

IS PERSONALITY A VIABLE PREDICTOR OF SUCCESS IN THE OFFICE OF
GOVERNOR?
A COMPARISON OF THE PERSONALITIES OF
GOVERNORS DAVIS AND SCHWARZENEGGER

Sheila Bhagavathi Kolla
B.A., California State University, Stanislaus, 2003

THESIS

Submitted in partial satisfaction of
the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

In

PUBLIC POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

at

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

SPRING
2009

© 2009

Sheila Bhagavathi Kolla
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

IS PERSONALITY A VIABLE PREDICTOR OF SUCCESS IN THE OFFICE OF
GOVERNOR?
A COMPARISON OF THE PERSONALITIES OF
GOVERNORS DAVIS AND SCHWARZENEGGER

A Thesis

by

Sheila Bhagavathi Kolla

Approved by:

_____, Committee Chair
Edward L. Lascher, Jr.

_____, Second Reader
Timothy H. Hodson

Date

Student: Sheila Bhagavathi Kolla

I certify that this student has met the requirements for format contained in the University format manual, and that this thesis is suitable for shelving in the Library, and credit is to be awarded for the thesis.

_____, Graduate Coordinator
Robert Wassamer, Department Chair

Date

Department of Public Policy and Administration

Abstract

of

IS PERSONALITY A VIABLE PREDICTOR OF SUCCESS IN THE OFFICE OF
GOVERNOR?

A COMPARISON OF THE PERSONALITIES OF
GOVERNORS DAVIS AND SCHWARZENEGGER

by

Sheila Bhagavathi Kolla

The personality of a leader can influence the manner and perceptions of decision making. Personality may affect how leaders define and react to issues and situations. Prior scholarship has used personality to predict the success of American presidents. However, scholars have neither identified the personality characteristics of California governors nor used personality to account for their policy decisions and actions. This thesis aims to identify the personalities of Governors Davis and Schwarzenegger and assess whether this can be used as an indicator of success in the California Office of the Governor.

I first conducted a literature review based on James David Barber's model of predicting presidential personality in the White House. Using the literature review as a starting point, I was able to create my own research design. This design included researching academic journals that outlined both Governor Davis' and Schwarzenegger's personality and performance in elections and tenure, as well as reviewing speeches, newspaper articles, interviews, biographies and statistical data illustrating public approval rates. I used all of this information too classify each governor's personality into the Barber model.

My research found that personality is a viable predictor of success in the Office of Governor. Voters, when given the choice, will undoubtedly choose an active personality. Additionally, voters will discard a candidate or elect someone else if the sitting leader shows signs of active-negative personality traits.

_____, Committee Chair
Edward L. Lascher, Jr.

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, thank you to both of my readers for their patience and guidance.

I wish to thank everyone that believed that I could finish my thesis.

To Guruji.

To my grandmother, I miss you everyday.

To my family, for your continued love and support.

To my friends, thank you for your support and motivation to make me see this thesis through to the end.

To Ryan, for being my best friend and encouraging me to finish.

To Bella, to being the most beautiful blue fawn and Sammy's best friend.

And of course, to Sammy, for always wagging your tail and being the best distraction to writing my thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Acknowledgments..... | vi |
| List of Tables..... | ix |
| List of Figures..... | x |
| Chapter | |
| 1. WHY STUDY PERSONALITY CHARACTERIZATION?..... | 1 |
| Classifying Personality..... | 2 |
| Structure of Thesis..... | 6 |
| 2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE..... | 8 |
| Scholars' Response..... | 9 |
| Application of Barber's Study..... | 12 |
| Questions for Further Research..... | 14 |
| 3. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH..... | 16 |
| Qualitative Case Study..... | 17 |
| Variables..... | 19 |
| Themes..... | 20 |
| Research..... | 21 |
| 4. PERSONALITY TYPES OF GOVERNORS DAVIS AND SCHWARZENEGGER..... | 23 |
| President Richard Millhouse Nixon: An Active-Negative President..... | 23 |
| Nixon's Childhood: A Key to Understanding his Political Actions..... | 24 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Franklin Delano Roosevelt (FDR): An Active-Positive President..... | 27 |
| The Purpose of Identifying Barber’s Work..... | 29 |
| Governor Davis..... | 29 |
| Davis’ High Approval Ratings..... | 32 |
| The California Energy Crisis..... | 35 |
| Factors that Contributed to Declining Approval Rates..... | 38 |
| Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger..... | 44 |
| Summary..... | 54 |
| 5. CONCLUSION..... | 55 |
| Recommendations for Further Research..... | 56 |
| References..... | 57 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. Table 1 Trend of Gray Davis' job performance as Governor..... | 32 |
| 2. Table 2 Trend of Arnold Schwarzenegger's job performance as Governor..... | 52 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. Figure 1 Barber Personality Matrix..... | 5 |

Chapter One

WHY STUDY PERSONALITY CHARACTERIZATION?

Is personality characterization a viable predictor of success in the Office of Governor? Scholars and political psychologists have written numerous articles and books on this topic, and have found that personality is a key predictor of the success in presidents; however, this question has yet to be directed at California's governors. Governors, much like presidents, share similar responsibilities in that they must be the connecting factor between the people of the state and the policies that govern them. However, the strength of their personality and their ability to govern can change the course of their actions while in office. Their specific personality type can dictate their success as a governor.

In California politics, those that seek to become the governor must strive to display their personality the first day of their campaign trail. The type of personality a governor holds can dictate how well they maintain relationships with the Legislature, lobbyists and of course, the voters of California. Because the job of governor is multifaceted, their specific personality type may dictate how well they will control the direction of policy, how influential they will be in working with both parties of the legislature, and lastly, how they will handle crises. This list of responsibilities makes the Office of Governor, the leader of all leaders within the State of California.

A governor's personality is scrutinized from the first day of their announcement of candidacy. The scrutiny is the product of media exposure through the campaign trail. The media makes up one of the most important vehicles that display a candidate's personality while on the campaign trail; this display continues as a governor makes their way through their term in office. Media exposure brings both praise and criticism, both which exemplify the true personality of the governor and their ability to achieve success in office. However, why is identifying and displaying the personality of the governor important?

I. Classifying Personality

Personality characterization, as defined by James David Barber, allows the ability to predict the success of an individual leader, in comparison to other leaders. The personality identification will prove that personalities do play a part in all policy decisions; the type of personality a leader holds creates greater or lesser advantage in how successful the governor is.

Barber was the first to show the analytical and predictive potentials of psychology in studying presidents with his classic, *The Presidential Character: Predicting Performance in the White House*. The purpose of Barber's model was to identify the factors that shape a presidency. Specifically, Barber found that the powers that shape the institution, meaning the political powers and influences of political party, the power balance in the legislature and the courts, can set the scope of action that a president can act within.

Additionally, the balance of power creates the climate of expectations of the public, and the president's need for action. Lastly, the president's habits, his character and his perception of the world will contribute to the personality he displays.

The power situation refers to the power divide in Congress and the Supreme Court.

Barber (1992) specifically states that the political situation adapts him as he tries to adapt it. The support he has from the public and interests groups, the party balance in Congress, the thrust of the Supreme Court opinion, together set the basic power situation he must deal with. (p. 6)

Barber (1992) states that the climate of expectations refers to the public opinion polls, the president's popularity which is both indicative of performance. The president must provide the public with reassurance that his people are being 'taken care of,' to alleviate any anxiety or worry, and to maintain normalcy in the nation. The public also requires progress and action, of moving the country forward; he must produce change. The last expectation is to maintain legitimacy, to be a 'politician who is above politics.' (p. 6)

The president must be able to adapt to the changing climate of expectations in a manner that is reflective of the public sentiment and his duty as President.

President's personality is analyzed from childhood; the personality of a president is based on his actions and decisions as a young adult, his work habits, performance and viewpoints obtained on his path to the presidency. By studying the past, the future can be

predicted, as the president will most likely make similar decisions and act consistently as they grow older. All of these traits combined, place the president into a specific personality classification.

Barber Personality Matrix

| | Positive | Negative |
|---------|--|---|
| Active | <p>ADAPTIVE:</p> <p>These presidents are confident & flexible; they create opportunities for action; they enjoy the exercise of power & do not take themselves too seriously; they emphasize the "rational mastery" of their environment; power is used as a means to achieve beneficial results.</p> <p><i>Presidential Examples: F. D. Roosevelt, H. Truman, J. F. Kennedy, G. Ford</i></p> | <p>COMPULSIVE:</p> <p>Power is used as a means to self-realization; they expend great energy on tasks but derive little joy; they are preoccupied with whether they are failing or succeeding; they have low self-esteem; they are inclined to rigidity & are highly driven; they have a problem managing aggression.</p> <p><i>Presidential Examples: W. Wilson, H. Hoover, A. Lincoln, L. B. Johnson, R. Nixon</i></p> |
| Passive | <p>COMPLIANT:</p> <p><i>Superficially optimistic</i> they seek to be loved; they are easily manipulated; they have low self-esteem which is overcome by an ingratiating personality; they react rather than initiate.</p> <p><i>Presidential Examples: W. H. Taft, W. Harding, R. Reagan, W. Clinton</i></p> | <p>WITHDRAWN:</p> <p>They respond to a sense of duty; they avoid power; they have low self-esteem which is compensated by service to others; they respond rather than initiate; they avoid conflict and uncertainty; they emphasize principles and procedures and have an aversion to politicking.</p> <p><i>Presidential Examples: C. Coolidge, D. Eisenhower, G. Washington</i></p> |

This paper will aim to identify the personalities of Former Governor Joseph Graham Davis Jr., more commonly referred to as Governor Gray Davis and current Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger. I will use articles, biographies, quotations, interviews and polls to find the qualities of the personality type. The purpose of the thesis therefore becomes proving that by identifying the personality of a governor, the successfulness can be determined.

