THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Personality or role? Comparisons of Turkish leaders across different institutional positions

OPEN ACCESS

PERSONALITY OR ROLE? COMPARISONS OF TURKISH LEADERS ACROSS DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONAL POSITIONS

Esra Cuhadar

Department of Political Science

Bilkent University

Ankara, Turkey

e-mail: esracg@bilkent.edu.tr

Juliet Kaarbo

Politics and International Relations

The University of Edinburgh

United Kingdom

e-mail: J.Kaarbo@ed.ac.uk

Baris Kesgin

Department of Political Science

Susquehanna University

Selinsgrove, Penn., USA

e-mail: kesgin@susqu.edu

Binnur Ozkececi-Taner

Department of Political Science

Hamline University

USA

e-mail: bozkececitaner01@hamline.edu

ABSTRACT: Personality approaches to politics are often criticized for not examining the effect that institutional role constraints have on individual beliefs and preferences. When leaders appear to change their stance when they change roles, it is assumed that roles have a determining influence. Modern personality theory and contemporary sociological role theory, however, view the effects of roles as interacting with agents' personalities. In this paper, we investigate this question by comparing personality profiles of three Turkish leaders (Özal, Demirel, and Gül) during their tenure as prime minister and during their subsequent time as president. For Gül, we perform an additional comparison during his time as foreign minister. The personality profiles are in the form of quantitative scores generated from machine-coded content analysis of leaders' words using the Leadership Trait Analysis method. We hypothesize that different leaders will be more susceptible to changing role contexts, depending on core personality traits and that different traits are more likely to change with new roles. Overall, our results suggest that leaders' traits are fairly resistant to changes across roles and that task orientation is the most likely trait to change as leaders adapt to different role demands and expectations. This study makes a contribution to our understanding of the interaction between personality and political contexts by offering specific theoretically-derived hypotheses and by empirically and statistically examining a preliminary set of expectations that could be applied more broadly to other leaders.

Keywords: personality, institutional role, Leadership Traits Analysis, Turkey

Introduction

When leaders change their political and institutional position, many would expect them to adapt to that new position. Their expressed beliefs and style of engaging with others might change with different role demands, expectations of role appropriate behavior, and the powers and incentives associated with the position. When leaders do adapt to new roles, this change in expressed beliefs and behavior may be interpreted to support an institutional, structural, or situational perspective, contra a psychological perspective. If, the argument goes, leaders' actions and decisions are a product of their institutional role, then the effect of their own personality must be minimal.

For personality theorists, on the other hand, political leaders may approach their positions of power very differently. While some leaders choose to delegate power to their advisors, for example, others may prefer taking initiatives and become actively involved in the decision making process. Similarly, they argue, when two similarly positioned leaders face the same situations, they respond differently or an individual who occupies different political roles in his or her career will have the same set of beliefs and behave accordingly. For example, Jonathan Renshon (2008), in his study of G.W. Bush's beliefs as governor and president, predicted that there would be little change in Bush's operational codes across roles. According to Renshon, "In novel situations, actors are likely to use a familiar role until events either reinforce that role

conception or a new role is learned…. In the case of GWB [Bush], his new role as president of

the United States was sufficiently novel that he was unlikely to have at his disposal a role

conception appropriate to his new office and therefore likely to retain his old role conception

(including his old beliefs) after taking office" (Renshon 2008: 829). Renshon argues that

consistency theories as well as cognitive miser and limited information processor perspectives

support an expectation that beliefs are 'sticky' and are more often confirmed than changed.

Somewhat contrary to his hypothesis, however, Renshon finds some changes in Bush's beliefs

upon taking office, although they are in the direction of reinforcing existing beliefs.[1] This

conclusion begs important questions, which we address in this study: Do *all* political leaders

change their personality characteristics when they occupy different institutional roles? And

which aspects of personalities are most likely to change across role positions?

David Winter (2005), a prominent personality and leadership scholar, has defined the

relationship between personality and social context (e.g., role) as a complex one. According to

Winter (also Keller 2009; Van Esch 2014) personality interacts with the opportunities and

obstacles of situational contexts; at the same time, personality can be defined as a series of

embodied contexts—characteristics formed by environments and experiences that, once

---

[1] Other works on personality changes across roles include Holsti's (1970) suggestion that John Foster
Dulles's beliefs were partly a product of his role.

developed, are then resistant to alteration or are altered only with more effort than it took to form them (Winter 2005: 574). According to psychologist David Funder, "the person-situation debate, concerning whether consistencies in individuals' behavior are pervasive or broad enough to be meaningfully described in terms of personality traits…can at last be declared about 98% over….The long-standing and controversy-generating dichotomy between the effect of the situation versus the effect of the person on behavior…is and always was a false dichotomy" (Funder, 2001: 199-200). Indeed, modern personality theory, as well as contemporary sociologically-based role theory, do not see individuals as static across roles. Rather, the personality-role (or agent-structure) relationship is conceptualized as interactionist (Roberts 2007; Wood and Roberts 2006).

