

Svitlana PYK¹Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Ukraine
ORCID: 0009-0004-5427-934X

DOI : 10.14746/ps.2024.1.15

PERSONALITY FACTOR INFLUENCE IN FOREIGN POLICY DECISION MAKING (THE FIVE-FACTOR MODEL OF PERSONALITY PRISM)

INTRODUCTION

The ground of international relations is human decisionmakers, as Valerie Hudson suggests discussing theoretical hallmarks of Foreign Policy Analysis (Hudson, 2014: 4). True, because to understand foreign policy decisions one must know who makes them. And the key word here is “human”: heads of state and heads of government responsible for decision making are humans first and foremost. No doubt human nature is way too complicated to try to explain it within one article, still many attempts have already been made to characterize personality in power. Different approaches taken and various variables considered by researchers to “calculate” personality push forward the idea that a kind of unification is needed. In this sense the Five-Factor Model seems to be more or less optimal thus far.

Let’s check some patterns. J. D. Barber using psycho-biographical approach studies world leaders from the perspective of their energy level and sense of personal influence (active or passive), and motivation for seeking office and overall outlook of life (positive or negative). The cross of active/passive and positive/negative axes produces four types of leaders: lawmaker (active-positive, with the need for achievement as a primary motive), advertiser (active-negative, with the need for power), spectator (passive-positive, with the need for approval), reluctant (passive-negative, with the need to feel useful) (Snare, 2019: 107). Broadly speaking, active/passive and positive/negative criteria correspond with the traits composing Extraversion/Introversion and Emotional Stability/Neuroticism factors of the Five-Factor Model.

J. Post claims that at the heart of personality there are “ego defenses,” the need for constant mediating between the person’s internal and external worlds. From this perspective he examines three types of personality: narcissistic, obsessive-compulsive and paranoid. These categories describe certain behavior in power and a leadership style that directly influences the decision making. For example, the narcissistic personality would prefer an egocentric style with a heavy emphasis on support and teamwork from his or her inner circle; the obsessive-compulsive personality afraid of making a mis-

¹ This article is licensed under the Creative Commons – Attribution – ShareAlike 4.0 (CC-BY-SA 4.0) license.

Artykuł udostępniany jest na licencji Creative Commons – Uznanie autorstwa – Na tych samych warunkach 4.0 (CC-BY-SA 4.0).

take focuses on concrete and quantifiable data and would prefer a formalistic style, while the paranoid personality would adopt either a formalistic or competitive style (it depends whether that person can trust his or her advisors) (Post, 2006: 77–78, 87, 92, 99). But in fact, the narcissistic, obsessive-compulsive, and paranoid personality traits can be easily correlated with the traits composing Extraversion/Introversion, Conscientiousness and Emotional Stability/Neuroticism factors of the Five-Factor Model.

L. Etheredge suggests four types of personality in power as an outcome of the two main variables combinations, such as dominance and extraversion. Inclination to domineering makes either world leaders (extravert personalities) or bloc leaders (introvert personalities). Otherwise, extraverts reluctant to domineering become conciliators, and introverts – maintainers. The behavior of world leaders, bloc leaders, conciliators, and maintainers in the foreign affairs evidently differs considering their relationships with foreign leaders, active or passive reaction on events, and predisposition to use hard power (Snare, 2019: 108). Actually, extraversion is associated with dominance in the sense of status, so, there is no difficulty to correspond the variables mentioned with the Extraversion factor of the Five-Factor Model.

M. Hermann using content analysis studies four broad types of personal characteristics that directly influence decision-making. They are beliefs (leader's assumptions about the world, nationalism), motives (leader's need for power and approval), decision style (leader's preference for certain levels of risk, ability to tolerate ambiguity), and interpersonal style (leader's excessive suspiciousness/paranoia, manipulative behavior). The way personal characteristics interrelate is a clue to understand leader's orientation to foreign affairs either independent or participatory. Aggressive political leader tends to form independent orientation and conciliatory political leader is expected to form participatory orientation (Hermann, 1980: 8–13).

Studying political leader's interest in foreign affairs and sensitivity to the environment M. Hermann suggests that personal characteristics would have maximum impact on foreign policy in two extreme and opposite cases: low sensitivity/interest and high sensitivity/interest. The less sensitive and interested leader becomes more belligerent, self-reliant, and inflexible in the behavior he urges on his government, while the highly sensitive and interested leader looks for friends and support and becomes less definite in the behavior he urges on his government (Hermann, 1984: 74). While dealing with political constraints and processing information, a leader may act as a crusader, a strategist, a pragmatist or an opportunist. A crusader is usually the least sensitive to the political context in which he operates and does not wait to take action until the time is right. An opportunist, on the contrary, respects constraints and is open to the information from the political setting. Strategist and pragmatist behave like “cognitive managers” for whom political timing is top priority. A strategist usually knows what he wants to do and needs information to avoid mistakes, while a pragmatist respects political constraints and tries to find an optimal way to work within them but sometimes he seems indecisive (Hermann et al., 2001: 96–97).

