication of leadership messages. Charismatic leadership messages emphasize collective purpose, values, beliefs, and morality (House & Shamir, 1993). Individualized consideration messages emphasize that followers are individuals who would benefit from coaching and development to meet their needs for achievement and growth (Bass & Avolio, 1993, 1994). Leadership messages that combine charismatic leadership and individualized consideration content are referred to as integrative
leadership. Leadership messages that have become the content of an oral or written tradition or dogma are said to be routinized (Bendix, 1962).

After a short discussion of leadership message content versus the communication of leadership messages, we will present a brief psychological perspective on self-concepts. Four hypotheses are proposed and tested with an experiment that varied the charismatic and individualized-consideration content of leadership messages. The effects of these experimental manipulations on the accessibility of followers’ self-concepts are reported. Findings are discussed in relation to the self-concept-based theory of charismatic leadership (Shamir et al., 1993). Limitations of the study and implications for future social-cognitive leadership research conclude the article.

Leadership Message Content

Recent research has begun to clarify the distinction between the content of a charismatic message and the communication of the message. Both leadership message content and communicative behaviors are related to subjects’ perceptions and attributions of charisma to a leader (Awamleh & Gardner, 1997; Holladay & Coombs, 1993, 1994; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; Sidani, 1993). The strong communication of a charismatic message increases subjects’ perceptions and attributions of charisma to a leader (Awamleh & Gardner, 1997; Holladay & Coombs, 1993, 1994; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996). Strong communication of a noncharismatic message can also result in the perception of a leader as charismatic (Awamleh & Gardner, 1997; Holladay & Coombs, 1994; Sidani, 1993). Holladay and Coombs (1993) found a significant interaction of leadership message content by delivery. Strong delivery increased subjects’ perceptions of charisma to a greater extent for visionary messages than for nonvisionary messages. The highest perceptions of charisma were obtained with strong delivery of a visionary message and the lowest with weak delivery of a nonvisionary message.

The experimental control of leader communicative behaviors in this stream of research has resulted in the identification of both main effects and interactions between leadership message content and communication. Leaders’ communicative behaviors have been controlled experimentally through the use of written speeches and profiles of leaders (Sidani, 1993), videotapes of leaders (Awamleh & Gardner, 1997; Holladay & Coombs, 1993, 1994), and simulations employing trained actors as leaders (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996). The findings from this stream of research have led to the suggestion that the measurement of charisma be enlarged to account for the importance of leaders’ communicative behaviors (Holladay & Coombs, 1994). These findings also imply that conservative experimental tests of charismatic leadership can be designed to emphasize the content of a charismatic message and to control communication-related variance.
Self-Concepts

Influential psychologists such as William James (1890), Charles Horton Cooley (1902), George Herbert Mead (1934), Carl Rogers (1951), and others view the self-concept as central to psychology, since the perspective of the self is necessary to achieve an adequate understanding of individual behavior. Schlenker (1985a) noted that the terms self, self-concept, and identity are sometimes used to refer to an identical construct. Schlenker defined identity as "a theory (or schema) of an individual that describes, interrelates, and explains his or her relevant features, characteristics, and experiences" (p. 68). A person’s self-concept structures relevant features and experiences of the person. It may include information about that person's appearance, background, motives, personal qualities, accomplishments, aspirations, associates, friends, roles, and other important characteristics and contexts. Self-concepts specify constructs that are pertinent to individuals, fixing their standing on construct dimensions relative to others, and guiding and regulating their subsequent experience (Schlenker, 1985a). The unique combination of information contained in the self-concept provides a sense of distinctiveness and continuity for a person since it remains relatively stable in memory from day to day (Schlenker, 1985b).

