UNIVERSITÄT
ERFURT

Bachelor's Thesis

Political Leadership Traits
in Peace Processes

Nelson Mandela & Manuel Santos

Submitted by:	**Juliana Tappe Ortiz**
Matriculation number:	35024
Course of study:	International Relations
	Comparative Peace and Conflict Studies
Supervisors:	Prof. Dr. Oliver Kessler
	Chair of International Relations, University of Erfurt
	Prof. Dr. Matthias Basedau
	Lead Research Fellow, GIGA Hamburg
Date of submission:	13 January 2017

Table of Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ANC	African National Congress
FARC	Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia
IR	International Relations
LTA	Leadership Trait Analysis
OC	Operational Code
OPA	Operational Code Approach
PP	Political Psychology
PT	Personality Trait
SD	Standard Deviation
VICS	Verbs in Context System

List of Tables

"Y en cuanto al tema de la seguridad y la determinación mi inspiración es Churchill, en el manejo político y del Estado es Franklin D. Roosevelt, y en la paz, Mandela. "[1]

Juan Manuel Santos
President of Colombia

Introduction

Nelson Mandela is seen as the father of the South African nation, the man who put an end to Apartheid, who brought peace to a country in war and who tried to reconcile the South African people after many years of separation (Barnard 2014, 293). From an international and interior perspective, he is more than a president, he is a myth of peace and the personification of reconciliation (Meredith 1997, 370). Without him, critics argued, peace and development would have been impossible in South Africa (Miall 2007, 178). Apparently, he is responsible for a historical change in his country and he seems to be the one who let South Africa rise to become a regional power. What are his leadership traits that made him such a successful leader especially in terms of peace building?

Colombia's current president Juan Manuel Santos' has a clear vision: He wants to achieve peace in Colombia. For over half a century, Colombia has been entangled in a bitter civil war between the government and different guerrilla movements. In 2012 President Santos initiated peace negotiations between the Colombian government and the most influential guerrilla movement, the FARC (*Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia*). Santos' role model for peace negotiations is Mandela, the former president of South Africa.

---

[1] Translation: "Concerning security and determination my inspiration is Churchill, concerning political and state manners, Roosevelt and concerning peace, Mandela." Santos, Juan Manuel (2014): *La visión del Presidente en sus propias palabras*. Presidencia de la República en http://es.presidencia.gov.co/presidencia/Paginas/presidente.aspx.

The peace negotiations in Havana have led to comprehensive peace talks, however, it was the Colombian people, through a plebiscite, rather than the negotiating parties, who had the final say on the agreement on the 2nd October. The results show that Santos encounters strong resistance within the government and the population. These facts lead to the question if he shows other leadership traits which differ from his role model Mandela?

This bachelor thesis seeks to systematically introduce the individual perspective of Political Psychology into the study of comparative peace and conflict studies. Apparently, Nelson Mandela's personality has undoubtedly influenced South Africa's history which highlights the importance of psychology for domestic and international politics. Mandela's success as a political leader is a promising aspect for comparing him to another leader involved in a peace process who claims to be inspired by him. Additionally, it is interesting to figure out if Santos' claim is true. Santos and Mandela initiated peace negotiations stopping long and protracted conflicts in their countries with largely divided societies. Thus, these negotiations are important issues in peace and conflict studies.

In the context of this thesis it is my aim to respond to the following research questions:

- Which are the leadership traits that are grounded in the presidents' personalities of Manuel Santos and Nelson Mandela?
- Are those leadership traits appropriate for peace processes?

The idea is to underline that leadership traits make a difference in peace processes because in the end, based on beliefs and convictions, a leader initiates, discusses, presents, signs and implements a peace agreement. Character traits seem to be essential, however, they have not yet been tested in detail in peace processes.

The remainder of this thesis proceeds as follows: First, an overview of the literature on peace processes, leadership and Political Psychology will be given. Secondly, the theoretical approach for this thesis will be discussed. In the third part, primary sources from speeches and interviews given by Santos

and Mandela will be analysed using the automated methods of content analysis called *Leadership Trait Analysis* (LTA) and *Verbs in Context System* (VICS). These methods reveal Santos' and Mandela's leadership traits which will be used to compare their styles of governing between each other and different regional groups and global leaders. In the last part, it will be discussed which leadership traits are appropriate for peace processes and whether the two leaders show those characteristics. Mainly for Mandela, historical facts and analysis can be given as the process has come to an end while Colombia is still grappling for peace.

In general, I aim to focus on a rather marginal perspective on peace processes comparing two leaders from two totally different countries who as individuals do not seem to be similar at all in order to highlight the importance of leadership. In current comparative peace and conflict studies, less known approaches like Political Psychology should be considered to improve the chances of success for peace negotiations.

# 1.	Literature Review

The aim of this introduction is to show that leadership traits and Political Psychology probably matter for peace and conflict studies and that a study of their effects on peace processes is largely lacking. It is a very specific angle to consider leadership traits in peace processes in the context of conflict resolution. As there is only a limited range of sources on the topic, different schools of thought have to be taken into account in order to understand the concept of leadership traits in peace processes. Firstly, the literature on Political Psychology will be reviewed. Then, the role of leadership will be highlighted which will be related to the literature on conflict resolution and peace building. Finally, this procedure leads to leadership in peace processes and to the research questions.

Political Psychology

Political Psychology (PP) is the theory that lays the basis for this thesis. In a nutshell, PP is the theory that considers the individual at a particular time, in a particular situation, a given political system and culture for the study of politics. Including variables of individual psychology into the study of International Relations (IR) and conflict resolution has resulted in a number of inherently interdisciplinary research studies. One of them is Political Psychology which focuses on the individual person as the unit of analysis (Hermann 2002, 46).

In current literature, there are two extreme positions between scholars who make the individual responsible for everything and others who do not consider individual behaviour at all (Huddy 2013, 426). MONDAK for example clearly sees political attitudes and actions as the consequence of personality (2010, 2-5). In the context of PP personality is the broad term for any type of behavioural or mental expression (Walker 2006, 27).

Many general approaches in IR deny the impact of individuals on politics as those theories see individuals as rational and unitary actors within the structures of power. PP sees international actors from a different point of view considering the first image perspective. Even WALTZ (1959, 27-30) realized the

importance of the individual, although he limited this statement by seeing the nature of the system as an anthropological constant which means that he denied individual change, development or direct impact. BYMAN and POLLACK mention three reasons why IR is impersonal: First, many scholars truly believe that individuals do not have any impact on international politics. Second, scholars perceive individuals as too individualistic to gather generalizations and form theories. Third, general theories which dominate the study of IR define the study of individuals as a hopeless approach (Byman, Pollack 2001, 108). BYMAN and POLLACK respond to the critique that personal statements made by individuals cannot be operationalised and that this critique was also applied to culture, norms and ideas which are nowadays common approaches in IR (2001, 140).

An exception in the literature concerning the impact of individuals can be seen from a negative side. Several scholars mention the negative impact an individual can have on politics (Stedfeld 1997, 5-10; Tuchman 1984, 11-49). In her book *The March of the Folly* TUCHMAN describes from a historical perspective how leaders ignored and rejected possible solutions and reacted against their own interests and common sense (e.g. Karls XII's, Hitler's and Napoleon's plan to invade Russia; Tuchman 1984, 11) According to TUCHMAN a negative individual impact on the political realm is undeniable which makes it more interesting to focus on the individual in politics.

The integration of politics and psychology started already in the 1920s, however, it has remained a very fragmented discipline. Scholars of PP mention that their approach should receive more attention as it is one of the few concepts that searches for answers to global phenomena on the individual level (McDermott 2004, 16). The reason for combining psychology with politics can be clearly seen in the fact that explanations for important historic events like 9/11 show that leaders' personalities can affect politics (McDermott 2004, 12). However, many scholars see the challenge to study personality at a distance because many individuals cannot be interviewed or examined personally. They have to be studied from afar which is the reason why PP scholars have developed different systematic procedures to measure psychological characteristics (see Walker and Hermann). Current literature

very often mentions the Cuban Missile Crisis as an example for a crisis, which could be peacefully solved thanks to individual reflection and patience (Hermann 2002, 47, Korzenny 1990, 89-93). HUDDY clearly identifies that "political outcomes are shaped and channelled by personalities of leaders and other elite groups" (2013, 423). However, she also reveals the limits of a leader's impact on politics. Based on her studies a leader can only affect politics when power is concentrated in one position, when the leader occupies this strategic position, when the institutions are in conflict, when the situation is new or when the situation is full of emotional and symbolic significance (2013, 425-430, see also: Byman, Pollack 2001, 109).

Finally, PP wants to highlight what goes on among those involved in politics and how individual interactions among people affect politics. HERMANN mentions (2002, 50): "Political Psychology as a perspective involves the examination of politics as a process." Therefore, a major focus in PP lies on the analysis of leaders' preferences to resolve a conflict and on the values, which determine their way of governing. Those ideas are definitely needed for the study of personality in peace processes. Considering these aspects, it is essential to use PP and its leadership assessment approach to understand how a leader's personality can be characterized and when it affects politics.

Leadership traits

The following aspect of this thesis is a part of 'leadership' which, in general, is defined as the way how a leader governs. Leadership can be analysed with the help of the following questions:

- Is he/she somebody who looks for challenges, who wants to prove something, who has a mission?
- Is he/she hostile or friendly?
- Is the leader confident about decisions? Is he/she naïve or suspicious?
- Does he/she govern the state alone or as a team player?

All these questions and many more revolve around leadership styles. According to HERMANN (1999, 4) it is important to know something about a leader's personality in order to understand leadership. MARGARET HERMANN is not only an important scholar in PP in general, but particularly within the sector of personality research.

For PENDLETON (2016, 172-174) 'leadership traits' are distinguishing qualities or characteristics which influence a leader's personality in the long run. This means that personality research is less transient than the study of states which depends entirely on changing conditions. HUDDY intensifies this definition by saying that "traits are the public observable elements of personality" (2013, 427). The literature on leadership and its traits is quite extensive and shows a distinct focus on leadership in the management company nexus and concerning military studies. Not all these studies are relevant for the analysis of political leaders' personalities, however, some of their findings can illuminate important areas in IR. In the study of business leaders e.g., personal integrity and cooperative effort had an enormous impact on the levels of performance (London 2002, 253). Those leadership traits could also be important for leaders in politics based on LONDON'S studies.

Intuitively, according to MCDERMOTT (2004, 215) "[…] most people talk and act as though individuals obviously make a difference […]". Decision making is often connected in every kind of mass media to men and women (Janis, Mann 1977, 3). However, ironically most literature in IR does not attribute special importance to leadership. The only exception is made when looking at the political elites. Most early leadership studies have concentrated on the presidents' personalities. An important contribution is e.g. GREENSTEIN'S ground-breaking study (2001) on the differences a US-president can make. He identifies six leadership qualities a president should have: "Effectiveness as a public communicator, organizational capacity, political skill, vision, cognitive style, emotional intelligence" (Greenstein 2009, 48).

Another way to differentiate between different styles of leadership is through categorizing the presidents' personalities, e.g. the dominator vs. the introvert (Rubenzer, Faschingbauer 2005, 56). HERMANN also contributes to this way of

categorizing presidents by differentiating between "great man, salesman, puppet and firefighter" (1986, 364). GORMLEY-HEENAN makes a simple differentiation between "rulers" and "leaders". Rulers lead through authority and repression whereas leaders stay in office thanks to admiration and respect (2001, 31). BURNS distinguishes between "transactional and transforming leaders" and he points out that leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomenon on earth. To him transactional leaders only interact with others for an exchange of goods whereas transforming leaders want to interact with others changing the whole group to achieve better living conditions (Burns, Hermann 1979, 121-125). Scholar SIMONTON reveals that successful presidents must be perceived as strong, active and good (1987, 238).