These personality approaches would expect individuals, and some personality types more than others, to develop their interactions with their role (and the institutional environment in which their role resides) over time. Hollis and Smith argued in their analysis of the Carter administration's 1980 attempt to rescue hostages in Iran that institutional roles sit "rather loosely on the actors" as roles and situations are generally ambiguous enough for actors' individual personalities to interpret their roles and role demands (Hollis and Smith 1986: 276). In other words, individuals do not simply wear and change roles as they would clothes; their personalities shape both the degree to which they mold themselves to roles, and the manner in which they play

their role. Wood and Roberts (2006) and Roberts and Mroczek (2008) argue that personality

traits may change even into adulthood and in old age, following a role learning process.[2] As

Roberts (2007) suggests, roles are unique situational levers because they provide both enough

'context' to capture its impact and are not too narrow of a focus to prevent researchers from

missing the impact of personality traits in return.

Taking an interactionist perspective, Margaret Hermann (1980, Hermann et al., 2001) has

argued that the permanence of a trait across roles (or situations) is itself a personality

characteristic and varies across leaders. According to Dille and Young (2000: 594), "such an

argument would need to be supported by further inquiry into trait variability under more

controlled circumstances." We seek to provide this in this study. Drawing on previous research

on the personalities of political leaders, we develop specific expectations about role adaptation.

---

[2] A similar interactionist perspective can be found in recent work on role theory in international relations and other research that has made strong claims about the co-constitutive nature of structural and institutional constraints and the characteristics of agents (e.g., Giddens 1984; Carlsnaes 1992; Bueno de Mesquita et al. 2003; Barnett and Duvall 2005; Thies 2010; Chiozza and Goemans 2011; Shannon and Kowert 2012). Studies on national role conceptions, for example, see egos interacting with others and with normative structures to identify appropriate patterns of behavior (e.g., Harnisch, Frank and Maull 2011; McCourt 2011). Strong empirical evidence, however, about how the co-constitution between agent and structure influence the decision-making process or the outcome, however, has been lacking (e.g., Dessler 1989; Barnett and Duvall 2005). In addition, role theory approaches to foreign policy often neglect the importance of personality and individuals as agents (Cantir and Kaarbo 2012). On role learning in foreign policy, see Harnisch (2012), Malici (2006) and Malici and Malici (2005).

We are interested in what types of leaders are most likely to change their expressed political personality when they come into a new political position.

With several leaders holding different institutional roles in Turkish politics, Turkey provides a natural quasi-experimental design and opportunity for this theoretical investigation. Thus, as a first step, we investigate and compare the personality profiles of three Turkish leaders – Süleyman Demirel, Abdullah Gül, Turgut Özal - and examine any changes in their leadership traits across roles. Our study of three leaders must be considered preliminary and suggestive of future research to develop our understanding of agents' interactions with institutional structures.

Characterizing Leaders' Personalities: The LTA Conceptual Framework

Leadership Trait Analysis (LTA) is one of the most prominent approaches to the study of political leaders. This framework was developed by Margaret Hermann and integrates her decades of research on the role of personality characteristics in foreign policy (Hermann, 1980, 1983, 1984, 1987, 2003). In this approach, personality is conceptualized as a combination of seven traits: belief in ability to control events, conceptual complexity, need for power, distrust of others, in-group bias, self-confidence, and task orientation (see Table 1).

Table 1

Personality Characteristics in Leadership Trait Analysis

LTA Trait	Description
Belief in Ability to Control Events	perception of own degree of control over political world
Need for Power	interest in developing, preserving, or reinstituting own power
Conceptual Complexity	ability to distinguish complexities of political life
Self-Confidence	notion of self-importance, and of his/her capacity to take on the political environment.
In-group Bias	belief that own group constitutes the center of political world
Distrust of Others	suspicions, skepticism, worry of others than own group
Task Focus	concentration on problem solving vs. building relationships

Source: Hermann, 2003

LTA has been used to study the personalities of many leaders, including U.S. presidents, British Prime Ministers, sub-Saharan African leaders, Iranian leaders, Soviet Politburo members, and heads of international organizations such as the European Union and the United Nations (Dyson, 2006; Hermann, 1984, 1987; Kille and Scully, 2003; Mastors, 2000; Preston, 2001; Taysi and Preston, 2001). This research has shown that leaders' personality traits do indeed vary. What does LTA explain? LTA research has demonstrated that its seven personality traits systematically link to a leader's propensity to challenge or respect constraints in their

environments, their openness to information and advice, the structure of their advisory systems, the quality of the decision making process, and the policies leaders choose for their country or organization (e.g., Hermann 2003; Kille and Scully 2003; Dyson 2006; Schafer and Crichlow 2010).

According to Hermann, the seven traits combine in particular ways to produce specific behaviors by leaders (see Table 2) (Hermann 2003). Leaders who have a high belief in their ability to control events and a high need for power, for example, are expected to challenge constraints; and leaders low in need for power and/or who do not believe they can control events are expected to respect constraints. Conceptual complexity and self-confidence are related to and predict leaders' openness to information. Leaders with high scores on both traits, and leaders who have high complexity and low self-confidence are expected to be open to information, whereas leaders with low scores on both traits and leaders with high self-confidence and low complexity are expected to be closed to information. These two composite traits combine with a leader's motivation for leading to produce a typology of eight different leadership styles which Hermann argues provide a profile of how "leaders relate to those around them and how they structure interactions and the norms, rules, and principles they use to guide such interactions" (Hermann 2003: 181).