II. Structure of the Thesis

The focus of the thesis will be to prove that personality characterization is a viable predictor of success in the Office of the Governor. Chapter two will provide an extensive literature review of James David Barber's study in order to present the basis for conducting a similar study using only State Officials. Additionally, critiques and the limitations of Barber's study will provide the reader a starting point to which to apply the findings of this thesis.

Chapter Three will identify the methodological approach used to test to my research question. I will identify a systematic process as to why the question needs answering, how I formulated my hypothesis, and how I gathered and assessed my data. The methodology will state the limitations of the research.

Chapter Four will focus on first providing examples of Barber's work; specifically, his classification of the personality types of Presidents Nixon and Roosevelt. Providing

these examples will show that similar personality types, regardless of public office, will approach policy decisions and office responsibilities similarly. I will relate the personality types of President Nixon and Roosevelt, to the personality types of Governors Davis and Schwarzenegger. In my classification of the governors, I will identify the governor's childhood, family life, military service and careers. Based on their actions, policy decisions, speeches and personality portrayed by the media, I will be able to identify their personality type under the Barber model.

Lastly, the conclusion will identify the policy implications of the thesis, while also providing research recommendations and suggestions for further studies.

Chapter Two

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of the literature review is to provide an account of what has been published on a topic by scholars and researchers. The literature reviewed for this thesis focused on a variety of themes centralizing around presidential character, presidential personality, and presidential leadership. The primary source of information used was the study conducted by James David Barber (1992), author of *The Presidential Character: Predicting Performance in the White House*. Barber focused on proving that finding a president's character, skills, and biography provides insight into the success of a president. (1992)

In his analysis of American Presidents, Barber studied the life, style and character of all presidents between Woodrow Wilson, and George H. Bush. Barber wanted to prove that character and personality has always been central to the success of a president; for instance, George Washington was appointed as the first president based solely on his character and leadership abilities. According to Watson (2001), Barber gained notoriety as a presidential scholar by maintaining that one could predict performance in the White house through understanding the presidential aspirant's personality. His work offered the first systematic effort to apply personality theory to the task of assessing candidate's performance for the presidency.

The chapter seeks to provide critiques of Barber's research and approach to his study. This chapter will also identify other examples of personality identification, and lastly, will explain the applications and limitations of the literature review, while also providing questions for further studies.

I. Scholars Response

In general, articles that critiqued Barber's study were positive; most studies agreed with Barber's methodology, however, the application of Barber's thesis was where the legitimacy of the study occurred. For instance, Alexander George and Juliette George (1998) stated that it was important to consider character because of its impact on policy making, however, the broad criteria in identifying the relationship between character and performance in Barber's is unclear. Glad (1998) agreed with the assessment by George and George, stating that there are too many perspectives involved in assessing character; for instance, how does one differentiate between public and private moral character? This is valid limitation of Barber's study because one would have to truly be immersed in the assessment from the very start to truly predict performance in the White House. Essentially, scholars critiquing Barber's work claim that his framework for personality identification may be too simple.

Goethals (2005) found that Barber's study is valid in its approach because he applies independent variables as they would affect performance. Specifically, Goethals stated that "Barber does not see presidential effectiveness as solely dependent on character,

world view, and style. One important external variable he uses is the power situation.” Barber’s scope of study identified that he conducted research and applied the findings to his prediction of personality and performance. Many scholars also stated that it is difficult to carry out the assessment identified by Barber primarily because there is such a strong necessity for a psychological profile. Goethals (2005) reviewed psychological theories of leadership and selected literature on the American presidency to highlight key psychological principles of presidential leadership. His study suggested that by applying Freud’s theories of psychology to Barber’s approach to performance prediction, high expectations, and success rates of current or future presidents can be predicted.

Another scholar built upon Barber’s study. Stephen Skowronek (1997), in *The Politics Presidents Make*, proposed a two-dimensional, four-category classification of presidential politics and leadership. He attempted to make predictions about the fate of different presidencies based upon his classification scheme. Unlike Barber, who classified a president’s style, character, and worldview, Skowronek’s dimensions included classifying whether 1) they are affiliated or opposed to the ‘established regime, and 2) whether that established regime is resilient or vulnerable. Skowronek (1997) continued to place presidents into four different categories. They are as follows:

- A president affiliated with a resilient regime practices a politics of articulation, where he continues in his own way the politics, policies, and practices of the established regime with a good deal of support.

- Presidents who practice the politics of articulation, that is, those that are affiliated with a resilient regime are constrained by their received commitments. They attempt to be orthodox innovators, trying hard to be independent without betraying the basic philosophy with which they are affiliated.
- Presidents who practice the politics of preemption by opposing a resilient regime receive rough treatment. They oppose the regime, but because they are resilient, they make certain compromises with it. They are not trusted, and are seen as having large character flaws. They are actually or nearly impeached.
- Presidents who are affiliated with a vulnerable regime hold little credibility, are weak in leadership, and often try to salvage something in their administrations by devising policies and programs that have technical merit and propriety even if they do not really address the major problems of the day. (Goethals, 2005)

Many leadership theories consider the interaction of personal and situational variables. Barber emphasized the role of personal variables in presidential effectiveness, while giving less weight to situational factors. In contrast, Skowronek's approach seems to attribute the effectiveness of presidential leadership almost entirely to situational variables. What both Barber and Skowronek agree on however is that those presidents

who illustrate that they have strong, active, flexible and adaptive personalities can take advantage of the political opportunity to make their marks on history. (Goethals, 2005)

In addition to applying various studies to Barber's conclusions, Goethals found that Barber's theory is helpful in broadening an understanding of leadership. Barber clearly identified the factors that followers expect from their leaders. Specifically, Goethals concluded that style, world view, and character garner public support; any lack thereof severely diminishes the success and effectiveness of a president. Lastly, Goethals (2005) suggests that applying both a psychological component in predicting presidential performance, like Barber did, will provide insight into the personal qualities that contribute to an effective presidency, and the attributes that can undermine successful presidential leadership.

II. Applications of Barber's Study

Barber's study, although widely cited and referenced, has not been applied outside of the Presidential scope. This is primarily due to the extensive background and ongoing research that is necessary to predict performance in such a large context. Additionally, scholars attempting to apply and predict performance must have some psychology credentials to assess the meanings of specific actions and judgments. Barber (1992) himself stated, that "politics needs psychology right now." Barber (1992) meant that there are currently underlying psychological profiling that takes place during every election, and that by identifying and applying his profiles, presidents can be chosen efficiently.

For instance, in his article titled *Choosing the President*, Barber (1974) states that American citizens need direct and confirmed knowledge of the psychology of real political judgments. To expand, Barber applies this knowledge to the election cycle. From beginning to end, candidates display their personality through the media. The election is one long interview, until Election Day, where candidates continually spread their charisma, leadership, and policies through the public stage. A candidate that consistently shows a credible and personable character identifies with the majority of voters. Additionally, Barber (1974) states that voters are already predicting performance; they are just unaware of their own study. But, those who do recognize the importance of character in predicting performance hold expectations of performance once the candidate steps into the White House. (Barber, 1974)

Barber's study was also applied to the First Ladies of the White House. Watson (2000) sought to determine that first ladies, too, held a variety of important and politically significant roles that include, chairing presidential task forces, testifying before Congress, championing social issues, supervising historic restorations of the White House, hosting state dinners, addressing national party conventions, and lastly, serving as a trusted political confidante to the president. The First Lady is an institution in itself in America, and Watson (2000) sought to assess their performance based on Barber's model. Watson (2000) found that it was much more difficult to assess their personality and character types primarily because less is known about the First lady. The amount of information available on the lives of first ladies, the number of scholars pursuing research on the

topic, and the number of institutions collecting, housing, and dissemination documents on the presidential spouses pales in comparison with what exists on the presidents (Watson, 2001) However, Watson (2001) was still able to classify each First lady into Barber's four personality-character types by not emphasizing the predictive component used for presidents. Specifically, Watson (2001) assessed character from the perspective of a role-based model, meaning that the character of the first lady would be analyzed with respect to each major role or area of responsibility in the office rather than simply performing an overall, character assessment.

