

**UDC 159.923**

**POLITICAL LEADERS, THEIR TYPES AND PERSONAL QUALITIES: THE  
PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECT**

**Lustina Ye.Yu.**

Applicant for a Degree of Candidate of Psychological Sciences

The Donetsk National University, Ukraine, Vinnitsa

*The work is devoted to the problem of types of political leaders in modern society. The author made accent on modern psychological models of leaders' typology. It has been concluded that leader is a member of a group who is much more responsible to take care about the achievement of group targets than other members. There are different typologies of political leadership. Among them it is necessary to name typologies of M. Weber, J. Burn, D. Goleman and R. Tucker. It is obvious that today social development needs the elaboration of integrative and united psychological model of types of political leadership which will help to resolve the most burning questions of the global political development.*

*Key words: Human, Personality, Individual, Individuality, Society, Leader.*

One of the main problems of modern psychology is the problem of political leadership. In modern science leadership is analyzed as one of the most important elements of regulation of social relations in the field of politics. A leader is a member of a group who is much more responsible to take care about the achievement of group targets than other members. Appearance of leaders in human society was an objective necessity. Leadership is an essential part of human nature. In pristine society there was a need in it because of collective survival and functioning in natural environment. A society needed strong, experienced and clever individuals who became chieftains. Later forms of leadership transformed in many aspects. This phenomenon became more and more complex but its basic principle was still one and the same. When social class had appeared social leadership became political one. It has general character and involves groups of youth, trade unions, families, etc.

The aim of this work is psychological investigation of the problem of typology of political leaders according to their personal characteristic feature.

The question of typology of political leaders has been investigated by many sciences. Among them are M. Weber [1], J. Burns [2], D. Goleman [3] and R. Tucker [4].

But because the phenomenon of political leadership is closely connected with rapid social transformations the question under investigation still needs great attention of social psychologists and other scientists.

An informal leader is a member of a social group who more than others corresponds to group values and have the most authoritative position. Formal leader is appointed or elected in correspond with a certain procedure. He has an official status of a manager. A manager has some rights and duties. He can impose sanctions on other members of a group. A manager not always has the leader's authority. A leader plays the central role in decision-making and organization of collective activity and social relations. He is always a bright individuality. He may be not a manager but may have more chances than others to occupy this position.

A leader as a political subject always feels the influence and pressure of different social groups and should be ready to accept some propositions, to meet some expectations, and to make a compromise with different political forces. If he act only as a subject of policy he becomes a dictator and loses touch with people (both with his influence on them). So, as a result such a leader will lose his status very soon. If a political leader does not express any initiative and will he becomes an object of manipulations of other political forces. In this case leader is an ordinary marionette. Running to both of these extremes are negative for a political leader.

Political leader is always a bright personality. Personality (from the Ancient Greek "persona") firstly denoted masks which were used by antique actors during dramatic performances. In many languages there is an expression "to lose face". It denotes to lose one's status and place in social hierarchy. In the Russian language there is a word "lik" which described the image of face on an icon. If try to remember the essentials of philosophical anthropology, namely the definitions of such notions as a "human", "individual", "personality" and "individuality", their meaning can be expressed in the following way. A human is the most general term. It denotes a living being – homo sapiens. A human is an individual in the social life. An individual is a separate member of society. This term does not reflect biological peculiarities and the specific of social activity of a man. The notion "individuality" reflects the unique originality of a human.

Personality is a separate man with certain character, individual faculties and inclinations. This term relates only to a certain man or woman from the definite stage of his or her personal development. It is impossible to say something about the personality of a new-born child. A personality always has the world out-look, personal position and

specific attitude to life. The most important distinctive features of personality are the following: reason; speech; ability to labour; independence; great variety of feelings and emotions; responsibility; free will. All these features are determined by a system of relations in society.

