

Do Emergent Leaders Speak Transformational Language: A Study of the Language and Non-Verbal Behavior of Donald Trump and Senator Ted Cruz Announcement for Candidacy Speeches

**Charles Salter
Schreiner University**

**Diana Hargrove
Our Lady of the Lake University**

**Phyllis A. Duncan
Our Lady of the Lake University**

**Dan Coleman
Schreiner University**

**Mark Woodhull
Schreiner University**

This study investigated the leadership language found in the initial running for president announcement speeches of Donald Trump and Senator Ted Cruz. This study with the utilization of quantitative content text analysis software, as well as the objective decoding of the facial expressions of the candidates as measured by the Facial Meaning Sensitivity Test (Lethers & English, 1980) will render a greater understanding of the political process. These findings are more empirically based than relying solely on the qualitative viewpoints of the media. The fundamental purpose of the study was to explore the theoretical impact of leadership verbal and limited non-verbal behavior in the candidates in order to infer meaning to their ability to garner their party's nomination. Approximately, 400 respondents were asked to participate in this study, by going on to a class website and reviewing the operational definitions and the variables as well as given websites to review the announcement speeches and the running total of the issues under review concerning the two candidates. This investigation compared the different usages of transformational, transactional, passive, economic issues, domestic issues, and self-history communications used by both candidates in what some pundits exhort is the most important speech in the candidates' campaign.

INTRODUCTION

Many political pundits have suggested that the 2016 run for the Presidency of the United States is a historical one. For the first time a woman, Hillary Clinton, was named as a candidate for a major political party, the Democratic Party. And the candidate who battled her to the Democratic Convention, Bernie

Sanders, was for the first time a professed Socialist running for a major party's nomination (NBC News Political Unit and Meet the Press, 2016). Also, there was a heavy support in the Republican Party for candidates outside the mainstream of the party. The two to battle deep into the nomination process were the subject of this research. Senator Ted Cruz, originally a Tea Party Candidate for Senator from the state of Texas, and Donald Trump, a billionaire business man, are both not what one would label a mainstream Republican (NBC News Political Unit and Meet the Press, 2016). In summary, all candidates with one notable exception, Hillary Clinton, are considered to be outside the mainstream of their political parties. What is most interesting here is that a crevasse of political views from socialism to very conservative pure free market system ideals are represented by the candidates in the two traditional Democratic and Republican Parties. These candidates advocacy for a socialistic form of economy and others for a pure free market system could not be further opposites in terms of governmental attitude and process. There are many questions that need answering here, however as of this research the Republican convention has transpired allowing us a winning candidate, Donald Trump. Therefore, in this research we are focusing on the oratory behaviors expressed by Senator Ted Cruz and Donald Trump on the first occasion of announcing for candidacy to run for President of the United States.

Effective leadership has been discussed and outlined throughout history. Burns (1978) discusses Plato's description of the ideal leader as a Philosopher-King, a leader who acted in the best interest of his subjects. Kennedy (1994) states that Cicero recognized that an effective leader orator was most powerful when communicating to his constituency. Northouse (2001) defines leadership as the ability of an individual to influences others towards achieving common goals.

Historically, leadership has been studied from many perspectives, leader' traits, leader' behavior, leader' situation, follower' maturity level, and follower' characteristics. Mann (1959) and Stogdill (1948) looked at characteristics or traits which effective leaders possessed. However, soon researchers recognized the inadequacy of trait theories to explain adroit leadership, which led to investigation of situational variables which might affect a leader's situational match to effectively lead (Fiedler, 1967) or which require a change in behavior in order to be effective (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969). As the ability to influence is the manifest skill in leadership, investigators turned then to the social powers individual's exercise as leaders over their constituents (French & Raven, 1959). These researchers suggested that leaders influence constituents using five social powers. They along with Kellerman (2008) asserted a leader's strength of influence over a follower is given by the follower's acceptance of the leader. In the absence of the follower's acceptance of the leader, the leader's legitimate power is thwarted and the leader is less effective. The social powers associated with French and Raven's (1959) research has by some considered the foundational components of transformational and transactional leadership (Barbuto, Fritz, & Matkin, 2001).

Comprehending the necessity of follower willingness to allow the leader to influence them has lead to studies on follower' personality, motivations, and needs as important to leader' effectiveness. Acknowledgement of the follower as an important component in effective leadership has resulted in research on follower' traits (Salter, Green, & Ree, 2006; Felfe & Schyns, 2006), needs (Salter, Green, Hodgson, & Joyner, 2013), expectations, (Green, Salter, Duncan, & Chavez, 2012) spirituality and moral development (Green, Salter, Chavez, & Garza-Ortiz, 2010; Salter, Harris, Woodhull, & Coleman, 2015). Continued research on the follower has centered around follower' perceptions, communicative behavior, and values. (Lord & Maher, 1990; Lord, DeVader, & Alliger, 1986; Lord, 1985; Calder, 1977; Graen & Cashman 1975; and Lord, 1977).

