

## Leadership trait analysis in Foreign Policy

<sup>1</sup> Aabid Majeed Sheikh, <sup>2</sup> Aaqib Muhammad

<sup>1</sup> PhD Candidate, <sup>2</sup> Master's Student,

<sup>1</sup>Department of International Relations, Selçuk University, Konya, Turkey, <sup>2</sup>Department of Political Science, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, India.

Email – <sup>1</sup> aabidamu7@gmail.com, <sup>2</sup> aaqibamu7@gmail.com,

**Abstract:** Leadership has for quite some time been perceived as a standout amongst the most essential factors affecting the achievement or discontent of different activities, going from military crusades, to hierarchical execution in business and administration, to the character and nature of country state foreign and domestic policies. In fact, it may be the most initial case of foreign policy analysis, Thucydides, amid his depiction of the Peloponnesian War amongst Athens and Sparta, highlighted exactly how on a very basic level vital the idea of individual pioneers and their styles were with his difference between the respectable Pericles (who carefully and logically composed a triumphant military methodology against Sparta) and his successor, the foolhardy, greedy globe-trotter Alcibiades (who relinquished Pericles' arrangement for military adventurism, in the long run driving Athens to destroy). Likewise, the thought that "individual leaders" can have any kind of effect was plainly represented in the compositions of Machiavelli, who in *The Prince* gave a manual to youthful rulers giving them, generally, a format to direct their individual activities to help guarantee their prosperity. Many have discussed the issue of at which level of analysis International relations ought to be considered keeping in mind the end goal to make inductions about foreign policy. A developing assortment of writing has underscored the identity of the individual policymaker as an essential variable that shapes foreign policy. The analysis of people in foreign policy analysis, nevertheless, adapts to the issue of summing up to a bigger universe of cases. Consequently, the point of this study is to come to testable, generalizable theories about the part of individuals in foreign policy making.

**Key Words:** Leadership, Foreign Policy, Leadership Traits.

### 1. INTRODUCTION:

Researchers examine foreign policies of nations through different conceptual contraptions. They use various hypotheses and ways to deal with a variety of interior and exterior elements that effect state conduct and foreign policy decision making. Realists focus on survival and power politics, while liberals concentrate on the interdependence that prevails in the 21st century world. Constructivists, then again, take a gander at socially fashioned issues at play in the worldwide arena. Among different issues, scholars can examine foreign policies of nations by taking a glance at their governmental framework or societal gatherings. In addition, scholars can examine foreign policy through the analysis of leaders, their identity and their leadership style.

Albeit numerous present day Realist scholars ignominy a lot of individual level investigations by concentrating on the systemic components that shape international relations, it is in any case hard to impugn the impact of influential personalities. In foreign policy, investigating leadership truly matters. For instance, according to Jonathan W. Keller, a nation reacts diversely to foreign policy crises relying upon the leadership style of its leader (Keller, 2005, p, 205-231). In the same way, through the appraisal of a few American presidents and their advice giving crews, Thomas Preston has determined that to comprehend foreign policy making completely, analysts can't overlook the important role played by leaders (Preston, 2001, p. 267)

Through perceiving the prevalent identity traits of political figures, scholars can pick up a multidimensional comprehension into the decision making of the influential personalities and eventually more noteworthy comprehension of the foreign policy making of states (Herman, 1980, pp. 7-46). Thus, when foreign policy researchers examine about personality traits, they endeavor to observe which foreign policy behaviors are related with which traits (Neack, 2003, p.62). By scrutinizing foreign policy behaviors with their comparing identity traits or characteristics, political scientists can make leadership profiles and could conceivably predict how certain leaders would respond under a given situation (Hermann, 2003, pp.178-212). Furthermore, it has been proposed by specialists that foreign policy conduct or behavior is considerably influenced by decision makers? Identities, especially when in a condition of war or policy making crisis.

### 2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF LEADERSHIP STUDIES:

Foreign policy decision making might be the consequence of different aspects. In other words, when examining foreign policy, there are large numbers of assumptions and methodologies that academics use to clarify the outside and inside elements molding the conduct of nations. Outside elements being the organization of the international framework,

the present features of international affairs, and the activities of different countries, international organizations, and individuals; inside elements being the particular elements of the domestic political framework, the citizenry, government associations, and individual leaders.