Modern civil society as the social environment in which a personality lives and acts makes certain demands which one should correspond to in order to adapt to them successfully. For the development of strong civil society personal self-determination of citizens is quite important. Very often personal self-determination is identified with personal worldview. But, as completely truly A. Matveyeva says, each personality has its own worldview. But it does not mean that such personality is self-determined [5, p. 36]. Personal self-determination is impossible without high level of self-consciousness, deep awareness of one's own life and restriction of conformism. But in real democratic societies of modern world development of individuality is not always maintained. The ideas of Russian and American scientist M. Gofman who analyzed relations between society and personality in Western society are rather interesting. He uses the term "minimal personality" borrowed from works of famous sociologist K. Lash and starts his work devoted to this topic with the words of J.-J. Rousseau (from his treatise "Social Contract"): "Prominent in its talents person is a danger for democratic society and should be thrown overboard. In society people should finish their existence as personalities" [6]. Really, the principle of standardization in highly developed and industrialized Western democracies has been spread not only in the sphere of economy but also psychology. It causes the situation when personality has been reduced to labour function and its transforming into a "basic personality" or "one-dimensional personality" (E. Colwell, H. Marcuse).

The embodiment of the American dream always was a self-made man who creates financial good. But highly developed personality (and especially individuality) is characterized by priority of spiritual values. In the European countries the high social class has been always represented by artists, philosophers and scientists. In modern American society the value of personality depends first of all from its financial and material success. The uniqueness and originality are not integrated into American democracy. A unique personality always has its inner conflicts and contradictions which can shake fragile social and political stability. Here the following worldview principle can be found: Life success demands adaptation and compromises. That is why worldview

model of a typical representative of the American democracy really can be regarded “one-dimensioned”.

As brilliantly M. Gofman said “...individualism and conformism of the western democracy seem to be polar contradictions. But in modern forms of life they are combined in the integrated unity embodying in the image of a conformist-rebel... Extreme individualism and self-insularity form a social psychological type which can easily be used as a victim of manipulations (much easier than social mass)... Breaking off normal social links with other people he finds himself helpless in front of external pressure” [6]. M. Gofman makes a comparative analysis of American and European personal worldviews and makes conclusion that they are antithetical. But it seems that this statement was equitable earlier, may be in the beginning of the 20th century. Today the American way of looking at the world is rapidly spread all over the world. Such an “one-dimensioned” worldview is spread by western educational standards, music, television and other aspects of globalization (which can be named also “Americanization” without any harm for sense). Reducing of personal worldview to only one dimension cannot enrich and develop human nature. It means the same for society as a whole. The answer to the question about this situation can be found in M. Heidegger’s works. Analyzing the problem of technocratism he wrote that for overcoming of historical determinism personal efforts and reason were necessary. Personal work on oneself is necessary. A man must “open himself to the essence of technique”, “awake” and “renew the feeling of latitude of his inner space” [7, p. 254] (which, by the way, F. Dostoyevsky wanted to make narrower: “A man is wide, too wide. I would like to make him narrower”).

There are different classifications of political leaders in modern psychology. The most general and classic classification was formulated by M. Weber. According to Weber, leadership in a political system is spearheaded by three types of leaders: traditional leaders, charismatic leaders and bureaucrats. They operate under either a transactional or transformational political leadership model. According to Weber's political leadership theory, transactional political leaders use their knowledge or legal authority to achieve results. On the other hand, transformational leaders utilize their personal charisma to achieve their objectives.

There are 3 types of leadership by M. Weber: 1) Traditional leadership. This type is based on the power of traditions and inheritance of power. He may express his personal will and realize his personal qualities in practical activity or may just fulfill his formal

functions; 2) Charismatic leadership. This type is based on people's belief in outstanding qualities of a leader such as talent, heroism or infallibility. These faculties distinguish a leader from a crowd and perceived as a supernatural gift. As a rule, these leaders appear in turning points of history; 3) Bureaucratic leadership. This type of leadership is based on the idea of rational norms and laws of social life. Leaders are elected according to legal procedures.

