Exploring the Dynamics of Charismatic Attribution: How and Why Do People Think of Other Individuals as Charismatic?

Miguel Alejandro A. Silan

Department of Psychology
College of Social Sciences and Philosophy
University of the Philippines
Diliman, Quezon City

ABSTRACT

Charisma is a popular and enthralling concept both in its academic and lay usage; with some alluding to the role of charisma as important to various historical events including the 2016 Philippine presidential elections (Curato, 2016; Francisco, 2017; Pedrosa, 2015). However, the dynamics of charismatic attribution – how and why people think of, label, perceive or categorize other individuals as charismatic – has had a disproportionately fewer share of discussion in the literature. This is despite the fact that charismatic attribution has played a central, if implicit, role in the development of the construct of charisma. This study sought to explore the dynamics of charismatic attribution, and *pagtatanong-tanong* (indigenous participatory interview; Pe-Pua, 2006) was done with N=17 participants (523 minutes of audio recorded data) of diverse occupations, ages, and SES. The participants' conceptualization of charisma varies, but the role of effects is primary. These effects include 1.) capturing attention, 2.) behavioral influence, 3.) making people believe the figure's message, 4.) effects on emotion and 5.) having devoted followers. Results indicate that charismatic attribution is mainly an effects-based appraisal - an evaluation of whether figures are able to achieve the participants' notion of what a charismatic effect is. Various attributes and various behaviors are used to describe charismatic figures in so far as these help produce the previously stated effects but are not in themselves primary considerations for charismatic attribution. Only for a proportion of the participants do moral judgements factor in whether they would think of another individual as charismatic. It is argued that the process of charismatic attribution facilitates attending to internal characteristics of figures to describe and explain why effects occur. Charismatic attribution allows to make sense and simplify complex social phenomenon. Other theoretical considerations are then discussed, including a comparison with the signaling framework of charisma (Antonakis et al., 2016; Antonakis, 2017) and an alternative model of charisma is developed: The Constructed Charisma Framework.

Keywords: charisma, charismatic attribution, folk ontology, ontology of psychological attributes, social ontology

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	7
CHARISMA: BACKGROUND AND HISTORY	7
DOES CHARISMA EXIST? ISSUES AND CRITICISMS	9
RESEARCH GOALS AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	9
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	11
CLASSICAL CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF CHARISMA: WHAT HAD WE TALKED ABOUT WHEN WE TALKED ABOUT CHARISMA?	11
Pauline charisma.....	11
Weberian Charisma.	12
Subsequent Studies in Sociology and Political Science	12
Leadership Studies and Charisma	13
Charisma as Leader Signals.	14
Celebrity Studies, Self-Help Genre and Charisma	15
WHEN ARE PEOPLE THOUGHT OF AS CHARISMATIC? CHARISMATIC ATTRIBUTION AND CHARISMA ACROSS CULTURES	16
Charisma across cultures	18
CRITICISMS OF THE LITERATURE: CHARISMA’S ILL-DEFINITION AND CONFLATIONS	20
What is the role of charismatic attribution?	23
THE CONSTRUCTED CHARISMA FRAMEWORK.....	25
The ontology of psychological constructs.....	25
In what forms do psychological constructs exist?	25
Charisma is a social construction.	26
What does this mean for charismatic attribution?	28
The dynamics of charismatic attribution.	29
Charismatic attribution as categorization.	29
Charismatic attribution is multiply realizable.....	32
RESEARCH QUESTION AND RATIONALE FOR METHODS.....	33
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	34
STUDY DESIGN, QUESTION GUIDE AND RATIONALE.....	34
SAMPLE SELECTION.....	35
Participants	35
ANALYSIS.....	36
Reflexivity, Saturation and Verification	36
Ethical considerations.....	37
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS.....	38
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FROM THE <i>TANUNGAN</i>	38
HOW DO PEOPLE THINK OF OTHER INDIVIDUALS AS CHARISMATIC?	48
The role of effects.	48
The role of attributes and behaviors.	50
The role of sense-making.....	51
The role of moral judgement.	51
So how do people think of other individuals as charismatic?.....	52
WHY DO PEOPLE THINK OF OTHER INDIVIDUALS AS CHARISMATIC?	53
Existence of charisma as a concept.	53
Charisma facilitates a certain way of thinking about the social world.	54
Social comparison and communication.	56
Sense-making and framing.	57

So why do people think of other individuals as charismatic?	57
THE CASE OF RODRIGO DUTERTE: HOW AND WHY DO PARTICIPANTS THINK OF DUTERTE AS CHARISMATIC?	58
How do participants think of Duterte as charismatic?	58
Why do participants think of Duterte as charismatic?	60
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION	62
THE CONSTRUCTED CHARISMA FRAMEWORK	62
COMPARISONS TO ANTONAKIS AND COLLEAGUES' LEADER SIGNALING FRAMEWORK.	63
COMPARISON OF CHARISMA CONCEPTUALIZATIONS	65
CHARISMA AND THEORY BUILDING.	66
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUDING CHAPTER	69
REFERENCES:	71
APPENDIX A: CRITICISMS TO THE SIGNALING FRAMEWORK	88
APPENDIX B: PHILOSOPHICAL GROUNDING - MECHANISTIC SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION AND FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS IN ONTOLOGY	94
APPENDIX C: <i>TANUNGAN</i> GUIDE.....	97
APPENDIX D: COPY OF INFORMED CONSENT FORM (ENGLISH)	104
APPENDIX D: COPY OF INFORMED CONSENT FORM (FILIPINO)	105
APPENDIX E1: EXAMPLE TRANSCRIPT	106
APPENDIX E2: EXAMPLE TRANSCRIPT	113
APPENDIX G – FURTHER NOTES ON SATURATION, REFLEXIVITY AND VERIFICATION	121
APPENDIX H: EXAMPLE EVIDENCE OF EFFECTS-BASED REASONING ACROSS PARTICIPANTS.....	124
APPENDIX I: REPOSSES REGARDING DUTERTE.....	129
APPENDIX J: OTHER THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS	132

TABLES

Table 1: <i>Different Notions of Charisma</i>		20
Table 2: <i>Themes, Codes and Examples of Reasons for Being Called Charismatic</i>		40

FIGURES

Figure 1: <i>The variety of charismatic figures, attributes, behaviors, and effects</i>		39
Figure 2: <i>The different charisplananda</i>		39

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Charisma: Background and History

In the Philippine 2016 Presidential Elections, candidate Rodrigo Duterte - then the Mayor of Davao City with a questionable human rights history (Campbell, 2016a) - has captured the public imagination. Despite being marred with controversies, his campaign trail featured large, frenzied crowds; local businesses volunteered to print shirts and campaign materials at their own expense; and the online landscape passionately amplified his campaign discourses (Ranada, 2016; Campbell, 2016b). This culminated in an electoral win with around 16 million votes in the 5-way race against other established politicians (CNN Philippines, 2016). Rodrigo Duterte has been repeatedly praised and vilified for his charisma on the campaign trail (e.g., Sison, 2016; Teehankee & Thompson, 2016; Andanar, 2016), with many alluding to this charisma as a substantial factor in winning the presidential election (Francisco, 2017; Pedrosa, 2015; Curato, 2016).

Charisma, in its academic and popular lay notions, is an intriguing concept. Today the term charisma can conjure images of social influence, power, social movements, magnetic personalities, celebrity star appeal, devoted followerships and some generalized notion of success. This has also been used to describe individuals across history and help explain consequential events. Those who are attributed as charismatic are usually political figures (e.g., Adolf Hitler, John F. Kennedy), social movement leaders (e.g., Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Jr.) and, more recently, businessmen (e.g., Steve Jobs) and celebrities (e.g., Oprah Winfrey) (Devarachetty, 2012; Potts, 2009; Spinrad, 1991). But what is charisma?

χάρisma (“charisma”) is a Greek word that first appeared in the writings of Paul; which he used to refer as the ‘gift of God’s grace’ or ‘spiritual gift’ (Potts, 2009). Charisma in its original term draws from the root Greek word *charis* meaning grace or favor; and first arose in the early Christian community in the first century AD (Smith, 1998; Potts, 2009). This religious concept was eclipsed by the 3rd century AD and the use of the term laid dormant until Weber’s reinvention in the early 20th century, which eventually popularized the concept in Western academic, media and popular discourse (Antonakis, Bastardo, Jacquart, & Shamir, 2016; Potts, 2009). Charisma as a concept has been taken up in sociology (e.g., Weber, 1922/1968; Shils,

1965), political science (e.g., Willner, 1984; Davies 1954), management, leadership and psychology (e.g., Antonakis, 2017; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993), celebrity studies (e.g., Currid-Halkett, 2010), and popular self-help books (e.g., Cabane, 2012). Over the years, charisma has been characterized as a source of power (Kudisch et al., 1995), as a type of authority, or as a construct that organizes social activity (Shils, 1965; Weber, 1922/1968). It has been used to discuss a type of (effective) leadership style – the charismatic or transformational leadership – as opposed to non-charismatic or transactional leadership (Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Shamir, House & Arthur, 1993; Bass, 1999). It has commonly been associated with political figures and social movements (Willner, 1984; Spinrad, 1991), and with intense and passionate relationships (Lindholm, 1988). Lay accounts, as seen in the self-help genre, tend to characterize charisma as personal magnetism and individual difference for social influence; which is popularly linked with some general notion of success (e.g., Cabane, 2012; Cohen, 2006; DuBrin, 1997).

Much of the academic research on charisma is dedicated to communication dynamics which are asserted to be charismatic - including behaviors such as the use of metaphors (e.g., Mio, Riggio, Levin, & Reese, 2005), the presentation of a vision, (e.g., Towler, 2003), the explicit communication of morals and values (e.g., Antonakis, Fenley & Liechti, 2011), and expressive verbal, bodily and facial signaling (e.g., Howell & Frost, 1989; Niebuhr, Voße & Brem, 2016; Signorello, 2019). There seems to be the implicit assumption that once ‘charismatic behaviors’ are enacted, these will be logically seen as charismatic by other individuals (as long as they share values or moral principles e.g., Antonakis et al., 2016; Shamir, House & Arthur, 1993). However, the dynamics of charismatic attribution – how and why individuals think of, label, or categorize other individuals as charismatic – has had a disproportionately fewer share of discussion in the literature. This is despite the fact that charismatic attribution has played a central, if implicit, role in the development of the construct of charisma.

Further, despite the call for research on charisma across cultures (Antonakis et al., 2016) charisma as a construct is little studied in the Philippines, with academic accounts being few and far between, and not necessarily following a common theoretical framework (e.g., Baldesco, n.d; Thompson, 2012). There are minimal indigenous analogs of the term recorded across cultures, with possible terms such as *mana* and *barakah* being unlikely to be equivalent (Potts, 2009;

Tybjerg, 2007). However, charisma enjoys popular lay usage, and are often attributed to consequential political outcomes (Silan & Encarnacion, 2017).

Does Charisma Exist? Issues and Criticisms

Despite its popularity and perceived importance, charisma has often been conceptualized in a conflicting manner, often ambiguously, and with questionable measurement integrity (Yukl, 1999; Antonakis et al., 2016; Paul et al., 2002; Van Knippenberg, & Sitkin, 2013). Some scholars write of the oversaturation of the term, with ‘charisma’ being indiscriminately used to describe anything compelling, from good parenting to commercial products and other objects like cities, plays and sandwiches (Bensman & Givant, 1975; Potts, 2009). Further, the existence itself of charisma as a construct is a contentious topic (Gemmell & Oakley, 1982; Tybjerg, 2007). It has been said that “while little understood, charisma is highly valued” (Dawson, 2006, p. 5). These conflicting conceptualizations include whether charisma is a “gift” one is born with or one that is not easily accessible to others (Weber, 1922/1968) versus something that can be learned (e.g., Antonakis et al., 2011); whether it is something (latent variable, trait, constellation of characteristics, patterns of behavior) that resides within the leader (e.g., Signorello, 2016); something that followers construct (Meindl, 1995); an interaction between the two (e.g., Shamir, House & Arthur, 1993); or a complex interaction between leader, followers and environment (e.g., Klein & House, 1995).

Discussions also include whether charisma is necessarily moral (Lloyd, 2018) or if it is value-free, and can be used for moral or immoral purposes (Antonakis et al., 2016), whether at all it is important, and to what degree if it is (Roberts, & Bradley, 1988; Willner, 1984; Klein & House, 1995; Spinrad, 1991), and ultimately, whether it exists at all (Gemmell & Oakley, 1992; Tybjerg, 2007). That is, it may be alive in popular usage, but does this represent something ‘real’ beyond its social reality? And if not, what purpose does the word have, that it had been kept? These different conceptualizations, and related issues will be discussed further in the next chapter.

Research Goals and Significance of the Study

If popular accounts are to be considered, then charisma as a construct has the promise of practical significance, with people attributed with charisma purportedly hosting numerous social privileges and seemingly able to affect a range of positive outcomes; extreme versions of which

include radical social transformations such as in the cases of Mahatma Gandhi and Adolf Hitler. However, the heterogeneity in how charisma is conceptualized, and the heterogeneity in who gets labelled as charismatic (and their differing characteristics, behaviors, personality and related impressions) make the case of charisma as a fuzzy construct. Thus, investigating the ontology and nature of the construct is paramount. That is, inquiring into its “reality” (and whether or in what form it “exists”), its features, properties, and relations (see Effingham, 2013, for a short introduction to ontology, and Naar & Teroni, 2017 as well as Barrett, 2006 for how discussions of ontology play out in psychological constructs such as emotion). After evaluating classic and contemporary theories of charisma, in this manuscript a model is proposed that hopefully captures appropriately the nature of charisma: The Constructed Charisma Framework. In summary, the model posits that charisma, despite being intuitively thought of and felt as something (objectively) ‘real’, is not a natural kind but is instead a socially constructed, fuzzy, cultural product.

This model has important implications for the focus of the research: *exploring the dynamics of charismatic attribution. How and why do people think of other individuals as charismatic?* This includes incursions to the ‘folk logic’ of the use of the concept and the processes individuals rely on when categorizing other individuals as charismatic. Why study charismatic attribution? Aside from the lay appeal of being thought of and labelled as charismatic across occupational and personal settings (from the celebrity industry to leadership to personal relationships), more substantially, charismatic attribution plays out in the perception of consequential social outcomes. In the local arena, for the Philippine 2016 Presidential Elections, it has been popularly claimed that then candidate Rodrigo Duterte won due to his charisma, particularly to the masses (Francisco, 2017; Pedrosa, 2015; Curato, 2016), a characteristic his rival candidate, then administration-backed Mar Roxas, presumably lacked (Politiko News, 2015; Gonzales, 2015). Fundamentally, this project aims to contribute theoretically to the disproportionately small corner of the literature that focus directly on the dynamics of charismatic attribution.

CHAPTER 2

Review of Related Literature

This chapter will be discussed as follows: first the classical conceptualizations of charisma will be presented, from its religious roots in Paul to the reinvention by Weber, and its subsequent characterizations in sociology, political science, leadership, and the self-help genre. Then, the current conceptualization of charismatic attribution is discussed. This represents the mainstream literature on charisma and charismatic attribution, both of which are criticized – after which a new model of charisma is introduced, the Constructed Charisma Framework (CCF). The important implications of this model for the study of charismatic attribution is discussed, as well as the current knowledge and suppositions about the dynamics of a perceiver-centric charismatic attribution. Finally, the chapter ends by discussing the research question, and the rationale of the study design.

Classical Conceptualizations of Charisma: What Had We Talked About When We Talked About Charisma?

In its two-thousand-year history, charisma has been conceptualized in a variety of ways, leading some to note that there “is no universally agreed upon definition of charisma” (Levine, Muenchen, & Brooks, 2010, p. 579). But this is not for the lack of trying. In this section, I summarily trace how charisma has been conceptualized across time and across fields, from its inception in religious Greek-Christian communities, to the reinvention of Weber as a sociological concept, its use in political science, leadership, celebrity studies, the ubiquitous self-help genre, and the contemporary signaling framework.

Pauline charisma. The original formulation of charisma was particularly religious. This was coined by Paul the Apostle, whose writings are shown in the different epistles in the New Testament of the Bible (Potts, 2009). Paul specifically characterized charisma as the gift of God’s grace. He called the particular gifts themselves *charismata*, which included healing, miracle work, prophecy, glossolalia (Corinthians 12:1-31), as well as teaching, giving aid, and showing mercy (Romans 12:6-8). These gifts in turn, Paul wrote, should explicitly be in the service of the early Christian congregation. Note here, that this original conceptualization is not primarily associated with authority, personal magnetism, or social influence (connotations that the term would later have). Charisma here is religious, moral or value-laden and prescriptive.

Weberian charisma. Charisma, as popularly known today, has its roots in the writings of Max Weber (Antonakis, Bastardo, Jacquart & Shamir, 2016). Weber, while acknowledging the religious use of the term, largely reinvents this as a sociological concept. He defines charisma as a certain exceptional quality of an individual, the same quality of which is not accessible to everybody (Weber, 1922/1968) and that “charisma can only be ‘awakened’ and ‘tested’; it cannot be ‘learned’ or ‘taught’” (p. 249).

While it is tempting to paint Weberian charisma as largely characterizing a ‘trait’ definition of charisma, Weber also used charisma chiefly for his characterization of charismatic authority. This type of authority is contrasted with two other ‘ideal’ forms – rational-bureaucratic authority and traditional authority. In Weber’s (1922/1968) framework, under charismatic authority, individuals follow the leader *because* of the leader himself, who has exceptional qualities and not because of rules that can be rationally analyzed or because of traditional norms and customs. This kind of authority is said to be validated and maintained by ensuring the followers about the proof of charisma (for example, winning glory or promoting welfare of the followers). He emphasized that charisma becomes a tenable form of authority when followers face psychological distress or some form of crisis. However, Weber routinely described charisma as unstable, and so much of his writing also focused on the routinization of charisma, or how charismatic authority eventually leads to bureaucratization or traditionalization.

Subsequent studies in sociology and political science. Subsequent work in sociology discussed charisma in relation to institutions which organize social behavior (e.g., Shils, 1965) and the explication of other elements characterizing charisma such as feelings of “awe” (e.g., Friedland, 1964; Shils, 1965), and the charismatic leader as a purveyor of possibility (e.g., Dow, 1969; Spencer, 1973). That is, typical charismatic effects are said to be caused by charismatic leaders because they are able to convince followers not of what is actual now, but of what is possible. The construct of charisma was also transplanted to the field of political science. Here, prominent work is represented by Willner (1984), which focused on the devoted relationship itself between leader and followers. Studying prominent political figures, such as Mahatma Gandhi, Fidel Castro, Adolf Hitler, and others, Willner asserted that the charismatic relationship is characterized by followers believing the leaders to have extraordinary qualities, the followers being highly receptive to the leaders’ ideas, and followers complying because of the leader

himself (and not because of, say, laws, punishments, fear of loss, etc.). This kind of relationship is said to be intense, which is characterized by emotions such as devotion, awe, reverence, and faith – emotions which are also similar to ones present in religious worship. These various works in sociology and political science typically tap into the notion of charisma as something relating to authority and devoted followerships.

Leadership studies and charisma. In the field of organizational studies and leadership, charisma was largely developed as a type of leadership (charismatic leadership) or subsumed under other variants of leadership typologies (e.g., transformational leadership). The bulk of work here is on expounding what charismatic leadership behaviors are, which are then contrasted with non-charismatic/traditional/transactional leadership behaviors. For example, Conger and Kanungo (1987) listed behaviors of a charismatic leader, including: setting a vision, self-sacrifice, taking higher personal risk, doing unconventional behaviors and having a realistic assessment of the environment. They would later make this succinct and write that essential charismatic leader behaviors are “(1) vision, (2) inspiration, (3) meaning-making, (4) empowerment, (5) setting of high expectations, and (6) fostering of collective identity” (Conger & Kanungo, 1998, p. 19). Shamir, House and Arthur (1993) asserted that these charismatic leader behaviors work because they tap into the follower’s self-concepts, values, identity and these in turn affect the prototypical follower outcomes seen in charismatic leadership studies e.g., stronger personal commitment to the mission, better organizational citizenship behaviors, follower self-sacrificial behavior etc.

Similar to these models are the work on transformational leadership theory, including the most popular line of work from Bass, Avolio and colleagues (e.g., Bass, 1985, 1999; Avolio, Bass & Jung, 1999; Avolio, & Bass, 2001; Bass & Riggio, 2006). This builds on the earlier work of Burns (1978) that demarcated between transactional leadership, which cater to follower’s immediate needs, and transformational leadership, which “uplift morale, motivation and morals of the followers” (Bass, 1999, p. 9) or deal with ‘higher order’ needs of followers. In this line of work, charisma is considered to be just one factor of the multi-factor structure of transformational leadership – the other factors include, among others, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (however, see Yukl, 1999; Van Knippenberg, 2013; Antonakis et al., 2016 for conceptual and methodological criticisms). Here, charisma is operationalized

with items that try to measure whether the leader “provides followers with a clear sense of purpose that is energizing, is a role model for ethical conduct and builds identification with the leader and his or her articulated vision” (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999, p. 444).

These seminal works discussed largely overlap with many of the variants of charismatic and transformational leadership over the years, where the focus is on symbolic leader behaviors that suffuse meaning to work (e.g., Downton, 1973; House, 1977; Burns, 1978; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996), that both are treated either synonymously (Potts, 2009), or at least with greater similarity than differences (Shamir et al. 1993; although see Yukl, 1999). These various works in leadership studies typically relate charisma to either behaviors, attribution or as an effective leadership style in itself. The discussion of charisma, while popular in leadership and management studies, has not had a major impact or presence in mainstream social psychology (Turner, 2003)

Charisma as leader signals. Criticizing much of earlier literature as producing vague definitions that cannot measure the causal impact of charisma, Antonakis and colleagues (2016; Antonakis, 2017) re-conceptualize charisma as “values-based, symbolic, and emotion-laden leader signaling” (Antonakis et al., 2016, p. 394), and a charismatic leader is therefore someone who uses these signals. In this framework, a leader can’t *have* charisma, but a leader *does* charisma. It’s not a trait but signals (behaviors, communication) that the leader transmits that will be perceived and interpreted by those that receive those signals.

These are operationalized into different behaviors they term as charismatic leadership tactics (CLTs), which currently include nine verbal tactics: (1) stories and anecdotes, (2) rhetorical questions, (3) metaphors and similes, (4) contrasts, (5) lists and repetitions, (6) moral conviction, (7) articulating the sentiment of the collective, (8) setting high and ambitious goals, and (9) creating confidence that these goals can be achieved. In addition, CLTs include three non-verbal tactics: (10) varying voice modulation, (11) varying facial expressions, and (12) use of gestures. This framework has been used to look into the causal impact of the use of CLTs across outcomes in different domains such as worker productivity and election prediction (Antonakis, d’Adda, Weber, & Zehnder, 2014; Jacquart, & Antonakis, 2015; Tur, Harstad, & Antonakis, 2018).

Celebrity studies, self-help genre and charisma. While leadership studies seem to present the most popular *academic* conception of charisma, this may not represent the most popular conception of charisma, at least for lay individuals. While traditionally used as a label for leaders such as popular movement figures, populist politicians and businessmen, the term ‘charisma’ has also by and large been used to describe celebrities (Potts, 2009). Examples include Oprah Winfrey (Schonfeld, 2018) and more recently, Timothée Chalamet (Kahn, 2016; Jacobs, 2018). In the field of celebrity studies, it seems that charisma is one determinant (neither necessary nor sufficient) to become a celebrity (Currid-Halkett, 2010).

However, a great portion of the discussion on charisma is contained in the ‘self-help’ literature, a massive multi-billion market that aims to help individuals in some aspects of their lives (Research and Markets, 2017). Following the trend of leadership studies, the subgenre of self-help charisma markets themselves as something that will help lay individuals develop charisma, and in turn, some generalized notion of success. This is immediately apparent, even in the titles of the self-help books themselves¹. In this sample of work, the authors predominantly define or associate charisma with personal magnetism and social influence. While many pertain to the ‘mysticism’ of the concept, the books prescribe different tips, behaviors and set of characteristics to be cultivated (e.g., warmth, ‘empowerment’) to develop charisma. This is with the promise that gaining charisma will lead to desirable outcomes (e.g., be more influential, have better sales, be remembered for promotion, etc.) and more hyperbolically, the notion that it is the ‘secret ingredient’ that separates those who are successful and those who are not (Mortensen, 2010).

Principally, this set of references also has the consensus that charisma is something that can be learned or developed, and not just something one is born with (although some do note that others have a natural affinity for it, e.g., Durbin, 1997). How they define charisma slightly vary among authors, others defining it as “possessing compelling attractiveness or charm that can inspire devotion in others” (Smith, 2006, chapter 2, paragraph 1) or the “ability to empower and

¹ A few examples among many: *The Laws of Charisma: How to Captivate, Inspire, and Influence for Maximum Success* (Mortensen, 2010); *The Charisma Myth: How Anyone Can Master the Art and Science of Personal Magnetism* (Cabane, 2012); *Banned Charisma Secrets Unleashed Learn The Secrets Of Personal Magnetism And How To Attract, Inspire, Impress, Influence And Energize Anyone On Command* (Smith, 2015); *Win the Crowd: Unlock the Secrets of Influence, Charisma and Showmanship* (Cohen, 2006); *Personal Magnetism: Discover Your Own Charisma and Learn to Charm, Inspire, and Influence Others* (DuBrin, 1997)

persuade others to believe in you, trust in you, and want to be influenced by you.” (Mortensen, 2010, p. 3). It’s also seen as some general notion of personal magnetism achieved through a set of behaviors (Cabane, 2012) or some multifaceted construct (Morgan, 2009) or a constellation of characteristics (Cohen, 2006). Generally, however, there is less focus on the definition, and more on illustrating it using exemplars; with common exemplars including Steve Jobs, Bill Clinton, Martin Luther King Jr. and various CEOs and politicians. There is the implicit backwards-mapping framing that this is the set of people who are seen as charismatic, this is what they do, and if an individual does something similar, these individuals will be seen as charismatic too. Thus, charisma in the self-help literature is commonly related to personal magnetism and social influence.

Arguably, this set of reference, marketed to and bought by lay people, can also be a proxy about what lay people think of charisma. From these it can be inferred that the implied causal relation is: a set of specified behaviors increases some notion of personal magnetism which then leads to social influence which then positively affects other desired outcomes. Needless to say, hypotheses from these generally are not formally tested, do not usually follow norms of academic production of knowledge, extrapolate findings from their original primary contexts, and have great incentive to assert that their particular technique, framing and prescriptions work.

Fuzziness of the charisma construct. What definition should one adopt? For many of these studies, there is little to be said about the explicit definition of charisma, and instead the focus is on the indicators of charisma such as the devoted relationships (Willner, 1984), the leader behaviors (e.g., Conger & Kanungo, 1987, Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999), or otherwise on other outcomes and exemplars. The definitional issue will be revisited later on (*Criticisms of the Literature: Charisma’s Ill-definition and Conflations*). For now, the heterogeneity in how charisma is conceptualized across time, fields and studies makes the case for charisma to be characterized as fuzzy construct.

When are People Thought of as Charismatic? Charismatic Attribution and Charisma Across Cultures

Implicit but central to many discussions about charisma is that there *are* charismatic individuals and that these individuals can be identified. This identification varies depending on how charisma is conceptualized, for example through leader-follower relationships, certain

classes of leader behaviors and leader outcomes, or back-mapped from popular icons who are already described or known as charismatic. However, this process of how a figure is known to be charismatic (and generally how they are perceived by other individuals as charismatic) and what processes guide this has received far less attention in the literature.

This identification of charismatic individuals can be referred to as the charismatic attribution, but this tends to be a misnomer in that attributional frameworks (e.g., Weiner, 2012; Kelley & Michela, 1980) need not necessarily be applied, so more appropriate terms may include: charismatic perception, charismatic inference, charismatic appraisal, or charismatic categorization. These terms will be used interchangeably to refer to the process of being thought of, labelled, perceived or otherwise having an individual attributed with charisma (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Yukl, 1999). However, in keeping with mainstream literature in charisma studies (e.g., Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Shamir et al. 1995) the term attribution will be used frequently and in its general capacity.

Traditional accounts, including studies on the signaling framework (Antonakis et al., 2016; Antonakis, 2017) relegate charismatic attribution as following naturally from, or is the logical effect of, charisma signals. Over the years, there have been different strands that try to investigate factors that cause or are associated with charismatic attribution. However, these different factors do not neatly map into any of the earlier models of charisma (e.g., Willner, 1984; Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Shamir et al., 1993; Antonakis et al., 2016). Some of them are either part of the CLTs (i.e., use of metaphors, motion and acoustic-prosodic features) but some of them are treated as either antecedents (including appearance, height, and intelligence) or situational variables (such as the death of the individual).

For example, certain acoustic-prosodic features have been associated with charismatic attribution. That is, those who are deemed to be charismatic are said to exhibit in their speeches variation in pitch, vocal emphasis and prosody (Signorello, d'Errico, Poggi, Demolin, 2012; Rosenberg & Hirschberg, 2009), as well as having voice qualities of being fuller, less breathy and louder (Niebuhr, Skarnitzl, & Tylečková, 2018). Further, a roster of scholars also assert that expressive non-verbal behaviors (ones that make for a strong speech delivery), including frequent body gestures, more eye-contact and variation in intonation, are positively associated

with charismatic attribution (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999; Holladay & Coombs, 1995; Holladay & Coombs, 1993; Gardner, 2003)².

Different variables such as height (Hamsta, 2014), the use of metaphors (Mio & Riggio, 2005), in-group prototypicality (Haslam, Reicher & Platow, 2010), and even the death of the individual (Steffens, Peters, Haslam, & van Dick, 2017) are associated with increased ratings of various measures of charisma, leading others (Reh, Quaquebeke, & Glessner, 2017) to theorize that signals that lead to charismatic attribution need not necessarily come from the leader themselves. However, these specific variables are not generally singled out as *the* cause of charismatic attribution when lay individuals are asked who they think are charismatic (Potts, 2009). That is, while it seems easy to point out who charismatic individuals are, it's harder to define what charisma itself is.

And who are seen as charismatic? As mentioned previously this label is usually used to describe politicians, movement leaders, CEO's, celebrities, and people of renown, including Steve Jobs (Niebuhr et al. 2016), Mahatma Gandhi (Spinrad, 1991), Oprah Winfrey (Schonfeld, 2018), Adolf Hitler (Lindholm, 1988) and Nelson Mandela (Porter & Williams, 1999 in Potts, 2009).

Note that unlike the effect of CLTs, the *effect of charismatic attribution* is minimally studied. None of the studies above directly inquire as to what happens *after* a person is thought to be charismatic. That is, there is little to no evidence that shows if labelling an individual or a leader "charismatic" mediates, moderates or multiply determines prototypical charisma effects, or whether charismatic attribution is merely the description of the influence process from individual behavior to prototypical charismatic effects.

Charisma across cultures. Despite the call to examine charisma signaling across various cultures (Antonakis et al., 2016), there is scant work on direct charisma³ research on non-

² Although note that many of these cited tend to have small samples, and use the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) which may be a poor measure for charismatic attribution (Yukl, 1999; Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013). Further, results are not corrected for multiple comparisons. Of the cited only Rosenberg & Hirschberg (2009) measure charismatic attribution directly.

³ A great deal of transformational leadership research has been done across various cultures; however, these primarily use the MLQ questionnaire or variants of it. And with it, the severe conceptual and measurement issues of the model (Yukl, 1999; Antonakis et al., 2016). Thus, little cumulative knowledge is gained from these wide-ranging research.

Western populations. By definition, it should be possible to observe CLTs / charisma signaling across various contexts and cultures. However, the effects of these CLTs are not sure to be invariant. While little cross-cultural work has been done on charisma signaling, there is a greater number of studies across cultures on charisma attribution. These include initial inroads on acoustic-prosodic features of speakers deemed to be charismatic (D'Errico, Signorello, Demolin, & Poggi, 2013) and how different cultures might prefer (and attribute charisma to) different acoustic-prosodic profiles (e.g., lower pitch, longer pauses; although see Cullen, Hines & Harte, 2014). However, the greater number of work on studying charisma cross-culturally is not on attribution per se, but on case studies, especially of 20th century charismatic figures (Willner, 1984) that led impactful movements, countries, or companies. This includes a study of their behaviors, personality profiles (e.g., Oakes, 1997), biographies and/or case studies (e.g., Gentile, 1998; Roberts & Bradley, 1988; Schweitzer, 1984) and their commonalities (Willner, 1984). Otherwise, work has been on theoretical propositions on charisma, for example, using an evolutionary framework, relating to dominance and benevolence (Castelnovo et al., 2017).

In the local context, the term charisma has been used primarily in the political arena as a descriptor for some notable or successful politicians. This includes, for example, president Ramon Magsaysay (Willner, 1984), the notorious conjugal dictators Imelda and Ferdinand Marcos (Pedrosa, 2017; Richburg, & Branigin, 1989) and the housewife-turned-president that defeated them, Cory Aquino (Cruz, 2011; Cabacungan & Dizon, 2015) as well as former populist president, Erap Estrada (Pedroche, 2002; Llanto, 2009). Charisma has also been a talking point in the 2016 Philippine National Elections (Silan & Encarnacion, 2017), with many proclaiming presidential candidate Rodrigo Duterte to be charismatic (Francisco, 2017; Pedrosa, 2015; Curato, 2016) especially to the masses, while Mar Roxas, a popular rival candidate is widely seen as and criticized for lacking this crucial 'trait' (Politiko News, 2015; Gonzales, 2015). That is, its presence or absence in certain individuals are deemed worthy to be commented on.

There is also the question of the term or the concept itself as used across cultures. If it is more universal than culture-specific, then one would expect for there to be multiple independent production of the word across cultures. Thus far, there is little work on the cross-cultural

indigenous analog of charisma. Potts (2009, p. 1) mentions the Melanesian *mana* and Sufi *barakah* as possible candidate analogs, but notes that:

Each of these terms is generated from specific belief systems; none is exactly equivalent; none has the particular sense and associations of charisma; none has undergone the trajectory of the term ‘charisma’: that is, a transformation from religious idea to sociological concept to general usage.

Criticisms of the Literature: Charisma’s Ill-definition and Conflations

Up to this point, what has been discussed are the mainstream conceptualizations of charisma and charismatic attribution. And, as Antonakis and colleagues (2016) have noted, the literature has included exemplars, outcomes, behaviors and questionnaire items as de facto definitions of charisma. What is charisma exactly? From the discussion above, it is apparent that there are many different senses of the word; Table 1 summarizes the different notions of the construct developed across time and across different fields.