Realist hypothesis is derivative of the works of Thomas Hobbes and Niccolo Machiavelli then further expounded on by twentieth century researchers, for example, Hans Morganthau and Kenneth Waltz. Although there are numerous modifications of Realism, Realist theory or hypothesis contains four center suppositions: anarchy, distrust, power politics, and survival. Realism assumes that the international environment is in a condition of disorder or anarchy, which alone demonstrates that international politics is fundamentally not quite the same as the domestic governmental issues of states. While in the domestic framework there is an overall governmental arrangement that controls conduct or behavior through rules and regulations also has the abilities to uphold the rules and regulations executed, in the international framework as expressed by realist assumption such control system does not effectively exist. Despite the fact that, there might be doctrines set by international associations and international law, there is yet to be a strategy for implementation. Accordingly, countries may follow the standards or may pick not to which would bring about anarchy. This unavoidably puts countries in a steady condition of contention and distrust. Because of this state of uncertainty, power aggregation by different countries is viewed as a danger to others. This risk then drives countries to obtain and preserve power. As such foreign policy turns into a game in which balancing power is vital to a country's survival (Mearsheimer, 1995, pp.5-26).

Liberalism, not at all like Realism, emphasizes on the dissemination of economic wealth and the common society in which states are entrenched which obliges their activities. As indicated by liberals this dissemination of wealth and interdependence that has germinated from it, is the essential trademark describing the international system. Interdependence means the dependence and reliance that forms between countries because of international trade and the international financial system. Because of this dependence on each other, i.e. interdependence, countries will probably liaise as it is in their best financial and economic interests (Keohane and Nye, 1997). Even the smallest of countries can profit by such a structure. Small countries can generate merchandise and enterprises in which they practice and after that take part in territorial and worldwide trade systems; consequently, setting up a proficient approach to produce wealth. As countries are interdependent clashes inside the global system are more unfavorable to happen and collaboration is more collective. The level of interdependence can decide the flexibility of control regarding one's own particular foreign policy. That is interdependence may restrain a country's capacity to execute a practical and autonomous foreign policy as their decisions will then significantly influence their trading accomplices and in this manner may create ramifications for themselves.

Constructivist hypothesis stretches out from the point of view that states follow arrangements of standards and social collaborations that constrain state conduct or behavior. All things considered the international system in comprised of international laws, associations, and principles which are altogether given importance by the states' behaviors and the states themselves (Kaarbo, Lantis, and Beasley, 2002, p.11). For illumination, Norms signify shared assumptions about proper conduct that derive from an amalgamation of convictions, standards of conduct, international traditions, and decision making procedures. In accordance to this, norms in regards to suitable international state conduct are socially built and socially controlled. On the off chance that a state carries on in a manner outside of the socially acknowledged standard, different nations will respond in an approach to dishonor them or sanction them. States, in this way, tend to work inside the perceived standards and in spite of the fact that states don't generally agree to international laws, the framework carries some sort of moral, normative authority that states support (Kaarbo, Lantis, and Beasley, 2002, p.12). Scholars consider such standards or norms as a portion of the conceivable external factors that may bear an effect on the foreign policy of states.

In total, Realism, Liberalism, and Constructivism all clarify some of the external components that may affect states' foreign policies. Realism emphasizes on the self-interests of states, which are encouraged by the self-survival in an anarchical international framework. Liberalism focuses to the interdependence that stems from the international trading plans which takes into account more collaboration and less war. Constructivism takes a glimpse at the socially built standards, for example, personality and religion that shape the worldwide system and state conduct. The one thing each of these assumptions has in common is that external components, for example, the interaction of states from around the world and the over-all plan of the worldwide community, are the causes of states' foreign policies. Other than the theories and methodologies that indicate the outside elements that affect foreign policy, there are likewise interior elements, for example, public opinion, governmental organizations, societal groups, and leadership styles that influence foreign policy-decision-making.