Watson's study was far less ambitious than Barber's study; however, it proved that character assessment is an important component of public office. Also, Watson's approach raised an interesting variation to Barber's original study, by implementing a specific role assessment rather than an overall personality assessment.

III. Questions for Further Research

If further research were to be conducted based on Barber's initial study, it would be interesting to see the universal application of Barber's performance predictions. For instance, could one apply Barber's study to say, Prime Ministers, or Congressional Leaders? What would be the basis for the study, as well as the situations for which the study could take place? Does the study only apply in democracies, or are other governmental structures acceptable to conducting a similar study?

Although Barber's study has been accepted and utilized as a starting point for criticism and revisions, a researcher must undoubtedly be adept at psychological profiling in order to truly understand the basis for actions and judgments. Therefore, any future research should assess the qualifications of the researcher.

Chapter Three

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

Is personality characterization a viable predictor of success in the office of Governor in California? The literature reviewed in the previous chapter suggests that personality is a valid indicator of success in public office. The factors found to be significant surround the lifestyle and life choices a governor makes before and during their term in office. An in-depth analysis of the way they present and handle political and policy situations can determine the classification of personality, as described in the Barber model. Once identified, the effectiveness and success of a governor can be predicted.

In this chapter, I discuss my methodology for testing the hypothesis that personality is indicative of the level of success of Governor Gray Davis and Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger. The chapter will be divided into three sections; in Section II, I will explain my method of analysis, which is a qualitative case study. This section will explain the basis for the case study and identify the phenomenological application utilized for this thesis. In Section III, my theories for testing my hypothesis are presented in terms of the dependent and independent variables, in addition to the themes that connect the variables. Lastly, section IV will focus on explaining how I identified and tested the hypothesis for the model.

I. Qualitative Case Study

Defined, qualitative analysis is a rigorous and logical process through which data are given meaning. Through this analysis, a researcher is able to progress through an initial description of the data, and then can make connections into new concepts, providing the basis for a new description of the hypothesis. Specifically a qualitative research design involves a number of characteristics that include finding the themes that emerge from the data, obtaining multiple interpretations, and require inductive analysis. (Gray, 2004, p. 319)

My research design included the qualitative approach as the foundation for the study. After identifying the approach would be of this nature, I was able to conduct phenomenological research. The approach was aimed at answering the following questions:

- 1) Can personality predict the success and effectiveness of an elected official, specifically the Governor of California?
- 2) Should the Barber model be used to identify the personalities of Governor Gray Davis and Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger?
- 3) What is the significance of predicting personality and performance in the Office of the Governor?

In order to answer these questions, I used a phenomenological approach. Defined, phenomenological research is a theoretical perspective that uses relatively unstructured methods of data collection. The advantages of this perspective are that the emphasis is inductive in the collection of data, and is flexible in its design. (Gray, 2004, p. 28) A phenomenological approach allows the researcher to factor in dependent and independent variables throughout the design. This allows for the researcher to draw the connections between variables during the whole course of the study. Specifically, phenomenological research allows for the design to do the following:

- emphasize inductive logic
- seeks the opinions and interpretations of participants
- relies on qualitative analysis of data
- is concerned with contextual description and analysis of a smaller and more focused population. (Gray, 2004, p. 28)

This particular approach will be applied in the following manner:

- Conducting a thorough research analysis of literature written on the topic
- Collect a series of biographies, speeches, interviews, articles and talks given by the Governors Davis and Schwarzenegger
- Analyzing the factors and variables identified through the collected research
- Using the data to link factors and themes to identify the personality category of the Barber model that the Governors fit into

Essentially, the phenomenological approach allows for the research design to be flexible and incorporate a variety of research, while also providing the ability to focus the direction of the research to prove or negate the hypothesis.

II. Variables

Variables are crucial to the research design and finding the solution to the policy problem because they define the characteristics that are central to the research question. Presented in two forms, the dependent variable and independent variable, variables allow for the design to be focused on the dependent variables, while also identifying the relationships between independent variables. Specifically, dependent variables form the focus of research, but depend on independent variables. As defined, independent variables are used to explain or predict a result or outcome on the dependent variable. (Gray, 2004, p. 400)

The key variables that will have the significant correlation to the dependent variable listed and illustrated below are:

- The personality style as identified in the Barber model

Independent variables that may show a correlation to the dependent variable, but not as significantly are as follows:

- Upbringing- what was the general home life for each governor? What was their relationship with their parents? What influenced their future?
- Political division within the party the governor represents: Does the Governor have the support of his own party? If support is divided

amongst members of his party within the Legislature, the Governor may have to negotiate harder to pass his agenda or to create significant change.

- Career experience and education of the governor: Where did the Governor come from? Is he a career politician just waiting to make the next step on the political ladder? Or did he come from a place where he can relate to the majority of the public he represents? These factors are significant in understanding the level of trust the public has in their Governor.
- Public approval and disapproval rates of the governor: Although the data may vary, these rates are especially significant in identifying the approval rates of Governor Gray Davis. The rates illustrate the level of frustration or approval of action from the Governor.

Identifying these variables will establish a premise for key themes and concepts to be found when classifying the personality of Governor Davis and Governor Schwarzenegger.

Themes

I expect the themes I identify through the research design to be intertwined. This is based primarily on the fact the themes are constantly changing. The themes will be identified once the relationship between the dependent and independent variable are analyzed with each Governor. I expect that the themes found will be similar; for instance, I expect to find both governors had similar agendas, but executed them in different ways.

Additionally, their agendas were played received differently by the general public. The only explanation I expect to find is that this is due to varying personality styles.

III. Research

In order to answer the research questions, I first conducted a literature review based on James David Barber's model of predicting presidential personality in the White House. Having reviewed an extensive amount of literature in articles and journals, I was able to find that the majority of researchers felt that personality can be predicted for a president, in addition to being a successful measure of success. Using the literature review as a starting point, I was able to create my own research design that included researching academic journals that outlined both Governor Davis' and Schwarzenegger's personality and performance in elections and tenure; speeches, newspaper articles, interviews, biographies and statistical data illustrating public approval rates. All of this combined allowed me to classify both governor's into the Barber model. The next chapter will provide an in-depth analysis of the personalities that both governors personify, which were able to be conducted based on the research model.

I expect research design to show that personality is an indicator of success. I hope to illustrate the similarities of Davis to Nixon, and Schwarzenegger to FDR's personality types. Furthermore, by using primary sources, such as newspaper articles, interviews, and first hand accounts of the agendas and actions of the Governors of California, I hope to prove the personality identification can lead to speculating exactly how effective a governor can be once elected into office.

Chapter Four
PERSONALITY TYPES OF
GOVERNORS DAVIS AND SCHWARZENEGGER

Gray Davis and Arnold Schwarzenegger, have both had the opportunity to hold the most powerful position within California; the Office of Governor. Although both have had the privilege of holding the same title and responsibilities, they couldn't be further apart when it comes to their personality. As previous chapters have illustrated, personality has played a critical role in predicting the success of a president. This chapter seeks to apply Barber's model by identifying the personalities of both Governors Davis and Schwarzenegger, and if, in fact, their personalities could help predict their actions. I will identify their personality by first providing examples of two presidents that had the same personality types of both Governors Davis and Schwarzenegger. This will enable me to point out the clear consistencies in personality types, which I will depict by providing my own analysis of the personality types of Governors. Explaining their upbringings and careers will illustrate that specific personality types have distinct characteristics that provide explanations for actions. Lastly, I will provide a summary of my results, showing that actions can be linked to personality types.

I. President Richard Millhouse Nixon: An Active-Negative President

Barber (1992) identified Nixon as an active negative president. As defined by Barber, an active-negative personality has the potential to have their legacy end in disaster (p. 126).

History shows that Nixon's legacy ended in disaster, he resigned from his term willingly, but was forced out by his own actions. How did Nixon become this way?

Nixon's childhood: a key to understanding his political actions

Richard Nixon, raised in Whittier, California, experienced a difficult life from an early age. He was the son of hard-working parents, parents that lived with two varying outlooks on life. Nixon's mother, Hannah, was a patient and passive individual; his father, Frank, on the other hand, was exactly the opposite, never afraid to speak his mind on any matter. Throughout Nixon's childhood, his parents were always working hard in the family business, struggling hard to make ends meet. His mother typically worked hard, without complaining about the many jobs she had to do, while his father often times complained and took his frustrations out on the children and wife (Barber, 1992, p. 126). Barber (1992) finds that Nixon exemplified both qualities throughout his presidency, stating that Nixon always had an unresolved conflict between his strong identification with his calm, reliable, and repressed mother, and his feelings that manliness meant being like his father – impulsive, aggressive, and surprisingly, unpredictable (p. 131). Perhaps Nixon exemplified the qualities of his father when he felt threatened or the need to overcompensate for his weaker qualities.