Other studies focus on British prime ministers which reveal that a strong power motivation and a belief in his or her own ability to control events are important leadership traits to be successful in office (Rohrer 2014, 1-3; Stone, Schaffner 1988, 118-120). On the contrary, BRUMMER describes high self-confidence as one of the traits that leads to failures within politics. According to him a high level of self-confidence increases the inclination to pursue conflictual strategies (2016, 703).

Based on KRAMER and MESSICK motivation is an essential characteristic that leaders have to transmit through stories to their followers. Without a strong idea and persuasive stories followers' support for a leader would decline (2005, 105-110).

To summarize, general literature on leadership and leadership traits is very fragmented. The leadership traits mentioned in various sources are high level of self-esteem, strong motivation and the ability to establish a relationship with his or her followers. Those traits are supposed to increase a leader's success in office.

Peace processes and leadership traits

When focussing on the literature on peace building and conflict resolution it is necessary to emphasize that for this thesis, the focus lies on the literature on peace processes. Peace processes "include […] some attempt to address root causes […] [of] armed insurgencies […] that had not or could not be addressed in the existing political system […] (Arnson 1999, 1)."

Especially for this work it should be considered that intrastate peace negotiations are often more difficult to implement than negotiations between states (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, Miall 2010, 161). Conflicts within states are very often full of hatred which divides the whole society. Based on RAMSBOTHAM's, WOODHOUSE' and MIALL's studies the main condition for negotiated settlements is a hurting stalemate. Both sides must realize that they cannot achieve their aims by further violence and that it is costly to go on that way. BAR-TAL focuses more on challenges for peace negotiations which, according to him are firstly, the temporary conflict management that rests on leaders, and secondly, the reconciliation on a societal level (2009, 363).

Looking at the literature on peace processes, it becomes obvious that the engagement of third parties in international crises has been studied on multiple levels, however, what is absent, is an individual perspective. Often theorists speak of a "culture of peace" that needs to be achieved for a societal change, however, they fail to see that changing societies means changing the actors, and those actors are individuals (Miall 2007, 169). Communication always plays an intensive role in IR literature, mainly in diplomacy, nevertheless, many scholars ignore the person who communicates (Korzenny 1990, 19). Some of the few scholars who consider the individual level claim that possible transformers of a conflict are continuously underestimated in general approaches (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, Miall 2010, 159). Literature on leaders in peace processes, their impact and their importance is basically absent. Only a few scholars consider the individual for peace negotiations even though historically most scholars would not deny the impact Churchill, Mandela or Carter had on peace. This is quite interesting, adding the fact that all negotiations are concerned with power; which ultimately means, that they

are the result of power relationships between negotiating partners (Korzenny 1990, 40).

One of the scholars who recognized this fact is ARNSON who is one of the few who mentions that presidents are essential for negotiations and he highlights their need for domestic allies to achieve peace. Comparative studies on Latin American peace processes show that successful negotiations can be carried forward only when government leaders, particularly presidents, are viewed as legitimate by the politically active population and the insurgents (Arnson 1999, 7). KORZENNY also mentions that negotiations are heavily influenced by both, the participants' perceptions and the environment in which they are conducted (1990, 43).

BUTLER, another scholar, also highlights the importance of leaders in peace processes in the Middle East. He believes that without Jimmy Carter's diplomatic patience during the Israel-Egypt war peace negotiation would have failed to materialise. But still he questions the leaders' motivation to solve a conflict. Based on his studies leaders only act as mediators during a conflict to do something for their ego, to promote their legacy or to enhance the profile of a state (2009, 133).

One scholar who also argued that leadership traits in transition are important is WESTLAKE. He analysed which character traits are essential for beginning and implementing a state transition. However, in comparison to other scholars, he focuses on leaders who do not profit from this transition (e.g. de Klerk and Gorbatschow) to discuss their motivation for change (2000, xix). According to him, all leaders in transition display vision and will, they are flexible, adaptive and open-minded, have a high self-consciousness and very often they have a "political alter ego" which works as a partner for the process (2000, 160-169). Therefore, he mentions that de "Klerk was fortunate that Mandela had identified him as his preferred agent of change (2000, 160)."

A possible negative influence of leaders in peace processes should not be ignored. Many leaders may depend economically or psychologically on the continuation of the conflict. For such protagonists, peace may bring loss of role

and status, and thus directly threaten their interests (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, Miall 2010, 159-163). Colombia's current peace process is e.g. in danger because ex-President Álvaro Uribe has raised a huge verbal and intransigent campaign against the talks. Along with the support of his centre-right party, he has mobilised huge parts of the population against the deal. (Pease, Tappe 2016, 2). Even though there might be many reasons for Uribe to argue against the peace deal in Colombia it is obvious that he hinders a peaceful solution to the conflict. The problem of leaders in peace negotiations is also mentioned by STEDFELD who highlights that the highest risk for achieving peace comes from the leaders (1997, 5, see Angola 1992 and Rwanda 1994).

In order to connect peace processes with the leadership traits mentioned it is significant that the personal "equipment" negotiators use in negotiations plays a crucial role. A special look at the literature on leadership traits in peace processes reveals that several scholars mention integrative or conceptual complexity as one of the key characteristics of a successful leader in ending a conflict (Tibon 2000, 1; Suedfeld, Ranks 1976, 171; Miall 2007, 68). TIBON mentions this especially for leaders in the Middle East peace processes. Other scholars focus on revolutionary leaders and come to the conclusion that in times of consolidation the leader's conceptual complexity needs to be very high whereas during a revolution the trait mentioned should be low. According to SUEDFELD and RANKS leaders who are able to rethink information, understand their enemies and adapt easily to a changing society are the most successful ones (1976, 170). Apart from integrative complexity, the ability for compromise is essential for the success of a peace process (Bacher 2012, 63).

The most important scholar on leadership qualities in peace processes is GORMLEY-HEENAN who constantly works against the omission of this aspect in the literature on peace building. In her studies, she compared leaders in peace processes in Northern Ireland, South Africa and Israel/Palestine and through this comparison she discovered some leadership skills that were missing or important for all leaders during the negotiations. In her work *From Protagonist to Pragmatist* she points out that any peace negotiation requires a

transformation of the political leader before society can begin to transform. This is a complex process because the leader can lose his or her supporters when he changes his or her attitude towards the conflict. In general, consistency and credibility are the most important factors to keep political supporters. Most followers could be disappointed which is the reason why an effective power base and a good marketing strategy are important factors. Mainly during peace negotiations, a strong leader needs to be prepared for compromises without affecting his support base negatively.

Additionally, leaders in peace processes have the difficult task to create a new picture of the enemy, 'sell' their political programme and reunite the population at the same time (Gormley-Heenan 2001, 63-68). This can be achieved by mentioning common interests and creating a new narrative of the conflict. Nevertheless, an institutional and normative change can lead to a fragmentation within society. Based on GORMLEY-HEENAN's studies, a successful leader in peace process has to be above everything a pragmatist because he needs a feeling for the right time, tone and action and simultaneously he has to continue to meet the expectations of the population. This goes inherently with GORMLEY-HEENAN's thesis that a leader's primary task is to deliver something to his or her own people (Gormley-Heenan et al. 2004, 18-23). She concludes with the thesis that a successful leader in peace processes has to have a long-term vision for his or her country before starting changes in society.

To summarize, the literature on leadership in peace processes mentions some character traits a leader should have: pragmatism, conceptual complexity, consistency and credibility. However, the literature reviewed shows that studies on leadership traits in peace processes are very poor in terms of empirical analysis and methods. General leadership traits that were mentioned regarding high success rates in office do not seem suitable for the complex challenges concerning peace processes. Reviewing the literature, it becomes obvious that leadership traits and peace processes have not yet been related to Political Psychology. Studies on comparative peace processes and political leaders have intensively focused on qualitative methods despite existing quantitative methods used in PP. The concrete assessment of leadership traits

that PP offers could help to gather new information on character traits in peace processes. This lack of research is going to be the approach for this thesis which can hopefully give a different perspective on the study of peace building and leadership.

2.   Hypotheses

The review of literature clearly showed that leadership traits in peace processes should be related to traditional methods of Political Psychology to broaden the studies on leadership and peace and conflict. Assessing leaders' personalities is a classic aspect of PP; however, it has not been connected to the individual level in peace processes. Therefore, this thesis fills a gap between PP and peace and conflict studies through the assessment of leadership traits which so far has been totally absent in literature.

In a world where it seems that more and more conflicts happen within states which cannot and should not be solved by military force it is necessary to focus on the aspects that promote the conditions for peaceful solutions. Peace negotiations have become a very important aspect of conflict resolution. There are several conditions which affect the development and the outcome of peace negotiations. However, it has to be clear that political leaders are the main actors who start, write, sign and implement peace agreements. From a historic perspective, reconciliatory behaviour is quite rare because most leaders prefer direct strategies, or the international community intervenes in a conflict. Colombia's president Santos e.g. was a very strong defence minister and led the hardest attacks against the FARC in Colombian history. As a president, he was expected to continue applying military pressure on the insurgents, but against all odds he initiated a peace process (Gehring, Puentes 2014, 64). Why did he do this after having had success as a defence minister? Normally, individuals tend to opt for "good-enough decisions" that meet a minimal set of requirements minimalizing stress and conflict (Janis, Mann 1977, 25f.). What were Santos' reasons to start negotiating with the enemy? Taking the path of reconciliation is a complicated way to achieve peace as he mentioned himself during his Nobel lecture in 2016:

> "I have served as a leader in times of war […] and I have served as a leader in times of making peace. Allow me to tell you, from my own experience, that it is much harder to make peace than to wage war." (Santos 2016).

The difficulty of making peace is a very promising aspect for the study of personalities as it shows that the individual decided to take a non-expected

path based on *something* that led him or her to this decision. This *something* is the black-box that leadership traits could fill.

However, having in focus leadership traits and leaders should not lead to the assumption that individual-level variables operate independently from their respective context. They are insufficient to fully explain peace initiatives or reconciliatory behaviour and they need to be seen in combination with domestic and systemic-level explanations. However, as outlined above, focusing on traits promises to be particularly useful in the context of anomalous and historic actions in which it is not clear why something stopped or began. Many existing historical examples (Cuban Missile Crisis) lead to the assumption that traits are important for politics, however, this marginal perspective on traits has not been taken into consideration by a larger group of scholars. Therefore, this approach reconsiders the core precondition of rational theories concerning the presence of rational and unitary actors (Flemes, Lobell 2015, 164). The study of leaders and traits in peace processes is indispensable as long as they have not been tested or excluded as determinants of peace processes. Scholars ought to know which are the preferences leaders have in the process of resolving a conflict, which are the values, that determine their way of governing and which character traits they show during peace negotiations.

The focus of this thesis lies on the last aspect. The study of leadership traits during peace process can be very promising in order to know which character traits leaders typically show in peace negotiations.

For this paper two leaders in peace processes were chosen: The first one is South Africa's freedom fighter Nelson Mandela. World-wide he is seen as the personalization of peace and serves as an example of how a leader should deal with peace negotiations to make them work. The second leader is Colombia's unpopular president Juan Manuel Santos. He has encountered strong resistance in Colombia and his peace process seems to be unstable. Interestingly, he claims to act like Mandela and even received the Nobel Prize for Peace in 2016 like his role model in 1993.