While reviewing public opinion, researchers are evaluating the personality, culture, and opinion of the residential masses. Governmental organizations additionally points out the distinction in foreign policy-making in democratic systems and authoritarian administrations. They basically focus on bureaucratic politics where bureaucracies are fundamental in gathering data, creating proposals, offering advice, actualizing policy at times, making foreign policy decisions (Kaarbo, Lantis, and Beasley, 2002, p.8). Societal groups, which can be comprised of resistance groups, political parties, interests groups, common society gatherings, or military, may likewise have substantial effect on

foreign policy-making in a nation. Such groups or gatherings might be encouraged by financial matters, religion, security, or values. The expansion in the amount of financial groups as a result of progression may prompt the prevailing impact of financial groups on state's foreign policies. Occasionally, military groups subordinate the democratically elected authorities may compel the leaders to follow expansionist policies. At last, as an interior element leadership, including the personal qualities and convictions of a country's leaders, may have huge impact on the foreign policy of a state.

### **3. FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS AND LEADERSHIP:**

Leaders occupy the highest point of government and usually have the decision-making power to shape foreign policy. Qualities and identity characteristics or personality traits of a leader are for the most part more substantial when the leader has significant sovereignty in deciding policy and when the conditions are either vague or difficult. Such a setting is profoundly possible in foreign policy making. At the point when the setting is ready, a leader's identity or personality and leadership may influence state conduct. In that capacity, leaders matter impressively in foreign policy especially when they employ much power in decision-making.

According to Joseph S. Nye Jr the individual in the most top position of political power truly affects the general political and historical scheme of occasions. Nye inferred that some transactional leaders in actuality take part in making history by influencing the political results and executing their policies (Nye, 2013, pp.13-15). In the view of Jean Blondel, political leaders can influence more than their own nations and in fact leaders of powerful countries can influence different territories of the world too. Within every country, political leadership can order and communicate generally and broadly; and the leaders of the most important countries have a reverberation that conveys an echo to all sides of the world (Blondel, 1987, p.1). Hence, political leaders don't just influence political results inside and to do with their own particular country, however a few leaders do in certainty influence the political results of different countries also. It is under this postulation that people or individuals can influence international politics.

The analysis of political leaders adds broadly to the pedagogic scholarship of international relations and foreign policy consideration. Through the research of political leaders, academics conduct individual-level inspections. Albeit, individual level inspections are not the most well-known process to study and decipher international political conduct, they have proven helpful to the general comprehension of state conduct. Actor specific studies are essential to foreign policy analysis and basically offer meaning to the study of international relations (Hudson, 2005, pp.1-30). Individual-level inspection or analysis, e.g. studying leadership, has extended within the field of political science, especially in international relations, and particularly within the field of foreign policy analysis. The enlargement of individual-level inspections is owed partially to the field of psychology and political psychology (Snyder, Bruck and Sapin, 1962). There is not, in any case, just a single approach to deal with examining a political leader.

Numerous strategies can be utilized to analyze leadership styles. Young and Schafer recognize four forms or bodies of research studies directed on operational code analysis, cognitive mapping, image theory, and conceptual complexity that offer promising approaches to decide leaders' cognitions (Young and Schafer, 1998, p. 64). By utilizing diverse strategies, each of these forms or bodies of research recognized above are intended to comprehend and dissect components, for example personality traits, political attitudes and behavior, methods of decision-making, and in addition relational abilities of leaders and persons. Of these scrutiny programs, leadership trait analysis, the investigation of applied intricacy has emerged as a solid and reliable research program keeping in mind the end goal to look at the personality traits of a leader and hence decide the leadership style of a person.

### **4. LITERATURE REVIEW ON LEADERSHIP STUDIES:**

Psychopathology and Politics was published in 1930 and composed by Harold Lasswell, is one of the initial endeavors of a researcher to join psychology and political science to produce a complete expression into the identity or personality types or of powerful individuals. In 1950, this exertion was portrayed by McConaughy as an innovator in its field (McConaughy, 1950, p. 903). In fact, not until 1950's did political researchers start to delve further into the analysis of identity or personality and its impacts on political leadership. Following the Psychopathology and Politics, there was a progression of research projects that empowered leadership inquiries of the present day. Psychobiography is a field that purposes to comprehend political leaders, as well as any major individual, utilizing authentic historical proof and mental speculations to create an inclusive inspection. On account of such fields, methodical studies of leaders started to emerge in the second half of the twentieth century. Such evaluations would have hoped to figure out what sort of identity or personality qualities leaders had a tendency to possess. Political researchers started to brand quantitative and qualitative plans to enumerate such identity or personality attributes and traits (e.g. operational code, leadership trait analysis).