However, no matter how much the political leader is interested in foreign affairs, or is sensitive to the environment, or has well been trained in foreign affairs, certain situations may occur in which his strategy (or style) will not be productive. In such cases, the leader would adapt it in order to cope with the situation. Knowing something

about his personality can help predict whether and when such changes are likely, because the leader's traits shape his initial inclinations and determine how he will regard advice from others, react to information from the environment, and assess the political risks of any action planned (Hermann, Hermann, 1989: 365). Traits are consistent through the lifetime and their configuration is predominant in determining the political leader's personal influence on decision-making. As far as political leaders are usually extraverts, seem to be more power-hungry than ordinary people, mostly like and enjoy being with people, are more dogmatic or authoritarian than most people (Hermann, Milburn, 1977: 15), the Five-Factor Model is no doubt helpful to identify leaders' personality traits configuration.

The idea of this article is to suggest that the Five-Factor Model is quite a reliable instrument in assessing (at a distance) personality in power and understanding the nature of foreign policy decisions made by this personality. At the same time the FFM helps to recognize personality factor influence in foreign policy decision making.

THE FIVE-FACTOR MODEL EVOLUTION

The origins of the Five-Factor Model can be traced back to the 1930s when L. Thurstone applied factor analysis and concluded that five factors were sufficient to account for sixty common descriptive adjectives and when G. Allport and H. Odbert had listed nearly 18,000 trait terms found in an unabridged dictionary of English language (Mondak, 2010: 30). In the subsequent studies by R. Cattell the number of trait terms had been reduced to 4,500, and then to 35 variables, out of which 12 and later on 16 personal factors were synthesized. The following studies by D. Fiske, E. Tupes and R. Christal reexamined correlations and clarified Cattell's 35 variables and found five broad, relatively strong factors which were soon replicated by W. Norman, E. Borgatta, J. Digman and N. Takemoto-Chock. Those factors were labeled as Extraversion or Surgency (talkative, assertive, energetic), Agreeableness (good-natured, cooperative, trustful), Conscientiousness (orderly, responsible, dependable), Emotional Stability (calm, not neurotic, not easily upset), Culture (intellectual, polished, independent-minded) (John, Naumann, Soto, 2008: 118–119). In the next bunch of studies notwithstanding different approaches of analysis and methods of measurement the researchers independently came to the conclusion that at a very broad level of abstraction a personality can be represented by five robust dimensions (factors) which L. Goldberg called the "Big Five," with the "big" in the sense of broad (Mondak, 2010: 33; Noller, Law, Comrey, 1987: 775). The results of many cross-cultural investigations proved the Big Five to be either replicable in different languages with a little possible deviation in one or another factor caused by traditional perception of certain personality traits. At the same time the labels of factors were still not strictly stable: Extraversion or Surgency, Emotional Stability or Neuroticism, Agreeableness or Warmth or Social Conformity, Conscientiousness or Orderliness, Culture or Intellect or Openness to Experience, that meant that adjective-based models needed additional back-up.

In 1980s, after series of cluster analyses of Cattell's 16 personal factors R. McCrae and P. Costa, Jr. had elaborated the NEO Personality Inventory to measure three factors of the Big Five and later on upgraded it with questionnaire scales to measure Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. Since 1992 the NEO-PI-R (revised) has been widely known as an instrument for differentiated measurement of each Big Five dimension in terms of six more specific facets per factor. In contrast to lexical studies, the NEO-PI-R is based on factor-analytic and multimethod validational procedures of test construction (John, Naumann, Soto, 2008: 124–125). At this standpoint the difference between the Big Five model and the Five-Factor Model (FFM) becomes more evident: the first one has been derived from lexical data and is rather a model of personality attributes, while the latter is based on the hypothesis that the five factors correspond to biological basic tendencies and has been elaborated on the findings from cluster analyses of personality questionnaires data (Saucier, Goldberg, 1996: 37). According to R. McCrae and O. John, the FFM is a hierarchical organization of personality traits in terms of five basic dimensions: Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Openness to Experience, and Neuroticism. Thus far its long history, cross-cultural replication, and empirical validation across many methods and instruments make the Five-Factor Model a basic discovery of personality psychology (McCrae, John, 1992: 175, 207).

