

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF ARMENIA

THE TRAITS AND SKILLS OF EFFECTIVE POLITICAL LEADERS

**A MASTER'S ESSAY SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF
POLITICAL SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
FOR PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS**

BY

MARIA AMARYAN

YEREVAN, ARMENIA

NOVEMBER 2005

SIGNATURE PAGE

Dr. Michael Conrad

Faculty Advisor

Date

Dr. Lucig Danielian

Dean

Date

American University of Armenia

November 2005

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to the School of Political Science and International Affairs for providing me with valuable skills and abilities and broadening the scope of my knowledge. Moral and ethical political leadership is the topic of real interest for me, which influenced me to choose this field of investigation. As it was mentioned in the research on traits and skills of effective political leaders, skills and experience increase with the rise of difficulties and challenges. I am very grateful to my advisor, Dr. Michael Conrad, because he could combine together my field of interest, skills/abilities and match them with the task difficulty, which is critical for the improvement of skills and knowledge.

The experience that I got from working on this Master's Essay is priceless. Starting from researching materials till the end was not an easy process, but, at the same time, the process was very satisfying. This was also the experience that I got from life: Dr. Conrad provided me with his own expertise and experience in the field of leadership. I am very grateful to my advisor because he motivated and inspired me to work very hard, which gave me increased self-confidence to accomplish the task in a superior manner.

**Maria Amaryan
American University of Armenia 2005
School of Political Science and International Affairs**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	3
Abstract.....	5
Introduction.....	6
Literature review.....	11
Analyses.....	35
Conclusion.....	51
References.....	58

ABSTRACT

This thesis aims to investigate the relationship between personality traits and skills and effective political leadership. Therefore, it was hypothesized that:

1. Personality has a role to play in explaining leader behavior and leader effectiveness;
2. Skills of political leaders also contribute to their effectiveness; and
3. Culture influences leadership, and, therefore, effective leadership styles and practices in one culture are not necessarily effective in others.

Summarizing the studies on leadership effectiveness that were reviewed, support for all the hypotheses is found. Indeed, personality traits have a significant influence on political leadership. For example, it is found that self-esteem is one of the most important traits that a leader should have. Also, it is desirable for a leader to be charismatic, but this trait is not necessary in all situations. With respect to skills, it is concluded that communication, problem solving, and negotiation are among the most important skills for effective political leadership. Also, it should be pointed out the style of effective political leadership will vary according to the situation in which the leader finds himself/herself. Finally, it is concluded that country culture can have a major effect on the style of leadership exhibited by a person. For example, it would be expected that an effective Russian leader would behave in an authoritarian manner. Conversely, an effective Scandinavian political leader would most likely exhibit a participative style.

It is concluded that the best way to “test” a leader is by looking at his/her performance over time in different situations, since it is not advisable to use personality tests to measure political leaders’ traits of leaders before they enter office. Furthermore, political leaders’ skills can develop over time, but it is not clear what is the most effective way to accomplish this development. In today’s world, one of the biggest obstacles to leadership effectiveness is leaders’ unethical attitudes and behavior in many countries (both developed and undeveloped). Finally, it is concluded that, in the short run, a charismatic/revolutionary type of a leader is necessary to bring about needed changes in certain countries. But, in the long-run, societies themselves bear a significant responsibility to not passively accept unethical leader behavior.

Introduction

In today's complex and rapidly-changing world, it has become impossible to rely on a traditional approach to rule a country and its people in general. Nowadays, as never before, there is more need for strong, effective leaders. For example, among the dangers facing the world today, the threat of terrorism has become more than obvious during the last several years. After the terrorist attacks on the USA, Russia, and other countries, people in the world understood that for a country it is not enough to be strong physically (e. g., military defense). Today it is also necessary to pay attention also to who rules the country--what kind of personality he/she has and what his/her values and motives are. The current situation in the world is a big challenge for the leadership. More than ever before, leaders have to lead in complex, uncertain, and risky conditions and it is likely these conditions will become more uncertain in the future. The traditional, old style of leading in politics, when the situation was more predictable, cannot work now in the new context.

The dilemma of leadership (how to differentiate among the leaders) confronts the governments of all nation-states now. There is a great need in moral, ethical leadership—leadership in edification. Being an effective leader in politics means to serve the interests of people. Candidates for power must declare and demonstrate their commitment to these interests in order to convince the constituencies that they can perform their leadership roles appropriately. This will require an ability to recognize the situation and the possible consequences deriving from it. In other words, this will require strategic thinking.

Books alone cannot provide this awareness. Leaders must be inspirational and idealistic in order to communicate their goals and desires to people. They must have a vision and the capacity to transform that vision into reality. In order to reach this goal, modern leaders must have a strong belief in themselves and in people. It is necessary to take measured risks and also to encourage followers to take similar risks. These are some of the personality traits

which are essential for the leader to be effective. But the question is: How to recognize and differentiate between the candidates for leadership whose desire is to serve their egoistic needs and the people who devote their lives for the benefit of a society? The “situation” can be the answer to the question, because only in difficult situations is there a great need in a leader’s potential (personality traits, skills, motives, desires, emotions, feelings).

Very often, life puts complex, unpredictable challenges before countries and their leaders. The way the leader is able to overcome difficulties and influence people effectively depends on what personality traits he has, how skillful and experienced he is, and how ready he is for a particular situation. For example, the two 2005 hurricanes in Louisiana (USA), Katrina and Rita, demonstrated political leaders’ inability to deal with complex situations in a timely manner. This can be explained by the fact that the American political officials were not ready for such problems, partly due to the situation (e.g., government bureaucracy) and partly due to the leadership style (e.g., inability to handle a crisis).

The damage from the hurricanes can also lead to a significant political change. State officials are sure that, because of the loss of population in Louisiana, the state will lose a Congressional seat. This can change the state’s balance between races and parties and, therefore, affect the principle of representation.

Another example of wrong, ineffective political behavior is the recent naming recently of Harriet E. Miers to the U.S. Supreme Court by President Bush. As Stevenson (2005) indicates, the criticism towards Bush is that he chooses “cronies” to work in the government rather than highly qualified people. When people from Bush’s administration defend this choice by saying that in 10 years Ms. Miers will have proven to be a “great appointment”, the natural question is: Why should people wait for 10 years? An easier and more efficient way would be to select a true judicial professional for this critical position.

The reason for this Supreme Court choice is that the administration of the American President has a lot of problems: diminished political support because of the war in Iraq, high gasoline prices and the failure of Mr. Bush's push to overhaul Social Security, and the last failure—inability to predict and overcome the damages from hurricanes. All of this forced Bush to select a person who showed her loyalty to the President during a long period of time, and who will support him in any case. So, Bush puts a high priority on loyalty rather than whether the person possesses the appropriate qualities for the job.

These two examples of ineffective political behavior show how important it is to have effective leadership in politics, and what the consequences can there be if there is a lack of it. It is not an easy task to differentiate between leaders. Much research has been conducted since the 1940s and researchers continue to investigate the issue of leadership till now. As Burns (1978) mentioned, "Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth" (Fernandez 2004, 197 quoted in Burns 1978, 3). Leadership is a subject that has long excited interest among people. The term connotes images of powerful and dynamic individuals who command victorious armies, direct corporate empires, or shape the course of nations. Brave and clever leaders are the plot of many legends and myths. Much of our description of history is the story of military, political, religious, and social leaders who were credited or blamed for important historical events.

Questions about leadership have long been a subject of speculation, but actual research on leadership did not begin until the twentieth century. The focus of much of the research has been on the determinants of leadership effectiveness. Social scientists have attempted to discover which traits, abilities, behaviors, sources of power, or aspects of the situation determine how well a leader is able to influence followers and accomplish group objectives. Why some people emerge as leaders and what factors determine the way a leader acts are

other important questions that have been investigated. However, the predominant concern has been leadership effectiveness.

Researchers usually define leadership according to their individual perspectives and the aspects of the phenomenon of most interest to them. As Yukl (2002) quoted in Stogdill (1974), “there are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept.” (Yukl 2002, 2). Leadership has been defined in terms of traits, behaviors, influence, interaction patterns, role relationships, and the occupation of an administrative position.

According to Nystedt (1997), in a historic perspective, the focus of leadership research has changed from time to time. From the beginning of the 20th century to the end of 1940 the major assumption was that leaders possessed universal characteristics that turned them into leaders. Accordingly, research centered on the identification of traits associated with great leadership. By contrast, from the late 1940s up to 1960 research focused on what leaders did rather than who the successful leaders were.

Research emanating from Ohio State University and The University of Michigan identified two leadership-style dimensions: behavior directed towards task accomplishment and behavior focusing on interpersonal relations. From the late 1960s to 1980, research was dominated by the view that effectiveness of leadership depends on the interaction between a leadership style and a situation. This contingency view emphasizes the idea that leadership cannot be understood without considering the situational context in which a leader operates.

In leader-behavior theories, personality and trait psychology have had only a minor role to play. The theories describe such behavior as involving a leader-follower exchange relationship, with the leader providing support, direction and reinforcement. However, the leadership theories developed in the 1980s, which focused on charismatic, transformational, and visionary leadership behavior, attribute importance, both explicitly (with high degree of

preciseness) and implicitly (supposedly), to personality traits. Leadership theorists concerned with charismatic leadership suggest that traits help to predict how a leader behaves, and also which leaders will be the most effective.

Despite the absence of a broad and common theoretical framework for the interpretation of results and the methodological shortcomings of most studies, theorists and researchers in the leadership arena increasingly recognize that personality may have a role to play in explaining leader behavior and leader effectiveness. As Nystedt (1997) mentions, personality traits offer some insight into why people seek leadership positions. They also help to explain why a person acts the way he/she does when in a leadership position. Personality does matter, but its importance relative to other factors of leadership depends on the nature of the situation.

As was mentioned above, the situation in politics represents a big challenge for political leaders. The well-being of a country and society depends on how political leaders will find ways to overcome complex situations. That is why, in contemporary democracies, there is a need for a better understanding of the nature of political leadership. According to Finlayson (2002), the way in which techniques of image construction and media representation have led to an attempted intimacy between the figure of the leader and the audience, or the imagined person, is fundamental. Non-rational aspects of political appeal which, being hard to measure, are often ignored or downplayed by political science. However, these non-rational aspects are some of the most important aspects of a political skill. For example, such a personality trait as charisma is one of the most valuable, non-rational aspects of politics:

Many people can collaborate on the development of policy and, no doubt, there are many others who can manage a ministry, keeping on top of staff and workload in order to ‘deliver’. But the charisma that Weber famously identified as one of the three central sources of authority is not granted to everyone and to none for all of time. It is a skill that can be cultivated and enhanced and one that is essential (if not, itself, sufficient) for securing consent to long-term shifts in ideology or programme. (Finlayson 2002, 586).

As a whole, with the changing situation in the world, it is clear that the approach to political leadership and the political leadership itself should be changed. What was considered acceptable in previous times cannot work now. Political leaders must be effective and strong enough to overcome difficulties of their time. The challenging task is to differentiate the effective leaders from the ineffective ones. As it was mentioned above, most studies in leadership arena show that personality traits and skills do matter and have an influence on leader behavior and effectiveness. So, this means that further investigation of political leaders' traits and skills will offer some insight into the complicated issue of leadership and help to make a right choice of a political leader.