### **5. PSYCHOBIOGRAPHY:**

In 1956, Alexander L. George and Juliette L. George published a standout and influential psychobiographies to date, titled Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House: A Personality Study (George and George, 1956). The analysis uses

history, political science, and psychology to make an extensive scrutiny of Woodrow Wilson, driving it to be known as one of the most demanding and conclusive of the psychobiographies of political figures (Greenstein and Lerner, 1971) as noted by Fred I. Greenstein and Michael Lerner. As indicated in the book, characteristics or traits that were set up amid Wilson's adolescence influenced not just his quest for power after achieving adulthood, but also the way in which he exerted his accomplished power as President. George and George proceed as it is to Wilson's primary years, then, that we must search for the starting points of his brilliant quality and of his really traditional lamentable weakness (George and George, 1956). In this way, it can be comprehended that characteristics which are coagulated in adolescence can and do have an effect in one's future life.

Victor E. Wolfenstein made noteworthy advances in the literature for political psychology as to determining political leaders through the blend of psychological assumptions and political investigation. His work is one of the primary organized examinations of leaders' identity or personality utilizing hypothetical intuitions of psychoanalysis. Wolfenstein used the hypotheses of Otto Fenichel, Erik Erickson, and Sigmund Freud in his analysis of the lives of Mahatma Ghandi, Vladimir Lenin, and Leon Trotsky. As to his strategies, Wolfenstein noticed that he meant to use psychoanalysis as the hypothetical reason for his probe and apply it to the field of international politics to better comprehend the identities or personalities that lead people to act in revolutionary actions (Wolfenstein, 1967, p. 12). Through his investigations, Wolfenstein planned to gain a more profound comprehension of these men's inspirations as political revolutionaries.

## **6. SYSTEMATIC STUDIES OF THE PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF POLITICAL LEADERS:**

Conclusively not the same as psychobiographies, new identity or personality literature started to emerge in the realm of political science amidst the twentieth century. Not at all like psychobiographies that utilized psychology to examine important figures, had the organized political studies on identity or personality of a similar period concentrated on identifying the exact identity traits that influenced politics in general. As such, rather than concentrating on the great men of history to decide their own identity traits and qualities that affected their life and careers like psychobiographies, these systematic analyses looked towards the masses to find which identity traits were more helpful for politics and political life. In 1959, Bernard Hennessy finished an analysis utilizing interviews and questionnaires from 138 grown-ups keeping in mind the end goal to find out the sorts of identity traits that are related with being political and apolitical. The identity characteristics that Hennessy used to base his scales are as per the following: Power Orientation, Willingness to Risk, and Willingness to Compromise, Tough-mindedness, Authoritarianism, and Liberalism. It was found that politicals had a higher power drive than apoliticals and political men will probably go for risks than apolitical men. Apolitical, nevertheless positioned higher regarding willing to Compromise. With respect to Tough-mindedness, Liberalism, and Authoritarianism, no distinction exists amongst political and apolitical (Hennessy, 1959, pp. 336-355). Such an evaluation is vital to the literature of political science as it gives the base to answering questions regarding what sort of identity characteristics are obvious in those involved within politics.

## **7. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK OF LEADERSHIP TRAIT ANALYSIS:**

In order to adequately examine the identity traits of a political leader, it is first important to figure out who qualifies as a leader and what precisely identity traits are. Hermann provides a definition for political leaders as, a person who has power to pledge the assets and select the objectives of political unit and, thus, to influence its policies (Hermann and Milburn, 1977, p.2). Political leaders can be at the local, state, regional, or national level of government. Besides, leaders can have an office through free elections, revolutions, appointments, or death. In spite of the fact that identity or personality and identity traits are both thought to be steady structures, as per Hermann, it is still in any case conceivable to figure out which traits remain most predominant given the specific situation; specifically, the analyst can determine the vulnerability of the leader to be effected by the conditions of his environment. The subject in the matter of regardless of whether the identity traits utilized as a part of Leadership Trait Analysis (LPA) are fixed or contextual has been a long debate.