Table 1

Different Notions of Charisma

	Broad Notion	Specific Notions	Sample References
1	As a gift	As a gift from the divine As an individual quality that cannot be learned or taught	Paul (see Potts, 2009) Weber (1922/1968)
2	As a basis of legitimate authority	-	Weber (1922/1968), Sociological studies (e.g., Shils, 1965)
3	As an exceptional quality of an individual	-	Weber (1922/1968)
4	As personal magnetism	Either as an individual who is desirable, socially preferred or able to garner preferential attention As an ‘X’ factor or ‘it’ factor or ‘indescribable presence’ of an individual	Self-help genre (e.g., Dubrin, 1997) Self-help genre (e.g., Cabane, 2012)

5	As individual capacity to, or actually have social influence	As ability to or actually influence other people to accomplish the goal of the individual	Celebrity studies (e.g., Currid-Halkett, 2010) Self-help genre (e.g, Mortensen, 2010)
		As the ability to / actually be / set of behaviors that lead to ‘motivating’ (in that individuals are excited to pursue the goals the leader set out for or create with them)	Leadership studies (e.g., House, 1977)
6	As something that can explain 20th century “irrational” follower movements including Hitler’s Nazi Germany, Jonestown Massacre, and Gandhi led liberation movement of India	As the devoted leader-follower relationship itself As the cause of this relationship (either because of personal magnetism, because of personal magnetism because of exceptional quality etc.)	Political Science (e.g., Willner, 1984)
7	As an attribution or inference about the individual	Which may be due to any one or more of the notions above	Leadership studies (e.g., Conger & Kanungo, 1987) Sociological studies (e.g, DuPertuis, 1986) Political science (e.g., Spinrad, 1991)

Thus, the different notions can get severely conflated all under one term of charisma. Note that these notions of charisma are not synonymous. Further and importantly, it doesn’t follow that one notion follows or causes another. To help in the discussion, notions in this section will be italicized.

The self-help genre (and implicitly and arguably, the leadership studies) for example, assume that *individual capacity to influence* and/or *devoted leader-follower relationships* is caused by some general notion of *personal magnetism* or to be preferentially attended to.

Meanwhile and traditionally, political science (e.g., Willner, 1984) has tried to explain these *devoted relationships*, but this same name construct is transplanted in leadership studies largely in the notion of *capacity to influence*. It's also commonly assumed that this notion of *personal magnetism* and this notion of *capacity for social influence* come hand in hand, but to be socially preferred can be associated with, but is not necessary, for social influence. As a rough example, in traditional Filipino families the mother, as 'ilaw ng tahanan' might be more loved (that is, socially preferred) but the decisions are still made by the father (that is, more influential). This also leads to another potential notion of charisma, as a *special case of social influence, specifically due to being socially preferred*.⁴

In leadership studies for example, theories may have started out implicitly alluding to charismatic leaders as individuals characterized by any of the varying notions such as *personal magnetism*, *capacity for social influence*, *capacity for/have actual devoted relationships* and/or *attribution of charisma*, but they slowly build upon themselves and end up with some nebulous constellation of behaviors. When theorists develop their models, what image of a charismatic leader do they hold? Is it a CEO that attracts attention or is it an individual in the organization without formal power but are able to socially influence towards a common goal? Is it a leader whose followers prefer to work under even if material benefits are greater in another unit/company? All of the above? As Turner (2003) wrote "... attempts to quantify the concept did not rely on Weber's formulations directly, but on what one might call the popular or 'cultural' concept of charisma." (p. 7).

Disentangling these notions is important because 1.) studying all aforementioned conceptualizations under the construct of charisma may pre-emptively assume a functional, necessary or causal relationship among the notions, and 2.) the conflation adds a layer of

⁴ These different notions is difficult to reduce to just that of social influence, as one might be tempted to do so. While a broad notion of influence permeates some, but not all of these notions - they are sufficiently different in focus and function that labelling all as simply influence would likely be unproductive even if it can be done. For example, Pauline's conceptualization of charisma as a gift is not primarily associated with influence, but rather with prosocial behaviors in the early Christian community. Compliance is also present in all three of the Weberian authority systems (traditional, bureaucratic and charismatic) but attitudinal influence is seen more as an effect of charisma, but is *not* charisma in the Weberian sense of it being the special quality in a person. Leader influence on followers might be conceptualized as a special type of influence to those with defined followership roles - but large movements with dedicated followerships (with dynamics beyond those of behavioral and attitudinal influence) seem to be fruitfully demarcated from just leadership alone, or social influence in general. And, as discussed, "personal magnetism" or effects on attention need not lead to social influence; and charismatic attribution may be due to any of the things above, not just influence. In other words, these different notions are difficult to reconcile or unify.

intractable complication when synthesizing a definition of charisma across different fields: authors of theories don't normally explicate which notion of charisma they're building on when they label their construct as charisma. Even the most recent work by Antonakis and colleagues (2016) do not mitigate this issue – their synthesis of different behaviors as de-facto operationalization of what charisma is makes sense if their different source articles share the same notion/s, which do not seem to be the case.

Note that charisma has been criticized in practically all fields that the construct has been used in (Spencer 1973; Turner, 2003; van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013; Paul et al., 2002; Yukl, 1999; Nur, 1998; Kotter, 2000; Gemmill & Oakley, 1992; Meindl, 1995; Spinrad, 1991; Bensman & Givant, 1975; Tybjerg, 2007; Antonakis et al. 2016). The above-mentioned issues and these criticisms inform the model that I will propose – one that hopes to accommodate the fuzzy nature of charisma, and its apparent conflations and contradictions.

What is the role of charismatic attribution? The discussion above leads to a conundrum: charisma, arguably, is a fuzzy construct. However, it is also deemed important by individuals. Either one abandons the construct as scientifically intractable or one inquires into it at the explanatory level which allows probing into its relevance on individuals' day-to-day lives (Wimsatt 2007; Smith, 1995; Atkinson, 2017). Thus, this project tackles it at the level of folk psychology, inquiring into the 'practical reasoning' or 'mundane reasoning' of people as they use the term in their day-to-day lives, and what functions the term has that it is kept in the cultural repertoire (Atkinson, 2017; Potts, 2009). This incursion into the folk logic of charisma leads to the exploration of charismatic attribution - that is, the act of thinking of, labelling, inferring or otherwise attributing other individuals as charismatic (or otherwise 'having' charisma, 'embodying' charisma).

Why study charismatic attribution? One important insight based on extant literature is that *different theorists seem to build their models of charisma with the popular conception of charisma in mind*. However as discussed, *this popular conception of charisma they draw from would very likely have different notions across these sources*. For example, Conger and Kanungo (1998) developed their model with the consideration that “most of us carry in our heads a naïve theory of what constitutes charismatic leadership. What is needed is a more precise and scientific understanding of the phenomenon” (p. 47). House (1977) wrote of this implicit image, by saying

how “literature concerning charismatic leadership and the opinion of laymen seem to agree that the charismatic leader can be described by a specific set of personal characteristics” (p. 6) and how in the development of his model he asked his class to form small groups and describe charismatic leaders they know or have been exposed to. Bass and Riggio (2006) discussed whether controversial exemplars such as Hitler, are really transformational leaders (they decided that he is not), but who other theorists do label as charismatic (e.g., Willner, 1994). These previous examples show that charismatic attribution is central to the development of the concept of charisma.

One can make the case that charisma, as developed through time, is explicated through charismatic attribution – or that the knowledge of the construct of charisma comes from various forms of charismatic attribution. Put another way, the implicit logic is that because there is charismatic attribution -individuals and commentators label politicians, celebrities and other figures as charismatic- there ‘must’ be charisma. Charisma then ‘must’ exist – but what form does this existence take shape? Later sections would expound this discussion, for now what is emphasized is that charismatic attribution plays an important role both theoretically (in providing hints of what charisma actually is), and practically (in that discussions of charismatic attribution play out during socially consequential events including those in the political arena).

Note that not all scholars will agree on the focus on charismatic attribution, nor on the fuzziness of the construct of charisma which the recent signaling framework has tried to iron out (Antonakis et al., 2016; Antonakis, 2017). However, even in the signaling framework, 1.) charismatic attribution has played an important foundation in its development and 2.) while empirically sound (e.g., Antonakis et al., 2011; Antonakis et al., 2016; Jacquart & Antonakis, 2015) the disagreement is not on empirics, but on theoretical grounding - their redefinition of charisma into an operationalist signaling endeavor provides an inadequate inquiry into the ontology of charisma, as the next section will flesh out [See Appendix A for details of the criticisms against the signaling framework].

Thus, this research project will explore the largely understudied dynamics of charismatic attribution: how and why are people thought of as charismatic? What folk logic guides the process of charismatic attribution? What processes, heuristics and reasoning take place during charismatic attribution? Before these discussions are fleshed out, I will first introduce the

Constructed Charisma Framework and discuss some elements of it, as it has important implications for how to go about fruitfully inquiring into the processes of charismatic attribution.

The Constructed Charisma Framework

The ontology of psychological constructs. Knowing the ontology of psychological constructs is paramount (Yanchar & Hill, 2003; Maul, 2013) because the existence -and in what form these psychological constructs exist- has direct implications on measurement, design, analysis and inference (Borsboom et al., 2004; Kievit et al., 2011; Nowland, Beath & Boag, 2019; Trendler, 2009; Petocz & Newbery, 2010)⁵

In what forms do psychological constructs exist? If the constructs the field deals with are similar to those in physics or chemistry, similar traditional methods would provide fruitful inquiry into the constructs. However, not all things that exist, exist in the form as mountains and molecules. Fried (2017) for example, summarily distinguishes between four different types of psychological constructs: 1.) natural kinds, which are perceiver independent and would exist even when no one exists to perceive them; 2.) social kinds, otherwise known as social constructions, which are borne out of socially agreed upon definitions and are thus perceiver dependent, in that it ceases to exist without perceiving individuals; 3.) practical kinds, where constructs are conceptualized as ‘useful metaphors’, but need not exist as an entity and; 4.) complex kinds, where constructs are conceptualized as relatively stable patterns (‘emergence’) of complex network systems.

Emotions, for example, are typically assumed to be natural kinds – the traditional account is that there are 6 universal basic emotions - anger, sadness, disgust, happiness, surprise, fear (Ekman & Cordaro, 2011). What is often deduced is that these emotions in turn affect facial expressions, behaviors and so on. Thus, in a traditional account, disgust causes the scrunched up facial expression as well as turning away from the stimuli and saying ‘yuck’. However, Barrett (2006, 2017a, 2017b) reviews decades of evidence and assert that emotions are not natural kinds, but are underlied by complex core systems, where indicators such as facial expressions and other

⁵ Petocz & Newbery emphasize (2010, p. 13): “Therefore, the choice of quantitative or qualitative method must be determined not by a priori ideological commitment (e.g., “I subscribe to social constructionism, so I do qualitative research,” or “I am a scientist, so I do quantitative research”), nor by imposing one type of structure onto another (e.g., “If I apply numbers to this material, that will render the material quantitative”), but by the nature of the material under investigation.”

behaviors are made meaningful by being placed into socially agreed emotion categories such as “happiness” and “disgust”. Varied instances of disgust have varied instances of facial expressions and varied instances of consequent behaviors - and these need not have a common neural bases for individuals to place them all in the cultural category “disgust”. Thus, an instance of these emotions is “a brain state that makes the sensory array meaningful” (Barret, 2017b). As such, they can be seen as a combination of Fried’s (2017) typology – emotions are complexly constructed (neural-, psycho- and socially constructed) psychological constructs that can be roughly viewed as culturally influenced perceptions (Barrett, 2017a; Barrett, 2017b). Emotions are real (Barrett, 2012) but in what sense? Emotions are social constructions underlied by complex biological dynamics.

Similarly, in depression, instead of being thought of as a latent variable that *causes* the various symptom indicators - lethargy, anhedonia etc.- it can be conceptualized as a network of causally interacting symptom indicators which gives rise to what is commonly known as the clinical picture of depression (Fried & Cramer, 2017; see also Borsboom, 2017; Borsboom, Cramer, & Kalis, 2019). In other words, instead of having a common cause, “from the network perspective, certain symptoms like insomnia, fatigue, and concentration problems in patients with Major Depression (MD) co-occur not because they result from an underlying brain disorder or neurochemical imbalance but because not sleeping well leads to being tired and having concentration problems.” (Fried & Cramer, p. 1). Further, other mental disorders may be a hybrid between common-cause and network models, for example where the onset might be due to a common cause, but the maintenance might be due to network interactions between symptoms (see Fried & Cramer, 2017 for further discussion).

Charisma is a social construction. What is the ontology of charisma? Does it exist as a natural kind or is it just a useful fiction? For Antonakis and colleagues (2016; Antonakis, 2017) charisma is nothing more than leader signals; other scholars (e.g., Shamir et al., 1993; Conger & Kanungo, 1987, 1998) implicitly treat it like a natural kind, where there are more-or-less necessary behaviors that distinguish charismatic leadership and non-charismatic leadership. Still others treat it as the passionate leader-follower relationship in itself (Willner, 1984) or as some nebulous emergence from leader-follower-environment interaction (Klein & House, 1995). If charisma has an ‘objective’ essence (i.e., if there was a true latent variable underlying it, or some

necessary set of behaviors, signals, or even necessary leader-follower-environment interaction) then one or a combination of the notions discussed above should be “correct”. However, if the ontological status of charisma is that it is ultimately socially constructed -it is not a natural kind, and does not have a perceiver independent reality- then there is no ‘objectively’ correct notion, only that which there is more-or-less virtual agreement by people within a culture. Put another way, if charisma is socially constructed then it can encompass and take on these many different notions including their combinations and confluences, without being ‘in error’ (and whether earlier academic accounts match lay individuals’ conceptions still needs to be explored).

That is to say, the Constructed Charisma Framework (CCF) posits that both charisma and charismatic attribution will have no neural basis, no essence, no latent variable that ‘manifests’ as a constellation of behaviors, and no necessary collection of behaviors or signals. But charisma is as ‘real’ as other conceptual categories such as money. Money has no necessary physical essence, and it is not a ‘latent variable’ that manifests through indicators. What is something ‘objectively real’ underneath the social construction of money? It is not the round silver object. Rather, its existence gains meaning (and value) through consensus (Searle, 2010 see also Epstein, 2015). In a similar manner, to say that charisma is constructed, and has a socially constructed reality does not negate the ability of the concept to have practical relevance in the day-to-day lives of people:

Most things in your life are socially constructed: your job, your street address, your government and laws, your social status. Wars are waged and neighbor slaughters neighbor, all for the sake of social reality. When Benazir Bhutto, the late prime minister of Pakistan, said that “You can kill a man, but not an idea,” she was proclaiming the power of social reality to reshape the world (Barrett, 2017a, p. 133).

This account again does not essentialize charisma either as *de facto* trait/s, as a concrete set of behaviors, or even as a certain subset of signals. Rather CCF treats charisma as a fuzzy concept and cultural product, and as I will later on discuss, the model predicts that this is often used for attribution and sense-making purposes.

Note that I differ here constructivism and social constructionism (Raskin, 2011); both are related in the common interest of how individuals construct knowledge, and that these constructions (and not necessarily objective “reality”) are what’s accessible. However, when I

write of charisma being constructed, this does not mean that any person is actively constructing it at the moment of asking or is free to change the agreed-upon meanings at their will. Rather, like other social constructions (money, emotions) people may be born into a culture that has these concepts, learns them, and perceives them as “objectively real” despite having no perceiver-independent reality (Raskin, 2011). And they in turn, through interacting with other social agents help perpetuate, and modify these construction’s meanings. (See also Barrett 2017a; Hacking 1999). However, once created, these social constructions can ‘have a life of its own’ and social constructions can impact how one experiences oneself and their surroundings; and once constructed can constrain what is possible to experience (Hacking, 1999, 2002). [See Appendix B for further details on issues of ontology]

What does this mean for charismatic attribution? If charisma is a natural kind (with a reality which is perceiver independent) then the best way to go about the construct is to study it as how it has traditionally been studied: and charismatic attribution is left to whether one can “correctly” identify individuals with charisma (or *does* charisma). For example, Conger and Kanungo (1986) wrote that the charismatic “attribution [is] made by followers who observe certain behaviors on the part of the leader” (p. 639) and charisma can be inferred as a dimension of leadership. However, much of the mainstream literature especially in leadership do not explicitly discuss the process of charismatic attribution, and the assumption seems to be that if the individuals have the ‘special quality’ (Weber, 1922/1968) or enact the prescribed charismatic behaviors (Shamir et al., 1993; Conger & Kanungo, 1987, 1998; Willner 1984; Spencer, 1973) then charismatic attribution naturally follows. Or at least, if the values that the leader purports to have match with those of the followers (Antonakis et al., 2016; Shamir et al., 1993). That is, the assumption in much of traditional charisma research is that there is a direct progression from prescribed behaviors to charismatic inference.

However, if charisma is a social construction, then it is highly likely that there are minimal or even no necessary signals/behaviors, and multiple sufficient ones – and thus, one cannot rely on the natural progression of perception from ‘necessary behaviors’. That is, the behavioral and signaling models of charisma (e.g., Conger & Kanungo, 1987, Antonakis et al., 2016) seem to provide behaviors and signals that are *sufficient* to produce charismatic attribution, but are not necessary for individuals to think of a leader as charismatic. For example, as Haslam,

Reicher and Platow (2010) note, these behaviors are not enacted despite and when charisma ratings increase after a figure's death. Further, if the posited ontology is appropriate, then the explanatory level of 'folk psychology' becomes useful (Wimsatt, 2007; Atkinson, 2017) and instead of identifying 'correct' or 'incorrect' charismatic inferences, this project instead looks at the variation of charismatic attribution, the folk logic that coheres these disparate instances together, and fundamentally the how's and why's of the attribution process that can exist without necessary signals or behaviors. As a social construct, these incursion to the folk level of charismatic attribution also help us trace the shape of charisma-as-a-construct itself. That is to say, if there are no necessary signals and no simple causal or necessary relationship of these purported signals to charismatic attribution, then directly inquiring into the perceiver-centric attribution and inference process is likely to enrich traditional accounts that are leader-centric.

The dynamics of charismatic attribution. In this section I will tackle preliminary elements of the dynamics of charismatic attribution, first by noting how charismatic attribution can be seen as a process of categorization. Different categorization processes will then be discussed, focusing on folk-logic based categorization. After which, I will discuss the issue of multiple realizability, and what this means for charismatic attribution.

Charismatic attribution as categorization. When analyzing, there seems to be no feature that uniquely defines⁶ the category of charismatic individuals (for a short review of concepts, categories and defining features: Sternberg, 2011, p. 322-340; see also: Medin & Coley, 1998; Gelman & Hirschfeld, 1999). Some charismatic people are leaders, some are not as in the case of celebrities, teachers, particular colleagues (Shamir, 1995); some are famous, some are not. Some are 'successful' by conventional standards, some are not. Some are dominant, expressive, have a core group of devoted followers but these are merely characteristics and not defining features (see also Levine, Muenchen & Brooks, 2010; Tskhay et al., 2018). This is similar to the concept of a *game* where there seems to be no unique defining features, but "we all know what we mean, or think we do, by the word game" (Sternberg, 2011, p. 325). As many scholars have noted,

⁶Defining features or necessary attributes refer to when "For a thing to be an X, it must have that feature. Otherwise, it is not an "X." (Sternberg, 2011, pg. 324)

charisma and the category of charismatic individuals are fuzzy concepts whose boundaries are able to, and do shift (e.g., Paul, Costley, Howell & Dorfman, 2002).

In this sense, charismatic attribution can be thought of as a categorization problem: who do we put under the category of charismatic individuals? In the concepts and categorization literature (Smith & Medin, 1981; Medin & Rips, 2005; Sternberg, 2011; Harnard, 2017, however see also Malt et al., 2015) different categorization processes include:

1.) Features-based categorization, which categorizes an object based on presence or absence of specific features. For example, features of an apple can be: round, hard and red, so an unknown object that has these features will be considered as an apple.

2.) Representative-based categorization, which compares the object to be categorized with either the prototype (average summary instance) or exemplars (salient instances) of the objects within the category. If the unknown object is more similar to the average instance of what the individual knows to be apples rather than the average instance of what the individual knows to be bananas, then it will be categorized as an apple.

3.) Folk-logic based categorization, which relies on the ‘lay theory’ of what constitutes the category which is then applied to the object to be categorized. The knowledge that apples come from apple trees for example, will be in use when an unknown object is seen in a plantation.

The ability to identify features-based categorization for charismatic attribution first needs to have a list of more-or-less stable features for that of charisma (and these may come from the behaviors noted by previous scholars, e.g., setting a vision, using metaphors, etc.) and see whether a rated individual is evaluated for these before attributing charisma. The features-based approach implicitly seems to be the attribution process popular charisma models rely on (e.g., House, 1977, Conger & Kanungo, 1987; 1998, Willner, 1984). Representative- based categorization meanwhile, implies that individuals categorize another individual as either charismatic or not by comparing them to a prototype of charisma, or to exemplars (for example Steve Jobs and Obama). Many in the self-help genre (e.g., Cabane, 2012; Cohen, 2005; Morgan, 2009) try to “reverse-engineer” behaviors and attributes of exemplars although these do not necessarily assume a representative-based approach.

Folk-logic based categorization, meanwhile makes use of the individuals own understanding of charisma, or their ‘lay theories’ or implicit notions of what it means for another individual to be charismatic. In this sense, the folk-logic based categorization can overlap with the other categorization processes. However, there is great uncertainty. At this point, it is not certain which categorization process is dominantly or frequently used for charismatic attribution, although it is possible that the different processes will be used at different instances by the same individual. However, for this project the focus is on explicating the folk-logic of charismatic attribution. What logic, heuristic processes and reasoning do people rely on when categorizing other individuals as charismatic?

One prediction for this folk-logic categorization is that charismatic attribution is used as a sense-making heuristic. It seems that charisma is an explanation for the inexplicable and the mysterious (Lindholm, 1998; Turner, 2000; Gemmill, & Oakley, 1992). Why did Rodrigo Duterte, despite his track record of human rights violations, manage to win the presidency with around 16 million votes? Why did hundreds of members commit suicide along with James Jones? Why is Individual X able to influence group Y to perform above-and-beyond despite having no formal position, no coercive or rewarding power? Why does celebrity X versus some celebrity W land magazine centerfolds despite the lack of ‘talent’? Charisma, in this sense seems to be lexically alive in that it enjoys popular usage and is deemed important because it serves the cultural need for a heuristic for the seemingly irrational, the inexplicable and/or those with ‘mystical’ components. Charisma appears to survive because of its folk logic. And this might be the source of its potency: in a complex society, with incomplete information, ambiguous and multiple determined causes, charisma is used as explanation for ambiguous events. This appears to have a roughly similar cultural need for astrology. There is no underlying reality to the notion that planetary positions affect personality traits or life outcomes, but one hears people say “oh he’s a Sagittarius? That explains a lot.” Charisma, like astrology, seems to serve as an explanatory or sense-making heuristic.

This sense-making heuristic is also predicted to be similar to that of “romance of leadership”, where attributions of successes or failures in organizations are systematically biased towards the leaders or executives, instead of say, attributing them to external events, randomness, organization networks, the rank-and-file, effects of previous policies and so on

(Meindl et al., 1985; Meindl, 1995). That is, there exists an inflation of leadership's importance in folk reasoning about organizations' outcomes.⁷

Charismatic attribution is multiply realizable. Multiple realization is when psychological states or constructs are underlied by multiple configurations; but these configurations give rise to / or is labelled with the same term (Kim 1992; Kievit, 2014). For example, instances of the emotion “fear” can be underlied by vastly different neural activation patterns (Barrett, 2017a), or two individuals with the same latent score g might do so because of different strategies, one through large working memory size while the other because of efficiency through experience (Borsboom, Kievit, Cervone & Hood, 2009).

In a similar way, charismatic attribution seems to be multiply realizable. One can imagine both managers John and Jane might be labelled as charismatic despite the fact that John is labelled so because of his confident and well-applauded speeches, while more soft-spoken Jane is labelled as such because of her high success rate in closing deals (see for instance various descriptions in Shamir, 1995). Further, not only may the multiple realization issue arise due to different substantive reasons for labelling, it may also come from the different categorization processes themselves. One may be labelled because he “fits the mold” of charismatic leaders, while another might be labelled to explain why a consequential outcome was achieved.

The ‘multiple configurations’ that underlie why a person is thought of as charismatic may also depend on the social distance of the individual (Shamir, 1995; Yagil, 1998 as well as social networks - Balkundi, Kilduff, & Harrison, 2011) where close figures may be thought of as charismatic because they are sociable and considerate, while distant figures may be seen as charismatic because of their vision and rhetorical skill (Shamir, 1995).

While multiply realizable, the reasons for attributed charisma do not seem to be infinite - what this project also aims to do is map the variability of the realizability of charismatic

⁷ Subsequently, an issue is that prevalent charismatic attribution, especially in socially consequential events, might serve as a hierarchy-enhancing myth (Sidanius & Pratto, 2012; Pratto, Sidanius & Levin, 2006; see also Gemmill & Oakley, 1992; Gerpott & Kieser, 2017) that can legitimize a particular hierarchical dominance. To attribute Duterte's 2016 presidential win (or Mar Roxas's loss) in terms of charisma may overlook the social conditions, political structures, campaign propaganda, campaign resources, power coalitions and so on that facilitated the election win. Whether leader or celebrity, success is legitimized because a within-individual factor is popularly attributed to.

attribution, and see if there are general patterns to these realizations.⁸ The landscape of charismatic attribution is largely understudied and is ripe for exploration.

Research Question and Rationale for Methods

What I want to explore and answer in this paper is **how and why do people attribute charisma?** For this, a qualitative *pagtatanong-tanong* was done, focusing on the ‘mundane reasoning’ or folk logic of charismatic attribution. This line of questioning was also able to capture other possible categorization processes by looking into various category representatives (prototypes/exemplars), and features of charismatic individuals. It also explored the larger dynamics of charismatic attribution -- including whether it is used as an explanatory/sense-making heuristic, the variability and patterns in the attributions’ multiple realizations, and the different categorization/attribution processes themselves.⁹

I emphasize that I did *not use qualitative research for grounded theory or phenomenology*, but rather, qualitative analysis as used in its general form for exploration (Braun & Clarke, 2006). *Neither did I use the qualitative study to derive an ‘official’ definition for charisma.* [See Appendix B for further details on the philosophical grounding of the project] While I care about the ‘1st order understanding’ (Atkinson, 2017) of the participants - that is, their direct answers and their own descriptions of their reasoning, I also care about 2nd order understanding, that is, what the patterns and heterogeneity of their responses can reveal about the underlying processes of charismatic attribution. The goal is not just to re-describe their experiences. Note also that for the *pagtatanong-tanong*, instead of pursuing a purely suppositionless design (i.e., by asking about different figures, and seeing whether the individuals would freely label them as charismatic), the questioning was more or less direct, with the notion that what is documented and analyzed are the local knowledge that social actors use in order to accomplish mundane tasks in their cultural milieu (Atkinson, 2017). Participants are thus assumed to be subject matter experts of their own day-to-day experiences; the navigation and reasoning I am interested in inquiring into both 1st and 2nd order understanding.

⁸ Finding empirical evidence for the multiple realizability of charisma also corroborates the proposition that there are many sufficient but minimal necessary conditions for charismatic attribution (instead of traditional accounts where ‘charismatic signals’ are seen as necessary but not sufficient). A weaker version of this proposition is that there are multiple non-sufficient and non-necessary signals for charismatic attribution.

⁹ Note that this secondarily serves as preliminary incursion to the validity of the constructed charisma framework.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

Study Design, Question Guide and Rationale

To explore the dynamics of charismatic attribution, *pagtatanong-tanong* (indigenous participatory interview; Pe-Pua, 2006) was done (See Appendix C for *tanungan* guide). Primarily, the procedure aimed to explore how and why people attribute charisma to other individuals, with probes that explored the folk logic, category representatives (prototypes/exemplars), features of charisma and charismatic individual, how people actually define charisma, as well as possible indigenous analogs. (See Appendix E1 and E2 for example transcripts)

The *tanungan* guides were divided into two parts. The first section contained substantive questions while the second section asked the participants to meta-cognize about why they answered what they answered during the first section. The first section included questions such as who they found charismatic, who they don't find charismatic, when they felt most and least charismatic, if they find themselves to be charismatic, if they find other previously cited figures to be charismatic, what charisma is for them, what contexts they encounter or discuss charisma and if they know of a local translation or indigenous analog of the concept charisma. Various probes were prepared to expound and give depth to these questions. [See Appendix C for the *tanungan* guide]. The *tanungan* guide has a copy in English and Filipino, and the *tanungan* session itself was matched with the participants' comfortability, with the sessions conducted either in conversational English, Taglish (mixture of English and Filipino), or with mixture of English, Filipino and Bisaya. Pilot testing was done to ensure smooth logistics, and last-minute modifications to the *tanungan* guide.

All *tanungan* were audio-recorded, although some were recorded late in the session, after gaining rapport and asking permission. In which case, notes were supplemented with the transcripts. There were 523 minutes of audio recorded data, which do not include pre-and post-*tanungan* conversations, as well as recorded notes. The average length of *tanungan* took around 30 minutes, the longest *tanungan* took 1 hour, while the shortest took 10 minutes¹⁰. The

¹⁰ Not all questions were asked to this participant because the participant had a different understanding of charisma – as that describing a religion, or individuals that are hypocritical.

tanungan was deployed in a semi-structured manner with all the main questions being covered; although five participants were not able to answer questions in the meta-cognition section. No new questions were added during the course of the data gathering.

Sample Selection

Twenty to twenty-five individuals were planned to be interviewed, benchmarked with the recommendation of Dworkin (2012) to allow the responses to more likely reach saturation and redundancy, and if not then at least to allow for enough data to “clarify relationships between conceptual categories and identify variation in processes, and [maximize] the chances that negative cases and hypothetical negative cases have been explored in the data” (p. 1320). Because it is an exploratory study, sampling selection took cue from earlier exploratory *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* (SP) research (Pe-Pua, 2006; Torres, 1982; Nicdao-Henson, 1982; Santiago, 1975), with the particular goal in this study to interview as varied participants as possible. Like with earlier SP studies, there is no strict stratification plan, however sampling was conducted that ensured a diversity of SES, age, communities, and occupations/industries. Thus, purposive and snowball sampling was done. To complement this, and ensure various perspectives, after a couple of sessions, I went around the geographic area after the planned *tanungan* session and had a *pagtatanong-tanong* of individuals in the vicinity.

However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the government mitigation responses - including community quarantines (Esguerra, 2020; Lopez, 2020) as well as ethical considerations for conducting a *tanungan* under great upheaval, data collection was stopped with a total of 17 participants. Due to safety concerns, four of these participants had the *tanungan* session online. To not waste any information, responses from three participants during the pilot phase were added to the pool of analyzed responses— one was asked the full *tanungan* guide, while two were only asked about the main questions without the meta-cognition. The three were re-contacted for their consent to use their data for the analysis.

Participants. For the 17 participants in the study, there was a huge variation in the occupations, which include: software engineer, admin officer, transportation officer, veterinarian, researcher, housewife, animator, teacher, set designer, game designer, barista, security guard, life coach, college instructor, project administrator and student.

The youngest participant was 22 years old, while the oldest was 58 years, with the mean age being 34 ($SD=11$). Eight of the participants were men and nine were women. Most participants were trilingual with the third languages including: Bisaya, Ilocano, Waray, Chinese, Japanese, Spanish and Greek.

Analysis

The data were analyzed using general qualitative analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Toma, 2011) with thematic analysis as the first stage to provide the second stage of analyzing the underlying processes (Atkinson, 2017). *Pagtatanong-tanong* responses were transcribed. These transcribed texts were inductively coded, with no a priori codes. These inductive codes were frequently multiply nested and often overlapping with other family of codes. For example, “Reasons for being called charismatic” had sub-codes, one of which included “looks and presentation” and under this were further nested codes which included “good looks” “good smell” “well-dressed”. This is different from the family of codes “Who is charismatic?” which included “International figures,” “Filipino public figures,” “Socially close figures,” as well as nested codes including “Reason for International Figure” and so on.¹¹ These codes and subcodes were frequently checked against each other, after which these were either merged, nested, or split depending on the comparison. Overarching themes that cut across different codes were noted, for example, three major themes for “Reason for being called charismatic” included that of “attributes”, “actions” and “effects”.

Reflexivity, saturation and verification. The participant transcripts, the above discussed codes and themes, the summary notes for each participant and comparative tables served as the basis of analyses for inferential claims. While I was the sole coder and analyst for all the transcriptions, a process of verification, reflexivity and scrutiny was applied for all analytic claims. For example, analytic claims were closely checked and re-checked against the participants’ raw data to see whether the claims hold, and whether there were contradictions or viable competing hypotheses. Supporting and contradictory evidence are discussed and footnoted as appropriate. Further discussion of saturation and reflexivity on bias requires knowledge of the results, and so a detailed discussion is attached on Appendix G.

¹¹ These two family of codes can be seen either as overlapping families, or a finely granulated lengthy tree of codes.

Ethical considerations. Pseudonyms were used for all participants in this manuscript. Otherwise, for potentially sensitive quotes, short segments of speech, or when names are not needed for readability, participant IDs were used to denote the source of the text (e.g., P1, P2, P3... and so on). No undue discomfort was observed during the *tanungan* session, and no risk was anticipated that was greater than those ordinarily encountered in their day-to-day life. Due to ethical considerations of conducting non-essential research during upheavals due to COVID-19, four *tanungan* sessions were conducted online, and data collection was stopped after the 17th participant.

The consent form given to the participants detailed how the data will be handled and shared, with information on how to contact the researcher for further inquiries or concerns (See Appendix D). For the impromptu *pagtatanong-tanong* with participants with no scheduled appointments, various consent information were discussed, but no signatures were collected – and verbal assent constituted the consent to avoid a ‘legalistic’ or intimidating start to the participant-researcher relationship.

CHAPTER 4

Results

The chapter is organized as follows: the first section tackles 1st order understanding – the summary of the direct responses and variation in the participants’ responses. The succeeding sections tackle the 2nd order understanding, first discussing inferences about the underlying processes of charismatic attribution (how do people think of other individuals as charismatic?) This is then followed by considerations and putative social functions of charismatic attribution why do people think of other individuals as charismatic?) Finally, these processes are illustrated with a short case study focusing on how and why participants regarded Rodrigo Duterte as charismatic or not.

Following the suggestion of Moravcsik (2010; 2014), while illustrative textual data will be presented in the main text, other relevant data will be footnoted as appropriate to actively track the evidence, but not impede readability by not swamping the main text with the qualitative data.

Summary of Responses from the *Tanungan*

Who were seen as charismatic? Typically brought up figures included Kris Aquino, Rodrigo Duterte and Barack Obama. Socially close figures also included those of particular workmates, bosses, friends, family members and teachers/professors. Other international figures that were found to be charismatic included: Tom Hanks, Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, and Anthony Robbins; while local public figures included: Vico Sotto, Miriam Santiago, Imee Marcos and Bong Go.