Many of Nixon's actions while in the White House demonstrated this aggressive tendency that was similar to the attitude that his father possessed. For instance, Nixon was the type of leader that always had to be in control, he was quite wary of those around

him, and would often make irrational decisions that forced him to take unconventional courses of action. Fearful of his own actions, Nixon often resorted to taking unlawful actions to preserve his power, or what he thought of as power. Barber (1992) summed up his action in the following statement: “Through nearly all of his presidency, Nixon had to assert his authority to enhance power, be the power to bomb, tap, impound, burglar, broadcast, blackmail, or bribe” (p. 145). Nixon exemplified these tendencies during the Watergate scandal, which was a series of political scandals that began with five Nixon aides breaking into the Democratic National Committee Headquarters at the Watergate Hotel in Washington, D.C.

A subsequent investigation by the FBI, Senate Watergate Committee, House Judiciary Committee, and the press eventually exposed many illegal activities executed by Nixon and his aides. Specifically, the investigation revealed the immense scope of crimes and abuses, which included campaign fraud, political espionage and sabotage, illegal break-ins, wiretapping on a massive scale, including the wiretapping of the press and regular citizens, and a secret slush fund laundered in Mexico to pay those who conducted these operations (Barber, 1992, p. 159). The investigation went on for two years, and during those two years, Nixon attempted to cover up his involvement but ultimately resigned from office before impeachment proceedings could begin. (Barber, 1992, p. 160) A typical active-negative, Nixon continued to deny fault and shift focus away from the matter at hand. For instance, instead of admitting fault, Nixon urged the public to forget the “Watergate nonsense” and march on into the future. Barber (1992) found that

through his whole presidency, Nixon had always given new explanations, but never new facts. He succeeded by redefining the meanings of his acts (p. 159). Nixon's tendencies to make excuses illustrate the manner in which Nixon approached his responsibilities as president; not only did he believe that he was above the law, he also used the vulnerability of the American political system to compensate for his shortcomings. He undoubtedly acted against the trust the voters put into him, as President of the United States.

The passive side of Nixon was illustrated more in his tendencies to isolate himself. His tendencies included ordering his aides around, while hiding behind closed doors. Barber stated that "In January 1971, Nixon realized that he had an isolation problem, and tried to correct it by proclaiming open door hours. The plan backfired, and he became more and more isolated. He had no contacts with the press, his aides and lawyers" (Barber, 1992, p. 161). However, Nixon realized that his isolation was a potential problem too late and subsequently resigned.

Nixon, being a prime example of an active-negative president, illustrated his qualities of compulsiveness, anxiety, and his quest to seek more power. If Nixon were not so threatened by his own insecurities, he would have not been forced to lie, burgle, and abuse the trust of the presidential office and the American public. Essentially, Nixon would have been able to leave office with some level of dignity.

II. Franklin Delano Roosevelt (FDR): An Active-Positive President

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, often referred to as FDR, has been identified by Barber as an active-positive president. FDR exemplified the active-positive primarily due to his ability to have fun in the vigorous exercise of presidential power; he sought out and even created opportunities for action, rather than waiting for the action to come to them (Barber, 1992, p. 267). From an early age, FDR was a rather independent child; having been born into a wealthy family, he was provided with many luxuries in life. The most valuable luxury was the framework for life that his parents gave him. Specifically, FDR's parents set a framework within which he could develop but they were not insistent on watching him every moment of his life (Barber, 1992, p. 271). FDR's parents gave him enough freedom of thought and action, which allowed him to excel through boarding school, college and his first career with no major life crises. He had an open relationship with his parents in which he communicated freely, and he maintained that relationship throughout his adult life. His ability to communicate with his elders undoubtedly helped him in building his network that helped him build his political career.

The first signs of FDR as an active-positive president emerged when he became the Assistant Secretary of the Navy. During his tenure, FDR learned the art of becoming involved in everything. He attended all hearings personally, so that he would understand policies first-hand. Furthermore, FDR also learned how to promote togetherness; he often preached togetherness, stating that "nothing to my mind promotes efficiency so much as the feeling amongst the employees that they are all members of the same club"

(Barber, 1992, p. 282). It was during his stint as Assistant Secretary of the Navy that FDR learned how to be an executive; he learned to listen, to decide, to cut through bureaucratic knots, and to get favorable action, placing himself at the center of the decision, and taking credit for whatever worked out well (Barber, 1992, p. 282). He carried this framework with him into his presidency and his style and character most likely attributed to his ability to implement policy changes while in office.

FDR's personality sat well with the public; not only did he know how to keep his things simple, he also knew how to make people happy. For instance, he never claimed to not know the correct answer, but he acted in such a way to present to the audience that he would find the answer. Furthermore, he learned the effectiveness of personalizing his talks. He would always address a crowd as "my friends," and would make certain to make those around him feel comfortable (Barber, 1992, p. 285). His ability to relate to people most likely allowed him to turn to people for information to get his facts; constantly asking questions and seeking out answers if he did not hear the answer he liked (Barber, 1992, p. 286). Throughout almost his entire presidency, FDR did not use his position to make himself above anyone else; instead, he was more interested in being ahead of any situation or discussion. He exemplified the active-positive personality by always being ready to act whenever a situation arose. Furthermore, Barber (1992) found that FDR was always ready to accept that he may not always be right, but was ready to not suffer from being wrong (p. 288).

FDR's greatest strength as an active-positive president was that he had an insatiable hunger for and attention to results. His personality type allowed him to succeed in solving problems because he was aware of what he was doing (Barber, 1992, p. 298). Unlike Nixon, FDR was able to have a vision and created situations to be successful in. Even if his ideas were not entirely successful, his lack of fear provided with the strength to be a successful leader and president.

The Purpose of Identifying Barber's Work

The purpose of providing two examples of Barber's work is to illustrate the depth of research that must go into analyzing how a president obtained his specific personality type. Barber (1992) examined these presidents from early childhood to their last day in office. He proved that personality identification is an arduous task that involves one making many interpretations of situations (p. 6). I will prove the same applies to the Office of Governor, as identified through examples of Governors Davis and Schwarzenegger.

III. Governor Gray Davis

Born in New York, Joseph Graham Davis was the eldest of five children. His family moved to California in 1954, as part of a post-World War II migration ("Gray Davis," 2009). His upper- middle class background allowed him to attend private schools but when his father left the family, he was forced to join ROTC to earn money for college. His father left while Davis was attending Stanford; after college, Davis entered into

ROTC to attend law school in 1967. He attended Columbia Law School where he earned his Juris Doctorate Degree and won the Moot Court Award (“Governors of California,” 2009).

Davis served in Vietnam for two years, and returned as a Captain who earned a Bronze Star for merit (Chorneau, 2003). Davis often mentions that it was during this time that he became a changed man. Davis was surprised to discover that the majority of those serving in Vietnam were Latinos, African Americans, and southern whites with very few from schools like Stanford and Columbia. Davis believed that the burden of the war should be felt equally and he resolved early on to go about changing America so that would change (“Conversations with Gray Davis,” 2006). Returning home in 1969, he started working on the campaign that started a statewide Crime Watch Program as a volunteer for the campaign of US Senator John Tunney. He then worked on the campaign of Tom Bradley, who became the first black mayor of Los Angeles (“Gray Davis,” 2009). From then on, Davis was primed for a career in state service. He eventually made his way to the State Capitol, first as Chief of Staff to Governor Jerry Brown (1975-1981), a State Assemblyman (1982-1986), State Controller (1987-95), Lieutenant Governor (1995-1998) and finally Governor of California (1998-2003) (“Governor Gray Davis,” n.d).

Throughout much of his life, Davis’s personality was described as ‘aloof,’ and his political style as ‘cautious and calculated’ instead of charismatic. Although being born

Joseph Graham Davis, his mother gave him the name of “Gray” at a young age (“Gray Davis,” 2009). Little to be known to her, the symbolism of being a nickname that represented a boring color stuck with Davis longer than he probably would have wanted. The symbolism of his nickname haunted Davis mostly through his career as governor of California. In his darkest days as Governor, right before the recall, local radio show host Hugh Hewitt, hosted a contest where he asked his listeners to complete the following sentence; “if Davis were...” and email him their entries. The following are a sample of what his listeners, also Californians, felt about the Governor.

“If Gray Davis were...

software, he’d be a virus.”
a dumbwaiter, he’d be over-employed.”
a gift, he’d be returned.”
a check, he’d bounce.”
a seaman, he’d be Gilligan.”
a placebo, he’d be a placebo.”
a number, he’d be zero.”
a thought, he’d be forgotten.”
a flower, he’d be a dandelion.”
a tense, he’d be the past” (Hewitt, 2001).

These sentiments were shared prior to California’s historic recall of 2003. Davis’ approval ratings were dwindling. The following table details how Davis was viewed in the polls.

