ПОЛІТИЧНА КУЛЬТУРА ТА ІДЕОЛОГІЯ

UDC 316.46(075.8)
Maria-Katarzyna Grzegorzewska, AGH University in Kraków (Poland)
Gabriela Kuc-Stefaniuk, KUL (Poland)

THE POLITICIAN'S STRESS IN TERMS OF PSYCHOLOGY AND POLITICS' ANTHROPOLOGY

The aim of this article is to explain the term and show that it is right to connect the discourse of political anthropology with the research from the psychological perspective. Stress in politics affects not only individual (direct influence) but also the political citizens' lives. Decisions which are quite important depend on behaviors and the state of politics. The political life doesn't go in the professional and technical process what the political anthropology wants to prove. Emotions also influence human behaviors in terms of politics. It is proved thanks to examples of different countries and their situations. As far as stress is concerned, its impact on the functioning of different groups and the knowledge about mechanisms creating political behaviours connected with the psychological experience can make that politics will be badly seen by society. What is more, the awareness concerns their dependence of stress can be motivating. In addition, the knowledge about dealing with stress by the authority in a specific situation isn't common.

Key words: *stress, politician's stress**,** politics' behaviours, psychology, politics' anthropology, the influence of stress*

The research on how the stress influences a career and the way of generating stressful situations and nervous tension is a field of scientific exploration concerning not only psychologists and psychiatrists but also specialists from other domains who compare their results with elaborated theories thanks to the development of various and multilateral discourses and analyse it in the meantime. We can say that stress connects domains and subdomains while the reflection about it is interdisciplinary. It is connected with the fact that in the last few years the interest of emotions and emotional development are more and more attaching. In addition, scientists are interested in relations between those ones and stress which influenced behaviours [1].

Politicians belong to an unformalized vocational group which has a strong influence on reality. It is exposed to stress from vocational environment but it is also the reception of their actions in the social space. Nowadays these actions, the scope of responsibility, expectations and the opportunity of checking their work cause stronger role of stress as far as our mentality, relations with others and communicative metabolism are concerned. It seems that such difficult research about the influence of stress on politician's actions is worth examining – it refers to individual perspectives but also mutual effects. In this way, the connection of psychology's, political science's and political anthropology's experience can be quite interesting.

Political anthropology focuses on examining political organizations of societies but now it often takes into consideration the issue of people's behaviour in the political domain. "Political anthropology" is a very important publication of Ted D. Lewellen and its polish edition from 2010 is based on the third American one [11]. The author of this valuable publication emphasises in "Foreword" that the text about political anthropology written in 1980 became the book's seed, although there were no plans to create it, so the connections of psychologist results and achievements in order to examine stress with an anthropologist view to human politicus will succeed in broaden scientific actions. M.Gierycz points out that in general the interest of political anthropology goes with the research but not only in the ethnology perspective [4, p.173]. The essential thesis of the text concerning the experience of political science and political anthropology in terms of examining human's behaviours in political domain. They create valuable context in order to know in what way and how important are stress and emotions. This text is just a presentation and the explanation of

chosen theories to carry out research. It has a demonstrative character and doesn't present research. There is a chance that they will be shown in the other presentation.

The basis was the statement that if "the knowledge about politics is interested in behaviours determined politically and causing political results" [8, p.110], the research of the influence of stress on politician's actions will be not only intentional and conscious but also unintentional, unconscious, positive and negative. M. K. Grzegorzewska writes "(...) the reflection about stress shows us two aspects. On the one hand stress is like speeding for our actions, achievements or creative activity. On the other hand it leads to the destruction of mental health and disorders what is important for our immunity system. It is obvious that lots of things depend on the type of stress and its force. So we should ask essential questions: "What can decide on how the factors effecting stress?", "Which factors are the most effective while dealing with stress?'' [5].