As expected, there was a great heterogeneity in why people were thought of, perceived, or labelled as charismatic (see *Figure 1*). Predominant reasons for why figures were deemed charismatic lie in variations in three themes: attributes, behaviors/actions, and effects (See *Table 2* for summary and examples). For **attributes**, this included a.) sincerity, b.) certainty and confidence, c.) approachability, d.) *palangiti* or happy disposition, e.) intelligence, f.) looks & presentability and, g.) other attributes, including patience. For **behaviors/actions**, this included a.) caring behaviors (*malasakit*), b.) rhetorics and delivery, c.) listening and shows interest, d.) unconventional behaviors, e.) and other behaviors including expressing vision, expressing moral

convictions, and expressing the sentiment of the collective. For **effects**, this included a.) capturing and maintaining attention ('engagement', 'making people listen', 'drawing people in'), b.) behavioral influence, c.) believing what the figure is saying, d.) the effects on emotions and mood (including 'inspiration' and '*pagkahawa sa emosyon*'), as well as e.) having devoted followers. Furthermore, there were also lots of instances of sense-making. Since this will be repeatedly discussed in this and the upcoming sections, the formerly stated class of effects will be given the technical term, *charisplananda* (combining charisma and explananda, the Latin term for phenomena that needs explanations; see *Figure 2*)

Figure 1. The variety of attributes, behaviors, and effects. Circles are overlapped to convey that attributes, behaviors and effects are often 'baked-in' or used together when describing a charismatic figure.

Charisplananda

Figure 2: The different charisplananda. Participants tap into the notion of one or two among these set of effects.

Table 2**Themes, Codes and Examples of Reasons for Being Called Charismatic**

Themes	Inductive Codes	Examples
Attributes	Sincerity	<i>"To me hindi siya tunog nagsisinungaling noon."</i> [P1, regarding Duterte]
	Certainty and confidence	<i>"I could feel a lot of certainty in how he was speaking. He was very sure of himself, but not in an arrogant way. I would say arrogance would turn someone off, and charisma would draw people to them"</i> [P12, regarding a workshop speaker]
	Approachability	<i>"... the way he carries himself is like someone you could approach."</i> [P15]
	Happy disposition (Palangiti)	<i>"Tapos yun bang palaging palangiti. Good vibes. Good vibes palagi."</i> [P4]
	Intelligence	<i>"He seems smart, he's charming and when he speaks he claims it's always for the betterment of the Filipino people"</i> [P13]
	Looks & Presentability	<i>"Diba, beauty, matangkad, mabango. Nandiyan na yung charisma niya. Ta's kunwari tutulong sa mga mahihirap mga beautiful, beautiful. Lahat bukabibig siya, beautiful."</i> [P4]
	Others	<i>"Siya yung mediator madalas. Oo yun. Siya palagi yung, 'tigilan niyo na nga yan! Ba't hindi kayo mag-arrive sa isang ano, tapos kung ano di pagbigyan niyo din ang isa-' – ganun, ganun siya. Sobrang haba ng pasensiya pati."</i> [P6]
Actions	Caring behaviors (Malasakit)	<i>"Anyway nakita ko sa kanya yung charisma kasi parang pinapakita niya na may malasakit siya sa mga mahihirap. Yung slogan niya nga na "Erap Para sa Mahirap" parang tinotouch niya yung mga mahihirap talaga kunwari ipagawa ng mga bahay mga ganun. Tapos magpapagawa ng roads"</i> [P4]
	Rhetorics & Delivery	<i>"Antonio Meloto, the way he speaks is – okay so exaggerated movements, loudness, choice of powerful words. Very emotional yung kanyang mga speeches. And he makes it personal. The use of the pronouns, "you", "us", "we" noh."</i> [P9]
	Listening and shows interest	<i>"... she listens with an intent to really help you out."</i> [P11]
	Unconventional behaviors	<i>"Si President Duterte has managed to still – and into subvert the norms of everyday Philippine expectations of what a politician should be like. Of a certain decorum that you should have in office. But, people still follow him."</i> [P5]
	Expressing vision	<i>"Siguro isa sa criteria ko ng para maging charismatic yung isang tao is may sarili siyang vision, may sarili siyang gusto galing sa kanya. Ta's firmly siyang nagbebelieve doon."</i> [P1]
	Expressing moral convictions	<i>"... she has strong convictions and does stand by them. And she can support her convictions I guess."</i> [P14]
	Expressing sentiment of collective	<i>"Ikaw you cannot be angry at this country, at this people, but then he voices it out and then his words have implications and sometimes actions, he has actions behind it."</i> [P14]
	Other behaviors	<i>"he's a strict disciplinarian and yet lahat ng sinasabi sa amin na ifollow eh he follows it. He's never late. He's on time. He never forgets his lines."</i>

		<i>So you know. Kahit pa masigawan ka, nakikita mo sa kanya eh na he practices it” [P17]</i>
Effects	Capturing and maintaining attention (including ‘engagement’ ‘making people listen’, ‘drawing people in’)	<p><i>“ And whenever he delivers those particular events, people are always laughing, people are always engaged in what he’s saying even though yun nga it’s a boring topic or it’s a topic you wouldn’t find fun” [P5]</i></p> <p><i>“... that makes me, not really devoted to him but inspires me to yeah listen – not to be devoted, but to listen and stop and just look at him and listen.” [P17]</i></p> <p><i>“ when I say someone is charismatic, well it feels like you’re more or less drawn to these people. You know? You can’t quite put your finger on it but something about these people that just makes you feel like drawn to them.” [P12]</i></p>
	Behavioral influence / persuasion	<i>“ kaya niyang i-ano na “uy ito kasi ang goal natin, ganito” parang najo-joke niya. Ta’s eventually nale-lead niya lahat ng tao, to that specific goal. Which is for me, wow kaya niyang gawin na hindi kailangan ng galit or force.” [P2]</i>
	Believing what the figure is saying	<i>“Someone na – basically yung papaniwalaan mo. Ganun siya.” [P1]</i>
	Effects on emotions and mood (including ‘inspiration’ and ‘pagkahawa sa emosyon’)	<p><i>“the charisma of people – I feel like they change how you feel about yourself, and how you feel about life. And I feel like it’s a gift, you know, because you can hear information from anyone – but to be able to come in contact with someone and it changes the way you feel and you-. I would have to say that Les Brown is another guy. Zig Ziglar is another guy.... when you hear them speak they just change how you feel about yourself, how you feel about life.” [P12]</i></p> <p><i>“She sweeps people off their feet with her experience. Pag nagsasalita siya, napapaintindi niya tapos nahihila ka sa mood niya ba. Although sometimes it’s also overwhelming” [P14]</i></p>
	Having devoted followers	<i>“... basta alam ko people really believe kung ano yung mga gusto niyang gawin. Kahit na masama siya. Kaya sobrang dami niyang followers” [P1]</i>
	Sense making	<i>“Diba si Erap, siya yung aking magiging example. Kasi si Erap artista lang naman yan siya. Di naman siya -. Diba talsik nga siya sa Ateneo kuno. Tapos, why is it na, may mga tao ba, gustong-gusto siya noon, tapos diba ilang cycle eh. Talagang nasa top ano siya – top 1 or top 2. Until naging president.” [P4]</i>

These attributes, actions and effects (charisplananda) were sometimes ‘baked-in’ or used together when describing a charismatic figure – for example when Ian described a speaker he found charismatic, he asserted that

I think it had to do with his confidence, I would say. Confidence, also his certainty. [When] I say someone is charismatic, well it feels like you’re more or less drawn to these people, you know? You can’t quite put your finger on it but something about these people that just makes you feel like drawn to them. So, I would say, possibly observing human behavior, I would say perhaps his non-verbal communication, the way he stood, his facial expressions, the way he uses hands. I could feel, ang assessment ko, I could feel a lot of certainty in how he was speaking

And thus, Ian brought in a mixture of attributes (being confident), actions (non-verbal communication) and effects (drawing in others). However, for much of charismatic attribution, this was primarily due to the effects of the figures:

Kaya niyang kausapin even the pinakadifficult na people. So diba, when you’re working with different people, ang dami-daming gustong i-achieve pero like, kaya niyang i-ano na “uy ito kasi ang goal natin, ganito” parang najo-joke niya. Ta’s eventually nale-lead niya lahat ng tao, to that specific goal. Which is for me, wow kaya niyang gawin na hindi kailangan ng galit or force. (Katherine, regarding a workmate)

Very charismatic speaker, very effective one. He can even make some seemingly objectionable statements agreeable. He has that power to engage (Yael, regarding a former boss)

[Kung] siya yung nag endorse – parang ang lakas ng ano ng product. Atsaka makikita mo dun diba, parang highest paid endorser siya, yung mga ganun. (July, regarding Kris Aquino)

I think he’s charismatic because he’s always the guy we assign as the MC. We always assign him as the person that leads our training programs, [recess], whenever may pag-usap. And whenever he delivers those particular events, people are always laughing, people are always engaged in what he’s saying even though yun nga it’s a boring topic or it’s a topic you wouldn’t find fun. (Sam, regarding a workmate)

While in total there were several types of effects, individually, participants usually attributed charisma in reference to only one or two of these charisplananda (see *Figure 2*). For example, one participant focused on whether the figure can make other individuals believe him/her with the participant citing figures such as such as Hitler, Duterte and Vice Ganda. Another, meanwhile, focused on whether they can ‘convince’ people and influence behavior citing figures such as her workmate and her boyfriend. One participant tapped into several of these charisplananda including ‘drawing people in’, making people listen and making people follow commands – with the participant citing figures such as Kris Aquino and the late director, Tony Mabesa.

There was also a wide variability in who participants don’t find charismatic. This can be because they are perceived not to produce the class of effects, that is, the cited figure doesn’t convince, or manage to make people listen or isn’t engaging and so on. This can also be because participants found their behaviors and moral values to be objectionable. Another reason for not finding people charismatic is when the participants believed there to be an incongruence between what impression the figures thinks they’re sending, and the actual impression that they have on people. Otherwise, the lack of attribution of charisma can come from a host of different negative character evaluations: including for example arrogance, aggression, hypocrisy, awkwardness and being boring, among others. Commonly reported non-charismatic figures include Duterte, Trump, Bato, Panelo, as well as particular acquaintances, bosses, and family members. These are illustrated for example, by the following passages:

I find him really crass. In the sense that he’s offensive to other people. And other people find him charismatic, but I find him super uncharismatic. “Oh he’s charismatic, we connect to that”, but to me, he doesn’t connect to other people. So, he’s not that charismatic to me. And yun nga, binabastos niya yung ibang tao. Even like the way he carries himself, he doesn’t put – he doesn’t attend meetings, he’s tired. He gives the impression he doesn’t want to be there. (Karen, regarding Duterte)

The way she poses herself naman is a mother figure. So parang she always describes the college as one big family. There are all united. Pero the way she handles kasi her things is pa backstab. So after the speech maglalaglag siya ng people that she dislikes. Kunwari

somebody says something in disagreement, sasabihin niyang “ah si ganito, ganito yung performance.” So, parang people tune her out. (Sam, regarding a head of an institution)

Did they find themselves charismatic? Some participants definitively felt that they are not charismatic— as they did not normally achieve the charisplananda they described for other people, such as making other people believe in them.¹² Others felt like they need to “*turn it on*” (Elaine) or need to “*do the preps for it*” (Karen), as needed. Others still, affirmed that they are charismatic. Interestingly of these participants, they were generally the ones who emulate specific behavioral acts in others that they find to achieve successful outcomes or appear charismatic.¹³

Participants typically felt most charismatic when there is an acknowledgement that they achieved the charisplananda; noting indicators such as crowd interest, retaining followers or achieving business goals¹⁴. Or otherwise, it was generally when they felt like they can *potentially* achieve these effects, even though the situation does not call for it¹⁵. And this may either be because they felt prepared or felt good about themselves. Participants reported feeling least charismatic meanwhile, predominantly by citing instances where they had negative affect: mad, tired, overburdened, awkward or was simply in a low mood¹⁶.

Participants found it hard to translate or give an approximate indigenous analog, however the most frequent translation included “*angas*” (although one participant qualified it as

¹² E.g., “*I don’t think of myself as someone charismatic. I guess felt confident, but I never really felt charismatic. I felt confident, but I’m not sure if that confidence will translate to charisma... I don’t think just because you’re confident you’ll be charismatic... You don’t just have to believe in yourself, you have to get other people to believe in you. I’m not sure if I manage to make people believe in me.*” (P13)

¹³ E.g., “*... we inherited Tony Meloto’s passionate way of speaking. And the use of stories... And I wouldn’t borrow a technique if I knew it didn’t suit my personality. So, I guess in a way, me and Tony Meloto are similar. We’re very similar.*” (P9)

¹⁴ E.g., “*it depends on the body language of others. If they’re enthralled or if I manage to keep their attention during a talk or if I see that they’re understanding, they’re nodding, they’re smiling, they’re agreeing. So, it’s like “oh okay, they’re listening to my message, they’re okay with me talking in front”. Tapos I look at the body language of others if it’s clicking with them*” (P15)

¹⁵ E.g., “*. So, I first wore a suit nung MA ko. It was a pin stripe blazer, tapos pin stripe fully pressed na suit. Tapos, I was just feeling like ‘hell yeah this is my day’. Even though wala naman akong kausap and everyone else was doing the same.*” (P5)

¹⁶ E.g., “*When I’m so mad siguro. I’m sure I’m not charismatic*” (P2)

“*magandang angas*”), “*dating*” (or “*malakas ang dating*”) while others included: “*mapersonalidad*”, “*makatao*”, “*gusto ka ng tao*”, “*lapitin ng tao*”, and “*kapit*”; although participants tended to qualify this and explained that it isn’t truly the same. One participant also provided an analog for Japanese charm: チャームポイント (“charm point”); while another provided context to the Greek root word meaning of “charisma”, as to graciously give.

How did participants actually define charisma itself? When asked to explicitly define, they spoke of it as an individual difference, capacity, trait or ability to bring out (a class of) effects; this can be for example the ability to make people believe in the figure¹⁷, the ability to initiate and hold attention¹⁸ (including ‘engagement’, or ‘drawing people in’ or ‘making people listen’) as well as the ability to influence others’ behaviors (including influence that does not produce negative affect in others)¹⁹. Otherwise, it was defined as a particular way of interacting²⁰, or some “totality” of the person²¹.

However, these definitions were not universally held – some participants held views of charisma that did not correspond to popular notions of charisma. Junjun for example, held the notion of charisma as hypocritical preaching, stemming from religious groups (“*Parang yun ang charismatic eh diba? Parang nagpe-preach ka ng kabutihan pero deep inside di mo naman magawa*”). Liam, meanwhile, eschewed definitions of charisma related to delivery and personality and asserted that charisma ultimately is stimuli – which either “*affects or effects*” and

¹⁷E.g., “*Yung pinakanaisip ko kasi sa word na charisma is yung kakayahan mo na paniwalain yung mga tao sa gusto mo. Or parang kahit hindi paniwalain – not paniwalain na ijoin ka nila kahit paniwalain na ‘uy tama siya’ kahit hindi ka necessarily sasamahan nila*” (P1)

¹⁸ E.g., “*I think charisma is an invisible magnetic force that draws people to an individual*” (P12)

¹⁹ E.g., “*Some na nasuko in.ana [sic], so I don’t find them charismatic I just did it because they were mad. Diba, okay don’t be mad I’m gonna do it na. But the other people who did it nicely or with confidence, diba. So that’s when I realized na oh, charisma is making people do but in a nice way*” (P2)

²⁰ E.g., “*Way of interacting but it might involve two people from different positions and so di ko naman sasabihin na someone who’s my equal na charismatic siya. “Oo, grabe ang charisma mo!” hindi parang, so someone from a higher position reaching out to someone who’s in the lower position. Yeah, so reaching out, mingling, socializing – interacting in a friendly, accommodating way.*” (P11)

²¹E.g., “*Charisma is the total you. The people like you. Charisma is being, reaching to people na walang kapalit. And charisma is being happy, not affecting people to be sad. You give good vibes, that sila din ay nahahawa. I think that’s charisma, that’s it.*” (P4)

thus everyone is charismatic and it's just a matter of whether they are aware of it or properly manage it.

For a majority of the participants, they remembered being aware of the concept at an early age - usually during gradeschool or highschool. These were usually through games (as “attributes” of game characters), books, or discussions with other people. While a familiar term for many, and well-used by some, the majority did not usually encounter or discuss the term in day-to-day life, with the few encounters being in political commentaries, pocketbooks/romance books or through games. When asked whether they believe charisma is important, they unanimously agreed that it is.

For the meta-cognition section, participants were asked to think about why they responded the way they did to the earlier questions, and their thinking process behind their responses. When asked what their thinking process was for thinking of other individuals as charismatic, participants pointed to thinking about whether the figures are able to produce the *charisplananda*²² with some in particular evaluating whether the figures had the effect on the participants themselves²³. Others pointed to thinking of figures that they look up to or idolize²⁴ while a couple of participants described a process of evaluating first those who are familiar to them for whether they are charismatic²⁵. When asked to think about their thinking for their responses to who they did not find charismatic, participants reiterated their reasoning that these

²² e.g. “*Magtutukoy ako ng tao – nung una kasi, magaling makahatak, yun yung definition ko ng sinasabi mo eh. Ah malakas ang appeal niya na mag-open ng kahit na anong topic, tapos interesado ka agad kasi magaling siya. Parang ganun*” [P6]

²³ e.g. “*Okay, when you ask these questions I just blurted out what came to mind. So I think yung thought process maikli. But! I think when you asked that question, ang iniisip ko “kanino ba ako nakikinig, sino bang pinapakingan ko, sino ba yung pinapanood ko” ganun*” [P17]

²⁴ e.g. “*Ang inimiagine ko, sino ba yung tao na parang ina-idolize ko or parang ini-isip ko na ang galing naman ng taong to na parang. Like yun nga kung endorser ka diba.*” [P3]

²⁵ e.g. “*Yung tinanong ako about charisma, anong pumasok sa isip ko? Pumasok sa isip ko kasi, yung – yung – kasi ire-relate mo yan sa tao, everyday na nakakasalimuha mo eh, so naisip ko agad yung husband ko, yung parents ko diba – mga members ng family*” [P4]

are the figures who were not able to achieve the charisplananda²⁶ or who are likely unable to²⁷. Otherwise, the reasoning was on whether the participants disliked the figures²⁸.

Similar to their answers in the first section - when asked to meta-cognize about their response to when they felt most charismatic, the participants also commonly referred to instances and indicators that they achieved charisplananda²⁹; or otherwise when they were in a good mood³⁰. When asked to meta-cognize about when they felt least charismatic, the participants commonly thought of the times when they were in a low mood³¹ or otherwise were not able to achieve the charisplananda³².

Finally, when asked to meta-cognize about how they defined charisma, participants reported either thinking of the commonality between the figures that they cited³³, relating the definition to their previously held conceptualization of charisma³⁴ or relating the definition with how charisma relates to themselves³⁵.

Now a puzzling consideration: the general explicit response to defining charisma was as a capacity, attribute, or ability to produce one or few in a class of effects. However, when asked to think about figures that they find charismatic – evidence pointed towards the participants thinking not directly about ability or actions in itself, but whether the figures *manage to*

²⁶ e.g. “Sino ba yung mga inignore ko minsan. Sino yung mga nagsasalita pero di pinapansin ng mga tao” [P1]

²⁷ e.g. “I was thinking of people, na no matter what I did, what they say or what they do I won’t believe. So it shouldn’t be to my boss but whatever. [laughs]. Everytime na he approaches, okay ‘what do you want’ but ignore it. And then everytime I hear, I remember na yung kay Panelo or Bato, like whatever.” [P2]

²⁸ e.g. “I was thinking of people I disliked. Na parang people that had the opposite effect. People I didn’t want to think about anymore. Na repulsive ganun.” [P5]

²⁹ e.g., “Kung kalian ba ako nagsalita sa medyo madaming tao, ta’s pinapaliwalaan nila ako – tapos they followed me para ma-achieve ang isang goal.” [P1]

³⁰ e.g. “I was thinking of emotions – I was thinking of a time again, I was pulled by an emotion, which is usually enthusiasm, or excitement or joy, you know.” [P12]

³¹ e.g. “Yung time na parang galit ka, down ka, na hindi mo – ayaw mo naman gawin pero parang inis ka nga parang ba’t ko naman nagawa yun na narealize mo ang salbahe ko pala. Yun.” [P3]

³² e.g. “Times na I failed [to convince]. So whatever I did, I smiled, I did everything [but still failed]” [P2]

³³ e.g. “Kung anong common sa kanila – sa anong common sa mabuti or masama na charismatic. Sila Hitler, sila Duterte.” [P1]

³⁴ e.g. “Kasi nga, depende dun sa charisma. Yung charisma kasi, ang reading ko dun is yung appeal. Yung magaling ka talagang – yung sobrang galing. Yung taong ito galing ng charisma niya. Galing niya makisama, ang talino niya, pwede siya makibagay kahit anong uri ng tao. Mataas man, mababa man. Salbahe, mabait. Alam mo yun, yung ganun yung ano ko.” [P6]

³⁵ e.g. “Iniisip ko yun kasi, dinescribe ko lang yung sarili ko, paano ako may charisma sa kanila” [P4]

successfully produce the outcomes desired. James, for example, did not necessarily point to Hitler's ability as to why he is seen as charismatic, but directly to the fact that "*people really believe kung ano yung mga gusto niyang gawin.*" Similarly, for Katherine, it was directly to the reason that her coworker can talk to "*even the pinakadifficult na people*" that pointed to her coworker being charismatic. It seems to be the case that only when these successful outcomes are seen or thought to endure across situations that it is then attributed to the individual – whether as an ability, attribute, capacity or simply something of an individual difference that not all are able to do or have.

In the next section I try to make sense of this puzzle, the great heterogeneity in the figures, attributes, behaviors, and effects in the results (See *Figure 1*) and what the patterns of responses say about the research question.

How do people think of other individuals as charismatic?

As expounded later on, I make the case that much of this heterogeneity (See *Figure 1*) in the attributes, behaviors and figures labelled as charismatic is driven by an underlying effects-based appraisal process. This effects-based appraisal is in itself the folk logic of charismatic perception. I first discuss the primary role of effects as the guiding logic of folk-logic based categorization, as well as review other non-common charismatic categorization processes. Then I discuss the role of attributes and behaviors in this process, as well as instances when sense-making occurs. Finally, the role of moral judgement is discussed, and how it affects or moderates charismatic perception for some participants.

The role of effects. What can one say about the underlying process(es) of charismatic attribution, and how people categorize individuals as charismatic or not? There's tentative evidence that some participants follow a features-based categorization process that matches a "charismatic feature" and evaluate individuals for whether they have this feature/s or not. For example, Conching's explicit feature of charismatic individuals were those that are "*palaging goodvibes*" or "*madaling pakisamahan [and] may malasakit*" and consequent individuals are evaluated for whether they are perceived as having "*goodvibes*" and *malasakit*. These included her husband, Erap, and Kris Aquino but not Vice Ganda. This feature-matching procedure was similar in Maria, whose various figures she evaluated as whether the interactions of the figure with another person (especially if the person is from a lower status) is warm and approachable.

She cited Tom Hanks, Imee Marcos and her former dean as charismatic, but not Bong Bong Marcos nor her current dean.

There's also tentative evidence that some participants followed a representative-based categorization process. This is clearest from James, when asked to meta-cognize about his thinking of who he found charismatic, said, *"To be honest parang naiisip ko sino bang Hitler ng buhay ko, pero at the same time inisip ko rin na hindi siya necessarily evil, ganun."* In representative-based categorization, various figures seem to be, if not evaluated then at least accessed, and compared to an exemplar. For Kiko, on the other hand, he mentioned that for someone to be charismatic, a factor is that one *"looks like a proper leader"* citing figures such as Abraham Lincoln and Martin Luther King Jr.

However, the most common process seems to be that of folk-logic based categorization. This folk logic seems to be a sort of effects-based appraisal or effects-based reasoning. For example, while thinking of possible figures, Frida evaluated if they're charismatic by thinking to herself *"... would I follow this person? Would I believe in this person? Would I vote for this person?"*³⁶ And this seems to explicate the process of how other people think of, appraise or label figures as charismatic. This process is also illustrated for example when Juana said, *"Magtutukoy ako ng tao [na] magaling makahatak..."*, as well as in Sam's reasoning of *"[I] was thinking of examples of people na I was drawn to personally"*. That is, the primary consideration of whether a person is found to be charismatic is mainly based on the effects they manage or seem to manage to produce.

Evidence for this process is further supported when looking into the responses of the participants when asked when they felt most charismatic. Yael meta-cognized that *"thoughts immediately flashed to events where I was able to successfully engage."* Similarly, Claire felt charismatic when she performs on stage, *"charismatic kami... kasi the audience eyes were on us and grabbed their attention basically, and held it for so long until the end of the presentation."* The emphasis again is on the effects they have on other people. Evidence for the primacy of this effects-based appraisal is detailed in Appendix H, and there is evidence to support that this is the primary process of attribution for P1, P2, P3, P5, P8, P9, P10, P12, P13, P14, P15, P16 and P17.

³⁶ This is also similar to Gideon's explicit meta-cognition: *"... ang iniisip ko 'kanino ba ako nakikinig, sino bang pinapakingan ko, sino ba yung pinapanood ko'"*

Evidence for this effects-based appraisal process permeate across the different components of the *tanungan* guide, from who they thought of as charismatic, who they didn't find charismatic, when they felt most and least charismatic, whether they considered themselves as charismatic and so on.

The role of attributes and behaviors. While effects are primary, why is there a whole class of other attributes (sincerity, approachability, etc.) as well as actions (speech delivery, *malasakit*, etc.) that also seem to factor in when thinking of someone as charismatic (See *Figure 1*)? What seems to be happening is that these *variety of attributes and actions are a collection of what participants idiosyncratically believe will produce or help produce the charisplananda (or the particular class of effects)*. For Katherine, she characterized charisma as the ability to convince people towards a desired behavior without negative feelings. She also responded to feeling most charismatic when she puts in the effort to be nice. That is, it seems to be the case that niceness is brought into the reasoning behind charisma in so far as it helps produce the effects - in this case, of convincing people without negative feelings.

Similarly, Karen characterized charisma as “... *a special kind of persuasion. It's the ability to get other people to listen to you and take your message to heart*”, but also held the notion that “... *a charismatic person is really extraverted*”. Extraversion in this case, is seen to be relevant to charisma because Karen believed extraversion and extraverted behaviors lead to successfully making others listen and take the message to heart. This also applies not only to the different attributes but also to the different actions. Kiko for example stated that, “*If you wanna win the hearts and minds of people, you gotta [have speeches directed] to them.*” Non-boring and relevant speeches, in this way are seen as something that will successfully produce the effect of winning the hearts and minds of people.

Another way to put it is that the individual folk logic of charismatic attribution taps into the schema of what people believe makes for effective charisplananda – effective way to initiate and hold attention, effective way to make people believe the figure, effective influence and so on. And this seems to be why there is such a huge variation in responses (see *Figure 1*), not only because participants tapped into different effects, but because individual folk notions of what should effectively produce these effects also vary. It is also important to note the implications of charismatic attribution as a predominantly effects-based appraisal and not primarily an attribute-

or behavior-based appraisal. This implies that effects are appraised first and then abilities/actions are used to explain, contextualize, or simply coincide with these effects – but common specific attributes and behaviors are not necessary for charismatic attribution.

The role of sense-making. Where does sense-making fall into this? Sense-making happens when participants observe the figures' effects, but which are incongruent with the attributes and behaviors that they observe. This is illustrated for example by the following:

Malaking impact na masasabi ko na instrument ang charisma is when Erap won the presidency. Kasi dun ko nadefine ang charisma sa kanya eh. Kasi, why does people cling to him, ang bobo naman niya diba. (Conching)

For Conching, lay theoretically, being “bobo” should not inspire devoted relationships but Erap still managed to do so. In this case, because there is incongruency, charisma is then used as an explanation for why the effects were achieved by the different figures. Similarly,

Kasi iinisip ko wala naman silang nagawa evidently pero nanalo sila. So may appeal sila sa tao. Kaya siguro dun pumupasok yung charisma nila. (James)

For James, he did not observe any substantive political actions from ‘traditional politicians’ (such as Bong Go and Manny Pacquiao) but noted that they were still able to win the elections – thus ascribing charisma.

The role of moral judgement. There is also the consideration of the role of moral judgement in charismatic attribution. Moral judgement refers to beliefs and normative judgements of what is right and wrong, and what is good and bad (Sverdlik, Roccas, & Sagiv, 2012). For the participants who followed a mainly effects-based appraisal process, there seems to be two types: 1.) participants who found figures charismatic even if they dislike their morality and behaviors; and on the opposite, 2.) participants who simply did not find a figure charismatic if they disagree with their morality. Moral judgement only seems to moderate or affect the charismatic attribution of the latter type of participants (or, moral judgement only “filters” charismatic perception for these types of participants). See for example the competing statements:

Well Duterte is exciting – I don't like him, but he's exciting. I mean I don't hate him [laughs], personality-wise he is charismatic even if I don't agree with his personality and fifty percent of his politics. (Yael)

Because lahat ng sinasabi niya ay against my values. Like, very disrespectful to women. And then you know naman his stance against yung mga NPA, yung killings. So I'm sure sa sinasabi pa lang niya hindi talaga ako maniniwala. (Katherine)

This divide in whether moral judgements affect charismatic perception also seem to reflect the divide on the importance of effects-on-others versus effects-on-the-perceiver. For example, while Katherine knew about Duterte's effect on other people ("... *si Duterte, kaya niyang i-BS out everyone.*"), this was not sufficient for her to find Duterte charismatic because she, herself did not believe in him. Meanwhile, as Sam's passage above shows, Duterte doesn't need to appeal to him, just to a mass of other people. Thus, for participants like Sam, effects-on-others were sufficient for charismatic attribution even if there was no effect-on-the-self.

These are the underlying processes that drive most of the variation in figures, attributes and behaviors that we see in the responses: 1.) There is the difference of categorization process. While effects-based appraisal (folk logic) is predominant, there are a few cases of features-based categorization and representative similarity-based categorization. 2.) There is the difference in charisplananda – different individuals will focus on different effects such as capturing or holding attention, versus behavioral influence, versus effects on emotions and so on. 3.) These different charisplananda are thought to be effectively produced by a range of different attributes and actions across different participants. 4.) There is also the moderating/filtering role of moral judgement and consequently its apparent role in whether effects-on-others is sufficient for charismatic attribution.³⁷

So how did participants think of other individuals as charismatic? Principally, through folk-logic based categorization – particularly that of an effects-based appraisal. That is, appraising whether the figures successfully produce charisplananda. Attributes and actions are added to the reasoning in so far as they help produce the effects (or “lay theoretically” should) but this is not necessary – if the attributes and actions are unknown or incongruent with observed

³⁷See other theoretical considerations (Appendix J) for a possible fourth relevant factor – the visibility of the link between figures and effects, but which currently is not optimally captured in the design

effects, then sense-making will occur to explain why the effects are observed. In which case, charisma can be used as an explanation for why the effects occur. This process is affected for some participants by whether their moral values match with those of the figures; and consequently, whether effects-on-others is sufficient for the participant to label the figure charismatic or if there needs to be effects-on-the-perceiver.

Why do people think of other individuals as charismatic?

There are many meanings of ‘why’, with some of them having been tackled in the previous section (e.g., why are certain figures thought of as charismatic?). In this section, what is explored is why charismatic attribution is done, and why charisma as a concept seems to be kept in the cultural repertoire of the participants.

Existence of charisma as a concept. As seen in Junjun³⁸ and Liam³⁹’s case, as well as moments of uncertainty of the concept by some participants⁴⁰ charisma does not seem to be a uniformly understood concept. However, there is also particular sophistication in many participants – as seen in their being able to draw out what isn’t quite charismatic from what is⁴¹, with some charismatic categorization often feeling automatic⁴². So there is granularity to their understanding of the concept, although it isn’t discussed or encountered day-to-day. Participants found it hard to translate or give a local language equivalent; but some participants asserted that

³⁸ “*Parang yun nga yung charismatic, nag preach ng mga kabutihan, mga laws of God, parang gusto talaga nilang i-ano yung-, parang sinasamba talaga nila yung ano tapos deep inside sila rin pala hindi naman ganun [kabait]”*
“... naka-tatak na sa isip ko dati na charismatic yun nga yung tungkol sa mga nagpe-preach sa Bible ganun. Yun yung na sa akin hah, ang pagkakaalam ko dati pa.”

³⁹ “*Everyone has charisma. Why? Because everyone has their own unique vibe. Everyone has their own way of presenting themselves. Actually three layers: [1.] outside for other people – we use charisma for that. If you exude that ‘gloomy mood, stay away’, la la la – that’s charisma, it’s not bad or good it’s how you use it. Or [2.] you also use charisma unconsciously, with for example with friends or with family. And then you know, on how to keep on that layer. And then you also have [3.] a personal charisma for when you are yourself.”*

⁴⁰ E.g., “*Hindi – iaano ko muna kung ano talaga yung -- charisma is yung parang charm tama ba?... Ewan ko lang kung tama yung concept ko ng ano, [charisma]”* (P3)

⁴¹ E.g., “*They’re interesting, but they’re not charismatic. They have a different way of engaging. Very business like. Humility, yun! They engage through humility.”* (P9)

e.g., “*Kasi pwede kasing name-based lang yung winning nila, so not necessarily charismatic.”* (P1)

e.g., “*Well, like I said, I don’t think just because you’re confident you’ll be charismatic... You don’t just have to believe in yourself, you have to get other people to believe in you. I’m not sure if I manage to make people believe in me.”* (P13)

⁴² E.g., “*Its kind of automatic. Na like, ‘oo nga no this person’”* (P16)

it exists, and that other people must know about it even if they did not have a term for it.⁴³ Almost all reported knowing about it early on in their lives, unanimously assented to its importance, identified who and why they find figures charismatic, and recognized if they themselves are charismatic.

Charisma facilitates a certain way of thinking about the social world. So why do people use charisma, and why do they perceive someone as charismatic? The use of words and concepts encode specific aspects of an experience (Barrett, 2017; Malt et al., 2015) – that is, given the complexity of events and experiences, they capture a specific aspect that allows easier communication among individuals. Charisma as a concept seems to afford (Costall, 1995) or facilitate a specific way of looking into the world, no matter how temporarily: as that of class of effects as well as who produces these effects and potentially (lay theoretically) what attributes and actions help produce these effects.