While many personality researchers agree that the FFM provides the best representation of personality trait structure (see Digman, 1990: 442–426), there are critical assessments either worth mentioning. Probably the strongest critic of the FFM is H. Eysenck who reexamined Cattell's 16 personality factors and suggested that there were two basic personality dimensions, extraversion and neuroticism. Later, he added a third one – psychoticism, but further investigations of McCrae and Costa proved stable negative correlations between psychoticism and agreeableness and between psychoticism and conscientiousness (Eysenck, 1991: 782; Mondak, 2010: 35). The only question left open is on the fifth dimension – “openness to experience” substituted by McCrae and Costa for “culture.” As Eysenck believes, it is still debatable whether agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience should be regarded as independent major factors or as subfactors of more inclusive dimensional concepts, like psychoticism (Eysenck, 1991: 784).

Contrary to Eysenck's minimized three dimensions model (extraversion, neuroticism, psychoticism), S. Paunonen and D. Jackson suggest that there is “much important variance in human behavior not accounted for by the Big Five personality factors” (Paunonen, Jackson, 2000: 832). They propose a dozen of clusters identified as relatively independent of the Big Five, including religious, devout, reverent; sly, deceptive, manipulative; thrifty, frugal, miserly; egoistical, conceited, snobbish; humorous, witty, amusing, which in turn compound additional personality dimensions (*ibid.*, 827–830).

Having in mind that the number of basic dimensions or factors is still debatable, the disagreement among the proponents of the FFM is also pending. The main argument evolves around the interpretation of five-factor framework and which one to consider optimal. For example, R. McCrae and P. Costa have positioned warmth as a facet of Extraversion while L. Goldberg places it under Agreeableness. Impulsivity is usually a facet of Neuroticism, but sometimes it is viewed to be an attribute of low Conscien-

tiousness (McCrae, Costa, 2008) or as a facet of Extraversion (Goldberg). P. Trapnell and J. Wiggins prefer to retain their long-held conceptualizations of Dominance and Nurturance factors rather than accept Extraversion and Agreeableness. R. Hogan and J. Hogan have split Extraversion into Sociability and Ambition, and thus far advocate six, not five factors, named differently and with psychologically different connotations (Block, 1995: 207–208; see also Digman, 1990: 422–424).

Another portion of critics toward the FFM concerns its descriptive character which is not enough to claim to serve as a basis for a theory of personality. If a personality can be described in terms of five broad dimensions, each of which consists of several specified and correlated facets, the essential need is to understand how these five dimensions combine into a coherent personality within individuals. According to G. Allport, each individual possesses a unique constellation of traits, though neither traits nor dimensions, but actually neuropsychic structures underlying traits drive a core scientific interest because their dynamics is a key to explain behavior (John, Robins, 1993: 224–229). Thus far, personality research should be both descriptive and explanatory, and the FFM doesn't satisfy the latter.

D. McAdams shares an idea that if a personality is studied from the “standpoint of observer” and further from the “standpoint of actor,” the Five-Factor Model will be not sufficient. The FFM describes personality characteristics but not the personality in its organization and development. At the same time the five-factor taxonomy leaves little room for the possibility that important dimensions of personality reside outside the person's awareness (McAdams, 1992: 340, 355), so the data obtained from self-rating questionnaires should be significantly bolstered by other relevant sources. As H. Eysenck concludes, in personality research there is “no agreement on definitions, models, methods, results or indeed anything whatever; all is confusion” (Eysenck, 1991: 773).

THE FIVE-FACTOR MODEL: RELIABLE AND APPLICABLE TO STUDY PERSONALITY IN POWER

Certainly, the Five-Factor Model is not a personality theory or any kind of paradigm and cannot be seen as *a priori*. But it is a model that works and substitutes effectively for the other tools used to understand personality. Its broad factors and lack of strict labels make the FFM quite flexible and allow it to be applied in many cultures. People speak thousands of different languages and sometimes it is difficult to find the exact equivalent for a single needed word. That is why establishing the universality of personality structure seems almost impossible. Researchers use questionnaires with conditional and contextualized statements to assess personality which are more cross-culturally transportable than lists of adjectives (McCrae, Costa Jr., 1997: 510). For example, the NEO-PI-R of R. McCrae and P. Costa translated into German, Portuguese, Hebrew, Chinese, Korean, and Japanese proved quite valid in personality studies within five-factor framework.

Several attempts have either been made to explain the main personality dimensions distinguished by the FFM through the perspective of psychobiology. Extraversion, Neuroticism and Conscientiousness levels depend on the length of such human genes,

as dopamine and serotonin, and either the levels of testosterone. In simple terms, dopamine mediates human positive emotions such as hope, desire, and joy. Its different forms have varied number of repeats of the base sequence. The longer forms of the gene are found more frequently in those scoring high on Extraversion. Serotonin is a neurotransmitter highly involved in the regulation of emotion in the human brain. It also influences appetite, sleep, activity, and sexual function. Individuals with the short form of the gene score high on Neuroticism and those with the long form score high on Extraversion and Conscientiousness. Testosterone is correlated with sociability, sensation seeking, dominance, activity, and the higher its levels are the higher an individual scores on Extraversion (Zuckerman, 2005: 100–101, 132–133, 198).