The aim of this research thesis is first to show which leadership traits that are grounded in their personalities Manuel Santos and Nelson Mandela can be traced, and second if those leadership traits are appropriate for peace processes. Their leadership traits will be presented using two different quantitative methods and existing literature. At the end, there are three options to figure out which traits are appropriate for peace negotiations which could be called peace traits. On the one hand peace traits could be defined by reviewing the literature on traits in peace process. This would mean that pragmatism, conceptual complexity, consistency and credibility are peace traits. On the other hand, traits could be set by a new theory focusing on those traits that have not been considered or tested. Some imaginable traits could be e.g. the ability to forgive, cordiality or political farsightedness. Finally, peace traits could simply be defined as Mandela traits. Mandela was very successful as a negotiator and this leads to the possible conclusion that his traits are obviously appropriate traits for peace processes. The three ways to figure out peace traits will be considered for the discussion; however, it has to be clear that the automated programmes are not able to measure all traits which might be important in peace negotiations.

In general, I aim to test the following hypotheses:

H1: Mandela is seen as the role model for peace negotiations. If specific leadership traits are needed for peace processes, Mandela will have significantly different scores for certain traits than other world leaders.

H2: Santos claims to be "Latin America's Mandela". If he is really as good as a negotiator (like Mandela), he will show similar character traits like his role model or have at least significantly different scores than other world leaders.

H3: If Santos and Mandela show similar scores for certain character traits, those traits might prove to be appropriate for peace processes and support the existing observations in qualitative literature.

3.   Methodology

It is quite complex to analyse which leadership traits are appropriate for peace and which leadership traits exist at all. As mentioned, IR literature has focused on qualitative studies for traits in peace processes, whereas PP has more often used quantitative approaches for the study of the individual impact on politics. Both sides will be used and connected for this study.

The challenge of studying leaders' personalities lies within the fact that the subject is studied at a distance. General quantitative approaches in analysing individuals at a distance are based on historical or biographical data. Scholars tend to use expert surveys (e.g. historians working on the biographies of presidents), historiometry (e.g. study on age and productivity) or content analysis for their studies on personalities. Content analysis very often includes the analysis of verbs which were used in speech acts. Using speeches can ultimately produce a bias as speeches could have been written by somebody else whose work does not reflect the individual's personality correctly. Therefore, spontaneous data should be preferred even though, no leader would hold a speech that does not reflect his or her thoughts. Another problem for the study of leaders at a distance is the subjectivity of the examiner when he or she chooses the material (Richard, Fraley, Krueger 2007, 180). Additionally, political leaders tend to use different words in a domestic and in international contexts which can lead to biased results (Hermann 1999, 38).

In this thesis two different automated programmes for the study of leadership will be used. Automated coding was chosen due to the high level of consistency that it provides, reducing the potential that unintended personal opinions affect the scoring of the material. Both programmes are methods of content analysis and calculate numeric scores. They are offered online by the programme *Profiler Plus.* The first one is *Verbs in Context Systems* (VICS) which gives an insight into the individual operational code. Its analysis is a further development of the traditional *Operational Code Approach* (OPA). Operational codes reveal individual preferences for achieving political goals and the personal view on the nature of the political system. However, the most promising programme is *Leadership Trait Analysis* (LTA) which identifies

seven leadership traits. The scores of both programmes can be compared to general scores from a number of world and regional leaders. For both programmes, roughly 10.000 words from each leader were collected and in the case of Santos transcribed as the programme works in English. According to HERMANN translated material is acceptable as the results from native and translated texts do not differ significantly (1999, 40). However, both programmes could show a "cultural bias" reducing its reliability for non-western studies which has not been studied in depth (Brummer, Oppermann 2014, 170). In order to reduce a possible "cultural bias" results will be compared to world and regional groups.

The primary sources were selected from spontaneous and planned speech acts, e.g. interviews and discourse. Furthermore, in the case of Santos social media comments were added to the analysis. The whole content analysis was limited to the time of the actual peace processes which means that for Mandela only material from 1992- 1994 and for Santos from 2012-2016 was considered. This procedure promises to give a more focused view on peace processes.

3.1 Operational Code Approach

Operational code is the term for a set of general beliefs about the nature of history and politics. Another more comprehensive but unused term would be "approaches to political calculation". GEORGE describes it as a "[…] prism that influences leader's perceptions and actions." (1967, 3)

The *Operational Code Approach* (OPA) which is often used for the study of leaders knows two basic principles: "[…] who leads matters and beliefs matter." (Brummer, Oppermann 2014, 157) The aim of OPA is to give an insight into the black box of the individual. This means that the code is supposed to explain which political principles guide a decision-maker. Those principles are divided into philosophical and instrumental issues. Philosophical principles deal with the nature of politics whereas instrumental issues focus on

the objectives of political actions and on the strategies which are used to achieve those aims (George 1967, vii).

Historically, the OPA started with LEITES' study of Bolshevikian thought in the 1950s. In the context of the Cold War he tried to develop an operational code for "Bolshevik leaders" through content analysis. He analysed writings from Stalin and Lenin and developed generalizations for the US military. His aim was to discover the rules which "Bolsheviki" use for effective political conduct (see Leites 1951, 91-96). About 20 years later GEORGE continued with LEITES' study and developed two sets of questions for philosophical and instrumental principles (as mentioned above). In the last years, WALKER developed an automated system for the OPA which is called *Verbs in Context System* (VICS). This programme codes verbs from primary sources in order to calculate how an actor perceives the exercise of power and the nature of the political system. Some individuals may view it very hostile and rather use conflict-oriented than cooperative verbs (e.g*. to discuss* vs. *to fight*). To bring it to the point, VICS calculates indices from verbs based on GEORGE'S set of questions.

For this thesis indices for the following questions will be considered: nature of the political universe, optimisms vs. pessimism and direction of strategy. Other convictions seem to serve less for the study of individuals in peace processes. The subsequent study of leadership traits reveals more about individual personalities than the operational code.

3.2   Leadership Trait Analysis

Leadership Trait Analysis (LTA) focuses rather on traits than on beliefs and principles. Traditionally, psychology mentions five traits (the Big Five) for the study of personality: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability and openness to experience (Huddy 2013, 427). However, these traits have not been proved to be appropriate for the study of leaders' personalities.

In 1999, HERMANN developed an automated programme which focuses on seven leadership traits: *belief in own ability to control events, need for power and influence, self-confidence, conceptual complexity, task focus on problem solving, distrust of others* and *intensity of an ingroup bias*. Those seven leadership traits were distinguished from assessing presidential differences for 20 years and appear to be very useful for assessing how political leaders respond to the events in their environment. Similar to GEORGE's approach HERMANN used three questions which are grounded on leaders' reactions to constraints, their openness towards incoming information and their reasons for seeking their office. In comparison to the OPA, LTA does not only code verbs but also nouns and adjectives which provides a larger basis for analysis. (e.g. *absolutely, fight, war, compassion* etc.). HERMANN's concept offers a deep analysis of the results after coding the material. This means that different trait scores can be compared and linked to each other (1999, 11-18). Additionally, scores can be put into perspective by comparing them with 284 political world leaders from 1945-1999. Those leaders are drawn from 48 countries and include 87 heads of states, revolutionary leaders, terrorist leaders, leaders of opposition parties and members of cabinets. Interestingly, HERMANN's profiles for political leaders are nearly identical with presidential expert surveys, a fact which confirms the reliability of her programme (1999, 40-41).

For this thesis, especially the following leadership traits will be considered as they appear to be useful for the study of leadership in peace processes: *conceptual complexity, distrust of others, belief in own ability* and *self-confidence*. Other traits seem to be rather important for achieving political aims and sustaining power than for achieving peace. However, this will be discussed in detail in the part of the discussion after presenting the results.

4.   Results

The results will be presented in the following order: First, Mandela's operational codes and then his leadership traits will be presented. Second, the same procedure follows for Santos and lastly, the two leaders of peace processes will be compared. Due to the fact that both leaders were socialized in very different cultural contexts, regional scores will be considered.

Mandela and Santos have had very different lives and the aim of this thesis is not to proclaim that Santos is like Mandela. The main aspect is to show which leadership traits exist for both of them and if a correlation can be seen. All results were calculated via the online page *ProfilerPlus* by introducing 10.000 words for each leader (see appendix) into the programmes. The average results for world and regional leaders were received from HERMANN (Syracuse University) for LTA with data from 2014 and from the *Social Science Automation's* 2007 data for OPA. If the result did not differ from the standard deviation (SD), it would be interpreted as average (*low* or *high* were chosen for scores above or under the SD).

4.1   Mandela's leadership traits

Mandela was born to the Thembu royal family in 1918 and lived in South Africa until 2013. Some biographers think that it was crucial for his personality not to have any brothers but sisters and that his father was practically absent (Sulloway 1997, 27). According to Thembu custom Mandela was inappropriate to inherit the throne but recognised as hereditary royal councillor. He did not take this path and became a lawyer in Johannesburg before becoming politically active in the ANC. In 1964 he was sentenced to life imprisonment for guerrilla activities against the government and released in 1990 (see his speech *I am prepared to die* inspired by Castro in 1964). From 1991-1993 he negotiated peace conditions with President de Klerk whom he succeeded as president of South Africa in 1994. In 1993 he received the Nobel Prize for Peace together with de Klerk.

Many Mandela experts claim that it is not possible to compare Mandela to anyone as his greatness is not measurable (Barnard 2014, 391). These expectations are quite interesting for the study of his personality; however, it is subject to investigation whether that holds true for the analysis. There is no doubt that Mandela is one of the greatest men in world history and, independent from the results, it cannot be denied historically that the end of apartheid in South Africa was strongly influenced by him. This basic overview should help to introduce Mandela' s scores and leadership traits.

The first table shows Mandela's scores for the OPA in comparison to 214 world leaders and four African political leaders. At first sight, these scores do not seem to reveal anything extraordinary about Mandela.

Table 1: Mandela's codes and comparison groups

Operational Codes (OC)	214 political world leaders	4 African political leaders	Mandela's codes	Interpretation w = world r = regional
Direction of Strategy +1 cooperative -1 conflictual	Mean = 0.51 SD = 0.16	Mean = 0.6 SD = 0.14	**0.59**	w: average r: average
Nature of Politics +1 friendly -1 hostile	Mean = 0.34 SD = 0.18	Mean = 0.51 SD = 0.08	**0.24**	w: average r: low
Optimisms vs. Pessimism +1 optimistic -1 pessimistic	Not yet generated	Not yet generated	**0.04**	w: n.a. r: n.a.

Apparently, Mandela holds average scores for *direction of strategy*, *nature of politics* and *optimism* vs. *pessimism.* The first two operational scores called *master beliefs* have the strongest influence on leaders' reactions (Brummer,

Oppermann 2014, 160). As shown in table 1, the four regional leaders from the African continent in general show higher scores in *cooperation* and *optimism* than general world leaders, however, this difference stays within the scores for the standard deviation. Concerning *cooperation*, Mandela even appears to see the *nature of politics* less friendly than other African leaders as his score is 0.26 lower than the average. However, the specific scores should not distract from the obvious facts that Mandela prefers cooperative to conflictual strategies, that he sees the nature of the political universe rather friendly than hostile and that he is more optimistic than pessimistic.

The following table shows Mandela's leadership traits according to the LTA criteria from HERMANN in comparison to 46 regional and 284 world leaders.