Greenwald and Pratkanis (1984) and Triandis (1989) conceived of the structure of the self in memory as a system of multiple self-concepts. The term self-cognitions refers to the contents of a particular self-concept. The private self-concept consists of cognitions related to traits, states, and behaviors (e.g., "I am intelligent"), and self-evaluation is based on internal standards. The public self-concept consists of cognitions related to the generalized other’s view of the self (e.g., "People think I am intelligent"), and self-evaluation is based on the approval of others. The collective self-concept consists of cognitions related to the relationship of the self to others (e.g., "I am a mother"), and self-evaluation is based on internalized goals of a referent group. Triandis conceived of individuals as sampling cognitions from these multiple self-concepts with different probabilities. The emphasis placed on certain aspects of the self in different cultures results in the differential development of self-concepts, increasing the number of cognitions that comprise particular dimensions of self. The probability that a particular aspect of self will be referenced depends on the complexity of each self-concept and the specific situation.

Triandis' (1989) conception of the self as a system of multiple self-concepts set the stage for empirical research into the cognitive representation of self-concepts. Trafrimow, Triandis, and Goto (1991) provided support for the view that private and collective self-concepts exist in two distinct locations in memory. In a series of experiments, they found that the conditional probabilities of retrieving a private or collective self-cognition were higher given that the previous response was a similar self-cognition. These findings have been replicated with collectivists in their own country (Trafrimow, Silverman, Fan, & Law, 1997).
Research on the cognitive structure of the self is still in its infancy, yet based on empirical studies, some psychologists have concluded that the self is a highly elaborate cognitive structure that contains considerable self-relevant information (Klein & Kihlstrom, 1986; Klein & Lofius, 1988; Rogers, 1981). The emerging structure of the self is consistent with Kihlstrom and Cantor's (1984) view of the self as a "mental representation of oneself, no different in principle from mental representations that a person has concerning other ideas, objects, and events and their attributes and implications" (p. 2). Two current views of the cognitive organization of the self that are compatible with recent research are a system of multiple self-concepts and a hierarchical structure of self-concepts (Trafimow et al., 1991).

Management researchers are beginning to recognize that individuals' perceptions of themselves play a role in virtually all human cognition and social behavior (Wyer & Srull, 1989). With this recognition, the self-concept is an increasingly important topic in the management literature (Katz & Kahn, 1978; Korman, 1970; Leonard, Beauvais, & Scholl, 1995, 1997; Shamir 1990, 1991a, 1991b; Shamir, Arthur, & House, 1994; Shamir et al., 1993; Shamir, Zakay, Breinin, & Popper, 1998). Yet, the relationship between charismatic leadership and followers' self-concepts remains empirically unexplored.

Hypotheses

A social-cognitive perspective on the self-concept-based theory of charismatic leadership (Shamir et al., 1993) stimulated the research question addressed in this study: Do the contents of different leadership messages differentially affect the accessibility of followers' self-concepts? Figure 1 presents the theoretical model on which the formal hypotheses are based.

Social-Cognitive Terminology

Psychologists generally agree that there is a conceptual distinction between individual-based and group-based aspects of the self, but they have not agreed on a theoretical approach or vocabulary to describe this distinction (Reid & Deaux, 1996). Individual-based aspects of the self include concepts and terms such as individualistic, identity, personal identity, idiocentrism, independent self-construal, and private self-concept. Group-based aspects of the self include concepts and terms such as collectivistic, situated identity, social identity, collective identity, allocentrism, interdependent self-construal, and collective self-concept. In this study, the terms private self-concept and collective self-concept refer to the distinction between individual-based and group-based aspects of the self. The term self-cognitions refers to the contents of the private or collective self. In cognitive psychology, the term accessibility refers to "the degree to which
information can be retrieved from memory” (Ashcraft, 1994, p. 236). In this study, accessibility refers to the probability of sampling from the private or collective self.

**Self-Concept Accessibility**

Weber (1925/1968) emphasized that charismatic leaders have a mission. According to Weber, a charismatic leader “seizes the task for which he is destined and demands that others obey and follow him by virtue of his mission” (p. 1112). All of the contemporary charismatic leadership theories parallel this aspect of Weber’s charisma by including elements related to a leader’s emphasis on a purpose, vision, or mission (House & Shamir, 1993). A charismatic leader’s mission is collective in nature and requires the participation of others for its fulfillment. As Weber indicates, “Normally, the mission is directed to a local, ethnic, social, political, vocational, or some other group” (p. 1113). The collective mission also has ideological components (Burns, 1978) that are expressed in terms of a belief system and value structure that create group norms (House, 1977). Followers contribute to the accomplishment of such a mission because “it is their duty” and obligation to recognize the charismatic leader’s authority (Weber, 1925/1968). These collective aspects of charismatic leadership may stimulate followers to think about themselves as interdependent members of a group, rather than as independent individuals. We argue that the collective
aspects of charismatic leadership messages act by stimulating, or priming, the accessibility of followers' collective self-concepts.