Of course, studying genes is a far more complicated task than just counting alleles in their forms. As P. Hatemi and R. McDermott explain, genes do not “determine” any behavior or trait. They are static, but their expression is not. For example, dopamine appears critically involved in such behaviors as aggression, novelty seeking, and reward dependence. Individuals with a low activity form of serotonin manifest increased impulsivity, explosive violence, and higher levels of testosterone (Hatemi, McDermott, 2012: 117, 120). Correlations with Extraversion (sociability, tempo, vigor, predisposition towards positive affect) and Neuroticism (emotionality, impulsivity, fear, anger, predisposition towards negative affect) are on the surface. Indeed, as R. McCrae and P. Costa suggest, extraverted traits contribute to one’s positive enjoyment or satisfaction in life, although they do not generally appear to reduce the unpleasantness of adverse circumstances. Neurotic traits predispose an individual to suffer more acutely from misfortunes, but they do not necessarily diminish one’s joy or pleasures (Costa Jr., McCrae, 1980: 674). Personality traits are a function of biology, as the authors conclude, and all humans share a common genome. Therefore, the structure of personality ought to be universal (McCrae, Costa Jr., 2008: 169).

Notwithstanding pros and cons, the Five-Factor Model offers a comprehensive guide to personality traits and is able to accommodate different personality variables proposed by researchers. So, let’s have a closer look at Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Openness to Experience, and Neuroticism and their interpretations concerning personality in power.

Political leaders who score high on Extraversion are usually energetic, enthusiastic, spontaneous; dominant, assertive; sociable, gregarious, excitement and novelty seeking; risk-taking, venturing forth with confidence into the unknown. They experience positive emotions and are impulsive but not anxious, demonstrate decisive thinking, keen interest in other people and external events, and desire for social attention. High levels of Extraversion either predict an energetic approach toward the social and material world; career-advancing behavior, drive for power status and status attainment; in combination with Openness to Experience they provide a promising personal growth. Extraverts may become workaholics with intense goal pursuit driven by the great optimism about achieving goals, they excel in complex environments where a variety of stimuli are competing for attention.

A high level of Conscientiousness predicts academic success, good health habits and longevity. Political leaders with this prevailing dimension are hard-working, industrious, responsible; rule-conscious, dutiful, reliable; competent, achievement

striving, scrupulous; self-disciplined, constraint, staid. They persevere until the task is finished, value organization and accomplishment, are committed and invested in their jobs. Conscientiousness describes impulse control that facilitates task- and goal-directed behavior; deliberation, prudence, and thinking before acting are indispensable characteristics of conscientious people. Strong-willed, orderly, traditional they usually possess leadership skills, are perfectionist, neat, honest, and successful in conventional jobs. In policymaking these leaders plan long-term, are risk-averse, cautious, and ideologically conservative. Conscientiousness has negative correlations with Neuroticism.

People with a high level of Agreeableness are generous, good-natured, caring; trusting, friendly compliant, cooperative; sympathetic, kind, compassionate; tolerant, forgiving, even-tempered. They arouse liking in others, crave for positive relations with others, and behave in giving ways. Agreeableness is related to psychological sense of community and volunteer work, corresponds with career stability and good performance in jobs where employees work in groups, contrasts a prosocial and communal orientation towards others with antagonism, is averse to racial prejudice. Political leaders with a predominant Agreeableness score are altruistic, demonstrate affection and emotional support, speak inoffensive language, tend to avoid conflict. They can easily see the world through others' eyes and feel their suffering. To some extent, Agreeableness depends on the level of Extraversion.

Openness to Experience describes the breadth, depth, originality, and complexity of an individual's mental and experiential life. People with this prevailing dimension are open-minded, imaginative, creative; sensitive to art and beauty, empathetic, unconventional; open to change, experimental, analytical; risk-taking, craving experiences that will be cognitively engaging, seeking information of various sorts. They demonstrate high degree of intellectual capacity, seek aesthetic impressions, and tend to be seen by themselves and others as somewhat more intelligent. These people are usually employed in positions with a great deal of decision making, manifest decreased loyalty to the organization and earnings, successfully adjust to international work assignments. Political leaders who score high on Openness to Experience are open to new ideas and blessed with cognitive flexibility, possess emotional intelligence and vivid imagination, prefer abstract and theoretical information, are strongly averse to authoritarianism. Their intellectual curiosity and eagerness to try new things correspond with political liberalism and negatively correlate with dogmatism, prejudice and intolerance.