Table 2: Mandela's traits and comparison groups

Personality Trait (PT)	284 political world leaders	46 African political leaders	Mandela's traits	Interpretation w = world r = regional
Belief Can Control Events	Mean = 0.35 SD = 0.05	Mean= 0.33 SD = 0.06	**0.44**	w: high r: high
Need for Power	Mean = 0.26 SD = 0.05	Mean= 0.27 SD = 0.06	**0.29**	w: average r: average
Self-Confidence	Mean = 0.36 SD = 0.10	Mean= 0.31 SD = 0.13	**0.38**	w: average r: average
Conceptual Complexity	Mean = 0.59 SD = 0.06	Mean = 0.56 SD = 0.08	**0.65**	w: high r: high
Task Focus	Mean = 0.63 SD = 0.07	Mean = 0.58 SD = 0.06	**0.54**	w: average r: average
Ingroup Bias	Mean = 0.15 SD = 0.05	Mean = 0.15 SD = 0.06	**0.13**	w: average r: average
Distrust of Others	Mean = 0.13 SD = 0.06	Mean = 0.16 SD = 0.07	**0.33**	w: high r: high

This table reveals that Mandela has average leadership scores for the following traits: *need for power, self-confidence, task focus* and *ingroup bias*. He has high scores for *belief in his own ability to control events*, *conceptual complexity* and *distrust of others*. Average results for 46 African leaders and 284 world leaders do not differ significantly which explains why Mandela's scores are always either high or average with respect to both groups. This means that if he has high scores compared to world leaders, he will also have high results for African leaders. Apparently, no cultural bias becomes visible. The results can be interpreted more in detail by a set of criteria by HERMANN.

First, *belief to be able to control* events is described as a point of view on the world in which leaders believe to have some degree of control over the situations they are in. It is the perception that governments and individuals *can* make a difference. Leaders like Mandela with a high score in this trait are more active in decision-making processes. They make sure to have control and that their decisions are implemented. At the beginning of a process this also means that they tend to initiate actions, however, they do not prefer compromises as they are sure about their power. According to HERMANN a leader like Mandela who is high in *belief to control events* but low to average in *need for power* "[…] will take charge of what happens and challenge constraints […]", however, he or she will not manipulate or lead the people like somebody who has high scores in both traits (1999, 12). Seemingly, leaders with these scores are "[…] too direct and open to their use of power […" to be able to set things behind the scenes and to manipulate everything for their expectations (1999, 12). As his *need for power* is very average and has been related to the *belief to control events* there is no need to interpret this score in detail.

Second, political leaders tend to differ on their level of openness towards incoming information based on their levels of *self-confidence* and *conceptual complexity*. HERMANN describes this as *self-other orientation* which indicates a leader's openness to information from others and how he perceives others in general (1999, 17/18). *Conceptual complexity* is the term to describe which differentiation an individual makes to describe other people, places, policies or ideas. Leaders with high scores in *conceptual complexity* see the ambiguities in the world and react more flexible to new ideas and situations. For Mandela's

results, with a high score in *conceptual complexity* and an average level in *self-confidence,* the following description is crucial:

> "Those whose scores on conceptual complexity are higher than their self-confidence scores are open, generally more pragmatic and responsive to the needs, ideas, and demands of others. […] They are sensitive to situational cues and act based on what they sense is acceptable under current conditions. They appear to others to be open and to listen. […] These leaders deal with problems and events on a case by case basis." (Hermann 1999, 18)

Additionally, those leaders tend to gather much information on a certain case before acting and they involve many actors in their decision-making processes (Hermann 1999, 23). Mandela has average scores in *self-confidence* which have been analysed in connection to *conceptual complexity*. No further explanations for *self-confidence* seem to be necessary.

Third, Mandela shows average scores for *task focus* which is the motivation for seeking office. In his case this means that he was in office for two reasons depending on the context: building relationships and solving problems (Hermann 1999, 25-26).

Fourth, *ingroup bias* is described as a concept in which the own social, ethnic or political group is the centre of the world because it is seen as the best group. Leaders with a high score think that this privilege must be maintained and secured. Mandela's scores for *ingroup bias* are very average, however, his scores for *distrust* are extremely high in comparison to other leaders. This seems very counterintuitive at first sight as distrust does not seem relatable to peace. However, especially this trait should be seen in the context of Hermann's analysis and will later be discussed in detail. *Distrust* in general means to have feelings of doubt and weariness about others.

> "Leaders who are high in distrust of others are given to being suspicious about the motives and actions of others, particularly those others who are viewed as competitors for their positions or against their cause/ideology." (Hermann 1999, 31).

As Mandela has high scores for *distrust* and average scores for *ingroup bias* HERMANN highlights that leaders with these scores see the world as "conflict-prone" (1999, 28). *Ingroup bias* and *distrust* are seen as two traits which can be described together as motivation towards the world. Leaders like Mandela

are always taking advantages of opportunities and relationships; however, they stay vigilant and observe the changing circumstances in the international system.

To summarize, Mandela is pragmatic, responsible, open to new information, vigilant and sure of his own power to achieve goals according to his leadership traits.

4.2   Santos' leadership traits

Juan Manuel Santos was born in 1951 into an influential Colombian family which owns the national newspaper *El tiempo*. He is the last-born male out of three brothers without any sisters. His grandfather's brother had been President of Colombia. Santos' way into politics was not a straight line as he initially intended to work for the family business and within the economy-nexus. As an economist, he started working for the *National Federation of Colombian Coffee Producers*. In his speeches, he often describes this time as a very important phase in his development because he learned to make decisions as a group (Santos 2015). His first political success was in 1991 when he was elected minister of foreign commerce.

Interestingly, there are four moments and individuals of his life he tends to mention frequently in his speeches. First, he met Jimmy Carter in 1984:

> *"1984 Tuve el privilegio de conocer al expresidente de los Estados Unidos Jimmy Carter muy poco después de que dejara su mandato. Fue un privilegio y una inspiración conocer a quien había logrado firmar un acuerdo de paz como el de Camp David, entre Egipto e Israel. Encendió una llama en mí."[2]*(Santos 2015)

Second, Santos was taught by Roger Fisher at Harvard University in 1987, an expert in managing constraints and negotiations. Fisher and other colleagues developed the "Harvard Concept" – a strategy to achieve win-win situations for both negotiating partners. This concept was first applied in the Camp David negotiations. Third, he met Mandela in 1994 which impressed him a lot (Santos, 2015) and fourth, in his position as a defence minister he liberated Ingrid Betancourt. This liberation was a success due to negotiations with the FARC. According to Santos, this was very important for him because his "efficient" tactics against the FARC as a defence minister led him believe that war is essential to make peace. Betancour's liberation made him see that

---

[2] Translation: "1984 I had the privilege to meet the former president of the United States Jimmy Carter shortly before he finished his mandate. It was a privilege and an inspiration to meet somebody who had achieved to sign a peace agreement like the Camp David one between Egypt and Israel. It lit a flame in me." Santos, Manuel (2015): Una vida por mi país. Presidencia de la república de Colombia. In http://www.juanmanuelsantos.com/mi-vida/una-vida-por-mi-pais/.

negotiation is an option to achieve peace (Santos, 2015). In 2006, he became defence minister and since 2010 until present he has been President of Colombia.

It is obvious that this short introduction is very selective as it highlights aspects of Santos' life which lead to the assumption that he is the right person to negotiate in a peace process. However, it is subject to investigation whether that holds true for the quantitative analysis. As mentioned, data for the Latin American comparison groups were received from HERMANN with 2014 mean scores for LTA and from the *Social Science Automation's* 2007 data for OPA.

The first table shows Santos' scores for the OPA in comparison to 214 world leaders and 19 Latin American political leaders. At first sight, these scores seem to be average for all codes.

Table 3: Santos' codes and comparison groups

Operational Codes	214 political world leaders	19 Latin American political leaders	Santos' codes	Interpretation w = world r = regional
Direction of Strategy +1 cooperative -1 conflictual	Mean = 0.51 SD = 0.16	Mean = 0.44 SD = 0.15	**0.55**	w: average r: average
Nature of Politics +1 friendly -1 hostile	Mean = 0.34 SD = 0.18	Mean = 0.32 SD = 0.16	**0.26**	w: average r: average
Optimisms vs. Pessimism +1 optimistic -1 pessimistic	Not yet generated	Not yet generated	**0.14**	w: n.a. r: n.a.

According to the data, Santos has got average scores for *direction of strategy*, *nature of politics* and *optimism vs. pessimism*. As already mentioned for

Mandela's scores, the first two operational scores called *master beliefs* have the strongest influence on leaders' reactions (Brummer, Oppermann 2014, 160). Table 3 shows that the 19 regional leaders from Latin America on an average show lower scores for *cooperation* than Santos does, but his results remain within the standard deviation. Concerning *nature of politics* Santos is less friendly than world and regional leaders, however, this difference also stays within the scores for the standard deviation. Even though all scores are average, it should be clear that Santos prefers cooperative to conflictual strategies, that he sees the nature of the political universe rather friendly than hostile and that he is more optimistic than pessimistic.

The following table presents Santos' leadership traits according to the LTA criteria from HERMANN in comparison to 13 regional and 284 world leaders.

Table 4: Santos' traits and comparison groups

Personality Trait	284 political world leaders	13 Latin American political leaders	Santos' traits	Interpretation w = world r = regional
Belief Can Control Events	Mean = 0.35 SD = 0.05	Mean = 0.37 SD = 0.03	0.37	w: average r: average
Need for Power	Mean = 0.26 SD = 0.05	Mean= 0.25 SD = 0.02	0.33	w: high r: high
Self-Confidence	Mean = 0.36 SD = 0.10	Mean= 0.34 SD = 0.05	0.40	w: average r: high
Conceptual Compelxity	Mean = 0.59 SD = 0.06	Mean = 0.60 SD = 0.05	0.66	w: high r: high
Task Focus	Mean = 0.63 SD = 0.07	Mean = 0.65 SD = 0.06	0.57	w: average r: low
Ingroup Bias	Mean = 0.15 SD = 0.05	Mean = 0.15 SD = 0.03	0.16	w: average r: average
Distrust of Others	Mean = 0.13 SD = 0.06	Mean = 0.19 SD = 0.06	0.16	w: average r: average

This table shows that Santos has average leadership scores for the following traits: *belief in own ability to control events*, *distrust of others* and *ingroup bias*. He has high scores for the traits *need for power* and *conceptual complexity*. Average results for 13 Latin American and 284 world leaders do not differ significantly, however, for some traits the standard deviation (SD) is lower or higher. According to the SD, two traits differ on a regional and a global basis: *self-confidence* and *task focus*. This means that he has high scores compared to Latin American leaders in *self-confidence* and in comparison to them, low scores in *task focus*. The results can be interpreted in more detail by a set of criteria by HERMANN.

First, the *need for power and influence* indicates a concern for maintaining and establishing one's power. Santos' scores for this trait are quite high which implies that he controls his environment maintaining his power. Leaders like him "[…] are good at sizing up situations and sensing what tactics will work to achieve their goals […] Leaders high in *need for power* are generally daring and charming — the dashing hero", mainly, because they see individuals as instruments for their goals (Hermann 1999, 16). They could be described as the typical Machiavellians who manipulate and lead with force, charm and hidden tactics. According to HERMANN a leader like Santos who is high in *need for power* but low to average in *belief to control events* prefers to pull the strings behind the scenes. Even though they tend to make plans from the background, they govern and lead actively. Those leaders do not want to be held accountable for their decisions and tend to act in secret, however, they challenge constraints and take part in decision-making processes (1999, 12).

Second, political leaders show different levels of openness towards incoming information based on their levels of *self-confidence* and *conceptual complexity*. As mentioned, HERMANN describes this as *self-other orientation* which indicates how open the leader is to information from others and how he perceives others in general (1999, 17/18). Santos has high scores for *conceptual complexity* (a term to describe which differentiation an individual makes for descriptions). For Santos' results two different analyses are possible: one regarding his scores in relation to average world scores and the other one concerning regional data in comparison to his scores.