In addition to the methodological rigor of the content analysis scheme associated with LTA (described below), the advantage of using the LTA framework for investigating the relationship between personalities and roles is that it provides specific expectations regarding which characteristics of leaders matter and how. In other words, leaders with different traits are expected to relate to their context, institutional setting, costs and benefits of various policy options, and other political actors in theoretically meaningful and predictable ways. One purpose of this study is to make these expectations more specific than they have been in previous research.

Table 2
LTA Trait Combinations

Leader Composite Characteristic	Leader Types	Component Traits
Responsiveness to Constraints	Challenger/Respecter	Belief in Ability to Control Events + Need for Power
Openness to Information	Closed/Open	Complexity + Self-Confidence
Leadership Style	Active Independent, Collegial, Evangelical, Directive, Expansionist, Incremental, Influential, Opportunistic	Responsiveness to Constraints + Openness to Information + Task Motivation

Source: Hermann, 2003

Role Adaptation: What Types of Leaders Are Most Likely to Change With New Roles and

Which Personality Characteristics Are Most Likely to Change?

In this section, we review the extent of research on the personalities of political leaders

with the aim of developing expectations on the effects of role change on personality

characteristics. Although we offer some specific hypotheses, these must be considered

preliminary. Given the dearth of research on change in LTA traits, our aim is to start a

conversation regarding these relationships. Our empirical analysis provides more information

for future research and theoretical development. We know of no study that specifically

examined changes in LTA traits across role positions. Related research, however, has examined

changes in leaders' beliefs over time and belief stability, which are pertinent to our question.

While not specifically examining the impact of role change, they do provide clues on which traits

are most likely to change and when. Many have examined the trait of complexity. Dille and

Young (2000), for example, examined the temporal stability of cognitive complexity in their

study of Carter and Clinton. Finding that Carter's complexity trait remained stable (and high)

across his term, while Clinton's scores for complexity change (becoming simpler), the authors

conclude that their results "indicate that conceptual complexity is stable for some people, but not

for others" (2000: 594). Suedfeld and Wallace (1995) also find Clinton's integrative complexity

changed across time. Overall, these studies reinforce the notion that trait stability is itself a

personality variable. They also suggest that complexity is a trait that is particularly susceptible to change. Others have focused on changes in operational code beliefs across time and also point to variability in the stability of beliefs. Crichlow (1998), for example, noted changes in Israeli Prime Ministers Rabin and Peres across time, while Malici and Malici (2005) found little change in the beliefs of Fidel Castro and Kim Il Sung. Walker, Schafer, and Young (1999) also found only minor changes in the operational codes of George H. Bush and Bill Clinton across time.

Many previous studies were interested in the effects of exogenous events on leaders' beliefs, comparing their beliefs before and after events. Walker and Schafer (2000a and 2000b) attribute changes in Carter's and Johnson's beliefs to events in their environments, as does Feng (2005) in her study of Mao's operational code before and after events in the Korean War. Renshon (2008) hypothesized that GW Bush's beliefs would change considerably after the terrorist attacks of 9/11. While some parts of Bush's operational code did change, others did not, leading Renshon to conclude: "Bush's overall operational code can still be described as relatively stable, with only three out of ten indices experiencing a statistically significant change" (836). This is consistent with Tetlock's (2005) finding that dramatic and unexpected events can serve to consolidate beliefs rather than change them and Robison's (2011) finding that in periods of international and domestic hardship, U.S. presidents show considerable stability in their belief systems.

Renshon's study of Bush is also in line with others who have found changes in some beliefs, but not others (e.g. Malici 2006a, 2006b; Robison 2011). As Renshon notes, "An interesting trend that emerges from these studies concerns which beliefs were stable and which were prone to change. The results indicated that philosophical beliefs are more prone to change than instrumental beliefs" even though these findings "directly contradict the social psychological theories of belief change" (Renshon 2008:827). For the purposes of this study, the research on change and stability in beliefs over time reinforces the idea of variation in susceptibility to change across leaders and suggests that some aspects of leaders' personalities are more likely to change than others. The puzzle of which *leaders* are more likely to change personality traits or which *traits* are more likely to change when they change roles, however, remains.

The theoretical conceptualization of Hermann's LTA research suggests some answers to this question. Specifically, Hermann (1993) argues that certain traits are particularly important and can act as intervening variables between triggers from leaders' environments and the other aspects of leaders' personalities. Some leaders are more sensitive to their environments and will adapt themselves to the demands of that environment, including the demands of their institutional roles. For less sensitive leaders, their personality characteristics are likely to remain consistent across different situations and environments. Sensitivity to the environment can be

assessed in a number of ways in the LTA framework, including some of the trait combinations. Those with the combination of traits, for example, that make them constraint respecters (see Table 2) are more likely to change other traits with role changes since changing roles involve new constraints. Similarly, those leaders who are open to information (see Table 2) are more likely to change other traits when they take on new roles and are exposed and attend to new information environment.