Neuroticism contrasts emotional stability and even-temperadness with negative emotionality, such as feeling anxious, nervous, sad. People with high levels of Neuroticism are reactive emotionally, changeable, easily upset; worrying, insecure, tense, not calm. They have low self-esteem, irrational perfectionistic beliefs and are averse to imperturbability, to facilitating social and collective action and to satisfaction with close interpersonal relationships. Neuroticism predicts health-risk behaviors, chronic negative affects and the development of a variety of psychiatric disorders (nervous tension, depression, frustration, somatic complaints). Political leaders with this prevailed dimension experience negative attitudes, nervousness, moodiness; irrational thinking, disturbed thoughts, poor control of impulses and cravings. The lower the level of Neuroticism, the less the risk of burnout and emotional exhaustion is (see Widiger, 2017:

39–143; Mondak, 2010: 50–62; John, Naumann, Soto, 2008: 130–143; McCrae, Costa Jr., 2008: 164–166).

The characteristics of Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Openness to Experience, and Neuroticism mentioned above are not exhaustive and still there are many left behind, but somehow indirectly these broad personality dimensions correspond with other political personality taxonomies. For example, A. Immelman on the basis of Th. Millon's personological model proposes five political personality types: active-independent (forceful/aggressive), active-dependent (sociable/histrionic), passive-independent (confident/narcissistic), passive-ambivalent (respectful/conforming) and paranoid (Immelman, 1993: 736–737). Comparing the relevant interpretations, there is no difficulty to associate each type with consecutively Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism.

D. Simonton, using Historical Figures Assessment Collaborative and then factor analysis, suggests that there are five presidential styles: interpersonal (endears himself to staff through his courtesy and consideration, emphasizes teamwork, maintains close relationships with associates, is willing to make compromises); charismatic (is a dynamo of energy and determination, views the presidency as a vehicle for self-expression, is a skilled and self-confident negotiator, exhibits artistry in manipulation); deliberative (understands implications of his decisions, exhibits depth of comprehension, is able to visualize alternatives and weigh long term consequences, is cautious, conservative in action); creative (initiates new legislation and programs, is innovative); and neurotic (places political success over effective policy, suffers health problems which tend to parallel difficult and critical periods in office) (Simonton, 1988: 929–931). The characteristics of each style correspond with Agreeableness, Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Openness to Experience, and Neuroticism respectively.

In their turn, T. Gravelle, J. Reifler and Th. Scotto try to explain foreign policy through the lenses of the Big Five. They assume that the main international orientations toward cooperation and conflict could be distinguished as the four foreign policy “postures” – Cooperative Internationalism, Militant Internationalism, Isolation, and support for Global Justice. Accordingly, Cooperative Internationalism correlates with Agreeableness and Openness to Experience and has negative correlations with Conscientiousness, because self-disciplined and responsible political leaders may see international cooperation as “impinging on what they believe to be right” (Gravelle, Reifler, Scotto, 2020). Isolationism correlates with Conscientiousness but not Agreeableness, Openness to Experience, and Emotional Stability (conscientious political leaders do not need to engage permanently with the outer world). Militant Internationalism has positive correlations with Extraversion and Conscientiousness and negative – with Openness to Experience (political leaders with Openness to Experience as prevailing dimension perceive military force as a counterproductive in foreign affairs). Support for Global Justice correlates with Agreeableness and Openness to Experience and has negative correlations with Conscientiousness (conscientious political leaders, who are hard-working and achievement-oriented, don't expect any benefits from global redistributive initiatives) (*ibid.*).

It is worth mentioning, that the measurement of personality in power within the actor-specific approach in the Foreign Policy Analysis nowadays is limited to two

well-known tools, such as the Leadership Traits Analysis and the Operational Code Analysis. Both methods are quite operable due to the elaborated Profiler Plus software and the Psychological Characteristics of Leaders data set, though are not exempt of shortcomings either (for more details see Brummer, 2023: 238–254; Schafer, Walker, 2023: 255–268). Integrating the Five-Factor Model into the study of personality in power may greatly contribute to the field. If the Big Five content analytical scheme could be computerized, as J. Kaarbo suggests, this would make a promising step toward foreign policy comprehending (Kaarbo, 2018).

CONCLUSIONS

The logical conclusion is that seeing a political leader through the Five-Factor Model prism can profoundly facilitate understanding of the foreign policy conducted by this leader. Knowing his or her main personality dimensions and associated traits helps interpret a leader's behavior in certain circumstances, his or her motives and will to make certain decisions.

For example, the main dimension of the US president G. H. W. Bush personality was Conscientiousness. His “personal diplomacy” and negotiations with the Soviet leader, German chancellor, People's Republic of China leadership, Middle East kings and presidents and other top political figures greatly improved dealing with international challenges during the final stage of the Cold War, and the Persian Gulf war in particular. President's conscientiousness constituted the success of his administration foreign policy and contributed to the rational managing of the new world order arising (for more details see Pyk, 2020).