Trend of Gray Davis' job performance as Governor
(Among registered voters)

| Month/Year | Approve | Disapprove | No Opinion |
|----------------|---------|------------|------------|
| August 2003 | 22% | 70% | 8% |
| July 2003 | 23% | 66% | 11% |
| April 2003 | 24% | 65% | 11% |
| September 2002 | 39% | 49% | 12% |
| July 2002 | 41% | 49% | 10% |
| April 2002 | 39% | 54% | 7% |
| January 2002 | 39% | 53% | 8% |
| December 2001 | 38% | 51% | 11% |
| September 2001 | 38% | 52% | 10% |
| May 2001 | 36% | 55% | 9% |
| January 2001 | 57% | 34% | 9% |
| August 2000 | 56% | 28% | 1% |
| June 2000 | 61% | 24% | 15% |
| February 2000 | 62% | 20% | 18% |
| October 2000 | 54% | 27% | 19% |
| August 1999 | 59% | 26% | 15% |
| March 1999 | 57% | 15% | 31% |

(The Field Poll, 2005)

Numbers are very telling of exactly how successful a Governor can be, however, Davis' numbers were once very high before they steadily declined a year before he was recalled.

Why were Davis' numbers so high and so low?

Davis' High Approval Ratings

Davis assumed his new role of Governor with a very high approval rating; California overwhelmingly supported him. Apart from being the seen as the average man that worked his way up through the ranks and holding seven different public offices, Davis was able to relate to the average California voter. For example, during the 1998

gubernatorial primary, Davis' two opponents, Al Cheeci and Jane Harman were both multimillionaires who spent tens of millions of dollars attacking each other. (Miller, 2002). Davis identified with the California voter and was able to use the fact that he wasn't a multimillionaire to his advantage. His campaign slogan quickly became, "Experience Money Cannot Buy;" In June Davis earned only 34.7 percent of the vote but it was more than Cheeci and Harmon who each garnered only 12.5 percent of the vote allowing him to win the support of organized labor and even votes from the Republicans ("Secretary of State," 2003).

In the general election Davis again showed his ability to resonate with the voters of California. Davis ran against Republican nominee Dan Lungren, who actually helped Davis shine favorably in the spotlight. Lungren made some rookie campaign mistakes and Davis, a seasoned politician, was able to capitalize on those mistakes. For instance, Lungren made it a point to personally attack Davis in the media. In contrast, Davis had already set tone of running a low-key campaign with even-toned commercials. Lungren refused to soften his often strident conservatism while Davis emphasized his middle of the road, pragmatic approach. Davis gained wide spread support, even from Republicans. In November 2004, Gray Davis became the first Democrat to be elected governor since Jerry Brown in 1974, leaving Lungren to set a new record; that is, only the third Republican in the 20th century to get less than 40 percent of the vote (Miller, 2002).

Davis' win over Lungren showed a side of Davis that wasn't seen before. Davis, the seasoned veteran of the capitol, having previously held five public offices in California and working as a chief of staff for Governor Jerry Brown, Davis showed California that he could do the job of Governor of California. Even though personalities played a major part in the 1998 gubernatorial campaign, Davis showed a personality to California that they wanted to see; calm, cool, and confident. The California Journal observed,

“While Lungren’s kinetic qualities clearly turned off voters, the seemingly bland Davis was a revelation his pale countenance and silver hair coming across as comforting and cool. In the debates, Davis leavened his serious discussions with flashes of self-deprecating humor, an appealing counterpoint to Lungren’s unsmiling archness. While both men sport king-sized egos, Davis’ somehow came across as self-confidence, while Lungren’s seemed to smack of arrogance. Most importantly, Davis commanded the political center on a variety of issues. Lungren’s “I am what I am” approach got him points for honesty, but his refusal to offer even a spoonful of sugar with his conservatism gave Davis plenty of running room, and he used every bit of it, eventually running away from the field” (California Journal, 1998).

Davis' first term in office witnessed a budget surplus, a growing population, and a booming economy that created new jobs. Under Davis, spending increased from \$75 billion to \$103 billion, California's population increased by 5 percent and the workforce increased by 15 percent. Under Davis, the economy soared and therefore opened up 44,000 new jobs. Although the overall outlook of California looked promising, Davis did receive some criticism about how he increased state spending. Senator Tom McClintock (R-Thousand Oaks), said in regards to Davis' spending habits “This is a simple lesson that Davis refuses to learn; when you spend money in sight during good times, you won't have any around during the bad times” (Miller, 2002). McClintock was referring to how Davis' inclination to allow state spending to occur. The surplus allowed the Legislature

to pass major spending programs and Davis reluctantly agreed to sign expensive programs into law, mostly to keep the bipartisanship relationship with the Legislature positive.

Davis' spending habits would come into question months later when he was questioned about his spending habits when the energy crisis of California hit; his handling of the crisis eventually led to declining numbers and his loss in the recall election.

The California Energy Crisis

The energy crisis hit California in 2000, even though most recall the height of the crisis during January 2001. The energy crisis was set in motion during Governor Pete Wilson's administration, and unfortunately, Davis had to deal with the repercussions. The crisis was a result of a utility-industry deregulation law enacted in 1996 intended to lower energy prices by breaking up the utilities and creating competition amongst new energy service providers that would be allowed to enter into the market. The law also imposed price ceilings on energy companies (Baldassarre, 2007). By June 2000, the state's recovering economy and population growth started to create more demand for power than the utilities were able to generate. Large areas of the state started to experience power outages and brown-outs. In addition, although California power companies were subject to price ceilings, out-of-state power companies were not. Thus when California utilities were forced to purchase out-of-state power, they had to pay exorbitant rates. Companies like Enron worsened the situation by artificially creating shortages and then increasing

prices even more. In 2000, California utilities paid more than \$12 billion more for power than in 1999 and were facing bankruptcy.

Although the crisis was apparent in June 2000, Davis did little. When he finally acted in September, he started a prime-time television address by blaming others. He then promised a summit meeting with all the main actors to seek a solution. No meeting occurred and when he finally called the Legislature into special session in December, he did not initially propose a plan. In January, the Public Utilities Commission, an independent board not subject to the Governor's authority, finally approved rates hikes. In February the Legislature approved Davis' proposal for the state to buy power through long-term contracts. The crisis ebbed but not the public's view of Davis' failed leadership (Miller, 2002).

The delayed response proved to be critical for how the voters perceived Davis. During the gubernatorial election, voters saw Davis as competent to handle such matters; he showed California a different side of personality when he failed to fix the crisis. Barber would identify the actions as indicative of Davis' personality type; active-negative. As Barber describes, active-negative types as both highly driven and aggressive. Davis' reaction to his handling of the energy crisis depicts his active-negative personality type. In addition, the personality he displayed during the energy crisis affected the perception of California voters. His attitude became a key indicator in the recall election, that

California wanted a governor that had a more positive, engaging personality, if given the choice.

The Economist wrote that although Davis had months to act, he did not and ended up purchasing electricity at the highest price; this caused consumers to pay up to 3 times as much for the same amount of electricity (Economist, 2001). His inaction was at the center of criticism across the country. Most critics linked his performance to his personality; for instance The Economist carried an article entitled “Gray Davis’s Perfect Storm,” which described Davis’ strategy as rooted in principles of cautious incrementalism and avoiding giving offense that may have been his hallmark.” Senator Joe Dunn (Democrat-Orange County) said that “Davis should have let the power companies darken the state. Then, Davis could have used his emergency powers to seize the plants, pay the owners a “reasonable” rate of return and keep the power flowing. That would have been a bold statement that would have initiated an immediate meeting of all the stakeholders” (Wientraub and Gagliano, 2002).

Davis disagreed with these assessments. The energy crisis was a defining moment in Davis’ career and he stood by the way he handled it. In an interview with the San Diego Union Tribune, Davis said, “I kept the lights on. And this sounds a little presumptuous, but I think I should at least get a round of applause, but I don’t get squat” (Miller, 2002). Davis continued to stand by his actions when interviewed with the Union Tribune. They had asked Davis if he panicked in his response to the Energy Crisis. Davis responded

with “If I didn’t panic, you wouldn’t be able to put out your paper. I saved this friggin’ paper. I kept the lights on in this state. I kept the lights on!” (Miller, 2002).

Davis’ handling of the energy crisis was one factor in his declining approval ratings. His compulsion created a cloud that voters were uncomfortable with. Davis was more concerned with defending his actions than accepting his reality; that is, the reality that Californians suffered.

Factors that contributed to declining approval rates

Gray Davis’ approach to the state budget crisis of 2000-01, his fundraising activities, and autocratic style also contributed to his declining approval ratings.

In his first term Davis benefited from a booming state and national economy. In particular, personal wealth greatly increased which generated billions in state revenues because of a tax system heavily weighted toward income, capital gains and sales taxes. At one point the state enjoyed a \$10 billion surplus. Davis initially resisted spending the surplus on anything but short-term projects. However, he soon gave in to bi-partisan legislative pressure and approved expansions of programs to reduce class size and provide health insurance to children. He also signed into law large and wide-spread tax breaks, especially for businesses. As noted above, he also faced billions in expenses from the energy crisis as well as massive post 9/11 security costs. The state’s budget collapse was triggered by the end of the dot com boom in Wall Street. The crash of

2000-01 took \$5 trillion out of the US economy and replaced the state's surplus with billion dollar deficits by 2001-02. Again, Davis' reaction was a mix of hesitancy and blaming others. He was widely viewed as minimizing the deficit during his 2002 reelection campaign.