Building on this prior research, we offer Hypothesis 1 and specific sub-hypotheses (see Table 3) indicating certain LTA traits (conceptual complexity) and trait combinations (responsiveness to constraints and openness to information) acting as intervening variables for other traits and will affect the likelihood of changes in other personality characteristics when leaders change roles. Support for the hypothesis on openness to information also comes from Van Esch's (2014) study that found openness to information correlated with change and stability in leaders' beliefs during the Euro financial crisis. Leaders open to information were more likely to change fundamental beliefs in specific directions. Van Esch also found that leaders who are more complex were more likely to change some beliefs in response to the crisis. Conceptually complex individuals are expected to be more capable of integrating new and contradictory information from their contexts (Van Esch, 2014). This implies that leaders high in conceptual complexity may be more open to new role demands, thus triggering change in other traits. This

expectation also builds on other research that singles out complexity as a particularly important trait for distinguishing changes in personality across time (e.g., Suedfeld and Wallace 1995; Dille and Young 2000).

Table 3
Hypotheses on Personality Characteristics and Role Change:
Key Traits as Intervening Variables

HYPOTHESIS 1: Personality characteristics are more likely to change when certain types of leaders change roles:
   1a: Leaders who respect constraints (low in belief in ability to control events and low in need for power) are more likely to change other traits when they change roles.
   1b: Leaders open to information (high in complexity and high in self confidence) are more likely to change other traits when they change roles.
   1c: Leaders with higher scores on complexity are more likely to change other traits when they change roles.

Leaders' personalities may also respond to role change depending on the particular role demands of their institutional positions.   We can reasonably expect that with significant differences between the old role and the new role, the greater chance there is for changes in individual traits.   Going from the post of prime minister to the post of president in a parliamentary democracy, for example, might prompt changes in specific directions of personality characteristics, given the different role expectations and responsibilities these roles carry. These differences are visible in the Turkish context, and in most parliamentary political systems with presidential offices. According to the Turkish Constitution, the president, as the

head of the State, "represents the Republic of Turkey and the unity of the Turkish Nation." In this role "she/he shall ensure the implementation of the Constitution," and "the regular and harmonious functioning of the organs of State" (Article 104). With regard to foreign policy, Turkish presidents have less 'power,' in both legislature and executive branches, than do prime ministers and the cabinet. Again, according to the Constitution (Article 104), the specific foreign policy functions of the president include: (1) to ratify and promulgate international treaties, (2) to represent the Commander-in-Chief of the Turkish Armed Forces on behalf of the Turkish Grand National Assembly, and most importantly, (3) to decide on the use of the Turkish Armed Forces.

In comparison, the prime minister, who is appointed by the president from among the members of the Turkish Grand National Assembly, is "chairperson of the Council of Ministers," (Article 112) meaning that she/he is the *head of the government*.[3] The Prime Minister "supervise[s] the implementation of the government's general policy" (Article 112). These roles also differ from other key cabinet positions such as a minister in charge of a specific policy area, such as trade or foreign affairs. Ministers in the cabinet are expected to advocate for their agency and policies, which support their agencies' worldviews, status, and budget. However, it should be noted that in the Turkish and many other contexts, each minister is responsible to the

---

[3] This has changed when the president became elected by popular vote, first with Erdogan in 2014. All leaders examined in this study served before this change.

prime minister, not the president, in the exercise of their duties and powers (Articles 112 and 117). The different roles and powers the president and the prime minister are given by the Turkish Constitution would, according to an institutional perspective, lead to different priorities and decision-making processes by these individuals.

Table 4

Hypotheses on Personality Characteristics and Role Change:
Trait Responses to Role Demands

HYPOTHESIS 2: Some personality characteristics are more likely to change when new roles carry with them specific expectations and responsibilities:
  2a: Task focus may be more likely to shift from goal-oriented to relationship-oriented if the leader shifts to a less policy-focused position (e.g. from prime minister to president position).
  2b: In-group bias is likely to decrease when the leader shifts from a partisan role (e.g. prime minister elected from a political party) to a less partisan role (e.g. president).
  2c: Belief in ability to control events is likely to decline with a change from the prime Minister to president role because prime ministers are considered the "doer" role and presidents are more symbolic in parliamentary systems.

Our expectations on which traits are most likely to change across these institutional roles are presented in Hypothesis 2, with additional sub-hypotheses (see Table 4). Task focus, in-group bias, and belief in ability to control events are the personality characteristics most likely connected to the different role demands faced by presidents and prime ministers in parliamentary democracies like Turkey. The nature of these roles also allows us to hypothesize the specific direction expected with changes in these roles.

Data and Methods

We use the Leadership Trait Analysis (LTA) at-a-distance method to profile three Turkish leaders: Süleyman Demirel, Abdullah Gül, and Turgut Özal. Individually, and as a set, these leaders offer a natural quasi-experimental design for examining personalities across roles as each leader has served as both the prime minister and the president of Turkey. Gül also served as Turkey's foreign minister. Table 5 presents the dates each leader held these positions.

LTA assumes that certain words spoken by a leader reflect specific personality traits: the more frequently leaders use certain words and phrases in their speeches, the more apparent and salient such content is to them and the more it reflects underlying personality traits (Hermann 2003). Coding is quantitative and employs frequency counts taking the word or phrase as the unit of analysis. Extensive dictionaries have been developed for each trait. Early LTA research used hand-coding techniques, now computer programs have been developed to code leaders' speeches to produce more reliable assessments at greater speeds and volume.[4] ProfilerPlus, a language parsing software program developed by Social Science Automation[5]determines the percentage of particular words and phrases used by the leaders based on the length of the text.[6] The

[4] Walker (2000), Young (2000).