Evidence seem to point to charismatic attribution existing as *description* of individual difference to successfully produce charisplananda. That is, typically it is not so much *an explanation for the effects, but rather describes who and how they successfully influence, who and how they successfully hold attention and so on*. Why make this distinction between description and explanation? Participants, when pressed, could cite underlying reasons for why their cited charisplananda was achieved. For example, when asked why Vice Ganda among other actors/actresses had the particular draw from the masses, James replied that:

Yun nga, feeling ko normal siya makipagusap. Di siya tulad ng ibang artista na feel ko may two cases: yung iba feeling separated sila sa society since mayaman na sila from the start ganyan, yung iba naman tinatry nilang maging mabait dun sa ibang tao. Si Vice kasi parang kanto kausap eh, so madaling makasama sa masa bale.

Asked why her particular co-worker was able to convince a range of people to doing the project tasks without resorting to anger or force, Katherine responded:

⁴³ E.g., “*Pero, everybody knows what charisma is maski hindi na nila sabihin yung term na charisma. But they already know yan yan, charisma na yan. Hindi nila yan sasabihin ang word, but it exists everyday*” (P4)

I think cause he's confident. And then because confident siya, other people believe in him also. "Oh we can do this", woah confident siya. So. Let's go, let's do another [task]!

The conceptualization of charisma by the participants as an ability shows an understanding that charisplananda is easier achieved by some people rather than others. But this is not necessarily due to some inherent "something" – or some inherent inner variable charisma, but is rather due to various attributes and behaviors done by the figures. It is only in the minority of cases that charisma is really used as an explanation for why effects occur – during instances of sense-making. This sense-making for example, is seen in Gideon's explanation for Kris Aquino's effect, *"I hate her... I don't like her as an actress, as a host, but she has this certain charm that keeps people still wanting to see her. And that includes me 'shit ano kayang nangyari kay Kris.' So negative man, I think that is charisma as well."*

An interesting aspect here is what gets encoded in charismatic perception and discussions of charisma and what does not. The role of environment and context usually did not get discussed by the participants, and the main focus was on individual differences. For example, participants generally did not bring up the environment or context as the reason for why they found their cited figure/s charismatic, nor the role of the environment/context into how the successful outcomes were achieved. For example, in Gideon's account:

Of course, it is, [charisma is] very important. It's a rallying cry – it can make a nation and break a nation. Steve Jobs, because of him being charismatic, look at Apple now. Hindi lang naman - the first time he showed the Iphone to the world, hindi lang naman yun yung Iphone he it's how he spoke about it. It's how he valued it as a person. He gave it value, he gave it importance by showing us what it is and how important it is to him. And thus "ay shit, Iphone. Ay ang ganda."

In the quote above, the success of Apple is attributed to Steve Jobs and his charisma, rather than the rank-and-file in the company, the market landscape for smartphones, technical aspects of the product and so on. Charisma is given as the primary explanation.

Further, the specifics of behavior are commonly not detailed but rather the focus is on the effects of these behaviors. For example, elements of what makes a great speech

aren't parsed down (e.g., what makes a delivery strong). This is usually abstracted to as "*the way they speak*" or "*the way they talk*" as illustrated below:

It's not necessarily yung actual, physical appearance, but rather the way that they do things or the way that they speak, the way that they talk. The way that they act. Parang, it's surprisingly parang there's the element of down-to-earth like you could relate to them but at the same time, parang if you talk to them they could make something more interesting (Elaine)

Although part of this lack of specificity is the retroactive recall inherent in a *pagtatanong-tanong* design. Even for participants who did get into the specifics of behavioral acts, the focus was still on effects these produce:

Every step is deliberate. The twirl of her skirt. The wave of her fan. The touch of her hand on the back of her head, noh to perm, touching the bum or even just fixing herself a bit. Everything is very delicate. She makes it seem like everything she does is important. And that you should pay attention. There's something about the way she walks, stands, speaks. Makes you [stutters], takes away your attention from everything (Yael)

Further, subjectivity is also usually noted. Participants understood that who they find charismatic will not necessarily be seen as charismatic by other people⁴⁴.

Social comparison and communication. The use of the concept of charisma allows people to order other individuals along a specific criterion – that is, how successful they are in achieving charisplananda (how successfully they influence, hold attention and so on). In a way, the use of the concept is similar to other words such as “annoying” where the primary focus is the effect on other people – particularly that of annoyance. One can order individuals along a criterion of how successfully they produce the effect of annoyance (i.e., how “annoying” they are) without there needing to be some inherent trait or some fixed set of behaviors that necessitates being “annoying”. Although, like the use of charisma, there are a minority of

⁴⁴ E.g., “I dont know eh, it might be the energy. I just don't resonate with either of them in terms of how they speak and their energy – nonverbally, how they communicate non-verbally as well. Voice tone, content of what they say, I just don't resonate with them. But obviously other people have a different opinions.” (Ian)
E.g., “What I find charismatic is different from what other people find charismatic” (Frida)

instances where one claims of there being “something” about that makes him/her annoying. Nonetheless, like charisma, these concepts allow for 1.) thinking about individuals in a particular manner, 2.) communicating to others about the figure-to-effect links, and 3.) comparing, ranking and categorizing individuals in how they produce these effects.

The function of charisma for social comparison is most readily seen when participants are asked if they find select figures to be charismatic (e.g., Duterte, to be discussed next section), or whether they find themselves to be charismatic. Frida for example, did not find herself to be charismatic because “... *You don’t just have to believe in yourself, you have to get other people to believe in you. I’m not sure if I manage to make people believe in me.*” Meanwhile, Gideon was able to see himself as charismatic when “... *people follow my instructions, or follow me and see me as an example. Then yes, if that’s a measurement of being charismatic, then yes people follow me*”. Charisma, in this sense, allows Frida and Gideon to compare themselves to others along the criterion of particular effects - belief for Frida, and followership for Gideon.

Sense-making and framing. Why has charisma been kept in the cultural repertoire? Participants know the concept and use it to reason during charismatic attribution. One answer may be that it is used simply because it exists. Like many concepts of unknown origin and multiple cultural functions (ex. “*duda*”, “*kilig*”, “*tatay*”) it gets used because it can be used and allows communication of particular ideas. However, another reason may be that the concept of charisma allows to simplify thinking about the complex social world. It provides both a shorthand description of figure-effect links (e.g., that Kris Aquino can hold the audience attention), as well as an explanation for successful outcomes (e.g., Erap won in elections even if he flunked college). These attributions facilitate attending to the internal characteristics of the figures instead of the multitude of environmental factors and the interaction of various causal determinants. In this sense, charisma and charismatic attribution may provide a way to simplify and make sense of outcomes that happen in a complex world.

So why did participants think of other individuals as charismatic? Much more can be explored with other designs, but the qualitative incursion here provides preliminary foundational insights. The concept endures within the culture and is known by the participants. The process of thinking, labelling, or perceiving other individuals as charismatic is a process that facilitates thinking and communicating about specific aspects of the social world and not others. It allows

participants to focus on effects (charisplananda) and how people compare to others in producing these effects; and facilitates attention to internal characteristics of the figure. Charismatic perception allows making sense of particular outcomes and simplifies the framing of complex social phenomena.

The Case of Rodrigo Duterte: How and why did participants think of Duterte as charismatic?

To illustrate the process of charismatic attribution laid above, as well as the considerations and functions of charismatic attribution, I discuss in the succeeding sub-sections what participant responses regarding Duterte (See Appendix I for the raw responses).

How did participants think of Duterte as charismatic? Duterte was labelled, thought of or perceived to be charismatic due to different effects. For example, James initially found Duterte charismatic citing that he is able to make Filipinos believe his message⁴⁵. Gideon also found Duterte charismatic, this time focusing on Duterte's effect of making people listen and cultivating followers⁴⁶. Sam also tapped into the notion of followerships, and reasoned Duterte to be charismatic through a sense-making logic.⁴⁷ As expected, he was not uniformly seen as

⁴⁵ “Kasi nung simula wala pa masyado siyang ginagawa nun as a president so ang iniisip ng mga tao is yung mga ginawa niya sa Davao and paano siya magsalita. Kung paano siya makitungo sa mga tao, so dun niya nakuha yung mga tao – sa promises. Kung paano isya magsalita na sure siya eh. Na matutulungan niya ang Pilipinas. Jejetski siya papuntang Spratlys. To me hindi siya tunog nagsisinungaling noon.”

⁴⁶ “Yes. Kasi he managed to speak... kanto? You know, salitang kanto. Alam mo marami akong kaibigan sa squatter eh, lumaki ako beside the squatters [location redacted]. Marami, lahat yan barkada ko, kaya pag naglalakad ako diyan, okay lang. And yung mga manginginom, ganun siya magsalita. [laughs]. You know, and he managed to use that in his favor. That and the tough guy image. And oo, nagagamit niya. That's why people listen. I mean look at – sabihin natin 20% nun DDS, yung mga naglalalike, mga nagheheart. But the other percentage? Mataas pa rin ah! Bakit, kasi he's charismatic.”

charismatic, with those that didn't find him charismatic either citing lack of effects⁴⁸ incongruence of moral values⁴⁹ or other negative evaluations⁵⁰.

For those that found him charismatic, various attributes and behaviors were also ascribed including certainty/confidence (“*Kung paano siya magsalita na sure siya eh*”; P1), honesty (“*hindi siya tunog nagsisinungaling noon*”; P1), being exciting (“*I don't like him, but he's exciting*”; P9), unconventional behaviors^{33,51} (P5, P3), being able to speak “*kanto*” (P17), and having a tough guy image (P17).

As fleshed out in the previous section, these varied attributes/behaviors seem to be included in the descriptions of Duterte because the participants idiosyncratically believe these different attributes/behaviors facilitate the achievement of Duterte's effect – the particular effect of which differ slightly across participants. For James, certainty/confidence and perceived sincerity seem to help in Duterte making Filipinos believe in him. For Gideon, being able to speak *kanto* and leveraging the tough guy image help Duterte draw attention, and cultivate followers.

The dynamics of sense-making was also seen. For example, Sam observed that Duterte still has followers despite being an unconventional politician – and so he attributed charisma to Duterte:

Si President Duterte has managed to still – and into subvert the norms of everyday Philippine expectations of what a politician should be like. Of a certain decorum that

⁴⁸ “*he grows on you. Let's call it that way. Personally I don't know if I could . would call him charismatic. I don't find him charismatic. But I do find him just very blunt, you know?*” [P12]

“*I find him really crass. In the sense that he's offensive to other people. And other people find him charismatic, but I find him super uncharismatic. “Oh he's charismatic, we connect to that”, but to me, he doesn't connect to other people. So he's not that charismatic to me. And yun nga, binabastos niya yung ibang tao. Even like the way he carries himself, he doesn't put – he doesn't attend meetings, he's tired. He gives the impression he doesn't want to be there*” [P16]

⁴⁹ “*Because lahat ng sinasabi niya ay against my values. Like, very disrespectful to women. And then you know naman his stance against yung mga NPA, yung killings. So I'm sure sa sinasabi pa lang niya hindi talaga ako maniniwala*” [P2]

⁵⁰ “*parang does not care about the people kasi eh. He doesn't care about – ayun basically he does not care*”.[P11]

⁵¹ “*Kasi siya lang yung politiko na parang hindi conventional type na he doesn't care kung may masagasaan siya. Katulad ngayon yung ABS-CBN binabangga niya.*” [P3]

you should have in office. But, people still follow him. So in that sense, I would say he's charismatic

The moderating or filtering role of moral judgement was also seen – where the matching of moral principles was important to others' charismatic perception but not to all. For example, Katherine, despite knowing Duterte's effect on others (*"parang kunwari si Duterte, kaya niyang i-BS out everyone"*) did not find him charismatic because of their clash of moral principles. Yael, meanwhile, did not like Duterte, but observed his effect on others and did see him as charismatic. (*"I don't like him, but he's exciting... he is charismatic even if I don't agree with his personality and fifty percent of his politics."*)

Why did participants think of Duterte as charismatic? These different effects – drawing attention, making others believe in Duterte's message, cultivation of followers – were almost entirely internally attributed to Duterte either because of charisma or other various attributes or behaviors. Minimal attention was given to various surrounding contexts such as the political landscape, institutions, propaganda campaigns and so on. It can be argued that the discussion of and process of charismatic attribution facilitated this almost systematically internal attribution.

The dynamics of charismatic attribution also allowed participants to think about, compare and evaluate Duterte in how he achieves (or not) the charisplananda. This is seen for example, in Karen's text, *"other people find him charismatic, but I find him super uncharismatic. 'Oh he's charismatic, we connect to that', but to me, he doesn't connect to other people. So he's not that charismatic to me"* or Gideon's passage, *"That's why people listen. I mean look at – sabihin natin 20% nun DDS, yung mga naglalalike, mga nagheheart. But the other percentage? Mataas pa rin ah! Bakit, kasi he's charismatic."* In the course of the *pagtatanong-tanong*, they would also evaluate these charisplananda against themselves and various other figures – and judge whether they and the other figures are charismatic.

It can also be argued that the process of charismatic attribution allowed to simplify the framing of complex political phenomena that surround Duterte. It provided both a shorthand heuristic of describing his effects (e.g., James thinking Duterte's perceived honesty makes people believe his message) and an explanation for these effects (e.g., Gideon stating Duterte's charisma makes people listen) without needing to take all possible relevant environmental,

contextual and other causal factors into consideration. The process of charismatic attribution allowed to simplify the thinking about Duterte.

CHAPTER 5

Discussion

This section reviews points of intersection of the current empirical study with various theoretical concerns that come up in the literature on charisma and charismatic attribution. First, the Constructed Charisma Framework is discussed in light of the empirical results. Then, the implications of the results are discussed in comparison to the signaling framework of charisma (Antonakis, 2017; Antonakis et al., 2016). Further, how participants conceptualize charisma is compared to how the academic literature has conceptualized charisma. And finally, considerations in theory building for charisma are explored.

The Constructed Charisma Framework

The Constructed Charisma Framework is a model that treats charisma as a social and cultural product, and has implications for the study of charismatic attribution. As posited by CCF, charismatic attribution is multiply realizable. That is, different figures can be thought of as charismatic due to different effects, attributes, and actions. And even referring to one figure, why people reason about them as charismatic differ, and this is usually because the charisplananda they refer to also differ. For example, some participants tapped into the effect on attention as their reasoning for why they find Kris Aquino charismatic (“... *you could listen to [Kris] talk for days*”; “*Because she can hold the media’s attention, despite talking about random shit*”). However, for another participant, Kris Aquino’s charisma is not so much based on the effect on attention, but on the effect on behavioral influence, in particular the effect on sales (“*parang kung siya yung nag endorse, parang ang lakas ng ano [sales] ng product. Atsaka makikita mo dun diba, parang highest paid endorser siya*”)⁵². There is empirical evidence for the multiple realizability of charismatic attribution.

What was not anticipated in the initial development of model however was the primacy of the effects-based appraisal, especially on the fact that this seems to be the underlying process that drives much of the “fuzziness” and the variety in this multiple realization of charisma. While CCF predicted that charisma will be used for sense-making, especially during ambiguous situations – this sense-making is embedded in an effects-based reasoning by participants. As

⁵² Although note that not everyone finds Kris Aquino to be charismatic, Katherine for example states that “*if she endorses something, she does it for the money but she doesn’t actually believe the product.*”

discussed in the previous chapter, the CCF initially provided three candidates for the categorization process (features-based, similarity-based categorization and folk-logic based categorization) of who is seen as charismatic. There is evidence for the use of all three, but by and large – across participants, the most commonly used is folk-logic based categorization, with the folk logic being the reasoning for the effects the figures produce.

Note that the socially constructed nature of charisma is neither proven nor falsified, but a framework that *does* treat it as such is useful – both in providing the direction of inquiry and in making sense of both the current results and the conflicting accounts in the literature. Further, the trends in the qualitative data are compatible with the model and its predictions, and the current empirical results give preliminary credence to the framework. The current results, with the backdrop of the CCF, provide a rich perceiver-centric account of charismatic attribution.

Comparisons to Antonakis and colleagues' Leader Signaling Framework

The effects-based nature of charismatic attribution also casts doubt on the tradition to operationalize “charisma” or “charismatic leadership” as a set of (implicitly necessary) behaviors. Evidence from the qualitative incursion shows that there are multiple ways to go about the effects – and some particular set of behaviors, whether Conger and Kanungo’s (1998) which include expressing a vision and setting high expectations, or the signaling frameworks’ (Antonakis, 2017; Antonakis et al., 2016; Antonakis et al., 2011) 12 charismatic leadership tactics⁵³ may be sufficient but not necessary to achieve the different charisplananda or the charismatic attribution in itself. For charismatic attribution, appraisal of effects seems to be primary and not the specifics of behavior or attributes. It is difficult to reconcile a framework that operationalizes charisma as a set of behaviors to the dynamic effects-based nature of the concept captured in the qualitative data – that they share the same name may be a cause of confusion.

The current design cannot rule out that the various charisplananda reported by the participants may have been due to CLTs; however, given the variety of responses and the multiple realizations, this may not be a likely explanation. In the case that the CLTs did cause

⁵³ To review, the 12 CLTs include: (1) stories and anecdotes, (2) rhetorical questions, (3) metaphors and similes, (4) contrasts, (5) lists and repetitions, (6) moral conviction, (7) articulating the sentiment of the collective, (8) setting high and ambitious goals, and (9) creating confidence that these goals (10) varying voice modulation, (11) varying facial expressions, and (12) use of gestures.

the effects, it is not the leader signals that gets appraised (or at least, remembered) by the individuals, but the effects themselves which seem to bring about the charismatic attribution. However, it is also interesting to see which of the CLTs are cited as reasons for, or part of reasons for charismatic attribution. Of the different CLTs, the most focus by the participants are on the non-verbal techniques, with delivery and the way of speaking being commonly noted. However, this delivery need not be in the context of speeches, where most of Antonakis and colleagues' work has focused on, but even conversationally ("*paano magsalita*")⁵⁴. The use of stories has also been remarked upon by a couple of participants⁵⁵.

Interestingly, there's minimal discussion of *explicitly* expressing moral convictions as the cause of the respondents' charismatic attribution, as well as setting high and ambitious goals and creating confidence that these goals can be achieved. However, many of these convictions seem to be relegated to the *effects* and not as behaviors as formulated by Antonakis and colleagues. For example, while few report of expressing the sentiment of the collective, being "relatable" and "approachable" are recurrent reasons for charismatic attribution⁵⁶ (but these need not necessarily be because they express the sentiment of the collective)⁵⁷. While few report the expression of moral conviction, moral objectionability is routine grounds for dismissing someone as charismatic.⁵⁸

Finally, no participant remarked on the following CLTs: rhetorical questions, metaphors, contrasts, and lists & repetitions although these may likely be 'baked in' in reasons such as

⁵⁴ e.g., "*She's a good talker. And even if in real life she might not be so friendly, the front she's presenting – she's like friendly, she can talk to a wide range of people*" [P14]

⁵⁵ e.g., "*All related to the words that they say, the stories that they tell. So they capture the attention of the audience through stories. Stories that are believable. And address a subconscious need for you to be affirmed of something*" [P9]

⁵⁶ e.g., "*Yan kasi he makes it relatable to those – easily relatable naman kasi yung pinagagawa niya, right?*" [P15]

⁵⁷ e.g., "*he tries to mingle and at the same time, tries to be approachable. Given yung sa palagay mo hindi [kailangan], but will be given anyway. People na wala naman siyang makukuha in return for giving them attention, and he's a celebrity.*" [P11]

⁵⁸ e.g., "*Kasi diba, we know na sobrang BS ng sinasabi niya. Parang why would I be convinced. Diba he's always telling na "it's a joke, it's a joke. You're misinterpreting". Parang, hello? How many times na. Parang why would I believe you, it's not convincing. Parang binu-brush off lang niya pagkasabi, ganyan. So parang, hindi talaga siya charismatic at all.*" [P2]

general “*pagsasalita*”, giving great speeches, or even the general descriptor of charismatic figures being “*engaging*”. There also seems to be support from the data for the two additional CLTs currently considered (Antonakis, Tur, & Jacquart, 2017): 1.) unconventional behavior is discussed in large part as reason for Duterte’s charisma⁵⁹ as well as 2.) jokes/humor⁶⁰ but of this, the larger discussion is on having a happy disposition rather than just being humorous.⁶¹

The current design was not planned as any test, nor as any systematic comparison between the signaling framework and the CCF. Further, future studies can investigate how much of the discrepancies are robust and how much can be attributed to the difference in focus – Antonakis and colleagues’ development of charisma is focused on leaders while this study takes on a broader view where leaders and non-leaders can be considered charismatic. However, as the discussion in this section shows, the current study does provide hints of how the CLTs relate to charismatic attribution. To this end, while the CLTs seem to effectively estimate the causal effects of a bag of behaviors (Antonakis et al., 2011; Antonakis et al., 2014; Jacquart, & Antonakis, 2015), in light of the qualitative evidence, the current operationalization may not capture the effects-based nature of charisma and charismatic attribution in the lives of participants. The current study suggests that it is this nature of charisma which captures its dynamism and the reasons for its popular public usage and perceived importance.

Comparison of Charisma Conceptualizations

It is interesting to see how the participants’ conceptualizations match with different notions discussed in Chapter 2 (summarized in *Table 1: Different Notions of Charisma*) that show how charisma has been conceptualized across history and across fields. While there have been links to religion, no participant conceptualized it as a gift from god (Pauline; Potts, 2009), nor as the original Weberian formulation as the basis of legitimate authority (Weber, 1922/1968; Shils, 1965). However, in some ways charisma has been treated as an exceptional quality of an

⁵⁹ e.g., “When you look at Duterte he doesn’t fit -. Especially looking at the previous administration, he doesn’t look like a typical politician. He keeps saying simpleng tao lang siya, mayor lang siya. So people feel like he’s sincere because he’s like them” [P16]

⁶⁰ e.g., “Si [coworker] naman, whenever he delivers a lesson mapapatawa ka niya lagi. Kasi he will always try to crack a joke in the meantime. Pero at the same time he will also try to deliver the lesson. “ [Sam]

⁶¹ e.g., “She was very, she was outgoing, she’s very lively and bubbly and you could say that she was the life of the party.” [P12]

individual, but this is not limited to the context of leadership.⁶² Interestingly, there was also minimal focus on devoted leader-follower relationships and other strong “charismatic bonds” (e.g., Willner, 1984; Lindhol, 1988). Of the charisplananda across participants, charisma was minimally conceptualized as the ability to cultivate devoted relationships - more commonly referred effects were those that involve engagement (attention), behavioral influence, and positive effects on mood and emotions.

Comparing to the listed notions, participants conceptualizations largely lie on the notions of personal magnetism and capacity for behavioral influence. These two latter notions are famous conceptions in the self-help genre (e.g., Cabane, 2012; Dubrin, 1997) and leadership studies (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Bass & Riggio, 2005; House 1977), although no participant reported of reading charisma in self-help books. When books were mentioned that contain the term charisma, these were either said to be romance pocketbooks or textbooks. However, both the self-help genre and the participants’ notions are likely to reflect the amalgamated popular conception of charisma (Turner, 2003; Potts, 2009.)

Charisma and Theory-Building

As theoretical psychologists argue (Borsboom, van der Maas, Dalege, Kievit & Haig, 2020; Haslbeck, Ryan, Robinaugh, Waldorp, Borsboom, 2019; van Rooij & Baggio, 2020) a fruitful approach to theory building is to first identify phenomena that need explaining, before considering ways on how to appropriately create mechanistic, formal or substantive models of why this phenomenon comes to be. In this line, as a preliminary step, the charisplananda themselves may prove as useful partitions or as themselves the phenomena to be explained – and not some intractable single concept of charisma.

That charisma feels (objectively) real and intuitive may be linked to the visibility of the charisplananda: some people visibly hold attention better than others, some people visibly influence better than others and so on. That these different effects are clumped together under the umbrella concept of “charisma” appears to show the particular functional historicity (Millikan, 2017; Gallotti & Michael, 2014; Epstein, 2014) of charisma. That is, it need not be the

⁶² “I don’t like her as an actress, as a host. But she has this certain charm that keeps people still wanting to see her. And that includes me “shit ano kayang nangyari kay Kris, ay nagrapasa” so negative man, I think that is charisma as well. Diba?”

case that it is clumped in this certain way (Hacking, 1999) but that that it is so, is likely due to its development as a concept across time, fields and agents into what is now the popular notion of charisma. This socially constructed bundling has caused much confusion, conflation and talking-past-each other in the charisma literature.

Future work can also inquire into the charisplananda: not just with lay theory and folk reasoning about how these effects come about, but with a systematic approach to discover more-or-less generalizable principles that bring about these effects. Each of these charisplananda seems to be a fruitful investigation on their own - what predicts initiating and maintaining attention, what predicts belief in a message or a person, what predicts 'inspiration' and so on and many of these can be linked to related fields in social psychology. More excitingly, future work can look at the functional forms of the relationship of the charisplananda with each other especially with different patterns and combinations, such as for example: when does initiating and maintaining attention lead to believing the figure? When does belief turn to behavioral influence? And are all these needed to form devoted relationships? Which are necessary and which are sufficient to produce another?

At the end of this manuscript one may ask, what really is the definition of charisma? Even with the data at hand, as a social construction, it remains, empirically and in principle, a fuzzy construct. Folk theoretically, charisma is generally thought of as an ability to produce a set of effects. This set of effects refers to those that involve attention, belief, social influence, emotions, and devoted followerships. More conceptually, charisma can be thought of as a social construction that 'glues' together various instances of these figures-to-effects links and this population of instances is what mainly constitutes the popular notion of charisma [See Barrett, 2017a; 2020, for population thinking and concepts as population instances] with the 'glue' likely being the concept name, common history and collective intentionality about the concept. In this sense, the operationalization of charisma is scientifically intractable. But what is promising is the operationalization of charisplananda, such as measures and indices of asymmetry of attention, behavioral influence, belief to a message or person, intense parasocial relationships, asymmetry of affect and so on. Put another way, there can be a mechanistic study of these effects, and there can also be a study of why it is bundled together within a cultural concept, and consequently

various considerations in social ontology and social cognition. That is, for the latter, how do people understand charisma? How and why do people think of other individuals as charismatic?

CHAPTER 6

Concluding Chapter

There is a great heterogeneity in the responses of the participants across the different areas: who they found and did not find to be charismatic; if they believed themselves to be charismatic and when they felt most and least charismatic; the contexts where they discussed, encountered, and thought about the concept; and whether they knew of an indigenous analog and consequently, variations in how they defined the concept.

Participants characterized a figure to be charismatic with a wide mixture of attributes, actions, and effects. This set of effects is given a technical term, the *charisplananda* which refers to a.) initiating and maintaining attention ('engagement', 'making people listen', 'drawing people in'), b.) behavioral influence, c.) believing what the figure is saying, d.) and the effects on emotions and mood (including 'inspiration' and '*pagkahawa sa emosyon*'), as well as e.) having devoted followers.

How do people think of other individuals as charismatic? There is some evidence for features-based and representative-based categorization, but the process is predominantly that of an effects-based appraisal, where the primary appraisal is whether cited figures successfully manage to produce the *charisplananda* – that is, whether in general they successfully manage to capture and hold attention, whether they successfully make others believe in them and so on. Different attributes (such as relatability, confidence etc.) and different actions (such as caring behaviors, rhetorical techniques etc.) are added to the characterization of charismatic figures in so far as they are thought to help produce the effects, but are generally not in themselves necessary for charismatic attribution. If attributes, actions, and what individuals know of the figure are incongruent with the effects that are produced, then sense-making will occur that uses charisma to explain why the effects were achieved. This charismatic attribution process is moderated or affected in some participants by the role of moral values-matching and the sufficiency of whether figures have effects-on-the-perceiver rather than just effects-on-others. This moderating role of moral judgement, the focus on different *charisplananda*, and consequently what attributes and actions are thought to effectively produce these *charisplananda* seem to explain much of the great heterogeneity in the data.

Charismatic attribution is a process that affords the encoding of specific aspects of the social world and not others. This includes the focus on charisplananda as a class of effects and how individuals compare to others in producing these effects. Meanwhile, the environment and context are generally omitted in favor of individual differences, and the specifics of behavior are less primary than the effects of these behaviors. Charisma and charismatic perception seem to be able to provide a simpler frame of describing and understanding complex social phenomena.

These inferences about charismatic attribution has theoretical implications for the future study of charisma – primarily on disentangling and refocusing the mechanistic and causal studies on what is tractable, for example, the charisplananda. Otherwise the serious consideration of charisma must tackle its social ontology as a fuzzy, cultural product; an approach that is forwarded in the Constructed Charisma Framework. Effort should be made to distinguish between how phenomena mechanistically arise, how they are grouped in a folk taxonomic category, and how people perceive and think about these purported categorized and often reified phenomena. The latter two is what are attempted in the current qualitative study. These are probed in the hopes of contributing to a fruitful conceptual grounding of a concept that has been used to explain various consequential social outcomes and has wildly captivated the academic and public imagination.

References:

- [Tedx Talks] (2015, May 29). Let's face it: charisma matters | John Antonakis | TEDxLausanne. [Videofile] Retrieved from: (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SEDvD1IICfE>)
- Almeder, R. (2007). Pragmatism and Philosophy of Science: A Critical Survey. *International Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, 21(2), 171–195.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02698590701498100>
- Andanar, M. (2016, December 29). A man of charisma. Inquirer.net. Retrieved from: <https://opinion.inquirer.net/100384/a-man-of-charisma>
- Antonakis, J. (2017). Charisma and the “new leadership”. J., Antonakis, DV Day, (Eds.), *The nature of leadership*, 56-81.
- Antonakis, J., & House, R. J. (2014). Instrumental leadership: Measurement and extension of transformational–transactional leadership theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(4), 746-771.
- Antonakis, J., Bendahan, S., Jacquart, P., & Lalive, R. (2010). On making causal claims: A review and recommendations. *The leadership quarterly*, 21(6), 1086-1120.
- Antonakis, J., Bendahan, S., Jacquart, P., & Lalive, R. (2014). And solutions. The Oxford handbook of leadership and organizations, 93.
- Antonakis, J., d’Adda, G., Weber, R., & Zehnder, C. (2014). Just words? Just speeches? On the economic value of charismatic leadership. *NBER Rep.* 4.
- Antonakis, J., Fenley, M., & Liechti, S. (2011). Can charisma be taught? Tests of two interventions. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(3), 374-396.
- Antonakis, J., Fenley, M., & Liechti, S. (2012). Learning charisma. Transform yourself into the person others want to follow. *Harvard business review*, 90(6), 127-30.
- Antonakis, J., Tur, B., & Jacquart, P. (2017). *Scoring Charismatic Signalling for Research and Training*. Unpublished working paper. University of Lausanne.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2001). *Developing potential across a full range of Leadership Tm: Cases on transactional and transformational leadership*. Psychology Press.
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 72(4), 441-462.

- Awamleh, R., & Gardner, W. L. (1999). *Perceptions of leader charisma and effectiveness. The Leadership Quarterly, 10*(3), 345–373. doi:10.1016/s1048-9843(99)00022-3
- Baldesco, S. (n.d). The social construction of charismatic leadership: President Corazon Aquino of the Philippines. Retrieved from:
https://www.academia.edu/37450810/The_social_construction_of_charismatic_leadership_President_Corazon_Aquino_of_the_Philippines
- Balkundi, P., Kilduff, M., & Harrison, D. A. (2011). Centrality and charisma: Comparing how leader networks and attributions affect team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(6), 1209
- Balkundi, P., Kilduff, M., & Harrison, D. A. (2011). Centrality and charisma: Comparing how leader networks and attributions affect team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(6), 1209.
- Barrett, L. F. (2006). Are emotions natural kinds?. *Perspectives on psychological science, 1*(1), 28-58.
- Barrett, L. F. (2012). Emotions are real. *Emotion, 12*(3), 413.
- Barrett, L. F. (2013). Psychological construction: The Darwinian approach to the science of emotion. *Emotion Review, 5*(4), 379-389.
- Barrett, L. F. (2017a). *How emotions are made: The secret life of the brain*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Barrett, L. F. (2017b). The theory of constructed emotion: an active inference account of interoception and categorization. *Social cognitive and affective neuroscience, 12*(1), 1-23.
- Barrett, L. F. (2020). Variation is the Norm: Population Thinking in the Science of Emotion. Retrieved from:<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FUohKL5WWi8>
- Bass BM. (1985). *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York: Free Press
- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European journal of work and organizational psychology, 8*(1), 9-32.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (Eds.). (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. Psychology press.

- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of applied psychology*, 88(2), 207.
- Bengtsson, M. (2016). *How to plan and perform a qualitative study using content analysis*. *NursingPlus Open*, 2, 8–14. doi:10.1016/j.npls.2016.01.001
- Bensman, J., & Givant, M. (1975). Charisma and modernity: The use and abuse of a concept. *Social research*, 570-614.
- Boag, S. (2015). Personality assessment, ‘construct validity’, and the significance of theory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 84, 36-44.
- Borromeo, M. P. (2016, May 19). Duterte’s supporters divided on cyberbullying. *Davao Today*. Retrieved from: davaotoday.com/main/culture-2/dutertes-supporters-divided-on-cyber-bullying/
- Borsboom, D. (2005). *Measuring the mind: Conceptual issues in contemporary psychometrics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Borsboom, D. (2017). A network theory of mental disorders. *World psychiatry*, 16(1), 5-13.
- Borsboom, D. (2018). The Philosophy of Psychometrics. Retrieved from <https://vimeo.com/256145513> . Mirror: <https://web.archive.org/save/https://vimeo.com/256145513>
- Borsboom, D., & Molenaar, D. (2015). Psychometrics. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (pp. 418–422). <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.43079-5>
- Borsboom, D., Cramer, A. O., & Kalis, A. (2019). Brain disorders? Not really: Why network structures block reductionism in psychopathology research. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 42.
- Borsboom, D., Kievit, R. A., Cervone, D., & Hood, S. B. (2009). The two disciplines of scientific psychology, or: The disunity of psychology as a working hypothesis. In *Dynamic process methodology in the social and developmental sciences* (pp. 67-97). Springer, New York, NY.
- Borsboom, D., Mellenbergh, G. J., & van Heerden, J. (2004). The concept of validity. *Psychological review*, 111(4), 1061.