Literature review

As was already mentioned, leadership has been studied in different ways, depending on a researcher's methodological preferences and the definition of leadership. Most researchers deal only with one narrow aspect of the leadership, and as a result, most studies fall into distinct lines of research. The various lines of research include leader traits, behavior, power and influence, and situational approaches. In recent years there has been an increased effort to cut across and integrate these approaches. The best example is some of the research on charismatic leadership.

Another basis for differentiating theories is the relative focus on the leader or follower. For many years, the research focused on leader characteristics, and followers were studied only as the object of leader influence. Some progress is being made in that direction.

As Yukl (2002) mentions, leadership theories can be classified as prescriptive versus descriptive, according to the emphasis on "what should be" rather than on "what occurs now". "A final basis for differentiation (universal versus contingency) is the extent to which a

theory describes leadership processes and relationships that are essentially the same in all situations rather than the ones that vary in specified ways across situations.” (Yukl 2002, 19).

This literature review will be based on descriptions of a several studies on leadership, which are more relevant to this research, starting from 1940s until the present time.

Stogdill (1948) represents an overview of the studies in which an attempt has been made to determine leaders’ traits and characteristics. The factors which have been found to be associated with leadership could all be classified under the general headings of capacity, achievement, responsibility, participation, and status. What Stogdill (1948) concluded was that a person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits. It is not difficult to find persons who are leaders (that is, to identify leaders solely by their personality traits found to be effective). It is quite another matter to place these persons in different situations where they will be able to function as leaders.

Burke (1965), based on the studies of Stogdill (1948), Gibb (1954), Carter (1956), and other researchers, attempted to test the notion that leadership is a function of leader’s personality, follower’s personality, and the leadership situation. According to the author (Burke 1965), a “trait theory” of leadership does not explain the entire picture. However, leader traits or attributes must not be overlooked in developing an adequate theory of leadership.

Kirkpatrick et al. (1991) supported the same idea that traits alone are not sufficient for success—they are only preconditions. Leaders must take certain actions to be successful. However, as Kirkpatrick et al. (1991) mention, it is not right to say that leaders are ordinary people who happened to be in the right place at the right time. “Maybe the place matters, but it takes a special kind of person to master the challenges of opportunity.” (Kirkpatrick et al. 1991, 81).

The importance of personality traits was also mentioned by George (1974) in his review of the study of Barber (1972) The Presidential Character: Predicting Performance in the White House. George (1974) mentions that personal motives and needs aroused by a particular situation may serve to alert the individual to perceive the opportunities presented by that situation. The possibility of gratifying these personal needs may also help to energize the individual to meet a difficult role and situational requirements. As a result, personality factors may facilitate and improve the performance of role requirements. As George (1974) implies, the study of Barber adds new support to the thesis that various facets of personality can have an important effect on performance of presidential duties and the use of presidential powers, and can sometimes make a real difference in terms of political outcomes.

Describing perspectives on effective leadership behavior, Yukl (1985) identifies that investigating a leader's behavior may help to analyze complex events and understand them better. However, it is important to remember that every person considers behavior as "right or wrong" in accordance with his/her own perceptions. This means that studying behavior is arbitrary and has no validity (when the meaning correlates exactly with the word) in any absolute sense. So, Yukl's (1985) advice is that in both questionnaire and observational research it is essential to be flexible about the behavior constructs used in analyzing the patterns of leadership behavior, rather than assuming that we already know what constructs will be the most useful.

In recent years, the leadership traits have also been investigated by Hughes et al. (2002). They examined the relationships between personality traits, personality types, intelligence, and emotional intelligence with leadership success. In general, all of these attributes can help a leader to influence a group to accomplish its goals, but in and of themselves they are no guarantee of leadership success. "Oftentimes the situation will dictate which personality

traits, components of intelligence, or emotional intelligence attributes will positively affect a leader's ability to influence a group.” (Hughes et al. 2002, 201).

The importance of such a personality characteristic as self-esteem and its influence on decision making within political institutions has been emphasized by Gibson (1981). According to Gibson (1981), the centrality of self conceptions in the psychological matrix suggests that if any theory of political psychology is to make a contribution to the understanding of political behavior, it is likely that theories of self-esteem will do so. The ways in which individuals evaluate themselves is so fundamental that a wide array of political and non-political behaviors may be affected. For example, willingness to take innovative positions on legal issues may, because of the judge's risk, require a high level of self-esteem.

The observation of leadership styles, which are closely connected with leaders' personality traits, and the results that they bring was presented by Potter (1979). Potter (1979) emphasizes the effective leadership that people need and the specific features of character that modern leaders must have. “The kind of leadership our nation needs, as I see it, will require a willingness to speak up, a knowledge of the techniques and processes, abundant amounts of conscience and credibility, healthy doses of courage and ample supplies of tenacity and patience.” (Potter 1979, 182). Potter (1979) also emphasizes the importance of experience. Learning by mistakes is a part of becoming a leader, no matter how many books are read. “It took Winston Churchill 40 years to perfect the leadership skills that ultimately saved Great Britain.” (Potter 1979, 182).

Speaking of the complexity of contemporary situation, Jaworsky (1982) mentions that traditional authoritarian models of the “old style” leadership won't work in this context. The old style—in total control of a predictable closed system—worked in the past, but it will not now. Jaworsky (1982) identifies five ingredients that are key to developing good leadership

in today's environment: a compelling vision; power; authenticity; entrepreneurship; and the ability to transform followers/organizations.

Paying much attention to the leader's image and style, Finlanson (2002) explores some aspects of the leadership style of Tony Blair. The focus is on the ways of how Blair tries to be closer to ordinary people through his style, appearance, and language. As Finlanson (2002) mentions, in contemporary politics, there should be more attention devoted to its non-rational aspects. For example, the leader's charisma, personality characteristics, image, and style are essential contributions to the intimacy between the leader and the people. Modern leaders cannot be the same as the classical ones. They should not to be imposing something on the people, but rather—they must represent people's own will and needs. They require charisma, but that charisma cannot be so exceptional that it highly differentiates them from the people.

Blair's leadership image is affected by these changed conditions. On the one hand, he must appear as more competent and skilled than anyone else, but, on the other, he must appear as "one of us". "Blair's image works to attain a unity between the man and the policies he espouses. They are carried by his conviction, which is carried in turn by his personal testimony. In this process the appearance of ordinariness is central." (Finlanson 2002, 598).

Intelligence, feelings, and charisma among other personality traits were mentioned as important for effective political leadership by Tucker (1977). Trained and sophisticated insight and the capacity to judge situations accurately that comes from experience and intellect, are characteristics of an effective leader and are a particularly vital requisite for leadership in the extremely complex world of today. The possessor of charismatic authority:

...comes forward in a distressful situation and presents himself or herself in a convincing way to the sufferers as one who can lead them out of their distress by virtue of special personal characteristics or formula for salvation may arouse their intense loyalty and enthusiastic willingness to take the path the leader is pointing out. (Tucker 1977, 388).

Tucker (1977) also mentions how important it is for political leadership to be humanistic, to have a compassionate feeling for people, which determines the extent to which the leader's knowledge and powers of intellect become, or fail to become, a force for humanistic leadership. "Without compassion, human sympathy, or emotional identification with the people, a leader's cognitive grasp of the facts will not necessarily cause him or her to define the situation politically as one that should be remedied." (Tucker 1977, 385).

In this regard, Miroff's (1986) article John Adams: Merit, Fame, and Political Leadership is a continuation of the idea about the real merit in politics. "There is a voice within us, which seems to intimate that real merit should govern the world; and that men ought to be respected only in proportion to their talents, virtues, and services." (Miroff 1986, 125 quoted in Adams 1851, 249). As Miroff (1986) pointed out, a contemporary American thinking about political leaders is particularly shallow when it comes to the issues that preoccupied Adams. Little attention is paid to the kind of "talents, virtues, and services" that are to be sought from public actors. Few investigations have been made to distinguish real political merit (that is leaders' self-sacrifices to their mission) from the one that can be easier seen on the surface.

The amount of discussion and research on ethical leadership has continued and even increased during the past several years. In situations where sharing information and interpreting events involve competing values, there are complex ethical issues to be resolved. According to Yukl (1999), conceptions of ethical leadership include nurturing followers, empowering them, and promoting social justice. Ethical leadership includes efforts to encourage ethical behavior and efforts to stop unethical practices in the organization. Such leaders do not foster distrust or play favorites to gain more power or achieve personal objectives.

As Hughes et al. (2002) pointed out, leaders must be judged on the basis of a framework of values, not just in terms of their effectiveness. Leaders represent a moral

example for others, a model for good and bad. Leaders who do not honor the truth themselves do not inspire it in others. Values are developed in different spheres: family, peers, the educational system, religion, media, science and technology, geography, and current events. Although, values can be changed throughout life, they are relatively firmly established by young adulthood. Hughes et al. (2002) introduced the pyramid of building blocks of leadership skills, where values (along with intelligence, personality traits, interests, and goals) are at the bottom. This means that they are the most stable and important; they are the foundation for other attributes of leadership that are less stable and thus more changeable.

The literature on virtue, ethics, and moral character of the leader is linked with the literature on charismatic, transformational leadership. In the 1980s, scientists became very interested in the emotional and symbolic aspects of leadership. These processes help us to understand how leaders influence followers to make self-sacrifices and put the needs of the mission above their materialistic self-interests. The theories of charismatic and transformational leadership describe this important aspect of leadership.

For example, Yukl (1984) identifies charisma as the result of an interactive process between a leader, followers, and the situation. Charismatic leaders arouse enthusiasm and commitment in followers by articulating a compelling vision and increasing follower confidence in achieving it. The attribution of charisma to the leader is more likely if the vision and strategy for attaining it are innovative, if the leader takes personal risks to promote it, and if the strategy appears to be succeeding.

According to Yukl (1984), the theories of transformational and charismatic leadership emphasize that emotional processes are as important as the rational ones, and symbolic actions are as important as instrumental behavior. Yukl (1984) also mentioned that charismatic leaders can have a big influence on an organization, but the consequences are not always positive. The self-orientation of such charismatic leaders makes them insensitive,

manipulative, domineering, impulsive, and defensive. Positive charismatics devote to ideological goals and are more likely to have a beneficial influence on an organization.

Hughes et al. (2002) also emphasized the difference between two types of charismatic leadership--transformational and transactional. All transformational leaders are charismatic, but not all charismatic leaders are transformational. The difference is whether the changes are for the benefit of the leader or the follower. Hughes et al. (2002) also mentioned that charisma is probably more a function of followers' reactions to the leader than of the leader's personal characteristics. If followers do not accept the leader's vision or become emotionally attached to the leader, the leader will not be perceived to be either charismatic or transformational.

The moral aspect of authentic transformational leadership has also been investigated by Bass et al. (1999). They argue that to be truly transformational, leadership must be grounded in moral foundations. The four components of authentic transformational leadership (idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) are contrasted with pseudo-transformational leadership. The criteria for differentiation are: a) leaders' moral character and their concerns for self (pseudo-transformational leaders) and others (transformational leaders); b) the ethical values embedded in the leaders' vision, articulation, and program, which followers can embrace or reject; and c) the morality of the processes of social ethical choices and action.