[5] See www.socialscience.net.

[6] See Hermann (2003) for more information on how scores are calculated on each personality trait.

percentages for any leader can be compared to a reference group to determine whether the particular leader is high, low, or average on a trait (Hermann 2003). Hermann's studies have produced a large sample of 284 world political leaders to which new profiles can be compared.

Although LTA and other at-a-distance assessments are now, with machine-coding, reliable, they continue to face a central question of validity: do the words of leaders truly reflect their personal beliefs and personality characteristics? This question revolves around authorship, audience effects and deception, temporal stability, and language differences. For this study, we address these issues by using only interviews and other spontaneous material and not prepared speeches, we aggregate across audience, and we assume that these leaders' characteristics can be meaningfully assessed in English (if the text was originally spoken in English) or in English translations. We build on previous scholarship and assert that leaders do have some control over their speech acts and that LTA can capture leaders' *public* personalities (if not their private ones) which matter more for explaining their decision making style and policy choices.[7] We also directly address this question by comparing personality traits across role positions. If traits are fairly stable, this lends greater confidence in the validity of the LTA approach.

---

[7] For discussions and examinations of these issues, see Dille and Young (2000); Marfleet (2000), Schafer (2000), Schafer and Crichlow (2000), Schafer and Walker (2006), Renshon (2008), Renshon (2009) and Schafer and Crichlow (2010).

For our research, we collected spontaneous statements, mainly from interviews, for the

three Turkish leaders. We selected statements that are exclusively about foreign policy issues.

After we classified leaders' statements according to the dates they stayed in each role (prime

minister, president, and [for Gül only] foreign minister), we then conducted an LTA analysis for

each period separately.

Table 5
Leaders and Roles

Leader	Role	Term
Süleyman Demirel	Prime Minister	27 Oct. 1965 – 26 March 1971 31 March 1975 – 05 Jan. 1978 [1] 12 Nov. 1979 – 12 Sept. 1980 [2] 21 Nov. 1991 – 16 May 1993 [3]
	President	16 May 1993 – 16 May 2000
Abdullah Gül	Minister of Foreign Affairs	14 March 2003 – 28 Aug. 2007
	Prime Minister	18 Nov. 2002 – 14 March 2003
	President	28 Aug. 2007 – present
Turgut Özal	Prime Minister	13 Dec. 1983 – 9 Nov. 1989
	President	9 Nov. 1989 – 17 April 1993

Notes:

[1] Demirel led two cabinets, with a one-month break in between two.

[2] Demirel's prime ministership ended with a coup d'état.

[3] Demirel government continued until June 26th under Deputy PM Erdal İnönü's leadership.

Sources: Turkish Grand National Assembly's website
http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/kutuphane/e_kaynaklar_kutuphane_hukumetler.html , the website for
The Presidency of the Republic of Turkey at http://www.tccb.gov.tr/en/ , Ministry of Foreign
Affairs webpages at http://www.mfa.gov.tr/list-of-former-ministers-of-foreign-affairs.en.mfa
(last access to all pages, September 1, 2015).

Results and Discussion

In Table 6, each leader's traits are listed separately for each of their leadership positions. Arrows indicate the movement in their scores from prime minister to president for Özal and Demirel and from prime minister to foreign minister and then to president for Gül. To facilitate comparability, the direction of change in traits is only indicated between these leaders as prime minister and as president. Table 6 also indicates the statistically significant differences. For Özal and Demirel, we ran two-tailed t-tests with independent samples in SPSS to test whether the differences in trait scores for prime minister and president roles were significant. We ran the same test for Gül's prime minister and presidency traits as well. In addition, for Gül we also did an additional significance test using ANOVA for within and between groups to compare trait scores on his prime minister, president, and foreign minister roles. Table 7 lists the comparison outcomes for the three leaders based on the 284 world leader comparison group. Table 8 indicates the classification for the three leaders in terms of the combinations of traits, as suggested by Hermann (2003). It is important to note that the classification of these leaders in terms of their orientation towards constraints, sensitivity to information, motivation, and leadership style is solely based on the content analysis of their statements, consistent with other

LTA research. In this paper, we do not trace the process to examine if the leaders actually

behave this way in decision making.[8]

Table 6
LTA Analysis Results

	Özal		Demirel		Gül		
	PM	*PRES*	*PM*	*PRES*	*PM*	*FM*	*PRES*
BACE	.391	.357⬇	.369	.346 ⬇	.338	.361	.268*⬇
PWR	.249	.216⬇	.282	.278⬇	.276	.245	.211⬇
CC	.664	.642⬇	.598	.579⬇	.540	.591	.580⬆
SC	.482	.433⬇	.411	.405⬇	.446	.534	.484⬆
TASK	.676	.644⬇	.627	.579*⬇	.796	.704*	.660**⬇
DIS	.142	.129⬇	.124	.120⬆	.168	.094	.134⬇
IGB	.126	.109⬇	.120	.143⬆	.118	.129	.129⬆
# of interviews	29	44	64	77	11	20	40

Note: ** = p<.05; * = p<.10. The statistically significant result for the task trait for Demirel is from a comparison of his prime ministership and his presidency t(138)=1.78, p=.07. For Gül, the significant results for the task trait is from a comparison of prime minister to president {t(49)= 2.41, p<.05} and also between prime minister, foreign minister, and president {F(2, 68)= 3.31, p<.05}. The significance result for Gül's BACE traits is from a comparison of his foreign ministership to his presidency.