Openness to Experience and a high level of Extraversion of the US president W. Clinton directly affected the kind of foreign policy decisions his administrations made. As an achievement-motivated person, in relations with foreign leaders Clinton used his diplomatic talents, almost unique intellectual capacity and absolute awareness of the matters he dealt with, self-confidence and ability to convince. He managed to become the first foreign leader who had won a compromise among British and Irish authorities and the representatives of Northern Ireland. Under his presidency the US became an arbiter in international affairs after finishing bloodshed in Balkans and persistently promoting peace process in the Middle East (see Pyk, 2021b).

G. W. Bush as the US president is widely known and heavily criticized for the decision to invade Iraq in 2003. But the overwhelming Extraversion of his personality with a moderate level of Agreeableness explains his ambitiousness, striving for big achievements in foreign affairs, impulsivity and assertiveness to get things done. So, the controversial decision to invade Iraq became an example of straightforwardness, adventurousness, and little conscientiousness of the US Commander-in-Chief (see Pyk, 2022a).

President B. Obama's personality traits in their complexity claim moderate level of Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Extraversion. In the foreign policy decision making it reveals empathy and cooperation, prudence and industriousness, ambitiousness and goal-pursuit. Determination bred by Extraversion is balanced by Agreeable-

ness and together with thoroughness and dutifulness (Conscientiousness) resembles very rational but mostly actionless personality. That was the reason of multiple attitudes towards Obama as president and his “reluctant” foreign policy (see Pyk, 2021a).

The personal profile of D. Trump is divided in two, so far as the image he promotes for himself in business and media hides his real personality. Trump’s extremely high level of Extraversion is complementary to Neuroticism with the negative correlation of the latter with Conscientiousness. In the foreign policy decision making it reveals ambitiousness and goal-pursuit, assertiveness, decisive thinking and domination, but either could lead to non-prudent, unconstrained behavior, irritability and irrationality within uncomfortable circumstances. Trump’s unusual behavior as the US president directly affected the pursuit of foreign policy and the functioning of his administration. Controversial statements and extravagant actions of the president proved his foreign policy to be chaotic, inconsistent with traditional approach and methods, and biased by prevailing personality factor (see Pyk, 2022b).

These findings on foreign policy decision making enhanced by the scrupulous studying of personality in power, responsible for making decisions, give the new focus on the role of personality in foreign policy. The “personalization” of foreign policy is nothing extraordinary but still reveals hidden aspects of how and especially why certain decisions have been made. There is no doubt that within the same circumstances different personalities won’t behave the same way. Say, if president Obama were in president’s Bush-43 shoes after 9/11 he would have probably ordered the “war on terror” (to be on the right side of history) but definitely not to invade Iraq. The psychobiographical approach and the Five Factor Model profoundly help to understand the personality in power, which in turn contributes to better comprehension of foreign policy decisions. The possibility of predicting the kind of decisions to be made by a certain political leader is still open.

REFERENCES

- Block J. (1995), *A Contrarian View of the Five-Factor Approach to Personality Description*, “Psychological Bulletin”, 117(2).
- Brummer K. (2023), *Leadership Trait Analysis*, in: *Routledge Handbook on Foreign Policy Analysis Methods*, (eds.) P. A. Mello, F. Ostermann, Routledge, London–New York.
- Costa P. T. Jr., McCrae R. R. (1980), *Influence of Extraversion and Neuroticism on Subjective Well-Being: Happy and Unhappy People*, “Journal of Personality and Social Psychology”, 38(4).
- Digman J. M. (1990), *Personality Structure: Emergence of the Five-Factor Model*, “Annual Reviews. Psychology”, 41.
- Eysenck H. J. (1991), *Dimensions of Personality: 16, 5 or 3? – Criteria for a Taxonomic Paradigm*, “Personality and Individual Differences”, 12(8).
- Gravelle T. B., Reifler J., Scotto Th. J. (2020), *Personality Traits and Foreign Policy Attitudes: A Cross-National Exploratory Study*, “Personality and Individual Differences” 153, Article 109607, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.109607> (25.07.2024).
- Hatemi P. K., McDermott R. (2012), *A Neurobiological Approach to Foreign Policy Analysis: Identifying Individual Differences in Political Violence*, “Foreign Policy Analysis”, 8(2).