The morality of transformational leadership has been sharply questioned by some scientists. They complained that it manipulates followers and ignores followers' own interests. However, Bass et al. (1999) argue that rather than being immoral and transformational leadership has become a necessity in the modern world:

Self-aggrandizing, fantasizing, pseudo-transformational leaders can be branded as immoral. But authentic transformational leaders, as moral agents, expand the domain of effective freedom, the horizon of conscience and the scope of altruistic intention. Their actions aim toward noble ends, legitimate means, and fair consequences. Engaged as they are

in the moral uplifting of their followers, in the sharing of mutually rewarding visions of success, and in enabling and empowering them to convert the visions to realities, they should be applauded, not chastised. (Bass et al. 1999, 19).

As was already mentioned, not all charismatic leaders have a positive influence on their followers. Even more, this kind of leaders can damage the interests of the subordinates. Certain amount of research was devoted to the so called “dark side” of leadership. Leaders’ presence is always risky because many of their qualities have both positive and negative face. For example, Conger (1990) considers that when a leader’s behaviors become exaggerated, lose touch with reality, or become vehicles for purely personal gain, they may harm both the leader and the organization. Unsuccessful strategic visions can often be traced to the inclusion of leaders’ personal aims that did not match their constituents’ needs. Highly directive and visionary leaders are often described as extremely autocratic.

An example of a “dark”, overconfident leader is Nazi dictator Adolph Hitler, who believed that he could fight the whole world at once and win, as he had the strongest army in the world in the early 1940s. However, leaders need to know what they are realistically not capable of doing. If they make decisions based on unrealistic confidence in their strengths, their subordinates will suffer and such leaders will probably lose their positions.

According to Manfred et al. (1985), leadership effectiveness and dysfunction can often be explained by another type of the dark side of leadership—the narcissistic dispositions of the leader. The aim of this article is to explore the relationships between narcissism and leadership. For example, it was discovered that, because narcissistic personalities often have strong needs for power and prestige, they are often found in top leadership positions. Manfred et al. (1985) discuss three types of narcissistic orientations beginning with the most pathological one and proceeding toward the more adaptive or functional one. These orientations are reactive, self-deceptive, and constructive. For example, parents’ insensitiveness to the needs of a child can lead to a defective sense of self and not enable

him/her to maintain a stable level of self-esteem. This leads to a search for narcissistic recognition throughout adulthood and generates “reactive” narcissism.

Another aspect of charismatic leadership, such as the attribution of charisma to close and distant leaders, has been investigated by Yagil (1998). The results show that the attribution of charisma to socially close leaders is related to the ascription of extraordinary traits to the leader and to the perception of both the leader as a behavioral model and his/her confidence in the individual. The attribution of charisma to distant leaders was related to the willingness to accept the leader’s ideas, the perceived confidence of the leader in the group, the ascription of extraordinary traits to the leader, and the leader’s general positive impression.

Existing research on charismatic leadership focuses primarily on the traits and behaviors of charismatic leaders and the effects of charismatic leaders on their followers. One issue that has been neglected is the disposition of the followers who form charismatic relationships with their leaders. To investigate this topic, Ehrhart et al. (2001) conducted a laboratory study in which the participants’ values and personality dimensions were used to predict their preferences for charismatic leadership vs. two other leadership styles: relationship-oriented and task-oriented leadership. The goal of this study is to begin to identify the follower characteristics that may differentiate followers most attracted to charismatic leaders from followers most attracted to relationship-oriented or task-oriented leaders. The study suggests that followers differ in their attraction to charismatic and other types of leaders. The more attractive a follower is to a given leader, the more likely the follower will: a) seek to work for that leader, b) be satisfied working with that leader, c) form a leader-follower relationship with that leader, and d) perform well under the supervision of that leader.

An employee who has strong worker participation values and low security values is more likely to seek to work with a charismatic leader than with a task- or relationship-oriented one. In other words, employees who want to be actively involved in making decisions and who do

not require a high degree of stability at work, may, thus, seek to form a charismatic leader-follower relationship. So, the results showed that values and personality were useful in predicting leadership preferences.

Emphasizing the importance of “new”, charismatic transformational theories, Boal (2000) indicates that, by the mid-1980s, there was a shift from “supervisory” (when there was a focus on task- and person-oriented behaviors of leaders and their attempt to provide guidance, support, and feedback to subordinates) toward the study of strategic leadership. The study of strategic leadership focuses on the context that surrounds the conditions, timing, and means of strategic leaders’ actions, and also on the creation of meaning and purpose for the organization. Activities associated with strategic leadership include: a) making strategic decisions; b) creating and communicating a vision of the future; c) developing key competencies and capabilities; d) developing organizational structures, processes, and controls; e) managing multiple constituencies; f) selecting and developing the next generation of leaders; g) sustaining an effective organizational culture; and h) developing ethical value systems into an organization’s culture.

According to Boal (2000), researchers can gain a better understanding of the processes that lead to effective strategic leadership if they focus on its essence and incorporate the new and emerging theories of leadership. Absorptive capacity (capacity to learn from the environment), capacity to change, and managerial wisdom (some features of which have been mentioned above) represent the essence of strategic leadership. Cognitive ability, social intelligence, and behavioral complexity (the ability to cope with diverse situations) of strategic leaders positively affect the essence of strategic leadership. The new theories of leadership (vision, charisma, and transformational leadership) have a positive moderating effect on the above mentioned relationships.

Although traditional leadership theory still has value for understanding leaders in more direct and supervisory situations, charismatic leadership theory is an additional tool for understanding leaders such as those who head large enterprises or nation states, who cannot maintain direct relationships with their followers and who must lead by inspiration rather than by controlling the followers' environment. For example, the role of the president of a country has become more important in the modern world because the situation is less structured now, and leaders cannot rely on traditional rules and procedures. So, if the president's personality represents great importance now, the investigation of his personality profile can bring its outputs in identifying the effective leader. A lot of research has been conducted concerning the U.S. presidency.

For example, Fiol et al. (1999) address the following questions: "Why do charismatic leaders adopt certain behaviors?", "Why do their followers respond in predictable ways to those behaviors?", and "Does the leader/follower interaction generate social change?" Fiol et al. (1999) test empirically theoretical propositions by content-analyzing all the 20th century U.S. presidents' speeches, up to and including Ronald Reagan. The empirical results show that charismatic leaders employ consistent communication strategies for breaking down, moving, and re-aligning norms of their followers. These are the three phases, through which the leaders modify individuals' beliefs and preferences in order to create new values. For example, a charismatic leader must first attempt to reduce the strength of individuals' conventional values and norms (frame-breaking or unfreezing phase). If the current value is the fear of innovation, the leader must neutralize this fear and create non-fear of innovation. Then, in the second phase, leaders must move personal values from a neutral to a more active phase—from non-fear of innovation to fear of non-innovation (which is stronger than the previous one). The third phase includes re-freezing new values. This means that the new vision (innovation) replaces the old values.

Simonton (1981) studied the leadership of the American presidency. In contrast to previous research, in this one the trend has been to move away from the discussion of leadership as a personality trait to the examination of situations and contextual or environmental forces that affect the emergence, exercise, or evaluation of leadership in groups. The outcome of these results is that the assessment of greatness is mostly influenced by largely situational factors (such as the duration of the president's term, the occurrence of an assassination attempt, the number of wartime years) over which the president has little control either by the Constitution or by precedent.

At the same time, Simonton (1981) argues that it is too early to determine the extent to which the predictors of presidential leadership are situational and it will require additional research to discover if some personality traits or other individual differences can be useful for the nature of the presidency. Nonetheless, as Simonton (1981) further indicates, findings show that the individual characteristics (such as family background, formal education, age upon inauguration, prior occupation, and also previous political experience) have been proven totally irrelevant to the prediction of presidential performance.

Among modern studies of charismatic transformational leadership, House et al. (1991) argue that in an age of complexity, change, large enterprises, and nation states, leaders are more important than ever. However, their effectiveness depends on their personality and charisma and not solely on their control over bureaucratic structures. House et al. (1991) used a study of U.S. presidents to test a general model of leader effectiveness that includes leader personality characteristics, charisma, crises, age of the institution headed by the leader, and leader effectiveness. The study demonstrates that personality and charisma do make a difference:

Complexity and change characterize the modern world. Leaders of large enterprises and nation states cannot rely solely on traditional face-to-face encounters, direct supervision, and rules and regulations. Modern organizations need cohesion, inspiration, and basic values. Effective leaders provide this through their own values, their personal example, their

enthusiasm, and their confidence in themselves and in others. They are effective because they are charismatic. (House et al. 1991, 15).

Another investigation of the U.S. presidency was made by Greenstein (2004). Comparing the American presidency with the presidency of other countries, Greenstein (2004) pointed out that the United States government "...is one in which the matter of who occupies the nation's highest office can have profound repercussions." (Greenstein 2004, 2). The role of contemporary presidents has become more independent. Their personality traits, image, style, skills began to play a central role in their effectiveness. "The president became the most visible landmark in the political landscape, virtually standing for the government in the minds of many Americans." (Greenstein 2004, 3). According to Greenstein (2004), each president is a valuable source of knowledge for future presidents and for the people choosing them, as much for his weaknesses as his strengths. It is more beneficial to learn from others' mistakes than to make them yourself.

In this regard, Greenstein (2004) investigated all American presidents on six qualities that relate to presidential job performance: 1) the president's proficiency as a public communicator, 2) the president's organizational capacity (his ability to motivate his colleges and structure their activities effectively), 3) the president's political skill, 4) vision, 5) cognitive style, and 6) emotional intelligence. Having this material about American presidents will give an insight into better performance and the right choice. "The presidency is often described as an office that places superhuman demands on its incumbent. In fact, it is a job for flesh-and-blood human beings, who will be better equipped for their responsibilities if they and those who select them do not begin with a blank slate." (Greenstein 2004, 9).

The relationship of American presidential proactivity (the ability to influence the environment) with charismatic leadership and rated performance has been examined by Deluga (1998). The analyses generally supported the predictions that presidential proactivity would be positively associated with charismatic leadership and rated performance (the more

proactive the president is, the more charismatic and effective he is, and vice versa). In other words, the results are discussed in terms of how proactive features (such as actively identifying situation and opportunities for change) increase the understanding of presidential charismatic leadership and effectiveness. So, the person, his/her behavior, and the environment interact with each other. Thus, American presidents are affected by the situation, but also influence the situation themselves.

According to Deluga (1998), proactivity is an important ingredient of charisma and can contribute to the explanation of behavior. For example, charismatic leaders have extraordinary effects on followers and social systems because their actions are not limited by situational factors and they actively search opportunities. Therefore, the study of leaders' proactivity advances the understanding of charismatic leadership.

Finally, as the proactivity relates to the leader's effectiveness, so personality and charisma do influence his/her performance. That is, charismatic leaders have extraordinary effects on social systems by virtue of their own enthusiasm, self-confidence, and by personal example. All these attributes are combined by the need to directly influence the situation—by the proactive personality.

Studying presidential effectiveness, House et al. (1991) also emphasize the importance of leaders' motives. The major purpose of the study was to extend the work of Winter (1987) and Stewart (1977) by testing the impact of the leadership motive profile on presidential performance. This study has shown that power and an index based on “*not*”s [the measure, which refers to the means by which power is exercised—institutional (for the people) versus personal and radical] appearing in presidential speeches were positively related to presidential performance and that achievement and affiliation were negatively related to presidential performance. This means that, for example, the president who is low on the “*not*”s index favors exercising power through others and through established institutions. The

president who is high on “*not*”s tends to bypass established institutions to take personal action, and, therefore, he/she is more effective.