- Borsboom, D., van der Maas, H., Dalege, J., Kievit, R., & Haig, B. (2020). Theory Construction Methodology: A practical framework for theory formation in psychology. Retrieved from: <https://psyarxiv.com/w5tp8/>
- Bourdieu, P. (1987). Legitimation and Structured Interests in Weber's Sociology of Religion. Teoksessa: Scott Lasch & Sam Whimster (ed.): *Max Weber, Rationality and Modernity*.
- Brader, T. (2006). Emotional appeals in ad campaigns. In *Campaigning for hearts and minds: How emotional appeals in political ads work*. University of Chicago Press.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Cabacungan, G. & Dizon, N. (2015, August 2). Cory magic is still there. *Inquirer.net*. Retrieved from: <https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/709776/cory-magic-is-still-there>
- Cabane, O. F. (2013). *The charisma myth: How anyone can master the art and science of personal magnetism*. Penguin.
- Cambell, C. (2016a, May 6). Everything you need to know about the Philippine Presidential Election. *Time News*. <https://time.com/4319098/philippines-rodrigo-duterte-presidential-election-grace-poe/>
- Campbell, C. (2016b, April 29). How loudmouth mayor Rodrigo Duterte got to the verge of the Philippines Presidency. *Time News*. Retrieved from: <https://time.com/4312083/rodrigo-duterte-philippines-presidency/>
- Chakravartty, A. (2017). Scientific Realism. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2017). Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University. Retrieved from: <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2017/entries/scientific-realism/>
- CNN Philippines. (2016, May 30). Official count: Duterte is new president, Robredo is vice president. Retrieved from: nine.cnnphilippines.com/news/2016/05/27/official-count-duterte-president-robredo-vp.html
- Cohen, S. (2005). *Win the crowd: Unlock the secrets of influence, charisma, and showmanship*. HarperCollins.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of management review*, 12(4), 637-647.

- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Sage Publications.
- Connelly, B. L., Certo, S. T., Ireland, R. D., & Reutzel, C. R. (2011). Signaling theory: A review and assessment. *Journal of management*, 37(1), 39-67.
- Costall, A. (1995). Socializing affordances. *Theory & Psychology*, 5(4), 467-481.
- Cruz, E. S. (2011, January 25). The Cory charisma. BusinessWorld Online. Retrieved from: www.bworldonline.com/content.php?section=Opinion&title=the-cory-charisma&id=25045
- Cullen, A., Hines, A., & Harte, N. (2014, November). Building a database of political speech: Does culture matter in charisma annotations?. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Workshop on Audio/Visual Emotion Challenge* (pp. 27-31). ACM.
- Curato, N. (2016). Flirting with Authoritarian Fantasies? Rodrigo Duterte and the New Terms of Philippine Populism. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 47(1), 142-153.
doi:10.1080/00472336.2016.1239751
- Currid-Halkett, E. (2010). *Starstruck: The business of celebrity*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- D'Errico, F., Signorello, R., Demolin, D., & Poggi, I. (2013, September). The perception of charisma from voice: A cross-cultural study. In 2013 Humaine Association Conference on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction (pp. 552-557). IEEE
- Dalege, J., Borsboom, D., van Harreveld, F., van den Berg, H., Conner, M., & van der Maas, H. L. (2016). Toward a formalized account of attitudes: The Causal Attitude Network (CAN) model. *Psychological review*, 123(1), 2.
- Devarachetty, S. (2012). *Women as charismatic leaders* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Akron).
- Dow, T. E. (1969). The Theory of Charisma. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 10(3), 306-318.
doi:10.1111/j.1533-8525.1969.tb01294.x
- Downton, J. V. (1973). *Rebel leadership: Commitment and charisma in the revolutionary process*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- DuBrin, A. J. (1997). *Personal magnetism: discover your own charisma and learn to charm, inspire, and influence others*. Amacom.
- Dworkin, S. L. (2012). Sample size policy for qualitative studies using in-depth interviews.
- Eden, D. (2017). Field experiments in organizations. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 4, 91-122.

- Effingham, N. (2013). *An introduction to ontology*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Eilam-Shamir, G., Kark, R., & Popper, M. (2017). Boas Shamir: The person, his impact and legacy. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(4), 563-577.
- Ekman, P., & Cordaro, D. (2011). What is meant by calling emotions basic. *Emotion review*, 3(4), 364-370.
- Elman, C., & Kapiszewski, D. (2014). Data access and research transparency in the qualitative tradition. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 47(1), 43-47.
- Epstein, B. (2014). How Many Kinds of Glue Hold the Social World Together?. In *Perspectives on social ontology and social cognition* (pp. 41-55). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Epstein, B. (2015). *The ant trap: Rebuilding the foundations of the social sciences*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Esguerra, Darryl Joh. (2020, March 12). Metro Manila placed under 'community quarantine' due to COVID-19. *Inquirer.net*. Retrieved from: <https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/1240942/breaking-metro-manila-placed-under-community-quarantine-due-to-covid-19>
- Fiebich, A. (2014). Perceiving affordances and social cognition. In *Perspectives on Social Ontology and Social Cognition* (pp. 149-166). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Finfgeld-Connett, D. (2013). Use of content analysis to conduct knowledge-building and theory-generating qualitative systematic reviews. *Qualitative Research*, 14(3), 341–352. doi:10.1177/1468794113481790
- Flynn, F. J., & Staw, B. M. (2004). Lend me your wallets: The effect of charismatic leadership on external support for an organization. *Strategic Management Journal*, 25(4), 309-330.
- Francisco, K. (2017, July 24). 'Tatay Digong' brand, charisma behind Duterte's survey numbers – analysts. Retrieved from: <https://www.rappler.com/nation/176555-sona-2017-philippines-duterte-ratings-charisma>
- Frese, M., Beimeel, S., & Schoenborn, S. (2003). Action training for charismatic leadership: Two evaluations of studies of a commercial training module on inspirational communication of a vision. *Personnel Psychology*, 56(3), 671-698.

- Fried, E. I. (2017). What are psychological constructs? On the nature and statistical modelling of emotions, intelligence, personality traits and mental disorders. *Health psychology review*, 11(2), 130-134.
- Fried, E. I., & Cramer, A. O. (2017). Moving forward: challenges and directions for psychopathological network theory and methodology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 12(6), 999-1020.
- Friedland, W. H. (1964). For a Sociological Concept of Charisma. *Social Forces*, 43(1), 18–26. doi:10.1093/sf/43.1.18
- Gallotti, M., & Michael, J. (2014). Objects in mind. In *Perspectives on social ontology and social cognition* (pp. 1-13). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Gardner, W. L. (2003). Perceptions Of Leader Charisma, Effectiveness, And Integrity. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 16(4), 502–527. doi:10.1177/0893318903251324
- Garrett, K. (2017). The “echo chamber” distraction: Disinformation campaigns are the problem, not audience fragmentation. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, 6 370–376
- Gelman, A., & Imbens, G. (2013). *Why ask why? Forward causal inference and reverse causal questions* (No. w19614). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Gelman, S. A., & Hirschfeld, L. A. (1999). How biological is essentialism. *Folkbiology*, 9, 403-446.
- Gemmill, G., & Oakley, J. (1992). Leadership: an alienating social myth?. *Human relations*, 45(2), 113-129.
- Gentile, E. (1998). Mussolini's charisma. *Modern Italy*, 3(2), 219-235.
- Gerpott, F. H., & Kieser, A. (2017). It's not charisma that makes extraordinarily successful entrepreneurs, but extraordinary success that makes entrepreneurs charismatic. *Managementforschung*, 27(1), 147-166.
- Gerstenfeld, P. B., Grant, D. R., & Chiang, C.-P. (2003). *Hate Online: A Content Analysis of Extremist Internet Sites. Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 3(1), 29–44. doi:10.1111/j.1530-2415.2003.00013.x

- Gonzales, Y. (2015, August 1). Mar Roxas needs new packaging to win in 2016, says analyst. Retrieved from: newsinfo.inquirer.net/709683/mar-roxas-needs-new-packaging-to-win-in-2016-says-analyst
- Guala, F. (2014). On the nature of social kinds. In *Perspectives on social ontology and social cognition* (pp. 57-68). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Hacking, I., & Hacking, J. (1999). *The social construction of what?*. Harvard university press.
- Haig, B. D. (2018). An abductive theory of scientific method. In *Method Matters in Psychology* (pp. 35-64). Springer, Cham.
- Hamstra, M. R. (2014). 'Big' men: Male leaders' height positively relates to followers' perception of charisma. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 56, 190-192.
- Harnad, S. (2017). To cognize is to categorize: Cognition is categorization. In *Handbook of categorization in cognitive science* (pp. 21-54). Elsevier.
- Haslam, S. A., Reicher, S. D., & Platow, M. J. (2010). *The new psychology of leadership: Identity, influence and power*. Psychology Press.
- Haslbeck, J., Ryan, O., Robinaugh, D., Waldorp, L., & Borsboom, D. (2019). Modeling Psychopathology: From Data Models to Formal Theories. Retrieved from: <https://psyarxiv.com/jgm7f/>
- Hayakawa, S. I., & Hayakawa, A. R. (1991). *Language in thought and action*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Hehman, E., Sutherland, C. A. M., Flake, J. K., & Slepian, M. L. (2017, May 8). The Unique Contributions of Perceiver and Target Characteristics in Person Perception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000090>
- Hohwy, J., & Palmer, C. (2014). Social cognition as causal inference: Implications for common knowledge and autism. In *Perspectives on social ontology and social cognition* (pp. 167-189). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Holladay, S. J., & Coombs, W. T. (1993). *Communicating Visions*. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 6(4), 405-427. doi:10.1177/0893318993006004003

- Holladay, S. J., & Coombs, W. T. (1994). *Speaking of Visions and Visions Being Spoken. Management Communication Quarterly*, 8(2), 165–189. doi:10.1177/0893318994008002002
- House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *The cutting edge* (pp. 189–207). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press
- Howell, J. M., & Frost, P. J. (1989). A laboratory study of charismatic leadership. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 43(2), 243-269.
- Jacobs, M. (2018). What it was like to cas Timothee Chalamet before he was an 'international sex symbol'. Retrieved from: https://www.huffpost.com/entry/timothee-chalamet-hot-summer-nights_n_5b561da6e4b0fd5c73c7dcf9?guccounter=1&guce_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuZ29vZ2xlLmNvbS8&guce_referrer_sig=AQAAAEERRVPqX-TLAoXIw1ZzKnhLYXrMNWknBAu41HaHO9glXcc0-Js_aqxBDPae0LVEgkcw1LWY-SYHVi9qUl-4hqyaVLG2RbW4EiT50q4up9qapJJdXsvXiaO3OAfO0FCotHckMva2jRvE0mbz3UlGGe-vveP7oBhbK8zQAz67Y8pl
- Jacquart, P., & Antonakis, J. (2015). When does charisma matter for top-level leaders? Effect of attributional ambiguity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(4), 1051-1074.
- Kahn, Robert. (2016, February 9). Timothée Chalamet, Robert Sean Leonard in Shanley's 'Prodigal Son', Retrieved from: <https://www.nbcnewyork.com/entertainment/the-scene/Review-MTC-ProdigalSon-Shanley-368181941.html>
- Kelley, H. H., & Michela, J. L. (1980). Attribution theory and research. *Annual review of psychology*, 31(1), 457-501.
- Kievit, R. A. (2014). *Turtles All the Way Down?: Psychometric Approaches to the Reduction Problem*. Universiteit van Amsterdam
- Kievit, R. A., Romeijn, J. W., Waldorp, L. J., Wicherts, J. M., Scholte, H. S., & Borsboom, D. (2011). Modeling mind and matter: Reductionism and psychological measurement in cognitive neuroscience. *Psychological Inquiry*, 22(2), 139-157.
- Kim, J. (1992). Multiple realization and the metaphysics of reduction. *Philosophy and phenomenological research*, 52(1), 1-26.

- Klein, K. J., & House, R. J. (1995). On fire: Charismatic leadership and levels of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 183-198.
- Knobe, J. (2019). Morality and Possibility. In J. Doris & M. Vargas (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Moral Psychology*. Retrieved from: <https://cpb-us-w2.wpmucdn.com/campuspress.yale.edu/dist/3/1454/files/2019/05/Morality-and-Possibility.pdf>
- Kotter, J. P. (2000). What leaders really do. *The Bottom Line*, 13(1).
- Kramer, R. S., Arend, I., & Ward, R. (2010). Perceived health from biological motion predicts voting behaviour. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 63(4), 625-632.
- Kudisch, J. D., Poteet, M. L., Dobbins, G. H., Rush, M. C., & Russell, J. E. (1995). Expert power, referent power, and charisma: Toward the resolution of a theoretical debate. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 10(2), 177-195.
- Levine, K. J., Muenchen, R. A., & Brooks, A. M. (2010). Measuring transformational and charismatic leadership: Why isn't charisma measured?. *Communication Monographs*, 77(4), 576-591.
- Llanto, Jesus. (2009, November 30). Take 2 for Erap. ABS-CBN News. Retrieved from: <https://news.abs-cbn.com/nation/11/30/09/take-2-erap>
- Lloyd, V. W. (2018). *In Defense of Charisma*. Columbia University Press.
- Lopez, Virgil. (2020, March 16). Duterte orders Luzon-wide 'enhanced community quarantine'. Retrieved from: <https://www.gmanetwork.com/news/news/nation/729875/duterte-orders-lockdown-of-entire-luzon-due-to-covid-19-threat/story/>
- Lunenburg, F. C. (2011). Goal-setting theory of motivation. *International journal of management, business, and administration*, 15(1), 1-6.
- Machery, E. (2014). Social ontology and the objection from reification. In *Perspectives on social ontology and social cognition* (pp. 87-100). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Malt, B. C., Gennari, S. P., Imai, M., Ameel, E., Saji, N., & Majid, A. (2015). Where Are the Concepts? What Words Can and Can't Reveal. *The conceptual mind: New directions in the study of concepts*, 291.
- Maul, A. (2013). On the ontology of psychological attributes. *Theory & Psychology*, 23(6), 752-769.

- Medin, D. L., & Coley, J. D. (1998). Concepts and categorization. *Perception and cognition at century's end: Handbook of perception and cognition*, 403-439.
- Medin, D. L., & Rips, L. J. (2005). Concepts and categories: Memory, meaning, and metaphysics. *The Cambridge handbook of thinking and reasoning*, 37-72.
- Meindl, J. R. (1995). The romance of leadership as a follower-centric theory: A social constructionist approach. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(3), 329-341. doi:10.1016/1048-9843(95)90012-8
- Michell, J. (2004). The place of qualitative research in psychology. *Qualitative research in Psychology*, 1(4), 307-319.
- Millikan, R. G. (2014). Deflating socially constructed objects: What thoughts do to the world. In *Perspectives on social ontology and social cognition* (pp. 27-39). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Millikan, R. G. (2017). *Beyond concepts: Unicepts, language, and natural information*. Oxford University Press.
- Mio, J. S., Riggio, R. E., Levin, S., & Reese, R. (2005). Presidential leadership and charisma: The effects of metaphor. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(2), 287-294.
- Miyahara, K. (1983). Charisma: From Weber to Contemporary Sociology. *Sociological Inquiry*, 53(4), 368-388. doi:10.1111/j.1475-682x.1983.tb01229.x
- Moravcsik, A. (2010). Active citation: A precondition for replicable qualitative research. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 43(1), 29-35.
- Moravcsik, A. (2014). Transparency: The revolution in qualitative research. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 47(1), 48-53.
- Mortensen, K. W. (2010). *The laws of charisma: How to captivate, inspire, and influence for maximum success*.
- Naar, H., & Teroni, F. (Eds.). (2017). *The ontology of emotions*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nakawake, Y., & Sato, K. (2019). Systematic quantitative analyses reveal the folk-zoological knowledge embedded in folktales. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.03969*.
- Nicdao-Henson, E. (1982). Pakikipanuluyan: Tungo sa pag-unawa sa kahulugan ng panahon [Living in the community: A guide to understanding the concept of time]. In R. Pe-Pua (Ed.), *Sikolohiyang Pilipino: Teorya, metodo at gamit (Filipino Psychology: Theory, method and application)* (pp. 209-220). Quezon City: Surian ng Sikolohiyang Pilipino, 1982

- Niebuhr, O., Skarnitzl, R., & Tylečková, L. (2018). The acoustic fingerprint of a charismatic voice-Initial evidence from correlations between long-term spectral features and listener ratings. In Proc. 9th International Conference on Speech Prosody 2018 (pp. 359-363).
- Niebuhr, O., Voße, J., & Brem, A. (2016). What makes a charismatic speaker? A computer-based acoustic-prosodic analysis of Steve Jobs tone of voice. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 64, 366-382.
- Nonato, V. A. (2016, April 25). Duterte pulls away despite rape talk flap. BusinessWorld Online. Retrieved from: www.bworldonline.com/content.php?section=TopStory&title=duterte-pulls-away-despite-rape-talk-flap&id=126484
- Nowland, T., Beath, A., & Boag, S. (2019). Objectivity, realism, and psychometrics. *Measurement*, 145, 292-299.
- Nur, Y. A. (1998). Charisma and managerial leadership: The gift that never was. *Business Horizons*, 41(4), 19-27.
- Paul, J., Costley, D. L., Howell, J. P., & Dorfman, P. W. (2002). The mutability of charisma in leadership research. *Management Decision*, 40(2), 192-200
- Pedroche, A. (2002, March 4). Ang 'charisma' ni Erap. Retrieved from: <https://www.philstar.com/opinyon/2002/03/04/152678/ang-charisma-ni-erap>
- Pedrosa, C. (2015, December 5). Duterte's charisma. Retrieved from: www.philstar.com/opinion/2015/12/05/1529214/dutertes-charisma
- Pedrosa, C. (2017). *Untold Story of Imelda Marcos*. Flipside Digital Content Company Inc.
- Pe-Pua, R. (1985). » Ang Pagtatanong-tanong: Katutubo Metodo ng Pananaliksi.«. *Sikolohiyang Pilipino: Isyu, Pananaw at Kaalaman*. Manila: National Bookstore.
- Pe-Pua, R. (2006). From decolonizing psychology to the development of a cross-indigenous perspective in methodology. In *Indigenous and cultural psychology* (pp. 109-137). Springer, Boston, MA.
- Pe-Pua, R., & Protacio-Marcelino, E. A. (2000). Sikolohiyang Pilipino (Filipino psychology): A legacy of Virgilio G. Enriquez. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 3(1), 49-71.
- Petocz, A., & Newbery, G. (2010). On conceptual analysis as the primary qualitative approach to statistics education research in psychology. *Statistics Education Research Journal*, 9(2).
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction,

- commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 22(2), 259–298.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, N. P., & Lee, J. Y. (2003). The mismeasure of man (agement) and its implications for leadership research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(6), 615-656.
- Politiko News. (2015, October 22). No mass appeal: Miriam says Roxas acts like academician, not politiko. Retrieved from: politics.com.ph/miriam-mar-has-no-charisma/
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., & Levin, S. (2006). Social dominance theory and the dynamics of intergroup relations: Taking stock and looking forward. *European review of social psychology*, 17(1), 271-320.
- Ranada, Pia. (2016, May 2). Why Duterte's message of 'care and power' attracts. Rappler. Retrieved from: <https://www.rappler.com/newsbreak/in-depth/130827-rodrigo-duterte-message-care-power-supporters>
- Rappler.com (2013, September 10). Rappler is PH's 3rd top news site – Alexa. Retrieved from: <https://www.rappler.com/nation/38290-rappler-third-top-news-site-alexa>
- Raskin, J. D. (2011). On essences in constructivist psychology. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 31(4), 223.
- Reh, S., Van Quaquebeke, N., & Giessner, S. R. (2017). The aura of charisma: A review on the embodiment perspective as signaling. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(4), 486-507.
- Research and Markets (2017, August). The U.S Market for Self IMprovement Products & Services. Retrieved from: https://www.researchandmarkets.com/research/fvt93q/the_u_s_market?w=4
- Richburg, K. & Branigin, W. (1989, September 29). Ferdinand Marcos dies in Hawaii at 72. Retrieved from: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1989/09/29/ferdinand-marcos-dies-in-hawaii-at-72/d1c26275-d9bd-4bfd-8934-c2a02ff4ab51/?noredirect=on>
- Riggio, R. E., & Riggio, H. R. (2008). Social psychology and charismatic leadership. *Leadership at the crossroads*, 1, 30-44.
- Roberts, N.C., & Bradley, R.T. (1988). Limits of charisma. In J.A. Conger & R.N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 253-275). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Rosenberg, A., & Hirschberg, J. (2009). Charisma perception from text and speech. *Speech Communication*, 51(7), 640-655.
- Russell, J. A. (1991). In defense of a prototype approach to emotion concepts. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 60(1), 37.
- Santiago, C. E. (1975). Ang kahulugan ng pagkalalake sa mga Pilipino [The meaning of 'masculinity' among Filipinos]. *Serye ng mga papel sa pagkataong pilipino (Series of papers in Filipino personality)*, 51-70.
- Sapolsky, R. M. (2017). *Behave: The biology of humans at our best and worst*. Penguin.
- Schmittmann, V. D., Cramer, A. O., Waldorp, L. J., Epskamp, S., Kievit, R. A., & Borsboom, D. (2013). Deconstructing the construct: A network perspective on psychological phenomena. *New ideas in psychology*, 31(1), 43-53.
- Schonfeld, Z. (2018). Oprah Winfrey is the most charismatic person in america— and yes, she really could be president <https://www.newsweek.com/2018/02/02/oprah-winfrey-president-campaign-golden-globes-777508.html>
- Schweitzer, A. (1984). *The age of charisma*. Burnham Incorporated Pub.
- Searle, J. (2010). *Making the social world: The structure of human civilization*. Oxford University Press.
- Shamir, B. (1995). Social distance and charisma: Theoretical notes and an exploratory study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(1), 19-47.
- Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization science*, 4(4), 577-594.
- Shils, E. (1965). Charisma, order, and status. *American Sociological Review*, 199-213.
- Sidanius, J & Pratto, F. (2012). Social Dominance Theory. In van Lange, Kruglanski & Higgins, eds, *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology*, vol. 1. London: Sage Publications.
- Signorello, R. (2019). Voice in Charismatic Leadership. In Eidsheim, N., & Meizel, K. (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Voice Studies*. Oxford Handbooks.
- Signorello, R., Derrico, F., Poggi, I., & Demolin, D. (2012, September). How charisma is perceived from speech: A multidimensional approach. In *2012 International Conference on Privacy, Security, Risk and Trust and 2012 International Confernece on Social Computing* (pp. 435-440). IEEE.

- Silan, M. & Encarnacion, A. (2017). Exploring charisma and morality in the Philippine 2016 presidential elections. Unpublished manuscript, University of the Philippines Diliman
- Sison, Shakira (2015, December 11). #PHVote: Why is Duterte so appealing? Rappler. Retrieved from: <https://www.rappler.com/views/imho/115440-phvote-duterte-appealing>
- Smith, (2015) *Banned Charisma Secrets Unleashed Learn The Secrets Of Personal Magnetism And How To Attract, Inspire, Impress, Influence And Energize Anyone On Command*
- Smith, B. (1995). Formal ontology, common sense and cognitive science. *Int. J. Human-Computer Studies* 43, 641-667
- Smith, D. N. (1998). Faith, Reason, and Charisma: Rudolf Sohm, Max Weber, and the Theology of Grace. *Sociological Inquiry*, 68(1), 32–60. doi:10.1111/j.1475-682x.1998.tb00453.x
- Smith, D., Schlaepfer, P., Major, K., Dyble, M., Page, A. E., Thompson, J., ... & Ngales, M. (2017). Cooperation and the evolution of hunter-gatherer storytelling. *Nature communications*, 8(1), 1853.
- Smith, E. E., & Medin, D. L. (1981). *Categories and concepts* (Vol. 9). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sperber, D. (2011). A naturalistic ontology for mechanistic explanations in the social sciences. *Analytical sociology and social mechanisms*, 64-77.
- Steffens, N. K., Peters, K., Haslam, S. A., & van Dick, R. (2017). Dying for charisma: Leaders' inspirational appeal increases post-mortem. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(4), 530-542.
- Sverdlik, N., Roccas, S., & Sagiv, L. (2012). Morality across cultures: A values perspective.. Retrieved from: portal.idc.ac.il/en/symposium/hspsp/2010/documents/09-sverdlik.pdf
- Sweney, Mark. (2014, October 21). The Guardian overtakes New York Times in comScore traffic figures. Retrieved from: <https://www.theguardian.com/media/2014/oct/21/the-guardian-overtakes-new-york-times-in-comscore-traffic-figures>
- Sy, T., Horton, C., & Riggio, R. (2018). Charismatic leadership: Eliciting and channeling follower emotions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(1), 58-69.
- Teehankee, J. C. & Thompson, M. R. (2016, May 8). Duterte and the politics of anger in the Philippines. East Asia Forum. Retrieved from: <https://www.eastasiaforum.org/2016/05/08/duterte-and-the-politics-of-anger-in-the-philippines/>

- Thompson, M. R. (2012). Class, charisma, and clientelism in Thai and Philippine populist parties. In *Party Politics in Southeast Asia* (pp. 80-97). Routledge.
- Toma, J. D. (2011). Approaching rigor in applied qualitative. *The SAGE handbook for research in education: Pursuing ideas as the keystone of exemplary inquiry*, 263.
- Torres, A. (1982). " Pakapa-kapa" as an Approach in Philippine Psychology. *Surian ng Sikolohiyang Pilipino*.
- Towler, A. J. (2003). Effects of charismatic influence training on attitudes, behavior, and performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 56(2), 363-381.'
- Trendler, G. (2009). Measurement theory, psychology and the revolution that cannot happen. *Theory & Psychology*, 19(5), 579-599.
- Tskhay, K. O., Zhu, R., Zou, C., & Rule, N. O. (2018). Charisma in everyday life: Conceptualization and validation of the General Charisma Inventory. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 114(1), 131.
- Tur, B., Harstad, J., & Antonakis, J. (2018, July). Effect of Charisma in Informal Leadership Settings: The cases of TED and Twitter. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 2018, No. 1, p. 13242). Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510: Academy of Management.
- Turner, S. (2003). Charisma reconsidered. *Journal of Classical Sociology*, 3(1), 5-26.
- Tybjerg, T. (2007). Reflections on 'Charisma'. *Nordic Journal of Religion and Society*, 20(2), 167-178.
- Valsiner, J., Molenaar, P. C., Lyra, M. C., & Chaudhary, N. (2009). *Dynamic process methodology in the social and developmental sciences*. Springer.
- Van Knippenberg, D., & Sitkin, S. B. (2013). A critical assessment of charismatic—transformational leadership research: Back to the drawing board? *The Academy of Management Annals*, 7(1), 1-60.
- van Rooij, I., & Baggio, G. (2020). Theory before the test: How to build high-verisimilitude explanatory theories in psychological science.
- Weber, M. (1968). Translated by G. Ross & C. Wittich. *Economy and society*.
- Weiner, B. (2012). An attribution theory of motivation. *Handbook of theories of social psychology*, 1, 135-155.
- Willner, A. R. (1984). *The spellbinders: Charismatic political leadership*. Yale University Press.

- Wimsatt, W. (2007). *Re-engineering philosophy for limited beings: Piecewise approximations to reality*.
- Yagil, D. (1998). Charismatic leadership and organizational hierarchy: Attribution of charisma to close and distant leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 9(2), 161-176.
- Yanchar, S. C., & Hill, J. R. (2003). What is psychology about? Toward an explicit ontology. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 43(1), 11-32

APPENDIX A: Criticisms to the signaling framework.

I make several points of criticism to the signaling framework some of which overlap and build on one another. These include issues in the criteria for their definition, issues in naming, the currently questionable categorization of signals, the appropriate role of charismatic attribution, the assumption that CLTs are the primary determinants of prototypical charismatic effects (including charismatic attribution) and whether this signaling framework is adequate for capturing the ontology of charisma. I believe a lengthy exposition of the criticism of the Antonakis signaling framework is warranted, if only because any contemporary theory of charisma must contend with this theory that seems to overcome major issues of previous conceptualizations of charisma. And in fact, one we previously used in our own research inquiry (e.g. Silan & Encarnacion, 2017). Why propose a new model if this framework is adequate?

However, before I criticize, *I note strongly that I do commend the lineage of Antonakis and colleagues program of research for producing actionable knowledge, with rigorous checks, and when possible, relevant outcomes* (Antonakis et al., 2011; Antonakis et al. 2014; Jacquart & Antonakis, 2015). I believe that it does provide much to the understanding of causal effects of an effective package of leadership rhetoric (and interesting inquiries on why this is so); I am just not sure if it is adequate for the understanding of charisma. However pragmatic a model, I echo Fried (2017; see also Borsboom, 2005; Borsboom, 2018) that the study of a construct's ontology is paramount, if only because going forward it equips to have a better conceptual navigation, not only in prediction and intervention, but also in explanation.

Is exogeneity the best criterion for definition? At first glance, Antonakis and colleagues (2016) seem to iron out the landscape of charisma, with an actionable and air-tight definition of charisma: “values-based, symbolic, and emotion-laden leader signaling”. But how do they come up with this definition? By surveying the literature, listing down common features across different articles/theories/frameworks, and checking whether these elements are “useful for a definition”. The criteria for this “usefulness” include, primarily, 1.) whether the effects are included in the definition itself (to avoid tautology), and 2.) whether the element lends charisma to be easily modelled as an exogenous variable. However, there seems to be a conflation of conceptual and measurement goals, where unfortunately the latter seems to be placed before the former. Measurement clarity is not conceptual clarity. Exogeneity isn't the goal for conceptual definitions. ‘Forcing’ charisma to be exogenous only makes sense if charisma is a causal factor,

and not a descriptive term. Their re-definition obviously makes their ‘charisma signaling’ fit these criteria, however, as will be discussed below there is a problem to this definitional approach.

This exogeneity criteria (Antonakis, Bendahan, Jacquart & Lalive, 2010) seems to be the reason why two conceptualizations are hastily dismissed a.) charisma as attribution and b.) charisma as a devoted relationship. For Antonakis and colleagues (2016) these are dismissed as not ‘useful definitions’ because of potential modelling difficulties. But relationships and attributions are routinely measured (e.g., Hehman, Sutherland, Flake, & Slepian; 2017) and are understood to be phenomena in themselves. These need not necessarily be exogenous to exist, or be worthy of study. To fight the tautology of describing the constructs in terms of their effects is commendable (this approach they stem from MacKenzie, 2003), *but it only makes sense to have a demarcation between antecedents, construct and effect if it is a natural construct and/or causal variable. but it makes little sense to demarcate if the construct is used as the description of the process towards those effects.* For example, it makes sense to define the antecedents (increased or excess nutrients including phosphorus and nitrogen) and effects (oxygen take-up, fish deaths) of algal bloom however it makes little sense to find the antecedent and effect of ‘cycle of lake quality’ which is a description of this process itself. Is charisma in the broad sense really the cause of the effect, or the description or attributed explanation of the effects?

Why is charismatic attribution not at the forefront of the signaling model? Try as the authors disentangle their definition from charismatic attribution, this still lives on in their definition *simply because their different sources in the literature build their theories with the popular amalgamation of charisma in reference (including commonly attributed exemplars).* And as discussed in chapter 1, *this popular conception of charisma they draw from would very likely have different notions across these sources.* For example, Conger & Kanungo (1998) developed their model with the consideration that “most of us carry in our heads a naïve theory of what constitutes charismatic leadership. What is needed is a more precise and scientific understanding of the phenomenon” (p. 47). House (1977) wrote of this implicit image, by saying how “literature concerning charismatic leadership and the opinion of laymen seem to agree that the charismatic leader can be described by a specific set of personal characteristics” (p. 6) and how in the development of his model he asked his class to form small groups and

describe charismatic leaders they know or have been exposed to. Bass and Riggio (2006) discussed whether controversial exemplars such as Hitler can really be described as transformational. They decided he is not, but other theorists do label him as charismatic (e.g., Willner, 1994). One can see in these previous examples that charismatic attribution is central to the development of the concept of charisma. And one concern, that will expounded later on, is that a coherent or necessary set of characteristics will only likely emerge if the ‘implicit image of charisma’ is the same one that each of the different theorists try to explicate.

In fact, earlier versions of Antonakis’s work do allude that some sort of charismatic attribution was used as the goal for choosing the 12 CLTs. In course of the development of the framework, part of what they want to answer is “... what makes a leader seem powerful and confident?” (p. 390, Antonakis et al., 2011). In their results (Antonakis et al., 2011) attribution was a main section of inquiry ⁶³: “Our study shows that leaders appear charismatic because they use a wide array of verbal and nonverbal CLTs” (p. 390). And they also wrote of “how charisma can be engendered by displaying the CLTs” (p. 381) where the word charisma in the previous sentence can be construed as being charismatic attribution in itself. The same points can be accrued from their article written for Harvard Business Review (Antonakis, Fenley & Liechti, 2012), as well as Antonakis’s TedX video (TedX Talks, 2015), “How can we change the price people put on our tag?” Thus, even the signaling framework -at least in its development- has charismatic attribution as an implicit core

Further, their seminal article (Antonakis et al. 2016) a priori assumes two strong and contentious positions 1.) that charisma exists, and 2.) that it is an important concept. These assumptions are not questioned in the development of their definition. For example, they write in their introduction that charisma is “a concept that has immense importance for society... charismatic leaders wield enormous power and can use this power to accomplish great good or evil (p. 294)”. Further, in the TedX Video (2015), Antonakis mentions “charisma is hard to define, hard to measure but its effects are evident to see... [it gives] gravitas to social movements.”. As discussed, the greatest argument for the use of Antonakis and colleagues signaling framework is in its pragmatism, in that it ‘works’ (e.g Antonakis et al., 2014; Jacquart,

⁶³ Although they didn’t measure this directly, but through the conceptually ambiguous MLQ

& Antonakis, 2015). However, this pragmatism doesn't speak to the ontology of charisma as a construct.

Issues in naming and questionable categorization of signals. What's in a name? By labelling the 12 CLTs as 'charisma' (or at least as operationalization of the charisma-signaling) one may be making artificial boundaries or hastily 'unifying' different behaviors which can conflate or hide different underlying influence/attentional/motivational processes. Paraverbals seem to rationally have a different influence contribution which may be through initiating and maintaining attention than espousing moral convictions, which likely influences by affecting how people think about alternative possibilities (Knobe, 2019). This also differs from the CLT - creating confidence that these goals can be achieved, which is likely to work through the dynamics of the goal setting theory (Lunenburg, 2011) versus articulating the sentiment of the collective which seems to work through the dynamics of the social identity theory (Haslam et al., 2010).

This is not a trivial issue. By putting these different behaviors (or signals) under one name, or one category it forms an 'inside' and an 'outside'. As Sapolsky (2017) writes, "Once some arbitrary boundary exists, we forget that it is arbitrary and get way too impressed with its importance... When you think categorically, you have trouble seeing how similar or how different two things are." (Introduction, Section 2, Paragraph 4). By making a category it's easy to assume that those inside is more similarly related than those outside. But for the CLTs it is very likely the case that elements inside are loosely related and may have more similarities to elements outside.