Considerable attention was also focused on Davis' fundraising practices. Californians didn't like that while he was supposedly serving their best interest, Davis' mind was on fundraising. Derek Cressman (2007) found that because "Davis only worked for state government, he didn't have a large bank account, therefore he became really good at asking other people for money" (p. 12). When Davis realized how much he could raise, California could not understand what Davis' real motives as Governor were. Although fundraising is a major part of being governor, Davis was unexpectedly attacked personally for his fundraising. When Schwarzenegger fundraised and bypassed the amount Davis raised, it was not as big an issue with California.

Finally, Davis, like Nixon and other active-negatives, tended to insist on loyalty and obedience, even from those outside the governor's staff. Davis assumed that members of his party in the Legislature were there to help him further his policy vision ("Gray Davis," 2009); however, he could never find a member to carry his legislative package (Hewitt, 2001). Davis treated his political and even judicial appointees in the same manner, stating that "the job of my appointees is to reflect my vision; my appointees should reflect my views. They are not there to be independent agents" (York, 2000).

Another aspect of an active-negative personality type, Davis believed that he was always owed something by his appointees.

Davis was reelected in 2002 after an especially dull campaign featuring a weak Republican nominee. Bill Simon had gained the Republican nomination in part because of an unprecedented action by Davis. Fearing the candidacy of former Los Angeles mayor Richard Riordan, Davis spent millions on ads attacking Riordan during the GOP primary. Like Nixon's dirty tricks of the Watergate era, Davis's actions underscored his personality.

Davis in fact did not have political successes; in the first 18 months in office, Davis' accomplishments included implementing school accountability programs, creating an achievement test all public school students must pass before graduating (California High School Exit Examination), giving patients limited rights to sue their HMO's, and extending California gun control laws (York, 2000). York (2000) continues to say that "Davis likes to joke that he spent 25 years in government trying to move 25 feet (from the chief of staff's office to the governor's office, running as the tortoise, not vowing to dramatically change politics. Politics had to change to fit him" (York, 2000).

Why was Davis recalled? He came into office in 1998 as the only man for the job; he did something that no other Democrat candidate could do in the last 20 years: win. Once he did win, he created new jobs and experienced a bountiful budget surplus. But Davis'

response to the energy crisis, which was typical of how he responded to policy and political challenges, made him vulnerable to the recall.

Davis was subjected to a new type of election, one in which the voters got to decide if the Governor should be removed from office, and if so, who would replace him. Under the California Constitution, a recall is initiated by delivering to the Secretary of State a petition alleging the reason for the recall. A petition to recall a statewide officer must be signed by electors equal in number to 12 percent of the last vote for the office. The Secretary of State is required to maintain a count of all signatures certified. (California Codes, n.d.).

In October 2003, Governor Davis became the nation's second governor in 82 years to face a recall election. The recall was successful in making it to the ballot due largely to the financing of a San Diego Congressman, Representative Darrell Issa (R-49). Issa used \$2 million of his money to finance the campaign; without his money, the recall would not have qualified for the ballot. Ironically, the lackluster election and dismal turnout of 2002 helped the recall as the number of signatures required was particularly low; low enough to be obtainable. When Davis first heard that the recall qualified, he hired the same public relations firm that helped President Bill Clinton survive the Monica Lewinsky scandal (Cressman, 2007, p. 28). Although Davis thought this could help him, most political experts disagreed. Experts said that the weeks coming up to the recall election was not enough time for Davis to portray a bold, warm, or humble behavior that

was yet to be seen in the six years prior to the recall. Jack Pitney, a professor of Government at Claremont McKenna College, stated that “arrogance has always been a problem for Davis. In the next few weeks, he’s going to need a humility implant” (“Davis,” 2003). Additionally, Tim Hodson, director of The Center for California Studies at California State University, said that “it would be artificial and would be seen as a ploy if suddenly Gray Davis started acting like Jay Leno. Voters are very suspicious of candidates who appear as chameleons – willing to be the good ol’ boy in Fresno, the sophisticate in San Francisco, and the glamorous type in Los Angeles” (“Davis,” 2003).

Hodson continues on Davis’ personality, stating;

“If people perceive him [Davis] as being absent and passive, it will reinforce the negative perceptions. If people see him out at rallies making the argument why the recall should be defeated, actively engaged, then some of the negative associated with his personality will ebb. The negative perception is not so much that he is personally cold or reserved, the negative perception is more that he was passive. If he’s out there being very active, then that’s going to undermine that” (Gessinger, 2003).

Davis’ personality was also identified by the media. Specifically during the recall election, various television comedians had comical one-liners that hit directly on Davis’ personality. For instance, Jay Leno said, “Al Gore is coming to California to help the Gray Davis campaign, they are a pretty good team – Al Gore and Gray Davis – you put those two together and you almost have a personality, kinda like Yanni going on tour with John Tesh.” Leno continued, saying that “An NBC poll has found that if the election were held today, 31% of California voters would vote for Arnold

Schwarzenegger and 26% were not sure. Today, Gray Davis announced he is changing his name to 'Not Sure'" (Kurtzman, 2003).

The evidence points me to conclude that Davis is in fact an Active-Negative Personality.

Barber (1992) described an active-negative personality type as one that is "compulsive. Power is used a means to self-realization, they expend great energy on tasks but derive little joy. They are preoccupied with whether they are failing or succeeding, have low self-esteem and are inclined to rigidity. Additionally, they are highly driven" (p. 8).

Davis had all of these qualities. His active-side is personified by the fact that he spent 25 years of his life as a career politician illustrates that he desired a position of power. He also coasted in to the spotlight behind two others and claimed victory. Davis' negative side was personified by Davis' response to the energy crisis. Although he did fix the problem, he said in multiple occasions that 'he had no other choice,' that 'he shouldn't be blamed,' and that he hasn't 'received any praise for solving the problem' (Miller, 2002).

Davis also illustrated that he really did not have 'fun' as governor until it was too late, until his job was in jeopardy. Essentially, Davis caused his own demise as governor because he was always running from himself. He was obsessed with himself and the possibility that he may be failing, which is ultimately what happened. He was in fact, a compulsive personality type.

IV. Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger

Arnold Schwarzenegger (Schwarzenegger) came into the position of Governor of California with even more fanfare than he received after completing his coveted Terminator movie series. Schwarzenegger had the whole world watching his victory of the California Recall Election of 2003; it was literally a phenomenon that the world had never seen before. First and foremost, Schwarzenegger won the election in 63 days (Blitz and Krasniewicz, 2004, p. 30). Even more surprising were the headlines that Schwarzenegger made around the world. Following are a few samples that will personify the impact Schwarzenegger's victory had on California and for the world:

“Movie Hero Becomes California Governor” – Pravda.ru

“Schwarzenegger Overpowers Davis” – Taipei Times

“Arnold, De Powerman” – De Morgen, Brussels

“From Moscow to his Hometown, World Marvels at Schwarzenegger's Victory”
– Associated Press

“The Tidal Wave that Swept Schwarzenegger to Victory was Powered by a Policy of Letting Arnold be Arnold” – Scotland on Sunday

“Terminator 4: Arnie's Victory is a Triumph of Populism over an Incumbent” – Financial Times, London (Blitz and Krasniewicz, 2004, p. 29).

The samplings of headlines provide a great indication for the personality of Schwarzenegger. He was on a first name basis with the world, and more importantly the voters of California. How did Schwarzenegger attain celebrity status in both in politics and in the media?

In order to understand Schwarzenegger's celebrity status, I must first provide background on where Schwarzenegger came from. Surprisingly, Schwarzenegger did not come from riches; much like Davis. Schwarzenegger was raised in a middle class family in Austria,

with very strict Roman Catholic parents. His father a police chief and his mother a stay at home housewife, Schwarzenegger had a better relationship with mother.

Schwarzenegger was a mediocre student who did not excel much in school but was more known for his 'cheerful, good-humored exuberant character' (Nigels, 2003) Because Schwarzenegger was not particularly a great student, his father pushed him into sports. Instead of playing football, Schwarzenegger chose body building. He obviously succeeded and made a life-long career of body building.

Schwarzenegger desired to leave his country later on in life to leave his country at the young age of ten; he was strong willed to make his dreams come true, as shown in his commitment to bodybuilding. He was so committed to the sport and making it to the Olympics that he did not even attend his brother's funeral, or even his father's funeral (Leigh, 1990). He did not want distractions he could not control, which perhaps was the reason he paid for his nephew's education when his brother unexpectedly passed away. That was the most active role he took in family (Leigh, 1990) once he was set on his career.