Winter (1998) developed the idea of motives in politics by investigating President Clinton’s first term and the 1996 presidential campaign. According to Winter (1998), motives are one important element of a personality. They involve patterns of goal-striving and interact with other personality elements such as cognitions, traits, and social context. Achievement, affiliation, and power represent three principal dimensions of motivated behavior. The results showed that Clinton’s motive profile, over the years of his first term and particularly since the 1994 midterm elections, moved away from the “frustration” pattern (achievement greater than power) reminiscent of Wilson, Nixon, and Carter, and toward the “pleasure of politics” pattern (power greater than achievement) that characterized Roosevelt, Truman, Kennedy, and Reagan.

As was mentioned above, leaders’ values, beliefs, and motives have a big influence on their behavior and effectiveness. So, in this case, it would be logical to conclude that, like countries that are different by their cultures (in the core of which are the values, beliefs, motives, and people’s attitudes), the leaders (their behavior, personality traits, values, etc.) must be different across cultures, too. In other words, researchers are interested in whether leadership characteristics are culturally endorsed or they are universal. Research shows that there are both similarities and differences in how the leaders from different countries try to influence their subordinates and what the perceptions of the followers to their leaders are.

Most international research on leadership has focused on Europe, East Asia, the Middle East, and on developing countries such as India, Peru, Chile, and Argentina. For example, according to Kejriwal et al. (2004), the studying of thought processes, beliefs, and attitudes of leaders will have a meaning only if they are viewed as a whole with the cultural attributes of a particular leader. This study explores the personality traits and transformational leaders’

worldview from the Indian cultural perspective. Kejriwal et al. (2004) try to analyze the true nature of personality traits, beliefs, characteristics, values, and behaviors, which are attributable to the Indian culture (and, at the same time, are very similar to universal understanding of transformational leadership). The results show that the leader's awareness, his/her understanding of the contradictions of the world, and belief in the cause-effect chain enhance transformational behavior in a leader, whereas inertness (which is the opposite of the mobility) reduces the same behavior. As Kejriwal et al. (2004) mention, only through the clear understanding of the leader's worldview we can open the secrets of transformational leadership and try to enhance it.

Hartog et al. (1999) emphasize that the most important characteristics of effective leadership vary across cultures. For example, in authoritarian countries, the person in power needs to take a strong decisive action in order to be seen as a leader, whereas in democratic countries, consultation and democratic approach are more preferable. The focus of this research is on leader behaviors and attributes that can be effective or ineffective across cultures, especially when they are related to charismatic/transformational leadership.

The Globe research program (Javidan M. and House R., 2001) introduced here aims to identify universal as well as culturally contingent leadership attributes and behaviors in 60 countries. Attributes associated with charismatic/transformational leadership are expected to be universal because of their approved positiveness (as true, authentic leadership) and their contribution to leader effectiveness. However, as Hartog et al. (1999) mention, despite the universal endorsement of an attribute (the acceptance that the attribute is universal), it will not exclude cultural differences during the usage of an attribute.

For example, US management theories contain a number of characteristics not necessarily shared by other countries. They are the following: a) individualistic rather than collectivistic; b) emphasizing assumption on rationality rather than religion or superstition; c) stated in

terms of individual rather than group incentives, stressing follower responsibilities rather than rights. Hartog et al. (1999) pointed out the existence of theoretical dimensions of cultures, from which many hypothesis regarding cross-cultural differences in leadership derive.

These dimensions of culture are:

- Uncertainty avoidance (the extent to which people are afraid of unknown and complicated situations and create beliefs and institutions that try to avoid them. For example, Germany, Japan, and Spain);
- Power distance (the extent to which people accept or reject the power of authority. The examples are: Mexico, South Korea, and India);
- Masculinity-femininity (a culture in which the dominant values in society are success, money, and things (Germany, Japan)—versus a culture in which the dominant values in society are caring for others and quality of life (Norway);
- Individualism-collectivism (the tendency of people to look after themselves and their immediate family only (USA, Canada, Australia, Denmark, Sweden)—versus the tendency of people to belong to groups or collectives and to look after each other in exchange for loyalty (Indonesia, Pakistan, a number of South American countries).

In this regard, for example, Hartog et al. (1999) noted that transformational leadership emerges more easily and is more effective in collectivistic cultures than in individualistic ones. The centrality of work in life, the high level of group orientation, the high respect for authority and obedience should increase transformational processes. High uncertainty avoidance cultures, with their emphasis on rules, procedures and traditions, may demand leaders not favored in low uncertainty avoidance cultures.

Therefore, it follows that a less negative attitude towards authoritarian leadership (structured, precise, rules-oriented, directive) will likely be found in high power distance societies. The combined results of the major GLOBE study demonstrate that several

attributes reflecting charismatic/transformational leadership are universal. These include: motive arouser, foresight, encouragement, communicativeness, trustworthiness, and motivation. Several other charismatic attributes are perceived as culturally contingent: enthusiastic, risk taking, ambitious, self-effacing, unique, self-sacrificial, sincere, sensitive, compassionate, and willful.

Dorfman (1997) supported the idea provided by Hartog et al. (1999) that, while the phenomenon of leadership is widely considered to be universal, the way in which it is operationalized is usually viewed as culturally specific. Conflicting viewpoints exist in the leadership literature concerning the transferability of specific leader behaviors and processes across cultures. Dorfman (1997) explored these conflicting views for managers and professional workers by empirically testing specific hypotheses which addressed the generalizability of leadership behaviors and processes across five nations in North America and Asia.

The above findings showed cultural universality for three leader behaviors in all five cultures. These are:

- supportive—when leaders show concern for followers and listen their problems
- contingent reward—when leaders show appreciation for followers' good performance and provide recognition and compliments
- charismatic—this leader behavior is emotional in nature and has its most consistent effects on subordinates' satisfaction measures across cultures. Also the findings showed cultural specificity for the remaining three leader behaviors (directive, participative, and contingent punishment—when leaders give negative feedback to their subordinates).

As the results showed, directive leadership has in general shown to be less effective in the United States, Japan, and South Korea. For example, in regard to the US, this can be

explained by the fact that extremely high individualism and low/medium power distance of the U.S. culture, combined with the participative character of leadership neutralizes the effects of leaders' directiveness.

Leadership across cultures has also been investigated by Hodgetts et al. (2003). First, Hodgetts et al. (2003) reviewed the basic philosophic foundation and styles of managerial leadership. Next, they examined leadership in various parts of the world, including Europe, East Asia, the Middle East, and developing countries. Results indicated that, although there will always be important differences in styles of leadership between various parts of the world, participative leadership styles may become more prevalent as countries develop and become economically advanced. This assumption is based on the tendency that appeared in the findings. Particularly, as a whole, the managers from European countries (which are mostly economically advanced) use a participative leadership style (encouraging people to play an active role in their work, highly decentralization of authority). The findings from India and Peru, indicate that the participative leadership style may be more common and more effective in developing countries than it was previously assumed. The reason for this is that many of the more enlightened participative leadership styles used in the United States and other economically advanced countries, such as Japan, serve as an example and have their influence on the developing countries as well as on the emerging Eastern European countries.

Francesco et al. (1998) differentiated countries with democratic and non-democratic government. For example, countries that have had autocratic political regimes and limited experience with democracy, such as Spain, have low expectations for worker participation in organizational decision making. In societies in which there is high power distance between authority figures and subordinates (the willingness of subordinates to accept the unequal distribution of power, which is less communication between the leader and the followers, and

the leader is more directive, not participative), the use of transformational leadership faces limitations. The question is: “What do people of a particular culture value more?” For example, in high-power distance cultures, achievements and self-development are not valued, as they are in the USA. In a high-power distance culture, a participative leader may appear even incompetent because he/she is expected to dominate, rather than to include subordinates in decision-making. Under such circumstances, a leader empowering subordinates, rather than directing them, is unlikely.

Analyzing what has been said so far about the effectiveness of political leaders, it is obvious that leaders’ personality traits (such as charisma, courage, risk taking, honesty, having a vision, and many others), and values/beliefs play the most important role in their success. The questions are: Is it enough for the political leader to have the appropriate personality traits and values to be effective? Can the skills and knowledge contribute somehow to political leaders’ effectiveness? The research in this field shows that leaders’ skills and knowledge do influence the performance of their duties.

Few people would disagree with the proposition that, under certain conditions, leaders have an enormous impact on organizations. Many organizations have, as a result, initiated programs intended to enhance leader performance. According to Yukl (1996), despite the massive volume of formal leadership training that occurs, there has been relatively little research on its effectiveness. Training methods such as behavior role modeling, cases, and simulations appear very promising, but we need to learn more about how to use these techniques for enhancing leadership skills. The importance of learning from experience on the job is widely acknowledged now, and researchers have begun to map the relationships between specific experiences and specific leadership competencies.

A question often asked by researchers and practitioners: How is it possible to develop people to ensure effective leadership? When one considers skills-based theories, a broader set

of theoretical questions comes to mind. Mumford et al. (2000) question whether there is reason to suspect that skills develop as a function of experience. Or, if skills improve as a function of experience, what kinds of experiences exactly contribute to skill increases at different points of leaders' careers? The intent of this article was to examine leadership skills and how they differ across multiple organizational levels as a function of experience in organizational leadership roles.

Mumford et al. (2000) used a cross-sectional design to assess differences in leadership skills across six grade levels of officers in the U.S. Army. Increased levels of knowledge, problem-solving skills, systems skills, and social skills were found at higher-grade levels. Certain skills and experiences, however, were found to be particularly important at certain phases of leaders' careers.

The study of Crewson et al. (1997) uses a survey of city managers to show how the skills and knowledge needs of public administrators evolve as they gain experience, migrate from smaller jurisdictions, and interact with differing political environments. As results show, early-career public administrators and those from smaller jurisdictions are more likely to experience a need for the science of administration, while those later in their careers and in larger jurisdictions are more likely to see the art of administration as a dominant skill.

According to Hughes et al. (2002), both education and experience can contribute to leader development by enhancing his/her ability to reflect on and analyze leadership situations. Exposure to formal leadership education programs can help to develop thinking frames or multiple perspectives to analyze leadership situations, and the people whom leaders work with and the task itself can also provide with insights on how to be a better leader. However, what leaders gain from any leadership program or experience is a function of what they make of it. Successful leaders are those who have "an extraordinary tenacity in extracting something worthwhile from their experience and in seeking experiences rich in opportunities

for growth.” (Hughes et al. 2002, 75 quoted from McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison 1998, 122).

Fernandez (2004) is among the latest investigators of effective leadership who tried to combine the skills of political leaders with their personality traits, and the situation (such as favorable conditions or task difficulty) into a model called the integrative framework. Fernandez (2004) pays much attention to public sector leadership. As Fernandez (2004) mentions, the mainstream leadership literature has exhibited a shift toward synthesis and the development of integrated models since the 1990s. Such attempts are largely lacking in the public sector literature.