In a global comparison, he has high score in *conceptual complexity* and an average level in *self-confidence* which leads to the assumption that he is open, sensitive, responsive and pragmatic to the needs of others (Hermann 1999, 18). Additionally, as mentioned, those leaders tend to gather much information on a certain case before acting and they involve many actors in their decision-making processes (Hermann 1999, 23). From this global perspective, Santos has got average scores in *self-confidence* which leads to the conclusion that no further explanations for this trait seem to be necessary.

In a regional perspective, Santos has high scores in *self-confidence*. This trait is described as "one's sense of self-importance" (Hermann 1999, 20). Leaders with high scores in *self-confidence* tend to be more immune to incoming information because they believe in themselves and they are satisfied with their decisions. Apart from these high scores, Santos has high scores for *conceptual complexity* which according to HERMANN, leads to the following assumption:

> "[…] leaders will be open, more strategic, focusing their attention on what is possible and feasible at any point in time. Their high self-confidence facilitates having patience in the situation and taking their time to see what will succeed. […] their behaviour seems to the outside observer and interested constituent to be erratic and opportunistic. If one knows the goals and political context of such leaders, their decision and actions become more logical. Without this knowledge, however, they seem indecisive and chameleon-like in their behaviour." (1999, 19)

To put it to the point, regional and global analyses highlight that Santos' scores show his openness towards incoming information. However, from a regional perspective he is more strategic and obviously less open-minded in comparison to the results on a global level where he is "directly" open.

Third, for the analysis of Santos' *task focus* scores there are also two interpretations possible. On one side, comparing Santos to global leaders he has got average scores in *task focus* which is the motivation for seeking office. In his case this means that he is in office for two reasons depending on the context: building relationships and solving problems (Hermann 1999, 25-26). On the other side, Santos' scores compared to regional leaders are quite low. This leads to the possible conclusion that his motivation for seeking office is based on building relationships. A relationship focus means that leaders

"[…] want to keep the morale and spirit of their groups high. […] They will only move the group towards its goals as fast as the members are willing to move. Camaraderie, loyalty and commitment in the group are critical for leaders with this emphasis." (Hermann 1999, 26).

For the last two traits, *distrust* and *task focus* Santos shows average scores. These two traits together underline a leader's motivation towards the world in general. As Santos' scores are neither low nor high it can only be assumed that the world is not a threatening place to him and that he thinks that conflicts can be solved on a case-by-case basis. These leaders tend to make flexible decisions and cooperate with others in the international system.

To conclude Santos' leadership traits: From a global perspective, Santos is power-oriented, pragmatic, and open to new information. From a regional point of view, he is power-oriented, pragmatic, open-minded (but chameleon-like) and patient regarding the group.

4.3   Comparison of leadership traits and codes

By making a trait analysis of seven dimensions of personality and by considering three operational codes, different profiles of leadership styles for Mandela and Santos become visible. The presentation of these results will be divided into two parts: First, operational codes and then leadership traits will be compared.

The following table shows the complete data from Santos' and Mandela's primary sources which were coded with VICS and LTA. For this analysis, every score with less than 0.04 deviation from the other is interpreted as *similar*. If the similar scores are relatively average compared to regional and global leaders these scores will be marked as *similar: average*. If similar traits seem to be specific for Mandela and Santos because they are not *average* compared to regional and global leaders, they will be highlighted as *similar: high* or *similar: low*, respectively. If the deviation between the two leaders' scores is higher or lower than 0.04 the interpretation will be marked as *different*. This is shown in the following table.

Table 5: Mandela's and Santos' data in comparison

Personality Trait and Operational Codes	Mandela	Santos	Interpretation similar/ different
Belief Can Control Events (PT)	0.44 high	0.37 average	different
Need for Power (PT)	0.29 average	0.33 high	different
Self-Confidence (PT)	0.38 average	0.40 average-high	similar: average
Conceptual Complexity (PT)	0.65 high	0.66 high	similar: high
Task Focus (PT)	0.54 average	0.57 average-low	similar: average
Ingroup Bias (PT)	0.13 average	0.16 average	similar: average
Distrust of Others (PT)	0.33 high	0.16 average	different
Direction of Strategy (OC)	0.59 average	0.55 average	similar: average
Nature of Politics (OC)	0.24 average-low	0.26 average	similar: average
Optimisms vs. Pessimism (OC)	0.04 not yet generated	0.14 not yet generated	different

Operational codes seem to be rather similar comparing Mandela's and Santos' results. For *direction of strategy* and *nature of politics* both have average results compared to regional and global leaders and average results compared to each other with a deviation of 0.04 and 0.02, respectively. A minor exception is Mandela's score for *nature of politics* which is slightly lower than Santos' score on a *regional basis*, but still average. The last operational code *optimism*

vs. pessimism differs quite significantly. Santos' score is 0.1 higher than the other score, which means that he is more optimistic than Mandela. However, it cannot be measured if these results are high in comparison to other leaders because so far no data concerning this operational code has been generated for global and regional leaders.

Coming to the scores for leadership traits more remarkable differences and similarities between Mandela and Santos become apparent. Starting with average similarities the following parts show specific similarities and differences. First, Mandela and Santos have similar scores compared to each other and mean data in comparison to global leaders for the following traits: *self-confidence, task focus* and *ingroup bias.* Those traits are marked as *similar: average* because Mandela and Santos show almost the same average scores than other world leaders. Compared to the regional group, however, a small difference becomes visible for the criteria *self-confidence* and *task focus* in which Santos shows slightly higher scores than Mandela (0.02 and 0.03 higher, respectively). Despite the fact that Santos' score is higher for *task focus* than Mandela's, this result is marked as *low* compared to Latin American leaders but *average* compared to world leaders. In general, deviations for the three traits mentioned are not significantly high which is the reason why they are not marked as *different* but *as similar: average.*

Second, there is one trait that is highlighted as *similar: high* which is *conceptual complexity.* This is the only trait which shows above average scores for both leaders compared to regional and global leaders. In comparison to world leaders Santos' and Mandela's scores are 0.07 and 0.06 and compared to African and Latin American leaders 0.09 and 0.06 higher than the average score (see tables 2 and 4). Compared to each other the deviation is only 0.01 which reveals the strong similarity for this trait.

Differences between Santos' and Mandela's scores become visible for the following traits: *Belief in own ability to control events, need for power* and *influence* and *distrust.* As mentioned for the individual results, Mandela has high scores for *belief in own ability to control events* and *distrust* whereas Santos has high scores for *need for power.* Apparently, mainly the difference

between Santos' average and Mandela's high traits is particularly large as the deviation between their scores is 0.07 and 0.17 for *belief to control events* and *distrust*, respectively. Santos' high score in *need for power* does not differ much from Mandela's average score with a deviation of 0.04.

Putting this data into the context of HERMANN's analysis the scores underline that both leaders are open to incoming information from the environment according to their conceptual complexity scores. They tend to see the world around them from a complex and contextual perspective and do not generalize new input before reflection. Their reactions to political constraints are mostly flexible and open-minded (Hermann 1999, 22).

Second, both leaders challenge political constraints even though their reasons and approaches might be different. Mandela challenges constraints thanks to his belief to be able to control events in a direct manner. He is active in the decision-making process and, according to the data, faces problems directly. In contrast, Santos wants to establish or maintain his power base by acting behind the scenes whereas Mandela's primary motivation is not the need for power. Santos tends to make decisions actively without seeming responsible for them, compared to Mandela who seems to be the protagonist in every decision-making process. According to HERMANN, both of them rather challenge constraints than respect them in comparison to other world leaders. Leaders like them take an active part in the decision-making process (1999, 13).

Third, Santos and Mandela have average scores for *task focus* which means that their motivation for seeking office is based on solving problems and building relationships at the same time with regard to the context. This motivation underlines their flexibility in office which in the case of Santos can even be seen as something negative from a regional perspective as mentioned in the individual results (see chameleon-like).

Fourth, regarding *ingroup bias* and *distrust* both leaders are opportunists in world politics. In this case, opportunism is not exclusively seen as a negative trait but rather as an attribute to see advantages and opportunities. Santos'

traits show that he focuses on these advantages and opportunities, seeing the world as a complex construct without scepticism. In contrast, Mandela's scores reveal a high suspiciousness seeing the world as a dangerous and mean place where a leader needs to be vigilant while making use of advantages and opportunities. None of them is a hardliner who focuses only on threats and advantages for his or her group by eliminating potential problems and dangers (Hermann 1999, 28).

To summarize, even though there might be some differences in their motivation and way of leading, a similar leadership style can be seen as they are both open-minded leaders, opportunists and decision-makers (Hermann 1999, 41). This will be discussed into detail in the subsequent chapter.

5.   Discussion

The discussion of the findings is divided into three parts. The parts focus on the different three hypotheses which will be assessed by taking quantitative and qualitative observations into account. Qualitative criteria will only be used for the first hypothesis concerning Mandela due to the unavailability of data for Santos, and they will be presented as an additional assessment on Mandela's leadership traits in order to broaden the results on his leadership style. For the second hypothesis, the results from the comparison will be discussed in detail. Third, appropriate leadership traits for peace processes will be discussed. A differentiation between traits which cause no harm and support peace directly called *peace traits* and those traits which are appropriate for peace processes seems to be useful for the discussion. The possible peace traits will be approached from three perspectives as mentioned in the methodology.

Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis (H1) said that Mandela will have significantly different scores for certain traits than other world leaders, if specific leadership traits are needed for peace processes.

According to the OPA, Mandela has got average results for operational codes (except for *optimism vs. pessimism* which has not been generated) which leads to the possible conclusion that operational codes are less appropriate for assessing this hypothesis. Therefore, these codes will not be discussed and analysed in detail in the subsequent part of the discussion. According to the LTA, Mandela's scores are above average for *belief in own ability*, *conceptual complexity* and *distrust* which has been analysed in detail in the individual part. These results verify H1 because Mandela's scores are significantly different concerning these three traits compared to the ones of general world leaders. Therefore, these three could be peace traits even though a high level of distrust seems contradictory at first sight. This will be discussed in detail after considering qualitative data. The OPA and LTA results

for Mandela will now be compared to qualitative criteria taken from scientific sources about his role in the peace process.

A qualitative assessment on leadership traits is only possible for Mandela as more material has been published about South Africa and Mandela's role in the peace process than about the current negotiations in Colombia. Nevertheless, pertinent criteria from scientific sources on Mandela's traits can be compared to the results of the quantitative analysis for both Mandela and Santos. Additionally, qualitative criteria could give a cue about a possible success of Santos in the peace process, if he shows the same traits as Mandela who succeeded. This aspect will be considered for the second hypothesis.

There are almost no reliable sources on Mandela's leadership traits because most articles focus on his whole life and not on his character traits shown in the peace process. Based on RAMSBOTHAM's, WOODHOUSE's and MIALL's studies it was crucial for South Africa's history that significant changes within actors happened. Firstly, the change in leadership from Vorster to F.W. de Klerk was very important and secondly, the appearance of Nelson Mandela after 27 years in prison who also changed his position from fighting to negotiating for victory.[3] A Mandela biographer says that Mandela matured a lot in prison and appeared to have no self-interests at all after his time in prison (Meredith 1997, 370). The importance of two strong actors and a transformation of actors in a negotiation is also pointed out by GORMLEY-HEENAN (2001, 22). RAMSBOTHAM, WOODHOUSE and MIALL also highlight that Mandela's leadership trait to "forgive" was crucial to divide the black majority into violent and pacific movements which supported the alliance of the ANC (African National Congress) and the government (2010, 176-178).