During researching the relations between politics' behaviours and stress we should concentrate on emotional stress (psychosomatic, short and chronic) [5] and moral one. It can appear in different political behaviours like:

a) active behaviours – when the subject takes actions done by others
b) inactive behaviours – when the subject stops doing actions, consciously or not
c) controlled behaviours – actions go with the plan
d) uncontrolled behaviours – on which emotional ones effect the most; they aren't reflective and conditional but minimal
e) rational behaviours – targeted and conscious, they go with taking advantages of specified political conditions
f) conventional behaviours – just individual behaviours
g) conventional actions (voting, public supporting for the leader, rivalry during elections, lobbism, the actions run by formal interest's groups: petitions, legal demonstrations etc.) [15, p.231-232].

It may seem that negative results of stress mostly appear in uncontrolled behaviours but they are also seen in individual behaviours. However, in this case it depends on personal and characterological features of the subject.

The political process works only in theory as professional and technical. It is anthropology that demitologizes its neutrality, says M. Gierycz. The researcher refers to what M. Abeles writes about European Parliament [1] whereas C. Shore and S. Wright postulate that politics is "total and social phenomenon" which has moral consequences and influences social relations [4, p.179]. Stress is one of the factors which deprive the political process of professionalism and it cannot be proved. We only have to observe political behaviours in different parliaments all over the world, especially when the situation isn't controlled.

In Western Europe where the transformation took place after 1989, the additional factor, which generates stress in politician's work, is a penitent social conviction that the government is responsible for the economic and social situation in the country [13, p.150]. Although in the common social opinion in many countries (especially Western Europe) politicians don't worry about this responsibility, this domain is definitely related to big mental load. However, each person has an extent of endurance (toleration) which can lead to contemporary or lasting damage if exceed. Everyone is exposed to different and stressful factors all the time. Although we deal with it successfully, each unimportant situation can damage the stability between this behaviour (when a person deals with a difficult situation) and a completely break [5].

The research concerning the extent of negative influence on politicians can help us answer following questions so succeed in what is commonly considered as a truth and create social attitudes. It is just the unwillingness to politicians, the indifference to their actions, the boredom of politics and in special cases frustration cause inactivity of citizens during elections, the unwillingness showing public aggression but most of all the lack of trust. We should consider some facts: during the survey connected with social trust which was performed by CBOS in 2012 only 39% of respondents claimed the trust to the government. 29% of respondents declared the trust to the parliament. Political parties occurred the most untrustworthy (20% of respondents). This reluctance was three times higher than

the trust (65% to 20%). Public administration clerks and the government were institutions with the smallest level of trust. It is interesting that in the same group of public institutions the most trustworthy were charities, secular Wielka Orkiestra Świątecznej Pomocy (89%), catholic Caritas (80%) and Polski Czerwony Krzyż (81%) [16]. This institutions arouse positive emotions in contrast to politicians and political parties. Maybe these negative social ones depends on politicians' ones and this is the entire mechanism.

Politicians are seen as people "without emotions", who ignore the opinion of their society. Is it possible? In terms of psychologist frame of human it isn't. What does it give? Can we only say that such political behaviours which are seen as negative, are caused by stress in order to improve reactions and attitudes to the government? Not at all. However, the connection with the achievements of political anthropology can ameliorate the quality of political life in which everybody participates, not only these "with power". The accurate analysis of possible relations between theories of psychology and political anthropology can make a solid base to carry out qualitative research of this problem. It is worth referring to theories of control mechanisms due to J. Beckmann who presents "two basic mechanisms of controlling our brain": self-control and self-regulation [17, p.146]. Self-control is negative while self-regulation is positive. First one is destructive and the second is more effective [17, p.146]. It can be a defensive mechanism to the negative influence of stress. "A person can try to change the environment or learn about changing own reactions in specified situations to deal with stress. If we want to achieve the balance between a person and the environment, the skill of coping in difficult situations is very helpful" [5]. It is related to the sensible connection of self-control and self-regulation. The interactive dealing model consists of five elements can occur quite helpful:

1. The conscious evaluation – the subjective perception of situation leading to the experience,
2. Experience – the perception of situations which depend on the individual experience- the knowledge about the situation, the application of previous impact, the knowledge of practising- the specified skill. It is also determined by success and defeat (the reinforcement of previous reactions),
3. Requirements – the real experience with skills which are seen. Needs, desires and the level of stimulation and involvement of individual influence the reception of experience,
4. Interpersonal impact – how the potential source is seen, it depends on other source's presence or absence, it has an influence on subjective experience of stress, preventive reactions and behaviours. It can be beneficial and harmful,
5. Imbalance – when it occurs between the requirement and the ability to deal with it, methods of coping in difficult situations and predictable consequences (positive return the balance, negative make the situation worse) are lead out [5].

The main reason of stress in politics' and other domains is a conflict. It seems that in politics it appears because of the antagonistic connection of interests: when one takes advantages the other fails [10, p.329]. In politics contradictory interests are related to the power struggle. The method of the fight depends on the scope of the conflict. J. Reykowski and J. Kuswik presents following ones:

- psychological pressure
- verbal attack
- manipulation
- the application of administrative measures
- the application of physical coercion's measures
- physical attack [10, p.331].

"When the conflict becomes stronger, 'the conflict spiral' starts working and is beyond control, it is a destructive conflict which causes material and spiritual loss [10, p.331]. It concerns not only a participant but also a society which depends on its actions. This state affects on an individual at first and then broadens. The conflict which generates stress is dangerous for human resources [10, p.333], especially state resources connected with roles in society and personal resources which help us maintain the resistance to stress [18, s.35-37]. Due to the thesis S. E. Hobfoll and J. Kuswik "Psychological stress concerns the loss of resources, it can be real or caused by exhaustion. This loss cannot be true, an observation or a threat are sufficient. In order to compensate it, we use other resources to transform them into another – thought as more valued. For example, they devote their

time and energy because they want to gain money and power [10, p.335] It makes that the results of politician's stress can affect on societies.

Stress during working is a social phenomenon which still increases and concerns different professions, claim J. Łodzińska, M. K. Grzegorzewska, A. Gajdzica. It is essential for the prosperity of different organizations and domestic economy [12, p.2]. We should be interested in the sources of stress which affect politicians the most. These are:

- activities concern the process of work and its organization,
- the position in the process of production; the type and the scope of vocational responsibility,
- the process of carrier,
- interpersonal relations,
- the organizational climate, especially the style of leading among groups [9, p.14].

The news and thesis from magazines can prove that the problem is important in each country and different political and economic conditions. In 2012 The Guardian wondered "Should politicians have their mental health monitored?" [14]. In the article with the same title there were statements: "(...) politicians do face high levels of responsibility and therefore stress. They send young people to war zones and determine the future finances of the country". Mental health specialists alarmed : **"**Despite the litany of poor decisions made by politicians who have become ill after taking office, there has been an unwillingness to recognise the worst-case scenario – a leader bent on a dubious political goal from which their psychological health or inability to cope prevents them from deviating" [14].

The specialist in this domain is doctor A. Weinberg from Salford University, the author of the book "Psychology of politicians". He stated that „With the 1997 cohort, you could see the differences in psychological strain before and after the election. In terms of emotional wellbeing, things like worry and feeling under strain had evened out after a year. But in terms of the physical manifestation of psychological strain, such as sleep difficulties and fatigue, they remained elevated. (…) There's no one-size-fits-all, but sleep problems resulting in tiredness and fatigue could have an effect on the ability to take decisions. (…) For people who are experiencing this kind of exhaustion and anxiety over time, these might be symptoms of depression, and individuals might not feel as capable of making decisions at all. (…) Regular and reliable health screening could help to flag up serious misgivings, from unreasonable demands on elected representatives to the inappropriate behaviour of a leader, and could act as a precaution against political abuse" [14].