Antonakis and colleagues (2011) themselves caution that: "first it is not clear whether we have identified the best markers of charisma" (p. 391) and I extend this concern. This not only extends to 'intuitively' appealing signals like the use of humor and unconventional behaviors (as noted in Antonakis, Tur, & Jacquart, 2017) but also more innocuous ones but under the current charisma signaling framework should be valid candidates. For example if rhetorical questions and contrasts are considered as CLTs, why not other rhetorical devices like "balanced speech structure" as well as amplifications and/or oxymorons, which also serve to "frame to get attention and focus on the key issues" (Antonakis, 2017 p. 72)? Should paraverbals include "relaxed posture" "eye contact" and "minimal use of filler nonlexical utterances (i.e., uhh,

ahhs)”? Seeing their very close similarity with other CLTs, the weightier question is why are they *not* part of the CLT roster? Why again, are the current CLTs inside and these adjacent signals outside?

Further, there can be multiple signals from the individual, some of which are unintended, including for example face dominance and face trustworthiness (Todorov, 2017) as well as attractiveness, height, the clothes one wears, behaviors and death – all of which seem to contribute to charismatic attribution. Of these, Antonakis only codes for the individual’s behaviors - which seem to be easiest to model exogenously and to change. But should the signaling framework be expanded to accommodate these other individual-originating signals?

Not only should one consider the relationship between currently considered CLTs and non-CLTs, but also importantly of the CLTs to one another. Preliminarily, one can ask what is the relationship between these 12 and why should there be a relationship in the first place? What kind of similarity should exist beyond the fact that these are ‘useful definitions’ collated from articles that considered these charismatic behaviors? Note that I do find it important to study the phenomenon, the effects and the practical significance of moral signaling, of affective or ‘emotion-laden’ signaling and of ‘symbolic’ or figurative signaling, but why is the combination of the three called charisma? If only one type of signal is used in a speech (ex. only values-based, without vocal modulation or without using figurative language), is the person still doing charisma?

This leads us to ask the crucial question: why is this whole thing called charisma? From the definition and operationalization, it could also be called effective rhetorical signaling or moral-affective signaling. Why charisma and not these descriptive terms?

The promise of the signaling framework is that it allows to cohere disparate strands of literature. But cohere to what exactly? It’s hard to be certain. As Sy, Hortin & Riggio (2018) write “it is difficult to explain why the different elements identified by researchers should be considered ‘charisma’ instead of a simple cluster of valued leader behaviors, grouped together arbitrarily.” (p. 2) That this definition is collated from different sources that handled different notions of ‘charisma’ is insufficient, especially without first inquiring whether the different “charismas” synthesized are truly comparably similar.

Are the 12 CLTs necessary, sufficient, both or neither for attribution and other outcomes? In another issue, one can also imagine the hypothetical profiles for example per aggregation of speech in unit interval time, say a campaign period or some other meaningful interval. This profile would consist of the frequency (and relative ratio) of the various CLTs, for example the number of stories, metaphors, sentiment articulation and so on. One would reasonably expect the CLT profile of one individual to be dynamic across time. It seems highly unlikely that a particular profile is the *one* structure to produce the desired outcomes. In fact, one can go out on a limb and hypothesize that multiple CLT profiles can lead to the same effects (ex. charismatic attribution of the speaker) and multiple configurations can lead to multiple effects (ex. both charismatic attribution and increased follower loyalty). There is unlikely to be a one-to-one correspondence between CLT profiles and the outcomes of interest. One can also imagine that Barack Obama campaign's speech, Adolf Hitler's wartime speech, Meryl Streep's anti-Trump speech would all engender charismatic attribution, despite the variability in the respective CLT profiles. Despite the differences, all would be labelled charismatic. The Constructed Charisma Framework (CCF) forwards that it is precisely because of the social construction of charisma that this is able to encompass this great variability.

Further, by operationalizing the CLTs as charisma signals in themselves, it may provide the misleading idea that these are the primary mechanisms for the typical charismatic effects that one wants to explain. (e.g follower loyalty, increase commitment or performance, follower self-sacrificial behavior, social influence etc.)

In summary, while the Antonakis lineage of studies commendably capture the forward causal effects (Gelman & Imbens, 2013) of a package of leadership rhetoric techniques, It is noted that 1.) charismatic attribution is an implied important element, but is not part of the main signaling model, 2.) there is the debatable categorization of signals; which may conflate underlying influence processes into one arbitrary category. 3.) there is the unquestioned assumption that CLTs are the primary or necessary determinants of prototypical charismatic effects (reverse causal question) and 4.) The operationalist signaling endeavor provides an inadequate inquiry into the ontology of charisma

APPENDIX B: Philosophical Grounding - Mechanistic Social Construction and Further Considerations in Ontology

One recurrent comment about the project during its development is a confusion about its philosophy of science grounding: in that it uses a method traditionally allied with constructivism (*pagtatanong-tanong*) for goals that appear superficially like those of logico-positivism and realism (study of processes, model-building and predictions). If it's not constructivism and positivism, what is it? The serious consideration of philosophy of science, and the issues of ontology would first caution that there are different strands of realist approaches (Chakravartty, 2017), constructionists and constructivism/s (Raskin, 2011), pragmatisms (Almeder, 2007) and complexity (Valsiner et al., 2009).

But the lineage most heavily used here is that of a *mechanistic social constructionism* (see for example Searle, 2010; Barrett, 2017a on emotions; and Sperber, 2011 on mechanistic studies of culture). 'Mechanistic'⁶⁴ in this sense refers to the primary consideration of the enterprise: that the production of social reality must be compatible with, causally come about, or follow the fundamental laws of nature, including those of physics, chemistry and neurobiology

Either the laws of physics admit of exception and social events provides such exceptions (and there is a Nobel Prize in physics to be won by doing sociology!), or else whatever has causal powers in the universe at large and among humans on earth in particular has them in virtue of its physical properties. Of course, this does not mean that social scientists should get involved in the physics of social causality. What it does mean though is that when we attribute causal powers to some social phenomena we should be able to describe it in such terms that its physical character is not a total mystery but raises a set of sensible questions that can be passed on to neighboring natural sciences, psychology, biology and ecology in particular, that directly or indirectly do ground their understanding of causal powers in physics (Sperber, 2011; p. 65)

In this sense, it is not anti-reality (which positioned by some constructivist approaches) even if it admits that commonsense realities, concepts and cultural experiences will vary wildly among

⁶⁴ an earlier draft of this manuscript writes this as "naturalistic social construction" which is the more commonly used term in the field. However, this is changed to "mechanistic social construction" to prevent the confusion regarding the different meaning of "natural" in "naturalistic social construction" (compatible with different levels of explanation) versus "natural kinds" (mind independent categories which reflect 'actual' structures of the world)

human societies and individuals. Studies of this lineage seeks to understand the social ontology of different things (ex. emotions, government, race, cocktail parties) how they are produced, how they are maintained, how they are thought about, what they are constituted of, what they afford, what they cause and/or what they are used for in different settings (Searle, 2010; Barrett, 2006, 2012, 2017a; Sperber, 2011; Gallotti & Michael, 2014; Millikan, 2014; Epstein, 2014; Guala, 2014; Machery, 2014; Fiebich, 2014; Hohwy, & Palmer, 2014. See also Maul, 2013; Yanchar & Hill, 2013; Hacking, 1999).

But this current project is not just about social ontology, but also social cognition, both of which have a fruitful interplay (Gallotti & Muchael, 2014) although currently, it is largely understudied. So the project deals with a rough broad-strokes ontology for the concept of charisma with certain implications for how it is thought of or used (social cognition), as well as directly gathering data about a certain putative “type” of social cognition – that of charismatic attribution, including its processes, considerations and variations.

At points in the manuscript one might ask, what are the considerations for the “appropriate” ontology of charisma (and in general, other psychological attributes)? Currently, there few tools in the field for doing so – and fewer guidelines for what kind of data gathering it entails or what kind of analytical tools to use to best match with the ontology. Much of the navigation around issues of ontology is through abductive reasoning or reference to best explanation (Haig, 2018; Borsboom et al., 2020) i.e., if this hypothesis, then what? Assuming a realist model of charisma, what indicators, whether quantitative or qualitative, is expected? Assuming a social construction of a particular kind, what is expected? And so on. As detailed in Chapter 2, what seems to be the biggest current divide between a strong realist position of charisma and a social construction model of charisma are the necessity versus sufficiency of behavioral signals.⁶⁵

⁶⁵ However, one other concern is this: some might concede, that maybe it’s socially constructed for managers or other ‘so-so’ examples, but surely charisma really or actually or objectively exists say for Adolf Hitler or for Mahatma Gandhi. Some might even go with the argumentation that charisma will have a socially constructed layer (as does the epistemological inquiry of anything), but there is something ‘objectively real’ underneath. Up front, data from the current project nor any previous models of charisma cannot test between the hypothesis of charisma as “purely socially constructed” versus having an “objectively real core but with socially constructed layer”.

But what the CCF argues is this: why should there be an “objectively real core”? William James (1890) cautions “Whenever we have made a word... to denote a certain group of phenomena, we are prone to suppose a substantive entity existing beyond the phenomena, of which the word shall be the name”. CCF argues that charisma has no “technical vs. lay” distinction because this cultural concept and category’s reality is borne out of this lay conceptualization(s). What is something ‘objectively real’

But what about pragmatism? Indeed, the leadership models (e.g., Conger & Kanungo, 1987, 1998; Bass, 1985; Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999) and the signaling framework (Antonakis et al., 2016; Antonakis, 2017) as operationalizations can be seen as pragmatic models which need not bear any correspondence to the “reality” of charisma, in so long as it serves its function; for example as an exogenous index that can capture the causal impact of a bag-of-behaviors or an intervention; or say to predict elections or increase firm earnings. However, by definition, pragmatic models would very unlikely capture the ontology of charisma, because they were not constructed to do so anyway - although these models may provide hints. This is not necessarily a limitation if it is consistently and clearly distinguished - pragmatic models are useful and essential. However, I still hold that *names* must serve some sort of stronger commitment than what pragmatic models usually commit to – those that refer to ontological considerations of the named: whether referring to entities, or processes, or relevant grouping of phenomena. Why? Simply because if pragmatic models by design, does not care for reality, it can be referred with other clearer nomenclature: An index of charisma, effective rhetorical techniques, persuasion, magnetism and so on, but not in itself *charisma*.

What of complexity? There is currently little intersection between complexity studies as ontological endeavors and those of charisma. However, as discussed in Chapter 4, the approach to study individual charisplananda and their relationships might be served by applying models of this kind, including network models (e.g., Cramer et al., 2012; Dalege et al., 2016) to explain how charisplananda emerges. However, at the moment without preliminary models, it is hard to compare an complexity-based ontology to that of CCF, and whether complexity is compatible or not with CCF is going to be a future challenge.

underneath the social construction of money? It is not the round silver object. Similarly charisma has no ‘natural essence’, it is not the different notions (pseudo-component parts, processes or behaviors) which can be seen better when the label is ripped off. However, if one cannot test between those two, why should one prefer one framework over another? More critical tests to probe the two might be forwarded in the future, however, as discussed in Chapter 4, the adoption of the CCF allows for the productive approach to studying charismatic attribution. And so, model selection (and consequently, the ontological assumption) is made both on abductive grounds (reasoning to most likely explanation) and on pragmatic grounds in the hopes of theoretical growth.

APPENDIX C: *Tanungan* guide

Main Questions & Probes	Notes
Introduction: I wanted to know if you were familiar with the term charisma. Can you tell me the last time you used, discussed or thought about charisma?	
Who do you find to be charismatic?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Give concrete example</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>If can't answer proceed with this probe and return: Who do you think people find to be charismatic?</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>For the given examples: For you, what makes this person charismatic?</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Can you walk us through a specific instance that makes you say this person was charismatic?</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>If examples are all Filipino, probe examples of international figures and vice versa</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>If examples are all socially distant, ask if they know of anyone they personally know or are close to, and vice versa</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Any other examples that come to mind?</i> 	
Who do you NOT find charismatic?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Give concrete example</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>If can't answer proceed with this probe and return: Who do you think people find to be NOT charismatic?</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>For the given examples: For you, what makes this person NOT charismatic?</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Can you walk us through a specific instance that makes you say this person was charismatic?</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>If examples are all Filipino, probe examples of international figures, and vice versa</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>If examples are all socially distant, ask if they know of anyone they personally know or are close to, and vice versa</i> 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any other examples that come to mind? 	
When do you feel most charismatic?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Walk us through what you were doing, what the situation was etc. 	
When do you feel least charismatic?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Walk us through what you were doing, what the situation was etc. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On average, would you say you are charismatic? Why or why not? 	
[Cite previously mentioned charismatic figures in previous interviews] Do you find these to be charismatic?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why or why not? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you think Duterte is charismatic? Why or why not? What about Mar Roxas? Do you think other people see Duterte as charismatic? Why or why not? What about Mar Roxas? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [Probe about the specific reasons for their given examples] Why do you think they were able to do this [specific outcome/reason], while other individuals have not? 	
So we've discussed above (summarize responses) For you, what is charisma?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How would you explain charisma to a person who doesn't understand the concept? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you think charisma can be learned? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you think charisma is important? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> And just to clarify, you believe that the figures you mentioned [cite specific figures] have charisma? 	
I'd also like to know a little bit about your history with charisma. When was the earliest that you remember knowing about charisma?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In which contexts do you usually think about charisma? 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>In which contexts do you usually encounter the term in your day-to-day life?</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Do you discuss it with friends or family?</i> <i>Probe: [Cite specific charismatic and not-charismatic figures they mentioned] Would you say that other people also find this figure to be charismatic/not-charismatic? Have you discussed this with them?</i> 	
What is charisma in Tagalog? In your local language, if any? (e.g., Bisaya, etc.)	
<p style="text-align: center;">PART-2 META-COGNITION</p> <p>There's actually a little part 2 to this pagtatanong-tanong. A while ago you were thinking about your answers to my questions. Now I'd like to ask you to think about <i>your thinking</i> a while you were answering a while ago.</p>	
I'd like to know about the thought processes that led you to answer how you did a while ago. Can you guide me through what you were thinking after I asked you the questions? For example, when I asked "Who do you find charismatic" what was going on in your mind?	
<i>If can't answer: You said that [Charismatic Figure 1] as your first example, walk me through what was in your mind or what your thought process was that led you to saying [Charismatic Figure 1] then? [And so on for the different figures]</i>	
What about when I asked you "Who do you NOT find charismatic"* , I want you to think about what your thinking was like. What was going on in your mind?	
<i>If they stumble/ find it hard to answer: It's okay. You said a while ago [summarize specific response], can you describe what was going on in your mind that led you to say [response]?</i>	
<i>Possible probes: Were there other people you were thinking that you didn't say out loud? Why or why not?</i>	
<i>Was What was the general imagery in your mind?</i>	
<i>What was the strategy, so to speak, about how you eventually chose which were charismatic and which were not?</i>	
What about when I asked you "When do you feel most charismatic"* , What was your thought process back then? How did	

you go about thinking of what to answer?	
And when I asked you “When do you feel least charismatic”, can you describe to me what was going on in your mind?	
And lastly, when you were thinking of your own definition of charisma, how did you go about doing it?	
Thank you! Before we end our pagtatanong-tanong, would there be anything else you want to say? Things we may have missed, things you want to clarify, or anything else you want to comment on? 😊	

Main Questions & Probes	Notes
Introduction: Magandang araw! Gusto ko sana malaman kung pamilyar po kayo sa konsepto ng charisma. Pwede niyo po bang sabihin kung kalian niyo ito huling ginamit, pinag-isipan o pinagusapan ang charisma?	
Para sa inyo, sino po ang charismatic?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Pwede niyo ba ako bigyan ng mga halimbawa?</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>If can't answer proceed with this probe and return: Para sa inyo, sino sa tingin niyo ang iniisip ng ibang tao bilang charismatic?</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>For the given examples: Bakit niyo nasasabing charismatic itong taong ito?</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Pwede niyo po kayang ikwento ang isang particular na pagkakataon kung kalian niyo nasabi na charismatic nga itong taong ito?</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>If examples are all Filipino. probe examples of international figures and vice versa</i> <i>Lahat ng nabanbgit niyo ay ang mga Pilipino, may halimbawa ba kayo ng hindi-Pilipino?</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>If examples are all socially distant, ask if they know of anyone they personally know or are close to, and vice versa</i> 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Lahat ng nabangit niyo ay hindi malapit sa inyo, may halimbawa ba kayo ng taong charismatic na malapit sa inyo? (Kaano-ano niyo po siya?)</i> 	
Para sa inyo, sino ang HINDI charismatic?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Pwede niyo ba ako bigyan ng mga halimbawa?</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>If can't answer proceed with this probe and return: Para sa inyo, sino sa tingin niyo ang iniisip ng ibang tao bilang HINDI charismatic?</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>For the given examples: Para sa inyo, bakit niyo nasasabing HINDI siya charismatic?</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Pwede niyo po kayang ikwento ang isang particular na pagkakataon kung kalian niyo nasabi na charismatic nga itong taong ito?</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>If examples are all Filipino. probe examples of international figures and vice versa</i> <i>Lahat ng nabanbgit niyo ay ang mga Pilipino, may halimbawa ba kayo ng hindi-Pilipino?</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>If examples are all socially distant, ask if they know of anyone they personally know or are close to, and vice versa</i> <i>Lahat ng nabangit niyo ay hindi malapit sa inyo, may halimbawa ba kayo ng taong HINDI charismatic na malapit sa inyo? (Kaano-ano niyo po siya?)</i> 	
Kailan niyo pinakanararamdaman na charismatic kayo?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Pakikwento kung ano yung ginagawa niyo, anong nangyayari sa situation atbp. .</i> 	
Kailan niyo pinakakaramdaman na HINDI kayo charismatic?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Pakikwento kung ano yung ginagawa niyo, anong nangyayari sa situation atbp. ..</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Suma total o sa kabuuan, masasabi niyo po ba na charismatic kayo? Bakit o bakit hindi?</i> 	
[Cite previously mentioned charismatic figures in previous interviews] Sumasangayon ba kayo na charismatic siya?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Bakit o bakit hindi?</i> 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Masasabi mo bang charismatic si Duterte? Bakit o bakit hindi? Paano naman si Mar Roxas?</i> • <i>Sa tingin mo, iniisip kaya ng ibang tao na charismatic si Duterte? Bakit o bakit hindi? Paano naman si Mar Roxas?</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[Probe about the specific reasons for their given examples] Bakit sa tingin niyo nagawa nilang [specific outcome/reason], pero yung iba hindi?</i> 	
So sabi niyo po [Summarize responses], ngayon para asa inyo, ano ang depinisyon ngcharisma?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Paano niyo maipapaliwanag ang konsepta para sa iba na hindi nakakaintindi nito?</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Sa tingin niyo po ba na natututunan ang charisma?</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Sa tingin niyo po ba, importante ang charisma?</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Linawin ko lang din po, naniniwala kayo na ang mga binangit niyo [cite specific figures] ay mayroong charisma?</i> 	
Gusto ko din malaman ng kaunti ang kasaysayan o nakaraan mo sa charisma. Kaialan ang pinakauna na naaalala mong nalaman mo tungkol sa charisma?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Sa mga anong kontesko mo karaniwan pinagiisipan ang charisma?</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Sa mga anong kontekso mo karaniwan nakikita o natatagpuan ang terminong ito?</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Pinaguusapan mo ba ito sa mga kakilala mo?</i> • <i>Probe: Masasabi kaya ng ibang tao na charismatic (o hindi charismatic) ang mga binangit mo [mention specific figure they mentioned]. Napagusapan mo ba ito sa kanila?</i> 	
Alam niyo po ba kung may salita na charisma sa Tagalog? Kung may iba pa po kayong lingwahe, ano po yung charisma dun?	
PART-2 META-COGNITION	
Meron konting pangalawang bahagi ang pagtatanong-tanong na to. Kanina nag-iisip kayo tungkol sa mga sagot niyo sa aking mga tanong, ngayon gusto ko naman na isipin niyo ang <i>pag-iisip</i> ninyo habang sinasagot niyo ang mga katanungan kanina.	
Gusto ko lang malaman kung ano yung proseso ng pagiisip niyo kanina at iyon ang mga naisagot niyo. Pwede niyo po ba akong igabay kung ano yung mga iniisip niyo pagkatapos ko magtanong-	

tanong kanina? Halimbawa, nung tinanong ko “Para sa inyo, sino po ang charismatic?” ano ang nangyayari sa loob ng pag-iisip niyo?	
<i>IF cant answer: Ang una niyong halimbawa ay si [C1], pakikwento sa akin ano yung nasa isipan niyo, yung proseso ng isipian niyo at kalaunan ay sinabi niyo na si [C1] [Atbp for other figures]</i>	
Paano naman nung tinanong ko kayo “Para sa inyo, sino ang HINDI charismatic?”. Gusto kong isipin niyo YUNG pag-iisip niyo kanina. Ano yung nangyayari sa kaisipan niyo nun?	
<i>Okay lang po yan. Sabi niyo kanina [summarize specific response], pwede niyo ba ilarawan kung ano yung nangyayari sap ag-iisip niyo at sinabi niyo [specific response]</i>	
<i>Possible probes: May ibang tao ba kayong naiisip kanina na hindi niyo sinabi sa akin? Bakit kaya hindi niyo ito sinabi kanina?</i>	
<i>Ano yung mga imahe na nakikita mo sa isipan niyo kanina?</i>	
<i>Ano ang stratehiya mo at kalaunan ay nakapagdesisyon kayo sino ang charismatic at sino ang hindi?</i>	
Paano naman nung tinanon ko kayo “Kailan niyo pinakanararamdaman na charismatic kayo?” Ano yung proseso ng pagiisip mo nun? Paano mo naisipan kung anong isasagot?	
Nung tinanong ko “Kailan niyo pinakakaramdaman na HINDI kayo charismatic?” pakilarawan ano yung nangyayari sa isipan mo	
At sa huli, nung iniisip niyo ang depenisyon ng charisma, paano niyo ito pinagisipan?	
Salamat! Bako tayo magtapos sa pagtatanong-tanong, may mga gusto pa kaya kayong sabihin? Mga bagay siguro na di napagusapan, mga bagay na gusto niyong linawin o basta pagusapan lang	

APPENDIX D: Copy of Informed Consent Form (English)

CONSENT AND INFORMATION FORM

Good day!

I am Miguel Silan, an MA student in the UP Department of Psychology. For my thesis under the direction of Sir Ton Clemente, I am conducting an exploratory study about **Charisma in the Philippine Context**. For this I would like to invite you to a *pagtatanong-tanong* session. Should you accept, this session will take around 25-50 minutes, and is wholly voluntary -. if for whatever reason you need, or want to stop in the middle of the interview, I will understand.

Findings from this research will be shared with the scientific community, but, should you wish, steps will be taken so that information (especially sensitive ones) will not be linked back to you. This research abides by all the stipulations of the Code of Ethics of the Psychological Association of the Philippines. If after the session you have any further questions or concerns about the research, please feel free contact me through my email listed below.

I consent to having a *pagtatanong-tanong* and being audio-recorded

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

I would like to use a pseudonym for when the results are written

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

I am comfortable with this sharing option below (*Note: you are free to change this after the pagtatanong-tanong*)

- ☐ The full transcript -except sensitive detail- can be shared
☐ Transcript portions can be shared, but no portion should be traced back to me
☐ Others (please specify to the researcher)

Signature: _____

Sincerely,

Miguel Silan
MiguelSilan@gmail.com

Noted by:
Ton Clemente

Short Demographic Questionnaire

Name (optional): _____

Age: _____

Occupation: _____

Currently Living in (City): _____

Born in (City): _____

Languages Spoken: _____

APPENDIX D: Copy of Informed Consent Form (Filipino)

CONSENT AND INFORMATION FORM

Magandang Araw!

Ako si Miguel Silan, isang MA student sa Departamento ng Sikolohiya ng UP Diliman. Para sa aking thesis, sa gabay ni sir Ton Clemente, gusto kong palawakin ang pagiintindi tungkol sa **Charisma ayon sa Pilipinong Konteksto**; at gusto ko sanang makapagtanong-tanong sa inyo tungkol dito. Kung sangayon kayo, ito ay tatagal lamang ng hangang 25-50 na minuto, at ito ay boluntaryo – kung gusto o kailangan ninyong umalis sa kalagitnaan, maaaintindihan ko.

Ang mga malalaman natin sa pananaliksik na ito ay ibabahagi sa siyentipiko komunidad. Ngunit, kung gusto ninyo, sisiguraduhin ko na hindi maiuugnay ang impormasyong inyong ibibigay sa inyong sarili (lalo na ang mga sensitibong impormasyon). Ang pag-aaral na ito ay sumusunod sa mga kondisyon ng Code of Ethics ng Psychological Association of the Philippines. Kung sakaling mayroon pa kayong katanungan o pagkabahala pagkatapos ng ating pagkikita, maari niyo akong i-email sa address na nakalista sa baba.

Pumapayag ako na tanungin at makuhaan ng audio-recording

- ☐ Oo
☐ Hindi

Gusto kong gumamit ng pseudonym o pekeng pangalan para sa pag-aaral na isusulat

- ☐ Oo
☐ Hindi

Pinakacomportable ako na: (Note: maari niyo tong baguhin pagkatapos ng)

- ☐ Pwedeng ibahagi ang buong transcript, maliban na lang sa mga sensitibong impormasyon
☐ Pwedeng ibahagi ang mga porsyon ng transcript, ngunit dapat ay walang maiugnay sa akin
☐ Iba pa (pakitukoy sa mananaliksik)

Signature: _____

Sumasainyo,

Miguel Silan
MiguelSilan@gmail.com

Noted by:
Ton Clemente

Short Demographic Questionnaire

Pangalan (optional): _____

Ede: _____

Trabaho: _____

Nakatira sa (Siyudad): _____

Pinanganak sa (Siyudad): _____

Mga sinasalitang lingwahe: _____

APPENDIX E1: Example Transcript

[Note: the release of this transcript had the participant's consent]

Name	Transcript
Tagapagtanong	So I just wanted to ask yung familiarity about the term, charisma – can you tell me the last time you used, discussed or thought about charisma. Before my invitation.
Tagapagtanong	Before your invitation.. I think with my boss. No, no not with my boss. With my workmates and then about my boss. Mga this month
Katherine	Okay, can you tell me about that
Tagapagtanong	So, we're talking about our leadership kasi [laughs] you know naman. [laughs]. Yes, yes. So parang dinescribe naming sila isa't isa, so may isang boss na charismatic siguro pero walang kwenta ganun [laughs]. So ayun.
Katherine	So was that a consensus sa mga nagchikahan na charismatic pero walang kwenta?
Tagapagtanong	Hmmm, no no.
Katherine	No, ikaw lang? [laughs]
Tagapagtanong	Maybe me? Pero mga two to three kami out of ten. Ganun. Pero not even, parang cinconsider nab aka charismatic, but not really siguro
Katherine	Bakit daw hindi, why did they fail your evaluation?
Tagapagtanong	Kasi, we're not sure if. Kasi bago din siya, bago din kami. So we're not if masalita lang ba, ma-people or ma-whatever lang. Versus, ewan. Parang until now ongoing ano pa kami. Ongoing evaluation whenever we talk
Katherine	So kung hindi yung boss, who do you find to be charismatic?
Tagapagtanong	[Boyfriend]. Siya, joke lang [laughs]
Katherine	Really, tell me more about that
Tagapagtanong	So, I don't think na mention niya na or na mention ko. Siya yung conductor ng choir ngayon, so even before nung president siya so we felt that charismatic siya as a [president]
Katherine	Why would you say so
Tagapagtanong	Because, during our term, kasi executive council kami, parang andami niyang gustong – during our time not sure right now, our time, parang approachable, parang kung ano gusto niyang ipagawa siguro. [redacted]. Yun may pinapagawa siya sa choir, may gusto siyang iachieve, parang andali niyang gawin.
Katherine	Can you, okay sorry if this makes it a little awkward pero can you give for example one specific instance when you felt, 'oh charismatic siya'?
Tagapagtanong	Wait, pwede revisit natin
Katherine	Sure, we'll get back. Other figures that you find charismatic?
Tagapagtanong	For me ba 'to personally? [interrupted] Not necessarily public figure din?
Katherine	Anyone, anyone that you find charismatic.
Tagapagtanong	Ahh, may isa akong workmate.
Katherine	Sure
Tagapagtanong	Sure ako na charismatic?
Katherine	Hindi, what makes your workmate charismatic
Tagapagtanong	Kasi, so siya yung naghost for last year's Christmas party naming. Tapos ayun, kaya niyang kausapin even the pinakadifficult na people. So diba, when you're working with different people, ang dami-daming gustung i-achieve pero like, kaya niyang i-ano na 'uy ito kasi ang goal natin, ganito' parang najo-joke niya. Ta's eventually nale-lead niya lahat ng tao. To that specific goal. Which is for me, wow kaya niyang gawin na hindi kailangan ng galit ng force. Na parang 'uy tara, can do this. Let's go jump there?' And gagawin siya ng lahat ng tao.
Katherine	When was the last na specific instance of that na napansin mo.

Tagapagtanong	Hmm, wait but hindi na kami magkasama. Last instance na – wait kailangan ba na may specific example ako.
Katherine	Not really, kung may naisip ka lang if it's hard..
Tagapagtanong	I think it's hard.
Katherine	Na specific? Pero in general
Tagapagtanong	Yes, yes yes
Katherine	These were two people that you know what about a public figure that you find charismatic.
Tagapagtanong	For myself? Hmm [long pause] Hirap eh. I know charismatic for other people, pero for me?
Katherine	Pero sige, tell me who you think other people find charismatic
Tagapagtanong	Of course si Duterte.
Katherine	Why do you not find him charismatic
Tagapagtanong	Because lahat ng sinasabi niya ay against my values. Like, very disrespectful to women. And then you know naman his stance against yung mga NPA, yung killings. So I'm sure sa sinasabi pa lang niya hindi talaga ako maniniwala
Katherine	Why do you other people find him charismatic
Tagapagtanong	Because I think na in general, siguro Filipinos want instant action. So diba, you know the – what I know of Davao, nae-eradicate daw ang drugs, then instantly, kasi nga pinatay. I believe people think na kaya din yun gawin for the whole Philippines. Na wooh. [laughs] Oh my god yes
Katherine	[redacted]
Tagapagtanong	[redacted]
Katherine	Alright, when you now think about your own public figure, your own example of a public figure that you find charismatic. If not in the Philippines then maybe an international figure?
Tagapagtanong	Kasi I don't, hindi masyado ako – oh my god. Ma-ano na ako, apathetic. Wow [laughs] sa ano [politics?]. But let me think. Pero maybe, wait, can I search 'famous twitter people?' Wait I'm not sure if charismatic or dahil gusto lang like si Atom. Well for me kasi, wala akong ma-ano masyado na. Nahh, can we skip the famous person part again?
Katherine	I wanted to talk about that , si Atom bakit hindi siya nag-ano sa threshold mo ng-
Tagapagtanong	Ng charismatic?
Katherine	Oo
Tagapagtanong	Kasi, parang. Well na consider ko siya kasi I agree with most of his statements and public figure siya. And he was tibak before and he understands the plight of the workers. So parang I agree. Pero wala kasing convincing. Well for me, for you to be charismatic parang kaya mong i-engage lahat ng people. For me, he puts it out there lang, but not necessarily engaging people talaga.
Katherine	Okay, so maybe coming from that, who do you find na naka-engage talaga na public figure.
Tagapagtanong	Na nakaka convince talaga? Shit ang konti kasi ng public figures..
Katherine	It's okay, balikan nalang natin. Now let's flip the question – who do you not find charismatic.
Tagapagtanong	Na public figure?
Katherine	Na anyone
Tagapagtanong	Public figure nalang [laughs]. For sure yung si ano. Si, yung sino ba yung speaker, si Panelo
Katherine	[laughs] okay tell me more please

Tagapagtanong	Kasi diba, we know na sobrang BS ng sinasabi niya. Parang why would I be convinced. Diba he's always telling na "it's a joke, it's a joke. You're misinterpreting". Parang, hello? How many times na. Parang why would I believe you, it's not convincing. Parang binu-brush off lang niya pagkasabi, ganyan. So parang, hindi talaga siya charismatic at all.
Katherine	Who else?
Tagapagtanong	Si Bato. My god
Katherine	What makes him not charismatic?
Tagapagtanong	Kasi, parang. He's like, not. Parang he's playing the part lang. Parang umiiyak, siya "ba't niyo ako inaaway" [laughs]. Who would believe you? Na uhh. Maybe because I know na hindi aligned yung beliefs namin, so I know na I won't believe him also.
Katherine	Who else, baka someone you know?
Tagapagtanong	I know! Our current head. He's new diba. Yung org chart namin, kami, tapos managers, line managers kami – directly reporting. Tapos siya, yung head ng buong transport. So parang awkward yung spot niya ngayon, kasi nag implement kasi ng bagong project. Parang bagong system for everyone. Hindi kasi siya ma-alam sa day-to-day ops. Ta's hindi siya, wala din siyang alam sa implementation ng projects, so what's he doing? Like, that's our question in life. Then for example, my team, tatlo kami – so we're handling different sites – I handle [redacted], ganto ganto, and then he doesn't know. So he's gonna ask us, "oh ikaw ba naghahandle nito? Baka gusto mong gawin to?" The fuck are you saying [laughs] parang most of the time iniignore nalang naming siya kasi we know na he's not value-adding. But hindi naman siya disruptive eh. Hindi naman siya – hindi naman affected yung business continuity kasi parang we can manage without him. [laughs]
Katherine	[laughs] okay, international figure? That you don't find charismatic?
Tagapagtanong	Si Trump siguro. Kasi parang yun din, ang weird weird ng sinasabi niya. [laughs]. Bakit ganito, bakit ka -. And mostly din hindi aligned yung beliefs diba. So why would I believe you. Parang kahit anong convince mo sa akin, hindi talaga ako maniniwala. Unless aligned sa beliefs yung sasabihin niya.
Katherine	Alright, any other examples that come to mind
Tagapagtanong	Na public figure, international? Boyfriend ko [laughs]
Katherine	Okay we'll get back. Kanina you were saying na may discussion with other people about yung boss niyo dati. Was it the same case for example for your workmate that you found charismatic. Were there also discussions with other people na nag agree kayo na charismatic siya?
Tagapagtanong	Not with the - with a smaller circle. With another friend.
Katherine	And she agrees? The person agrees?
Tagapagtanong	Yes
Katherine	And what about Panelo, have you ever discussed that with anyone
Tagapagtanong	Maybe with [boyfriend], always
Katherine	And Bato?
Tagapagtanong	Maybe. Char, no. With him siguro, maybe in passing lang, not very deep
Katherine	What about the current head, the current boss
Tagapagtanong	Oh my god, like almost every week.
Katherine	With your other workers – uh other workmates?
Tagapagtanong	For sure, yes
Katherine	How do the discussions usually go?
Tagapagtanong	So parang, we're always validating lang na 'wala talaga siyang kwenta no'. Kasi of course, we're all new we're giving him a chance also. Maybe he doesn't know his place

	lang. But, no effort is made eh. Parang he still doesn't know anything about ops or anything about the project.
Katherine	Now let's shift our track a little bit. When do you feel most charismatic?
Tagapagtanong	[Laughs]. Wait. When I'm trying to be nice. Yun. I think when I'm trying to be nice I feel na charismatic ako.
Katherine	And when was the last time na you tried to be nice?
Tagapagtanong	A few minutes ago. So yung carrier naming na late. So I had to tell our distribution center na please prioritize – baka naman . It's for our sales naman in the end, so I know na it's the carriers fault for being late but we have to deliver the product. So I tried, and I think I failed [laugh]
Katherine	Okay, and how do you feel about it
Tagapagtanong	It's okay. I'm aware naman na I don't like trying to convince other people din kasi. Parang I feel neutral about it. Na parang, 'okay'.
Katherine	Other times when you felt really charismatic?
Tagapagtanong	[redacted]
Katherine	[redacted]
Tagapagtanong	Yes, grabe shet. I can't believe what I said
Katherine	Okay, what did you say?
Tagapagtanong	[redacted] Parang we had our SPOA, GPOA diba ganun. "I believe that we can do this, you know I believe that we can do this! The minutes will be posted online. Believe in me! I can do, all the things I said" [laughs],
Katherine	And you felt charismatic then?
Tagapagtanong	Yes, yes yes. Yes because when I looked at the crowd, parang nag-affirm na man sila [laughs] oh my god. Yeah [laughs]
Katherine	[laughs], and you won?
Tagapagtanong	[laughs] yeah! [redacted]
Katherine	-interruption-
	And when do you feel least charismatic?
Tagapagtanong	When I'm so mad siguro. I'm sure I'm not charismatic
Katherine	When was the last time you felt really mad?
Tagapagtanong	February 12, exact date. That was the time na almost mag shut down yung factory namin. Kasi we have to move the goods out, kasi walang storage capacity yung factory namin. So hindi dumating yung trucks, so I called everyone from that trucking company na "what the fuck are you doing", like "I've been awake since 12 a.m nobody is answering, where are the trucks. Get me trucks!"
Katherine	Mmm, how did they respond?
Tagapagtanong	Well, we had -. Well, wala. They just listened to me, and then "okay ma'am". The trucks came, but I'm sure that's not because of me. Because our leadership had to intervene. Kasi big deal pag nag shut down ang factory.
Katherine	Nag shut down ba talaga?
Tagapagtanong	No [laughs].
Katherine	Did you feel like you contributed to it not shutting down?
Tagapagtanong	Yes, but that's because I called my manager at 3 a.m. "I can't do it". Kasi million kasi even if one hour lang mag shut down. So parang oh my god. If I don't call anything at this hour, for sure – so I had to call, "ma'am. I need your intervention"
Katherine	How did your manager feel about that?
Tagapagtanong	Siyempre, she was stressed kay I called her 3 a.m. But, she appreciated na I called her. Because of course, what if ano na, 6 a.m. na ako tumawag, and then it's on the brink na jud. At least 4 or 5 may sumagot na, and we had the trucks come in.