In general, the results indicate that the LTA scores of Özal, Demirel, and Gül vary from

one another, across their roles, and in comparison to other world leaders. To interpret these

results and assess our hypotheses, we first examine each leader individually across their role

---

[8] See 'Authors' (2015) for process tracing of the effects of leadership traits on decision making processes in Turkish foreign policy.

positions. Specifically, we examine which trait scores changed and in what direction, how they relate to world averages (i.e. Are they above/below the average? Do they move from within to beyond one standard deviation from the mean?), and which scores are statistically significant across roles. We then analyse the combined trait classifications, including respect for constraints, openness to information, motivation toward the world, and leadership style (presented in Table 8). For each leader individually, we examine the specific hypotheses noting which expectations received strong or partial support. Finally, we examine our hypotheses across our set of leaders. Although we only developed specific hypotheses about some traits and some combined characteristics, we are interested in all traits and combinations, given the exploratory nature of this study.

Table 7

Leaders in Comparison to World leaders

	World Leaders (n=284) average	Özal		Demirel		Gül		
		PM	*PRES*	*PM*	*PRES*	*PM*	*FM*	*PRES*
BACE	.35 (.05)	**above**	**average**	**above**	**average**	**below**	above	**1 low**
PWR	.26 (.05)	**below**	**1 low**	above	above	**below**	below	**1 low**
CC	.59 (.06)	**1 high**	**above**	**average**	**below**	below	average	**low**
SC	.36 (.10)	**1 high**	**above**	above	above	**above**	1 high	**1 high**
TASK	.63 (.07)	above	above	**above**	**below**	**1 high**	1 high	**above**
DIS	.13 (.06)	above	average	below	below	**above**	below	**average**
IGB	.15 (.05)	below	below	**1 low**	**below**	below	below	below

[see Table 8 at end of document]

Turgut Özal

Turgut Özal exhibits some differences in the office of prime minister and of president. Özal's scores on all seven traits decline after he moves from prime minister to president. These declines change his scores in relation to the world leaders mean; yet, comparing between his prime minister term and presidency terms, none of these changes are statistically significant. In terms of combined traits classifications (Table 8), Özal is an 'actively independent' leader who

would seek to maintain his own and his government's flexibility and independence in the world. His scores suggest that Özal would challenge constraints, but not always successfully due to his directness, explicit use of power, and inability to read and manipulate others. Although this classification applies to both Özal the prime minister and Özal the president, his reaction to constraints may be more role-specific during his presidency due to the decline in his belief in ability to control events. Across both roles, Özal can be classified as open to information. He is a leader who perceives the world as conflict-prone and takes advantage of opportunities and builds relationships while remaining vigilant, although the vigilance may decline in his presidency with his decline in distrust.

Overall, the results for Özal suggest that his personality characteristics are fairly stable across role changes. While changes in Özal's traits are in the direction consistent with our expectations, these differences are not significantly significant. The stability is expected given our classification of him as a constraint challenger (*Hypothesis 1a*), but inconsistent with his openness to information (*Hypothesis 1b*) and his high complexity (*Hypothesis 1c*). Consistent with *Hypotheses 2a*, *2b*, and *2c*, Özal is more problem-focused as prime minister and less so as president and his scores for both in-group bias and belief in ability to control events decline as he moves from prime ministership to presidency.

Süleyman Demirel

Our results indicate some differences between Demirel the prime minister and Demirel the president. Demirel's scores on belief in ability to control events, conceptual complexity, self-confidence, and task focus decline after he moves from prime minister to president. For three of these traits (belief in ability to control events, complexity, and task focus), Demirel's scores change relative to the mean of the world leaders comparison group. For self-confidence, his scores remain below the mean across his role positions. The scores for his other traits (need for power, distrust, and in-group bias) increase across his roles, but only the in-group bias scores change relative to the world leaders mean. Demirel's task orientation is the only trait that exhibits a statistically significant change across roles. As prime minister, Demirel is more goal and problem-focused; as president, he is more relationship-focused.

In terms of combined traits classifications (Table 8), Demirel exhibits two different types of leadership styles. As prime minister, Demirel is categorized as an 'actively independent' leader who seeks to maintain his own and his government's flexibility and independence in the world. Due to his declining complexity and his change in task focus during his presidency, Demirel as president moves to the 'evangelistic' category and would likely focus on persuading others to join his mission and mobilizing others around his message. Given his scores across different roles, we would expect Demirel to challenge constraints, in an indirect, behind the

scenes manner, because of his high control and power scores, although less so in the president's office due to his declining belief in ability to control events. Demirel moves from being open and sensitive to information as prime minister to closed and insensitive as president, due to his declining complexity score. In both of his roles as prime minister and president, Demirel is classified as a leader who does not see the world as a threatening place and his focus is on taking advantage of opportunities and building relationships.