In the medical context the influence of stress not only on politicians but also on respondents was examined by researchers from University of Nebraska which stated that **„**Biological variations – in this case levels of the stress hormone cortisol – are relevant to people's involvement with the political system. Many of the shapers of these biological traits are changeable via treatment and environmental manipulation but the fact that political variables have a biological signature suggests that for certain people change may require a somewhat different strategy than simply telling them that it is their civic duty to vote or browbeating them into joining civic organizations" [2].

A. Campbell, the spokesman and T. Blair's strategist states that "Politics is high stress psychological work – politicians would benefit from psychological support" [14]. "The Independent" also informed about the politics' stress in 2015 [7]. In the daily politicians shared with each other's the ideas about dealing with stress. There were such opinions:

- „I generally don't stress too much coming up to an election, at this stage I'm fairly philosophical about getting re-elected. I work hard and try to do my best as a TD... if that's not good enough, so be it" (R. Shortall – Social Democrats TD Dublin North West).
- "Too much stress not only damages your own health but is bad for family life. De-stressing is about switching off from the stressors – turning off the mobile phone at family mealtimes" (L. Twomey TD – Fine Gael TD Wexford).
- "Politics is definitely a high-octane life on a daily basis and it can be stressful, like many other jobs" (Councillor J. Chambers – F. Fáil candidate in Dublin west).

– "Political life can mean long hours away from family. The biggest pressure in the run-up to an election is that enough has been done" (B. Kelleher – F. Fáil TD for Cork North-Central and also Director of Elections) [7].

British politicians declared that the antidote for stress is just a sport, a hobby (for example fishing), spending time with a family, listening to music. But do they have long effects or work only for a moment?

Stress in politics influence too much social life to be only a theme of public conversations. So that presented text, which underlines the problem and explains its interest, can start preparing interdisciplinary research concerning sources and results of politician's stress. The background of political anthropology gives the wide perspective which definitely can improve it.

References:

1. Abeles M. La vie quotidienne au Parlament Europeén / M. Abeles. – Paris: Hachette, 1992. – 443 p.
2. French J. A. The Stress of Politics. Endocrinology and Voter Participation [Електронний ресурс] / J. A. French, K. B. Smith, A. Guck, J. R. Alford, J. R. Hibbing; Nebraska 2011. – Режим доступу: http://www.unl.edu/polphyslab/The%20Stress%20of%20Politics.final%20ISPP%20version.June%203.pdf [20.11.2016].
3. Gajdzica A. Portret zbiorowy nauczycieli aktywnych. Między zaangażowaniem a oporem wobec zmian / A. Gajdzica. – Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, 2013. – 384 s.
4. Gierycz M. O pojmowaniu antropologii politycznej na gruncie politologii / M. Gierycz // Roczniki Nauk Społecznych. – 2014. – Tom 6 (42).– Numer 3. – S. 171-194.
5. Grzegorzewska M.K., Emocjonalna reakcja na stres. Próba podejścia holistycznego // Konferencja „Emocje z perspektywy filozoficznej", AGH, 2016 (artykuł w druku).
6. Hobfoll S. E. Zachowanie zasobów. Nowa próba konceptualizacji stresu / S. E. Hobfoll // Nowiny Psychologiczne. – 1989. – Nr 5-6. – S.35-37.
7. How do our politicians deal with stress? [Електронний ресурс]. – http://www.independent.ie/life/health-wellbeing/mind-yourself/mindyourself-how-do-our-politicians-deal-with-stress-34218284.html; wszystkie wypowiedzi pochodzą z tego źródła [20.11.2016].
8. Karwat M. Działania polityczne jako składnik praktyki społecznej / M. Karwat, W. Milanowski // Elementy teorii polityki / Red. K. Opałka. – Warszawa: PWN, 1989. – S. 110-127.
9. Kowal E. Ekonomiczno-społeczne aspekty ergonomii / E. Kowal. – Warszawa-Poznań: PWN, 2002.– 244 s.
10. Kuświk J. Konflikt polityczny z perspektywy teorii zachowania zasobów / J. Kuświk // Środkowoeuropejskie Studia Polityczne. – 2013. – Nr 2. – S. 329-342.
11. Lewellen T. C. Antropologia polityczna / T. C. Lewellen. – Kraków: WUJ, 2010. – 298 s.
12. Łuczak A. Praca a stres / A. Łuczak, D. Żołnierczyk-Zreda // Bezpieczeństwo Pracy. – 2002.– Nr 10. – S. 2-5.
13. Marody M. Co nam zostało z tamtych lat… Społeczeństwo polskie u progu zmiany systemowej / M. Marody. – Londyn: Aneks, 1991.– 269 s.
14. Politics is high stress psychological work – politicians would benefit from psychological support [Електронний ресурс] / Alastair Campbell's Blog. – Режим доступу: http://www.alastaircampbell.org/blog/2015/02/15/politics-is-high-stress-psychological-work-politicians-would-benefit-from-psychological-support/ [20.11.2016].
15. Potulski J. Socjologia polityki / J. Potulski.– Gdańsk: Uniwersytet Gdański, 2008.– 337 s.
16. Raport CBOS Zaufanie społeczne, BS/33/2012 [Електронний ресурс] / Centrum Badania Opinii Społecznej. – 22 s. –http://www.cbos.pl/SPISKOM.POL/2012/K_033_12.PDF [20.11.2016].
17. Sotwin W. Głos w dyskusji: Człowiek jako podmiot zachowania w ujęciu psychologicznym / W. Sotwin // Diametros. – 2007. – Nr 7. – S. 145-154.
18. Zachowanie zasobów. Nowa próba konceptualizacji stresu // Nowiny Psychologiczne. – 1989. – Nr 5-6. – S. 24-48.