Katherine	Any other else na moment when you felt least charismatic?
Tagapagtanong	Well I think it was when I was still in [previous company] siguro. And then – ah yes for sure. Diba some of the drivers they don't like to drive [previous company] na. Maybe they don't like the style ganyan. I was driver retention then, so it's part of my KPI if they leave diba. I'm trying to talk them out, "why are you leaving", "mahirap gamitin yung app", "oh maybe we can teach you how to –". "We don't have booking", "Sir! Maybe you want to travel to [redacted] that's where most of the bookings are". But my god, wala pa rin. Rejected. They still left
Katherine	When was the most crushing rejection for you
Tagapagtanong	As in crushing?
Katherine	Oo, na dinibdib mo
Tagapagtanong	Wala naman. I don't think na, no. I don't think na may dinibdib ako na ever.
Katherine	Okay, on average would you say na you're charismatic or not charismatic
Tagapagtanong	Not, for sure Kasi! Well, I'm not sure if I'm not trying lang. I don't know, I don't think I'm charismatic lang. I'm like neutral siguro at best.
Katherine	Why would you say that?
Tagapagtanong	Yun nga. Because first of all, I don't like convincing people. Because I don't like it na it's on me ba. Na what if I tried to convince them na uy, don't leave. But then wala diay sila'y earnings. Diba? That's on me, because I don't want to take the blame if ever.
Katherine	Okay, now I'm just gonna mention charismatic figures na other people found to be charismatic. And I want you tell me if you agree na charismatic sila or disagree na hindi sila charismatic
Tagapagtanong	Wait, as in personal to
Katherine	Personally yeah. For example, Kris Aquino, do you find her to be charismatic?
Tagapagtanong	No.
Katherine	No, why not?
Tagapagtanong	Because I think when she – if she endorses something, she does it for the money but she doesn't actually believe the product.
Katherine	And what about Keanu Reeves?
Tagapagtanong	I think so, yes. Because you saw the movie, kanang, the Asian-American movie?
Katherine	Forever Be My Maybe?
Tagapagtanong	Yes, yes [laughs]. Then they were all mesmerized, kay na boyfriend ni girl si Keanu. Even the guy diba, instead of being jealous, is like all 'woaah'.
Katherine	What about Vice Ganda?
Tagapagtanong	No. I think she's funny lang, but not really convincing. But also, sometimes what she's saying is not aligned with my beliefs.
Katherine	And what about Mar Roxas?
Tagapagtanong	No. Cause diba, you saw the vid when he tried to – kanang mura siya'g stupid ba. Laughing stock, so sad.
Katherine	Okay. And I wanted to ask, you, going back to kanina, circling back. International figure, have you now?
Tagapagtanong	Wait I'll think of an artist. [pause] Wait, what are the other questions pa.
Katherine	Sige, before you go back there. Kanina you were talking about a workmate you admired, that you found charismatic – na nakakaconvince siya without being, angry at people etc. Why do you think kaya niya yung gawin and not your other workmates for example.
Tagapagtanong	I think cause he's confident. And then because confident siya, other people believe in him also. "Oh we can do this", woah confident siya. So. Let's go, let's do another [task]
Katherine	International figure that you don't find charismatic? [laughs] wala pa rin?
Tagapagtanong	[laughs]. Wala pa rin eh

Katherine	Alright, don't worry about it. Okay. So ayun we talked about who you found charismatic, part of that is, yung workmate, pero you haven't thought of a public figure (whether Filipino or not Filipino), and you also discussed about people that you don't find charismatic, Panelo, Bato, you're current boss but no international figure. Then you also discussed when you felt most charismatic – which is when you're being nice, and when you felt least charismatic for example when you were really angry. Knowing all of these, for you what is charisma?
Tagapagtanong	I think, It's when you're trying to convince other people by using confidence.
Katherine	Do you think charisma can be learned?
Tagapagtanong	Learned? Yes. Yes.
Katherine	Why would you say so?
Tagapagtanong	Well my benchmark are for sure politicians. Nobody's born na mayabang, or confident. I think na when they see other people can do that, that they're confident they think - parang binebenchmark, parang iniisip nila na, “oooooh” parang kunwari si Duterte, kaya niyang i-BS out everyone. Once they know how people think – ganun
Katherine	Do you think charisma is important?
Tagapagtanong	Yes of course, especially in Filipinos
Katherine	And just to clarify, you believe that the figures you mentioned, [boyfriend], you're workmate, you think they have charisma.
Tagapagtanong	Yes
Katherine	Alright. And now I'd like to know a little bit about your history of charisma. When was the earliest using, thinking or discussing about charisma.
Tagapagtanong	Earliest?
Katherine	That you've known about the concept
Tagapagtanong	For sure, pol sci 11.
Katherine	Ahh, pasabi what happened
Tagapagtanong	Pol Sci 11 is about politics in general. There are types of leaders. I can't remember about the exact types of leaders, pero I'm sure there's one type of leader na charisma yung gigamit dun.
Katherine	And before that, you don't remember thinking or knowing about the term
Tagapagtanong	Siguro not charisma exactly but siguro close concept
Katherine	And pol sci 11 was in freshman?
Tagapagtanong	Yes, yes
Katherine	In which contexts do you usually think about charisma?
Tagapagtanong	Politics, and when talking about leadership
Katherine	Politics and leadership, and in which contexts do you usually encounter the term in your day-to-day life?
Tagapagtanong	Wala.
Katherine	You don't usually encounter. Online? You don't encounter
Tagapagtanong	[head gestures, no]
Katherine	You don't discuss it with your friends and family?
Tagapagtanong	I mean, charisma talaga? [head gestures no]
Katherine	Not really. What about your workmates mo before, you discussed it with them.
Tagapagtanong	No, not charisma
Katherine	Not charisma? Just about your boss. And not about charisma itself. So yung kanina when you were talking about current boss, and the boss that may or may not be charismatic, it wasn't charisma talaga that you were using, not the term charisma
Tagapagtanong	No

Katherine	Alright, and I want you to try your hand at it, what is charisma in Tagalog? Or what is charisma in Bisaya?
Tagapagtanong	[pause] Aww I don't know.
Katherine	Bisaya siguro, pinakaduol na translation
Tagapagtanong	Samot. Joke wait. [Pause]. Pwede English nalang? Char. [Pause] But the words I'm thinking ba kay close to friendly.
Katherine	Like what. Just think out loud
Tagapagtanong	I can't. But when I'm thinking of it, I'm thinking of my titos. And how he describes our titos.
Katherine	Like with what words do you describe your titos?
Tagapagtanong	Like, you know when there's family gatherings, and they're usually the ones na entertaining. And then when we're invited to parties sila mag ingun na kaun, "kani si uncle lang adtua kay" kay kuan. People person in.ana? Okay. I can't think of the Bisaya word.
Katherine	Okay actually naay a little bit of part 2, to this pagtatanong-tanong. A while ago you were thinking about your answers to my questions, now I'd like to ask about your thinking - to think about your thinking while you were answering a while ago. Your thought processes that led you to answer what you did. Can you guide me for example what you were thinking when I asked you, the questions. When I asked you, who do you find charismatic, what was going on in your mind?
Tagapagtanong	I was looking for people, that convinced me
Katherine	Was there a general imagery, was it more verbal
Tagapagtanong	I think I'm thinking of the times na we're having meetings and a lot of people were in disagreement and then that's how it led me to answer, cause I remember him cause he wanted something to get done. My previous workmate, it's hard to ano jud people [convince]
Katherine	What about when I asked you who do you not find charismatic. What was your thinking like. What was going on in your mind?
Tagapagtanong	I was thinking of people, na no matter what I did, what they say or what they do I won't believe. So it shouldn't be to my boss but whatever. [laughs]. Everytime na he approaches, okay "what do you want" but ignore it. And then everytime I hear, I remember na yung kay Panelo or Bato, like whatever.
Katherine	What about when I asked you, when do you feel most charismatic what was your thought process back then.
Tagapagtanong	For sure, I was thinking of the times na I convinced people. Yes.
Katherine	And what about when you felt least charismatic
Tagapagtanong	Times na I failed. So whatever I did, I smiled, I did everything. yun nga
Katherine	Lastly, when you were thinking of your own definition of charisma, how did you go about doing it
Tagapagtanong	So I thought of what's common. I realized na, cause there are a lot of people na who convinced me, but some people didn't do it na kindly or nicely. Some na nasuko in.ana, so I don't find them charismatic I just did it because they were mad. Diba, okay don't be mad I'm gonna do it na. But the other people who did it nicely or with confidence, diba. So that's when I realized na oh, charisma is making people do but in a nice way
Katherine	Thank you, daghang salamat. Before we end our pagtatanong-tanong, would there be anything else that you want to say. Things you may have missed, things you want to clarify, anything else you want to comment on
Tagapagtanong	Wala. [asking about study]

APPENDIX E2: Example Transcript

[Note: the release of this transcript had the participant's consent]

Name	Transcription
Tagapagtanong	Alright. So I wanted to ask yung familiarity niyo with the term charisma, when was the last time you thought, discussed or used the term before my invitation?
Gideon	Madalas! Madalas because I watch,- I engage in politics ano pa ba, I work closely with directors. You know, pag malakas ang charisma ng director or yung, wait lang hah [interrupted] Oh game. Yeah, lagi ko siyang nagagamit
Tagapagtanong	Ok, so who do you find to be charismatic?
Gideon	Who? Generally? What do you mean, do I need to be specific, a certain person et cetera
Tagapagtanong	Sure, general muna and then let's go to particular figures that you find charismatic
Gideon	Usually, not all priests, but I find pope Francis to be very charismatic
Tagapagtanong	Why do you find him charismatic? For you what makes him charismatic?
Gideon	It's personal noh. I mean I'm not a practicing Christian, Catholic but whenever he says something I tend to listen. Why? Because of how he is as a person at how he practices his beliefs. And charisma kasi for me is not just the way a person talks, but you know a way he sets as an example himself, and what he does. Galing ako Argentina eh, so I really find Evita Peron very charismatic.
Tagapagtanong	What makes Evita charismatic for you?
Gideon	She can speak the language of the people. In fact, - yeah she can speak the language of the people, she can drive crowds.
Tagapagtanong	Okay, for Pope Francis was there a particular instance na you really thought at the moment that he was charismatic?
Gideon	Do you remember there was a time that he kneeled in front of women and washed their feet? Naalala mo yun? There's a certain charm you know, a compelling charm, that makes me, not really devoted to him but inspires me to yeah listen – not to be devoted, but to listen and stop and just look at him and listen. Things like that
Tagapagtanong	And kanina you were mentioning pag malakas ang charisma ng directors... What tends to happen? What tends to happen kung malakas ang charisma nila?
Gideon	Ang theater kasi and performing arts lalo na sa theater meron kaming sinusunod na vision eh. And that the vision of either the director or the play. So the more charismatic the director is, in my personal point of view and in my experience the more I listen and see what he wants to push through and the better – siyempre maraming factors noh, for example a good director has to be a good listener, a follower et cetera. And in a way kailangan meron siyang certain discipline to show his actors and his staff. But to have that little charm and charisma makes me listen more, and follow more. Things like that.
Tagapagtanong	And particularly charismatic directors that you know?
Gideon	What do you mean, tao, tao ba sasabihin ko?
Tagapagtanong	Yeah
Gideon	Maraming na akong naging director eh. Maybe I can just cite examples, hindi ko na sasabihin kung sino. But for me for example, you see pope Francis noh, sinabi ko kanina that he knelt and hinugasan niya yung mga paa nga mga babae and yung mga babae sa prison. So to me, to be charismatic doesn't just entail having that certain charm – to charm your viewers, to charm your staff, to charm your actors but a certain charm that's backed up by actions. Doing is not just saying, but doing as well. For me yun yung isa sa mga factors na nagiging charismatic ang leader. Nakikita mo

	<p>sa kanya, ginagawa niya. So sino ka sino ka para hindi sumunod, eh ginagawa nga niya eh? And he practices what he preach. So yun madaming director na ganun eh, marami din kasing director na sasabihin na oh sumunod ka “be on time”, and yet, they’re not on time. Parang may mga directors like the late Tony Mabesa I mean, he can be very [light laughter] he’s a strict disciplinarian and yet lahat ng sinasabi sa amin na ifollow eh he follows it. He’s never late. He’s on time. He never forgets his lines. So you know. Kahit pa masigawan ka, nakikita mo sa kanya eh na he practices it. And I think that’s why so many people follow him. Of course maraming galit sa kanya, it was another time. You know, grabe yung discipline niya and he can be very – he can be violent at times. And yet, you see him practicing the things that he preaches. The thing that he teaches you – not being late, being on time, having your lines really shows a certain professionalism that you really admire. And that, paano ba, dumadagdag yun sa pagiging charismatic ng isang tao, for me. Nakikita mong ginagawa niya eh.</p>
Tagapagtanong	Alright so you cited pope Francis, Evita Peron, certain directors pero what about a Filipino public figure that you find to be charismatic?
Gideon	Sinabi ko na, si Tony Mabesa
Tagapagtanong	Oh well, he’s someone you know. What about someone more socially distant siguro.
Gideon	<p>[sighs] charismatic, that I really listen to.. Hmmn... Wait lang hah. I really need to think hard about this. Ah! Hmm. Paano ba. Wait lang, wait lang. Jovito Salonga was very charismatic. Irurundown ko lang hah, those that I remember. Jovito Salonga is very charismatic, Ferdinand Marcos is very charismatic. Ninoy Aquino was very charismatic. Sino pa ba? Miriam Santiago for me was very charismatic, you listen to her. Yun, sa mga politician ngayon I think, hmm, sino ba. Mar Roxas used to be charismatic. When I was in college, he was at the – at an open house sa Sampa. Diyan sa Sampa. And you know, as a student and he was there speaking “wow!”. Kaya lang his popularity waned off and did so many things kaya parang nagsawa ako sa kanya. But the first time I saw him, “wow ano ‘to?’” and then suddenly “yuck, kadiri! Ano ba ‘to’”. Things like that</p>
Tagapagtanong	What do you think changed?
Gideon	I told you, you practice what you preach. Eh the more he was in politics, the more seemingly trapo he becomes. Na giving in to sa nakasanayan na, to our common politics, so to speak. So yun, nagsawa sa kanya
Tagapagtanong	And you mentioned Jovito Salonga. For you what makes him charismatic
Gideon	His intellect. His way of speaking, very statesmanly. Alam mo -, you know he was speaking of human rights and all that stuff. And he himself was a victim. He himself was part of rallies. And you know, you look up to him and see him as a hero. Yun, ganun
Tagapagtanong	Ferdinand Marcos, meanwhile?
Gideon	<p>Even now, you look at his videos and how he speaks and his humor and his candor. Kaya hindi mo din masisisi ang Pilipinas, kung bakit niya, sabihin natin naloko or bumilib sa kanya ng husto, even the world. You see his videos and how he speaks, his eloquence, his attention to detail. He really speaks very well. Hindi mo matatagal sa kanya yun. Sabi nga ni Imelda diba “reality is not important, perception is real”. You know? I think he was in many ways a master of that, through his speaking, through his speeches. Ganun. I’m sure nere-rehearse niya yun hours and hours before he speaks without a manuscript to read. Makikinig ka eh. Yung, “ano ‘tong gagang to” [laughs]</p>
Tagapagtanong	Lastly, Ninoy? For you what makes him charismatic

Gideon	Ganun din! Ganun din siya. Magaling din magsalita eh. If you watch old Youtube videos of Marcos and Ninoy speaking against each other, wow! They can really [unintelligible] the nation. Tapos tignan mo magaling magsalita. You know, parang parehong may sense. Ibang usapan yung mga asawa nila ha? Both wives [laughs] ibang usapan.
Tagapagtanong	Do you not, find for example Cory and Imelda charismatic? Their wives
Gideon	No! No!
Tagapagtanong	No? Why not?
Gideon	No. For me yuck! Have you heard her speak? Have you heard her speak? Kadiri! Parang ang cheap cheap. Imelda is the same, pero mas mataas yung – parang cheap na class. [laughs] No. No I do not find them charismatic. Hindi. Hindi. Erase, erase those things. But yeah, I don't find them charismatic, unlike their husbands. Their husbands are really charismatic.
Tagapagtanong	Okay
Gideon	Sa mga anak nila.. Sino po bang anak ni Ninoy? Si Noynoy, sino pa. Si Kris. Silang dalawa kasi yung personalities na.. Alam mo si Kris in a way is very – is charismatic. She has her own charm. Kaya lang maririndi ka sa boses, maririndi ka issue. Sa anak naman ni Marcos
Tagapagtanong	Bong Bong and Imee?
Gideon	No, no, no si Bong Bong walang charisma eh. Si Imee really, how she speaks. Parang ganun, parang nakuha niya how her dad speaks. Walang manuscript, memorize niya yung ano, alam niya mga pangalan. She speaks many languages, things like that. Madalaing maloko ang tao sa galing ng pananalita And those constitutes who the people being charismatic. Tignan mo, Hitler killed so many people and yet he was very charismatic and people were listening to him, diba? And it doesn't mean that you're charismatic that you're a good person, or vice versa.
Tagapagtanong	And you mentioned Imelda and Cory charismatic, as well as Bong Bong. Who else do you not find charismatic?
Gideon	Who else do I find not? What was your question, not charismatic?
Tagapagtanong	Yes, not charismatic. Maybe an international figure that you don't find charismatic
Gideon	An international figure... You remember the UN president dati? Sino yun? The Korean president.
Tagapagtanong	Okay. What about him for you doesnt make him charismatic?
Gideon	Not president, yung UN, yung si Ban-, Moon [note: Ban Ki-moon] yun anyway ayusin mo nalang ang pangalan. Basta yun. Yun! Parang pagnagsasalita siya, hindi ka makikinig sa kanya. [laughs] No. Something with him, with how he speaks or how he presents himself. Ganun, sino pa ba charismatic for me? Carlos P. Romulo was very charismatic. Was very small, yet he – look at his speeches as well. Sino pa ba
Tagapagtanong	What about someone close to you that you don't find charismatic, maybe in the theater world
Gideon	Someone close to me?
Tagapagtanong	Yeah, or someone you worked with
Gideon	Yan, sinabi ko na nga, si Tony.
Tagapagtanong	That isn't charismatic?
Gideon	Isn't?
Tagapagtanong	Yes
Gideon	Mahirap sa theater eh. Right now I can't think of anyone, not charismatic. Or really below charismatic [laughs]
Tagapagtanong	What if family, friends, that you don't find charismatic?

Gideon	Hmm. [pause]. To me kasi, kailangan mong-, hindi naman kailangan. To me kasi, meron dapat certain level of being a leader [if you're charismatic]. Kahit hindi ka leader per se, dapat meron kang-, you have that element, you have that personality na kaya mong magpasunod ng tao. Ang dami dami kong katrabaho, ang dami daming kong naging staff na are not really charismatic. Kahit anong gawin mo, alam mong magaling sila on paper, alam mong magaling silang sumagot, but they cannot lead people. Dami niyon! Di ko na kailangan isa-isahin, but marami. And yeah. No, really! I know genuises and brilliant people who just cannot lead. They can do it by themselves. They can follow instructions. They can do whatever you want them to do. They're brilliant, but they cannot lead. And to be charismatic you have to have that
Tagapagtanong	Sige. Now let's shift track a little bit, now lets focus it on you. When do you feel most charismatic?
Gideon	[redacted]
Tagapagtanong	[redacted]
Gideon	[redacted]
Tagapagtanong	[redacted]
Gideon	[redacted] Ganito nalang, if being charismatic means that I'm a good teacher, sa job, do I have people follow my instructions, or follow me and see me as an example. Then yes, if that's a measurement of being charismatic, then yes people follow me. And when do I feel most charismatic? It's when I'm working and I'm doing something I really love and passionate about like teaching and theater and designing and setting up. For example sa set-up, I need to stand up. I need to set-up, meaning working, setting up the stage et cetera. Then I need to, I need to set myself higher, because I need people listening to me and following my instructions. If that's a measure of being charismatic and then okay. I think I am most charismatic during set-ups.
Tagapagtanong	When was the most recent? When was the most recent set-up when you felt really charismatic?
Gideon	I just got home from South America right? I did a tour. So I had to set up in many countries and theaters with non-English speaking people. [interrupted] so for me, as the designer and the technical director I had to make sure that these people will listen to me. Sino ba ako? I'm a Filipino from across the world, across the globe. Mag-isa ako in going there and having foreigners, locals follow and listen to me – I need to level up. Kailangan ko ipakita who I am and they have to follow me, and they do follow me. Wala pa naman akong naexperience na foreigners did not follow me. So yun. Recently I was in Brazil and Argentina so ang mga katrabaho ko, mga puti, matatangkad sa akin so. Hindi sila nagtatagalog, hindi sila nagingles so, I need to step up and have them follow me and they did. No fuss, they followed me
Tagapagtanong	How were you able to do that?
Gideon	By really knowing what my work is. And my position is. Hindi ko naman kailangan sabihin na “you follow me, I'm the boss”, no. Have that sense of security; not being insecure with who you are and what you do and really have a full background knowing what you want, what your job is. Knowing what is right and what is wrong. Pupunta ka dun, ready ka – ready ka sa bala mo. And tatawagin mo sila lahat, you know call everyone's attention and talk to them right, talk to them nice and show them that you know what you're doing and everything will follow.
Tagapagtanong	I love it. Now -
Gideon	And isa pa, hindi ako bastos. Hindi ako bastos. But I'm strict. If they do not follow something that I told them, then I call them out. Hindi ako [pitched voice] “excuse

	me, mali to huhu”, no I call them out. “Excuse me this is wrong, you have to make this, you have to do this”. And they follow! Yeah
Tagapagtanong	Great. Now let’s flip the question, when do you feel least charismatic?
Gideon	When I’m insecure
Tagapagtanong	Yeah? When was the -
Gideon	When alam ko I didn’t do my homework. [laughs]. When I’m insecure, na alam ko I didn’t do my homework, I’m not prepared. Then mangangapa ako. That. Other than that, nothing.
Tagapagtanong	This might be a sensitive question but when was the most recent siguro that you felt most insecure? What was the situation like, what were you doing, where was this
Gideon	Ah! I was the designer of the Southeast Asian Games, the SEA games opening ceremonies. Ako yung designer nun. Yeah. I felt very insecure nung alam kong papasok na kami sa venue, hindi pa ready lahat Partly it was my fault, partly budget fault. Late lahat nangyari, because of so many things. Government issues. But yeah, I felt insecure na “shit hindi pa tapos lahat”. And kailangan na. And I really felt bad. And when I feel bad, usually it’s not a pretty sight. Why? Because merong konting panic, and I’m a bit sad. But! Double-edged eh, pagnagpapanic ako, and I’m a bit sad and insecure I work harder, in a way. So binabawi ko. Kasi there are times na hindi yun yung sasabihin mo eh. Na hindi mo naman pwedeing gawin reason yung “ah wala kasing pera eh, late dumating”. That’s not a reason. Dapat nagawan mo nang paraan. But it went very well, and we had a great opening. [laughs]
Tagapagtanong	[laughs]. And just to clarify on average, would you say that you are charismatic?
Gideon	Yes.
Tagapagtanong	Yes
Gideon	[redacted]
Tagapagtanong	Alright. Sige, now I’ll mention figures that other people might have found charismatic in the past or other people have said to be charismatic and I wanted to ask you if you agree with them that they are charismatic or if they aren’t. For example, Vice Ganda do you find him to be chairmsatic?
Gideon	Number one, I really do not know her. I know the person, alam kong artista siya, alam kong may show siya but if I will base my answer on her fans at alam ko mataas ang ratings niya then maybe she is. But! Hindi ko pa ever nakanaood ng show or ng- so I’m really not in the position
Tagapagtanong	And kanina you were talking about Kris, for you do you find her charismatic, personally?
Gideon	Lumaki kasi ako na sila yung artista eh. Sila yung mga sikat eh, you know? I mean I hate her
Tagapagtanong	Is that love-to-hate?
Gideon	No, no, no. hate! I don’t like her as an actresss, as a host. But she has this certain charm that keeps people still wanting to see her. And that includes me “shit ano kayang nangyari kay Kris, ay nagrapasa” so negative man, I think that is charisma as well. Diba?
Tagapagtanong	Sure, and what about Keanu Reeves
Gideon	I’m happy you said that. Why? Cause I really do not find him charismatic. I like him as a person, he’s a very good person, I see videos of him on Youtube and you know testaments from people working with him. But as an actor, kahit sa Matrix hindi niya ako nakuha. Na “wow! I will-” unlike wala eh. [laughs] I don’t find him charismatic. Tignan mo, bakit, nanominate na ba siyang Best Actor? Di pa diba? Kasi nga [laughs]
Tagapagtanong	[laughs] Okay, what about Duterte?

Gideon	Yes. Yes. Yes. Kasi he managed to speak.. kanto? You know, salitang kanto. Alam mo marami akong kaibigan sa squatter eh, lumaki ako beside the squatters [redacted]. Marami, lahat yan barkada ko, kaya pag naglalakad ako diyan, okay lang. And yung mga manginginom, ganun siya magsalita. [laughs]. You know, and he managed to use that in his favor. That and the tough guy image. And oo, nagagamit niya. That's why people listen. I mean look at – sabihin natin 20% nun DDS, yung mga naglalalike, mga nagheart. But the other percentage? Mataas pa rin ah! Bakit, kasi he's charismatic.
Tagapagtanong	Alright. And kanina you were talking about Kris Aquino even though you hated her or you don't like her you still parang want to know what's up with her or you still want to keep up with her. Why do you think she's able to have this specific effect, while other actresses and actors don't
Gideon	Well number one, royalty si Kris, kahit ano pang sabihin mo. Anak siya ni Ninoy Aquino. Anak siya ng presidente. And then there's charm eh, meron siyang – she's the EDSA revolution baby. Meron siyang charm, meron siyang – in fact the first time you see Kris Aquino, naka salamin, maiinlove ka sa kanya eh kasi this cute girl you know na is very TV – na anak ng napatay, anak ng -, maano ka sa kanya eh. Then suddenly lalabas ugali niya [then dun mawawala] but still, meron tayong royal-, meron tayong attachment in a way or we idolize royalty and meron siya nun. Meron siyang charm na ganun
Tagapagtanong	Sige, so kanina we were talking about who you found charismatic and you gave a lot including Pope Francis, Evita Peron, Tony Mabesa, Jovita Salonga et cetera et cetera, even Mar Roxas before. And you also talked about who you don't find charismatic – Imelda, Cory, and the UN figure
Gideon	Wait, wait wait, with Imelda hindi ko naman sinabi I don't find her charismatic. I.. Maybe I.., Hindi ko lang inisip siguro but if I do think about it, she has her charm. Para siyang si Kris Aquino, para siyang ganun. But yeah
Tagapagtanong	Pero Cory for sure hinde?
Gideon	No, I don't find her charismatic. I won't listen to her. I won't stop and listen to her.
Tagapagtanong	We also talked about where you were most charismatic during teaching, during set-up, when you're really prepared and you know what you're doing. And you talk about when you're least charismatic, during the SEA games when you felt insecure. And then you also talked about whether you agreed or not with who other people found to be charismatic like Vice Ganda and Keanu Reeves. Now of all these, let's distill it into one question, for you what is charisma?
Gideon	Hmm.. Uhm, all the things I've said, all the examples I've said constitutes to charisma eh. It can't be – I don't think it can be, pwede siyang masabi sa isang salita. So many things that make a person charismatic. For example nga, sabi ko sayo si Ronald Reagan or Bill Clinton can be very charismatic. Kasi magaling sila magsalita, Ferdinand Marcos magaling magsalita. And yet si Duterte ang pangit magsalita and people still find him charismatic. So there's so many factors. And you cannot really pinpoint it to one particular reason. The only thing I can think of is to be charismatic, one must have this sense of importance and knowledge and charm to make people listen and follow.
Tagapagtanong	Do you think it can be learned?
Gideon	Of course! Of course. Si Hitler nga diba nagkaroon ng acting lessons before going to politics. Tignan mo yung mga politicians na, - kaya nagwowork ang actors as politicians eh. Kasi they learned their craft, you know? Either you use it for good or for bad. But some people just have it, just like that. Merong natural charm.
Tagapagtanong	Do you think it's important?

Gideon	Of course, it is, very important. It's a rallying cry – it can make a nation and break a nation. Steve Jobs, because of him being charismatic, look at Apple now. Hindi lang naman - the first time he showed the Iphone to the world, hindi lang naman yun yung Iphone he it's how he spoke about it. It's how he valued it as a person. He gave it value, he gave it importance by showing us what it is and how important it is to him. And thus “ay shit, Iphone. Ay ang ganda”. And then, the Iphone.
Tagapagtanong	And just to clarify you believe Evita and Pope Francis and Tony Mabesa to have charisma
Gideon	Yes
Tagapagtanong	And I also just wanted to know your history about your understanding of charisma, when was the earliest you remember knowing about the concept?
Gideon	I think sa family. Kasi sa family, lalo na noon before the internet we watch television together. And we watch speeches as a family. Eh ngayon kasi kanya kanya nang phone
Tagapagtanong	[audio recording glitch]
Gideon	that leader's have or because I'm a theater goer, alam ko pag ang actor may charisma or you know. Kasi may ganun eh. May mga, kahit anong gawin niya titingin ka sa kanya gwapo man or hindi. Being gwapo does not equate charisma, it's an added factor but doesn't really make it. Kasi sabi nga ni sir Tony “beauty is 10 minutes on stage” afterwards pag wala kang talent, wala! So people will forget you, so may mga actors na you really look at them and listen. May mga actors na gaano pa kaganda and kagwapo after a while magsasawa ka “ay wag na. letse”. Things like that. So ako ang gauge ko of charisma is yes, family, TV, speeches and theater
Tagapagtanong	Alright, would you say those were in gradeschool, highschool, college? Earliest that you've known the concept?
Gideon	Yeah, gradeschool, highschool. Ano rin kasi ako eh, sumasali ako sa mga speech before nung highschool. Lagi akong nasa theater and I've won speeches and declamation contests. Ganun [laughs] siyempre pinapractice ko yun or sasabihin ng nanay ko “oh dapat may ano ka-. Dapat nakuha mo yung-, dapat nakukuha mo yung” ano yun? “Yung damdamin ng tao pagnagsasalita ka”. And you practice it and dati lang, ang iniisip ko o arte ba to or how you say it, and then suddenly you realize “ah ito pala yung charisma”. Ganun [laughs]
Tagapagtanong	Alright and these days, in which contexts do you usually think about charisma?
Gideon	With the leaders, with our leaders. And with actors. With people that you listen to, people with authority. Yeah
Tagapagtanong	Actors.. Philippine actors or your actors in the theater?
Gideon	I mean actors in general. There are actors that you listen and look at, there are actors na ayaw mo talagang pansinin.
Tagapagtanong	Alright. And the term itself, where do you usually encounter the term charisma?
Gideon	In performances and in politics. For example Michael Jackson has great charisma, big charisma. Diba? Napakapayat, but when he dances, when he starts to walk, when he starts to dance, when he starts to sing, people listen, people cry and that is not just – that is talent and charisma. Anyone can sing, anyone can dance but siya yung gumawa, people stop and listen.
Tagapagtanong	Okay, do you ever discuss it with your friends or family? Or with anyone, charisma or who you find charismatic?
Gideon	No, not really. Why? [laughs]. No ang pinakadiscussion a leader speaks “grabe ang charisma nito noh? Nakikinig ang mga tao”. That's it, no one really opposes it.
Tagapagtanong	Alright, if you were asked, what is charisma in Tagalog? If you needed to translate?