Fernandez (2004) implies that all these characteristics mentioned above are correlated with each other. Specifically, skills and abilities had to match the task at hand and had to be complemented by favorable conditions (favorable public opinion, political support, and public demand). Political, managerial, and leadership skills and experience, technical expertise, managerial style, and personality--all help to make leaders be more effective. However, leaders are most effective when they also receive strong political support, have the appropriate resources, and are assigned a task that matches their skills and abilities.

For example, the results show that both political support from the public and the level of task difficulty have a significant effect on organizational performance. A leader’s experience also has a positive effect on performance at higher levels of task difficulty (that is, the contribution to performance increases as tasks become more difficult).

However, Fernandez (2004) considers the explanatory power of the model as more important than any of the findings. The explanatory power of the leadership variables in this model strongly suggests that the leadership literature is not just a combination of leaders’ characteristics without any connections with each other that can be useful for the research. As Fernandez (2004) mentions, it “...is in no way a theoretical wasteland but, rather, a reservoir

of valuable knowledge that can be tapped by researchers to explain a leader's influence on organizational performance.” (Fernandez 2004, 214).

Summarizing the literature review, it is obvious that there is a big difference between the early and the modern research studies. New investigations (such as charismatic transformational theories) represent a valuable tool for the understanding of leaders' effectiveness, especially in the political arena. As a whole, hundreds of traits studies, conducted by the early researchers, failed to correlate individual traits in a strong and consistent manner with leadership effectiveness. Early researchers did not pay much attention to the question of how traits interact as an integrator of personality and behavior, or how the situation determines the relevance of different traits and skills for leader effectiveness. According to Yukl (1978), in recent years, the investigation of leader traits has been more productive, due to the inclusion of more relevant traits, use of better measures of traits, examination of trait patterns, and use of longitudinal research.

As Nystedt (1997) mentions, leadership is a multifaceted phenomenon that cannot be captured by focusing on a small number of variables. There is a need to gain an in-depth insight into the complexity of leader behavior and leader effectiveness. There should not be a fragmentation of individual functioning (that is, finding the appropriate traits for particular situation, rather than looking at how the leader behaves and which of his/her personal characteristics are more salient in different situations). In other words, research should focus on the dynamics of the relationship between leader characteristics and leader behavior in different social settings:

We need to employ a more differentiated approach than that of seeking to find traits or leadership styles that are important regardless of situation. Research should focus on the dynamics of the relationship between leader characteristics and leader behavior in different situations, rather than on the relationship leader characteristics and group performance... We need to study the whole person in context to obtain an in-depth understanding of the importance of leadership in organizations, and by that reduce fragmentation into individual functioning. (Nystedt 1997, 12).

For example, researchers have not paid much attention to feelings as a factor. As George (2000) mentions, feelings, rather than being an additional factor to consider, play a much more central role in the leadership process. Both positive and negative moods and emotions serve numerous functions in people's lives. They can sometimes be the cause of human dysfunctions. Effective leaders must have an ability to appraise their own and other people's emotions, including the ability to control their own emotions.

The investigation of charisma, values, emotions, motives, beliefs, and other personality traits, leads to a better understanding of leaders' behavior, their ability to influence the environment and predict their effectiveness. In the modern world of globalization and rapid communication between people, it is important for the leaders to differentiate leadership across cultures. The investigation of leadership traits and preferences and values across cultures represents a valuable tool for understanding leadership effectiveness because it provides us with the ability to differentiate universal versus culturally dependent characteristics. The research also shows that, not only personality traits, but also leaders' skills and experience to clearly identify the situation, are vital contributions to effective political leadership.

Analyses

One of the purposes of this paper is to find whether the hypotheses and assumptions, provided here, have their support in research that has been done on leadership. The research questions and hypotheses are the following:

1. To what extent does effective political leadership depend on personal traits? In other words, are personality factors (such as traits) important determinants for political leadership to be effective? Also, which personality factors have the greatest affect on political leadership

success? The hypothesis is that personality has a role to play in explaining leader behavior and leader effectiveness.

2. The second question comes out from the first: If personality matters, can good political leadership be learned? In other words, is it just enough to have appropriate traits for a political leader to be effective? The hypothesis is that, having appropriate traits should not be enough for the effectiveness of a political leader. Not only having appropriate traits, but also skills contribute to overcoming difficulties facing a political leader.

3. The last question is: To what extent does country culture mediate the effects that personality traits (such as charisma) have on political leaders' effectiveness? The hypothesis is that culture influences leadership, and, therefore, effective leadership styles and practices in one culture are not necessarily effective in others. Particularly, such features of a charismatic leader as self-assurance, dynamism, creativity, vision, risks-taking, self-confidence, need for power, and activity inhibition can successfully be exercised in a democratic society. However, when the situation (the system) is strong and structured (e. g., authoritarian), these features should not play an important role.

Hypothesis 1. Summarizing the studies on leadership effectiveness that have been done by researchers, it can be concluded that support was found for all the hypotheses mentioned above. Particularly, as it was hypothesized, personality traits have a significant influence on effective political leadership. Being a leader in the political arena, means not only being rational and practical and leading people by fulfilling a bureaucratic (structured) task, but also serving their interests, motivating and inspiring them by showing the “right” way. These are the features of a moral leader, who is honest, inspirational, altruistic, compassionate, enthusiastic, active and optimistic to reach this goal, the political leader should himself/herself possess these above mentioned personality traits and moral principles that will not let him/her manipulate people and deviate from the “right” way (this is the principle

of the activity inhibition). Also, for a political leader to be effective, it is critical to have the ability to identify this way (to have a vision), to have a strong belief that the choice is right (to be self-confident), and also to know the ways of realizing the idea (to have the ability to think strategically).

The effective political leader gains control over himself/herself as a precondition of controlling others. Such a leader has the ability to make right decisions in the right place at the right time. This person does not respond to ideas—he/she shapes them. In other words, leaders have personal and active attitudes toward goals and they influence people by taking risks and changing their images and expectations. The result of this influence changes the way people think about what is desirable, possible, and necessary.

Very often, the goal and desire can be risky because of their consequences. For example, John F. Kennedy, in his inaugural presidential address said: “Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty.” (Zaleznik, 2004). This statement can cause negative outcomes because it forces people to react and to identify with Kennedy and his ideals. This statement, if adopted, as in the Vietnam War, can produce disastrous results. However, unless expectations of people are aroused and mobilized, new thinking and new choice will never be born. This is another important personality trait that effective political leaders must possess—the willingness to take risks. The reason that one individual seeks risks while another does not, depends more on his/her personality and less on a conscious choice. For a mediocre person, a survival instinct dominates the need for risk, and that is why, he/she chooses practical and structured work. For an effective political leader, this is not the case.

In this regard, President George W. Bush’s behavior can be compared with Kennedy’s risk taking behavior. The war in Iraq has its bad sides as any war in the world. Bush took a

big risk by invoking people to go to war. However, it is too early to make judgments. Time will show whether the war was President Bush's achievement or his failure. If Iraq has a stable democracy in the future, with Al Qaeda neutralized, it will be a leadership achievement, written in history. President Bush proved that he is strong as a leader and that he is a visionary. Now he must prove that he is wise, because "greatness comes...when leaders make real a vision of the world as they wish it to be without losing touch with the reality of the world as it is." (Gilbert 2005, 19).

Another example of a personality trait that contributes to leader effectiveness is charisma. Usually, political leaders cannot maintain direct relationships with their followers and they must lead by inspiration rather than by controlling the followers' environment. This is a situation where rational leading does not work. Only a charismatic, transformational leader can inspire people, arise enthusiasm and commitment in followers by articulating a vision and increasing followers' confidence in achieving it. However, it is important to differentiate among charismatics. If a leader loses touch with reality, or cares only about himself/herself, and his/her aims do not match with the constituents' needs, this leader can damage the interests of subordinates. Such a leader is not transformational, but transactional (or pseudo-transformational).

A good example of a charismatic transformational leader is the first President of the UAE, the late HH Sheikh Zayed bin Sultan Al Nayan. This country, being non-democratic, became developed and industrialized by the virtue of one man. And this is a proof that personality does matter, even despite the political regime in the country. Sheikh Zayed was a man of extreme courage and strength of character. People from his country will always remember him as a man who led them from nowhere to the progress, prosperity and welfare not seen in the region before. He turned a small Emirate into a modern metropolis by his vision, persistence, and the belief that sincerity of purpose and hard work can lead to great

achievements. His political skills and the ability to think strategically were instrumental in keeping the UAE away from regional and international conflicts. He strongly felt that dialogue was the essence of civilized disputes. He said: "I am not imposing change on anyone, that is tyranny. We have our opinions, and opinions can change. Sometimes we put our opinions together, and then sift from them a single point of view. This is our democracy." (Qamar S. Hasan, 2004).

While analyzing the traits and skills of political leaders, it becomes possible to differentiate leaders by their styles. Particularly, a "power" leader who relies on the authority and compliance of others leads on the basis of fear and is viewed as a "boss" rather than a "leader". Political leaders belonging to this type are usually visionary, risky, directive, and self-confident. Followers know "where they are" with such leaders, but followers do not always trust them and may not support their actions. The "power" leaders are seen as effective and can be essential in times of conflict, confusion and uncertainty. Margaret Thatcher is among this type of leaders. She said: "If you just set out to be liked, you would be prepared to compromise on anything at any time, and you would achieve nothing." (Webpage: <http://www.opinionleader.co.uk/download/LeadershipInBritainReport.pdf>).

Another type of leadership style is "visionary". Leaders of this type inspire with enthusiasm and rely on followers' goodwill. These leaders are usually inspirational, optimistic, active, and integrative. Bill Clinton is an example of such a leader. For the visionary leader, the most important thing is to motivate people, to inspire them to take actions. Once he said about the presidency: "Being president is like a running a cemetery: you've got a lot of people under you, and nobody's listening." (Webpage: <http://www.opinionleader.co.uk/download/LeadershipInBritainReport.pdf>).

The third type of leadership style can be characterized as "social". A 'social' leader works through consensus and participation. These are negotiators, motivators and persuaders. Such

kind of leaders have good negotiation skills, are visionary, empathetic and stresses moral behavior and values. Kofi Annan is among them.

In politics, it is very important that people trust their leaders. Embodying trust in people also comes from the character and the personality traits of a leader. Many, seemingly irresolvable issues in politics, have been resolved by the virtue of trust toward a leader. One of the bright examples of such a leader is Kofi Annan's personality. He is "armed only with his mandate and his moral authority. He has something of the Pope's spiritual status, but of course he has no church - no army of believers. He is a small, solitary figure silhouetted against a vast backdrop." (Traub, 1998).

Kofi Annan was chosen to be a Secretary General because the Americans, specifically because Madeleine K. Albright, the United States representative to the U.N. then, wanted him to be Secretary General and because practically everyone else liked and respected him. Annan is not an intellectually formidable figure; his tact often keeps him from saying anything even remotely interesting. However, Annan is not, in any case, an abstract thinker. Iqbal Riza, his chief of staff, says that the Secretary General "goes more on instinct and intuition than on calculation." His gifts are the gifts of character - attentiveness, self-possession, clarity, kindness, and an utter lack of pretense.

Kofi Annan's ability to motivate was fundamental. He is like a parent who says to a child "I know you can do it." Annan has an almost mystical faith in positive outcomes. Elisabeth Lindenmayer recalls flying with him to Baghdad in 1990, on the eve of the gulf war, to negotiate the release of foreigners held hostage. "I said to him in the plane: What if it doesn't work? What kind of contingency planning can we do?" And I remember him saying: 'Don't ever speak to me negatively when I'm about to negotiate. We'll make it - and I don't want to hear that we may not make it.' (Traub, 1998).