*Hypothesis 1.* Charismatic leadership message content will increase the accessibility of followers' collective self-concepts.

A recent meta-analysis of the effectiveness of charismatic leadership found charisma to be the most strongly related leader behavior to subordinate perceptions of leader effectiveness. The mean corrected correlation was .81, with a 95% confidence interval of .75 to .86 (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). Individualized consideration was found to be second only to charisma as the most highly correlated leader behavior to subordinate perceptions of leader effectiveness. The mean corrected correlation was .69, with a 95% confidence interval of .63 to .73 (Lowe et al., 1996). If the effects of charismatic leadership are related to increasing the accessibility of followers' collective selves, it is also reasonable to inquire about the potential effects of individualized consideration on followers' self-concepts.

Individualized consideration describes leader behaviors that focus on followers' unique needs, abilities, and aspirations. These leaders treat followers as individuals, rather than merely as members of a group. Individually considerate leaders act as coaches and help followers to develop their strengths. Leader communication with followers is two-way and personalized (Bass, 1985). These private aspects of individualized consideration may stimulate followers to think about themselves as autonomous individuals, rather than as members of a group. It may be that the independent aspects of individualized-consideration messages prime the accessibility of followers' private self-concepts.

*Hypothesis 2.* Individualized-consideration message content will increase the accessibility of followers' private self-concepts.

Charismatic leadership rarely exists in its pure form (Weber, 1925/1947) and is often exhibited in combination with other leader behaviors. Bass and colleagues (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1995) reported average intercorrelations among the five transformational scales of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to be .83. Lowe et al. (1996) found that followers' ratings of charismatic leadership and individualized consideration were even more highly intercorrelated ($r = .85$) across the nine studies that were reviewed. The self-concept-based theory of charismatic leadership would be strongly supported if the effects of pure charismatic leadership on followers' self-concept accessibilities also occur when charismatic leadership occurs in combination with individualized consideration. In this study, leadership messages that combine charismatic leadership and individualized-consideration content are referred to as integrative leadership.
Hypothesis 3a. Integrative leadership message content will have effects on followers' collective self-concepts similar to the effects produced by charismatic leadership messages alone.

The self-concept-based theory of charismatic leadership would receive additional support if the effects of pure individualized consideration on followers' self-concept accessibilities are ameliorated when charismatic leadership occurs in combination with individualized consideration.

Hypothesis 3b. Integrative leadership message content will ameliorate the effects on followers' private self-concepts produced by individualized-consideration message content alone.

Weber (1925/1947) viewed charismatic leadership as unstable and inherently different from the relatively permanent structures of legal and traditional authority (Bendix, 1962). Weber described the routinization of charisma, where charisma is transformed into familial charisma or institutional charisma. In institutional charisma, charismatic authority is transformed through depersonalization into a mixture of charismatic and legal elements. Depersonalization transforms the personal relationship with a charismatic leader into impersonal institutional attributes (Bendix, 1962). Shils (1965, 1968) views this attenuated and dispersed charisma as normal charisma, which consists of "qualities, norms, and beliefs to which members are expected to adhere or are expected to possess" (Shils, 1965, p. 202). Shils described normal charisma as widespread and essential to societal functioning, whereas Weber viewed these depersonalized attributes of charisma in terms of rational-legal authority, denying the possibility of secular institutionalization of charisma (Shils, 1965).

In institutional charisma, the charismatic message may become the content of an oral or written tradition or dogma (Bendix, 1962). Alternately, Weierter (1997) conceived of charismatic messages as being routinized at a group level whenever a subculture questions mainstream reality and creates shared values to address their place in the world. In both cases, charismatic messages emphasize a desired future state or mission congruent with the desires and shared values of followers (Holladay & Coombs, 1994). Weber (1925/1947) and Weierter both assumed that a leader remains necessary and important "as a conduit through which the routinized charismatic message can overcome the opposing world-view" (Weierter, 1997, p. 174). In agreement with Weber and Weierter, we argue that charismatic and integrative leadership messages delivered by a leader will have greater effects than will routinized charismatic messages.

Hypothesis 4. Charismatic and integrative leadership messages delivered by a leader will affect the accessibility of followers'...
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collective self-concepts to a greater extent than will routinized charismatic and integrative leadership messages.

Method

The experimental design in this study was a between-subjects 3 x 2 (Leadership Message Content: Charismatic, Individualized Consideration, Integrative x Message Locus: Leader, Routinized) factorial design. The dependent variables are followers' private and collective self-concept accessibilities.

Participants

Participants in this experiment were 379 college students enrolled in four undergraduate courses offered by the Department of Management at a midsized university in the southwestern United States. Students were 78.2% (n = 275) juniors and seniors, 48.3% (n = 172) female, 55.9% (n = 198) Caucasian, 31.9% (n = 113) Hispanic, and had a mean age of 24 years and a mean 4 years full-time work experience. A table of random numbers was used to assign participants to experimental conditions so that within any particular course, participants were approximately equally distributed across conditions. The students received extra course credit for participating in the experiment for a total of about 20 min over two separate class periods. A few students chose to complete alternative assignments rather than participate in the experiment.

Procedures

Data were collected during regular class time. The first data collection involved the measurement of participants' self-concept strengths. Data were collected a second time at least 24 hr after the initial data collection. At the second data collection, the main research instrument containing written experimental stimuli and a self-concept accessibility measure was administered.

Leadership Message Content

The three manipulated levels of leadership message content were charismatic leadership, individualized consideration, and integrative leadership (a combination of both charismatic leadership and individualized consideration). Stimuli were developed in the form of short, written statements about leadership in a hypothetical organization, National Healthcare Incorporated (NHI). Statements for each cell were of parallel structure. The first paragraph of each statement provided information on the history and performance of NHI so that any performance cue effects (McElroy & Downey, 1983) would be similar across
experimental conditions. Following this introductory paragraph were four paragraphs of similar length that operationalized the appropriate leader behaviors.

The MLQ Form 5x-Short (Bass & Avolio, 1995) served as the basis for the leadership stimuli. In the charismatic leadership condition, the four paragraphs following the introductory paragraph included references to the Idealized Influence-Behavior scale items of the MLQ. In the individualized consideration condition, references were to the Individualized Consideration scale items of the MLQ. In the integrative leadership condition, the first and third paragraphs following the introductory paragraph were identical to those used for the charismatic leadership condition. The second and fourth paragraphs were identical to those used for the individualized consideration condition.

Message Locus

The term message locus is used here to refer to the origin of the leadership messages used in the experiment. In leader locus, the leadership message originates from a specific individual. The identified individual was described as the recipient of an Award for Management Excellence to emphasize his competence and abilities as a manager. In routinized locus, the leadership message originates from either a service-delivery team or describes how things are done at NHI without identifying a specific source of the information. Stimuli for the charismatic leadership stimulus in the leader locus and for the individualized-consideration and integrative leadership stimuli in the routinized locus are presented in the Appendix.

Self-Concept Accessibility

The probability of sampling a private self-cognition or a collective self-cognition is a function of the accessibility of individuals' private and collective selves. A modified version of the widely used Kuhn and McPartland (1954) self-attitudes instrument was employed to elicit participants' self-cognitions. The instrument asked subjects to answer the question "Who am I?" as if they were giving the answers to themselves and not to someone else. The original 1954 version of the instrument asked subjects to provide 20 responses. Trafimow et al. (1997) found that the first five responses generated by subjects are sufficient for the analysis of private and collective self-concept accessibility. The modified instrument used in this study asked subjects for only five self-cognitions.

Responses to the modified Kuhn-McPartland (1954) self-attitudes instrument were coded to provide a measure of the accessibility of participants' private and collective self-concepts. The coding of self-cognitions was consistent with previous theoretical and empirical work by Triandis (1989) and Trafimow et al. (1991). Self-cognitions coded as private included items relating to personal qualities, self-concept categories, common family, Kuhn-McPartland member coded the controls to write a reversed analyse.
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qualities, attitudes, beliefs, or behaviors that are not related to specific others. Self-cognitions coded as collective included items related to demographic categories or groups with which the participant was likely to be experiencing a common fate. For consistency, a single rater coded all participants' responses to the Kuhn–McPartland instrument. To assess the reliability of the coding, a faculty member at another university, who was blind to the purpose of the research, also coded the responses from 43 subjects. Interrater reliability was .90. Kappa, which controls for agreement as a result of chance, was .78. Since some individuals fail to write down the five responses requested, these measures are typically converted to proportions of private and collective self-cognitions for subsequent analyses (Trafimow et al., 1991, 1997).

Control Variables

We measured followers' self-concept strengths to control for potential direct effects of self-concept strength on self-concept accessibility. The 24-item Singelis (1994) Self-Construal scale was used to measure private and collective self-concept strengths. Items are measured on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Standardized Cronbach's alpha reliabilities were acceptable at .78 (n = 353) for the private self-strength scale and .72 (n = 352) for the collective self-strength scale.

Results

Subjects' responses on the Kuhn–McPartland (1954) Self-Attitudes scale were coded into two categories (collective or private self-cognitions), and proportions were used as measures of collective and private self-concept accessibilities. Since these measures of collective self-concept accessibility and private self-concept accessibility are not independent, all of the following analyses use collective self-concept accessibility as the dependent measure. Table 1 presents means and standard deviations for collective self-concept accessibility by leadership message content and loci.

The effects of leadership message content and message loci on followers' collective self-concept accessibility were tested with ANCOVA and are presented in Table 2. Followers' initial collective and private self-concept strengths were included as covariates to control for any direct effects of self-concept strength on self-concept accessibility (Trafimow & Finlay, 1996). The effects of leadership message content (LMC) on followers' collective self-concept accessibility, F(2, 338) = 2.89, p = .057, was modified by a significant LMC by message loci interaction, F(2, 338) = 3.42, p = .034. In the presence of a significant two-way interaction, caution must be used when attempting to interpret main effects. A graph of this interaction is presented in Figure 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loci</th>
<th>Charismatic leadership</th>
<th>Individualized consideration</th>
<th>Integrative leadership</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routinized</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Integrative leadership = individualized consideration + charismatic leadership.*
Table 2

Effects of Leadership Message Content and Locus on Follower Collective Self-Concept Accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>2.37*</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>6.43*</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private self-concept strength</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective self-concept strength</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership message content</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message locus</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>5.52*</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMC × Message Locus</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>3.42*</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>35.52</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37.30</td>
<td>338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. LMC = leadership message content.
*p < .05.

Because of the interaction between LMC and message loci, Hypotheses 1 through 3 are most directly tested with planned orthogonal contrasts in the leader locus. Two planned orthogonal contrasts performed to test Hypothesis 1 are presented in the first two rows of Table 3. The first contrast shows that followers' mean collective self-concept accessibility was significantly higher in the charismatic leadership condition than in the individualized-consideration condition (estimated difference = .22, p = .005). The 95% confidence interval does not contain zero. The second contrast shows that followers' mean collective self-concept accessibility was significantly higher across the two conditions that contained elements of charismatic leadership than in the individualized-consideration condition (estimated difference = .19, p = .005). The 95% confidence interval does not contain zero. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was supported.

Since measures of collective self-concept accessibility and private self-concept accessibility are not independent, another planned orthogonal contrast was performed to test Hypothesis 2. Followers' mean collective self-concept accessibility was significantly lower across the two conditions that contained elements of individualized consideration than in the charismatic condition (estimated difference = -.14, p = .041). The 95% confidence interval does not contain zero. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was supported.