J. Burns' political leadership theory borrows heavily from Max Weber's theory. In addition to Weber's description of transactional leaders, Burns distinguished five categories of transactional political leaders. They include opinion political leaders, who have an ability to sway public opinion; political party leaders holding various positions in a given country; executive leaders, such as heads of state; bureaucratic leaders who occupy positions of political power; and legislative leaders who work behind scenes to shape political systems.

According to Burns, transformational political leaders include political scholars who shape political societies through their clarity and vision on political affairs, reform political leaders who address issues of societal morality, revolutionary leaders who bring about rapid political transformations in societies and charismatic political leaders who utilize their personal charm to change political systems in societies.

This theory was advanced by D. Goleman in 1995. The theory focuses on the elements that make up the features of a political leader. It also places emphasis on behavioral approaches adopted by various political leaders. The theory leans heavily on emotional intelligence, and among the aspects of emotional intelligence highlighted in Goleman's political leadership theory are self-awareness, self-regulation, social skills, empathy and motivation amongst political leaders. There are 3 levels of leadership: 1) Leader of a small group; 2) Leader of a social movement, organization of party (expresses some social class interests); 3) Leader-politician (a head of the state or some branch of power who acts in the system of power relations). In real political systems there are features of different types of leadership, but one type is always the dominant one.

According to the type of interaction with social environment there are two types of leaders: 1) Authoritative type. Such leaders seek for the monopoly of power. They actively use power, violence and administrative methods in achievement of their purposes. They formulate independently all tasks of political activity; 2) Democratic type. Such leaders stimulate their supporters making accent on the atmosphere of

cooperation and feeling of personal dignity. They are objective, polite and always listen to public opinion.

American scientist R. Tucker distinguishes the following types of leadership according to the types of political consciousness:

1) Leader-reformer believes in collective ideal model of society. He defines deviations from this model in people's behavior and sees his main aim in getting over these deviations;

2) Leader revolutionary evaluates current social life as absolutely incorrect and sees the only possible way-out in fundamental rebuilding of society in accordance with new social ideas;

3) Leader-conservator does not want any social changes and fight against them using social traditions, norms and principles

Therefore, leader can be defined is a member of a group who is much more responsible to take care about the achievement of group targets than other members. There are different typologies of political leadership. Among them it is necessary to name typologies of M. Weber, J. Burn, D. Goleman and R. Tucker. It is obvious that today social development needs the elaboration of integrative and united psychological model of types of political leadership which will help to resolve the most burning questions of the global political development.

### **References:**

1. Weber M. *The three types of legitimate rule* / M. Weber // *Berkeley Publications in Society and Institutions*. – 2005. – Vol. 4 (1). – P. 12–38.
2. Burns J. *Leadership* / J. Burn. – N.-Y.: Harper & Row, 1978. – 530 p.
3. Goleman D. *Emotional Intelligence* / D. Goleman. – N.-Y.: Bantam, 2006. – 348 p.
4. Tucker R. *The Theory of Charismatic Leadership* / R. Tucker // *Political Leadreship*. – Los Angeles; London; New Delhi; Singapore; Washington DC, 2006. – Vol. 1. – P. 279 – 301.
5. Matveyeva A. I. *The principle of the Worldview Ideals of personality: The Social and Philosophical Analysis* / A. I. Matveyeva // *Teoriya i praktika obshshestvennogo razvitiya*. – 2011. – Vol. 5. – P. 32–40.
6. Gofman M. *The Minimal Personality* / M. Gofman // *Golos Epohi*. – 2010. – Vol. 07/08 [Electronic resource]. – Access regime: <http://golos-epohy.narod.ru/index.files/MINIMAL.htm>

7. Heidegger M. *Being and Time. The Articles and Speeches* / M. Heidegger; [per. s nem. V. V. Bibikhin]. – M.: Respublika, 1997. – 447 p.