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Abstract

This study examined the significance of vision and charisma as the two pertinent characteristics that explain the difference in the degree of commitment of followers. The following hypotheses were proposed: (1) Leaders who espouse a more inclusive vision are more likely to mobilize highly committed followers; and (2) Leaders who are more charismatic are more likely to mobilize highly committed followers.

Leaders of the Civil Rights Movement in the United States and the Independence Movement in India, specifically, Martin Luther King, Jr., Roy Wilkins, Stokely Carmichael, Mohandas Gandhi, Abul Kalam Azad, and Mohammad Ali Jinnah were assessed. Two orations and one written document presented by each leader were evaluated. Each selection was rated using three questionnaires: Vision Inclusiveness Questionnaire, Leadership Charisma Questionnaire, and Follower Commitment Questionnaire. After compiling the results of the questionnaires and conducting statistical analysis, charisma alone was determined to explain 95.1% of the commitment of followers, whereas vision was only able to explain 3.8%. In effect, charisma was found to be the most important variable by far.
Chapter I: Introduction

The study of leadership has become increasingly important due to the progressive complexity of our society. Leaders of today continue to face the perpetual issues of global warming, war, terrorism, and poverty, yet the consequences have escalated as nuclear, chemical, and biological weaponry have become more easily accessible. Our leaders are not only shaping the present, but are also transforming the future of our planet. In order to move forward with positive advances we need leadership of the highest caliber, individuals who will rise above the rest and move our world in a direction for the good of all.

This study will examine why over the course of history various leaders have been deemed to far surpass their counterparts. Winston Churchill, Benjamin Franklin, and Golda Meir have often been considered to be outstanding leaders, whereas others have been classified as mediocre. Great leaders stand out from the rest and usually elicit mass appeal long after they are physically gone from earth, whereas others are soon forgotten after their demise. In order to account for this difference, there must be some factor or factors that transcend a great leader. Specifically, this study will examine the significance of vision and charisma as the two pertinent characteristics.
that differentiate the degree of commitment of followers.

For the purposes of this study, the leader's intention will be for the good of all, in order to eliminate the cadre of individuals including Benito Mussolini, Adolph Hitler, and Osama bin Laden whose objectives were not for the good of all. Genocide, murder, and terrorism are tools that lead to the demise of people and must be taken into account. Killing populations for the sake of eliminating people who do not agree is clearly not an example of good leadership. The goals of our leaders have always been important and in the determination of leadership quality, these purposes deserve even more attention.

The ability to mobilize followers is reflective of the quality of a leader as a result of the symbiotic relationship between leaders and followers (Matusak, 1997, p. 25). In order to be a leader, one must have followers. Likewise a leader is needed to mobilize the masses. "Leaders should nurture strong, loyal followers who can be depended on and who can assume the lead if called upon to do so. Followers need to support and encourage their leader to successfully achieve their common goal" (Matusak, 1997, p. 25). The relationship between both parties is an important aspect of leadership. Not simply a numerical value, this factor also takes into consideration the commitment of followers. Size alone cannot clearly present the picture.

Vision and charisma are the two factors that explain the difference
in the quality of leadership. Vision is the element that creates a visual picture for followers; it outlines the path to reach the goal, and defines what the goal is (Kouzes & Posner, 1995, p. 111). To attract a broad based following and to guide the following to achieve it's goal, a vision needs to be inclusive. Without a clear and inclusive vision, followers lack not only commonality, but also focus. Vision is the cohesive component, the glue that bonds the followers together and provides direction for the future. When the vision is not inclusive, potential followers are eliminated and out-group isolation is greater. In such cases, the opposition can gain strength.

For example, there is presently grave concern about terrorism in the United States. Attacks on U.S. interests escalated on September 11, 2001 when the World Trade Center towers were demolished through acts of terrorism. Although acts of terror had previously been committed throughout the globe, leaders in the United States were slow to develop stronger security measures. Not until this horrific event was a new vision implemented. In order to provide a solution to alleviate the security problems, President George W. Bush created a new Cabinet position for the Department of Homeland Security. Additionally, the United States has sought the assistance of many other nations in the “War on Terrorism.” By creating an international coalition, greater success can be attained toward eliminating terrorism globally.
To provide a solution, a new and inclusive vision was required. By seeking new answers to an old problem, everyone can benefit through a win-win situation. However, for maximum effectiveness, the various Heads of State had to be convinced of the benefits. President Bush had to create a new vision of a future without terrorism. Providing a visual picture for other leaders, outlining the path to reach the goal and explicitly describing the goal is imperative to enlist followers. While vision is a necessary component to effective leadership, alone it is not enough. Vision can define the goal and process to achievement, but singly, it does not attract followers.

In order to attract followers, great leaders also need to possess something special that other people don’t have. This quality is often referred to as charisma. Charisma accounts for a presence, an aura, or a personality trait that non-charismatic people lack (DuBrin, 2001, p. 60). Charisma must be combined with vision, the two go hand in hand. As vision is the glue that bonds people together and focuses on the goal, charisma is like a magnet that attracts followers. Throughout the process of achieving the goal, during the daily struggle, charisma exuded by the leader will motivate the followers and maintain a level of enthusiasm to achieve success.

As a result of the daily influence of leaders, this study is imperative. Our world is continually changing and people often
complain about the lack of good leadership. Yet without understanding the essential elements of great leadership, we will continue to foster mediocre leaders. The present body of literature lacks clear-cut, definitive qualities of outstanding leaders. Without this knowledge, our society cannot produce leaders who can mobilize the masses to create positive change.

The timeliness of this study is impeccable as there are many current examples where good leadership is crucial, such as the conflict in the Middle East, the global problems with terrorism, and the numerous civil wars taking place worldwide. These examples all reinforce the need for further research in the area of leadership. As issues become more complicated, the need for extraordinary leaders is even more essential. Through comprehension of superior leadership is the possibility of a global movement away from war. Although research has been conducted regarding leadership there are many ideas as to what separates a great leader from a mediocre leader.

Significant qualities or traits differentiating good and great leaders are endless. Suggestions could include personality traits such as charm, courage, determination, passion, integrity, self-confidence, or loyalty. Other propositions would include cognitive abilities: intelligence, strategy, common sense, negotiation, diplomacy, or innovation. Additional possibilities consist of commitment, initiative,
vision, charisma, optimism, and responsibility.

Clearly numerous characteristics could be proposed as the most significant contributing factor to explain the difference in leadership ability. Whether it's a combination of innate personality traits, acquired skills, motivation, vision, style, special techniques or luck has been the debate throughout the study of this complex issue. Although each proposition has its own merits, alas, the question remains, what traits must a leader possess in order to nurture followers, encourage their support, and rise above the rest?

While the list of pertinent qualities is limitless, this study will focus on the leader's ability to mobilize committed masses as the distinguishing factor between good and great leaders. Specifically, this study will focus on the two most important aspects.

Attempts have been made to broaden the existing body of literature regarding leadership, but nonetheless, the subject remains insufficiently researched. The question, what factors separate good leaders from great leaders, continues to be unanswered. This study in particular is essential because it will make the body of literature regarding leadership more comprehensive. Without delving further into this area, we are limiting the potential greatness of future leaders. Additionally, this information will aid agencies and governments in their endeavors to create outstanding leaders.
Locally, our society can also benefit from further research into leadership. The daily experiences of people in the workplace, at home, at school, or anywhere else, can also benefit from mobilizing followers. Leadership positions can range from formally appointed to undeclared such as our government officials, our bosses, our teachers, or within our own families. Being a leader can be as simple as deciding what to eat for dinner. Opportunities to lead others arise on a daily basis. While anyone can take on the role of a leader, some people are more effective than others. Great leaders are able to foster a sense of unity among the masses; therefore, understanding the components of great leadership enables everyone to benefit. The future generations of our world will certainly reap the rewards of additional research into leadership. The more knowledge we acquire now, the better our future will be. Our leaders will be more effective than the leaders of today.
Dependent Variable

For this study, the dependent variable will be the level of commitment of the mobilized masses. Enlisting followers is a key component of leadership. Obviously without followers, one cannot be a leader. Hence this factor is imperative. Leaders recognize things can't be accomplished alone and focus on the need for a team effort (Kouzes & Posner, 1995, p. 151). "A leader is only as good as his followers. Followers will contribute the most informed, experienced, workable ideas to the process of accomplishment if they have a responsive channel open to them" (Willax, 2001, p. 9). Some believe that "leaders do not do the work: they depend on followers to actually do the work" (Van Wart, 2003, p. 220). There are various components to be taken into consideration when examining the commitment of mobilized masses, including: size of the following, difficulty of the goal, and dedication of the supporters (Foels, et al., 2000; Hawkins, 2001; Javidan & Waldman, 2003).

It would appear that a more populated base of followers would create greater strength for the organization. Therefore the
accomplishments would be greater than with smaller numbers. Additional people bring with them extra energy, ability, collaboration, money, effort, etc. Generally, more people translate into more manpower/womanpower. However, this is not always the case.

Prior studies have "established that as group size increases, the group becomes less cohesive and individuals are less satisfied" (Foels, et al., 2000, p. 680). As referenced by Foels, et al., multiple researchers have confirmed these findings: Indik, 1965; Katz, 1949; Slater, 1958. In another study by "Mullen, et al., 1989, it was determined] that members may also become less satisfied with a group leader as the size of the group increases" (Foels, et al., 2000, p. 680). When the group becomes too large, it is more likely that the goals will dissipate and smaller factions may be formed. Therefore, the importance in the number of constituents varies.

Another dynamic impacting the size of the following is the level of dedication of the masses. Ten devoted, enthusiastic, hard workers will accomplish more than one hundred faint-hearted, lackadaisical people. Just because an organization has more people doesn't necessarily mean it will accomplish more or is better. In fact, it is important that leaders "treat their constituents with respect and dignity to build a culture where people are empowered to make major contributions" (Hawkins, 2001, p. 4). "Gaining respect and maintaining respect of one's
The dedication of supporters is contingent on the quality of leadership. "Before [people] take personal responsibility for a commitment to excellence, they must see that their leadership team is committed" (Snow, 2002, p. 29). Leaders must "walk the talk" (Snow, 2002, p. 29) and "symbolize what the follower aspires to be" (Javidan & Waldman, 2003, p. 234). The commitment of the leader directly impacts the level of commitment of the masses.

Furthermore, the significance of the number of followers is affected by the goal. For example, someone running for office clearly needs many votes. Thus the size of the following is important. Yet, there are times when enlisting one person with influence is more powerful. An individual who enlists the head administrator in her plight for new coffee machines doesn't need a large following. By tapping into the source of one person with power, the strength of the leader is potentially greater; enlisting the right person as opposed to many people without influence can create the desired change.

However, the concept of goal difficulty must also be considered. Quantifying effectiveness in terms of outcome is easy to measure if the goals are achieved, but this does not account for the difficulty of attaining those goals. If the goals aren't fully actualized it does not necessarily mean the leader is ineffective. Likewise if an easily
attainable goal is achieved, it doesn't automatically mean a leader is highly competent. Possibly the leader is lucky, has good timing, or just is able to succeed at small projects. For example, gaining consensus in a boardroom meeting about the new desks the company will purchase is a significantly small task when compared to gaining consensus in the United States Congress to add a new cabinet position. The difficulty of the task would need to be considered in order to truly assess the ability of a leader.

To focus on the leader's ability to mobilize masses, the level of dedication of the followers is the most crucial facet. People who are willing to make greater sacrifices and take action will be more effective in accomplishing their goal when compared to their counterparts. Similarly, those who are involved in an organization for longer periods of time tend to be more committed. The dedication of the masses is inter-related with the size and the goal of the organization.

For this study, the degree of commitment of the masses will be defined by the amount of dedication exhibited by the followers. Whereas there is no prior survey used to measure the commitment of followers, the Leadership Commitment Questionnaire was created for this study. Questions include: sacrifices followers are willing to make for the cause/organization; length of membership to cause/organization; actions followers have taken for the cause/organization; participation
Using a Lickert Scale, also known as a frequency scale, this questionnaire ranks the degree of commitment of the followers. Based on the dedication, participation level, length of membership, action taken and sacrifices made, the followers will be classified as follows: 1=somewhat committed, 2=fairly committed, 3=committed, 4=moderately committed, 5=highly committed.