In the past some of these researchers have studied the speeches of Obama and Clinton as they vied for the Democratic nomination for President of the United States in 2008. This research investigates the communicative behaviors of two Republican candidates, Donald Trump and Ted Cruz, as they make what many pundits refer to as the most important speech of their campaign nomination (NBC News Political Unit and Meet the Press, 2016), the initial campaign announcement. As important as these speeches were in the past today technology increases the importance as candidates' initial campaign announcements are archived and easily viewed by millions of potential followers. This study specifically studies through content analyses t

More recently Bass and Avolio (1994) researched leadership from the Full Range Leadership Model, which included the transformational leadership behaviors of inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, idealized influence or charisma, and individual consideration, transactional leadership behaviors, and passive leadership behaviors. Studying these leadership behaviors as a dyadic relationship, or a set of communications between the leader and the follower's implicit expectations, suggests that a leader's behavior is evident in his or her communication to followers and that leadership is best understood from a communication verbal and non-verbal perspective (Hackman & Johnson, 2001). Clutterback and Hirst (2002). Johnson, Vinson, Hackman, and Hardin (1989) and Caroselli (2005) found that an effective transformational leader predicate a willingness to communicate and a skill as an effective communicator. Other researchers tell us that effective communicators are purveyors of meaning who use analogy and metaphor to illuminate in the follower a vision of some future preferred state. Further research on communication and transformational leadership (Burlison, 1987; Flauto, 1999) suggests a leader with a well-developed system of personal communication can understand listeners' needs and concerns more readily, and formulate communications which more directly interest the follower. Burlison (1987) gave these communicator leaders the moniker, *highly differentiated communicators*. Sypher (1981), Sypher and Zorn (1986), and Zorn (1991) found that leaders who were considered highly differentiated communicators were considered more effective by their superiors, were promoted throughout their organizations more readily and were considered transformational leaders. Other research on communication and leadership emergence and effectiveness has led researchers to sequester leader emergence into categories associated with shorter and longer social interactions. Riggio, Riggio, Salinas, and Cole (2003) found that in groups of shorter interaction time, leader emergence was defined by the amount of words an individual spoke, confirming the research of (Johnson, Vinson, Hackman, & Hardin, 1989). The finding that those who emerge as leaders of groups display a willingness to communicate is referred to by Bass (1990) as the babble hypothesis. These same researchers did find, however, that in situations which required more intricate decision making it was not only the willingness to communicate but also the quality of the communication which affected leader emergence

DeSteno, Petty, Rucker, Wegener, and Braverman (2004), and Bass (1985) suggest that persuasion and the stimulation of higher mental processes in the follower are more manifest and effective when garnered within the bounds of emotional communications. Additionally, Kennedy (1994) emphasizes the importance of emotional communications by quoting Marcus Tullius Cicero as saying, "...for everyone knows that the power of the orator is most manifest in dealing with people's feelings, when he is stirring them to anger or to hatred and resentment, or is calling them back from these same emotions to mildness and compassion..." (DeSteno et al., 2004, p. 3515).

In the past some of these researchers have studied the speeches of Obama and Clinton as they vied for the Democratic nomination for President of the United States in 2008. This research investigates the communicative behaviors of two Republican candidates, Donald Trump and Ted Cruz, and studies how these emergent leaders employ communicative behaviors to attract constituent support.

Language of Leadership and Politics

The leadership qualities of politicians have been hotly debated for a long time. Neustadt (1991) and Denning (2007) state while individuals attribute different styles of leadership to their presidents these attribution are based on images of the office rather than reality and a successful politician one who achieved election and reelection do not necessarily exercise leadership qualities in getting elected. Instead Denning (2007) states that a politician to be elected has to be well funded, be willing to exhibit their determination, be flexible, be ambiguous about their willingness to change things, and pursue issues which are of concern to the electorate. Politics and the art of being elected has been the source of study for some time (Freeman, 2012), and as Cicero suggested over 2000 years ago, every candidate must know how to make lots of promises without becoming excessively distracted by the absolute certainty he will fail to meet most of them. Cicero goes on saying if the political hopeful does not offer promises to the constituency, the outcome is certain he/she will not be elected. Once elected, broken promises are often forgotten in a mist of transformation, so electorate anger and disappointment is at a minimum.

Not until 2008 had engrained prejudices eroded sufficiently enough for the country to elect the first African American president. Also, in 2016 the first female ran a competitive race for president. It was not until 1960, that our first Irish Catholic president was elected. Besides these listed prejudices, there are these influencing factors in the nomination process: health, age, finances, family connections, and family life, all of these are factors which effect the nomination of someone for president (Edwards & Wayne, 2003).

Researchers have studied political speeches surrounding crises and have suggested leadership language expressing optimism, collective support or affiliation, and direction are more prevalent during times of societal tragedy (Kelloway & Barling, 2000; George, 2006; Bass, 1990) and suggest that a leader's ability to give constituents a feeling of identity or affiliation in times of crisis is an element of transformational leadership. Other investigations suggest that a transforming leader expresses an urgency for change, describes an intriguing vision, and reinforces initial communications for change which model the desired actions (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Kotter 1996; Bass & Riggio 2006; and Denning 2007).

Content Analyses

A content analysis is an objective and quantitative analysis of communications either from spoken or written language Neuendorf (2002). The purpose of a content analysis is to study trends of language from which one can infer meaning or purpose from the communication (Krippendorff & Brock, 2009). Content analysis has been used to study behaviors and communications from newspapers, magazines, speeches, and even face to face interactions for many years in order to find meaning within the text (Krippendorff, 2004). Colorado State (2010) in a content analysis words are grouped into smaller parts and then studies using cognitive and communication investigation.

In this study computer-assisted analysis was employed to assess all word units and phrases which were then counted and placed in a topical subject, if applicable. Using the Key Word in Context in the computer, words and phrases can be analyzed for their intent of usage. Those words placed in a topical subject sorting produce meaning units and then compared to themes associated with the communication. The inference of the meaning units are discerned in this case by over 300 respondents who acted as coders disseminating inferences in the communications.