Thus, Demirel is a leader with some traits changing, although not drastically, from one role to the other, and with other traits remaining consistent across his different roles. Overall, the results for Demirel show that his personality characteristics are fairly stable across role changes, with only one trait (task focus) showing a statistically significant difference. Demirel's trait stability is consistent with him being a constraint challenger (*Hypothesis 1a*), closed to information (*Hypothesis 1b*), and his average conceptual complexity (*Hypothesis 1c*). As his complexity scores change across his roles, it is difficult to assess *Hypotheses 2b and 2c* – although his higher complexity and openness to information as prime minister should have translated into more change in other traits across roles, according to an interactionist perspective. *Hypothesis 2a* is strongly (statistically significant) supported: Demirel shifts from a task/problem focus to a relationship focus after becoming president. *Hypothesis 2b* is not supported: Demirel's scores for in-group bias increase with his move to the presidency.

Hypothesis 2c has some support as his score for belief in ability to control events declines across these roles.

Abdullah Gül

With Abdullah Gül, we have three role positions across which to compare his leadership traits: prime minister, foreign minister, and president. One must note that Gül's tenure as prime minister is short, from November 2002 to March 2003, whereas the time period for his foreign ministership and presidency is longer. When we compare Gül the prime minister to Gül the president (similar to our comparisons for the other two leaders), we see a decline in the scores for four traits: belief in the ability to control events, need for power, task orientation, and distrust, and in-group bias. For all four of these traits, Gül's scores change in relation to the world leaders mean. Gül's scores for complexity, in-group bias, and confidence increase as he moved from prime minister to president, all changing in relation to the world leaders mean. Like with Demirel, the only trait with a statistically significant change in Gül is his task orientation. Like Özal and Demirel, Prime Minister Gül is more problem-focused than President Gül, although as president, Gül is still above the world average in his task focus score.

In terms of combined traits classifications (Table 8), we would expect Gül, in both the prime minister and the president role, to respect constraints, working within established

parameters. He is also closed and insensitive to information across both roles, although slightly

less insensitive as president, due to the increase in his complexity score. Prime Minister Gül sees

international politics as centred around a set of adversaries and focused on eliminating potential

threats and problems. President Gül, however, does not see the world as a threatening place and

takes advantage of opportunities and builds relationships while remaining vigilant. Gül's trait

scores as prime minister and president lead to a classification of him as an 'incremental leader'

who tries to improve his state's position in the world while avoiding any obstacles.

Looking at Foreign Minister Gül, we see a somewhat different personality profile.

Compared to both his prime minister and presidency scores, Foreign Minister Gül has a higher

belief in his ability to control events and lower distrust. The change in belief in ability to control

events is statistically significant across his role as foreign minister and president. Foreign

Minister Gül also is distinct in terms of the trait combination classifications. Although he

remains closed to information, as foreign minister he challenges constraints, and in a more direct

way. Foreign Minister Gül is more similar to President Gül, in terms of his motivation toward

the world; he does not see the world as threatening. Foreign Minister Gül, however, is classified

as an 'expansionistic' leader, who would focus his attention on expanding his, his government's,

or Turkey's control in the world.

Thus, Gül shows slight changes across his roles. Overall, the results for Gül suggest that his personality is also fairly stable across role changes, given that there are only two statistically significant differences. Gül's trait stability is inconsistent with him being a constraint respecter as prime minister and president, but consistent with him as a constraint challenger as foreign minister. Thus *Hypothesis 1a* receives mixed support for Gül. His trait stability is consistent with him being closed to information (*Hypothesis 1b*) and low in complexity (*Hypothesis 1c*). *Hypothesis 2a* is again strongly (statistically significantly) supported: Gül is more problem-focused as prime minister and less so as president. *Hypothesis 2c* is supported but not strongly as there is change in the expected direction and only significant at the .10 level. As expected, Gül's scores for belief in the ability to control events is lower for his presidency than for his prime ministership. *Hypothesis 2b* is not supprted at all in case of Gul, as his score on in-group bias hardly changes between different roles and remains below average all along.

Across Leader Analysis

Looking at all three leaders as a set, we can say that the personality characteristics for these leaders remain fairly stable across role changes. Across all analyses, there are only three instances of statistically significant changes in LTA scores when they change roles. In terms of the trait combination classifications, when these leaders' prime ministerships are compared to

their presidencies, all three show no change in their orientation towards constraints. Only Demirel changes with regard to openness to information and leadership style and Gül changes in his motivation toward the world; and these are not necessarily significant changes.

While no LTA score is the same across leaders' role changes, they seem to vary within parameters. Our leaders are not static, but their personalities may limit the degree of change that is possible. This is consistent with modern personality theory, which sees interaction between the person and the situation. Moreover, given the great variation we see in these leaders' scores across all seven traits, it is clear that the roles are not forcing particular characteristics in their leaderships. All three prime minister profiles are different from one another; as is all three presidents' profiles: we see no single 'prime minister profile' or 'president profile.' Leaders vary despite similar role expectations and role demands.

Our three leaders allow us to preliminarily assess *Hypothesis 1* and the view that certain types of leaders are more likely to change personality characteristics than others. *Hypothesis 1a* expects that those leaders who respect constraints will be more likely to change other characteristics. Of our leaders, only Gül respects constraints as prime minister, but we do not see more significant change in other traits across roles than we do for the other leaders who challenge constraints. With Özal and Demirel, we find changes as predicted in *Hypothesis 1a*. As constraint challengers, we would expect the trait stability we see in these two leaders.