- Hermann M. G. (1980), *Explaining Foreign Policy Behavior Using the Personal Characteristics of Political Leaders*, "International Studies Quarterly", 24(1).
- Hermann M. G. (1984), *Personality and Foreign Policy Decision Making: A Study of 53 Heads of Government*, in: *Foreign Policy Decision Making. Perception, Cognition, and Artificial Intelligence*, (eds.) D. A. Sylvan, S. Chan, Praeger Publishers, New York.
- Hermann M. G., Hermann Ch. F. (1989), *Who Makes Foreign Policy Decisions and How: An Empirical Inquiry*, "International Studies Quarterly", 33(4).
- Hermann M. G., Milburn Th. W. (ed.), (1977), *A Psychological Examination of Political Leaders*, The Free Press, New York.
- Hermann M. G., Preston Th., Korany B., Shaw T. M. (2001), *Who Leads Matters: The Effects of Powerful Individuals*, "International Studies Review", 3(2).
- Hudson V. M. (2014), *Foreign Policy Analysis. Classic and Contemporary Theory*, 2d ed., Rowman & Littlefield, New York–Toronto.
- Immelman A. (1993), *The Assessment of Political Personality: A Psychodiagnostically Relevant Conceptualization and Methodology*, "Political Psychology", 14(4).
- John O. P., Robins R. W. (1993), *Gordon Allport: Father and Critic of the Five-Factor Model*, in: *Fifty Years of Personality Psychology*, (eds.) K. H. Craik, R. Hogan, R. N. Wolfe, Plenum Press, New York–London.
- John O. P., Naumann L. P., Soto Ch. J. (2008), *Paradigm Shift to the Integrative Big Five Trait Taxonomy. History, Measurement, and Conceptual Issues*, in: *Handbook of Personality. Theory and Research*, (eds.) O. P. John, R. W. Robins, L. A. Pervin, 3d ed., The Guilford Press, New York–London.
- Kaarbo J. (2018), *Personality and International Politics. Insights from Existing Research and Directions for the Future*, "European Review", 4(2–3), <https://doi.org/10.3224/eris.v4i2-3.02> (23.12.2024).
- McAdams D. P. (1992), *The Five-Factor Model in Personality: A Critical Appraisal*, "Journal of Personality", 60(2).
- McCrae R. R., Costa P. T. Jr. (1997), *Personality Trait Structure as a Human Universal*, "American Psychologist", 52(5).
- McCrae R. R., Costa P. T. Jr. (2008), *The Five-Factor Theory of Personality*, in: *Handbook of Personality. Theory and Research*, (eds.) O. P. John, R. W. Robins, L. A. Pervin, 3d ed., The Guilford Press, New York–London.
- McCrae R. R., John O. P. (1992), *An Introduction to the Five-Factor Model and Its Applications*, "Journal of Personality", 60.
- Mondak J. J. (2010), *Personality and the Foundations of Political Behavior*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Noller P., Law H., Comrey A. L. (1987), *Cattell, Comrey, and Eysenck Personality Factors Compared: More Evidence for the Five Robust Factors?*, "Journal of Personality and Social Psychology", 53(4).
- Paunonen S. V., Jackson D. N. (2000), *What Is Beyond the Big Five? Plenty!*, "Journal of Personality", 68(5).
- Post J. M. (2006), *Assessing Leaders at a Distance: The Political Personality Profile*, in: *The Psychological Assessment of Political Leaders. With Profiles of Saddam Hussein and Bill Clinton*, (ed.) J. M. Post, The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Pyk S. (2020), "Osobystisnyy chynnyk" u procesi pryyniattia zovnishniopolitychnykh rishen' v administracii prezydenta Dzh. Busha, "Ekonomika i Derzhava. Seriya Politolohiia" [from Ukr.: Economics and State. Political Science], 2(2): 45–50.

- Pyk S. (2021a), *Vplyv "osobystisnoho chynnyka" na pryyniattia zovnishniopolitychnykh rishen' v administracii prezydenta B. Obamy*, "Politicus", 4: 105–109.
- Pyk S. (2021b), *Vplyv osobystisnoho chynnyka na uhvalennia zovnishniopolitychnykh rishen' v administracii prezydenta V. Klintony*, "Visnyk Kyivs'koho Nacional'noho Universytetu imeni Tarasa Shevchenka" [from Ukr.: Journal of International Relations of KNU], 54(2): 9–14.
- Pyk S. (2022a), "Personal Factor" Influence on the Foreign Policy Decision-Making in the President George W. Bush Administrations, in: *Challenges and Prospects of the Implementation of Political, Historical, Philosophical, and Sociological Research Amidst Digitalization*, Baltija Publishing, Riga, Latvia, 58–77.
- Pyk S. (2022b), *Vplyv "osobystisnoho chynnyka" na pryyniattia zovnishniopolitychnykh rishen' v administracii prezydenta D. Trampa*, "Visnyk Lvivs'koho Universytetu. Serii filosof.-politolog. studii" [from Ukr.: Visnyk of the Lviv University. Series Philos.-Political Studies], 41: 151–162.
- Saucier G., Goldberg L. R. (1996), *The Language of Personality: Lexical Perspectives on the Five-Factor Model*, in: *The Five-Factor Model of Personality: Theoretical Perspectives*, (ed.) J. S. Wiggins, The Guilford Press, New York–London.
- Schafer M., Walker S. G. (2023), *Operational Code Analysis*, in: *Routledge Handbook on Foreign Policy Analysis Methods*, (eds.) P. A. Mello, F. Ostermann, Routledge, London–New York.
- Simonton D. K. (1988), *Presidential Style: Personality, Biography, and Performance*, "Journal of Personality and Social Psychology", 55(6).
- Snare Ch. E. (2019), *Applying Personality Theory to Foreign Policy Behavior: Evaluating Three Methods of Assessment*, in: *Political Psychology and Foreign Policy*, (eds.) E. Singer, V. Hudson, Routledge, London–New York.
- Widiger Th. A. (ed.) (2017), *The Oxford Handbook of the Five-Factor Model*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Zuckerman M. (2005), *Psychobiology of Personality*, 2d ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, MA.