Hypothesis 3a predicted that the effects of charismatic leadership on followers' collective self-concept accessesibilities would occur even if charismatic
leadership was delivered in combination with individualized consideration (i.e., integrative leadership). A planned orthogonal contrast performed to test Hypothesis 3a is presented in the fourth row of Table 3. The contrast shows that followers’ mean collective self-concept accessibility was not significantly different between the integrative leadership and charismatic leadership conditions (estimated difference = -.05, $p = .504$), thus supporting Hypothesis 3a. Hypothesis 3b predicted that the effects of individualized consideration on followers’ private self-concept accessibilities would be ameliorated when the leadership message also contained elements of charismatic leadership (i.e., integrative leadership). A planned orthogonal contrast performed to test Hypothesis 3b is presented in Table 5. The contrast shows that followers’ mean collective self-concept accessibility was significantly higher in the integrative leadership condition than in individualized consideration (estimated difference = .17, $p = .032$), thus supporting Hypothesis 3a.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that charismatic and integrative leadership messages delivered by a leader would have a greater effect on followers’ self-concepts than would a routinized charismatic message. Planned orthogonal contrasts were conducted within the three leadership conditions to examine differences between loci. These contrasts are presented in Table 4. The planned contrast for charismatic leadership shows that followers’ collective self-concept accessibility was significantly higher in the leader locus than in the routinized message locus (estimated difference = .16, $p = .022$). The 95% confidence interval does not contain zero. The planned contrast for integrative leadership also shows that followers’ collective self-concept accessibility was significantly higher in the leader locus than in the routinized message locus (estimated difference = .14, $p = .036$). The
Table 3

Planned Orthogonal Contrasts for Differences in Mean Follower Collective Self-Concept Accessibility in Leader Locus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I)</th>
<th>(J)</th>
<th>Contrast estimate (I-J)</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% confidence level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1</td>
<td>Charismatic</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2</td>
<td>Charismatic and</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3a</td>
<td>Charismatic</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative</td>
<td>Charismatic</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3b</td>
<td>Integrative</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. IC = individualized consideration; Integrative = individualized consideration + charismatic leadership.

*p < .05, **p < .01.

95% confidence interval does not contain zero. The planned contrast for individualized consideration shows that followers’ private self-concept accessibility was not significantly higher in the leader locus than in the routinized message locus (estimated difference = .05, p = .453). Messages with charismatic elements delivered by a leader affected the accessibility of followers’ collective self-concepts to a greater extent than did routinized messages. This effect was not observed for individualized consideration. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 was supported.

Discussion

This experiment provides support for the relationship between charismatic elements of leaders’ messages and increased accessibility of followers’ collective self-concepts. As the charismatic content of leaders’ messages increased, followers’ collective self-concept accessibility increased. This empirical finding is consistent with a critical proposition of the self-concept-based theory of charismatic leadership that charismatic leadership increases the salience of collective identities in followers’ self-concepts (House & Shamir, 1993; Shamir et al.,
Table 4

Planned Orthogonal Contrasts to Test Hypothesis 4 Mean Follower Collective Self-Concept Accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I)</th>
<th>(J)</th>
<th>Contrast estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Lower bound</th>
<th>Upper bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic leadership Leader</td>
<td>Routinized</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative leadership Leader</td>
<td>Routinized</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized consideration</td>
<td>Routinized</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. IC = individualized consideration; Integrative = individualized consideration + charismatic leadership.
*p < .05.

In addition, the experiment suggests that individualized consideration may increase followers' private self-concept accessibility.

Private self-concept accessibility was higher in the conditions in which leadership messages had elements of individualized consideration than in the charismatic leadership condition. Further consideration of the integrative leadership in the leader locus helps to clarify these findings. The inclusion of charismatic elements in an integrative leadership message resulted in mean follower collective self-concept accessibility ($M = 0.41, SD = 0.39$) that was not significantly different ($p = .504$) from the charismatic leadership condition ($M = 0.44, SD = 0.33$). The inclusion of individualized-consideration elements in an integrative leadership message resulted in mean follower private self-concept accessibility ($M = 0.56, SD = 0.33$) that was significantly lower ($p = .032$) than in the individualized-consideration condition ($M = 0.76, SD = 0.26$). It appears that the charismatic elements of an integrative leadership message primes followers' collective self-concepts to a greater degree than individualized consideration primes their private self-concepts. These findings are consistent with the current self-concept-based theory of charismatic leadership (Shamir et al., 1993).