It is essential to note that Leadership Trait Analysis is not by any means the only technique used to study a political leader. There are a various approaches that can be utilized, for example, surveys, interviews, observation (e.g. self-perception, sources, participant observation, and field perception), biographical data, simulation (e.g. computer simulation, all individuals or individual machine simulation) and content examination. Leadership Trait Analysis is a helpful choice if the political leader who is to be analyzed is reluctant to take part in some of the above methods, or is far off from the analyst. In *Assessing Leadership Style: A trait analysis*, Margaret G. Hermann expresses that it is hard to run sequence of psychological investigations on well-known government officials with their endorsement and collaboration because of an absence of skepticism with respect to those to be analyzed (Hermann and Milburn, 1977, p.2). For instance, the politician may fear terrible outcomes, or they may undertake that the outcomes could harm their public image. Along these lines it is vital to govern identity and psychological investigations at a distance. Such studies utilize spontaneous spoken material from the politician being examined. Considering that, in the era of TV, radio, print, and the Internet, the vast majority of what government officials do and say is being recorded; such an errand is not

overwhelmingly troublesome. Leadership Trait Analysis (LTA) is only one of the ways that researchers and scholars can examine the identities or personalities of leaders and politicians.

Hermann too clarifies what precisely constitutes as spontaneous spoken material. There are two ways that a leader or government official addresses people in general: speeches and interviews. Speeches are frequently arranged ahead of time and composed by or with the assistance of a speech specialist. Consequently, scores gathered from equipped comments may encompass systematic contrasts sufficiently expansive to influence the workings of models utilizing at a distance measurement (Dille, 2000, p.583). As such, speeches would not be viewed as spontaneous material as they don't reflect precisely the character and genuine nature of the government official or leader. Interviews, then again, are managed without the help of props, or pre-composed reactions. Despite the fact that a leader may have questions ahead of time, or may have pre-planned reasonable answers if a specific question emerges, the politician is in any case compelled to convey answers rapidly and in their own particular words. The question and answer style of an interview permits those being addressed and interrogated to completely show their identity or personality. The words that leaders select while reacting or the sentence structure of the appropriate responses, all gives a look into the leader's character. As interviews make a situation where leaders are less ready to control what they say, interviews are the speech demonstration of most esteem while examining a leader at a distance.

While attaining interviews of particular leaders, it is vital to have regard for the foundations of said interviews. Interviews are regularly recorded in daily papers, magazines, or can be seen online through the Internet. The way to procuring satisfactory and appropriate material from interviews to use in an identity analysis is to ensure that the interview is in certainty the correct words verbatim from the interviewee. Regularly magazines or even daily newspapers will modify the answers or eliminate as well as alter pieces of the interview so as to make the interview more interesting the masses. Such material is not appropriate for Leadership Trait Analysis.

As per Hermann, while attempting to influence policy, political leaders confront a few difficulties. To begin with, political leaders must find approaches to maintain control over policy while, at the time, keeping up authority and allotting accountabilities to different actors inside the government. Second, political leaders must determine how to viably shape the policy motivation under conditions where he/she has not demarcated the terms and where the framework is being managed by different actors from within the political framework. The way in which a leader deals with these difficulties can be found in his/her leadership style. By leadership style what Hermann implied was the ways in which leaders narrate with everyone around them, regardless of whether constituents, counselors, or different leaders, how they structure communications and the standards, guidelines, and principles they use to guide such interactions (Hermann, 2005, p.181). The leadership style of a political leader not just determines how the leader will uphold control over the policy schedule while assigning authority and concurrently shape the schedule under conditions controlled by different actors, but also determines the nature of the decision making process.

More than 122 leadership style analyses have been directed in the course of three decades. Based on the outcomes from these 122 examinations, Hermann has discovered three determinants that decide a leadership style of a leader. As indicated by Hermann, these three determinants can be evaluated in light of the appropriate responses the following three following: (a) how do leaders react to restraints inside their political framework? (b) How open are leaders to new data and thoughts within decision-making process? (c) How are leaders headed to accomplish their political position, is it a private drive or one that is inspired by the relationship shaped with his/her constituents (Hermann,2005, p.181).

Inside the decision-making process, regardless of whether a leader is open or shut to approaching data and thoughts is suggestive of whether the leader has an intentional vision for a specific result or whether he/she will examine the circumstance before making a decision. The inspiration for why a government official keeps running for office likewise gives vital data with regards to the drives and motivations that boost an individual (Hermann,2005, p.183). In aggregate, how leaders react to limitations, observe information, and are inspired within their political framework, gives scholars data that can be utilized to derive a utilitarian leadership style.