The dedication he showed to his career at a young age suggests that Schwarzenegger wanted to become more and that he would do what it took to achieve his dreams. He was a rebel in this sense, because most children Schwarzenegger grew up with had to conform to the wishes of their family. When asked specifically about his childhood, Schwarzenegger said the following in an interview with Fortune Magazine in 2004:

"My hair was pulled. I was hit with belts. So was the kid next door. It was just the way it was. Many of the children I've seen were broken by their parents, which was the German-Austrian mentality. They didn't want to create an individual. It was all about conforming. I was one who did not conform, and whose will could not be broken. Therefore, I became a rebel. Every time I got hit, and every time someone said, 'you can't do this,' I said, 'this is not going to be for much longer, because I'm going to move out of here. I want to be rich. I want to be somebody'" ("Arnie: 'I was abused as a child,'" 2004).

And get out of Austria was what Schwarzenegger did. He moved to the United States at the age of 21 and has been in California ever since. Schwarzenegger had a series of open affairs, steroid use, and an admitted confession of purposefully going Absent With Out Leave (AWOL) in 1965, during Army basic training to compete in the Junior Mr Europe competition, because it was his ticket into the Mr. Universe Competition ("Arnold's Perspectives," 2001). Schwarzenegger thought this was his only option to compete in the competition in Europe, as Austria mandates military service. What followed next in his career eventually created the foundation that allowed Schwarzenegger to become Governor of California.

Following a successful bodybuilding and movie career, Schwarzenegger put his passion into politics. Dan Weintraub, author of *Party of One* (2008) writes that "Schwarzenegger was affected by the intense belief he saw in public service he saw in Sargent and Eunice Kennedy, Schwarzenegger's in-laws" (Weintraub and Barone, 2008, p. 11). Schwarzenegger started moving into the political spotlight in 1990, when George H. Bush appointed Schwarzenegger as a chairman of the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports; it was at this time that Schwarzenegger turned into a public figure

(Blitz and Krasniewicz, 2004, p. 4). Following a successful embrace in the public eye, Schwarzenegger toyed with the idea of wanting a more prominent role in the public sector; when the opportunity became available during the California Recall, Schwarzenegger made his decision on one of the most watched late night television shows, *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*. The media, voters, and the world immediately shined all of their spotlights onto California and onto Schwarzenegger. He was California's hero. Jay Leno made an interesting joke about Schwarzenegger on his show; he said "Yesterday, they had the first recall debate. There are no winners and losers in this debate. They wanted to have an empty chair out there to represent Schwarzenegger, since he didn't show up. But then they got worried, 'what if the empty chair wins?'" (Kurtzman, 2003). This was the essence of Schwarzenegger - he could pull off an historic victory without putting the same level of effort that other candidates put in.

Why did Schwarzenegger win the Recall Election? If one were to study the headlines of Schwarzenegger's victory across the world, one would believe his election was simply a function of his celebrity, the Terminator, was actually coming to life. There is some truth to this as clearly thousands of Californians regarded the action hero of the movies as the godsend voters were looking for. More important, Schwarzenegger was a political outsider with an engaging personality and compelling personal story of achieving dream after dream (Blitz, 2004, p. 11). Annie Brown, who wrote for the *Daily Record*, a Glaswegian newspaper, wrote that "most of the world is charmed by Schwarzenegger because "we don't have to concern ourselves with his political positions on anything.

Most Californians do not care that he is not a political veteran, in fact, that is why they like him” (Blitz, 2004, p. 16). Not having held office, and thus not having had to make unpopular decisions, Schwarzenegger had few political foes but millions of fans. He easily dominated a field of candidates who were relative unknown or jokes. He was a Republican in a state that had elected Republican governors in four of the six previous elections. And, he was not Gray Davis.

All of this was represented by the fact that the California Chamber of Commerce endorsed their first candidate, statewide, in 100 years (Cressman, 2007, p. 73).

Schwarzenegger had an impact and a clean slate to do whatever he wanted. Given the nature of the recall election, Schwarzenegger did not have the same barriers that other gubernatorial candidates had. Schwarzenegger did not have to endure creating a name for himself, as he already had one, or winning a primary election. The short-time frame of the recall election created positive factors for Schwarzenegger’s recall victory. Had Schwarzenegger had to endure a full campaign cycle, he may have been under much more scrutiny of the public eye.

Schwarzenegger therefore entered into his new position with a halo around his head. He could get away with things that haunted Davis in his darkest days. Schwarzenegger raised more money than any other politician in fundraising history. An analysis by the Associated Press found that more than 75 percent of Schwarzenegger’s funds came in amounts exceeding \$10,000 (Cressman, 2007, p. 269). In regards to spending,

Schwarzenegger spent \$167.5 million in five years, as opposed to the \$120 million that Davis spent in seven years. Schwarzenegger's fundraising schemes go much deeper than these totals.

Once elected, Schwarzenegger said that he would not accept a paycheck. However, days after being sworn in, Schwarzenegger signed a contract to edit *Muscle Magazine* while governor. This 'job' paid Schwarzenegger over \$8 million (Cressman, 2007, p. 6).

Schwarzenegger was also far from being humble in his lifestyle. While Davis was in office, he lived in a suburban-style ranch house that served as a temporary governor's residence. Schwarzenegger decided he wanted to live at a luxury suite at the Sacramento Hyatt, located right across the street from the State Capital. This accommodation costs \$7,000 per month; because Schwarzenegger could not ask taxpayers to pay for his high-profile residence, Schwarzenegger started a non-profit group, The Governor's Residence Foundation to raise giant sums of money (Cressman, 2007, p. 77).

Schwarzenegger actually created more than one nonprofit group to cover his expenses. The California Commission on Jobs and Economic Growth covered much of Schwarzenegger's travel around the world and throughout California. Even more interesting than these two nonprofits was Schwarzenegger's ingenious idea to pull together a team of corporate giants in a new organization. The organization was called "Citizens to Save California," and their purpose was to raise and spend the unlimited

sums of money that Schwarzenegger couldn't legally control himself, due to campaign fundraising limitations (Cressman, 2007, p. 111). Those running the group were veterans to politics; the team included Allan Zaramberg, president of the California Chamber of Commerce, R. William Hauck, President of the California Business Roundtable, Joel Fox, former chief policy consultant to Schwarzenegger's 2003 gubernatorial campaign and President of the Small Business Action Committee, Jon Coupal, President of the Howard Jarvis Taxpayer Association, and Rick Claussen, political consultant. The legal smokescreen was there to allow donors to contribute as much as they wanted while their interests, also the same interest of the Citizens to Save California, were being met (Cressman, 2007, p. 114). When Davis openly raised money he was chastised however Schwarzenegger could raise double the amount and be unharmed.

One explanation for Schwarzenegger's ability to fend off issues that haunted Davis was his personality type. Either voters were immune to the idea that governors fundraise and accepted it, or they truly were okay with Schwarzenegger's side job as editor of a *Muscle Magazine*. Another point that can be raised is that Schwarzenegger's aspirations cannot go further than the United States Congress seat whereas Davis was looking forward to a presidential nomination on the Democrat Party ticket. Being born in Austria, Schwarzenegger cannot become President because he does not have that option. Schwarzenegger's personality enabled him to charm California and instill the idea that he

was in office for public service; although he contradicted himself by taking a salary, Schwarzenegger did not have to combat the same type of criticism.

With all the attention Schwarzenegger received in the press, also of utmost importance is how the voters of California perceived him. Although Schwarzenegger experienced a high voter approval rating when elected, his numbers quickly went on a rollercoaster. Similar to Davis, Schwarzenegger's voter approval ratings declined as California began experiencing fiscal hardships. The table below illustrates his voter approval between January 2004 and late May 2008.

Trend of Arnold Schwarzenegger's job performance as Governor
(Among registered voters)

| Month/Year | Approve | Disapprove | No Opinion |
|----------------|---------|------------|------------|
| May 2008 | 41% | 48 | 11 |
| December 2007 | 60% | 31 | 9 |
| October 2007 | 56% | 32 | 12 |
| August 2007 | 57% | 31 | 12 |
| March 2007 | 60% | 29 | 11 |
| September 2006 | 48% | 37 | 15 |
| July 2006 | 49% | 40 | 11 |
| May 2006 | 41% | 46 | 13 |
| April 2006 | 39% | 47 | 14 |
| February 2006 | 40% | 49 | 11 |
| October 2005 | 37% | 56 | 7 |
| August 2005 | 36% | 52 | 12 |
| June 2005 | 37% | 53 | 10 |
| February 2005 | 55% | 35 | 10 |
| September 2004 | 65% | 22 | 13 |
| August 2004 | 65% | 22 | 13 |
| May 2004 | 65% | 23 | 12 |
| February 2004 | 56% | 26 | 18 |
| January 2004 | 52% | 27 | 21 |

(The Field Poll, 2008)

With dwindling numbers, why has Schwarzenegger not been recalled? Schwarzenegger raised more campaign money in more blatant ways than Davis. Schwarzenegger made serious political miscalculations (e.g., his 2005 special election) as did Davis. Both saw initial high approval ratings erode. Yet Schwarzenegger has not faced a recall and more important, has never experienced the depth of dislike and opprobrium that Davis did.

Why?