Non-Verbal Communication and Leadership

There is a severe poverty of research on the non-verbal communications of leaders and their determinants of understanding to followers (Bonaccio, O'Reilly, O'Sullivan, & Chiochio, 2016). Over the years the importance of non-verbal communicators and the additional value added in communications has been expressed by a number of researchers (Davitz, 1969; Birdwhistell, 1970; Philpot, 1983; Newton & Burgoon, 1990; Westman & Wautier, 1994; Leathers, 1997). Leather and Emigh (1980) studied the functional uses of non-verbal in conveying meaning within social and societal communications. Their findings state that non-verbal communication are major among the determinants of meaning in personal communications, that feelings and emotions are more easily conveyed non-verbally than by word syntax. Other findings on non-verbal communications suggests they are relatively free of deception, have a meta-communicative effect when combined with the language of the initiator, non-verbal behavior is more efficient as a communication tool, and ideas and emotions are more effectively communicated non-verbally. In this study we will look at what (Bonaccio et al, 2016) refer to as Kinesics, a sub-category of non-verbal communication. Kinesics concerns itself with facial, voice, and bodily expressions which convey meaning to an audience. Ekman and Friesen (1969) and Vrij (2006) state that non-verbal facial expressions make it difficult for communicator to deceive and are hard to suppress. Therefore, in this study we are only concerned with the facial expressions of the candidate as measured by the Facial Meaning Sensitivity Test (Leathers & Emigh, 1980). A cursory discussion of other non-verbal Kinesics will be included if appropriate.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The choice and the usage of words by a politician may be considered a window into the leadership style the political leader might employ when in office. In recent political history constituents cast their ballot without regard to a leader's style or even what they communicate. Salter, Green, Ree, Carmody-Bubb, and Duncan (2009) suggests a "halo effect" exists in politics. Members of the same political party have a tendency to view the language of the leaders of that party more transformational than those who are not members of that party and voters are more concerned with a politician's image instead of their leadership style (George, 2006).

Purpose of the Study

This study investigated the leadership language found in the initial running for president announcement speeches of Donald Trump and Senator Ted Cruz. This study with the utilization of quantitative content text analysis software, as well as the objective decoding of the facial expressions of the candidates as measured by the *Facial Meaning Sensitivity Test* (Lethers & English, 1980) will render a greater understanding of the political process. These findings are more empirically based than relying solely on the qualitative viewpoints of the media. The fundamental purpose of the study was to explore the theoretical impact of leadership verbal and limited non-verbal behavior in the candidates in order to infer meaning to their ability to garner their party's nomination.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Approximately, 400 respondents were asked to participate in this study, by going on to a class website and reviewing the operational definitions and the variables as well as given websites to review the announcement speeches and the running total of the issues under review concerning the two candidates. Participants were a convenience sample drawn from three universities in South Texas. From those 400 there were 373 fully operational ratings of the speeches of the two candidates, which made for a 93% response rate. The sample consisted of 62% female, 38% male, with a mean age of 29 years, 65% graduate students and 35% undergraduate students.

Operational Definitions for Dependent Variables

The operational definitions for transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and passive leadership were implemented by using custom dictionaries formulated by the researchers and published in a prior work (Hargrove, Duncan, Green, Salter, & Trayhan, 2011). Neuendorf (2002) states a custom dictionary is a set of units of words utilized to research texts. Researchers delineated specific issues associated with frequent themes discussed in the candidate's speeches. NBC News Political Unit and Meet the Press (2015) indicate through exit polls that the main issues concerning the electorate concerning the 2016 campaign for President were: 1) economic issues, 2) domestic issues, and self-history issues discussed by the candidates in their announcement speeches. As defined economic issues include discussed issues concerned with the United States Economy, in association with the economies of the European Union and other pertinent economies in the world. Included in the definition of the world view of the economy are those trade threats linked to terror and designed to disrupt trade and tourism in the world. Domestic issues were defined as issues concerning unemployment, inflation, issues concerning the domestic economy unilaterally, as well as terrorists concerns related to a concern for the welfare of United States citizens at home. The self-history issues the candidates posits is analogous to: where they came from, who their parents are or were, what their past work experiences, what challenges they may have faced, their qualifications, as well as those things for their family members were is also an important topic in an announcement to run for office speech.

The following dictionaries were created from exit polls taken by the pundits mentioned earlier: transformational language, transactional language, passive language, economic issues themes, domestic issues themes and self-history issues themes.

In their non-verbal communications the facial expressions of each candidate while giving their announcement speeches were noted and timed for duration of expression. The *Facial Meaning Sensitivity Test* (Leathers & Emigh, 1980) was utilized to decode the facial expressions of the candidates and the duration of the facial expressions were tabulated.

Procedure

Insch, Moore, and Murphy, (1997), Krippendorff, (2004), Neuendorf, (2002), and Weber (1990) indicate that a content analysis should state a set of procedures common in scientific methodology. Initially researchers reviewed the speeches to discern research questions and components. Then rationales were formulized as a resource for why a theme or construct would be included in the communication. These steps were followed by a search for availability of each candidate's initial announcement of running for president speech revealed a verified and reliable source of each candidate's speech. Computer analysis allows time-efficient detailed study of texts and for this reason the unit of study in this analysis was word units as discussed by (Insch, Moore, & Murphy, 1997).