The ability to "forgive" is also mentioned by BACHER in his book *Political Leadership in South Africa* (2012, 266) and he reveals that in order to forgive

---

[3] See: "Every soldier would like to defeat his enemy on the field but, in this case, such a victory was out of reach. The struggle was now at the negotitating table (Mandela 1994, 578).

you have to respect and understand your enemies which can be compared to the definition of *conceptual complexity* (see above). GORMLEY-HEENAN added that Mandela showed a far above average level of pragmatism which is also a trait that Santos believes to have (Santos, 2014). Unfortunately, pragmatism cannot be measured by automated programmes, however, it could be seen as part of *conceptual complexity*. Another trait mentioned is confidence because Mandela and de Klerk trusted each other on a basic level which helped to cultivate a culture of dialogue and respect (Gormley-Heenan 2001, 69). This leads to the conclusion that a low level of *distrust* was helpful for the peace process in South Africa.

Mandela himself mentions in this autobiography that it was essential not to undermine de Klerk which is the reason why he saw him as a "partner" (1994, 604). "Patience and mercy" are other traits Mandela mentions to describe his leadership role (1994, 595/ 442). He also reveals that knowing a country and delivering alternative ideas to your own people is crucial for peace negotiations (1994, 478-479). This is also discussed by GORMLEY-HEENAN concerning the main task of leaders in negotiations (see literature review). Mandela also declares himself an optimist and points out that a leader has to believe in his actions even though they seem unpopular (1994, 376-377). *Optimism vs. pessimism* and *belief in one's own ability to achieve goals* are two aspects that could be scored with OPA and LTA. Additionally, according to Mandela a leader has to stay true to his/her word (1994, 323).

Apparently, several leadership traits concerning Mandela are mentioned. Some of them can be proved by the automated programmes and interestingly, Santos has used many of them to describe himself as a person. The following leadership traits which were outlined could be tested through the automated results: *optimism vs pessimism*, *direction of strategy*, *belief in the own ability*, *conceptual complexity* and *distrust of others*.

As mentioned, Mandela's codes for the OPA are almost average which is the reason why they seem to be less important for the study of peace traits. Additionally, comparing the qualitative criteria with the data gathered from automated programmes it cannot be verified through operational codes that

Mandela is more optimistic or cooperative than other leaders. However, it neither can be said that his convictions are based on hostility. In general, the operational code scores just underline that Mandela has a rather positive set of beliefs and actions, but they do not fit exactly to possible expectations from the qualitative assessment. Therefore, concerning H1 in connection with qualitative criteria only three leadership traits might be appropriate for peace processes (excluding operational codes).

Regarding the LTA, Mandela's scores underline his above average level of *conceptual complexity* and *belief in own ability* just as qualitative sources describe it. However, Mandela's score for *distrust* should be rather low than extremely high according to the qualitative assessment. At first sight, *distrust* is an unexpected character trait which could be a theoretical problem. Indeed, it seems contradictory to have a high level of *distrust* to achieve peace. However, the trait *distrust* should be seen in the context of HERMANN's analysis. According to her, distrust is "[…] a general feeling of doubt […] about others […]" (1999, 30), however, as Mandela's trait for *ingroup bias* is average, these traits underline that even though he might have been suspicious, he still focused on taking advantage of opportunities. He was a "vigilant" opportunist taking HERMANN's analysis into account (1999, 28). Additionally, Mandela's score should be seen from a personal perspective. After 27 years in prison it seems more than understandable to be suspicious about the motives and actions of others. However, it is doubtful if this trait is rather an appropriate peace trait than a specific personal Mandela trait.

To conclude this part, H1 can be verified through the automated programmes and qualitative literature regarding three traits: *belief in own ability to control events, conceptual complexity* and *distrust*.

Hypothesis 2
The second hypothesis (H2) emphasizes that if Santos is really as good as a negotiator like Mandela, he will show similar character traits like his role model or at least significantly different scores than other world leaders.

According to the OPA, Santos has got average scores for the operational codes just as his role model Mandela. Due to the unavailability of further data and mean results for two operational codes, OPA does not seem suitable for the analysis of peace traits as mentioned for Mandela's interpretation. Concerning the LTA, Santos shows high scores for *need for power* and *conceptual complexity*. Furthermore, his scores for *task focus* are low and high for *self-confidence* compared to other Latin American leaders. Firstly, these results verify one part of H2 because Santos shows significantly other scores for up to four traits in comparison to other leaders.

Secondly, the other part of the hypothesis regarding similarities between Santos and Mandela can also be verified, even though only one trait is obviously similar and specific. In this context, specific means that it is not an average trait that also other leaders show. This specific trait is *conceptual complexity* - the ability to see the world from different angles. Both leaders show significantly high scores for this trait which confirms the reliability of the profile. According to HERMANN's analysis this means that Mandela and Santos are both open-minded and pragmatic (1999, 22).

Although, Mandela's and Santos' scores regarding *need for power* and *belief in own ability to control events* differ significantly, it is an important aspect, that both traits are essential for challenging constraints (see following table).

Table 6: Leaders' reactions to constraints (c.f. Hermann 1999, 13)

		Belief Can Control Eevents	
		low	high
Need for Power	low	*Respect* constraints; work within such parameters towards goals; compromise and consensus building important.	*Challenge* constraints but less successful in doing so because too direct and open in use of power; less able to read how to manipulate people and setting behind the scenes to have desired influence.
	high	*Challenge* constraints but more comfortable doing so behind the scenes.	*Challenge* constraints; skilful in both direct and indirect influence; knowing what they want and taking charge to see it happens.

This table from HERMANN clearly shows that Mandela's and Santos' traits differ less than they appear at first sight. According to the table, both leadership traits influence the way of dealing with challenges. Obviously, Santos' and Mandela's motivation and their way of challenging constraints may differ a lot. However, it has to be clear that at least one of these traits needs to be high to meet the characteristics of a leader who makes decisions and takes up challenges (Hermann 1999, 13). Therefore, it can be said that challenging constraints is an indirect similarity between Mandela and Santos.

Another indirect similarity is their average score for *task focus* which highlights their flexible motivation in office. They can focus on solving problems and building relations depending on the situation. Finally, this makes them less dependent from ideologies and influential groups. Moreover, Mandela's score for *distrust* should also be seen in the context of HERMANN's profiles (see following table).

According to table 7, Santos' average to low results for *ingroup bias* and *distrust* show that he his opportunistic because he tends to look for advantages. Interestingly, this can also be said about Mandela with high scores in *distrust* (see table 7) with the only difference that he is more suspicious than Santos. Therefore, some traits that seemed to be different at first sight are quite similar or head in the same direction after considering more points of analysis.

Table 7: Leaders' motivation towards the world (c.f. Hermann 1999, 28)

		Distrust of Others	
		low	high
Lowgroup Bias	Low / moderate	World is not a threatening place; conflicts are perceived as context-specific, leaders recognize that their country has to deal with certain constraints that call for flexibility of response; global cooperation with others is feasible. Focus is on **taking advantage of opportunities and building relationships**.	World is perceived as conflict-prone, but some flexibility in response is possible; leaders, however, must vigilantly monitor developments in the international arena. Focus is on **taking advantage of opportunities and building relationships while remaining vigilant**.

The fact that Santos and Mandela show more similarities than expected at first sight might be a cue for the Colombian peace process as Mandela had much success with these traits in South Africa. However, the regional context should not be ignored. It should be clear that Santos' traits for *self- confidence* are particularly high compared to regional leaders (not global leaders), and according to HERMANN this might explain his unpopularity. Leaders with high traits in *conceptual complexity* and *self-confidence* are often seen as "erratic, indecisive and chameleon-like" (Hermann 1999, 19). Being a "chameleon" is similar to the typical accusation Santos has to face in Colombia being frequently called a "traitor" (Caracol 2016).

To summarize, there is substantial support that a similar leadership style can be argued as both, Mandela and Santos are open-minded leaders (*conceptual complexity*), opportunists (*ingroup bias* and *distrust*) and decision-makers (*belief in ability to control* and *need for power*). Therefore, H2 can be verified, however, these similarities can finally not lead to the assumption that Santos' peace process is going to turn out as successful as Mandela's.

Hypothesis 3

The third hypothesis underlined that if Santos and Mandela show similar scores for certain character traits, those traits might prove to be appropriate for peace processes and they might support the existing observations in qualitative literature.

Mandela's and Santos' indirect and direct similarities are challenging constraints, being open-minded and taking opportunities. These traits will now be discussed from different perspectives.

Challenging constraints is a way of dealing with problems and taking an active part in decision-making processes but it is more than that as it means to think beyond possible frontiers. In politics, it is every leader's task to solve problems, to make decisions and implement them, however, a leader who challenges constraints is someone who does not respect but encounter rules and orders. Focusing on empirical data in order to define peace traits means that

challenging constraints is a peace trait because it is one of Mandela's traits. It seems that Mandela was an excellent negotiator who knew how to deal with the complex situation in South Africa finding a "grey-zone" which black and whites could accept. According to his biography and experts' opinions he continuously looked for solutions for even the smallest problems and fought with passion for his cause (see qualitative data). Peace processes are a challenge for every leader but mostly for elected leaders because they risk losing domestic power. Mandela was not elected; but he knew that he had the responsibility to please his people with the negotiations (Mandela 1994, 312). Furthermore, peace processes are often a balance act between the legal and the moral objectives. A leader who initiates a peace process knows that not every decision made in the negotiations will be transferred into a common and legal framework. Therefore, peace processes as such provoke political constraints. Neither Mandela nor Santos avoided the challenge of a peace process. However, does this fact make constraint-challengers peace-makers? Challenging constraints seems to be a precondition a leader should fulfil for initiating a peace process because no leader who respects constraints would start such a risky business. However, not only peace processes are risky but also wars or different domestic measures like tax increases. Leaders like Tony Blair had extremely high scores for *belief in ability to control events*, which means in *challenging constraints* and so he took part in the Iraq war (Derksen 2007, 12). Apparently, this trait is a pre-requirement to take action in politics. It shows that a leader is not afraid to question and to rebuild common values and norms according to his/her convictions. Coming back to H3, it can be verified that *challenging constraints* is appropriate for peace processes, however, it is not necessarily a specific peace trait.

The next trait is *conceptual complexity* which is the characteristic that Mandela and Santos show basically in the same way. *Conceptual complexity* implies to be open-minded and pragmatic towards incoming information. Qualitative data on Mandela clearly give evidence of his openness towards new ways of thinking as a typical Mandela trait. He could understand that his warders were prisoners of their own system which is an extremely reconciliatory perspective during his long time in prison (Mandela 1994, 56). Peace processes are never

"black and white"-cases because conflicts in which negotiations start are often the ones which are full of hatred and show a split through the whole society (Arnson 1999, 2). Winners and losers are often not visible and military solutions do not appear to be effective. In these complicated circumstances a leader must at least listen to all parties of the conflict to achieve a comprehensive agreement (Bar-Tal 2009, 363), an agreement which meets at least the basic expectations of the negotiating partners and of a civil society to achieve peace. Listening in this case does not mean to fully consider every opinion and concern about the conflict as Mandela did, however, it requires to be open towards incoming information. This is exactly the trait that can be measured through *conceptual complexity* which is the reason why this trait is appropriate for peace processes and a peace trait.

The last trait analysed here is *opportunism*: To see and to use the right moment when it comes up is a challenge every leader knows. Mandela and Santos both saw that they had the chance to put a conflict to an end, therefore, they took the chance and implemented it. However, the question remains if an opportunistic leader is also a peace leader. *Opportunism* only means that somebody takes a chance when it is coming. It does not reveal anything about the type of opportunity offered. As a defence minister Santos had the opportunity to lead the heaviest attacks on the FARC thanks to much financial and political support (Santos 2015). In this case the opportunity was there and he used it for his "war on terrorism" (Santos 2015). As president, he decided to take the chance of starting a peace process with the weakened FARC. Of course, he could have continued with his military strategies, however, he decided to use this new opportunity. These two cases of Santos' political life demonstrate that he is very opportunistic, however, apparently not always for a good cause. It can be argued that his military strategies were necessary to initiate effective peace dialogues (Santos 2015), but it can also be said that war always does more harm than good. Therefore, *opportunism* is just as *challenging constraints* a precondition a leader should fulfil to be able to act when the situation is there in favour of peace. Its eligibility for peace processes is given even though it might not necessarily be a peace trait.