Gideon	Ang hirap eh, paano nga ba, ikaw ano? [laughs] Hinde, i've never used it in Tagalog. "Dating"! "Malakas ang dating". Siguro, "ang lakas ng dating nito"
Tagapagtanong	What about in Greek?
Gideon	I think it's a Greek word, charisma? I'm not so sure, I need to review it. I think it's a Greek word
Tagapagtanong	So charisma din siya in Greek?
Gideon	Yeah.. charisma, parang ganun. Wait lang hah, I think it is a Greek word. I think it is. Charisma [pronounces charisma as har-isma]
Tagapagtanong	Alright. So there's just a little part 2. Kanina you were thinking about your answers to my questions, now I'd like to ask you to think about <i>your thinking</i> while you were answering a while ago. I'd like to know for example your thought processes that led you to answer what you did a while ago. For example, can you guide me through what you were thinking for example when I asked, "who do you find charismatic"? What was going on in your mind?
Gideon	Okay, when you ask these questions I just blurted out what came to mind. So I think yung thought process maikli. But! I think when you asked that question, ang iniisip ko "kanino ba ako nakikinig, sino bang pinapakingan ko, sino ba yung pinapanood ko" ganun
Tagapagtanong	And when I asked you, "who do you NOT find charismatic", what was going on in your mind? What was your thinking like?
Gideon	Ah ganun din, sinong hindi ko pinapakingan? [laughs] Sino yung dinededma ko
Tagapagtanong	Alright and when I asked you, "when do you feel most charismatic?" what was your thought process
Gideon	Oh, that was a bit personal, I had to – kasi ang charisma sinasabi ko sayo, it has to do with being secure in who you are, what you do and what you want to happen. So it was a bit personal because I had to look into myself. Kailan ba ako insecure? Kailan ba ako secure? Kailan ba ako sure? Ganun
Tagapagtanong	And similarly, for when you felt least charismatic, yun din?
Gideon	The same
Tagapagtanong	And lastly when you were thinking of your own definition of charisma, how did you go about doing it?
Gideon	I just gathered all the factors that makes me think what charisma is, like ability, talent, speech, graciousness, leadership, not being insecure. Things like that. So ginather ko lang: ano ba yung – what constitutes charisma? Ano ba yung mga bagay na feeling ko a person must have for people to listen and to follow? Yun
Tagapagtanong	Alright, that should -
Gideon	Ah, wait lang. Alam mo, ang "hua" [as pronounced in hua-risma] although we use it in Greek, it actually means "to give" you know? To give, graciously give. So if that is the root – that is definitively the root word of charisma. So I think it has to do with how you speak, that you speak openly and graciously you give. Yun yung root word niya eh, yun yung root meaning niya eh. So yeah, I think. You must have that as well, na bukas ka, seemingly open for questions and for clarifications and all that. And kasama yun sa factor that constitutes charisma, na you openly give yourself, graciously give yourself and your opinion. Tapos you listen. Ganun
Tagapagtanong	I love it. Alright, so any other things you want to clarify? Things you want to comment on, things we may have missed
Gideon	Wala naman [laughs]
Tagapagtanong	[laughs] so kung wala na, that ends our pagtatanong-tanong. Thank you so much! Alright I'll just end the audio-recording.

APPENDIX G – Further notes on Saturation, Reflexivity and Verification

Saturation: Because of the interruption of the data gathering due to the pandemic, responses-wise, I believe that a greater range of attributes and behaviors would have been seen had more participants been recruited. However, despite the lack of saturation for surface indicators, the current data do arguably saturate and paint a clear picture of the underlying process/es of attribution and the primary role of effects in charismatic attribution. How can one be sure of this purported saturation? This is also in a large part, related to the discussion of reflexivity and verification

Reflexivity and Verification: As a qualitative study that derives much of the inferences from analysis of textual data, a common refrain is, 1.) how can we trust the analysis? and 2.) how much of the analysis and claims are ‘biased’ by prior expectations and other characteristics of the analyst? For one, as much as possible, illustrative quotes are in the main text, and both supporting evidence *and* potentially contradictory evidence are footnoted along the claims in chapter 4. Thus one can track the evidence, and can also check this against the full transcripts (Appendix E1 & Appendix E2) and transcript portions released (Appendix H, Appendix I)

And is the analysis biased by my prior expectation? As a note on reflexivity, if anything, if there were bias this would have been on the direction of possible “non-existence” of charisma - I had come to expect a possibility of seeing a wildly diverse and probably incompatible use of the concept of “charisma” across participants. However, while a great variety is seen in the responses of the participants, that much of this diversity is related to a process of effects-based reasoning was not expected. Various claims for this purported process was checked and re-checked multiple times for supporting and contradicting evidence.

Order effects. Given the outline of the *tanungan*, one might also be concerned about the order effects of the instrument and whether previous responses affect the responses later on.

The clearest order effect is seen in how they answer the question “*So we’ve discussed above [summarize responses]. For you, what is charisma?*”. As seen in the meta-cognitive question “*And lastly, when you were thinking of your own definition of charisma, how did you go about doing it?*” a handful of participants answer this question by thinking what was in common with the different figures that they mentioned [P1, P2, P5, P11, P16]. However, this is not the

case for everyone, with some getting the definition from how they relate it to themselves [P4, P9] or from a previously held conceptualization of charisma [P3, P6, P13, P17]. See responses for the meta-cognition in this footnote⁶⁶. And in fact, some produce “de facto” definitions of charisma early on in the *tanungan* that couldn’t be influenced by either previous figures, or their summary of answers for the whole instrument [P3, P5, P6, P9, P10, P13]⁶⁷. Further, this

66

- “*Kung anong common sa kanila – sa anong common sa mabuti or masama na charismatic. Sila Hitler, sila Duterte*” [P1]
- “*So I thought of what’s common. I realized na, cause there are a lot of people na who convinced me, but some people didn’t do it na kindly or nicely. Some na nasuko in. ana, so I don’t find them charismatic I just did it because they were mad. Diba, okay don’t be mad I’m gonna do it na. But the other people who did it nicely or with confidence, diba. So that’s when I realized na oh, charisma is making people do but in a nice way*” [P2]
- “*Yung charisma ine-rerelate ko siya dun sa parang positive attitudes or positive aspect. Yung hindi naman charisma yung sa negative side siya. Parang ganun po.*” [P3]
- “*Inisip ko yun kasi, dinescribe ko lang yung sarili ko, paano ako may charisma sa kanila*” [P4]
- “*I first started with what I already said. Trying to keep it consistent with myself. Then ayun nga, when I realized it’s harder to articulate then it actually was, then I tried to think about it in a slower process. Na parang okay, this is where we’re at now. How would I then articulate this. O kaya for example, why wasn’t it brought up in regular things that I read or write even though it should have been more talked about especially in politics for example.*” [P5]
- “*Kasi nga, depende dun sa charisma. Yung charisma kasi, ang reading ko dun is yung appeal. Yung magaling ka talagang – yung sobrang galing. Yung taong ito galing ng charisma niya. Galing niya makisama, ang talino niya, pwede siya makibagay kahit anong uri ng tao. Mataas man, mababa man. Salbahe, mabait. Alam mo yun, yung ganun yung ano ko.*” [P6]
- “*It was my first time actually, defining it. So the thought process was, operationalizing the way I saw charisma being displayed by other people and by myself.*” [P9]
- “*Going over our discussion yung yeah, parang naririnig ko sa sarili ko na laging lumilitaw.*” [P11]
- “*Just the first thing that came out of my mouth you know. I didn’t really give it much thought.*” [P12]
- “*Well I guess I tired to think of what makes me want to believe in someone.*” [P13]
- “*I thought about all the things I said before, and I noticed that there were repeating things: engagement of the other person, [unintelligible] okay so what are the things I keep on seeing and how can I distill them into one?*” [P16]
- “*I just gathered all the factors that makes me think what charisma is, like ability, talent, speech, graciousness, leadership, not being insecure. Things like that. So ginather ko lang: ano ba yung – what constitutes charisma? Ano ba yung mga bagay na feeling ko a person must have for people to listen and to follow? Yun*” [P17]

⁶⁷ “...charisma is yung parang charm tama ba?” [P3]

“...but my awareness of the topic is that it’s sort of like an appeal, from a person or perhaps, things can have charisma right? So a certain appeal that a certain entity has, I guess” [P5]

“Charisma is.. Yung parang ano. Parang – hindi ko maiano pero alam kong meaning na – sa akin. Yung parang madali kang maka-ano ng tao, yung behavior mo. Kungbaga sasabihin sayo ang galing ng charisma niyang babaeng yan. Masyado siyang friendly. Yung mga ganun.” [P6]

“Well, okay. Honestly speaking, it’s a word I most often with myself. On an everyday basis.” [P9]

“Charisma kasi for me its a descriptor – of an action to provoke reaction” [P10]

“she asked me if she were charismatic. And I said, well sometimes! Yeah ... I think her charisma comes out when she wants something... I guess charisma is like, it’s like a combination of presence, and I guess a bit of persuasiveness

particular ‘order effect’ do not affect any claims made on the main manuscript, especially since who they answer as charismatic in the first place implicitly hints to their conceptualization.

However, another concern might be that the participants inadvertently try to make other figures “consistent” with who they first mention (which may likely be an exemplar). However, while there is some evidence that some participants do this [P1] many do not base their answer on similarity-to-exemplar, but as detailed in the main manuscript, this is on the effects the figures seem to produce.

Do the participants, then try to make these effects “consistent” based on the effect the first figure mentioned? There is no strong evidence for this concern. What is more likely the case is that their cited effects emanate from their notion of charisma. That is, for Ian to say that *“when I say someone is charismatic, well it feels like you’re more or less drawn to these people. You know?”* is not just mere order effect – or an artifact of his first cited figure being a workshop speaker that draws people in, but rather, because both that statement and his cited figures reflect his own notion of charisma. One can also be assured of this, because the effects-based reasoning appears not only in who they find charismatic, but also in who they don’t find to be charismatic,⁶⁸ in whether they find themselves to be charismatic⁶⁹ and in when they feel least and most charismatic.⁷⁰ Analytical claims from the manuscript can be triangulated within the data.

and some confidence. I guess the person just exudes confidence that you kinda believe them Or you kind of – you take note of them.” [P13]

Note that all these responses were given even before they responded with a figure that they found to be charismatic.

⁶⁸ E.g., *And what about when I asked you “who do you not find charismatic”, what was going on in your mind? Sino ba yung mga inignore ko minsan. Sino yung mga nagsasalita pero di pinapansin ng mga tao.* [P1]

⁶⁹ E.g., *“You don’t just have to believe in yourself, you have to get other people to believe in you. I’m not sure if I manage to make people believe in me.”* [P13]

⁷⁰ E.g., *“If they’re enthralled or if I manage to keep their attention during a talk or if I see that they’re understanding, they’re nodding, they’re smiling, they’re agreeing.”* [P15]

E.g., *“Well I think it was when I was still in [previous company] seguro. And then – ah yes for sure. Diba some of the drivers they don’t like to drive [previous company] na. Maybe they don’t like the style ganyan. I was driver retention then, so it’s part of my KPI if they leave diba. I’m trying to talk them out, “why are you leaving”, “mahirap gamitin yung app”, “oh maybe we can teach you how to –”. “We don’t have booking”, “Sir! Maybe you want to travel to Cebu City that’s where most of the bookings are”. But my god, wala pa rin. Rejected. They still left”* [P2]

APPENDIX H: Example Evidence of Effects-Based Reasoning Across Participants

	<p>Example Evidence (Transcript Portions) of Effects-Based Reasoning</p> <p>Participants highlighted in yellow are those that display evidence for following an effects-based appraisal as their primary process for charismatic attribution. These example evidence are not exhaustive, but evidence come from across the different components of the instrument, from who they think are charismatic, who they don't find charismatic, when they felt most, and least charismatic, whether they find themselves to be charismatic and so on. Bullet points demarcate jumps in transcript portions. Transcript lines in italics are those asked by the <i>tagatanong</i></p> <p>Participants highlighted in blue are those that have evidence that their charismatic attribution is not primarily due to an effects-based appraisal process.</p>
P1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hindi siya filtered gaya nung ibang artisa. So feeling ko yun yung bakit nada-draw sa kanya yung mga tao... Wala akong maisip na specific na tao pero naisip ko yung description ko ng isang charismatic na tao. Someone na – basically yung papaniwalaan mo. Ganun siya. Yung image niya sa akin, someone bright. Someone positive. Someone well-dressed... <i>And what about when I asked you “who do you not find charismatic”, what was going on in your mind?</i> Sino ba yung mga inignore ko minsan. Sino yung mga nagsasalita pero di pinapansin ng mga tao... <i>Okay, what about when I asked you “when do you feel most charismatic” what was your thought process back then. Or how did you go about thinking of what to answer</i> Kung kalian ba ako nagsalita sa medyo madaming tao, ta's pinapaliwalaan nila ako – tapos they followed me para ma-achieve ang isang goal...
P2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Because, during our term, kasi executive council kami, parang andami niyang gustong – during our time not sure right now, our time, parang approachable, parang kung ano gusto niyang ipagawa siguro... Kasi, so siya yung naghost for last year's Christmas party naming. Tapos ayun, kaya niyang kausapin even the pinakadifficult na people... <i>Can you guide me for example what you were thinking when I asked you, the questions. When I asked you, who do you find charismatic, what was going on in your mind?</i> I was looking for people that convinced me... <i>What about when I asked you who do you not find charismatic. What was your thinking like. What was going on in your mind</i> I was thinking of people, na no matter what I did, what they say or what they do I won't believe. So it shouldn't be to my boss but whatever. [laughs]...
P3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Siguro yung friend ko, mommy din siya ka-classmate ni [] nung elementary pa. Until highschool. Si [M.] <i>Bakit niyo po nasabing charismatic si [M.]</i> In a way, kasi. Ganto, successful siya sa business nila, and kaya niyang i-ano eh – i-insist kung ano yung gusto niya, without much effort. Yun ganun <i>Kris Aquino, bakit niyo po nasabi na charismatic si Kris Aquino?</i>

	<p>Yung kasi, yung napapanood ko siya sa ano niya nun. Na parang kung siya yung nag endorse – parang ang lakas ng ano ng product. Atsaka makikita mo dun diba, parang highest paid endorser siya, yung mga ganun.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kapag meron kang gustong, gustong ma-achieve. Na parang imposible na parang, “I wish I can be more charming” or “I wish I can convince him or her” Maininsert ko yung anong gusto ko pero hindi ko – feeling ko kulang. Kung ano man yung convincing power ko, parang nagwiwish ka sana, sana ganito ako. Sana I am more. Parang ganun
P4	[Note: various figures are evaluated as charismatic in whether they show ‘malasakit’]
P5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Si President Duterte has managed to still – and into subvert the norms of everyday Philippine expectations of what a politician should be like. Of a certain decorum that you should have in office. But, people still follow him. So in that sense, I would say he’s charismatic he’s an officemate his name is [R.] tapos I think he’s charismatic because he’s always the guy we assign as the MC. We always assign him as the person that leads our training programs, recessesions, whenever may pagusap. And whenever he delivers those particular events, people are always laughing, people are always engaged in what he’s saying even though yun nga it’s a boring topic or it’s a topic you wouldn’t find fun <i>Alright. Let’s change track a little bit. When do you feel most charismatic?</i> Myself? I don’t. [laughs]. Parang I don’t think naman I am. <i>Okay, why would you say that?</i> Ewan ko the best I get is parang sunny and lively ako in a room. Na I lighten things up. Or parang madali akong kausap. Parang I don’t think that amounts exactly to charismatic. Parang, I don’t feel like I have an appeal or influence ako on others to that effect. Parang madali lang ako mag infiltrate I guess. In friend groups. But not really dominating it with charm. <i>When I asked who do you find charismatic, what was going on in your mind</i> Parang I was thinking of examples of people na I was drawn to personally. For example, the thing I do every morning is to check Politics ng reddit to see if Bernie Sanders is still in the race. And he’s the first person that came up. <i>And what about when I asked you who do you NOT find charismatic. What was going on in your mind?</i> I was thinking of people I disliked. Na parang people that had the opposite effect. People I didn’t want to think about anymore. Na repulsive ganun.
P6	[Note: various figures are evaluated as charismatic in whether they show patience, or is ‘mabait’ as judged by the participant]
P7	[Note: charisma is largely thought of as hypocritical preaching by the participant]
P8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If you want to win people’s hearts and minds, you have to be convincing and committing to the cause. Not just the big speeches, like taking a speech and then that’s it. [Miriam Defensor Santiago is] notable, as in she points out ... people who take up the government, and the likes. There’s a lot corruption. Actually she is charismatic. And also convincing some points. Charisma is like, if you want to be a good leader, you gotta have some good speech, you gotta have good convincing speeches and commitment for the cause.
P9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bigger the crowd, the more charismatic I am. Parang, the bigger the crowd, the bigger the playground, so to speak. I go large, I go big. And, I always bank on my ability to engage

	<p>with a particular group of people, and – or I can always tailor fit what I’m about to say, how I carry myself to fit the needs of a particular group of people and allow them to carry the mood for everyone else. So it’s like hacking the group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tony Meloto... very charismatic speaker, very effective one. He can even make some seemingly objectionable statements agreeabl • Ani Almario has power in the weight of her words. So two very different ways of carrying themselves and showing their charisma and engaging or controlling the mood of the audience, capturing the attention of the crowd. They do it in very different ways. All related to the words that they say, the stories that they tell. So they capture the attention of the audience through stories. Stories that are believable. And address a subconscious need for you to be affirmed of something. To be part of something bigger. That’s what they are able to do. Antonio Meloto and Ani Almario whenever they speak it’s like they’re inviting you to be part of something big – so much bigger than yourself and that you can actually make a difference. That you can actually contribute to that bigger cause. • <i>For example when I asked you when do you feel most charismatic, what was going on in your mind?</i> Hmm. Thoughts immediately flashed to events where I was able to successfully engage. But it also made me remember some embarrassing failures. I tend to remember
P10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charisma kasi for me its a descriptor – of an action to provoke reaction. So it’s a double edged-blade. It could be good or bad, but it’s relative... To create what’s the term, not to create eh, but to be – I forgot about the term eh – [pause], to get an effect or to affect. So usually the execution of charisma is through conversations – connecting with another human being • But Brother Mike kasi understands what he’s selling. Also embodies it. Both edged blade. But he uses charisma, like clockwork. Production. Yun yung kumbaga, I know what my service will be, but he’s the main driver of using him as a center point of charisma to attract more followers • [Duterte is polairizing] But if people don’t like you, that’s charisma!
P11	[Note: figures are evaluated as charismatic in whether the interaction of the figure with other individuals are warm and approachable]
P12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At some point I would have said that this guy has really a good charisma, I would thought of that. Cause I really like how he was speaking, you know he had this parang personal magnetism. I would say that, yeah • I did do a live broadcast after listening to Devon’s talk and I just had to share. Yung enthusiasm niya sort of like rubbed off me and did a live on Facebook which I do a lot of. And did share a bunch of his message. I think for me, yun nga, the charisma of people – I feel like they change how you feel about yourself, and how you feel about life. And I feel like it’s a gift, you know, because you can hear information from anyone – but to be able to come in contact with someone and it changes the way you feel and you • <i>So for example, Vice Ganda, would you say that he’s charismatic</i> Charismatic? Yup, sure. Hundred percent <i>Can you sorry, just give a reason why you think he’s charismatic</i> I would say because of the effect he has on people. Yun lang eh. I will always base it on the results that are showing up in his career, you know, what he has—people like him, people get him for endorsements, he books out shows, he’s a mainstay on primetime show everyday. So, based on results? Yeah • <i>For example when I asked, who do you find charismatic, what was going on in your mind?</i>

	<p>Oh of course pictures of the people that I've experienced in my life that I felt were – that I was attracted to.</p>
P13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should? I guess someone – it's ano eh, it's hard to define it. Cause when someone's charismatic, it's ano eh, it's hmmm. It's not quite just confidence, it's also just not being effusive. It's also not just having presence. I guess it's a combination of all of those things. It's being able to – it's being able to get peoples' attention and to make them want to believe in you? I guess Oh just, I guess I think to myself "would I follow this person? Would I believe in this person? Would I vote for this person?" diba. I guess what my experience to them, do I find them, I guess, did I particularly find them charismatic or was there a point in my life I considered, I don't know <i>What was your thinking that led you to answer what you did, for example your answer was about talking with orgmates. What led you there, what was the thought process then?</i> I guess every time I suppose, when people don't know how to react to what I say or they're weirded out or when they side eye me which is a lot of times. I guess, a lot of times I'm kinda loopy. I guess every time people are weirded out by me, which is a lot of times, I feel least charismatic <i>I'd just like to back a little bit yung sa distinction mo with confidence and charismatic. For you what was the line that made you say, okay i'm confident but I'm not charismatic. What's that line like?</i> Well, like I said, I don't think just because youre confident you'll be charismatic. <i>Why not again?</i> You don't just have to believe in yourself, you have to get other people to believe in you. I'm not sure if I manage to make people believe in me.
P14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who do I find charismatic? [pause], meron ba? Oh ma'am [A.].! <i>Why? For you, what makes this person charismatic</i> She sweeps people off their feet with her experience. Pag nagsasalita siya, napapaintindi niya tapos nahihila ka sa mood niya ba. Although sometimes it's also overwhelming. Ayun, people who can speak their thoughts well and drag you in their mood. It was our stage so we were presenting as a group. Performing as a group, not just presenting. Ayun, charismatic kami. Kasi the audience eyes were on us and grabbed their attention basically, and held it for so long until the end of the presentation Feel ko nga baka namistake ko ang charisma sa confidence. Partially confidence I guess. The ability to pull people into your pace to make them acknowledge – if not like, acknowledge at least- you
P15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Who do you find charismatic?</i> Kris Aquino <i>Kris Aquino, why? For you, what makes her charismatic?</i> It's not necessarily yung actual, physical appearance, but rather the way that they do things. Or the way that they speak, the way that they talk. The way that they act. Parang, it's surprisingly parang there's the element of down-to-earth like you could relate to them but at the same time, parang if you talk to them they could make something more interesting. So even something as simple as an issue could be something as simple as you know, advertising. Ganun. Like you could listen to them talk for days <i>Okay great. When do you feel most charismatic?</i> I don't know. Not sure. Pero probably, it depends on the body language of others. If they're enthralled or if I manage to keep their attention during a talk or if I see that they're understanding, they're nodding, they're smiling, they're agreeing. So it's like "oh okay,

	<p>they're listening to my message, they're okay with me talking in front". Tapos I look at the body language of others if it's clicking with them</p>
P16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • And we saw Martin Nievera [unintelligible] and wow he is so charismatic. <i>Why do say or why do you think he's charismatic</i> Well, he commands the presence of the stage or whatever. Like when he says something, or when he sings you want to listen to him because he makes it engaging, he makes it interesting and you as an audience – and you are also amazed by his talent. But also want to get involved • <i>And what about Keanu Reeves [do you find him charismatic?]</i> Wow, that's interesting cause he doesn't fit – huh. Because he's a really-. Maybe because a charismatic person is really extraverted, but Keanu Reeves is more low-key. But in a way I do agree that he is charismatic – people do listen to him. I guess it's a more soft-spoken kind of charism • What is charisma? It's an ability to get some – in a way it's a special kind of persuasion. It's the ability to get other people to listen to you and take your message to heart. Basically really hear about your message and connect it to other people in a deeper, more personal level
P17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Usually, not all priests, but I find pope Francis to be very charismatic. It's personal noh. I mean I'm not a practicing Christian, Catholic but whenever he says something I tend to listen. Why? Because of how he is as a person at how he practices his beliefs. And charisma kasi for me is not just the way a person talk, but you know a way he sets as an example himself, and what he does. Galing ako Argentina eh, so I really find Evita Peron very charismatic. • So the more charismatic the director is, in my personal point of view and in my experience the more I listen and see what he wants to push through and the better – siyempre maraming factors noh, for example a good director has to be a good listener, a follower et cetera. And in a way kailangan meron siyang certain discipline to show his actors and his staff. But to have that little charm and charisma makes me listen more, and follow more • [Ferdinand Marcos] I think he was in many ways a master of that, through his speaking, through his speeches. Ganun. I'm sure nere-rehearse niya yun hours and hours before he speaks without a manuscript to read. Makikinig ka eh. Yung, “ano tong gagong to” [laughs] • <i>For example, can you guide me through what you were thinking for example when I asked, “who do you find charismatic”? What was going on in your mind?</i> Okay, when you ask these questions I just blurted out what came to mind. So I think yung thought process maikli. But! I think when you asked that question, ang iniisip ko “kanino ba ako nakikinig, sino bang pinapakingan ko, sino ba yung pinapanood ko” ganun <i>And when I asked you, “who do you NOT find charismatic”, what was going on in your mind? What was your thinking like?</i> Ah ganun din, sinong hindi ko pinapakingan? [laughs] Sino yung dinededma ko

APPENDIX I: Responses Regarding Duterte

	<p>Do they find Duterte charismatic? Why/why not?</p> <p><i>Note: passages separated by dashes --- refer to passages taken from different points of the tanungan. Unambiguous affirmation to him being personally seen as charismatic by the participant is highlighted in green. Ambiguous cases have no highlights</i></p>
Participant 1	<p>Before yes, now not anymore</p> <p>Kasi nung simula wala pa masyado siyang ginagawa nun as a president so ang iniisip ng mga tao is yung mga ginawa niya sa Davao and paano siya magsalita. Kung paano siya makitungo sa mga tao, so dun niya nakuha yung mga tao – sa promises. Kung paano isya magsalita na sure siya eh. Na matutulungan niya ang Pilipinas. Jejetski siya papuntang Spratlys. To me hindi siya tunog nagsisinungaling noon. So yun</p>
Participant 2	<p>No</p> <p>Because lahat ng sinasabi niya ay against my values. Like, very disrespectful to women. And then you know naman his stance against yung mga NPA, yung killings. So I'm sure sa sinasabi pa lang niya hindi talaga ako maniniwala</p>
Participant 3	<p>Yes</p> <p>Kasi siya lang yung politiko na parang hindi conventional type na he doesn't care kung may masagasaan siya. Katulad ngayon yung ABS-CBN binabangga niya.</p>
Participant 4	<p>Yes in some ways</p> <p>Yeah. In some ways. Ang ayaw ko lang talaga, kasi ayaw ko – nasanay tayo, kahit tayo pobre lang sanay tayo yung tao na nagsasalita ng maayos. Maging powerful ka man or hindi, alam mo yun. Tinuruan tayo na maging courteous, respectful sa pananlita maging maliit ka man or malaki ka. Serious siya sa pagtulong and sa kanyang trabaho pero ayoko nung, yang hambog bitaw? Kung 100% ako noon, ng hambog siya bam nag 0 pud siya. Diba? Nakakawalang ano. Diba, magsalita nalang, tumahimik nalang siya dapat. Kasi nasira eh. Nasira mo na, ganyan ka pala, talagang dismayado. Pero andiyan yung kanyang will to serve, nasa bloodstream na talaga nila yun. Pero presidency yan eh, di yan mayor! Oh my god, nakakahiya! Nakakahiya naman</p>
Participant 5	<p>Yes</p> <p>Si President Duterte has managed to still – and into subvert the norms of everyday Philippine expectations of what a politician should be like. Of a certain decorum that you should have in office. But, people still follow him. So in that sense, I would say he's charismatic</p>
Participant 6	<p>Depends on situation</p> <p>Si President Duterte, parang ano siya, kumbaga, bargas. Sa iskwatter term, bargas. Bargas means kahit saan pwede siya, mapadiplomatic pwede, mapagaguhan – alam mo yun pwede siyang isabak dun. Nagfifit siya kahit saan</p>
Participant 7	<p>Yes</p> <p>Lalo na yun. Super siguro ng charisma. Super siguro siya charismatic. Kasi magaling siya mag preach</p>

Participant 8	-
	-
Participant 9	Yes is exciting – I don't like him, but he's exciting. I mean I don't hate him [laughs], personality-wise he is charismatic even if I don't agree with his personality and fifty percent of his politics.
Participant 10	Yes Lets say, let's not go far away, Duterte is charismatic. The question here is, is it good charisma or is it bad charisma. It's not supposed to be relative. But for him, he is aware that he has a certain charisma, on how we define it, I don't know. [laughs]. On managing, he utilizes it, not effectively as say, but utilizes it as a tool. Not as a – kasi conscious siya, conscious siya that he has charisma, in terms of management he can use it as a double edged blade. He can efficiently use it, or he can just utilize it – he can just pull it out anytime that he wants it. --- But if people don't like you, that's charisma!
Participant 11	No Uhm, I don't know, parang does not care about the people kasi eh. He doesn't care about – ayun basically he does not care.
Participant 12	No I think, it'll take – he grows on you. Let's call it that way. Personally I don't know if I could . would call him charismatic. I don't find him charismatic. But I do find him just very blunt, you know?
Participant 13	No I don't know, everything that comes out of her mouth are lies [laughs] or are easily disproven
Participant 14	Yes to followers Duterte is charismatic for the right people. He's charismatic kasi he medyo went against the norms before, like, parang underdog ba yung pagkapresent niya ng sarili niya. And, but argh I hate watching his videos nabibwisit lang ako [laughs]. Yan kasi he makes it relatable to those – easily relatable naman kasi yung pinagagawa niya, right? And in a shortsighted manner it makes sense. Ikaw you cannot be angry at this country, at this people, but then he voices it out and then his words have implications and sometimes actions, he has actions behind it. --- Yeah in a way he's self-spoken.. Nata-transmit agad niya yung meaning, and then he can like even if he cusses – precisely because he cusses nashoshock ka pero you're forced to listen to him and then, [vocal sound] you're shocked after.
Participant 15	Yes I guess there's different types of charisma now that you think about it. Like charisma is presented in two different behaviors, by different people. Like there's people who are charismatic without talking. People who are charismatic when they start talking. And people who are long-term charismatic and people who are short-term charismatic. Not necessarily a good thing, na parang, someone can be charismatic but people still won't like them... [Duterte is a] Short term charismatic
Participant 16	No I find him really crass. In the sense that he's offensive to other people. And other people find him charismatic, but I find him super uncharismatic. "Oh he's charismatic, we connect to that", but to me, he doesn't connect to other people. So he's not that charismatic to me. And yun nga, binabastos niya yung ibang tao. Even like the way he carries himself, he doesn't put – he doesn't attend meetings, he's tired. He gives the impression he doesn't want to be there. Kasi other people [unintelligible] ---

	Because of perceived sincerity. When you look at Duterte he doesn't fit -. Especially looking at the previous administration, he doesn't look like a typical politician. He keeps saying simpleng tao lang siya, mayor lang siya. So people feel like he's sincere because he's like them
Participant 17	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes. Yes. Yes. Kasi he managed to speak... kanto? You know, salitang kanto. Alam mo marami akong kaibigan sa squatter eh, lumaki ako beside the squatters [location redacted]. Marami, lahat yan barkada ko, kaya pag naglalakad ako diyan, okay lang. And yung mga manginginom, ganun siya magsalita. [laughs]. You know, and he managed to use that in his favor. That and the tough guy image. And oo, nagagamit niya. That's why people listen. I mean look at – sabihin natin 20% nun DDS, yung mga naglalalike, mga nagheheart. But the other percentage? Mataas pa rin ah! Bakit, kasi he's charismatic.</p> <p>----</p> <p>And yet si Duterte ang pangit magsalita and people still find him charismatic</p>

APPENDIX J: Other theoretical considerations

Visibility of link between individuals and effects. Another theoretical consideration for charismatic attribution may be the question of the *visibility* of the link between individuals and the production of charisplananda. Two individuals may be equally effective say in changing a peer's behavior, but if one does so in a more visible way, that connects influence to him, personally, then it would seem that that person would be perceived as more charismatic. Further, the visibility of this link between individuals and effects may also lie in the visibility of effects *on the perceiver itself* - that is, the link towards the figure and effects-on-perceiver seems more weighty than effects-on-others. Further studies of charismatic attribution can be made that more explicitly inquire into this visibility link.

It is also important to note the implications of charismatic attribution as a predominantly effects-based appraisal; and not primarily a trait- or behavior-based appraisal. This implies that effects are appraised first and then abilities/actions as a way to explain, contextualize or coincide with these effects. That is, if there are successful outcomes, and if this seem to generalize across situations then there is an inference towards an ability; the opposite doesn't seem to be the case where ability is looked at first then processed whether this ability produces a successful outcome. Why does this matter? Because the effects-first process implies that who is processed as charismatic does not necessarily get to those with the abilities and have the actions (i.e., those who deliver well, or show malasakit etc.) but don't get to have successful outcomes.

Social Distance. Shamir (1995) hypothesize that there may be a fundamental difference between charismatic attribution of socially close and socially distant leaders. Unlike the current study which does not limit the relations to the figures, Shamir (1995) focuses particularly on leadership. Does social distance matter? Figures that were socially close to the participants (friends, families, workmates, bosses or generally someone that they have interacted with) tend to have, if not by much, lengthier and more detailed descriptions rather than socially distant figures including both Filipino and international public figures. A handful of international figures were also cited to be charismatic based on what other people have said about them, for example Maria thinks the Canadian Prime Minister is charismatic because *“Not [so much about Justin Trudeau] but what people think about him, or what people say about it. Kasi wala masyado in the news but yung parang comments sa news na he takes care of people, he communicates, he*

interacts, listens carefully and therefore responds”. However, at present it’s doubtful whether these are due social distance per se, or just a function of the participants’ familiarity with the figure. Gideon and Yael for example, do give detailed accounts of international figures they find charismatic: Pope Francis⁷¹ and Dean Karnazes⁷² respectively, seemingly because they are familiar with their lives and work. However, there is no fundamental difference in the aspect that generally, for both socially close and socially distant figures, the focus is on the effects that they have – and that the charismatic attribution process generally follows an effects-based appraisal outline in the previous section.

⁷¹ “I mean I’m not a practicing Christian, Catholic but whenever he says something I tend to listen. Why? Because of how he is as a person at how he practices his beliefs. And charisma kasi for me is not just the way a person talk, but you know a way he sets as an example himself, and what he does... Do you remember there was a time that he kneeled in front of women and washed their feet? Naalala mo yun? There’s a certain charm you know, a compelling charm, that makes me, not really devoted to him but inspires me to yeah listen – not to be devoted, but to listen and stop and just look at him and listen. Things like that” (Gideon)

⁷² “You can look him up, he’s an ultramarathoner. Ayon, that guy. I borrowed a lot from that guy. He’s an ultramarathoner, and he claims that he discovered his love of running by accident. So he told a story. But it’s a spin – because what he doesn’t tell you in that narrative is that he has a background of already being an athlete. So when he started running by accident, he was already very physically capable. But the way he delivers the story makes it seem that anyone can just pick it up, tie up your shoes and start running what, for 10 hours, 15 hours. So may ganun eh. It’s what you leave out – it’s what you leave out that actually captures the attention. Or rather, makes people believe. The parts that you leave out makes it more plausible, noh. And in some ways it can work, kasi it takes away fire. But it can also be a great disservice, because you might create false expectations.” (Yael)