Гжегожевська М.-К., Куц-Стефанюк Г., Стрес політика з точки зору психології та антропології політики

Стаття має на меті пояснити сутність терміну «стрес політика» і доводить доцільність його тлумачення за рахунок поєднання дискурсів політичної антропології і психології. Стрес в політиці впливає не тільки на окрему особу, але й на політичне життя громадян у цілому. Від стану і поведінки політиків істотно залежать життєво важливі для країни рішення. Політичне життя – це не тільки поєднання професійних і технічних процесів, як це намагається представити політична антропологія. На поведінку людини в політиці також впливають емоції. Про це свідчать численні приклади з різних країн. Знання, які поєднують психологічний підхід до розуміння стресу і його впливу на функціонування різних професійних груп з розумінням механізмів формування політичної поведінки, допоможуть суспільству більш об'єктивно сприймати політиків і змінити своє ставлення до них. З іншого боку, якщо ж самі політики знатимуть, у який спосіб вони залежать від стресу, то це може позитивно вплинути і на їхню поведінку.

***Ключові слова**: стрес, стрес політика, політична поведінка, психологія, політична антропологія, вплив стресу*

Гжегожевская М.-К., Куц-Стефанюк Г., Стресс политика с точки зрения психологии и антропологии политики

Статья раскрывает содержание понятия «стресс политика» и обосновывает целесообразность его истолкования за счет сочетания дискурса политической антропологии и психологии. Стресс в политике влияет не только на отдельную личность, но и на политическую жизнь граждан в целом. От состояния и поведения политиков зависят жизненно важные для страны решения. Политическая жизнь представляет собой не только сочетание профессиональных и технических процессов, как это пытается представить политическая антропология. На поведение человека в политике существенно влияют эмоции. Об этом свидетельствуют численные примеры из разных стран. Знания, сочетающие психологический подход к пониманию стресса и его влияния на функционирование разных профессиональных групп с пониманием механизмов, формирующих политическое поведение, помогут обществу более объективно воспринимать политиков и изменить отношение к ним. С другой стороны, понимание механизмов зависимости от стресса может положительно влиять и на поступки самих политиков.

***Ключевые слова:** стресс, стресс политика, политическое поведение, психология, политическая антропология, влияние стресса*