The answer lies in Barber's personality classifications. Schwarzenegger is clearly an active-positive personality type. Barber (1992) defines an active-positive personality as

one that is adaptive and with a high-self esteem. Along the same lines, the individual shows flexibility. Being adaptive allows the individual to develop well-defined goals (p. 8).

Active-positives are attractive and popular personalities. This is clearly seen in the extent and nature of Schwarzenegger's international media coverage. No other time in history has a candidate enjoyed so much publicity around the world. Schwarzenegger in a way, made it 'cool' to be governor. He was covered in newspapers worldwide, making him have a voter base that was the world. He was creative and was not afraid to be so; he also had a celebrity factor that made him warm with the spotlight. He couldn't look bad on camera or with the voters. Therefore, Schwarzenegger can be identified as an active-positive personality type. Barber (1992) defines an active-positive personality as one that is adaptive and with a high-self esteem. Along the same lines, the individual shows flexibility. Being adaptive allows the individual to develop well-defined goals (p. 8). Schwarzenegger did in fact, get creative with his fundraising schemes. He also got creative in dealing with a difficult legislature. When the legislature stalled during many different budget debates, Schwarzenegger called special sessions and special elections; he took the problems California was facing to the voters. Additionally, he engaged the Big Five in endless budget negotiations; he once resorted to pulling out the sword to symbolize the need to make cuts in spending. All of these example combined, depict the unique personality that Schwarzenegger holds as Governor.

V. Summary

Although Davis had all of the necessary qualities to be an active-positive governor, his personality faltered when it mattered the most; during crises. Schwarzenegger's personality allowed him to survive political crises, whereas Davis fell short of winning over the public when faced with unfavorable situations. The analysis both personality shows that active-positive personalities resonant with the public, especially when voters are given an option to remove a governor from office if their personality is less than desirable.

Chapter Five

CONCLUSION

Arnold Schwarzenegger and Gray Davis couldn't be more similar, yet more different in their personality and general demeanor while Governor of California. Two gentlemen, with similar backgrounds handled their job as governor differently. I make this conclusion because their personality provides reasons as to why they acted in specific ways when handling similar situations. Their personality type also proved that if given a choice, such in the recall, the public will vote for a candidate whose personality is livelier. Just as in Davis being chosen over Dan Lungren in the 1998 gubernatorial election, Schwarzenegger was also chosen as the more favorable candidate, personality-wise, over Davis.

Can personality be used as to gauge how successful a politician will handle policy situations? Research shows that by analyzing the personality type, the way a leader handles political and policy situations can in fact be predicted. However, one couldn't have predicted that Davis would be recalled; identifying personality type only goes so far as to identify how one would handle the responsibilities of governor. A more in-depth analysis could link specific incidents in a governor's life to their personality type; however, without a professional psychology degree one can only speculate the relationships between the two.

Personality type is not a trait that a governor can turn on and off; it is used as an indicator of the type of leader the voters expect. Especially when given a choice, the voters will always look to the more personable candidate. Barber found this was the case with FDR throughout his career, as shown in his ability to be president for twelve years. Nixon showed that his personality was the type where he'd cave under pressure, justifying his actions during the Watergate Scandal. Both Davis and Schwarzenegger used their personality as a tool in becoming an elected official; it showed the voters how they could expect their leaders to handle California. Personality is therefore used as a prime indicator of how well they may or may not do in office. Their personality type is tested when faced with a crisis and that in turn allows the voters to respond and react to the personality type. I therefore have to conclude that personality, as Barber defined, is in fact a useful tool in predicting the success of a president; I too believe that personality can be used as a measure of success; however, as my research has found, personality can also predict how a governor may react to political situations and that if given a choice, voters will choose an active-personality type.

Recommendations for Further Research

Those looking to further this study may find conducting a psychological analysis of Davis' and Schwarzenegger's upbringing may add value to the purpose of this study. Without knowing the true, psychological impact of important childhood events, I can only speculate what how events could have impacted the development of personality.

REFERENCES

- Anonymous. (n.d.) "Governors of California: Gray Davis." Retrieved January 18, 2009, from http://www.californiagovernors.ca.gov/h/biography/governor_37.html.
- "Arnie: 'I was abused as a child.'" *The Daily Mail*. 2004, August 4. Retrieved January 18, 2009 from <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/tvshowbiz/article-312729/Arnie-I-abused-child.html>.
- Baldassare, Mark. *The Coming of Age of Direct Democracy*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield, Maryland, 2007.
- Barber, J. (1974). *Choosing the President*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Barber, J. (1992). *The Presidential Character: Predicting Performance in the White House*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Blitz, M. & Krasniewicz, L. (2004). *Why Arnold Matters: The Rise of a Cultural Icon*. New York: Basic Books.
- California Elections Codes. (N.D.) *Elections Codes*. Retrieved April 5, 2009, from <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=elec&group=11001-12000&file=11100-11110>
- Chorneau, T. (2003) Davis' career one of survival despite long odds. *Associated Press State & Local Wire*. Accessed on LexisNexis on August 11, 2007. Retrieved February 16, 2009, from <http://www.answers.com/topic/gray-davis>.
- Cressman, D. (2007). *The Recalls' Broken Promise: How Big Money Still Runs California Politics*. California: The Poplar Institute.
- Gessinger, S. (2003, July 27). Davis faces startling handicap – he can't campaign as himself. *Oakland Tribune*. Retrieved January 18, 2009, from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qn4176/is_20030727/ai_n14557670/?tag=content;coll.
- Field Research Corporation. (3 June, 2008). *Big Decline in Governor's and Legislature's Job Ratings*. San Francisco: Field Research Corporation. Retrieved February 16, 2009 from <http://field.com/fieldpollonline/subscribers/RIs2272.pdf>.
- Field Research Corporation. (21 June, 2005). *Schwarzenegger's Job Ratings Hit a New Low*. Voters Oppose the Governor's Call for a Special Election. State Legislature not Highly Regarded, but voters more likely to side with it against the Governor. Trend of Gray Davis' Job Performance as Governor. San Francisco: Field

- Research Corporation. Retrieved February 16, 2009 from <http://www.field.com/fieldpollonline/subscribers/RLS2158.pdf>.
- George, A & George, J. (1998). *Presidential Personality and Performance*. Colorado: Westview Press.
- Geissinger, S. (2003, July). *Davis faces startling handicap-he can't campaign as himself*. Retrieved January 29, 2009, from http://digilib.library.ucla.edu/campaign/web/2009_999_022/latestnews.
- Goethals, G. (2005). Presidential Leadership. *Annual Review of Pyschology*, 56, 545-570.
- Governor: Time for Change. (1, December 1998). *The California Journal*.
- Gray Davis. In *The Biographic Icon*. Retrieved January 29, 2009, from <http://www.biographicicon.com/view/nkf98>.
- Gray, D. (2004). *Doing Research in the Real World*. California: Sage Publications.
- Gray Davis. In *Governors of California*. Retrieved February 16, 2009., from http://www.californiagovernors.ca.gov/h/biography/governor_37.html.
- Gray Davis's Perfect Storm. (2001, January 27). *Economist*. Retrieved March 10, 2009 from Academic Search Premier database.
- Hewitt, H. (2001, April). *Dark Days for Gray Davis*. Retrieved January 29, 2009, from <http://www.worldnetdaily.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=8916>.
- Kurtzman, D. (2003). *California Recall Jokes. Late-night Jokes about Governor Davis and the California Recall*. Retrieved January 29,2009, from <http://politicalhumor.about.com/library/images/blgraydavisjokes.htm>.
- Leigh, W. (1990). *Arnold: An Unauthorized Biography*. Illinois: Congden & Weed.
- Miller J. (2002, June 3). The State of Davis: California's Governor is Less Golden, but Still Rich. *National Review*, 31-33.
- Nigel, A. (2003). *True Myths of Arnold Schwarzenegger*. New York: Bloomsbery.
- Schwarzenegger, A. (2001, October, 3). "Arnold's Perspectives". Retrieved January 18, 2009, from http://www.schwarzenegger.com/en/life/hiswords/words_en_sac_perspectives.asp?sec=life&subsec=hiswords.

- Skowroneck, S. (1997) *The Politics Presidents Make: Leadership from John Adams to Bill Clinton*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Watson, R. (2000). *The President's Wives: Reassessing the Office of First Lady*. Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishing, Inc.
- Weintraub, D., & Michael Barone (2007). *Party of One: Arnold Schwarzenegger and the Rise of the Independent Voter*. California: PoliPointPress.
- Weintraub, D., & Troy Gagliano. (2002, January). Out of the Frying Pan. *State Legislatures*, 28(1), 22. Retrieved March 10, 2009, from Academic Search Premier Database.
- York, A. (2000, June). *Gray Turns Green—with Cash*. Retrieved January 29, 2009, from <http://archive.salon.com/politics/feature/2000/06/09/davis>.
- Unknown. (2006, July 10). *Conversations with Gray Davis*. [You Tube Broadcast] Retrieved April 5, 2009, from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UBslhYUC4ic&feature=related>.