## **8. USING TRAIT ANALYSIS TO ASSESS LEADERSHIP STYLE:**

As indicated by Hermann, there are seven traits that are predominant in surveying leadership style: (1) the faith that one can influence or control what happens, (2) the requirement for power and authority, (3) the capability to separate things and individuals in one's environment, moreover called as conceptual complexity, (4) self-assurance, (5) the propensity to concentrate on problem resolving and finishing something versus preservation of the groups and dealing with others' thoughts and impression, (6) general disbelief or crookedness of others, and (7) the force with which an individual holds an in group favoritism (Hermann,2005, p.178-212).The pertinence of these above mentioned seven traits to political leadership depends on research that has earlier associated policy conduct or behavior to the personal characteristics of individuals (Hermann, 1992, pp.1193-1199). Not just are individual traits noteworthy for comprehending components of a person's leadership style, but so are amalgamations of the traits or characteristics.

In Leadership Trait Analysis, it is presumed that the rate of specific words utilized by leaders in interviews shows the substantiality of the spoken substance. In other words it can be stated that, the more frequent certain words

are inside a speech, the more noticeable the matter is to the speaker. While evaluating the traits of a leader, particular words correspond to particular traits and with that, the rate of such words decides the trait score for the leader. This trait score can then be contrasted with some norming bunches which can be found in the related literature or through Social Science Automation website (<http://socialscience.net/>.2012). It is through this correlation that the examiner can conclude if a leader positions low or high for a trait. Gratefully, there is a computer program given by Social Science Automation that automatically codes in view of the speeches material given and furnishes the examiner with numerical information that can be utilized to survey each of the seven traits. The following segment will give a brief introduction of the seven personality traits studied under Leadership Trait Analysis.

### **8.1. Faith that one can influence or control what happens.**

The Faith that one can influence or control what happens is as to the impression of a person as to his or her own particular capability to control the conditions in which he or she is positioned. In other words, Faith that one can influence or control what happens, directions to the view in which people esteem themselves to have some measure of control over the happenings of their environment (Hermann,2005, pp.188-189). Persons with high faith have a tendency to have confidence in the notion that they can influence the results of circumstances. Such people trust that they are capable of shaping the activities of the world and accordingly have a tendency to be more dynamic during the course of policy-making. Inside policy making, people high in faith are slanted to keep up their control over decision-making and application of policies; thus, such people are less inclined to designate their duties to others. Low faith people will be responsive instead of proactive. As per Kesgin, such people follow a wait and watch policy before they settle on a decision to be made. Not like leaders high in faith, low faith leaders are more prone to delegate obligations. This, nevertheless, implies low in faith leaders are likewise more prone to consider others responsible for administrative catastrophes and faults (Kesgin, 2011, pp.13-14).

### **8.2. Conceptual Complexity (CC).**

According to Hermann, people who are high in CC can see fluctuating purposes behind a specific position. As for the individuals who are low in CC, such people are arranged to classify objects and thoughts into great-terrible, dark-white, either or dimensions; experiences issues in seeing uncertainty in the environment; and responds rather rigidly to stimuli. Therefore high CC people have a tendency to be more adaptable in thinking and tolerant to new thoughts, while low CC people are less adaptable in thinking and not as tolerant to new thoughts. Remarkably, Hermann at first affirmed that CC was a stable characteristic or trait and that it didn't change after some time or framework, unless under extraordinary circumstances. However, from that point, Hermann has recommended that environment and context may affect a few leaders, and henceforth their CC scores may in reality vacillate over the long run or under certain circumstances (Hermann and Hermann, 1986, pp. 361-387).

### **8.3. Self-Assurance or Self-Confidence (SA).**

Self-Assurance (SA) alludes to one's feeling of grandiosity, a person's picture of his or her capability to adapt sufficiently to objects and people in the environment (Hermann, 2005, p.194). It is significant to note that since individuals commonly form self-assurance by associating oneself with other people, the SA is then regularly utilized as an expression of the way in which one positions him or herself in a specific framework. Leaders with high SA are more averse to retain contextual data when related with those with lower SA scores. Also, leaders high in SA have a tendency to be very contented with themselves. Because of this, a leader with high SA does not follow extra data or material to use in evaluating one's conduct or one's general self (Hermann, 2005, p.195).] Furthermore, it is less conceivable that a leader high in SA will be influenced by changes in his or her environment; which means, he or she will keep up behavioral consistency. On the other hand, leaders low in SA will be unpredictable in execution and conduct as they will probably be influenced contextual variations. Changing conditions lead low SA leaders to look for new data as they frequently tend not to know how to imitate and alter to the fluctuating environment. As illustrated by Kesgin, low SA people are liable to perform incompatibly since the environment round them conditions their conduct and not their requirements and wishes (Kesgin, 2011, p. 18).

### **8.4. Problem Solving (PS).**

Problem Solving (PS) alludes how an individual positions him or herself; that is, most people have either problem centered or relationship-centered orientations. This character or trait can be considered as a continuum, with one end being problem centered and the inverse end being relationship-centered. Hermann elucidates on this subject by clarifying that leaders are either encouraged by an internal meditation (i.e. a problem, ideology, cause, or a particular arrangement of interests) or an external meditation (i.e. relationships, control, power, approval). In that capacity, leaders who are relationship focused will work to ensure the groups with which they feel partnered from potential dangers. Leaders who are problem centered won't pay special attention to dangers, but rather they will pay attention to circumstances from which they can benefit (Hermann, 2005, pp.197-199).

### **8.5. Disbelief of Others (DO).**

Disbelief of Others (DO) accomplishes sentiments of doubt, uneasiness, and a general trepidation of other individuals and their activities. Leaders with high DO frequently speculate the intentions of others as being sickening in nature. Frequently, those with contrasting perspectives will be considered as contenders and in this way the majority of their

activities will be interrogated. Disbelief of Others (DO) in outrageous forms can prompt suspicion, frequently making the individual question different people, as well as different groups and nations as well. As doubt and dubiousness is extreme for those high in DO, such people are probably going to move their mentors every now and again to abandon any dismay of uncertainty. Leaders who are low in the characteristic or trait of DO will regularly utilize past encounters to judge who to trust and not to trust (Hermann, 2005, pp.202-203).

#### **8.6. Requirement for Power and Authority.**

The trait, Requirement for Power and Authority (RPA), concerns a person's aspiration to build up and protect his or her power and keep up control or impact over others. A leader high in RPA will desire to perform as the champion in all incident, therefore will attempt to control his or her environment. Hermann expresses that the ones high in RPA are profoundly Machiavellian, regularly working in the background to guarantee that their positions prevail.[footnoteRef:43] In such manner, such people give little care to the general folks around them. Furthermore, leaders low in RPA frequently have a feeling of alliance and have to a lesser degree of a need be in charge. Besides, such leaders work to the greatest advantage of the groups, as what advantages the group is additionally considered to help the leader (Hermann, 2005, pp.190-192).

#### **8.7. In-group favoritism.**

In-gathering favoritism (IGF) or as known in past literature as nationalism, is a trait that estimates how an individual perspectives the significance of his or her recognizable group contrasted with the rest of the world. A group can be a social, political, or ethnic based alliance. Hermann clarifies that one's in-group depends on sensitive affections and frequently one identifies his or her in-groups as the best. Similarly, it is important to safeguard the in-group culture, values, and status. When a person levels high in this trait, he or she will endeavor to keep up the uniqueness of his or her own particular group. Additionally, he or she may become alarmed if different groups (i.e. associations, governments, nations) meddle in his or her group's issues. Hermann explains, Leaders with high marks for in-group favoritism tend to see the world in us and them (companions and adversaries) terms and to rush to view others as questioning the status of their group (Hermann, 2005, pp.201-202). Moreover, person's ranking high in IGF are probably going to be considered only the great features of their group, and overlook any current imperfections. In the event that an individual is low in IGF, nevertheless that does not mean he or she is not a loyalist to his or her group. On the contrary, such people would in any case be fascinated with group preservation and can be marked as faithful. Conversely, the contrast between a low and high positioning in IGF is that low IGF people are more equipped of seeing the world in shades of gray and judging adversaries in light of the circumstance and context, not just on "us versus them" Standard.