Sacrifices followers are willing to make for the cause or organization will help determine level of commitment. Highly committed followers would be willing to make the ultimate sacrifice by giving up human existence. The increased possibility of death by association to the organization or cause would indicate greater levels of commitment. On the other hand, followers who were unwilling to take risks would be classified with a low level of commitment.

Similarly, the types of action supporters are willing to take for the leader or the organization need to be assessed. The higher rating for commitment would be constituents whose actions may result in death or personal harm. Lower ratings would be for those whose actions result in minimal risk. For example, are members willing to speak up for what they believe in even if it means losing their job or personal harm?

Length of membership to the cause or organization would be
determined by looking at how long people are willing to be involved. Highly committed followers would be in for the long haul; over the duration of time are the masses falling by the wayside or do they continue to maintain involvement. Those who are minimally committed would be involved for short time spans, either at the beginning, middle or end. Some people choose to join only after the organizations are determined to be nearing success and would fall toward the low end of the scale. Others are members from the beginning when the possibility of success seems unlikely if not impossible and would be classified with higher levels of commitment.

Participation level of the masses means evaluating the amount of involvement of the masses. More committed members would be contributing greater amounts of time and effort toward the goal. To use a political campaign as an example, highly committed followers would be at campaign headquarters on a regular basis, spend countless hours making phone calls, delivering campaign literature, stuffing envelopes, or other related activities. Those who would be classified at a lower level of commitment might show up once or twice and participate in very few activities. Perhaps, they would even rely on others to pick up the slack for their lackadaisical attitude.

Finally, confidence exhibited by the followers in the leader must be incorporated to establish the level of commitment of the masses.
Higher levels of commitment would incorporate citizens who believe in the leader, who see someone leading by example that has earned the respect of the masses. Lower levels of commitment for this question would consist of people who just want to be part of the group, that don’t necessarily believe in the leader, and may not have respect for the leader.

Leaders who are considered more effective will have greater levels of commitment of their followers. After a questionnaire is completed for each leader, the average score for each individual will be used to rank the leader. In order to account for the various components, it is necessary to use the average for ranking.
Previous research has been conducted about various aspects of leadership. Beginning with the basics of leading people, to the role of followers, to the actual analysis of successful leaders, the study of leadership encompasses a broad spectrum. As a result of the diverse philosophies, few agree on the factors of effective leadership. “Effective leadership, research suggests, is remarkably chameleonlike. What it looks like on the surface is very much a function of the situation in which it is found” (Kotter, 1988, p. 21). In an attempt to find common ground, research for this study will be classified into two schools of thought: a psychological approach and a business/managerial approach.
Psychological Approach

The psychological approach consists of experimental research to determine what constitutes an effective leader. The scope of research conducted covers a broad range. While some studies examine traits of leaders through the perception of the leader, others are through the eyes of the follower. Whether through rewards and punishment, personal characteristics such as warmth and trustworthiness, or goal achievement, the psychological approach to leadership effectiveness is about perception.

Studying the effects of rewards and punishment on leader charisma, leader effectiveness, and follower reactions, Atwater, et al. (1997), examined behavior of freshmen at a male military college. Leadership surveys were compiled from The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire developed by Bass & Avolio (1990) and from the Leader Reward and Punishment Questionnaire (from the unpublished work of Podsakoff and Skov). These surveys consisted of Lickert scales, which were administered to measure charisma, contingent and non-contingent rewards and punishments, and peer rankings.

Findings suggested, “the best predictor of, and the leader behavior most highly correlated with perception of leader effectiveness was
Contingent reward behavior" (Atwater et al., 1997, p. 10). Leaders who rewarded their followers consistently were more likely to be perceived as being effective when compared to leaders who punished their followers. Additionally, leaders who utilized contingent punishment received sympathy from the victim, "whereas resentment characterized reactions to noncontingent punishment" (Atwater, et al., 1997, p. 148). In other words, leaders who administered negative feedback immediately were perceived as actually assisting the subordinate achieve greater success. Situations where the follower understood the purpose for punishment created a climate of mutual respect, as opposed to an environment of bitterness. This study provided valuable insight into the perception of rewards and punishment.

Other researchers in the school of psychology found different measures of effective leadership. In 1999 Hartman conducted a study that attempted to incorporate measurement of leadership effectiveness by combining the trait approach (focused on personal attributes), the behavioral approach (comparison of effective and ineffective behaviors), and the situational approach (focused on effective traits and behaviors in different situations). In order to measure oneself as a leader, forty-six senior managers answered the '16 Personality Factor Questionnaire' (16PFQ) developed by Raymond Cattell. Then, four or five people familiar with the manager answered the 'Leadership Practices Inventory'
(LPI) developed by Kouzes and Posner to measure personality characteristics.

The study reported that warmth was a consistent predictor of leadership effectiveness. People considered to have high levels of warmth, were described as "easygoing, adaptable, warmhearted, attentive to people, frank, expressive, trustful, cooperative, and participating" (Hartman, 1999, p. 31). The data suggested that while warmth is a necessary factor, alone it is not sufficient. Some other key qualities include: competence, trust, and integrity. Interestingly, warmth wasn't even a factor on the 16PFQ for managers to rate self-perceptions.

Although this study provided valuable insights into the mind of the follower, it did not present any information for the leader to measure his or her performance. Perception is purely subjective. Therefore, if a leader must exhibit warmth, how does an individual know whether or not he or she is perceived as being a "warm" person?

Researchers have also studied the differences between leaders' views of effectiveness and their subordinates' perceptions of effectiveness. Hooijberg and Choi (2000) used the Competing Values Framework (CVF) created by Quinn to differentiate eight leadership roles that have varying importance to raters. Two hundred and fifty two managers completed the CVF questionnaire. Each was then asked to
have a total of nine subordinates, superiors, and peers complete a survey packet. The data supported the hypothesis that leadership roles associated with effective leadership differ. The study "found distinct subordinate, peer and self leadership effectiveness models" (Hooijberg & Choi, 2000, p. 357). Managers, their subordinates, superiors, and peers all regard attaining goals, setting goals, and coordination of work as related to leadership effectiveness. However, that is where their agreement ends.

While managers' perception of personal levels of effectiveness were quite similar to their superiors, to subordinates and peers, the most important aspect of effective leadership was the role of facilitator. This study was helpful in noting the difference in the perception of effectiveness, but it was not complete. Other than noting the difference, no further information was provided. Why was there a difference in perception? How can one observe the difference in an actual setting without administering a questionnaire? Clearly, in order to be a successful leader, one must be able to distinguish how they are perceived by others. Although noting the existence of varying viewpoints is an essential first step, additional information would improve the value of this study.

Also included in the psychological school of thought are the ideas of psychologists, such as Gardner and Koestenbaum. According to
Gardner "the most essential feature of effective leadership [is] the capacity of a leader to create a story that affects the thoughts, feelings, and/or actions of other individuals" (Gardner, 1996, p. 111). In order for "leaders to be effective, they must embody the story in their own lives. Leaders tell stories on many topics, but their most essential story is the one that [re]defines the identity of the audience members" (Gardner, 1996, p. 112). For example, Margaret Thatcher was able to convey a vision to her constituents for Britain that reflected her own life. If she, a grocer's daughter could elevate herself to be Prime Minister of the nation, then, certainly Britain could get back on its feet and be a successful leading country (Gardner, 1996, p. 113).

Koestenbaum, another psychologist, looked at the inner self. "The question of leadership effectiveness is really the question of motivation. How does one motivate oneself? To motivate is to win the hearts of your people" (Koestenbaum, 1991, p. 214). By internally examining one's own stimulus, leaders could better relate to their followers. According to Koestenbaum, comprehensive understanding of the self will enable leaders to be more effective.

Overall the psychological approach to successful leadership examined perception, not only of the self, but of the followers as well. Delving into individual thought processes and belief systems to determine effective leadership, this school of thought investigated the
correlation between the mind and behavior. Similar to peeling away the layers of an onion, the psychological school of thought examined the observation of different views and interpretations. Relevant areas of this approach included rewards and punishment, personal characteristics such as warmth and trustworthiness, or goal achievement, but the underlying theme of perception remains.
The business approach to effective leadership however deals mainly with productive organizational management. "People perform in accordance with the manager's intention and find this is a path to the satisfaction of their needs...Thus, success has to do only with getting the job done, whereas effective adds the concept of satisfaction on those who do the job." (Cribbin, 1981, p. 35). It is up to the leader, in the business world the manager, to provide incentive for the employees. According to DuPre, (1989, p. 16) "effectiveness comes through enabling others to reach their potential - both their personal potential and their corporate or institutional potential." By doing so, both the individual and the company profit.

Heifetz adds, "business schools and schools of management commonly define leadership and its usefulness with respect to organizational effectiveness...Effectiveness means reaching viable decisions that implement the goals of the organization" (Heifetz, 2000, p. 21-22). The business perspective on leadership revolved around the organization.

In the realm of business leadership, companies have developed training courses to improve the ability of up and coming managers to
achieve effective organizational leadership. The Ford Motor Company created Leadership Development Centers “to accelerate the identification and development of leadership talent, and to drive the company’s mission, vision, and values deep into its culture” (Friedman, 2001, p. 24). Core principles of Ford’s leadership programs focused on: adopting a transformational mindset, using action learning, utilizing the power of c-equipment, integrating work and life, and generating business impact (Friedman, 2001, p. 25). Leaders learned how to think outside of the box and to capitalize on the talents of their staff for maximizing effects on the company. Participants were encouraged to seek alternative possibilities to eliminate unnecessary tasks and to obtain help. Projects throughout the training programs are focused on customer satisfaction, cost reduction, and enhanced revenue.

This active learning provided a positive impact on the business. Maximizing technology through e-tools, such as e-mail, faxing, telecommuting, et cetera, not only offers a method to improve communications, but also allowed leaders to create flexible schedules. This also integrated work and life. Greater control in one’s schedule benefited retention rates and minimized burn out. Additionally, community involvement was fulfilling for employees. The combination of these core principles had a positive impact for the company both financially and organizationally. Improved customer satisfaction,
reduced costs and increased revenue are the goals of effective business leadership.

The United States Postal Service has also recognized the need to improve business leadership. It developed the Advanced Leadership Program (ALP) to fulfill the gap occurring from an anticipated 70% postal executive retirement rate over the next 10 years (Delahoussaye, 2002, p. 24). To enhance the leadership ability of future managers, the ALP teaches principles of finance and decision-making. Simulation training forces the participants to examine their leadership abilities. The goal of the program was to create leaders who will improve the functioning of the organization, in this case the U.S. Post Office.

Another study sent 80 MBA candidates of the Wharton Business School to Quantico, Virginia for training with the Marines. This innovative approach was a practical experience to incorporate classroom learning with an actual situation. Through a series of mental and physical challenges, groups were forced to organize, solve problems, and work as a team. Inevitably, leadership ability emerged throughout the exercises; “someone who trusts the team and who earns their trust, but who can effectively motivate them. In some people, it takes a long time for these qualities to become visible” (Laymon, 2001, p. 16). Whereas Wharton takes two years to prepare its students for real life situations, the Marines were able to implement these tactics in a matter of two
People may believe there are clear differences between military leadership and business leadership. The morale and motivation needed when lives and national security are at stake are thought to be far different than when profit is the goal. However, the process of gaining trust by creating a cohesive team focused on one goal is the same. The overall picture is the same, but the differences lie within the risk. Once again, leadership in the business sector is focused on the enhancement of the corporation, which does not necessarily require the same qualities as leadership in the psychological approach.

In order to enhance business enterprises, Kotter focuses on the concept of effective executives. He asserts that the two key components of a successful business leader are agenda setting and network building.

Agenda setting creates a vision and strategy that takes into account the legitimate interests of other people and groups in the firm. Network building creates an implementation network that includes key bosses, peers, subordinates, and outsiders to facilitate the agenda, effective leadership for some activity in complex organizations is the process of creating a vision of the future that takes into account the legitimate long-term interest of the parties involved in that activity; of developing a rational strategy for moving toward that vision; of enlisting the support of the key power centers whose cooperation, compliance, or teamwork is necessary to produce that movement; and of motivating highly that core group of people whose actions are central to implementing the strategy (Kotter, 1988, p. 25).
Examples of Mary Kay and Lee Iacocca, who appear different, yet were both successful leaders through agenda setting and network building, were cited.

Both schools of thought contributed essential ideas regarding effective leadership. Within each category authors provided various qualities necessary to achieve success and described in detail the definition of each of these aspects. Yet, studies have demonstrated that effective leadership is entirely subjective (Atwater et al., 1997; Hartman, 1999; and Hooijberg & Choi, 2000). The psychological approach consisted of numerous experiments most of which concluded that individual interpretation was the largest factor contributing to leader effectiveness. Conversely was objectivity. In the business philosophy, effective leadership was measured quantitatively through increased profits, revenue, or other monetary figures. However, this did not account for effective leadership; it was effective management. Leaders, who are unscrupulous, tyrannical, or abusive, clearly cannot be identified as being effective merely based on increased dollar amounts.

Although each school of thought has its own nuances, when the ideas are combined they can lead to greater understanding. To fall into this overlapping area, the study of business leaders would need to incorporate some psychological motivation to increase the production of the organization. Likewise by combining managerial organizational
strategy with psychological perceptions, the study of political leaders may be more comprehensive. Some can argue that the different approaches are interrelated and not geared specifically for the corporate world or the psyche.

Selected scholarship could be classified as a bridge between the two schools of thought. In particular, certain ideas are general and can be applied in any leadership setting. For example, according to DuBrin (2001, p. 90) "an effective leader is one whose actions facilitate group members' attainment of productivity, quality, and satisfaction." This idea is important in a company or a family. Parents play an integral role in the development of their children. At this basic level of leadership, parents have the potential to affect their children's abilities, happiness, and capabilities. Similar to managers varying levels of effectiveness on employees, parents achieve differing levels of effectiveness on rearing offspring.

Kouzes and Posner also developed an approach, which can be classified as a combination of both schools of thought. They believed there are "five fundamental practices that enable leaders to get extraordinary things done: (1) challenge the process; (2) inspire a shared vision; (3) enable others to act; (4) model the way; and (5) encourage the heart" (Kouzes & Posner, 1995, p. 9). By incorporating these techniques, the success of leaders will be enhanced. Utilization
would benefit any leadership position, whether it were business oriented
or dealt with psychological aspects of leadership. Kouzes and Posner's
ideas are general principles of leadership, linking the gap between both
schools of thought.

Based on the existing scholarship, if leadership is a subjective
matter, there must be a common factor that can be altered to account
for differences in follower perception. The story of the elephant and
three blind men is a perfect example of disparity in observation. One
man, who wrapped his arms around the elephant's leg, compared the
elephant to a tree. Another who held the tail, said, no it's like a snake.
And yet the third gentleman, who held the trunk, argued it was like a
shower. Each was correct, but unable to see the entire picture.
Independent Variable #1: Vision

Specifically integrating the business and psychological schools of scholarship is the emphasis on vision. Agreeing with Kouzes and Posner, Wilhelm also emphasizes the importance of vision in an effective leader.

Effective leaders have the vision required to see things differently from others. They collect and arrange the same data we all see in ways that allow them to conceive of new and unseen phenomena. A core characteristic of all effective leaders is the ability to have a vision of where they are trying to go and to articulate it clearly to potential followers so that they know their personal role in achieving that vision" (Wilhelm, 1996, p. 223).

Blanchard's perspective on future successful leaders also focuses on the importance of vision. "When people talk about effectiveness, they are basically talking about vision and direction. Effectiveness has to do with focusing the organization's energy in a particular direction" (Blanchard, 1996, p. 82).

In order to see the "big picture" of an organization or a corporation, the vision component is key. Vision has been defined as "articulating a view of a realistic, credible, attractive future for the organization, a condition that is better in some important ways than what now exists" (Bennis & Nanus, 1985, p. 89). It has also been
referred to as "an ideal and unique image of the future...a picture of what tomorrow will look like. It expresses our highest standards and values. It sets us apart and makes us feel special. It spans years of time and keeps us focused on the future" (Kouzes & Posner, 1995, p. 111). "Strategic vision...provides purpose, rationale, and hope required for employees to develop emotional commitment to the goals of the organization and plan the detailed actions required for implementation" (Joiner, 1987, p. 38).

Vision is a component of leadership that has been given extensive attention by both the psychological and business approaches to leadership. Baum et al. (1998) researched the effects of vision attributes, vision communication, and vision content on venture growth. Members of the architectural woodwork industry were the subjects of this study. CEO's and a subordinate employee selected by the CEO, completed questionnaires rating the company's vision, its communication and content. This study found "vision significantly affects organizational-level performance, and vision affects performance directly as well as indirectly through vision communication" (Baum et al., 1998, p. 52).

In another study, Awamleh and Gardner (1999) researched "the combined effects of vision content, delivery, and organizational performance on perceptions of leader charisma and effectiveness" (p. 30).
Three hundred and four college students observed videotaped speeches by false CEO's, which demonstrated either visionary or non-visionary content, strong or weak delivery, and high or low organizational performance. "Findings for content confirmed that an idealized vision can help leaders enhance their message" (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999, p. 359). Results for delivery indicated that it was "a major determinant of perceived leader charisma and effectiveness" (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999, p. 360). Although this study illuminated the characteristics attributed to the perception of a charismatic leader, it did not provide enlightenment as to the qualities that inspire a shared vision among the follower population.

Studying the relationship between vision content and leadership style, Berson (2001) examined two types of leadership: transactional and transformational. Transformational leaders were considered to be inspirational or motivating, bringing about positive transformations. On the other hand, transactional leaders were typically focused on transactions such as setting agendas and offering rewards. It was hypothesized that leaders who were viewed as more transformational would produce vision content that was more optimistic, motivating, challenging, and future oriented than transactional leaders. Whereas leaders who were seen as being more transactional would develop visions that focused on extrinsic rewards, goal setting, and the creating
of time frames. After investigation, the first relationship was found to be strong. However, there was minimal correlation between transactional leaders and vision content based on reward (Berson, 2001, p. 67).

Recognizing the importance of vision as a component for effective leadership, Thoms and Blasko conducted "Preliminary validation of a Visioning Ability Scale" (1999). Pilot tests were given to fifty college students enrolled in an introductory management course. The test-retest method was used to measure reliability. "Research provided support for the validity of the Visioning Ability Scale...the Visioning Ability Scale is significantly related to valid measures of visionary leadership behavior and leader performance" (Thoms & Blasko, 1999, p. 112). The scale consisted of twelve questions whereby a participant rated himself/herself using a Lickert scale (ranging from 1-strongly agree to 5-strongly disagree) regarding his or her ability to see the future of the organization. A sample question was, "it is easy to imagine my organization and what it will be like in the future?" (Thoms & Blasko, 1999, p. 108). This scale can be used as an effective tool for self-assessment. Further investigation of this measure could prove beneficial for leaders who desire to develop and expand their ability to utilize and implement vision.

The leadership of the future must implement vision. While alone vision cannot achieve goals, it is a necessary factor to success.
However, in the creation of vision, certain aspects would best be avoided. Conger (1990) identified criteria that could pose potential problems. For example, "fundamental errors in the leader's perception can lead to a failed vision... (1) an inability to detect important changes in markets; (2) a failure to accurately assess and obtain the necessary resources for the vision's accomplishment; and (3) a misreading or exaggerated sense of the needs of markets or constituents" (Conger, 1990, p. 45).

Another area of caution is the potential insincerity in the development of vision. Hamburger (2000) assessed techniques in which vision had been created for a target audience to enhance the charismatic esteem of a leader. Two methods used to falsify vision were the comprehensive survey and the laddering interview. Investigators compiled research about issues important to the target group and then formulated the vision accordingly. The leader appeared to be leading, but in actuality was following the perceptions of the group. Likewise, the laddering interview was simply a method of retrieving information through personal interviews, instead of surveys. Although some researchers have argued this was the dark side of leadership, in certain arenas it is a highly effective method of developing vision. For example, the role of politicians is to represent the public. In order to maintain integrity and truly represent the ideas of one's constituents, it is
imperative for leaders to develop a vision that clearly incorporates the views of the public.

Based on the existing body of literature, vision is a component of leadership that requires further investigation. Although scholars have agreed on the need to create a shared vision, additional research needs to be conducted in order to investigate the relationship between the effectiveness of a leader and the level of inclusiveness of the vision. What level of inclusiveness is the most effective? How broad does a vision need to be without becoming watered down? As an example, when comparing coffee shops, a corporation such as Starbucks® exhibits a more inclusive vision because the company caters to customers who are both lactose tolerant and intolerant whereas Panera® is less inclusive because there is no milk substitute offered for consumers who are lactose intolerant. In this case, the broader vision is more effective because it leads to a larger consumer base, which in turn enhances profits.

An inclusive vision "creates a commonality of interest that enables people to see meaning and coherence in the diverse activities of the typical" (Snyder & Graves, 1994, p. 2). Similar to a healthy community, an inclusive vision "affirms itself and builds morale through ceremonies that honor the symbols of shared identity and enable members to rededicate themselves to shared goals. This does not mean that they
suppress internal criticism or deny their flaws. The community that cannot tolerate disagreement fails to meet the earlier criterion, wholeness incorporating diversity” (Gardner, J.W., 1990, p. 111).

Although the vision component has been given consideration, lack of attention to the level of inclusiveness has left the existing body of literature incomplete. In order to distinguish the pertinent characteristics of exceptional leadership, the level of inclusiveness of the vision will be examined. To mobilize followers, a leader must be able to include the masses into the vision. If individuals cannot see the benefits of joining an organization or a cause, then the likelihood of the leader’s success diminishes. Whereas, if a greater amount of people can see how they will benefit from membership, larger goals will be achieved.

The literature clearly outlines the importance of vision in outstanding leadership, unfortunately by neglecting the need for inclusiveness, lack of unity is promoted in our society. The current vacuum regarding inclusive vision exemplifies the persistent breeding of disharmony, war, and destruction in our world. The potential unity created through the development of inclusive visions is a significant factor in the differentiation between good and great leadership.

Developing on the ideas of Kouzes & Posner (1995), Snyder & Graves (1994), and Gardner, J.W., (1990), inclusive vision will be operationally defined as creating a common purpose for the future that
includes followers regardless of race, gender, or religion and is conceived of with good intentions. An inclusive vision incorporates a broad spectrum of followers without constraints to join. In other words, the issue or cause itself is simplified to a basic level that allows people to see a benefit in joining, not just a particular gender, race, or religious affiliation, but society as a whole.

The following hypothesis is proposed: (1) Leaders who espouse a more inclusive vision are more likely to mobilize highly committed followers. This hypothesis is based on the idea that a leader must create a sense of unity among the followers while creating a common purpose in a future direction in order to be effective (Kouzes & Posner, 1995; Snyder & Graves, 1994; Gardner, J.W., 1990). It is the job of the leader to unite the followers to attain the goal or to fulfill the purpose of the organization. Without a common purpose, there would be no reason for the group to exist.

While it is important that each individual cohort has a personal purpose within the group, there must be an overall goal. A leader cannot be effective if each follower believes the goal is something different. It is essential for the leader to maintain a common purpose within the organization or group. At the same time it is essential that the followers work together to take action to achieve the vision. Hence the level of inclusiveness of the vision is important.
For this study, the measurement of vision is the level of inclusiveness. Portions of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), developed by Kouzes and Posner, will be implemented to measure the level of inclusiveness. Although the Thoms and Blasko Visioning Ability Scale could be a useful tool in assessing one's ability to envision the future of an organization, it is too introspective to be used for the purposes of this study. Each of the questions specifically asks the subject to rate himself/herself. Since the present study is focused on the level of inclusiveness of the vision, the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) by Kouzes and Posner will be adapted because it is a better fit.

The LPI categorizes the strengths and weaknesses of leaders into five areas including: challenge the process; inspire a shared vision; enable others to act; model the way; and encourage the heart (Kouzes & Posner, 1995, p. 9). However, for this study, only two sections of the LPI will be used (Inspiring a Shared Vision and Enabling Others to Act). These sections were isolated for study because together they offer measurement of an inclusive vision. While the portion on inspiring a shared vision, focuses on the vision, the enabling others to act segment concentrates on the inclusive aspect. The other three sections have been eliminated, as they do not enhance the measurement of an inclusive vision as operationally defined in this study.
These sections will comprise the Vision Inclusiveness Questionnaire (VIQ). A Lickert Scale will be used to rate the levels of inclusiveness (1-highly exclusive, 2-moderately exclusive, 3-average, 4-moderately inclusive, 5-highly inclusive). If the individuals are working toward the same goal, then the leader has effectively created a common purpose. Additionally, if there are a wide variety of followers irrespective of gender, race, or religious affiliation working together the vision is inclusive. But if the followers have divided into factions within the group each striving for separate objectives and are divided by gender, race or religion, then the leader’s vision is considered exclusive.
Independent Variable #2: Charisma

While an inclusive vision is imperative, alone it cannot explain the effectiveness of a great leader. Yes, outstanding leaders must be able to generate a common purpose that includes followers irrespective of race, gender, or religion, and is conceived of with good intentions. However, in order to maintain the base of followers, leaders must not only attract followers but also keep their supporters motivated. Without enough enthusiasm, the group will dissipate. By itself vision cannot accomplish this. The factor that accounts for enhancing and sustaining enthusiasm is charisma. The concept of charisma further bridges the gap between the psychological and business/management schools of thought.

Integrating both an inclusive vision and charisma into one's style of leadership will increase an individual's effectiveness from mediocre to superior and enhance the degree of commitment of followers.

Charisma is often referred to as a quality that some people exude while others do not. But what exactly is it and how can one know if they portray it or not? Scholars have attempted to define charisma and discover ways to measure it. Some suggest it is a person's aura that enables one to persuade others to do things (Sellers and Puri, 1996). Others recognize charismatic leaders as "charming, self-confident, and..."
persuasive...eloquent, with an innate ability to sense followers' needs and concerns, they provide the assurance and direction to forge ahead." (Birchfield, 2000, p. 30). Charisma has also been defined as "the ability to draw people to you" (Maxwell, 1999, p. 10) or as "a positive and compelling quality of a person that makes others want to be led by him or her" (DuBrin, 2001, p. 60).

Charisma can be a method of inspiration through expressive communication "thereby bringing the vision to life in such a way that people can see themselves in it and sincerely believing what they're saying and demonstrating their personal conviction" (Kouzes & Posner, 1995, p. 129). A leader who effectively motivates his followers "mobilize[s] others to want to act" (Kouzes & Posner, 1995, p. 31).

Outlining charisma as a business tool that "makes you a leader" Sellers and Puri (1996, p. 68) compared CEO's who had it and those that did not. In order to understand the idea of charisma, five key factors were identified: simplify and exaggerate, romanticize risk, defy the status quo, step into another's shoes, and spar and rile (Sellers & Puri, 1996).

Breaking complex ideas into easily understandable messages was imperative. In order for others to follow, they must understand the meaning. Charismatic leaders flourish at the idea of risk; "fear of failure, that's the thrill" (Sellers & Puri, 1996, p. 72). Not only does this
excitement motivate the leader, but it also resonates onto the followers and enhances the magnetic personality of the leader. Similarly, defying the status quo provides an opportunity for charismatic leaders to capture the spotlight. Yet, the ability to view things from varying perspectives creates a commonality between the charismatic leader and his or her followers. People do not feel isolated, but instead have a sense of being understood. Finally, by 'sparring and riling' or 'poking and prodding' charismatic leaders challenge their followers to be their best and excel. According to Sellers and Puri (1996), by implementing the combination of these traits, individuals will exhibit charisma and shine as great leaders.

Using an alternative method to measure leadership charisma, Fiol et al. (1999) applied semiotic analysis to 42 speeches of 14 United States Presidents of the 20th Century. Semiotic analysis is inspection of word choice or specific semantics. This study examined charisma as a psychological process to create social change. In order to investigate this three-step process of breaking down belief systems, moving to new beliefs, and finally realigning those beliefs, three speeches were selected for each President: one from the first year as President, one from a middle year, and one from the final year in office.

Through examination of each sentence, charisma was coded into three categories: level of negation, level of abstraction, and level of
inclusiveness. Negation was measured by the number of times the word "not" was utilized. Level-of abstraction was categorized as least to most abstract: individual, thing or event, country or nation, and world or universal beliefs. Investigators believed that this variable was indicative of the size of the population the leader was able to encapsulate in his message. Finally, the level of inclusiveness was determined by the use of words "we" "us" or "our" as opposed to the words "I" and "me."

Researchers hypothesized that charismatic leaders would exhibit frequent use of negation in the beginning phase, more frequent use in the middle phase and infrequent use in the final phase. However, leaders who were non-charismatic would be consistent in level of negation. Charismatic leaders were hypothesized to use more inclusive language and to communicate at higher levels of abstraction than their counterparts. Additionally, during transformation, charismatic leaders were hypothesized to use higher levels of inclusion and abstraction during the moving phase than in initial or final phases. Their counterparts were not expected to follow this pattern.

"The empirical results of the study suggest that charismatic leaders employ a predictable, consistent set of linguistic techniques to break down, move, and re-align certain beliefs of followers" (Fiol et al., 1999, p. 470). Results emphasized that charismatic leaders "employed techniques of negation, inclusion and abstraction more frequently
during the middle phase of their tenure as leaders than in the earlier and later phases.” (Fiol et al., 1999, p. 470).

This study provided an innovative perspective for examining charisma, not as a personality trait, but as a process. Although this methodology was able to provide insight into the charisma of American Presidents, it does not account for leaders who have been deemed charismatic from the beginning of their careers. If charisma is a process that must be developed, then it cannot exist without going through a process of evolution. Perhaps the Presidential office or terms of office provide a unique example. It seems unlikely that this process of charisma would also exist within the corporate structure or a nation without varying term limits.

Additionally, speeches were analyzed in segments, not the message as a whole. This difference can create a possibility for inaccuracy. Similarly, if one were to read only the beginning, middle, or end of a story, chances are there would be misinterpretations because the message in its entirety would not be understood. According to this study, leaders that do not implement specific word choice, but present an overall idea would not be considered to exude charisma.

Another study (Deluga, 1998) utilized historiometrics to measure charisma, proactivity, and presidential performance of 39 American Presidents from George Washington to Ronald Reagan. Historiometrics is
a method of analyzing biographical materials. One hundred and seventeen undergraduate students rated three presidential profiles, which were each a short biography of approximately 600 words. After reading the anonymous biography, each student used the Proactive Personality Scale as created by Bateman & Crant to rate the leader's level of proactivity. Charismatic leadership was determined by using the results of a prior study by Simonton. Finally, rated presidential performance was determined through archival measures whereby the results of other presidential studies were used (Simonton, 1984, 1986). This study indicated "that presidential proactivity was a significant predictor for ... rated performance and ... charismatic leadership" (Deluga, 1998, p. 284).

Also using Simonton's charisma rating of U.S. Presidents, McCann, re-examined Weber's long held idea that "charismatic leaders emerge in times of crisis" (McCann, 1997, p. 393). Thirty-seven professors used a Lickert Scale ranging from (1) very non-threatening to (7) very threatening for each of the years from 1788 to 1992 with regard to social, political, and economic threat for each election year. Results supported the hypothesis that charismatic presidents were more likely to be elected in times that were considered more threatening.

Other scholars, (Brown & Lord, 1999) and (Wofford, 1999) have discussed the value of laboratory experiments to gain further
understanding of the concept of charisma. Wofford discusses "the contributions that laboratory experiments can make to the study of charismatic leadership. [He] contends that the charismatic leadership construct...can be operationalized for laboratory research with construct validity" (1999, p. 528). Similarly, in their assessment of experimental research, Brown & Lord (1999) acknowledge that "experimental approaches have been underutilized and there are advantages to employing a balanced methodological approach in any area of inquiry...such measures would serve only to complement...leadership literature" (1999, p. 538).

Further investigation was conducted regarding two forms of charismatic leadership. Hunt (1999) examined the idea that there are two categories of charismatic leadership: visionary and crisis-responsive. This study found that in a setting without crisis, visionary leadership was important, but crisis responsive leadership had limited effects unless the crisis was reinforced over time (Hunt, 1999, p. 442). This study supported the idea that crisis plays a major role in the perception of charisma when compared with visionary charismatic leadership (Hunt, 1999, p. 441). However crisis alone does not create charisma, crisis combined with response does.

For the present study, the second independent variable is the level of charisma exhibited by the leader. Merging the ideas developed by
Kouzes and Posner (1995), Birchfield (2000), Maxwell (1999) and DuBrin (2001) charisma will be defined as the leader's ability to motivate and create enthusiasm to achieve the goal. The following hypothesis is proposed: (2) Leaders who are more charismatic are more likely to mobilize highly committed followers. This is based on the idea that a leader must inspire the masses after creating an inclusive vision. Vision or charisma alone will not elevate a mediocre leader to be outstanding. The two variables go hand in hand.

In order to measure the leader's charisma, the Leadership Charisma Questionnaire (LCQ), will be used. This survey consists of eleven questions that were adopted from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). Although the Leadership Practices Inventory offers a valuable assessment of leadership characteristics, the MLQ provides an in depth evaluation of charisma. The MLQ in its entirety is comprised of six categories of leadership, including: charisma, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, contingent reward, active management, and passive-avoidant. When the relevant section for charisma is extracted from the larger questionnaire, it is a better choice. A five point Likert Scale will be used to evaluate the levels (1-Never Charismatic, 2-Almost Never Charismatic, 3-Sometimes Charismatic, 4-Almost Always Charismatic, 5-Always Charismatic).

Measurement of charisma will also incorporate the intention of the
leader. As previously mentioned this study will not examine the actual outcome instead, focus will be on the intention. Incorporating intention with the measurement of charisma will dismiss tyrannical leaders who achieved their goals.

Since the LCQ is an adaptation of the charisma section of the MLQ, the measurement for leader motives is already incorporated into the LCQ. There are questions that particularly focus on the intention of the leader. For example, "Models ethical standards" and "Considers the moral/ethical."

While this study will in no way attempt to approach the issue whether the ability to lead is innate or learned, its focus is to fill a gap within the body of literature. Although other authors have examined the vision component of leadership, there is no clear understanding about the level of inclusiveness of the vision component. Additionally, while research has been conducted regarding charisma, there is still much debate, as evidenced by the dedication of a two-part special issue of Leadership Quarterly on the topic (See Summer and Winter 1999 volumes).

This study will examine vision and charisma as two individual aspects that will differentiate mediocre leaders from outstanding leaders.

The seemingly endless stream of books, articles,
seminars, workshops, and broadcast programs on political leadership, business leadership, and community leadership testifies to the widespread belief that leadership is important and that we need to prepare potential leaders more effectively. Yet, despite specific regimens of leadership in specific domains, most of the larger society remains ignorant about leadership — not only about its importance but also about the ways in which it can be effective (Gardner, H., 1995).

Merely recognizing the importance of preparing leaders alone does not equip those leaders with the ability to be effective. Leaders must understand how to effectively achieve success.
Methods

In order to use the questionnaires with consistency to measure the leaders' vision and charisma, two executed speeches and one publicized written document will be analyzed. In a study conducted by Fiol & Harris (1999), when investigating the leadership of United States Presidents, three speeches were examined. One represented the first year in office, another a middle term, and the third an end of term speech. Similarly, this study will utilize three samples, which will also be used to account for consistency. Moreover, three selections will provide sufficient content of each leader's personality.

Given that leaders express themselves through public speaking and writing, examining both are effective ways to measure the vision and level of charisma of each. Generally leaders most often present their ideas verbally; therefore two orations will be examined. However, since leaders also use the written word to convey messages, it is important not to neglect written documents. While some leaders may demonstrate their ideas better in one forum than another it is necessary to examine both. Reviewing a combination of the two will provide more
diverse data and is an opportunity to analyze controversies of message through different mediums.

Although present day leaders could also be examined by utilizing technological advances such as recorded radio or television appearances that could also incorporate visual or audio cues, the study of historical leaders would limit this possibility. So for the purposes of continuity, this study will specifically focus on two speeches and one written document.

Other researchers, Mumford and Van Doom (2001) have also examined a variety of written documents in the study of leadership, specifically of Benjamin Franklin. There was “an unusually exhaustive body of historic material. Available documents... [included] his autobiography, personal letters, editorials, treaties, speeches and assembly proposals” (Mumford & Van Doom, 2001, p. 287).

Also following the prior study of Fiol & Harris (1999), selections will have “addressed a wide, national audience either in topic matter or in physical audience.” To accurately gauge the vision of leaders' speeches and writings, examples that received greater publicity and which are considered historical documents will be chosen. If more obscure selections were made, fewer people would have been exposed, whereby the results would be skewed and biased. Measuring realistic
perceptions of each leader is imperative to provide conclusive evidence to outline the significance of both an inclusive vision and charisma.

As the VIQ consists of twelve questions, and three samples will be critiqued, scores will range from a low of 36 to a possible high of 180. Highly exclusive visions will range from 36-64, moderately exclusive visions will range from 65-93, average visions will range from 94-122, moderately inclusive visions will range from 123-151, and highly inclusive visions will range from 152-180. The potential scores ranging from 36 to 180 represent 144 possible scores. In order to develop five groups, each rating consists of approximately 28 points.

In order to measure a leader’s charisma and to use the LCQ with consistency, the same two speeches and one written document used to analyze vision will also be used to assess charisma. As there are eleven questions on the LCQ, scores will range from 33 to 165. Once again, broken into categories: never charismatic ranging from 33-57, almost never charismatic ranging from 58-84, sometimes charismatic ranging from 85-111, almost always charismatic ranging from 112-138, and always charismatic ranging from 139-165. Each category represents approximately 26 possible points.

The samples for each leader will be examined and scored individually. For example, one sample would be read, than scored on both the VIQ and the LCQ for a particular leader. Then, the next
sample for that same leader would be scored, until all of the questionnaires were completed for each leader.
Case Selection

The Civil Rights Movement in the United States and the Independence Movement in India were historic movements in the course of mankind. These universal struggles for freedom and equality are timeless issues involving human rights. Throughout the course of history, people have fought for "the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" (Congress, 1776). Not only in the United States, but globally, individuals have been fighting for equality between race, class, and gender. These recurrent crusades emphasize the worldwide importance of human rights. As a prohibition of discrimination, civil rights are a vital component of human rights.

As outlined in the thirty Articles of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, "all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood" (G.A. Res. 217 A III, 1948). Human rights are vastly important, as exemplified through the dedication of time, programs, and money the United Nations has dedicated to the issue. Endowed with certain inalienable rights, each individual is entitled to the right to be free. Unfortunately there are leaders of nations who do not recognize this and abuse their citizens.
Human rights encompass the totality of human existence. When individuals in one region are not free to be or are suffering as a result of customary inferiority, the entire globe is affected. Each individual comprises humanity. No one person is exempt from his or her responsibility to civilization. Just as Hitler had the ability to obliterate the human rights of millions of people during his reign in Germany, the leaders of the Civil Rights Movement in the United States and the Independence Movement in India had the ability to remove barriers diminishing human rights. Although at opposite ends of the spectrum, each leader was able to vastly impact the progression of humankind. Some leaders have altered the course of history for the betterment of humankind and others for the detriment of humanity.

The importance of human rights has not diminished in today's world. Globally citizens are suffering from discrimination and suppression: "persons in Chechnya continue to 'disappear' in the custody of Russian forces," "in its campaign to eradicate Falungong, Chinese officials imprisoned thousands of practitioners and used torture and psychological pressure," and citizens in Afghanistan are still facing "widespread abuses including killings, sexual violence, beatings, 
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Presently in Pakistan, tribal councils have the authority to "decree that a young woman be raped in revenge for a crime allegedly committed by her brother" (Sarwar, 2002, p. 15). These examples of intolerance emphasize the continuing need to focus on human rights.

Furthermore, the United States' "war on terrorism" has led many to question the infringement of people's civil rights. The Patriot Act of 2001 is "a bill that allows police to secretly search the homes of suspects, tap all their cell and home phones and track their use of the Internet. The measure also eases the detention of suspects without charges." This legislation potentially jeopardizes the civil rights of all American citizens. "The right to live secure from the threat of mass murder is a human right. Freedom from fear is no less important than freedom of speech" (Terrorism and Democracy, 2002). Similar to past acts of discrimination, encroachment of civil rights continues to be questioned. Although technology continues to progress and human life expectancy increases, certain issues remain constant. As long as humanity continues, human rights will always be an issue.

If our goal is to move forward to a time where all citizens of the

---

world can actualize human rights, it is imperative to study leaders of previous movements so that we can cultivate powerful leaders for the future. The consistent problems of human rights abuses and suppression, force us to examine the potent leadership of the past. By incorporating the positive aspects and eliminating the negative, our future leaders will have the ability to extinguish present human rights abuses. It is only through investigation and examination that we can begin to replace the ill ways of the past. Through this understanding we can develop leaders who will actually be able to change the world for the better.

Leaders selected for examination were either involved in the Civil Rights Movement in the United States or the Indian Independence Movement. Additional criteria were also utilized. In order to control for gender bias, which was prevalent during the time period of each struggle, all subjects chosen for investigation were males. Each movement was researched individually to determine subjects that were involved during the same time frame under similar situations. One such condition was the exhibition of informal power.

The leaders of the movements under investigation were not Heads of State, nor did they have formal power within any branch of government to achieve change. They all exhibited informal power, or power that was acquired through passion, commitment, and
determination. People chose to follow each man based on ability, not position. Unlike CEO's or elected officials, there was no formal structure to achieve power or mobilize the masses. Instead, grassroots attempts elevated each man to a position of power, delegated by the people. These individuals guided, directed, and lead the followers as champions for the people. While some were good leaders and others were great, the fact remains that each man was able to achieve his influence through informal power.

Specifically, this study will examine the leadership of Mohandas Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr. as two leaders who are classified as extraordinary as a result of exemplifying an inclusive vision and charisma. Both leaders played an integral role in shaping our society. According to Time magazine, Gandhi and King were two of “twenty people who helped define the political and social fabric of our times.”

---

Numerous people played an important role in shaping the movement for racial equality in the United States. Removing the barriers of segregation and opening the doors for integration required the hard work of countless activists. The Civil Rights Movement in the United States was a time of both non-violence and brutality. In the bipolar fight for integration, leaders created gradual change.

Society was not transformed overnight; progress was made slowly. Throughout the course of the Civil Rights Movement, many leaders were involved. The "Big Six" leaders of the movement were: A. Philip Randolph, the head of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters; Roy Wilkins, President of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; James Farmer, founder of Congress for Racial Equality (CORE); John Lewis, President of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC); Whitney Young, President of the National Urban League; and Martin Luther King, Jr., President of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC).\(^6\)

Yet, the person who achieved the status as leader of the

movement and achieved the titles of “Alabama’s Modern Moses,” and
“Little Lord Jesus” was Martin Luther King, Jr. (Miller, 1992, p. 172).
Excelling beyond the other top leaders of the Civil Rights Movement,
King is remembered: “It is impossible to think of the movement
unfolding as it did without him at its helm. He was, as the cliche has it,
the right man at the right time” (White, 1999).

Martin Luther King, Jr. was the President of the Montgomery
Improvement Association from 1955 to 1956 as well as the founder and
President of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) from
1957 to 1968. He empowered others to join in the struggle for racial
equality. Promoting integration through non-violent resistance, King
appealed to Americans to participate in bus boycotts, sit-ins, and
freedom rides. Among the many leaders involved in the Civil Rights
Movement, Martin Luther King, Jr. has been the one who is widely
recognized for his extraordinary leadership ability.

The literature suggests that King had highly committed followers.
In his book Steven Kasher (1996) compiled photographs depicting the
Civil Rights Movement. Throughout the pictures and narratives, the
gruesome human rights abuses are detailed. Regardless of the
repercussions King’s followers continued to practice non-violence. His

---

University. [http://www.lib.lsu.edu/hum/mlk/srs218.html].

---
peaceful protestors participated in marches, sit-ins, pickets, and boycotts. The masses that followed King were subjected to lynching, stampedes, beatings, attack by dynamite, jailing, mauling by police dogs, vicious hosing by firemen, and tear gas. In spite of these horrific consequences, citizens continued to take action and participated at high levels.

When examining the level of commitment of the masses during the Civil Rights Movement, it is important to note that the followers of most leaders during the Civil Rights Movement faced severe consequences. While some leaders were more militant and faced greater opposition, the overall climate in the United States at the time meant increased risk for any level of involvement.

To analyze the vision and charisma of Martin Luther King, Jr., the two speeches to be examined will be “I Have a Dream” delivered at the March on Washington, August 1963 (Carson & Shepard, 2001) and “I've Been to the Mountaintop” delivered in Memphis, Tennessee, April 1968 (Carson & Shepard, 2001). Referred to as “the most cogent summation of the goals and strategies of the civil rights movement,” (Kasher, 1996, p. 94) King’s written document will be the “Letter from a Birmingham Jail” dated April 1963 (Carson, 1998). These examples are prime choices for study because they were widely publicized during the Civil Rights Movement and they are historic (Branch, 1988; Levy, 1992;

In order to test the proposed hypotheses, Martin Luther King, Jr. will be compared to other leaders of the Civil Rights Movement specifically, Roy Wilkins and Stokely Carmichael. To adequately measure the importance of both an inclusive vision and charisma of extraordinary leaders like King, there must be a comparison with leaders who did not exhibit both qualities. Roy Wilkins has been selected as a leader who exhibited an inclusive vision, but lacked charisma. On the other hand, Stokely Carmichael had charisma but was exclusive in his vision. The literature suggests, that Wilkins and Carmichael embody these qualities.

Roy Wilkins, as the President of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) from 1955 to 1977, fought to end discrimination through legal measures (Straub, 1996, p. 1287). "Wilkins devoted a considerable part of his lifetime to speaking on issues related to equality and justice" (Smith & Robb, 1971, p. 120). Similar to King, he too had informal power. Following an inclusive vision, "Wilkins...[was] strongly committed to integration, interracial efforts, and nonviolence" (Weiss, 1989, p. 111). While Wilkins seemed to exhibit an inclusive vision, he appears to have lacked the charisma of King. "The tone he set for the organization during that period reflected his own quiet, low-key style of conservative yet efficient leadership. But it also
made him the target of criticism from those who felt he lacked the proper 'fire'" (Straub, 1996, p. 1287).

According to the body of literature, followers of Wilkins seem to fall in the average level of commitment. At the helm of the NAACP, the organization was known as an agency of litigation and lobbying (Sitkoff, 1981, p. 18). Although making small strides, the NAACP seemed to be losing its base of constituents. "Disappointed, Afro-Americans also questioned the legislative tactics of the NAACP, which placed a premium on neither provoking the black masses nor embittering the white majority" (Sitkoff, 1981, p. 36). The sacrifices of membership and the actions taken were less extreme than those of King's followers.

In order to test the hypotheses, Wilkins' addresses given in 1955 at the NAACP Convention "The Conspiracy to Deny Equality" and his July 5, 1966 address also at an NAACP Convention will be assessed (Foner, 1972; Smith & Robb, 1971; Straub, 1982). As head of the organization, these are appropriate examples to scrutinize for his presence of vision and charisma. The written article will be "Black Power or Black Pride" dated March 1974 (Wilson, 1999, p. 456).

Although there is variety in the time frame from which each sample was selected, this assortment represents consistency of his vision and charisma.

Stokely Carmichael will be examined as a leader of the Civil Rights
Movement who did have charisma, but had an exclusive vision.

Replacing John Lewis as Chairman of the SNCC, Carmichael exhibited informal power. Displaying an exclusive vision, "under his leadership the SNCC excluded whites from its membership and de-emphasized racial integration as a goal for blacks. He popularized the slogan of black power" (Dudley, 1996, p. 219). Known as a "charismatic spokesman... Carmichael... was able to articulate the grievances of the black masses in simple, direct terms... [he] soon became the most popular young speaker in the nation" (Smith & Robb, 1971, p. 265). As the embodiment of a leader who demonstrated an exclusive vision and charisma, Stokely Carmichael is an excellent comparison to King and Wilkins.

Research suggests that Carmichael had a higher level of commitment among his followers than did Wilkins. It seems he had more followers willing to take action. "Word of Carmichael's jailing brought out a large and angry crowd" (Sitkoff, 1981, p. 214) as Carmichael spoke, fifteen thousand marchers were roaring Black Power, the phrase Carmichael had popularized (Sitkoff, 1981, 215). The idea of Black Power "galvanized many whom the movement had never touched to mobilize for concerted action. It spawned an array of new associations, caucuses, and community organizations" (Sitkoff, 1981, p. 215).
For examination of his vision and charisma, the famous “Black Power” speech “delivered at the Berkeley Black Power Conference of November 1966” (Smith & Robb, 1971; Staub, 1982) and the publicized Pacifica Radio Address “Free Huey Rally” of 1968 will be used (Levy, 1992, p. 184). An article titled “Power and Racism” from a pamphlet distributed by the SNCC in September 1966 will be inspected as the writing sample. These choices are relevant because of the exposure, time frame and historical significance of each (Sitkoff, 1993; Towns, 2002).

These three candidates are relevant choices. Other potential nominations included those dubbed the “six chiefs” of the Civil Rights Movement, as previously mentioned (Branch, 1988, p. 847). Historical representations of the principal civil rights organizations known as the “big six” have sometimes substituted John Lewis or Philip Randolph with Dorothy Height of the National Council of Negro Women (Houser, 1990, p. 186) (Farmer, 1985, p. 215). Again, due to gender bias during this era, only males were selected for study.

Randolph was eliminated due to the historical time period. Although he was a well-respected gentleman involved in the “big six,” he was also known as “the greatest black leader of the thirties” (Farmer, ...
During the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950's and 1960's Randolph was eclipsed and bypassed by younger and more militant leadership, but he still remained a well-respected figure for other civil rights activists" (Towns, 2002, p. 154). As a result of the time frame for his accomplishments, he was extracted as a potential sample.

John Lewis, President of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee was removed as a candidate to eliminate the control variable of age. Although his organization was essential in the grassroots development for the achievement of civil rights, being in his early twenties (Pfeffer, 1990, p. 245) he was much younger than the other leaders. In order to minimize extraneous variables, Lewis was extracted from the selection pool.

Another leader not chosen for study was James Farmer. "The forgotten man of the Movement" "never sought the limelight, and until today, ... frankly he's never gotten the credit he deserved for the contribution he has made to the freedom of African Americans and other minorities" (Farmer, 1985, preface).

When Wilkins and Young were compared, each was an appropriate candidate. Both exhibited informal power and were possible subjects for study with inclusive visions and without much charisma.

“While Roy Wilkins and Whitley Young maintained highly visible profiles,
they aroused no one with their painstaking gradualism and their plain-
vanilla, straightforward speechifying” (Miller, 1992, p. 171). However
Wilkins stance against Black Power made him a better choice to
compare to Stokely Carmichael. “Wilkins tore into Carmichael and
other proponents of Black Power as if they were a cancer in the
movement for racial equality” (Weisbrot, 1990, p. 205). This position
contrasts the inclusive/exclusive vision with more clarity.

During the Movement, the concept of Black Power created an
alternative vision. “To some, its message seemed to be perfectly sensible
— that black people wanted a share of the nation’s political power, as
they always had. But to others, it seemed a chilling challenge, a cast-
down gauntlet of racism in reverse” (Powledge, 1991, p. 633). The
significance of this vision discrepancy was essential to be encapsulated
in the candidates chosen for study.

While Stokely Carmichael was not considered one of the “big six”
(Pfeffer, 1990, p. 245), he did replace John Lewis as head of the SNCC.
As such, he did have informal power. His idea of Black Power,
“ultimately led to the changing direction of the movement
from... nonviolent approach that sought integration to... a black
nationalism approach that sanctioned violence” (Towns, 2001, p. 161).
Again, the significance of this concept and its effect on the Civil Rights
Movement contribute to the importance of selecting leaders who
represent both views, an inclusive and exclusive vision.

Although other leaders of the movement could have been selected, Carmichael and Wilkins clearly exhibit the contrasting variables. After researching the historical representations of various leaders such as A. Philip Randolph, James Farmer, Whitney Young, and John Lewis, the best match for each category was Carmichael and Wilkins. Based on each man's position, role, time frame, and qualities, confounding variables could be eliminated. The assortment of leaders during the Civil Rights Movement presented numerous possibilities for this study, but Wilkins and Carmichael are the most appropriate selections.

If Martin Luther King, Jr. were compared to an individual who lacked both an inclusive vision and charisma, then the hypotheses wouldn't truly be tested. He wouldn't be compared to a leader. In order to investigate the significance of both an inclusive vision and charisma as the factors that differentiate mediocre leaders from extraordinary leaders, the differences need to be represented. Moreover, there weren't any examples of leaders during the Civil Rights Movement who lacked both charisma and an inclusive vision.
Indian Independence Movement

For a comprehensive examination to be conducted, merely assessing one great leader and his counterparts is not enough. In order to account for confounding variables of time, place, and population, leaders from other movements need to be compared. Did an inclusive vision and charisma contribute to King's greatness only because of the time period? Would these variables be significant in leaders of other nations, or are they only specific to the population of the United States? In order to account for these confounding variables, this study will also analyze leaders from the Indian Independence Movement.

Numerous leaders had noteworthy roles during the Indian Independence Movement to remove British Imperial Rule over the nation. The development of the Indian National Congress in 1885 was the beginning of organized Indian nationalism (Hardgrave & Kochanek, 1993, p. 37). One of the early presidents of the Congress was G.K. Gokhale, considered “one of the most significant Indian politicians of the day” (Brown, 1989, p. 34). Throughout his leadership, he maintained that the British tradition was best (Hardgrave & Kochanek, 1993, p. 38). Other leaders such as Aurobindo Ghose and Bal Gangadhar Tilak were extremist and “demanded administrative reform [be] replaced with the
call for swaraj, or self-rule” (Hardgrave & Kochanek, 1993, p. 38).

Leading the untouchables, the lowest caste in India, Dr. Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar helped “develop a modernist spirit of political consciousness” (Wolpert, 2000, p. 310). Other central figures include C.R. Das and Motilal Nehru who led the Congress while Gandhi was serving time in jail (Hardgrave & Kochanek, 1993, p. 45).

The hard work and dedication of these individuals led to the actualization of independence from British Rule. “On August 15, 1947, India became an independent nation” (Hardgrave & Kochanek, 1993, p. 52). Indians achieved the right to Home Rule. However, the new nation created did not unite India. Instead a separation occurred: India supported the Hindu population and a partition known as Pakistan supported the Muslims.

Regardless of the number of leaders involved with the movement, the individual who remains the timeless leader of the Indian Independence Movement was Mohandas Gandhi. Dubbed “Mahatma” or “Great Soul,” Gandhi is an outstanding representative of an extraordinary leader. Mohandas Gandhi had an inclusive vision and a high level of charisma. “Gandhi was one of the great men not only of our time, but of all history...Gandhi’s greatness, which was widely recognized during his lifetime, has not diminished and indeed is likely to increase” (Jack, 1956, p. v).
First exemplifying his leadership abilities in South Africa against the 'Black Act' "by which all Indians wishing to reside legally in the colony had to register," Gandhi led the struggle for its repeal and the establishment of legal equality for immigrants (Brown, 1989, p. 45). After his success in South Africa, Gandhi returned to India and became involved with the Indian Home Rule Movement. Duplicating his ability to unite people in South Africa, Gandhi unified the masses during the Indian Independence struggle to remove imperial British rule. Lacking formal power, Gandhi's reputation for his achievement in South Africa spoke for itself.

Gandhi is a prime example of a leader who exhibited both an inclusive vision and charisma.

Gandhi vigorously fought for religious tolerance, the way of nonviolence, gender equality, and the removal of untouchability for the life of the new nation. The path of nonviolence Gandhi followed showed that men could live as brothers...it was his vision of an open, inclusive, society (Parel, 2000, p. 119).

Demonstrating an inclusive vision, Gandhi did not see gender, religious, or caste barriers. "Gandhi...continuously emphasized the multireligious, multiracial, multilingual character of Indian nationalism" (Ghose, 1975, p. 193). All were equal in his eyes.

Gandhi also had charisma. As described by Nehru,

And then Gandhi came. He was like a powerful current of fresh air that made us stretch ourselves and take deep
breaths, like a beam of light that pierced the darkness and removed the scales from our eyes, like a whirlwind that upset many things but most of all the working of people’s minds. He did not descend from the top; he seemed to emerge from the millions of India...(Dalton, 1993, p. 66).

Scholars imply that Gandhi had highly committed followers.

An outstanding example of the willingness of the masses to make the highest level of sacrifice was described by a reporter’s reaction to the Salt March:

Suddenly at a word of command, scores of native policemen rushed upon the advancing marchers and raided blows on their heads with their steel-shod lathis. Not one of the marchers even raised an arm to fend off the blows. They went down like ten-pins. From where I stood, I heard the sickening whack of the clubs on unprotected skulls...they marched steadily, with heads up, without the encouragement of music or cheering or any possibility they might escape serious injury or death (Mehta, 1976, p. 148).

Not only were Gandhi’s followers willing to face extraordinary brutality, but they were often jailed and detained as well. His followers appeared to have the highest level of commitment and respect for his leadership. “There was something almost magical about the mature Gandhi, in his power of winning over people of a great variety of kinds, getting work from them, establishing moral authority over them” (Green, 1993, p. 212).

For assessment, Gandhi’s two speeches will be “Non-cooperation” dated August 1920 and “Quit India” dated 1942 to
the All India Congress. The evidence of the impact of these speeches is timeless, as both were included in Sutton's book, Speech Index: An Index to 259 Collections of World Famous Orations and Speeches for Various Occasions. In further support, numerous other authors reference these examples as well including: (Bakshi, 1983; Parel, 2000; Almeida, 2001; Damodaran, 1992) Gandhi's written document will be excerpts from his famous book "Hind Swaraj." Although written approximately in 1908, the "basic tenants...remained firm guideposts illuminating Gandhi's mature years" (Parel, 2000, p. 107). Its significance was so great, it is cited in numerous publications about Gandhi's influence (Parel, 2000; Bakshi, 1983; Kytle, 1982). Again, the wide population exposed to these examples, as well as the historic significance exemplifies the pertinence of scrutinizing each to understand Gandhi's vision and charisma. Even though the selections for Gandhi span a large time frame, they represent continuity of his vision and charisma. Additionally according to the literature each was a central component to understanding the leadership of Gandhi.

Gandhi will be compared to other leaders of his time. Abul Kalam Azad will portray a leader that exhibited an inclusive vision but lacked charisma. While Mohammad Ali Jinnah will
embody a leader who had charisma but had an exclusive vision.

Abul Kalam Azad was president of the Indian National Congress in 1923 and again in 1940 (Ghose, 1975, p. 168). (The Indian National congress would be the equivalent of one of the civil rights groups in the U.S. as India was occupied by Britain at the time). He founded the famous journal, al-Hilal and was India's Minister of Education from its origination until his death (Hay, 1988, p. 236).

Maintaining an inclusive vision, Azad firmly “opposed the idea of partition” (Ghose, 1975, p. 166). Comparing the concept to matrimony, he did not believe in “divorce before marriage. Indians must begin by living in wedlock. If it did not work, they could get a divorce” (Azad, 1960, p. xxi). “He could see no conflict between Islam and sympathy for Islamic countries on the one hand and Indian nationalism on the other” (Ghose, 1975, p. 164). “Azad continued to insist that there was no Muslim problem, claiming that a hundred thousand nationalist Muslims were members of Congress and that Congress represented all of India” (Wolpert, 2000, p. 325-6). Furthermore, he emphasized “in the advancement of nations, there is no greater hindrance than narrow-mindedness” (Sharma, 1990, p. 8).

Highly regarded as a leader during the Indian Independence
Movement, Jawaharlal Nehru noted, among these giants of the freedom movement, young in years, but always looked upon as a veteran and old in wisdom, was Maulana Azad. He occupied a special place in our movement and he represented to us, more than anyone else, that synthesis of cultures for which India had always striven. He helped us to get out of the ruts of a narrow nationalism and enlarged our vision (Sharma, 1990, p. 12).

While the literature clearly describes the inclusive vision of Azad, there is minimal mention of his exhibiting charisma. Actually, one source stated, "President Azad, who was never the most charismatic of leaders" (Read & Fisher, 1997, p. 301). It has been noted that "as a speaker, he [Azad], adhered to logical argument; hence he was less dangerous than the emotional Alis' (Minault, 1982, p. 177). Since he has not been acknowledged as a highly charismatic leader, he is a prime example for this study as a representative of a leader with an inclusive vision but without charisma.

History shows that Azad was selected as President of the Congress in hopes of uniting the Indian and Muslim factions (Read & Fisher, 1997, p. 293). However, when the Congress was faced with political stalemate, "only one man was capable of reviving and uniting them, and it was not President Azad" (Read & Fisher, 1997, p. 301). Further researchers refer to Azad as
the scholarly and gentle Muslim presence in the Congress" (Ahmed, 1997, p. 69). Overall the representation of Azad throughout the literature does not indicate a high level of commitment of his followers.

For examination, his speeches will be two presidential addresses to the Indian National Congress, from 1940 and April 1946. Both of these speeches are prime examples for study. "In the midst of uncertainty about the future, the Congress met for its annual session in March 1940...under the leadership of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad" (Gopal, 1967, p. 417). As President of the All India Congress, Azad set the tone for the organization through these orations (Hay, 1988, p. 177).

The writing sample to be examined will be the April 11, 1942 published letter to Sir Stafford Cripps, representative on behalf of the British government. Known as the response to the "Cripps mission" this correspondence is historically significant and has been widely discussed throughout the literature. Numerous scholars have focused on the "Cripps mission" (Mitchell, 1942; Gopal, 1967; Clymer, 1995; Hodson, 1969; Brown, 1972; Mansergh, 1970). The vast attention dedicated to the "Cripps mission" and Azad's response is particularly significant in analyzing the leadership of Azad. Additionally, all
three selections are within a similar time frame.

During the beginning of the Indian Independence Movement, Mohammad Jinnah was a proponent of Hindu-Muslim unity. As President of the All India Muslim League, he obtained informal power and represented the minority population of India. However, as the struggle for independence continued, Jinnah's "hopes for a strong center in Indian government where Muslims shared power with congress [were] dashed on the rocks of Muslim provincialism" (Brown, 1989, p. 295).

"In 1940, Jinnah declared that the Hindus and Muslims form two separate nations. The Muslim League now adopted as its goal the creation of a separate and independent Islamic state, Pakistan" (Hardgrave & Kochanek, 1993, p. 48). After a discrepancy regarding the Congressional appointments of Cabinet positions in India, "Jinnah countered by declaring a day of 'direct action'" (Hardgrave & Kochanek, 1993, p. 51).

Although "for generations Muslims and Hindus had lived and intermingled in many parts of the sub-continent...Direct Action Day unleashed communal violence and a train of retaliation which even a joint appeal for peace by Gandhi and Jinnah in April 1947 could not control" (Brown, 1989, p. 374). As a proponent for the partition of India, Jinnah represents
an exclusive vision. However, he was known to have great charisma. "As an orator, he had the triple asset of a magnetic personality, an impressive delivery, and a fluent voice" (Merriam, 1980, p. 38). These qualities gave him the ability to inspire the Muslim population. His exclusive vision combined with charisma, led to the formation of two independent nations. The Hindus would reside in India and the Muslims would reside in Pakistan. Jinnah became known as "Quaid-I-Azam, the Great Leader" (Bolithu, 1964, p. 133).

The selection of Jinnah may be questioned for a variety of reasons. First, his alteration of views from an inclusive leader to an exclusive leader could be considered to make him a difficult subject. Jinnah was a complex individual, "there were two Jinnah's—the Jinnah of the twenties and the Jinnah of the late thirties and of the forties" (Merriam, 1980, p. 39). However, his role during the Gandhi era was pivotal. The historical significance of his exclusive vision far outweighs the questionability of his change of beliefs. Secondly, he achieved formal power as the Head of State of the newly created Pakistan. Yet, the time frame focused on is pre-Pakistan. In spite of these potential issues, he is a good choice to compare to Gandhi as a representative of a leader with an exclusive vision that had
charisma.

History presents Jinnah's followers as being toward the higher end of the commitment scale. Under the leadership of Jinnah, the Muslim League underwent a transformation (Ahmed, 1997, p. 111). His popularity increased, and he had membership counts in the millions. It is noted that he “had the confidence of the Muslim community” (Ahmed, 1997, p. 87); “his hundred million Muslims will march to the left, to the right, to the front, to the rear at his bidding and at nobody else’s” (Ahmed, 1997, p. 89). This alone, exemplifies the actions and participation his followers were committed to.

For examination, Jinnah’s speeches will be two presidential addresses to the All India Muslim League, dated October 1937 and March 1940. The writing sample will be from the Jinnah-Gandhi talks, specifically the September 21, 1944 letter from Mr. Jinnah to Mr. Gandhi. Each example is a relevant choice as it fits the criteria previously outlined.

Throughout the literature, reference is made to Jinnah's 1937 speech (Bandopadhaya, 1991; Wolpert, 1984; Almeida, 2001; Mujahid, 1981). It has been considered “noteworthy for its strong condemnation of the Congress Party” (Merriam, 1980, p. 58). Similarly, the 1940 oration has been referred to as “one of the most important political
speeches in modern Indian history" (Merriam, 1980, p. 66). Also, widely referenced by scholars (Mujahid, 1981; Wolpert, 1984; Merriam, 1980; Almeida, 2001). Likewise, the Gandhi-Jinnah talks are pertinent to the study of the Indian Independence movement. These are all relevant examples for study, since each selection is historically significant and within a similar time frame.

There were many contributors to the Indian Independence Movement who might have been selected for examination in this study. However, Azad and Jinnah were the best choices to compare to Gandhi regarding the variables under investigation. Others such as Tilak, Ghose, Mohamed Ali, Syed Wazir Hassan, and Tagore were leaders of an earlier time frame. Subhas Chandra Bose was also a potential choice, but his role was as a military leader. Additionally, his extensive bouts in prison and his early death complicated him as a subject. Jawaharlal Nehru exemplified a leader with an inclusive vision and charisma, but he and Gandhi worked too closely together during the movement to be used as a comparison. Therefore, the best subjects for comparison are Azad and Jinnah.

Each of the case studies selected for examination in this study are relevant representatives. For accurate results, it was imperative that each leader perfectly fit each combination of independent variables. As such, the leaders under investigation are prime examples of each
Similar to the Civil Rights Movement, there weren’t any examples of leaders during the Indian Independence Movement who lacked both vision and charisma. Some researchers may believe the only way to truly test the presented hypotheses is through comparison with leaders who lacked both qualities. However, it is important to note that this study is examining leaders of the past. Presumably there could have been people who did in fact lack both variables, and who did attempt to lead but were ineffective. In which case they would not have been incorporated into the history books. Perhaps the lack of potential candidates can be explained by the focus on historical data or perhaps one cannot be a leader without charisma and/or vision.

This study will examine the leadership of Martin Luther King, Jr., Roy Wilkins, Stokely Carmichael, Mohandas Gandhi, Abul Kalam Azad, and Mohammad Ali Jinnah. Specifically these leaders were selected based on the following criteria: role in the Civil Rights Movement in the United States or Independence Movement in India, position of informal power, vision, and charisma. As discussed, each of these factors was important for a variety of reasons.
Chapter 4: Analysis

Statistical Data

This study was conducted to predict the commitment of followers; therefore the regression line was utilized to search for trends. A regression analysis can determine whether or not a relationship exists between the variables \[\text{degree of commitment} = 4.503 \times 10^3 \text{ (vision)} + 3.305 \times 10^{-2} \text{ (charisma)} - 1.219\]. See Table 4.1 Coefficient Data. The statistical analysis verified that there is in fact a significant relationship.

According to the data, 98.9% of the degree of commitment of followers can be explained by the degree of inclusive vision and charisma \([r^2 = .989]\). See Table 4.2 Model Summary. Since this percentage was extremely high, stepwise regression was conducted, whereby vision was excluded and was determined to be insignificant. Further statistical analysis demonstrated that charisma alone explains 95.1% \([r^2 = .951]\) of the commitment of followers. The relationship between charisma and commitment of followers was significant at the 0.001 alpha level \((p=.000; \ p>.05)\).

After comparing the data for each of the six leaders, the means were 131.5, 140.0, and 4.0 for vision, charisma, and commitment of followers.
Table 4.1 Coefficient Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-1.219</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>-3.982</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>4.503E-03</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>3.282</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charisma</td>
<td>3.305E-02</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>16.715</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.11929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), charisma, vision
followers, respectively. See Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistics. (See also Appendix B for SPSS statistical analysis).

The high mean of 4.0 for commitment of followers emphasizes the significance of this study. The research supports the hypothesis that leaders who incorporate a more inclusive vision and charisma will attract more committed followers. However, it is the variable of charisma that accounts for this significance.

The mean of 131.5 for vision indicates that the leaders examined tended to have more inclusive visions. While the investigation classified average and moderately exclusive vision, overall the higher mean indicates that the leaders studied exhibited more inclusive visions.

The mean of 140.0 for the level of charisma exhibited seems to indicate the leaders tended to display high levels of charisma. Although one leader was categorized as sometimes charismatic and one was almost always charismatic, after analysis, the other leaders were all classified as highly charismatic. This data signifies the importance of charisma in mobilizing committed followers.

Each of the six leaders was ranked on the vision scale \( \bar{x} \). As anticipated, King \( (\bar{x}_1 = 169) \) and Gandhi \( (\bar{x}_2 = 165) \) exhibited highly inclusive visions. Wilkins \( (\bar{x}_3 = 133) \) and Azad \( (\bar{x}_4 = 143) \) were determined to have moderately inclusive visions. Carmichael had an
Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>131.5</td>
<td>36.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charisma</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>165.00</td>
<td>140.0</td>
<td>25.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment of Followers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

84
average vision ($x_5 = 107$) and Jinnah ($x_6 = 72$) was moderately exclusive. See Table 4.4 Vision Totals. Each leader was also ranked on the charisma scale ($y$). Once again, as anticipated, King ($y_1 = 165$) and Gandhi ($y_2 = 163$) were always charismatic. Wilkins ($y_3 = 113$) was almost always charismatic and Azad ($y_4 = 105$) was sometimes charismatic. Surprisingly, Carmichael ($y_5 = 146$) and Jinnah ($y_6 = 146$) were also ranked as always charismatic and interestingly had the exact same total. See Table 4.5 Charisma Totals.

As for the level of commitment of the followers ($z$), King ($z_1 = 5$) and Gandhi ($z_2 = 5$) were found to have highly committed followers. Carmichael ($z_3 = 4$) and Jinnah ($z_4 = 4$) had followers that were moderately committed. Falling at the bottom, Wilkins ($z_3 = 3$) and Azad ($z_4 = 3$) had committed followers. See Table 4.6 Commitment Rating.
### Table 4.4 Vision Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Wilkins</th>
<th>Carmichael</th>
<th>Gandhi</th>
<th>Azad</th>
<th>Jinnah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision Totals</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.5 Charisma Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Wilkins</th>
<th>Carmichael</th>
<th>Gandhi</th>
<th>Azad</th>
<th>Jinnah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charisma Totals</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.6 Commitment Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Wilkins</th>
<th>Carmichael</th>
<th>Gandhi</th>
<th>Azad</th>
<th>Jinnah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RATING</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Analysis and Conclusion

The leaders, King and Gandhi, who had highly committed followers were determined to exhibit highly inclusive visions and were always charismatic. Conversely, Wilkins and Azad, who had the least committed followers, were also the least charismatic, although they were classified in the inclusive vision category. Carmichael and Jinnah classified with the least inclusive visions however, were always charismatic and had moderately committed followers.

When the leaders of the Civil Rights Movement in the United States are compared to the leaders of the Indian Independence Movement, there is little difference. This indicates lack of disparity by location or time period. Each of the counterparts received equivalent rankings on all accounts. See Table 4.7 Counterpart Rankings Civil Rights Movement versus Independence Movement. The largest disparity is between the level of inclusive vision between Carmichael and Jinnah. Yet, the ranking of follower commitment is constant. This indicates that charisma has more significance than vision.

When the data for the vision component regarding the oral and written samples are compared, there seems to be greater consistency
Table 4.7: Counterpart Rankings Civil Rights Movement versus Independence Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision</th>
<th>Charisma</th>
<th>Commitment of Followers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Gandhi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmichael</td>
<td>Jinnah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkins</td>
<td>Azad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with the leaders of the Civil Rights Movement. Overall, the leaders were constant in their verbal and written vision, which indicates that these leaders showed consistency of message. However, the leaders of the Indian Independence Movement, showed some variation in the presentation of vision. Both Gandhi and Jinnah were less inclusive in the written sample when compared to speeches. In contrast, Azad was somewhat more inclusive in his writing when compared to his verbal samples. See Table 4.8 Vision Ranking By Sample.

Again, when the vision component of the speeches and written samples are examined individually, the counterparts received comparable scores.

When the data for the charisma factor regarding the oral and written samples are compared, there seems to be an even greater consistency than with the vision aspect, with the exception of Carmichael. Overall, the leaders were constant in their verbal and written expression of charisma as the raw data presents little difference. See Table 4.9 Charisma Ranking By Sample.

The hypothesized relationship between vision, charisma, and commitment of followers is significant, these variables explain 98.9% of the variation in commitment. However, 95.1% of the level of commitment of followers is explained by charisma. In effect, charisma is
Table 4.8 Vision Ranking By Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Wilkins</th>
<th>Carmichael</th>
<th>Gandhi</th>
<th>Azad</th>
<th>Jinnah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 Charisma Ranking By Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Wilkins</th>
<th>Carmichael</th>
<th>Gandhi</th>
<th>Azad</th>
<th>Jinnah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
by far the most important variable. As expected, the leaders who did incorporate both components had the followers with the highest levels of commitment.

According to the statistical analysis, the extremely high percentages for the significance of charisma seem almost impossible. Conceivably the numbers alone cannot explain this phenomenon. Perhaps the statistical data is alluding to some other justification.

The examination of two movements (Civil Rights Movement and Independence Movement) during different time periods (mid 1900's and early 1900's) in different nations (United States and India) eliminated extraneous variables of time frame and place.

Yet, both movements were focused on human rights. More specifically in each situation a minority of the population was struggling against the majority to change the status quo, often with the penalty of death or severe physical harm. Additionally, the leaders of these movements had informal power, whereby, charisma, the ability to motivate and create enthusiasm would be paramount.

Maybe the explanation for the high percentage for charisma is actually symbolic of the power structure. Meaning that leaders who represent the minority need high levels of charisma to maintain a base of followers. While on the other hand, the power of the majority motivates itself and enhances follower commitment.
Both movements investigated in this study were comprised of minority populations who sustained abhorrent abuse evoked by the majority. To maintain a follower base, the individuals would need to be inspired, regardless of the potential consequences. Without enough followers, public opinion about human rights for these populations was minimal if not non-existent. Possibly, the power struggle between the majority and minority, or the views of public opinion shed light on the issue.

Social psychologists have studied the impact of public opinion on minority opinions, "the fear of isolation ultimately results in a spiral of silence" (Noelle-Neumann, 1995, p. 43). The basis of the theory is that "all societies threatened with isolation, individuals who deviate from the consensus, and that individuals in turn, experience fear of isolation, [which] ensures integration and cohesion" (Noelle-Neumann, 1995, p. 42).

A study conducted by Solomon Asch further supports the significance of public opinion. Lines of varying lengths were drawn on a chalkboard. The participants in the classroom were all part of the experiment and incorrectly picked the two lines that matched. The subject of the study was the last participant asked to match lines, who also selected the line that blatantly was not a match. "Asch's subjects
were willing to discard their personal judgments and accept the obviously incorrect group position" (Price & Oshagan, 1995, p. 182).

Studies of lynch mobs, by Margaret Mead also suggest the power of the majority. "They abandon all caution; they cease to be single individuals under scrutiny from others who approve or reject their behavior, and become completely absorbed instead by the anonymous mass" (Noelle-Neumann, 1993, p. 108).

As the philosopher John Locke said in 1864, “new opinions are always suspected, and usually opposed, without any other reason but because they are not already common. But truth, like gold, is not the less so for being newly brought out of the mine” (Noelle-Neumann, 1993, p. 70). Leaders who represent the minority have to work harder to motivate and inspire people in order to gain followers and to keep them involved. Hence charisma could be the sole factor in determining commitment of followers in such circumstances.

Our leaders will continue to guide and shape the future of our globe by the decisions they make. Therefore, it is key to future generations that leaders of the highest caliber are cultivated. It is the research of today that will greatly impact and enhance the effectiveness of our future leaders. This study sheds light into one aspect of the vast array of components comprising leadership. If our global goal is to move toward a time of peace where all beings can actualize human rights, it is
imperative to foster leaders who can mobilize committed followers
toward that goal.


### Appendix A. Data Used for Statistical Analysis

#### Raw Data from Vision Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Wilkins</th>
<th>Carmichael</th>
<th>Gandhi</th>
<th>Azad</th>
<th>Jinnah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>169</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36-64</td>
<td>Highly Exclusive Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-93</td>
<td>Moderately Exclusive Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94-122</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123-151</td>
<td>Moderately Inclusive Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152-180</td>
<td>Highly Inclusive Vision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Raw Data from Charisma Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Wilkins</th>
<th>Carmichael</th>
<th>Gandhi</th>
<th>Azad</th>
<th>Jinnah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key

**Rating Classification**

- 33-567: Never Charismatic
- 58-84: Almost Never Charismatic
- 85-111: Sometimes Charismatic
- 112-138: Almost Always Charismatic
- 139-165: Always Charismatic
### Rating Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Wilkins</th>
<th>Carmichael</th>
<th>Gandhi</th>
<th>Azad</th>
<th>Jinnah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RATING</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key

**Rating** | **Classification**
--- | ---
1 | Somewhat Committed
2 | Fairly Committed
3 | Committed
4 | Moderately Committed
5 | Highly Committed
### Appendix B. Regression Data

Variables Entered/Removed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>Variables Removed</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charisma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. All requested variables entered.
b. Dependent Variable: Commitment of Followers

#### Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.11929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Vision, Charisma

#### Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td>.22032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Charisma
### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3.963</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.981</td>
<td>159.607</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>1.012</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.012</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Vision, Charisma
b. Dependent Variable: Commitment of Followers

### Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.219</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>-3.982</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>4.503E-03</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charisma</td>
<td>3.305E-02</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Commitment of Followers

### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>131.5</td>
<td>36.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charisma</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>165.00</td>
<td>140.0</td>
<td>25.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment of Followers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Vision Inclusiveness Questionnaire
Adopted from the Leadership Practices Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Wilkins</th>
<th>Carmichael</th>
<th>Gandhi</th>
<th>Azad</th>
<th>Jinnah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Describes the kind of future he/she would like us to have</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appeals to others to share his/her dream of the future</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Clearly communicates a positive and hopeful outlook for the future</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Shows others how their long-term future interests can be realized in a common vision</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Wilkins</td>
<td>Carmichael</td>
<td>Gandhi</td>
<td>Azad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Looks ahead and forecasts what he/she expects the future to be</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>2 3 3</td>
<td>5 4 4</td>
<td>4 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is continuously excited and enthusiastic about future possibilities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 5 4</td>
<td>2 3 2</td>
<td>3 2 3</td>
<td>5 5 4</td>
<td>3 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Involves others in planning the actions that will be taken</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>3 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Treats others with respect and dignity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Gives people a lot of discretion to make their own decisions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3 4 4</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Wilkins</td>
<td>Carmichael</td>
<td>Gandhi</td>
<td>Azad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Develops cooperative relationships with the people he/she works</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>2 2 3</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Emphasizes collective mission</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td>5 5 4</td>
<td>5 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Talks of commonalities with people</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating Classification**

1. Highly Exclusive Vision
2. Moderately Exclusive Vision
3. Average
4. Moderately Inclusive Vision
5. Highly Inclusive Vision
## Appendix D: Leadership Charisma Questionnaire

Adopted from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Wilkins</th>
<th>Carmichael</th>
<th>Gandhi</th>
<th>Azad</th>
<th>Jinnah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Creates sense of pride</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 4 4</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>5 5 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Goes beyond self-interest</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>5 4 4</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>5 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has respect of followers</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>5 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Displays power and confidence</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>5 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Talks of values</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>3 3 4</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6. Models ethical standards

Question

King Wilkins Carmichael Gandhi Azad Jinnah

7. Considers the moral/ethical

Question

King Wilkins Carmichael Gandhi Azad Jinnah

8. Talks optimistically

Question

King Wilkins Carmichael Gandhi Azad Jinnah

9. Expresses confidence

Question

King Wilkins Carmichael Gandhi Azad Jinnah

10. Talks enthusiastically

Question

King Wilkins Carmichael Gandhi Azad Jinnah

11. Arouses awareness about important issues

Question

King Wilkins Carmichael Gandhi Azad Jinnah
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Never Charismatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Almost Never Charismatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sometimes Charismatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Almost Always Charismatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Always Charismatic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix E: Follower Commitment Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Wilkins</th>
<th>Carmichael</th>
<th>Gandhi</th>
<th>Azad</th>
<th>Jinnah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sacrifices followers are willing to make for the cause/organization.</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Wilkins</td>
<td>Carmichael</td>
<td>Gandhi</td>
<td>Azad</td>
<td>Jinnah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Length of membership to cause/organization.</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Wilkins</td>
<td>Carmichael</td>
<td>Gandhi</td>
<td>Azad</td>
<td>Jinnah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Actions followers have taken for the cause/organization.</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Wilkins</td>
<td>Carmichael</td>
<td>Gandhi</td>
<td>Azad</td>
<td>Jinnah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Participation level of followers.</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Wilkins</td>
<td>Carmichael</td>
<td>Gandhi</td>
<td>Azad</td>
<td>Jinnah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Confidence exhibited by followers in the leader.</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Wilkins</td>
<td>Carmichael</td>
<td>Gandhi</td>
<td>Azad</td>
<td>Jinnah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Somewhat Committed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fairly Committed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Committed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moderately Committed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Highly Committed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King Wilkins Carmichael</th>
<th>Gandhi</th>
<th>Azad</th>
<th>Jinnah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranking Designation

---
Appendix F: Works Reviewed