There is no doubt that all of the above mentioned personality traits that a political leader should possess contribute to political leaders' effectiveness. But the question is: Which of them are the most important for effective political leadership? It is true that there is no such political leader who possesses all these personality traits—people are not ideal, but still, even without having all mentioned personality traits, leaders can be considered as effective. However, without having some of them, effective political leadership will not emerge in any way. The most important personality traits are: the need for power (this motive is the important element of personality, which means the enjoyment to rule for the people, and not for self) and self-esteem.

If a political leader does not like his/her job (that is, the power to influence the people), he/she will very soon become frustrated, disappointed, and defeated by the essence of politics. What is politics? It is the necessity of compromise, frustration, also the difficulties in implementing policy. In business, a chief executive can insist on the “one best solution” to any problem. In a democratic political system, a chief executive must negotiate with different constituencies who have different ideas about what is “the best.” People have to be persuaded and inspired to accept someone else's vision of the best. As a result, the “best” usually has to be compromised in order to get “the possible”. Even this must be implemented by people whom the political leader does not appoint, does not fully trust, and cannot remove.

If the political leader does not take pleasure from his job and, therefore, is not capable to overcome the frustration from politics, he/she becomes vulnerable to achievement motivation (concern for excellence that leads to restless activity). This means that the leader's aspirations for change and improvement (the achievement motive) will lead him/her to disappointment because of the lack in the capacity to take pleasure in influence, negotiation, and maneuvering (the power motive). This was exactly the case of failure and frustration of President Clinton during his first term. His health care reform plan was itself the “best” plan

developed by the experts. However, it was not developed politically. That is, most people could not understand the plan because of its complexity. Instead of simplifying health care and payment systems, Clinton's plan seemed to make them even more complex.

Over the years, Clinton's power motive dominated his achievement motive. His emphases were on a few popular issues such as Medicare and education, and his arguments were understood by the public at large. Throughout the 1996 presidential campaign, Clinton appeared as a confident leader who loved his job.

The second personality trait, which is also critical for effective political leadership, is self-esteem. Self-esteem refers to the attitudes that individuals have about themselves and whether they like or dislike themselves. A leadership style is constrained by a leader's self-esteem, which is so fundamental that affects his/her political behavior. Power, influence, dominance, and acquiescence are all affected by the self-esteem of a leader.

Particularly, people with low self-esteem are more influenced by acceptance or rejection from people; they are more dependent on external circumstances. The behavior of individuals with high self-esteem indicates that they have more stable self evaluations that permit them to be more independent of external evaluations. The fact that people with low self-esteem are more dependent upon others means that they are more responsive and make their decisions by perception of the expectations that people place upon them. Thus, such people are more inconsistent in their behaviors and decisions; they are less risky and less innovative.

Clear examples of how self-esteem influences political behavior can be seen in the leadership styles of Tony Blair and Margaret Thatcher. Blair's attempt to be closer to people, to be ordinary, to justify policies by linking them to his commitment, converted his charismatic behavior into anything but unusual. His image was finally tarnished because, as times moved on and things do not get better, it proved the inability to produce the active style of leadership needed to make reforms in public services and to motivate people. Politics that

cannot inspire are not politics. And the price of leader familiarity is not the hate towards him/her but indifference.

The leadership of Margaret Thatcher was significantly influenced by her high self-esteem. Like no other political figure since Churchill, Thatcher could embody self-confidence that enabled her to confront others and to meet her own demanding standards. In her autobiography, Thatcher says: “Chatham famously remarked: ‘I know that I can save this country and that no one else can.’ It would have been presumptuous for me to have compared myself to Chatham. But if I am honest, I must admit that my exhilaration came from a similar inner conviction.” (Gardner, Laskin 1996, 231). In general terms, Thatcher was among leaders who see themselves as figures of destiny and who have the ability to challenge people. Margaret Thatcher was effective by her ability of risk taking and her courage.

However, Thatcher’s own deficiencies grew out of her strengths. Her high self-confidence was converted into intolerance, little sympathy for the people, and her conviction dominated over consensus (which is so critical for political leader to be effective). These two examples illustrate the significance of two personality traits for effective political leadership: the need for power and self-esteem. For a political leader, it is critical to have the need for power in a good sense. That is, the need for power to influence for the welfare of people, and not for themselves. Also, not having the “right degree” of self-esteem, will lead to extremes that are inappropriate for effective political behavior.

Hypothesis 2. It is true that personality traits, along with intelligence, interests, and goals, are the foundation of the political leader development. They are the most stable and important; therefore, they represent the foundation to other attributes of leadership. However, it would be wrong to conclude that effective political leaders can be differentiated solely by possessing the appropriate personality traits. The research supported the hypothesis that political leaders’ skills also contribute to their effectiveness.

There are no known ways to train “great” leaders. Greatness starts from one’s personality. It means that personality traits are the means, which, with the help of developing leadership skills and experience, enable a political leader to become effective. So, good political leadership can not be learned unless a political leader possesses the appropriate personality traits, such as the need for power (love towards the job, which prevents the person from unacceptable behavior that can damage people’s interests) and the right proportion of self-esteem. At the same time, in order to take pleasure from possessing the power, political leaders must have necessary personality traits such as clear vision, integrity, empathy, clear set of values, and an ability to inspire and create consensus.

Among researchers, there is a mutual agreement that increased levels of knowledge and skills, such as communication skills, problem-solving skills, negotiation, compromise, and consensus building skills, increase over the course of peoples’ careers. The quality of solutions in difficult situations depends on whether an individual possesses appropriate knowledge and skills. And it was investigated that these advances in skills start from the lower level in leader’s career and steadily increase with the career growth. Thus, more senior leadership positions require higher levels of skills in general. This means that increased task complexity and gaining experience contribute to the increase in leaders’ skills and, therefore, effectiveness. So, it can be concluded that, in the process of development of a leader, it is critical to have interaction between skills, tasks, personality, and the situation.

In this sense, the leadership of Margaret Thatcher is a good example of how personality traits, combined with steadily growing skills, can contribute to a leader’s effectiveness. Thatcher was neither a genius nor an intellectual, but she was bright. She was hard worker and had the ability to get the experience which benefited her. Among her most salient personality traits and skills are the following: extraordinary memory for detail, the aptitude for hard work, tremendous energy, the ability to articulate a clear, convincing argument, the

willingness to engage in conflict, possessing of powerful rhetoric, debating skills, clear vision, and conviction.

As was mentioned in this paper, effective political leaders have firm beliefs in their ideas and inspire their subordinates to follow them. Margaret Thatcher is a clear example of a charismatic, transformational leader. Thatcher's ability to make her vision necessary and obvious was enhanced by her conviction. She was loyal to her principles, she strongly believed in her ideas, and tried to convince others in their importance. In her opinion, to seek compromise meant to abandon her ideas.

However, as it was already emphasized, if the leader is too visionary and imposing his/her attitudes too much, he/she becomes too directive. This was exactly what happened with Thatcher during her third and last term in office. As she grew more powerful, her tolerance for the disagreements among her Cabinet members decreased. She became less and less likely to listen to her opponents and more likely to ignore her allies. Thatcher was so much exposed to her principles that she did not see the reality (which is narcissism) that she became isolated in her positions, and her "conviction" became rigid, inflexible and fell into moralism. The downfall of Margaret Thatcher is a valuable lesson for political leaders which illustrates how important it is to be flexible and feel the situation in politics, and how strengths can become weaknesses. That is, transformational ideas, strong rhetoric and the strength of principle are effective in a democratic society only at the time of crises as during a major war or a severe economic depression. Thatcher was able to take advantage of such a crises atmosphere for a time. But when the crises disappeared, so did her effectiveness.

Among the most important skills which are necessary for a political leader to be effective are communication, negotiation, and persuasion skills. A clear example of a leader who possess these qualities is Kofi Annan. During his meetings with Saddam Hussein, at least for

a time, Annan had averted a war that only a week earlier seemed almost inevitable. And he had done so without offering anything more than a few symbolic concessions.

As Traub (1998) describes him,

Annan is so soft-spoken that though we were sitting next to each other on a couch in his wood-paneled office, I later found that I could barely hear his voice on my tape recorder. He has an elegance that comes less from dress than equipoise; he barely moves when he speaks, and he never hurries either a gesture or a word. Very few people have ever seen Annan lose temper, and I found him virtually unprovokable. (Traub, 1998 in Webpage: www.globalpolicy.org/secgen/kofi.html).

Jean-Pierre Halbwachs, who has worked with Annan for 20 years, says, "He has this uncanny ability to get people to shift their position without feeling threatened or without any tension." (Traub, 1998 in Webpage: www.globalpolicy.org/secgen/kofi.html).

Another example of how personality skills and experience can contribute to political leader's effectiveness is India's first woman prime minister, Indira Gandhi. According to the results of a millennium poll (Khushwant 2004 In Webpage: www.rediff.com/news/2004/oct/27inter1.htm), accomplished with the help of BBC News Online readers from across the world, Indira Gandhi, was rated higher than Queen Elizabeth I and was on top of the poll by a large majority. Those who voted for Indira Gandhi praised her leadership skills and strength. She was a dynamic leader and worked for the uplifting of India and its women. Indira Gandhi is an example of a leader who used her political skills and experience effectively.

In a difficult situation that her country faced, Indira Gandhi could prove herself as a strong, decisive leader who had the ability to communicate and persuade. Particularly, in the face of a potentially severe famine caused by the failure of the monsoon rains in 1965, Gandhi used her international experience to obtain the promise of wheat, loans, and credit from the United States. She visited the United States in 1966, establishing a good relationship with President Lyndon Johnson. "She was a true feminist to the core, a woman of substance

who helped the country through a testing phase, possessed all the virtues of a woman and fought valiantly for women's rights in a man's world." (Khushwant 2004 In Webpage: www.rediff.com/news/2004/oct/27inter1.htm).

In sum, it can be concluded that effective leadership styles vary according to the nature of the task or position. An effective leader typically is not the one who possesses only “power”, “vision” or “social” leadership style, but also who is flexible. The best leaders are those who are more than one-dimensional, who can adapt their leadership style depending on the audience or situation. For example, a leader may generally be a “visionary” type, but in certain situations, he/she needs to use more qualities of a “power” style of a leader when the situation needs a “firm hand” to guide.

So, while it is essential to differentiate among leaders to understand the types of leadership styles they belong to, it is also important to consider whether it is possible to develop and create effective political leaders. Although formal management development programs and Schools of Political Science/Diplomacy can contribute to the effectiveness, however, practical experience from the environment is seen to be more important. So, the most effective development of future leaders is to provide them with space for creativity. This is the environment in which leaders can flourish, and which contributes to new ideas to be tested and risks to be taken.

Thus, the conclusion is that, experience from the environment will contribute to leader’s effectiveness when, at the same time, he/she possesses some important personality traits that cannot be taught—the need for power and self-esteem.