This research also underscores the importance of charismatic leaders. A charismatic message delivered by a leader resulted in significantly higher follower collective self-concept accessibilities than did routinized charismatic messages.
The finding applies to both pure charismatic leadership and leadership that contains elements of charismatic leadership in combination with individualized consideration. This provides some empirical support for the views of Weber (1925/1947) and Weierter (1997) that a leader remains important to the effectiveness of charismatic leadership even when charismatic messages have become routinized.

This research also contributes to our understanding and appreciation of the distinction between the content of leadership messages and the communication of leadership messages. Written stimuli were used in this study to hold communication-related effects constant. This design allows us to attribute the effects of leadership messages on followers’ self-concept accessibilities to the content, rather than the communication of those messages. The main and interactive effects of articulation skills (Sidani, 1993), enthusiasm (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996), and delivery (Awamleh & Gardner, 1997; Holladay & Coombs, 1993, 1994) on followers’ self-concept accessibilities remain unexplored.

Limitations

The research design employed in this study allowed us to measure theoretically predicted effects of charismatic leadership that heretofore have never been empirically demonstrated. We employed written leadership stimuli to measure the effects of leadership message content while minimizing the confounding effects of leaders’ communicative behaviors. The use of written experimental stimuli that is less compelling than a real charismatic leader provides a conservative test of the hypotheses. Despite this deliberate design, the relevance of “paper leaders” and the implications for actual leadership situations can be questioned.

This experiment provided only limited information about the leaders and may have had no personal meaning for the participants. However, if these objections are valid, the fact that the leadership manipulations in this study had significant effects on participants’ cognitive processing suggest that more personally meaningful leadership messages delivered in rich organizational contexts may have even greater effects. Also, the results of experiments based on written leadership stimuli may be more generalizable to the initial stage of the leader–follower relationship when followers, or other observers, are forming their impressions of a leader. At this point in the leader–follower relationship, the follower has limited information about the leader, and the relationship may not yet be personally meaningful (Shamir, 1992). Finally, written stimuli may more closely approximate followers’ relationships with distant charismatic leaders than with close charismatic leaders (Shamir, 1995).

Implications for Future Research

This study has demonstrated the fruitfulness of a social-cognitive approach to leadership. Leadership research that applies social-cognitive theories and
methods can improve our understanding of how both leaders and followers process information in the leader–follower relationship. This study addressed only the effects of charismatic, individualized-consideration, and integrative leadership messages on followers’ self-concept accessibilities. Investigation of the effects of these and other leadership messages on additional aspects of followers’ cognitive processing is warranted.

This research provides empirical support for a critical proposition of the self-concept-based theory of charismatic leadership (House & Shamir, 1993; Shamir et al., 1993). Despite the lack of strong support for the theory in a recent study (Shamir et al., 1998), we believe that other aspects of the theory hold promise for future empirical research. Refinement and extension of the theory to include additional social-cognitive concepts, such as social categorization theory (Turner, 1985), should be a productive avenue for future social-cognitive leadership research. Other recent management theorizing relating to the self-concept (Leonard et al., 1995, 1997) may also be worthy of empirical exploration with social-cognitive methods. Future researchers should address the links between leader-primed self-concept accessibilities, further cognitive processing, and followers’ behavior.

In this research, we did not find significant differences between Caucasians and Hispanics on either initial self-concept strengths or leadership-primed self-concept accessibilities. However, the social cognition literature suggests that cultural differences in self-concept strengths (Singelis, 1994) and cultural differences in susceptibility to private and collective self-primes may be important (Trafimow et al., 1997). Indeed, cross-cultural studies may be necessary to understand how cultural variables moderate the relationships articulated in this study.