### **9. CONCLUSION:**

A leadership profile comprises of features which can assist the leadership style of an individual in view of his/her identity traits. A leadership profile answers these kinds of questions, for example, 1. Does the leader regard or contest restraints? 2. Is the leader open to advanced data? 3. What are the leader's inspirations for looking for office? 4. How do the leaders observe the world? In view of the outcomes from the above inquiries, a leadership style can be resolved. By leadership style, it is implied that the methods in which leaders identify with people around them, regardless of whether constituents, consultants, or different leaders, how they configure cooperations and the standards, tenets, and values they use to guide such cooperations (Hermann, 2005, pp.181). In other words it can be said that, leadership style is very vital in evaluating a leader's decision making style on foreign policy as it enables the scholars to comprehend the leader's convictions, how he or she decides, his or her perspectives of the world, and the archetypal ways he or she manages others. With everything taken into account, the seven traits can independently give data regarding how a leader sees his/her environment, to what degree a leader trusts he/she can control the circumstances in which he/she is available, regardless of whether he/she doubts people around him/her, and further. However, the seven traits can similarly work in amalgamation, enabling the examiner to gain additional data with respect to the identity or personality and leadership style of a leader. Consequently, examiners can utilize the traits separately and in amalgamation to study the most with respect to a leader, his identity or personality, and his leadership style.

### **REFERENCES:**

1. Blondel, Jean. (1987). Political leadership: towards a general analysis, (pp. 17-43). New York, NY: Guilford Press
2. George, Alexander and Juliette I. George. (1956). Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House: a personality study, New York: The John Day Co.
3. Hennessy, Bernard, (1959): Political and apoliticals: some measurements of personality traits. *Midwest journal of political science*, 4(1), 336-355.
4. Hermann, Margaret. (2005): Assessing leadership style: a trait analysis. *The psychological assessment of political leaders*, 7(2), 178-212.

5. Hermann, Margaret. (1980): Explaining foreign policy behavior using the personal characteristics of political leaders. *International Studies Quarterly*, 24(1), pp., 7-46.
6. Hermann, Margaret and Thomas w. Milburn. (1977). A Psychological examination of political leaders. Free press.
7. Hudson, Valerie. (2005): Foreign Policy Analysis: Actor specific theory and the ground of international relations. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 1(1), pp. 1-30.
8. Kaarbo, Juliet, Jeffrey S. Lantis, and Ryan K. Beasley. (2002). Analysis of foreign policy in comparative perspective, foreign policy in comparative perspective: domestic and international influences on state behavior, New York, NY: Guilford Press
9. Keller, Jonathan. (2005): Leadership style, regime type, and foreign policy crisis behavior: a contingent monadic peace. *International studies quarterly*, 49(2), pp. 205-232.
10. Keohane, Robert Owen and Joseph s. Nye. (1977). Power and interdependence: World politics in transition. 2nd ed. Boston: little, brown.
11. Kesgin, Baris. (2012): Tansu ciller's leadership traits and foreign policy. *Perceptions*, 17(3), pp. 29.
12. Kesgin, Baris. (2011). Political leadership and foreign policy in post-cold war Israel and Turkey. Diss. University of Kansas.
13. Mcconaughey, John B. (1950). Certain personality factors of state legislators in South Carolina. *American political science review*, 44(04), pp. 897-903.
14. Mearsheimer, John. (1994): The False promise of International Institutions. *International Security*, 19(3), pp.5-49.
15. Neack, Laura. (2003). New foreign policy: US and Comparative Foreign policy in the 21st century. Rowman & Littlefield.
16. Nye jr., Joseph. (2013): Do presidents matter. *Atlantic monthly*, 311(5),pp.35-57.
17. Paige, Glenn. (1972). Political leadership: Readings for an emerging field. Free press.
18. Preston, Thomas. (2001). The President and his inner circle: Leadership style and the advisory process in foreign affairs. Columbia university press.
19. Suedfeld, Peter and Stanley Coren. (1992): Cognitive correlates of conceptual complexity. *Personality and individual differences*, 13(11), pp.1193-1199.
20. Wolfenstein, e. Victor. (2015). Revolutionary Personality: Lenin, Trotsky, and Gandhi. Princeton University Press.
21. Young, Michael and Mark Schafer. (1998): Is there method in our madness? Ways of assessing cognition in international relations. *Mershon international studies review*, 42(1), pp. 63-96.
22. <http://socialscience.net/>