

Evaluating obama's presidential leadership

[Literature](#), [Russian Literature](#)



Obama's Leadership Style President Obama exemplifies the transformational leadership style. As the term "transformational" implies, a leader who is described as such is said to have the ability to change the views or goals of the people. In this instance, the people accept the vision of the leader and make it a long term goal. A leader is able to do this through the use of his or her charisma. This is to say that transformational leadership basically incorporates another kind of leadership, that is, charismatic leadership (Northouse 171). The leader's charisma is the natural force that drives the people to believe and adhere to the leader's sentiments. Obama has shown his transformational leadership ability in his recent dealing with America's budget crisis. The issue on federal budget became a crisis due to the opposing views of the Republicans and Democrats, each of them offering different ways of spending cuts (Hulse and Steinhauer). Also, the two political parties could not agree on several budget provisions which are to be implemented in the next fiscal year. To solve the conflict, Obama conducted several meetings with the respective representative of the two parties to come up with a compromise agreement. As stated in a newspaper article, Obama invited the Speaker of the House, Mr. Boehner and Harry Reid, the Senate Majority Leader for an Oval Office meeting (Zeleny: "Rifts"). Mr. Boehner is actually a Republican while Mr. Reid is a Democrat. Following such meeting, several negotiations followed. Due to such strategic action, Obama was dubbed as the mediator in chief between the conflicting parties (Shear). As the mediator in chief, he tried to be neutral in proposing solutions to end the conflicting claims of the two political parties. Notably, it could have been very hard for Obama to get the trust of the Republicans during

the negotiation process since he has been a long time member of the Democratic Party. Nevertheless, the negotiation became a success due to his charismatic appeal and speaking skill. Obama actually considered himself as the bridge instead of being an active participant to the negotiating table (Shear). By this statement, he wanted to emphasize the fact that he was the key to end the opposing claims of the Democrats and Republicans about the federal budget. Being the bridge, he used his power of persuasion to help the parties find a common ground. This fact connotes that during the negotiation process, he portrayed an impartial character. He did not favor any of the two parties. This particular strategy could have been very effective since the Democrats and Republicans announced that they had reached a complete deal and would unite to pass a bill (Hulse). This outcome only shows the negotiation prowess of Obama and how good he is in transforming the perception of the warring political parties. It is contended that through the meetings and negotiations that he personally conducted and mediated, Obama was able to showcase his ability as a transformational leader. Being a transformational leader, he was able to woe the two parties to his vision about the federal budget. In achieving such result, he could have expressed his own opinion with regard to the issue and emphasized the immediate need of having a compromise agreement. In expressing his own opinion, he could have cited the government shutdown which happened in America in the year 1995 (Zeleny: " President"). In 1995, under Clinton's administration, the conflicting views of the Republicans in the House and the Democrats in the Senate with regard to the fiscal budget had caused a government shutdown for almost two years (" Federal Budget"). In another instance, he

could have explained well the consequences of continued political bickering. Through these ways, the contesting political parties could have considered sacrificing some of their wants in exchange of what's really important -- to avoid a government shutdown. If Obama did not possess a charismatic appeal coupled with his power of persuasion, he could not have gained the sympathy of Boehner and Reid. Such characteristics are very important to his career as the president of the United States. It is claimed that he could not have been successful in adopting a transformational type of leadership if any of those two factors is absent. For instance, even though how good Obama is in public speaking, there would be a big possibility that he could not gather the support of the warring political parties towards a common goal if he does not have the charismatic appeal. Notably, Obama has been successful in adopting a transformational type of leadership because of his reputation. He has been known to be assertive, pragmatic, and trustworthy. He has the ability to unite people and rise above politics (Zeleny: "President"). Works Cited " Federal Budget (2011) -- Government Shutdown Averted." New York Times, 9 Apr. 2011. Web. 2 May 2011. Hulse, Carl. " Budget Deal to Cut \$38 Billion Averts Shutdown." New York Times, 8 Apr. 2011. Web. 2 May 2011. . Hulse, Carl, and Jennifer Steinhauer. " Budget Stances Harden as Deadline Nears for Shutdown." New York Times, 5 Apr. 2011. Web. 2 May 2011. . Northouse, Peter Guy. Leadership: Theory and Practice. California: SAGE, 2009. Print. Shear, Michael. " On Budget Dispute, Obama Casts Himself as Mediator in Chief." New York Times, 8 Apr. 2011. Web. 2 May 2011. . Zeleny, Jeff. " Rifts Within Both Parties Test Leaders in Budget Fight." New York Times, 5 Apr. 2011. Web. 2 May 2011. . ---. "

President Adopts a Measured Course to Recapture the Middle.” New York Times, 10 Apr. 2011. Web. 2 May 2011. .