Hypothesis 3. It is clear that any country will benefit more if their leaders are effective. In this sense, the dilemma of leadership is to differentiate among leaders. There is supported evidence that differentiation among leaders is possible to make by examining the personality traits of a particular leader and then—by developing his/her skills and abilities. But the

question is: Can these methods of differentiating and developing the leader be applied to all cultures, or there should be different approaches across cultures? The findings of research supported the hypothesis that, as countries differ by their cultures, values and attitudes, so there should be a different approach to the “right” leader across cultures. Country culture is like an individual that possesses his particular personality traits. If it is possible to differentiate people by their personality traits and somehow predict their behavior, so it would be possible to examine the personality traits (culture) of the country in order to know what kind of leader will be more preferable for that particular country.

For example, every country has its own “character” and values: some of them try to create institutions that would enable them to avoid uncertainty; some of them value success and money, while other’s dominant values are caring and quality of life; some cultures tend to belong to collectives, while others value individualism. These are the keys to understanding a country’s choice of a leader. For example, it was proved that, in the USA, directive leadership does not work well because of the individualistic culture of the country with the participative character. As it was hypothesized, in non-democratic, high-power distance cultures (less communication between the leader and the followers), the achievement, self-development, participation in decision-making are not valuable tools. Even more, a participative leader can be perceived as incompetent because what people expect from him/her is to dominate, direct subordinates, rather than empower them. These are not the features of charismatic transformational leadership, the primary purpose of which is to inspire and motivate people for change, by enhancing their participation in decision-making.

They say that every nation has the political leader that it deserves. For example, Russia has long been under an authoritarian regime (directive, non-participative ruling). Despite the fact that now Russia tries to become democratic, however, peoples’ values and attitudes (which are usually the most stable and, therefore, are not easily changeable) toward the leader

remain almost the same. Still there is a naive requirement for a “tough boss” who will stop corruption. This is a tool for a leader who, by his nature, is authoritarian and seeks to govern by force. President Putin understood the popular yearning for a “strong hand” and exploited this sentiment with great skill. His leadership style is accepted by the people and, therefore, is considered as appropriate for them. He saw “the oligarchs” as rivals for power and used every opportunity to put them in a bad light and also by jailing some of them.

But what changed after these actions by Putin? If wealthy private businessmen were the reason of the poor economic situation in Russia, so, after the sanctions against them, there should be a positive difference. However, living standards in a country with vast oil wealth have not improved much. Thus, unless people realize that there is a need for a charismatic transformational leader, who will change peoples’ attitudes and values, and who will serve for the people and not for him/herself, there will not be true democracy in Russia. And, unless there is such a leader, in countries without well-developed democratic institutions and with an easy manipulated public sector, oil and other natural resources that the country possesses will be considered as an evil, and not a gift for the people.

Another example of how country culture can influence the choice of a leader people make and his/her behavior is the President of Venezuela, Hugo Chavez. Venezuela and Russia have one important thing in common—they are both democracies with leaders who do not act like democrats. Hugo Chavez, like President Putin, is a former lieutenant colonel, who leads by the rule of force (controls courts, military, restricts media, tries to control oil). Venezuela, like Russia, is a case when rules and regulations do not work in practice and, therefore, its natural resources breed corruption, inequality, jobless growth, and power struggles. “The similarities...are the reflection of powerful forces that say as much about their recent past as they do about their likely future...” (Naim 2005, 59).

It seems strange how strongly people can be “used to a regime” they had before and accept the leader, whose ruling style damages them more than the direct actions of terrorists against civilians. The President of Belarus, Lukashenko, is a man responsible for reviving some of the worst practices of the Soviet Union. Since he came to power, Lukashenko has perpetrated violations of human rights and established authoritarian leadership. Taking into consideration the acceptance by the people in Belarus of such a leader, and the possibility of expansion of Lukashenko's communist-style authoritarianism — even if limited only to the former republics — it can have negative consequences for bordering Western European states. If left unchecked, Lukashenko, as a strong, directive leader, has the potential to influence other leaders in the region, making himself and others like him a serious threat to democracy, as the Husseins and bin Ladens that currently dominate the foreign policy agenda.

In conclusion, it is clear that the contributions of effective political leadership to countries and people as a whole can be countless if a considerable attention is paid to leaders’ personality traits and skills in the scope of their interaction with the environment, and also cultural differences in a leader’s perceptions. With the complexity of the modern times, it becomes evident that the requirements toward current leadership have also changed. Now effective political leaders are considered those who can combine different leadership styles in order to fit them to rapidly changing situations. This can be realized by the increase of political skills within the years of experience in political arena. Of course, it would be impossible to reach effective results, if the leader does not have the “basis”, that is, to possess some necessary personality traits that can not be taught. In other words, he/she must love the art of influence, have moral principles and values, and also have the right proportion of self-esteem.

Conclusion

This paper was devoted to effective political leadership. What is it? What does it mean to be effective in politics? What kind of people are and should be in politics? How to differentiate among political leaders and how to develop them, if possible at all? These were the questions of interest in this work. It is clear that the purpose of effective political leadership is the implementation of a vision for the sake of people's welfare of and the countries' as a whole. After the research was done, it became obvious that effective political leadership depends partly on the personality of the leader. The political leader must love his/her work, that is, to have a need for power in order to realize his/her vision, the purpose of which is to make people's life better. He/she must be honest, visionary, optimistic, inspirational, compassionate, and self confident.

So, how to differentiate such a leader? As personality matters, the easiest way to answer this question is to organize personality tests for future leaders. However, such tests are unreliable, subjective, and biased. The best way is to "test" the leader is by time and the environment: the way the leader will behave in different situations, and especially, what his/her actions will be in the time of crises. Leader behavior (and also this concerns to all people in general) will mostly depend on what kind of personality traits and skills he/she has. In politics, there is no such institution that teaches how to be an effective political leader—it provides with basic tools and knowledge in the political arena, which, of course are very important for getting necessary skills. The School of Political Science and International Affairs at the American University of Armenia is not the "first step" for the career of a political leader, because the "first step" is already there—a person's personality.

The enhancing of political leader's skills is not a very difficult task. Sooner or later, with the passing of time and, therefore, with the increased experience, the leader will become more skillful. The issue here is only the ability of a leader to get experience effectively, that

is learn lessons from the experience. It is like learning driving skills—the future driver must be put in different situations in order to enhance his/her skills. However, as it was mentioned above, for the politician to be effective, it does not mean to be only skillful (as it is for the driver). The outcome of the leadership style of a political leader depends on a person's personality, motives, values, morality and attitudes. These characteristics he/she applies to life and to politics every day. This is the biggest obstacle for differentiation among leaders because it requires time.

Very often, when people realize and see the negative outcome from the leadership style of a leader, it is too late to change anything. That is, one can “know” the person only by following his/her behavior in different situations. This means that different situations, facing the person during his/her life, provide with the tools of differentiation of a person's personality traits. In other words, we start to “know” one's traits by observing the person in different situations. This process requires time, and no one can predict in a short period of time what the time will “tell” about the leader. This is the “uncertain” nature of politics.

The complexity of the current situation in the world requires complex behavior patterns for the modern political leader to be effective. This means to be flexible in order to adapt to the rapidly changing situation. There is no question when the flexibility is related to the skills of a political leader. Of course, with getting experience and skills, he/she is becoming more knowledgeable and can easier adapt to the changing situation, which is the most critical outcome for the skillful political leader. But when the question refers to the traits, the answer is not so clear. Can one's personality traits be flexible? If it is so, should they be flexible at all? Is it right and ethical for a person to have flexible traits of a character? “To be flexible”-- doesn't it mean to be prepared to deviate from his/her own values and principles, even if they are not the “best”, but the “possible”?

Does it imply that the requirement to have “flexibility” in traits of a political leader became the reason that people forgot about the moral principles that any political leadership should possess, which are the “bases”, and the “foundation” that make such words as democracy, freedom, and equality have their true meaning in reality? Again the answer is— political leadership is for people’s welfare. A truly democratic government should be for the people and by the people. Any truly moral position should struggle for equal opportunities for all; security, support and protection for those in need; for the political leadership that pays attention to long term interests of future generations.

Power and money—these are the most salient motivation that leads the world politics now. The doors for corruption are open in the countries even with “well established democracy”, such as the USA. Political corruption represents a major obstacle to the citizens’ well-being. It undermines democracy and good governance. Corruption in elections reduces accountability and representation in policymaking; corruption in public administration results in the unequal provision of services. Corruption undermines the legitimacy of government and such democratic values as trust and tolerance.

The political system itself can also contribute to the rise of corruption. For example, the symbolic status of a leader plays a central role in politics now. People’s “awareness” about him/her depends on the way mass media presents the leader. This is on the surface, beyond which it is impossible to differentiate what kind of a leader he/she is. This is the modern requirement of media representation, which is Machiavellian. Machiavelli’s recommendations are not descriptions of what a good prince should be but how he should appear. What stands behind this is again power and money. Traditional information gatekeepers take the money from the candidates and then present the candidates in a good light because they are good for them. Then the case is just who of them will tell the truest

lies. When the made-up stories broadcast as “news” to the trusting public are disseminated, they become the most persuasive tool.

As it was seen, very often power and money become the motivators for unethical behavior. For example, now it is considered usual for the politicians to appear acting in the interests of the parties that fund them. From this it can be assumed that the corporations funding politicians are simply buying the votes of elected officials. For example, in business, the outcome is clear: if the leader is not effective, he/she cannot just perform his/her duties any more. In politics, this is not the case. There is always a chance for a political leader to avoid the obligations placed upon him, if he is influential and if he surrounds himself with competent people.

But the question is: do all political leaders behave in such an unethical way? Of course, not. And this is again the matter of a personality. Not all leaders can adapt to all situations, no matter how attractive they will be in terms of power and money. As it was mentioned above, the system of politics itself, if it is not based on the moral principles, not only provides the possibility, but also very often “requires” people to behave in an unethical way. This happens especially when such conditions as mentioned above are favorable: a) the concentration of power on decision makers, not the people; b) the lack of government transparency in decision making; c) costly political campaigns, with expenses exceeding normal sources of political funding; d) self-interested media networks; e) weak rule of law; f) minimal freedom of speech or freedom of the press; g) poorly paid government officials; and h) an apathetic society, uninterested in political processes.

All of the above mentioned negative features of a political system result in the perception of politics being “dirty”. Many leaders, whose personality traits and values do not “permit” them to behave in an unacceptable way, become frustrated from politics. They are too idealistic, deeply and emotionally involved and too “good” for a system of politics. They

knock against the brick wall, which is too high and too strong for them, and they finally leave politics. The leaders not frustrated from the politics see the wall as it is. They accept the bricks from which the wall has been built, and their size as it is. That is, they adapt to it, even at the price of compromising their values and principles.

Being an effective leader in politics and in business is different. The leaders in business are motivated by an inner vision, purpose, and mission. These people define themselves on the basis of their “being” (personality) rather than “doing” (actions). They do not have to persuade people to support them, because the outcome of their work can be clearly seen. In other words, the leaders in business behave in accordance to their personality traits and skills. If a leader in business is not being himself, he cannot be effective. What about the politics? If it is grounded on unethical, not moral motives, supported by the same motives of media representation, the political leader will not be able to function by his inner vision. Eventually, he will become a marionette in the hands of the influential people.