Hypothesis 1b also receives mixed support across our set of leaders. Only Gül's trait stability is consistent with him being closed to information while being prime minister.

Hypothesis 1c is also only supported with Gül, although Özal's scores on complexity, in comparison with the other leaders, is consistent with other research that complexity is an important mediating personality trait. Özal stands apart from the other leaders with his exceptionally high score in conceptual complexity and Özal is also the only leader of the three to see no statistically significant difference in any trait with his move from prime minister to president. Özal is also one standard deviation above the mean in self-confidence and differs from both Demirel and Gül in this respect. This suggests that leaders who are highly complex and self-confident may be least likely to change in other traits. This may be especially true for changes in leaders' task orientations as both Demirel and Gül (lower than Özal in complexity and confidence) significantly change in their task orientation when they move from prime minister to president, while Özal's change is not statistically significant. Overall, this study suggests that leaders' orientations to constraints, and very high levels of complexity and self-confidence, may be the most important mediating characteristics for personality stability across roles.

Finally, our set of leaders allow us to assess *Hypothesis 2* and the expectation that some traits are more likely to change with certain changes in role demands. *Hypothesis 2a* has partial

support with our leaders – all three move from more problem-focused to more relationship-focused orientation when they change from prime minister to president role. Two of these differences are statistically significant. While we do see this change with Özal and Gül, these leaders remain problem focused, just less so. *Hypothesis 2b* receives minimal support. Leaders' scores for in-group bias only decrease for Özal, from prime minister to president, and these changes are not statistically significant. *Hypothesis 2c* receives qualified support. All three leaders' scores for belief in ability to control events are lower during their presidencies than during their prime ministership, but these differences are not significant. Gül's score for his belief in the ability to control events is significantly lower when he moves from the foreign ministership to the presidency. Overall, the expectation that the less policy-driven and less partisan-based nature of the Turkish presidency will be reflected in the personality profiles of leaders is somewhat supported for our three leaders.

Conclusions

Institutional perspectives in political science have been critical of personality theories, arguing that individuals' behaviors can easily vary with different institutional incentives, constraints and opportunities, and role expectations. On the other hand, personality approaches see individual characteristics as resilient and resisting change in case of situations and contexts.

Although this debate remains unresolved, there is an emerging consensus that structural constraints and personal characteristics are co-constitutive. Yet, there are still few empirical studies on political leaders that illustrate this dynamic.

In this study, by using the LTA framework, a trait-based approach to the study of political leadership, we assessed how leaders respond to one of the major structural constraints in political life: changing political roles. We took advantage of the Turkish political context in which prime minister and presidency roles are defined very differently by the Turkish constitution and in which three leaders served in both of these roles. Using a quasi-experimental design, we constructed personality profiles with LTA and examined three Turkish leaders comparatively across roles. By assessing trait changes for these leaders across roles, we tested two sets of hypotheses.

Our results support the expectation that leaders personalities can remain stable across different institutional roles. Personality characteristics for the three Turkish leaders exhibited little change, when these leaders changed roles. We observed change in the same direction –all declined from prime minister to president profile-- in three of the traits: belief in ability to control events, need for power, and task focus. However, in only one of these traits (task focus) do we see significant difference across roles. Thus, personality is not directly determined by institutional incentives. We also find that our leaders vary from one another, and from other

world leaders; there is no single Turkish leader profile and no single Turkish president or prime minister profile. This helps us to evaluate another theoretical suggestion, which argues that certain types of leaders may be more likely to change traits when they change roles. Our assessment provided mixed support for this argument. The trait stability we see in two leaders is consistent with their orientations to challenge constraints, but this did not hold for all leaders. There was no clear pattern for openness to information as a mediating variable, and mixed support for complexity (hypothesized here) and self-confidence (not specifically hypothesized). Although our study does not provide clear direction for the argument that some leaders are more susceptible to change than others, this conclusion is limited to the types of leaders we have in our sample and requires further testing with other leaders.

Finally, building on previous research that suggests some traits and beliefs vary across roles and time, we offer more specific expectations regarding how different traits interact with institutional roles. We see little change across roles (both from individual analysis and looking across the set), although task orientation is the one trait that varies most and significantly. We conjecture that this is expected by the changes in demands and expectations of the Turkish prime minister and president roles as articulated in the constitution. While the prime minister is a more active executive position emphasizing problem-solving and policy implementation, the presidency is highlighted for its consensus building and above-politics status. We encourage

future research to take seriously the specific role demands associated with institutional positions and how leaders' personalities interact with those demands. A particularly promising avenue for future research would integrate work on role identities (how individuals perceive their roles) and their effects on personality traits (Wood and Roberts 2006).

The relative potency of individual differences and institutional positions is an important question, worthy of further empirical exploration and theoretical development. We suggest that further research should be conducted on this question with a bigger sample of world leaders, with even greater variability in traits and role demands. Future research in the form of case studies can focus on the processes and mechanisms by which leaders interact with role demands. This study provides a start in terms of suggesting hypothesis and testing some of the alternative ideas on the interaction of leaders and their roles.