This study has given us a glimpse into the “black box” of follower cognition. It has generated considerable support for the existence of a relationship between the content of leadership messages, the origin of leadership messages, and followers’ cognitive processing of information about themselves and their relationships to others. A research question that remains unaddressed is how increased follower private or collective self-concept accessibility associated with leadership influences subsequent cognitive processing. Future research that investigates the effects of leadership on followers’ cognitive processing will contribute to a more complete understanding of the leader–follower relationship.
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Appendix

Leadership Stimuli

Charismatic Leadership Stimulus: Leader Locus

Information about National Healthcare Incorporated from President Joe Hewlett:

My name is Joe Hewlett, and I'm the 1997 recipient of the Award for Management Excellence and president of National Healthcare Incorporated. NHI provides health care services to patients living in rural communities. NHI began operations 5 years ago in the small town of Crawford, Nebraska, and has expanded to serve over 400 rural communities today. NHI is currently the number-one provider of health care services to rural communities in the western United States.

My management at NHI is driven by our mission, our values, and our beliefs. Our mission reminds us of the purpose for which we exist. A strong sense of purpose keeps us focused on what is important.

While our purpose and mission determine the direction of the organization, our core beliefs and values guide us in setting policy and making decisions. It is important that we remember our mission, beliefs, and values on a daily basis.

Our values are guides that we use to ensure that our decisions are based on moral principles, not economic factors. We do whatever it takes to provide services consistent with our purpose and values. Our best employees are those who are committed to doing what is right and finding a way to make it work.

To achieve our mission, all of our employees must remain conscious of the common purpose for which we have come together. We must work together to fulfill our mission in accordance with our core values and beliefs.

Individualized-Consideration Leadership Stimulus: Routinized Locus
(Service-Delivery Team)

Information about National Healthcare Incorporated from a service-delivery team:

We are a service-delivery team at National Healthcare Incorporated. NHI provides health care services to patients living in rural communities. We began operations 5 years ago in the small town of Crawford, Nebraska, and have expanded to serve over 400 rural communities today. We are currently the number-one provider of health care services to rural communities in the western United States.

Service-delivery teams at NHI are based on the assumption that each employee is unique and different from other employees. Based on this assumption, teams
relate to each employee as an individual rather than as just another member of the team. Teams see NHI employees as unique individuals, not as interchangeable parts.

Teams recognize that each employee has his or her own needs, abilities, and aspirations. Teams try to understand the particular needs of each employee with whom they work. To the best of their ability, teams attempt to meet each employee's unique needs.

Teams listen to employees and try to understand their concerns. Teams have found that employees have unique abilities that should be encouraged and channeled. Teams take the time to help employees develop their abilities and apply their skills on the job.

Teams also recognize that employees have different aspirations for development. Teams make an effort to understand and support employees' aspirations and to facilitate their development whenever possible. Teams think of themselves as friends and coaches.

**Integrative Leadership Stimulus: Routinized Locus (Organizational Culture)**

Information about National Healthcare Incorporated:

National Healthcare Incorporated provides health care services to patients living in rural communities. NHI began operations 5 years ago in the small town of Crawford, Nebraska, and has expanded to serve over 400 rural communities today. NHI is currently the number-one provider of health care services to rural communities in the western United States.

NHI is driven by our mission, our values, and our beliefs. Our mission reminds us of the purpose for which we exist. A strong sense of purpose keeps us focused on what is important.

NHI recognizes that each employee has his or her own needs, abilities, and aspirations. NHI tries to understand the particular needs of each employee with whom it works. To the best of its ability, NHI attempts to meet each employee's unique needs.

Our values are guides that we use to ensure that our decisions are based on moral principles, not economic factors. We do whatever it takes to provide services consistent with our purpose and values. Our best employees are those who are committed to doing what is right and finding a way to make it work.

NHI also recognizes that employees have different aspirations for development. NHI makes an effort to understand and support employees' aspirations and to facilitate their development whenever possible. NHI thinks of itself as a friendly and coaching organization.