So, is it a hopeless desire to have good governance? It is true that people are not ideal, otherwise all of us could be compared with God. However, it is wrong when people give up and consider themselves as incapable: once they perceive themselves as such, they will not succeed. True leaders never give up, as people should strive for ideal in order to be closer to it as much as possible. This is the essence of the revolutionaries, people who oppose the injustice of the world. The revolutionaries are not the people who are flexible in politics, and they are not the people, who deviate from the politics. Being people with high moral principles, revolutionaries do not give up (as the leaders frustrated from the essence of the political system do). Just the opposite, they go ahead, inspire people and motivate them for change.

Joseph Conrad was one of the first popular writers of the beginning of the 20th century whose novels and short stories continue, to this day, to provide a counter-text to imperial

triumphalism. Conrad's view of empires as a corrupt and dishonest enterprises was not a common perception in his day. Today, many see his words as prophetic, suggesting that he understood the inherent weaknesses and the evil of empires that had not yet become visible. He considered democratic Northern European cities as laboratories for extremists. Doesn't this remind us of the recent terrible attacks on the USA on September 11? Modern empires consider themselves as the strongest and the best in the world, forgetting about the moral principles that should lead them. Their cynicism and narcissism breeds the terrorism rise against them. Again, this is a question of wrong political leadership, based on unethical behavior that results from leaders' personality traits. Particularly, they do not have the most important personality traits—the need for power, that is, the need to lead for people and not for themselves. Another important personality trait is the right proportion of self-esteem that will not permit them to deviate from the politics because of the sense of not being sure in one's potential (low self-esteem) and will not also lead to narcissism, directiveness and intolerance toward people (high self-esteem).

Joseph Conrad is now highly regarded as a novelist whose work displays deep moral consciousness. He divides all mankind into two types—the visionaries (who are truly “young” no matter what their chronological age is) and the cynical realists. Conrad implies that a man is already dead if he has lost his ideals and visions. His central faith is that there must exist in the world a recognized principle of honor, focusing on the ramification of the truth and ethical justice in the world of treachery and violence. So, for the establishment of moral, and ethical principles in politics, just being “flexible” will not help. The modern world of politics needs to be changed, and only a charismatic transformational leader (a revolutionary) who has a clear vision, ideals, and principles, believes in him/herself and inspires this belief in people, can motivate people for change.

However, as research indicates, the political leader will not be considered as charismatic and transformational unless the followers perceive him/her as such. That is, people must realize the need in such a leader and support him/her. This means that not only there is a need in a revolutionary leader (who is exceptional by his personality traits and principles and, therefore, represents rare case in the society), but also the civil society must challenge their attitudes toward political leadership. Instead of wasting time waiting for an exceptional, true leader, the civil society should take the first step to real democratic governance and effective political leadership, which will be for the society itself to behave in a sound ethical way and not passively accept the unethical behavior of its leaders.

REFERENCES

- Alford, Jeremy (2005) "Population Landscape." In New York Times (October).
- Bass, Bernard M., Steidlmeier, Paul. (1999) "Ethics, Character, and Authentic Transformational Leadership." In Leadership Quarterly (Summer) 10:2.
- Boal, KJimberly B. (2000) In Leadership Quarterly (Winter) 11:4.
- Burke, Warner. (1965) "Leadership Behavior as a Function of the Leader, the Follower, and the Situation." In Journal of Personality (March) 58: 3.
- Conger, Jay. (1990) "The Dark Side of Leadership." In Leaders and the Leadership Processes, Jon I. Pierce, John W. Newstrom (eds.). McGraw-Hill/Irwin, New York, NY, 10020.
- Crewson, Philip E., Fisher, Bonnie S. (1997) "Growing Older and Wiser: The Changing Skill Requirements of City Administrators." In Public Administration Review (September-October) 57:5.
- Deluga, Ronald J. (1998) "American Presidential Proactivity." In Leadership Quarterly (Fall) 9:3.
- Dorfman, Peter W. (1997) "Leadership in Western and Asian Countries: Commonalities and Differences in Effective Leadership Processes Across Cultures." In Leadership Quarterly (Fall) 8:3.
- Ehrhart, Mark G., Klein, Katherine J. (2001) "Predicting Followers' Preferences for Charismatic Leadership: The Influence of follower Values and Personality." In Leadership Quarterly (Summer) 12:2.
- Fernandez, Sergio. (2004) "Developing and Testing an Integrative Framework of Public Sector Leadership: Evidence from the Public Education Arena." In Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory (December) 15: 197-217. Quoted in Burns (1978) Leadership. New York: Harper and Row.
- Finlayson, Alan. (2002) "Elements of the Blairite Image of Leadership." In Parliamentary Affairs 55, 586-599.
- (2002) "Elements of the Blairite Image of Leadership." In Parliamentary Affaires. 55:586-589.
- Fiol, C. Marlene, Harris, Drew, House, Robert. (1999) "Charismatic Leadership: Strategies for Effecting Social Change." In Leadership Quarterly (Fall) 10:3.

- Francesco, Anne Marie, Gold, Barry Allen. (1998) "Leadership." In International Organizational Behavior. Text, Readings, Cases, and Skills. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey 07458.
- Gardner E. Howard, Laskin Emma (1996) "Margaret Thatcher: A Clear Sense of Identity" In Leading Minds. HarperCollins Publishers. (May).
- George, Alexandre. (1974) "Assessing Presidential Character." In World Politics (January) 26: 234-282.
- George, Jennifer. (2000) "Emotions and Leadership." In Leaders and the Leadership Processes. Jon I. Pierce, John W. Newstrom (eds.). McGraw-Hill/Irwin, New York, NY, 10020.
- Gibson, James L. (1981) "Personality and Elite Political Behavior: The Influence of Self-Esteem on Judicial decision Making." In Journal of Politics (February) 43:1.
- Greenstein, Fred I. (2004) "The Presidential Difference." In The Presidential Difference. Leadership Style from FDR to George W. Bush. Princeton University Press, 41 William Street, Princeton, New Jersey 08540.
- Hartog, Den, Deanne N. (1999) "Culture Specific and Cross-Culturally Generalizable Implicit Leadership Theories: Are Attributes of Charismatic/Transformational Leadership Universally Indorsed?" In Leadership Quarterly (Summer) 10:2.
- Hodgetts, Richard M., Luthans, Fred. (2003) "Leadership Across Cultures." In International Management. Culture, Strategy, and Behavior. McGraw-Hill/Irwin, New York, NY, 10020.
- House, Robert J., Spangler, William D., Woycke, James. (1991) "Personality and Charisma in the U.S. Presidency: A Psychological Theory of Leader Effectiveness." In Administrative Science Quarterly (September) 36:3.
- Hughes, Richard L., Ginnett, Robert C., Curphy, Gordon J. (2002) "Leadership Traits." In Leadership. McGraw-Hill/Irwin, New York, NY, 10020.
- (2002) "Leadership and Change." In Leaders and the Leadership Processes. Jon I. Pierce, John W. Newstrom (eds.). McGraw-Hill/Irwin, New York, NY, 10020.
- (2002) "Leadership and Values." In Leadership. McGraw-Hill/Irwin, New York, NY, 10020.
- (2002) "Leadership is Developed through Education and Experience." In Leadership. McGraw-Hill/Irwin, New York, NY, 10020.
- Javidan, M., House, J. (2001) "Cultural Acumen for the Global Manager: Lessons from Project GLOBE" In Organizational Dynamics. (Spring): 289-305.
- Jaworsky, Joseph. (1982) "The Attitude and Capacities Required of the Successful Leader." In Vital Speeches of the Day (November) 49:3.

- Kejriwal, Aditi; Venkat R Krishnan. (2004) "Impact of Vedic Worldview and Gunas on Transformational Leadership." In The Journal for Decision Makers (January-March) 29:1.
- Kirkpatrick, S.A., Locke, E.A. (1991) "Leadership: Do Traits Matter?" In Leaders and the Leadership Processes, Jon I. Pierce, John W. Newstrom (eds.). McGraw-Hill/Irwin, New York, NY, 10020.
- Manfred, F.R. Kets de Vries, Miller, Danny. (1985) "Narcissism and Leadership: An Object Relations Perspective." In Leaders and the Leadership Processes, Jon I. Pierce, John W.
- Miroff, Bruce. (1986) "John Adams: Merit, Fame, and Political Leadership." In Journal of Politics (February) 48:1.
- Mumford, Michael D., Marks A., Conely, Mary Shane, Zaccaro, Stephen J., Reiter-Palmon, Roni. (2000) "Development of Leadership Skills." In Leadership Quarterly (Spring) 11:1.
- Naim Moises (2005) "The Right Staff" In Newsweek. December 2004-February 2005.
- (2005) "Globoquiz: Guess the Leader" In Newsweek. December 2004- February 2005).
- Newstrom (eds.). McGraw-Hill/Irwin, New York, NY, 10020.
- Nystedt, Lars. (1997) "Who Should Rule? Does Personality Matter?" In European Journal of Personality (March) 11:1, 1-14.
- Opinion Leader Research. Leadership in Britain: Identifying, Nurturing and Developing tomorrow's leaders today (2002) In Webpage: <http://www.opinionleader.co.uk/download/LeadershipInBritainReport.pdf>.
- Potter, Norman. (1979) "Leadership." In Vital Speeches of the Day (January) 46:6.
- Qamar S. Hasan (2004) In Webpage: www.gulfnews.com/Articles/ShaiKhZayedNF.asp?ArticleID=189589 - 38k - 9 Nov 2005 -
- Simonton, Dean Keith. (1981) "Presidential Greatness and Performance: Can we Predict Leadership in the White House?" In Journal of Personality (September) 49:3.
- Singh Khushwant 2004(October) in Webpage: www.rediff.com/news/2004/oct/27inter1.htm
- Stevenson, Richard W. (2005) "When a President Is Not Spoiling for a Fight." In New York Times (October).
- Stogdill, R.M. (1948) "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature." In Leaders and the Leadership Process, Jon I. Pierce, John W. Newstrom (eds.). McGraw-Hill/Irwin, New York, NY, 10020.

- Traub James (1998) "Kofi Annan's Biggest Headache" In New York Times. April.
- Traub, 1998. Webpage: www.globalpolicy.org/secgen/kofi.html.
- Tucker, Robert. (1977) "Personality and Political Leadership." In Political Science Quarterly (Fall) 92:3.
- Winter, David C. (1998) "A Motivational Analysis of the Clinton First Term and the Presidential Campaign." In Leadership Quarterly (Fall) 9:3.
- Yagil, Dana. (1998) "Charismatic Leadership and Organizational Hierarchy: Attribution of Charisma to Close and Distant Leaders." In Leadership Quarterly (Summer) 9:2.
- Yukl, Gary. (1978) "Management Traits and Skills." In Leadership in Organizations. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, 07458.
- (1984) "Charismatic and Transformational Leadership." In Leadership in Organizations. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, 07458.
- (1985) "Perspectives on Effective Leadership Behavior." In Leadership in Organizations. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, 07458.
- (1996) "Developing Leadership Skills." In Leadership in Organizations. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, 07458.
- (1999) "Ethical Leadership and Diversity." In Leadership in Organizations. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, 07458.
- (2002) "Introduction: The Nature of Leadership." In Leadership in Organizations. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, 07458. Quoted in Stogdill, R.M. Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of the Literature (1974).
- Zaleznik (2004) "What is Leadership?" In Webpage:
www.pubpages.unh.edu/~ckb/leadership-part3.html