ABSTRACT

This article studies the personality factor influence in foreign policy decision making. The role of personality in power has for a long time been a matter of research interest of many psychologists, political scientists, and experts in Foreign Policy Analysis. Still, there is no universal model of personality, though elaborating it has been ongoing since 1930s. Among multiple versions of tools, the Five-Factor Model (FFM) promoted by American psychologists R. McCrae and P. Costa, Jr. currently seems to be the most promising. According to the FFM, personality can be described within the framework of five broad dimensions, such as Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Openness to Experience, and Neuroticism. Each dimension is quite abstract and embraces a number of certain personality traits in hierarchical subordination – from basic biological traits to more complicated behavioral facets, so that the complex comprehension of personality structure is possible. Interpretation of the prevailing personality dimensions and their intercorrelations helps to explain the behavior of personality in power during foreign policy decision making and understand why a certain decision has been made.

The personality dimensions under the FFM directly or indirectly correspond with personality characteristics and variables basic in other current personality taxonomies. So, the key

suggestion of this article is that the Five-Factor Model as a reliable tool can be used in further research of personality factor influence in foreign policy decision making.

Keywords: the Five-Factor Model, personality factor, person in power, foreign policy decision making

WPLYW CZYNNIKA OSOBOWOŚCI NA PODEJMOWANIE DECYZJI W ZAKRESIE POLITYKI ZAGRANICZNEJ (W KONTEKŚCIE MODELU PIĘCIOCZYNNIKOWEGO)

STRESZCZENIE

Niniejszy artykuł opisuje badania nad wpływem czynnika osobowości na podejmowanie decyzji w zakresie polityki zagranicznej. Rola osobowości osoby będącej u władzy jest od dawna przedmiotem zainteresowań wielu psychologów, politologów oraz ekspertów z zakresu analiz polityki zagranicznej. Do dnia dzisiejszego nie określono uniwersalnego modelu osobowości, choć prace nad nim trwają od lat trzydziestych XX wieku. Spośród wielu narzędzi najbardziej obiecujący obecnie wydaje się Model Pięcioczynnikowy (FFM) promowany przez amerykańskich psychologów: R. McCrae i P. Costa Jr. Według FFM osobowość można opisać za pomocą pięciu szerokich dziedzin, takich jak: ekstrawersja, sumienność, ugodowość, otwartość na doświadczenie i neurotyczność. Każda z tych dziedzin jest dość abstrakcyjna i obejmuje szereg pewnych cech osobowości w hierarchicznym podporządkowaniu tj. od podstawowych cech biologicznych po bardziej skomplikowane aspekty behawioralne, dzięki czemu możliwe jest kompleksowe zrozumienie struktury danej osobowości. Interpretacja dominujących wymiarów osobowości i ich wzajemnych korelacji pomaga wyjaśnić zachowanie osoby sprawującej władzę podczas podejmowania decyzji w polityce zagranicznej oraz zrozumieć, dlaczego została podjęta właśnie ta a nie inna decyzja.

Określone w ramach FFM cechy osobowości w sposób bezpośredni lub pośredni nawiązują do wymiarów osobowości, które zostały zaproponowane oraz opisane w innych aktualnych taksonomiach. Kluczową sugestią tego artykułu jest to, że Model Pięcioczynnikowy może zostać wykorzystany jako wiarygodne narzędzie w dalszych badaniach wpływu czynnika osobowości na podejmowanie decyzji w polityce zagranicznej.

Słowa kluczowe: Model Pięcioczynnikowy, czynnik osobowości, osoba sprawująca władzę, podejmowanie decyzji w polityce zagranicznej