To conclude, it can be proved that *opportunism*, *challenging constraints* and *openness* are appropriate traits for negotiations compared to data for Mandela, Santos and other leaders. However, only *conceptual complexity* is a direct peace trait as it really promotes a comprehensive dialogue in comparison to the other two traits which are preconditions for negotiations.

Concerning qualitative literature, it can be proved that *conceptual complexity* is an appropriate trait for peace processes (see literature review). The other traits defined by reviewing the literature on traits in peace process are pragmatism, consistency and credibility. It can be argued that pragmatism belongs to challenging constraints as a leader must reflect on different solutions and evaluate what can be done to achieve the objectives. Opportunism, however, does not appear in qualitative literature, therefore, this trait cannot be verified through external data.

To summarize all observations, it can be said that the automated programmes revealed three traits which Santos and Mandela show above average compared to regional and global leaders. Of course, their traits are not all equal, however, some general directions of their traits could be indicated through one of the two quantitative methods. Given the unavailability of data and scope of this thesis further possible peace traits could not be tested. At the end, Santos' and Mandela's traits do not differ very much and indirectly three similarities become visible: *conceptual complexity, opportunism* and *challenging constraints*. All three of them were proved to be appropriate for peace processes by comparing them to qualitative literature and data concerning Mandela. However, only *conceptual complexity* appears to be a direct peace trait as a pragmatic and open-minded leader probably does not intensify or initiate a conflict.

6.   Conclusion

The starting point of this thesis was if Santos and Mandela showed similar leadership traits and if those traits were appropriate for peace processes.

The literature review emphasized that research has suffered from a connection between Political Psychology with its automated programmes to assess personality and conflict resolution theories on an individual level. No study has been written on leadership traits in peace processes based on automated methods, therefore, this thesis contributes to three different areas: leadership traits, Political Psychology and peace and conflict studies. But it goes beyond these areas and is distinct from them, because it focuses specifically on the individual traits appropriate for peace processes according to quantitative data.

The results from the automated programmes showed that operational codes do not seem to be useful for the study of leaders whereas leadership traits lead to interesting conclusions. Mandela's LTA analysis revealed that he has above average levels of *belief to be able to control events, conceptual complexity* and *distrust* compared to regional and global leaders. Through this assessment, the first hypothesis could be verified as Mandela shows significantly different traits than other world leaders. In contrast, Santos' has high scores for *conceptual complexity* and for *need for power and influence*. These results were compared to each other which led to the conclusion that these traits are more similar than they appear at first sight. This led to the verification of the second hypothesis concerning similarities between the two actors. Leaders who believe in themselves challenge constraints just as the ones who need power and influence, even though the manners and motives might differ. Therefore, both Mandela and Santos are constraint-challengers. This counts as well for Mandela's high score of *distrust*: He might be more suspicious and vigilant than Santos, however, he takes the same opportunities and advantages as the Colombian president. *Conceptual complexity* is the trait that at first sight is equally high for both leaders which underlines the importance of being open towards incoming information. Finally, according to the LTA Santos and Mandela are open-minded opportunists who challenge constraints.

These results were compared to qualitative literature and concrete information on Mandela which showed that *conceptual complexity* is the only trait that seems to be a direct peace trait according to qualitative and quantitative criteria. Therefore, hypothesis 3 could only partly be verified. The other traits may also be appropriate for peace processes, however, not only for the cause of peace as a "warlord" also challenges constraints and takes opportunities.

Concerning its implication, this thesis proclaims first of all, that certain leadership traits can influence peace processes positively and that these traits allow to evaluate to what an extent a leader is more or less appropriate for a peace process.

Secondly, it implies that *conceptual complexity* is a peace trait which every leader who starts a peace process should have. It is the trait that opens the way to comprehensive dialogues which are needed in divided societies full of hatred. Further quantitative studies need to be conducted on this trait for leaders in the peace processes in Northern Ireland, Israel/Palestine and El Salvador (etc.) in order to confirm the reliability of this trait for conflict resolution.

Another implication is that leaders who focus on advantages and challenge constraints are more appropriate for peace processes than leaders who respect challenges and focus on threats and problems. This could lead to the assumption that Mandela and Santos are equally appropriate for peace process, which might be true, however, it has to be clear that these traits do not operate independently of their respective contexts. In and of themselves, individual-level variables are insufficient to fully explain peace initiatives or reconciliatory behaviour. Therefore, similar results between Santos and Mandela do not mean that Colombia's peace process is going to turn out successful, however, Santos' traits are a positive cue for upcoming steps. Considering the research questions, it could be analysed that Santos and Mandela have three similar leadership traits which are grounded in their personalities and that these traits are more (*conceptual complexity*) or less (*opportunism*) appropriate for peace processes.

In general, this thesis has shown that more studies on leaders in peace processes need to be carried out. The individual perspective should not continuously be neglected for the study of solving conflicts. In the end, the leaders of the United Nations, the heads of states and other protagonists of the conflict decide what is going to happen in a conflict-ridden region. They are the ones who plan, initiate and implement military strategies or peace negotiations in a conflict. It should be known which preferences leaders have in order to resolve a conflict, the values, that determine their way of governing and which character traits they show during peace negotiations. These aspects could be very promising to solve conflicts. However, it cannot be denied that other factors like structural and historical conditions and the interaction of many different actors play a role for peace and conflict studies as well. Therefore, this thesis does not lead to the assumption that leadership traits are more or less important to explain the reasons for war and peace than other structuralist and non-classic approaches.

For future studies, Political Psychology could be combined with structural variables in order to achieve a broader perspective on peace processes. Additionally, more leaders and their traits in other countries with peace processes should be assessed. It would be interesting to know if all leaders in peace processes show Mandela's and Santos' three character traits. Data of leaders in conflicts could also be used to see if Santos' and Mandela's traits are really more peaceful compared to other leaders in conflict and Santos' could be related to Uribe's traits who is the strongest voice against the peace agreement in Colombia. Additionally, it might be interesting to investigate when and how Santos and Mandela developed these leadership traits (e.g. studies on Mandela's traits before his imprisonment). Furthermore, a new approach to leadership traits could be very fruitful as many possible peace traits cannot be assessed through automated programmes. Some imaginable traits could be e.g. the ability to forgive, impulsivity, cordiality or political farsightedness. Additionally, the classic *Big Five* could be related to leaders and peace processes.

For future leaders, it is highly recommended to be open-minded and to take all sides of a conflict into consideration before acting. Peace processes are a challenge not every leader is prepared to face and they require more sensibility regarding leadership than other political issues.

In Mandela's words:

> "Like the gardener, a leader [in peace negotiations] must take responsibility for what he cultivates, he must mind his work, try to repel enemies, preserve what can be preserved and eliminate what cannot succeed." (Mandela 1994, 476)

Bibliography

Primary literature

Santos:

Santos, Manuel (2016): *Alocución del Presidente Juan Santos, Manuel sobre el Acuerdo Final con las Farc*. Online available at: http://es.presidencia.gov.co/discursos/160824-Alocucion-del-Presidente-Juan-Manuel-Santos-sobre-el-Acuerdo-Final-con-las-Farc (08.01.2017).

Santos, Manuel (2016): *'La situación económica es difícil, pero no es dramática': Santos*, El tiempo. Online available at: http://www.eltiempo.com/politica/gobierno/entrevista-con-juan-manuel-santos/16483249 (08.01.2017).

Santos, Manuel (2014): *La visión del Presidente en sus propias palabras*. Presidencia de la República. Online available at: http://es.presidencia.gov.co/presidencia/Paginas/presidente.aspx (08.01.2017).

Santos, Manuel (2016): *Palabras del Presidente Juan Santos, Manuel en el VII Congreso Liberal*. Presidencia de la República. Online available at: http://es.presidencia.gov.co/discursos/160513-Palabras-del-Presidente-Juan-Manuel-Santos-en-el-VII-Congreso-Liberal (08.01.2017).

Santos, Manuel (2013): "*Tengo mis líneas rojas y sé qué ceder; de ahí no me mueve nadie*": El Pais. Online available at: http://internacional.elpais.com/internacional/2013/04/25/actualidad/1366919348_421582.html (08.01.2017).

Santos, Manuel (2015): *Este fue el discurso del presidente Santos ante la ONU*. Presidencia de la República. Online available at: http://wp.presidencia.gov.co/Noticias/2015/Septiembre/Paginas/20150929_03-Palabras-Presidente-Colombia-Juan-Manuel-Santos-Asamblea-General-Organizacion-Naciones-Unidas-70-sesiones.aspx (08.01.2017).

Santos, Manuel (2016): *Palabras del Presidente Juan Santos, Manuel en la Clausura de la 63ª Asamblea Anual de la Confederación Evangélica de Colombia*. Presidencia de la República. Online available at: http://es.presidencia.gov.co/discursos/Palabras-del-Presidente-Juan-Manuel-Santos-en-la-Clausura-de-la-63-Asamblea-Anual-de-la-Confederacion-Evangelica-de-Colombia (08.01.2017).

Santos, Manuel (2014): *'Aquí se va a decidir entre la guerra y la paz'*: El Tiempo. Online available at: http://www.eltiempo.com/politica/partidos-politicos/entrevista-con-juan-manuel-santos/13995057 (08.01.2017).

Santos, Manuel (2014): *La visión del Presidente en sus propias palabras.* Presidencia de la República. Online available at: http://es.presidencia.gov.co/presidencia/Paginas/presidente.aspx (08.01.2017).

Santos, Manuel (2016): *Palabras del Presidente Juan Santos, Manuel en la entrega al Congreso de la República del Acuerdo Definitivo con las Farc y del informe sobre la convocatoria al plebiscito.* Presidencia de la República. Online available at: http://es.presidencia.gov.co/discursos/160825-Palabras-del-Presidente-Juan-Manuel-Santos-en-la-entrega-al-Congreso-de-la-Republica-del-Acuerdo-Definitivo-con-las-Farc-y-del-informe-sobre-la-convocatoria-al-plebiscito (08.01.2017).

Santos, Manuel (2016): *Declaración del Presidente Juan Santos, Manuel sobre el proceso de paz.* Presidencia de la República. Online available at: http://es.presidencia.gov.co/discursos/160324-Declaracion-del-Presidente-Juan-Manuel-Santos-sobre-el-proceso-de-paz (08.01.2017).

Santos, Manuel (2016): *Discurso del presidente de Colombia Juan Santos, Manuel tras firmarse el cese del fuego con las FARC.* CNN. Online available at: http://cnnespanol.cnn.com/2016/06/23/discurso-del-presidente-de-colombia-juan-manuel-santos-tras-firmarse-el-cese-del-fuego-con-las-farc/ (08.01.2017).

Santos, Manuel (2013): *Discurso completo del presidente Santos sobre marcha por la paz.* El tiempo. Online available at: http://www.eltiempo.com/archivo/documento/CMS-12731917 (08.01.2017).

Santos, Manuel (2014): *'Aquí se va a decidir entre la guerra y la paz':* El Tiempo. Online available at: http://www.eltiempo.com/politica/partidos-politicos/entrevista-con-juan-manuel-santos/13995057 (08.01.2017).

Santos, Manuel (2016): *Declaración del Presidente Juan Santos, Manuel sobre nuevo acuerdo logrado en La Habana.* Presidencia de la República. Online available at: http://es.presidencia.gov.co/discursos/160513-Declaracion-del-Presidente-Juan-Manuel-Santos-sobre-nuevo-acuerdo-logrado-en-La-Habana (08.01.2017).