Research questions, theories, and constructs were formulated from the classification of units of words into categories. The Full Range of Leadership Model (Bass, 1985) was the basis for defining the characteristics of leadership language. Prior to the examination of the texts, dictionaries of the model's components, transformational, transactional, and passive leader' language were created using single classification with each word placed in the category of leadership it best describes as proposed by (Saldivar Hodgson, 2007). Each category was reviewed to assess the face validity, or correspondence between the concept definitions and the category definitions, of the words assigned to reflect the concept. As proposed by Insch, Moore, and Murphy, (1997) each category was reviewed to assess the face validity or the concept and category definitions and as Weber (1990) suggests the researchers to ensure validity examined the keywords segregated in each category to ensure a conceptual congruence. Respondents were instructed to review the leadership dictionaries compiled by the researchers and the announcement speeches of each candidate, Ted Cruz and Donald Trump, Participants were then asked to tally the transformational, transactional, and passive language in those speeches using researcher' published dictionaries.

The candidate's non-verbal facial expressions were analyzed using the *Facial Meaning Sensitivity Test* (FMST) (Leathers & Emigh, 1980). Leathers (1997) established the validity of the FMST in years of associated facial non-verbal research. As respondents viewed the speeches from the online source mentioned earlier they were asked to simply review what facial expressions the candidates were using according to the FMST mentioned above, keeping a running tally of how long each candidate engaged a certain identifiable facial expression.

Repeated iterations concerning mean usage and ANOVA were used to develop statistical significance of between the candidate and usage of language overall and by topical issues. Considering that there are no known or expected means associated with the candidate's enduring facial expressions Chi Square Analyses were conducted on the available non-verbal behaviors.

RESULTS

This research investigated the relationship between Republican presidential candidates and the percentage of transformational language, transactional language, and passive language, utilized in their first announcement speeches when controlling for the subject matter of the speech: domestic affairs issues, economic issues, and candidate's self-history description. A non-verbal content measured the percentage of time each candidate's facial expression was measured into one of Leathers (1997) ten facial meanings: disgust, happiness, interest, sadness, bewilderment, contempt, surprise, anger, determination, and fear.

This content analysis used an Analysis of Variance, mean frequencies, and Pearson correlation to address the research questions. The study consisted of 1(speech), the first announcement speech communicated by Senator Ted Cruz on May 23, 2015, and the first announcement speech communicated by Donald Trump on June 16, 2015. Senator Cruz’s speech contained 2,481 word units, and lasted for approximately 31 minutes, while Donald Trump’s speech contained 6,778 word units and last approximately 51 minutes in length. Both speeches were attained from *YouTube* at the following websites:

Trump’s <http://youtube.com/watch?V=xUW2-MUbnbo> and Senator Cruz’s <http://youtube.com/watch?VON9H1SHL6Pg>.

Research Question 1: Transformational

The first research question asked if there was a difference in the percentage of transformational language used by Senator Ted Cruz and Donald Trump in their running for President Announcement Speeches.

Initially an ANOVA was conducted to see if any significant difference existed in the use of transformational language throughout the entirety of the speech given by the two candidates. This analysis revealed a significant main effect for the usage of transformational language by each candidate, $F(1, 372) = 79.58, p < .00$.

To further understand the use of transformational language by each candidate throughout the entirety of the speeches, the mean frequencies were compared. Ted Cruz used a greater percentage ($M = 4.18\%$) of transformational words than Donald Trump ($M = 3.08\%$). These results indicate that Ted Cruz utilized significantly more transformational words in his speech overall than Donald Trump.

Investigating the effect that one of the defined topics of interest to the electorate more readily elicited transformational language from the candidate we performed an ANOVA and a mean analysis by topic on the candidates’ usage of transformational language. The results indicated that there was a significant effect for the usage of transformational speech by candidate for the topics concerning domestic affairs $F(1, 372) = 37.63, p < .00$, economic issues $F(1, 372) = 667.87, p < .00$, and self-history issues, $F(1, 372) = 15.94, p < .00$.

As shown in Table 1, the study compared the usage of transformational language by candidate by investigating any difference in the mean frequencies as computed. Senator Cruz’s usage of transformational language when discussing domestic affairs issues showed a mean usage of ($M = 3.76\%$), while Donald Trump used transformational language discussing domestic issues with a ($M = 3.09\%$), a mean usage of ($M = 4.5\%$) for Ted Cruz concerning economic issues and for Trump ($M = 1.98\%$), and a mean usage of ($M = 3.94\%$) for Ted Cruz when discussing self-history issues versus a mean usage for Trump of ($M = 3.55$). In summary, Senator Cruz utilized significantly more transformational words throughout his speech and significantly more when discussing the aforementioned topical issues concerning domestic affairs, economic affairs, and issues concerning their self-history.

**TABLE 1
CANDIDATE’S PERCENTAGE OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LANGUAGE**

% Transformational Language	Trump	Cruz	+ for Candidate
Speech Overall	3.08%	4.18%	Cruz +
Domestic Issues	3.09%	3.76%	Cruz +
Economic Issues	1.98%	4.50%	Cruz +
Self-history	3.55%	3.94%	Cruz +

Research Question 2: Transactional

The second research question asked if there was a difference in the percentage of transactional language used by Senator Ted Cruz and Donald Trump in their announcing for President Campaign speeches.

An ANOVA was conducted to see if any significant difference existed in the use of transactional language throughout the entirety of the speech given by the two candidates. This analysis revealed a significant main effect for the usage of transactional language by each candidate, $F(1, 372) = 1487.59, p < .00$.

To further understand the use of transactional language by each candidate throughout the entirety of the speeches, the mean frequencies were compared. Donald Trump used a greater percentage ($M = 2.51\%$) of transactional words than Ted Cruz ($M = 1.28\%$). These results indicate that Donald Trump utilized significantly more transactional words in his speech overall than Ted Cruz.

Investigating the effect that one of the defined topics of interest to the electorate more readily elicited transactional language from the candidate we performed an ANOVA and a mean analysis by topic on the candidates' usage of transactional language. The results indicated that there was a significant effect for the usage of transactional speech by candidate for the topics concerning domestic affairs $F(1, 372) = 12.49, p < .00$ and economic issues $F(1, 372) = 838.61, p < .00$. There was no significant finding on the candidate's use of transactional language when discussing their self-history.

As shown in Table 2, the study compared the usage of transactional language by candidate by investigating any difference in the mean frequencies as computed. Senator Cruz's usage of transactional language when discussing domestic affairs issues showed a mean usage of

($M = .43\%$), while Donald Trump used transformational language discussing domestic issues with a ($M = .25\%$) and a mean usage of ($M = 2.10\%$) for Ted Cruz concerning economic issues and for Trump ($M = 6.60\%$). There was no significant differences found concerning self-history and transactional language; however the means were ($M = .67\%$) for Donald Trump and ($M = .61\%$) for Senator Cruz.

In summary, Donald Trump utilized significantly more transactional words throughout his speech and significantly more when discussing the aforementioned topical issues concerning economic affairs. However, Senator Cruz used significantly more transactional words when speaking about domestic affairs than Donald Trump. Again, there were no significant findings for transactional language utilization and the topic self-history.

TABLE 2
CANDIDATE'S PERCENTAGE OF TRANSACTIONAL LANGUAGE

% Transactional Language	Trump	Cruz	+ for Candidate
Speech Overall	2.51%	1.28%	Trump +
Domestic Issues	.25%	.43%	Cruz +
Economic Issues	6.60%	2.10%	Trump +
Self-history	.67%	.61%	Cruz +

Research Question 3: Passive

The third research question asks if there was a difference in the percentage of passive language used by Donald Trump and Senator Ted Cruz in their initial announcement of running for the Candidacy of President of the United States.

Another iteration of an ANOVA was conducted to see if any significant difference existed in the use of passive language throughout the entirety of the speech given by the two candidates. This analysis

revealed a significant main effect for the usage of transactional language by each candidate, $F(1, 372) = 1090.51, p < .00$.

To further understand the use of passive language by each candidate throughout the entirety of the speeches, the mean frequencies were compared. Donald Trump used a greater percentage ($M = .37\%$) of passive words than Ted Cruz ($M = .16\%$). These results indicate that Donald Trump utilized significantly more passive words in his speech overall than Ted Cruz.

Investigating the effect that one of the defined topics of interest to the electorate more readily elicited passive language from the candidate, we performed an ANOVA and a mean analysis by topic on the candidates' usage of passive language. The results indicated that there was a significant effect for the usage of passive speech by candidate for the topics concerning domestic affairs $F(1, 372) = 62.54, p < .00$ and discussions concerning the candidate's self-history $F(1, 372) = 56.03, p < .00$. There was no significant finding on the candidate's use of passive language when the topic was economic issues.

Table 3 indicates the difference in passive language and compares the usage of passive language by candidate by investigating any differences in the mean frequencies as computed. Senator Cruz's usage of passive language when discussing domestic affairs issues showed a mean usage of ($M = .03\%$), while Donald Trump used passive language discussing domestic issues with a ($M = .23\%$). When the candidates were discussing economic issues a mean usage of ($M = .28\%$) for Trump and ($M = .30\%$) for Cruz were found non-significant, while passive mean usage of ($M = .03\%$) for Ted Cruz concerning their discussion of self-history issues and for Trump ($M = .22\%$) were found.

TABLE 3
CANDIDATE'S PERCENTAGE OF PASSIVE LANGUAGE

% Passive Language	Trump	Cruz	+ for Candidate
Speech Overall	.37%	.16%	Cruz +
Domestic Issues	.23%	.03%	Cruz +
Economic Issues	.28%	.30%	Trump +
Self-history	.22%	.03%	Cruz +

In summary, Donald Trump utilized significantly more passive words throughout his speech and significantly more when discussing the aforementioned topical issues concerning domestic affairs and self-history issues. No significant findings for the use of passive language utilization and economic issues were present.

Research Question 4: Non-Verbal and Facial Expressions While Presenting the Speech

Table 4 reveals the findings of the studies' examination of the facial expressions employed by the candidates as they delivered these most important speeches.

TABLE 4
CANDIDATE'S NON-VERBAL FACIAL EXPRESSIONS BY PERCENT OF TIME IN EXPRESSION

	Facial Expression	% of time	Chi2	P (2-tails)
Trump	Disgust	76%	6.60	0.03
Cruz	Contempt	55%	4.50	0.05

Table 4 findings suggest that Donald Trump and Senator Ted Cruz spent a significant amount of time conveying disgust and contempt through their facial expressions for the topic or subject in which they were referring. Reviewing the speeches, the significant findings indicating an extended duration of time Trump spends in a disgusted facial expression coincided with transactional or passive language on economic and domestic issues. Senator Cruz's contempt expressions were congruent with his discussion on domestic affairs.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Certainly many variables constitute the citizenry's formulation of their opinions of a political candidate. One of these variables is undoubtedly the style and substance of their communications. In this study we found that Senator Cruz used almost twice as many transformational words in the entirety of this announcement speech than Donald Trump. Gardner (1990) suggests that every leader engages in transformational and transactional leadership, leaders act transactionally when actions or explanations are required and when emotion or increased motivation is required they act transformationally. Some researchers suggest that a Weber (1947), Bass and Avolio (1994), and Bass and Riggio (2006) suggest that a crisis is needed before a transformational leader will emerge. Transactional leadership has been found to produce higher quantitative performance and higher qualitative performance was found under transformational leadership (Hoyt & Blascovich 2003). Transactional leadership is preferred by followers in uncertain times, and transformational leadership gives aid to followers in distress by describing a vision of brighter times (Cavanaugh, Gelles, Civielo, & Zahner, 2008; Bass, 2008; Katz, 1977; and Bass & Riggio, 2006). These findings argue leaders should communicate transformational language to enhance relationships and directive transactional language to ensure task performance, in order to satisfy follower's needs.

This study found that Trump utilized more than twice the number of transactional words than was used by Cruz. Directive leadership or Transactional language, which gives people the steps with which they might accomplish what they envision builds confidence in a better future (Barone, 2008). This researcher even suggests that a leader's calm demeanor, a term used to express the non-verbal communications of the leader, will help abate the fear of his or her followers. Trump explained what needed to be done. In fact he gave transactional and explicit examples of what he would do given certain irregularities in the economy. The greatest percentage of his facial expressions of anger were present when he was describing his perceived inadequacy with the way the present government was handling economic concerns.

In her book, *The Times of Our Lives*, Peggy Noonan (2015), speech writer for Ronald Reagan and now a columnist for the *Wall Street Journal* comments on Nietzsche's rules for communicators. According to Noonan (2015) Nietzsche stated that the first thing the speech maker should endeavor to do is to give life to the topic through explicit facial expressions and appropriate gestures. This analysis revealed that Cruz used more imagery and less direction, while Trump used some transformative language but much more directive or transactional language. Also, while Cruz used facial expressions of anger or disgust he also displayed happiness and sadness much more of the time than Trump. Kellerman (2008) states that followers allow leaders to lead. This is most certainly true concerning elected officials. Simply put if followers do not feel the leader is experiencing the same degree of emotion or if a leader conveys a mixed message either in word or behavior, or if a leader makes little effort to fully explain in transactional language any transforming vision, followers might be suspect of their true intentions, talents, and or abilities.

Further investigation of the topics and contexts of discussion in both speeches reveals that one of the concerns of followers, which is a concern recently displayed in Great Britain by their citizenry's vote to exit the European Union, is a concern over perceived irresponsible immigration. Cruz began his speech by talking about his immigrant parents. Their immigration story was his first topic and while conveying the story he expressed facially a sad expression, which could have resulted in follower cognitive dissonance concerning his stance on the issue. Trump was definitive on immigration using transactional

language, build a wall. Another contextual observation was that Cruz's initial announcement speech was given at Liberty University in Virginia. The stage where the speech was given was a round one, with the audience on all sides of the stage, in front in back, on the sides. Cruz spent approximately 46% of the time with his back or profile only toward the camera recording the speech. While it is understandable that he did not want to ignore those in the audience, his major consideration should have been the television audience. After all this was a speech announcing to the American public that he was running for president, not just those students at Liberty University. Trump was always facing the camera and speaking directly to the camera audience. Ed Sullivan (1963) was once asked why he thought the Beatles were so successful and popular after visiting his show in 1963. His answer was that while John Lennon sang to the fans inside the auditorium, Paul McCartney sang to the camera so that all the fans in America felt part of the performance.

Another aspect of the reference to Nietzsche's rules for communicators is that the speaker's style should indicate that he or she truly believes in what they are saying. Orators should convey how they feel about their topic. Cruz appeared to be completely scripted in his address, cool under complete control, never drifted from the script, however that coolness might have been construed as a lack of passion. Trump's passion came through in his words and red face and scowl, the audience did not doubt that he was full of desire and passion for the topic. Also, Trump's speech was much longer than Cruz's, 6,788 words versus 2,481 words for Cruz. Trump appears many times to speak extraneously, he appears to go off topic and outside his prepared remarks; this too expresses his belief and passion in what he is saying.

The last contextual observation and reference to Nietzsche and his rules for communicators is that a good speech maker wants to come close to stepping close to poetry in use of language, but never stepping into it. Cruz begins his speech with the word "Imagine." "Imagine," he says, "having an opportunity to enter this country as an immigrant and find your children running for President of the United States," and so on. Many of those listening might have beckoned back to John Lennon's song *Imagine*, which indirectly or directly and perhaps to this audience subliminally that belief in a religion is one of the causes of war. John Lennon's *Imagine* was a beautiful poem, whether one agrees with or disagrees with the song writer's sentiments.

Lastly, one of the things mentioned in earlier research is that people emerge as leaders of groups by showing their willingness to communicate, (Hackman & Johnson, 2001). Trump's speech last a little over 50 minutes in duration while Cruz's lasted about 28 minutes. Trump entertained comments from the audience; there were no comments from Cruz's audience.

Utilizing content analysis as a quantitative evaluative tool, this study, considered the language used in the campaign announcement speeches of Donald Trump and Senator Ted Cruz. The goal was to determine their leadership style as conveyed by word and behavior and perhaps further explain the election results or effectiveness of each speech. This investigation compared the different usages of transformational, transactional, passive, economic issues, domestic issues, and self-history communications used by both candidates in what some pundits exhort is the most important speech in the candidates' campaign.

Directions for Future Research

The communications of effective leaders, whether emergent as in this case of study or whether leadership in a private firm, are important in order to garner proficient ways to communicate to followers. Many misunderstandings in communication led ineffectively to loss of resources, relationships, or viability. Studying effective communication procedures, whether in politicians or corporate leaders, can only aid in an ability to lead more effectively.

The readily available internet in concert with video processing tools could aid future researchers in a journey of investigation, which incorporates analysis of communication behaviors, could give illuminations into the effective leadership styles of political candidates. Other communication behaviors which should be investigated reside in even richer behaviors such as: posture, eye movement, pace and vocal tone, and storytelling. The research could potentially provide the critical thinking voter additional information to assess the leadership style of the candidate. It could also be used by followers to better

assess and understand leaders' directives and metaphorical speech, which aids in faster more efficient communication.

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited to one speech of varying words in two political campaigns. While announcement speeches should be carefully fabricated by the politician and as one researcher stated, should be the most important speech of the campaign, the limitation of variables associated with studying only two speeches is obvious. Another obvious limiting factor is that even though content analysis using computer-aided software is a frequently used research tool researchers are the definers of the concepts to quantify and how to quantify through researcher fabricated dictionaries, leaving the study open to validity challenges. Also, the Full Range Leadership Model (Bass, 1995) language dictionaries were fabricated and delineated by the researchers. Another concern is that only the language associated with economic, domestic, and self-history issues, discussed by the candidates, were analyzed by this research.

Lastly, this investigation made no attempt to address other mitigating variables which might have affected the political outcomes associated with these initial announcement speeches. In any emergent leader situation, there are subliminal and environmental contexts which effect leader choice. Many of these variables emanate from the individual follower, such as the amount the individual allows the aforementioned "halo effect" to influence them. Also in play in influence are any prejudice towards a leader based on unfounded bias would also be of concern.

REFERENCES

- Barone, M. (2008, Nov. 9). Obama's temperament, not policy, triumphs. *The Detroit News*. Available at <http://www.detroitnews.com/apps/>
- Barbuto, J. E., Jr., Fritz, S. M., & Matkin, G. S. (2001). Leaders' bases of social power and anticipation of target's resistance as predictors of transactional and transformational leadership. *Psychological Reports*, 89, 663-666.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Shatter the glass ceiling: Women may make better managers. *Human Resource Management*, 33(4), 549-560.
- Bass, (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, Research, and managerial applications*, (4th ed.), New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B., & Riggio, R. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategy for taking charge*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Birdwhistell, R. L. (1970). *Kinesics and Context*. Philadelphia, PA: Pennsylvania University Press.
- Bonaccio, S., O'Reilly, J., Sullivan, S., & Chiochio, F. (2016). Nonverbal Behavior and Communication in the Workplace: A review and agenda for research. *Journal of Management*, 42(5), 1044-1074.
- Burleson, B. R. (1987). Cognitive complexity and person-centered communication: A review of methods, findings, and explanations. In J. C. McCroskey & J. A. Daly (Eds.). *Personality and interpersonal communication* (pp. 305-349). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, New York: Harper
- Caroseli, M. (2005). *The language of leadership*. Amherst, MA: HRD Press.
- Colorado State University. (2010). *Writing guides: Content analysis*. Retrieved from <http://writing.colostate.edu/guides/research/content/pop2a.cfm>
- Clutterback, D., & Hirst, S. (2002). Leadership communication: A status report. *Journal of Communication Management*, 6, 351-354.
- Davitz, J. R. (1969). *The Language of Emotion*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

- Denning, S. (2007). *The secret language of leadership: How leaders inspire action through narrative*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- DeSteno, D., Petty, R. E., Rucker, D. D., Wegener, D. T., & Braverman, J. (2004). Discrete emotions and persuasion: The role of emotion-induced expectancies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 86*, 3514-3536.
- Edwards, G. C., III, & Wayne, S. J. (2003). *Presidential leadership: Politics and policy making*, (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1969). The repertoire of nonverbal behavior: Categories, origins, usage, and coding. *Semiotica, 1*, p. 49-98.
- Felfe, J., & Schyns, B. (2006). Personality and the perception of transformational leadership: The impact of extraversion, neuroticism, personal need for structure, and occupational self-efficacy. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36*, 708-739.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Flauto, F. J. (1999). Walking the talk: The relationship between leadership and communication competence. *The Journal of Leadership Studies, 6*, 86-89.
- Freeman, P. (2012). *How to Win an Election: An ancient guide for modern politicians*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Gardner, J. N. (1990). *On leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- George, B. (2006, October 30). Truly authentic leadership. *U. S. News & World Report*. Retrieved October 12, 2008, from http://www.usnews.com/usnews/news/articles/061022/30authentic_print.htm.
- Graen, G., & Cashman, J. F. (1975). A role-making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership frontiers* (pp. 143-165). Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.
- Green, M., Salter, C., Chavez, E., & Garza-Ortiz, D. (2010). Leader's spirituality: How followers correlate spirituality with leadership practice. *Paper delivered at the Southwest Academy of Management Conference in Dallas March 4th*.
- Green, M., Salter, C., Duncan, P., & Chavez, E. (2012). The educated worker: Expectations of leadership. *Journal of Leadership Accountability and Ethics, 9* (6), 94-113.
- Hackman, M. Z., & Johnson, C. E. (2001). *Leadership: A communication perspective*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Hargrove, D., Duncan, P., Green, M., Salter, C., & Trayhan, J. (2011). *Obama versus Clinton: A study exploring the impact of leadership language*, Diversity, Conflict, and Leadership, 15, (pp. 95-117). New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Press.
- Hart, R. P. (2002). *Campaign talk: Why elections are good for us*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Life-cycle theory of leadership. *Training and Development Journal, 23*, 26-34.
- Hoyt, C. L., & Blascovich, J. (2003). Transformational and transactional leadership in virtual and physical environments. *Small Group Research, 34*(6), 678-715.
- Insch, G. S., Moore, J. E., & Murphy, L. D. (1997). Content analysis in leadership research: Examples, procedures, and suggestions for future use. *Leadership Quarterly, 8*(1), 1-25.
- Johnson, C., Vinson, L., Hackman, M., & Hardin, T. (1989). The effects of an instructor's use of hesitation forms on student ratings of quality, recommendations to hire, and lecture listening. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 3*, 32-43.
- Katz, R. (1977). The influence of group conflict on leadership effectiveness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 20*(2), 265-286.
- Kellerman, B. (2008). *Followership*. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business Press.

- Kelloway, E. J., & Barling, J. (2000). Knowledge Word as Organizational Behavior. *International Journal of Management Review*, 2(3), p. 287-304.
- Kennedy, G. A. (1994). *A new history of classical rhetoric*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston, MA. Harvard Business School Press.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krippendorff, K., & Bock, M. (2009). *The content analysis reader*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Leathers, D., & Emigh, T. (1980). Decoding Facial Expressions: A new test with decoding norms. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 66(4), 418-436.
- Leathers, D. (1997). *Successful Nonverbal Communication: Principles and Applications*. Needham, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Lord, R. (1977). Functional leadership behavior: Measurement and relation to social power and leadership perceptions. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, 402-410.
- Lord, R. (1985). An information processing approach to social perceptions, leadership, and behavioral measurement in organizations. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (pp.87-128). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Lord, R., & Maher, K. (1990). Perceptions of leadership and their implications in organizations. In J. S. Carroll (Ed.), *Applied social psychology and organizational settings* (pp. 129-154). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Lord, R., De Vader, C., & Alliger, G. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 402-410.
- Mann, R. D. (1959). A review of the relationship between personality and performance in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56, 241-270.
- NBC News Political Unit and Meet the Press – 2016 batch of announcements to date (n.d.). Retrieved July 25, 2016, from <http://nbcnews.com>.
- Newton, D. A., & Burgoon, J. K. (1990). The use and consequences of verbal influence strategies during interpersonal disagreements. *Human Communication Research*, 16, 477-518.
- Neuendorf, K. A. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Neustadt, R. E. (1991). *Presidential power and the modern presidents: The politics of leadership from Roosevelt to Reagan*. New York: Free Press.
- Noonan, P. (2015). *The Time of our Lives*. New York, NY: Twelve.
- Northouse, P. (2001). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Philpot, J. S. (1983). The relative contribution to meaning of verbal and nonverbal channels of communication: A metaanalysis. Unpublished Master's Thesis: University of Nebraska.
- Riggio, R. E., Riggio, H. R., Salinas, C., & Cole, E. J. (2003). The role of social and emotional communication skills in leader emergence and effectiveness. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 7, 83-103.
- Saldivar Hodgson, M. N. (2007). A content analysis of leadership language in selected speeches communicated by America's First Ladies Hillary Rodham Clinton and Laura Welch Bush. (Doctoral dissertation, Our Lady of the Lake University, 2007). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 69(04). (UMI No. 3309537)
- Salter, C. R., Green, M., & Ree, M. (2006, April). *A study of the relationship between follower' personality and leadership ratings of George W. Bush*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association on Personality and Patriotism.
- Salter, C. R., Green, M., Ree, M., Carmody-Bubb, M., & Duncan, P. A. (2009). A study of follower's personality, implicit leadership perceptions, and leadership ratings. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 2(4), 48-60.

- Salter, C., Green, M., Hodgson, M., & Joyner, N. (2013). The language of transformational leaders: Communicating to the needs of followers. *The Journal of American Academy of Business*, 19(1), 60-68.
- Salter, C. R., Harris, M. H., Woodhull, M., & Coleman, D. A. (2015). Study of respondent's virtual social interaction, leadership style and moral development. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, 12(4), 161-172.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *The Journal of Psychology*, 25, 35-71.
- Sullivan, E. (1963). www.edsullivan.com/the-beatles-american-debut, retrieved August 3, 2016.
- Vrij, A. (2006). Nonverbal communication and deception. In V. Manusov & M. Patterson (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Nonverbal Communication*, p. 341-359, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organizations*. (T. Parsons, Trans.). New York: Free Press. (Original work published in 1924).
- Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic content analysis* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Westman, A. S., & Wautier, G. (1994). Early and autobiographical memories are mostly nonverbal and their development is more likely continuous than discrete. *Psychological Reports*, 74, 656-666.