Santos, Manuel (2015): *Santos responde a fuertes críticas por declaraciones sobre policía rural.* El País. Online available at: http://www.elpais.com.co/elpais/colombia/noticias/policia-sera-dirigida-por-guerrilleros-desmovilizados-aclaro-santos (08.01.2017).

Santos, Manuel (2016): *Declaración del Presidente Juan Santos, Manuel sobre cambios en estructura de la Presidencia de la República.* Presidencia de la República. Online available at: http://es.presidencia.gov.co/discursos/160427-Declaracion-del-Presidente-Juan-Manuel-Santos-sobre-cambios-en-estructura-de-la-Presidencia-de-la-Republica (08.01.2017).

Mandela

Mandela, Nelson (1993): *Opening Statement delivered by Comrade NR Mandela, President of the African National Congress at the meeting between the Presidents of the ANC and the IFP*, Nelson Mandela Foundation. Online available at:
http://db.nelsonmandela.org/speeches/pub_view.asp?pg=item&ItemID=NMS144&txtstr=1991 (08.01.2017).

Mandela, Nelson (1993): *New Year message from the ANC President Nelson Rolihlahla Mandela to the people of South Africa for 1992*, Nelson Mandela Foundation. Online available at:
http://db.nelsonmandela.org/speeches/pub_view.asp?pg=item&ItemID=NMS071&txtstr=1991 (08.01.2017).

Mandela, Nelson (1993): *Response by Nelson Mandela, President of the African National Congress, to the speech by the State President, FW de Klerk, at the first session of CODESA*, Nelson Mandela Foundation. Online available at:
http://db.nelsonmandela.org/speeches/pub_view.asp?pg=item&ItemID=NMS070&txtstr=1991 (08.01.2017).

Mandela, Nelson (1993): *Address by Nelson Mandela President of the African National Congress on the theme South Africa From Apartheid To Democracy The Challenge To Local Authorities and the Wider Community*, Nelson Mandela Foundation. Online available at:
http://db.nelsonmandela.org/speeches/pub_view.asp?pg=item&ItemID=NMS1197&txtstr=1991 (08.01.2017).

Mandela, Nelson (1992*): Statement by Nelson Mandela regarding statement made during interview with Sunday Sta*r, Nelson Mandela Foundation. Online available at:
http://www.mandela.gov.za/mandela_speeches/1992/920427_sundaystar.htm (08.01.2017).

Mandela, Nelson (1992*): Response by ANC President, Nelson Mandela, to President De Klerk's Memorandum*, Nelson Mandela Foundation. Online available at:
http://db.nelsonmandela.org/speeches/pub_view.asp?pg=item&ItemID=NMS111&txtstr=1992 (08.01.2017).

Mandela, Nelson (1993*): Acceptance speech of the President of the African National Congress, Nelson Mandela, at the Nobel Peace Prize Award Ceremony*, Nelson Mandela Foundation. Online available at:
http://db.nelsonmandela.org/speeches/pub_view.asp?pg=item&ItemID=NMS161&txtstr=1993 (08.01.2017).

Mandela, Nelson (1993*): Address by Nelson R Mandela to the plenary session of the multi-party negotiations process*, Nelson Mandela Foundation. Online available at:
http://db.nelsonmandela.org/speeches/pub_view.asp?pg=item&ItemID=NMS158&txtstr=1993 (08.01.2017).

Mandela, Nelson (1993): *Statement by ANC President, Nelson R Mandela, on the ultra right-wing's threats of civil war*, Nelson Mandela Foundation. Online available at: http://db.nelsonmandela.org/speeches/pub_view.asp?pg=item&ItemID=NMS159&txtstr=1993 (08.01.2017).

Mandela, Nelson (1993): *New Year message from the ANC President Nelson Rolihlahla Mandela to the people of South Africa for 1992*, Nelson Mandela Foundation. Online available at: http://db.nelsonmandela.org/speeches/pub_view.asp?pg=item&ItemID=NMS071&txtstr=1991 (08.01.2017).

Secondary sources

Arnson, Cynthia J. (1999): *Comparative peace processes in Latin America*. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

Bacher, Georg (2012): *Nelson Mandela. Political Leadership Im Suedafrikanischen Transformationsprozess*. Frankfurt: Lang Peter GmbH Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften.

Barnard, Rita (2014): *The Cambridge companion to Nelson Mandela*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bar-Tal, Daniel (2009): *Reconciliation as a Foundation of Culture of Peace.* In: Christie, Daniel J.; Rivera, Joseph (Eds.): *Handbook on Building Cultures of Peace*. New York, NY: Springer.

Brummer, Klaus (2016): *'Fiasco prime ministers'. Leaders' beliefs and personality traits as possible causes for policy fiascos*. In: Journal of European Public Policy 23 (5), pp. 702–717.

Brummer, Klaus; Oppermann, Kai (2014): *Außenpolitikanalyse*. München: Oldenburg.

Burns, James MacGregor; Hermann, Margaret G. (1979): *Burns on Political Leadership*. In: Political Psychology 1 (1), pp. 121–123.

Butler, Michael J. (2009*): International conflict management*. London: Routledge.

Byman, Daniel; Pollack, Kenneth (2001): *Let Us Now Praise Great Men: Bringing the Statesman Back In*. In: International Security 25 (4), pp. 107–146.

Caracol (2016): *Hijos de ex presidentes conservadores denuncian a Santos por traición a la patria*. Online available at: http://caracol.com.co/radio/2016/06/21/politica/1466460644_802350.html (08.01.2017).

Derksen, Hanneke (2007): *The role of Tony Blair's belief system in Great Britain's decision to support the war in Iraq*. Wyoming: University of Wyoming.

Flemes, Daniel; Lobell, Steven E. (2015): *Contested leadership in International Relations*. In: International Politics 52 (2), pp. 139-145.

Gehring, Hubert; Puentes, Diana (2014): *Die zweite Amtszeit von Juan Manuel Santos*. In; KAS Auslandsinformationen 9, pp. 64-71.

George, Alexander (1967): *The Operational code: A neglected approach to the study of political leaders and decision-making.* Santa Monica: The Rand Cooperation.

Gormley-Heenan, Catherine (2001): *From Protagonist to Pragmatist: Political Leadership in Societies in Transition*. Derry: INCORE.

Gormley-Heenan, Catherine; Peake, Gordon; Fitzduff, Mari (2004): *From Warlords to Peacelords: Local Leadership Capacity in Peace Processes.* Derry: INCORE.

Greenstein, Fred I. (2001): *The presidential difference. Leadership style from FDR to Clinton; with a new afterword on George W. Bush.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Greenstein, Fred I. (2009): *Inventing the job of president. Leadership style from George Washington to Andrew Jackson.* Princeton: Princeton University Pres.

Hermann, Margaret G.; Hermann, Charles F. (1989): *Who Makes Foreign Policy Decisions and How: An Empirical Inquiry.* In: International Studies Quarterly 33, pp. 361-387.

Hermann, Margaret G. (1999): *Assessing Leadership Style: A Trait Analysis.* In: Social Science Automation, pp. 1–49.

Hermann, Margaret G. (2002): *Political Psychology as a Perspective in the Study of Politics.* In: Kristen R. Monroe (Ed.): *Political psychology.* New York: L. Erlbaum, pp. 43–60.

Huddy, Leonie (2013): *The Oxford handbook of political psychology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Janis, Irving Lester; Mann, Leon (1977): *Decision making. A psychological analysis of conflict, choice, and commitment.* New York: Free Press.

Korzenny, Felipe (1990): *Communicating for peace. Diplomacy and negotiation.* Newbury Park: Sage Publication.

Leites, Nathan (1951): *The operational code of the Politburo.* Santa Monica: RAND.

London, Manuel (2002): *Leadership development. Paths to self-insight and professional growth.* New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mandela, Nelson (1994*): Long walk to freedom. The autobiography of Nelson Mandela.* Boston: Little Brown.

McDermott, Rose (2004): *Political psychology in international relations.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Meredith, Martin (1997): *Nelson Mandela. A biography.* London: Penguin.

Messick, David M.; Kramer, Roderick Moreland (2005): *The psychology of leadership. New perspectives and research.* New York: Erlbaum.

Miall, Hugh (2007): *Emergent conflict and peaceful change.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mondak, Jeffery J. (2010): *Personality and the foundations of political behavior.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Peace, Alice; Tappe, Juliana (2016): *Peace hurts. The Colombian Peace Talks and Collective Memory.* In Lieb, Theresa et al.: *EU-LAC Cooperation in the 21st Century: Combining Efforts in a Globalized World.* IFAIR Impact Group "LACalytics" Policy Paper Series 1. Berlin: Young Initiative on Foreign Affairs and International Relations e. V.

Pendleton, David; Furnham, Adrian F. (2016): *Leadership. All you need to know.* London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Ramsbotham, Oliver; Woodhouse, Tom; Miall, Hugh (2010): *Contemporary conflict resolution. The prevention, management and transformation of deadly conflicts.* Cambridge: Polity.

Robins, Richard W.; Fraley, R. Chris; Krueger, Robert F. (2007): *Handbook of research methods in personality psychology.* New York: Guilford Press.

Rohrer, Samuel R. (2014): *What Makes a Prime Minister Great? A Leadership Trait Analysis of the effectiveness of British Prime Ministers from 1902 to 2004.* In: Research & Politics 1 (3).

Rubenzer, Steven J.; Faschingbauer, Thomas R. (2005): *Personality, character and leadership in the White House. Psychologists assess the Presidents.* Washington, D.C.: Potomac Books, Inc.

Santos, Manuel (2014): *La visión del Presidente en sus propias palabras.* Presidencia de la República. Online available at: http://es.presidencia.gov.co/presidencia/Paginas/presidente.aspx (08.01.2017).

Santos, Manuel (2015): *Una vida por mi país.* Presidencia de la república de Colombia. Online available at: http://www.juanmanuelsantos.com/mi-vida/una-vida-por-mi-pais/ (08.01.2017).

Santos, Manuel (2016): *Juan Manuel Santos - Nobel Lecture.* Nobel Prize Homepage. Online available at: www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/2016/santos-lecture_en.html (08.01.2017).

Schafer, Mark; Walker, Stephen G. (2006): *Beliefs and leadership in world politics. Methods and applications of operational code analysis.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Simonton, Dean Keith (1987): *Why presidents succeed. A political psychology of leadership.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Stedmann, Stephen: *Spoiler Problems in Peace Processes.* In: International Security 22 (2), pp. 5–53.

Stone, William F.; Schaffner, Paul E. (1988): *The psychology of politics.* New York: Springer.

Suedfeld, Peter; Rank, Dennis (1976): *Revolutionary Leaders: Long-Term Success as a Function of Change in Conceptual Complexity*. In: Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 34 (2), pp. 169–178.

Sulloway, Frank J. (1997): *Born to rebel. Birth order, family dynamics, and creative lives*. New York NY: Vintage Books.

Tibon, Shira (2000): *Personality Traits and Peace Negotiations: Integrative Complexity and Attitudes toward the Middle East Peace Process*. In: Group Decision and Negotiation (9), pp. 1–15.

Tuchman, Barbara (1984): *Die Torheit der Regierenden. Von Troja bis Vietnam*. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer.

Walker, Stephen G. (2011): *Rethinking foreign policy analysis. States, leaders, and the microfoundations of behavioral international relations*. New York: Routledge.

Waltz, Kenneth N. (1959*): Man, the state and war. A theoretical analysis.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Westlake, Martin (2000): *Leaders of transition*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan.