

### Criteria and Formulas of Political Success: Measuring Methods and Outcomes of Research on Actual and Potential Success of Ukrainian Political Leaders

Golovakha, Yevhen

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Sammelwerksbeitrag / collection article

#### Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Golovakha, Y. (2005). Criteria and Formulas of Political Success: Measuring Methods and Outcomes of Research on Actual and Potential Success of Ukrainian Political Leaders. In Y. Golovakha (Ed.), *Ukrainian Sociological Review 2002-2003* (pp. 54-71). Kiev: Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-104538>

#### Nutzungsbedingungen:

*Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.*

*Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.*

#### Terms of use:

*This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.*

*By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.*

**YEVHEN GOLOVAKHA,**

*Doctor of Sciences in Philosophy, Head of the Department of  
Socio-Political Processes, Institute of Sociology, NAS of Ukraine,  
Chief Editor of the Journal "Sociology: Theory, Methods, Marketing"*

## **Criteria and Formulas of Political Success: Measuring Methods and Outcomes of Research on Actual and Potential Success of Ukrainian Political Leaders\***

*Abstract*

*This investigation examined the formulas of political success on the basis of expert evaluation criteria. The results suggest that career success of political leaders can be measured by a special procedure that includes two integral indices: an index of political realization and an index of actual political success.*

Studies on sociological contents of "political success" category and development of methods measuring success of various subjects of political activity are necessary because the society has to overcome discredit and de-legitimization of power and opposition, make their participation in political process more effective, and democratic institutions are to be of social prestige and authority. In the current political sciences, success in political activity is studied within the frames of the theory and practice of political marketing and management, and for substantiation of electoral technologies. So, the special attention is paid to the electoral policy, participation in elections, consequences of victories or failures of elections, lobby and political influence, the role of public opinion in the electoral process and development of political orientations of voters. So-

---

\*

Translated from the Ukrainian text "Kryterii i formy politychnoho uspiyku: metody vymyruvannia i rezul'taty doslidzhennia aktual'noho i potentsiynoho uspiyku politychnykh lideriv Ukrainy", *Sotsiologhiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh*, 2002, № 2, pp. 86–101.

biological theory of political success has been still undeveloped. Even this category has no conceptual substantiation. Although categories of life and social success are being widely studied in social and personality psychology, political sociology does not analyze a general phenomenon of political success; it is mostly concentrated on categories, like “victory”–“failure” or “winner”–“loser” in specific electoral situations.

The most developed “success” idea is in the humanist psychology if it concerns the life and personal success. Ukrainian researchers suggested various conceptual approaches to understanding criteria and factors of the life success [1]. Some results of their research can be applied to studies on political success as a sociological idea. As a whole, our analysis revealed that sociological studies on political success need original approaches to development of its concept, criteria and operational indicators, to systematization of factors and development of adequate methods for empirical research.

## ***1. Methodical Aspects of the Political Success Research***

In all spheres of social life, the common goal is to gain success. This is an integral characteristic of how specific tasks, plans, behavioral strategies of people are being realized. Various kinds of activity can differ in contents, sense, moral or pragmatic orientations, be in concord or incompatible, but all activity subjects have a common feature — they strive for success. Taking this fact into account, we have to regard success in political activity as a feature common for all subjects of political process that makes it possible to develop an integral assessment of “political weight” for a certain subject, to evaluate efficiency of its activity. Characteristics of this kind are mostly used in our every-day language when we talk about successful politicians, parties, countries or political losers who have not achieved success. As a rule, our intuition about political winners or losers helps us to develop our own scale of “political success”, but in order to determine, systematically and conceptually, positions of political subjects on the scale of political success, we need to develop corresponding scientific tools and measuring procedures.

This task brings up a number of methodological aspects one of which was stressed by R. Farnen, American political scientist: “Political success can have opposite senses depending on the applied criteria (individual, societal, political, cultural, environmental, cross-national, and even from the absolutes, like universal or eternal ideals)” [2, p. 105]. Of

course, evaluation of success is always difficult because of multi-criterion character. The classical example is a conflict between ethical and pragmatic criteria that leads to many contradictions when we evaluate success in all kinds of activity, first of all, in politics where achievement of a goal inevitably connected with violation of traditional moral norms and humanistic demands. To resolve this conflict and find agreement between ethical and utilitarian criteria of political success, it is necessary, according to V. Bakshtanovs'kyi and his colleagues, to develop a new direction in the applied ethics — ethics of political success based on the concept by Max Weber about professionalism in politics as a successful devotion without direct orientation to personal success [3, pp. 212–240]. We need to solve the following problem: is it possible to find a “metacriterion” of political success that will produce an integral evaluation of political subject’s activity in the way when the multi-criterion character and inner contradictions of assessments based on various particular criteria would be considered?

The second problem relates to multi-subject character of political activity, various kinds of political actors acting as individual or group subjects on different levels of political hierarchy and different scales of political space. Is it possible to develop common procedures for evaluation of political success of leaders, parties, social organizations, governmental bodies, irrespective of local, national or international character of their activity, or every political subject needs his own scale of political success evaluation incomparable to the scales of other subjects of political success?

And the last, how assessments of political success for different periods of subject’s political activity can be coordinated? Sometimes, the situational success of political leader or party that can be easily measured by a percent of votes or accession to the power peak contains a potential of future political fiasco because of a wrong political program or changes in political conjuncture. Conflicts between situational and strategic success, old achievements and prospects that can arise require from us to take into account temporal parameters of political success; we should develop measuring procedures good for evaluation in its real and potential aspects.

Before the research methods are developed, we have to determine the category of political success the starting point of which should be the idea that “success is an evaluation category first and foremost” [4, p. 92]. The same result of political activity could be considered as success or failure irrespectively to the situation in which a political subject acts and

to assessment of this situation in a certain social surroundings. Even obviously positive results related to winning elections, high positions in the power bodies or seizure of power can be evaluated by perspicacious observer as Pyrrhic victory if, in the near future, the “political triumpher” can lose their high results in the way when his final position will be much worse in the political hierarchy. So, the category of political success cannot be interpreted without taking into account social assessments of political achievements, without the subjective component containing not only formal establishment of “political victory” but also significance of this victory to the society and the winner. That is why, I agree with the most general determination by N. Panina (“political success is an achievement of a certain position in political hierarchy and strengthening of this position during further political activity” [5]), but I think that it is necessary to add an evaluation component of success and possibility to measure it by a number of operational indicators. This is the only way to find the common criterion (metacriterion) for all kinds and varieties of political success in different time scales — not only situational, when we talk about a separate achievement in political activity (winning elections, high position, etc.), but in the wide sense.

We must remember that political success can be studied from many sides only if it is structured in the certain coordinate system with socio-spatial and temporal parameters that could be measured. In the spatio-temporal structure of political success, there should be picked out local, national and global space aspects of political success as well as situational, tactic and strategic temporal aspects. In this coordinate system, there could be nine kinds of political success — from local-situational to global-strategic. As an example, the success of the first kind is winning election to local power bodies, the success of the latter kind is a geopolitical step of a country that can change political situation in the future and make it favorable for the country. For each subject of political activity — leader, political group, state — in different spatio-temporal parameters, there can be determined different criteria and different measuring procedures correspondingly. At the same time, there is a common criterion — social assessment of a set of political events that can be considered as achievements or failures. As to this approach, *political success for all subjects (irrespectively to the spatio-temporal parameters of their activity) is the resulting social assessment of political achievements and failures*. This determination stresses the universal character of evaluation criterion due to which a researcher can distance from variety of objective forms and conditions of political process in order to concen-

trate on subjective hierarchy of political subjects, as it exists in the social assessment.

This study deals with the kind of political success, subjects of which are political leaders, and we assess their political career as a whole (strategic scale), including not only actual assessments but also prospects of achieving success. We would like to stress that the developed methods could be applied to other subjects and scales of political success. The empirical data presented in this inquiry may be used for approbation of the actual and potential political success formulas as well as for methods measuring indicators included into these formulas.

## ***2. Actual and Potential Formulas of Political Success: Research Methods and Organization***

Due to assessment character of the political success phenomenon, methods for its measuring can be obtained with the help of the mass and expert questioning by the scale where success is evaluated from the maximum failure to the maximum achievement. The same could be applied for evaluation of possible success to be achieved by political subject in the future — from “zero” perspective to the maximum possible. But direct measuring supposes that a subject has developed an integral criterion for evaluation and can present this evaluation quantitatively. If a subject of evaluation is “an opinion of any passer-by” then we cannot talk about adequate quantitative evaluation (quantitative assessments need some distance from a variety of qualitative characteristics, so the subject has to be competent in politics). If we exclude politicians because they are involved into political process and cannot be independent subjects of evaluation, then we can pick out two categories of experts — specialists in political studies and political commentators of the mass media whose professional activity is directly connected to analysis of political process and participation of individual and collective actors in this process. So, taking into account the political competence criterion, we chose these categories of experts to be subjects of political success evaluation.

Evaluation quality and adequacy depend not only on expert’s competence, his knowledge about the subject and analytical experience in politics but also on the chosen evaluation method. Direct assessments are good for situational scale when we talk about a certain political event — an action that can be regarded as achievement or failure. If we evaluate a political career for some period of time (or as a whole), then an integral

index should involve correlation between positive and negative aspects of the career and be calculated as a result of them. Let us suppose that experts themselves have developed this assessment. So, our measuring task is to choose a scale and develop a question on success or failure of political leader's career now and on his prospects in the future. Such questions we presented to 40 experts (20 leading specialists in political sciences working for the corresponding academic institutes and 20 journalists professionally involved into political analysis and working for the most popular newspapers and TV channels of Ukraine). We asked experts to evaluate, according to the scale of 11 points (conditionally interval) and in the most possible general way, political success (or failure) of leading Ukrainian politicians for the whole period of their political career and their political prospects (see **Appendix**, chapter 1).

These assessments make it possible to calculate an integral index of political success in which there are involved not only current success or failure of political leader but also prognosis of his career development. This index is calculated as a correlation of actual assessments of political success and a sum of actual and potential assessments; it can be interpreted as an index of "political realization" because it is a specific weight of political past (assessments of achieved success) in the whole career of political leader (a sum of the achieved and expected in the future), as it is seen by experts.

Index of political realization (*iPR*) is calculated according to the formula:

$$iPR = \left( \frac{1}{n} \times \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{S_i}{S_i + V_i} \right) \times 100\%,$$

where  $n$ — a number of experts,  $S_i$ — an assessment of the current success of political career by the  $i$ -th expert,  $V_i$ — an assessment of political prospects by the  $i$ -th expert. In the formula,  $S_i$  can vary from 0 to 10 (as well as  $V_i$ ). To make this, in the formula, we added 5 to the "raw" points of  $S$  (from  $-5$  to  $5$ ). This transformation is necessary for unification of the past and future success measurements. *iPR* values vary from 0 to 100%.

If in the formula, the past prevails over future then *iPR* is more than 50%, if the future success prevails over the past then *iPR* is under 50%. The less *iPR* seems the more prospects of political leader. However, this index should be comprehended in the context of a certain political biography: for adult politicians, low *iPR*s mean their "political infancy" even

if they are still “very perspective” in public assessments. For young political leaders, their high levels of realization mean that they have become “politically old”. That is why, the optimal *iPRs* are related to different stages of politician’s career and show harmony of real and potential success.

Measurements of political success based on direct assessments make us think about an adequate character of “subject integration” procedure for different component of political career leading to the unique quantitative characteristics (even if we have no doubt as to political competence of the evaluation subject). So, along with direct assessments, we used a method of indirect evaluation of actual political success based on analysis of political leaders’ biographies. Its idea is that experts assessed separate results of political leader’s activity during their political career as success or failure. Each result was evaluated according to the 11-point scale (conditionally interval) as to their significance for political career and biography of the given politician (see **Appendix**, chapter 2).

In order to pick separate events (results of political activity) out of political leader’s biography, we conducted a special expert questioning in which 50 experts (political analysts of government and public centers of political analysis, political journalists, professionals in politology and sociology) took part. We asked experts to name successful events and failures in career of the most known Ukrainian politicians of various generations (V. Scherbyts’kyi, V. Chornovil, L. Kravchuk, L. Kuchma, V. Yuschenko, V. Medvedchuk). The following instructions were enclosed:

*For the following politicians (alive or passed away), please pick up a number of events from their political biographies which can be assessed as political success or political failure. Try to pick no fewer than 5 successful events and 5 failures.*

*Please assess each of the picked up events according to their social and political significance — its impact on social and political situation in Ukraine (the scale is from 0 to 10 points, where 10 points is the maximum possible social and political significance, 0 is no significance at all).*

After processing the data, we determined for each politician three positive and three negative results of their political activity which had the highest evaluations (summarized) of all mentioned events (see **Appendix**, chapter 2). These events were presented to participants of the main expert questioning, and we got assessments of separate (the most



significant as to experts' opinions) episodes of political career of six political leaders. Political success and failures were assessed according to the 11-point scale. The idea of integral index (of actual political success) development was to calculate a difference between the summarized positive and negative results of political activity. So we avoided direct (mostly emotional) evaluations and concentrated experts' attention on specific political success and failures. In our case, the formula of political success does not include general assessments of political career, it integrates specific assessments of events from political biography. The index of actual political success (*i*APS) was calculated according to the following formula:

$$iAPS = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\sum_{j=1}^k S_{ij} - \sum_{j=1}^k U_{ij}}{k},$$

where  $n$  — a number of experts,  $k$  — a number of assessed events,  $S_{ij}$  — an assessment of the  $j$ -th positive event of political career by the  $i$ -th expert,  $U_{ij}$  — an assessment of the  $j$ -th negative event by the  $i$ -th expert. In our study,  $n = 40$ ,  $k = 3$ . APS index varies from  $-10$  to  $+10$ .

Qualitative characteristics of political success make it possible to arrange political subjects according to their actual “success” and “prospects”. The obtained rating positions are not only interesting but also can affect political life of society. Recently public attention has been concentrated on ratings of political leaders, parties and electoral blocs. In political world, these ratings are often regarded rather suspiciously — as a result of inadequate measurements with biased routines and politically involved researchers. In order to avoid suspicion as to biased experts' evaluation of political success, we had to take into account how political experts were politically involved. For control over these factors, we included into the questionnaire presented to experts questions about their membership in political parties and about their general political positions (see **Appendix**, chapter 3).

Expert questionings due to which we obtained assessments of political success were being conducted by research fellows of Department of Socio-Political Processes, Institute of Sociology of the NAS of Ukraine, during January–March 2002 within the frames of scientific research project “Political Success in the Transforming Society: Subjects, Criteria, Factors”, supervised by N. Panina and me. I am grateful to Yu. Zadyraka, I. Kyrychenko and O. Parakhon'ska for their participation in organization and conduct of expert questionings, as well as A. Horbachyk

for his help in development of political success formulas and processing the primary sociological data.

### ***3. Research Outcomes: Political Success of Ukrainian Leaders in Expert Assessments***

In studies based on expert assessments, a composition of expert group is decisive for quality of the obtained data. In our case, experts were picked up according to the only criterion — they had to be competent as much as possible in aspects related to political leaders' activity; we talk about the corresponding specialty and experience in evaluation of political events and persons. So, we included into this group twenty experienced specialists of the highest qualification in political sciences and political journalism. Other parameters were not taken into account. As a result, the group consisted of 30 men and 10 women, at the age of 44 on average, and this reflects traditionally uneven gender representation in political life of Ukrainian society. Statistically meaningful differences between experts' assessments as to sex or age were not registered. We took into account political significance of languages in Ukraine, so we asked experts about their mother tongue: 23 experts named Ukrainian, 16 — Russian, 1 — other. We registered differences between assessments by experts speaking Ukrainian and experts speaking Russian but they were of not statistically significant character for any assessment of political success. It is possible that bigger group of experts could make these differences meaningful but we have no reasons to expect principal divergence.

Any suspicions that experts could be politically involved are avoided due to the fact that there were no governmental workers or members of political parties (except one expert). As to political orientations of experts, the scale "left-right" gave us the following distribution: left — 1 expert, left-center — 3, center — 13, right-center — 11, right — 9, difficult to say — 3. Obvious "right warp" had to affect the total expert assessment of political leaders' activity. "Right" experts could hardly be unbiased while talking about the "left" and vice versa. So, while processing the data, we took a group of experts who were in the middle of the scale "left-right". The group consisted of 30 people with wide centrist orientations (including those who found it difficult to say). As we can see in Table 1, differences between direct expert assessments of the achieved success and prospects of Ukrainian leaders are not principal when we compare the whole group of experts with the subgroup where "left" and "right" were excluded.

**Table 1**

**Assessments of Success of Ukrainian Politicians and Their Prospects in Achievement of Success in the Future by All Experts (N = 40) and Those of Wide Centrist Political Orientation (N = 30)**

Political leaders	Assessments of political success, the scale is -5 — +5				Assessments of the success prospects, the scale is 0—10			
	N = 40		N = 30		N = 40		N = 30	
	Average assessment figure	Standard deviation	Average assessment figure	Standard deviation	Average assessment figure	Standard deviation	Average assessment figure	Standard deviation
V. Scherbyts'kyi	2.90	2.09	3.00	1.65				
L. Kravchuk	2.63	2.45	3.03	2.04	1.54	1.83	1.79	1.99
V. Chornovil	2.74	1.33	2.83	1.39				
V. Gryniiov	-0.85	2.34	-0.77	2.43	0.35	0.84	0.47	0.95
V. Yavorivs'kyi	-0.47	2.49	-0.57	2.57	0.65	1.20	0.50	0.99
L. Kuchma	0.31	3.81	0.59	3.72	1.48	1.86	1.80	2.02
Ye. Marchuk	0.59	2.55	0.76	2.60	2.30	2.13	2.73	2.23
I. Pliusch	1.88	2.18	1.97	2.30	1.98	1.78	2.07	1.91
P. Lazarenko	-1.75	3.60	-1.33	3.67	0.63	1.74	0.57	1.60
O. Moroz	1.80	2.74	2.30	2.24	3.38	2.35	3.77	2.25
O. Tkachenko	-0.88	3.06	-0.50	3.19	0.77	1.40	0.83	1.36
P. Symonenko	1.13	2.20	1.27	2.20	2.50	1.95	2.73	2.00
V. Pustovoitenko	-0.98	2.67	-0.20	2.72	1.48	1.59	1.67	1.70
H. Udovenko	0.18	2.28	0.17	2.26	0.90	1.23	1.03	1.35
L. Luk'ianenko	0.28	2.46	0.50	2.49	0.85	1.48	1.03	1.64
Yu. Kostenko	0.38	2.32	0.43	2.43	2.58	2.05	2.67	1.91
V. Medvedchuk	2.35	1.99	2.47	2.08	5.53	2.56	5.53	2.71
N. Vitrenko	0.20	2.66	0.33	2.68	1.40	1.81	2.10	1.86
S. Tyhypko	0.93	1.99	0.90	2.18	4.03	2.36	4.57	2.23
Yu. Tymoshenko	2.00	2.20	2.03	2.37	5.23	2.92	5.31	2.97
V. Yuschenko	3.18	1.50	3.13	1.50	6.88	2.96	6.70	2.96
A. Kinakh	1.85	1.98	1.87	2.06	3.95	2.33	4.27	2.28
V. Lytvyn	0.28	2.65	0.87	2.75	3.50	2.27	4.00	2.30

This mostly relates to the hierarchy of political leaders as to the level of achieved success in the current and perspective aspects. This conclusion makes it possible to avoid exclusion of experts with polar political orientations. Assessments of leaders' political success are not too closely connected with political sympathies to be divided according to the criterion of coincidence or discrepancy between political positions of expert and the assessed person.

As to the substantial characteristics of the data, direct expert assessments put to the leaders of executive power (L. Kuchma, V. Lytvyn, Ye. Marchuk, V. Pustovoitenko) were lower than to the leaders of opposition (V. Yuschenko, Yu. Tymoshenko, O. Moroz) in the actual and perspective aspects. The worst assessments of political success belong to P. Lazarenko and O. Tkachenko, and to rather popular in the past politicians of the "first democratic wave" (V. Gryniov and V. Yavorivs'kyi). As a whole, expert assessments of actual political success correspond to the common political sense. I think it is interesting that the highest government officials who seem to be successful in their career got low evaluations. It means that while choosing an evaluation criterion for political success, experts think more about high posts demanding much of people who occupy them, how these political leaders' activity corresponds to their posts, and less about their election victories or designations.

As to assessments of political prospects, for most politicians, they correlate (in statistically meaningful sense) with direct assessments of political success within the 0.4–0.6 range. It means that in perspective assessments experts somehow base on the past success, but we did not register any direct extrapolations of future results from the past achievements. However, in some cases there were high (over 0.7) and low (under 0.3) correlation coefficients. The latter could be seen for experienced politicians who held or holding now high posts (L. Kravchuk, L. Kuchma, I. Pliusch). We think that experts cannot see prospects of those who totally have shown their worth at the highest governmental post. And vice versa, the highest correlation coefficient of actual and perspective assessments relate to the politicians whose work as high governmental officials is not long, and this work make experts hope for the future success of these politicians (V. Yuschenko, V. Medvedchuk, Yu. Tymoshenko, A. Kinakh). It is interesting that V. Lytvyn, P. Lazarenko and O. Tkachenko are the closest to the group of low correlation coefficients, whereas N. Vitrenko, Yu. Kostenko and O. Moroz are the closest to the group of high correlation coefficients.

As to direct assessments of political success in the future, experts consider those politicians, whose success achieved and forecasted is close, to be the most perspective — V. Yuschenko, V. Medvedchuk, Yu. Tymoshenko, A. Kinakh, S. Tyhypko. “Veterans of political scene” have the least prospects — V. Gryniov, V. Yavorivs'kyi, P. Lazarenko, O. Tkachenko, H. Udovenko, and L. Luk'ianenko. L. Kravchuk and L. Kuchma also belong to the last group.

Let us talk about calculations of the political realization index (*iPR*) the formula of which was mentioned in the previous chapter of this article. It reflects the specific weight of past success in the whole political career with regard for expected success in the future. The results are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2****Political Realization of Ukrainian Politicians**

<i>Political leaders</i>	<i>Percent of realization</i>	<i>Standard deviation</i>
V. Yuschenko	56.3	12.6
V. Medvedchuk	57.1	11.4
V. Lytvyn	57.9	24.7
Yu. Tymoshenko	59.4	14.7
S. Tyhypko	59.7	14.8
A. Kinakh	64.0	13.1
Yu. Kostenko	67.8	14.6
O. Moroz	69.7	13.9
Ye. Marchuk	70.2	15.9
P. Symonenko	70.4	18.4
N. Vitrenko	72.8	22.9
L. Kuchma	73.3	22.4
I. Pliusch	76.4	14.8
P. Lazarenko	82.4	30.1
L. Kravchuk	82.8	15.8
V. Yavorivs'kyi	85.9	16.8

According to these data, experts assessed almost all famous Ukrainian politicians as leaders who mostly realized their potentials of political success. It means that the past achievements are evaluated higher than those expected in the future. Even those who hardly realized their ambitions got the *iPR* over 50%. This result means that experts do not expect “sharp rises” of our political leaders. So, to find new perspective political leaders is still very important task for Ukraine. At the same time, *iPRs* of V. Yuschenko, V. Medvedchuk, V. Lytvyn, Yu. Tymoshenko, S. Tyhypko are within the limits of balanced past and future achievements. The most dissimilar expert assessments relate to political realization of P. Lazarenko. Some experts seem to see the political future connected to this person. But the total balance of somebody’s past and future success says nothing about the scale of this success. You can have a balanced *iPR* without any achievements both in the past and in the future. So, *iPR* should be analyzed together with *iAPS* (actual political success index) that is calculated according to the above-mentioned formula where we can see the difference between the summarized assessments of success and failures of politicians for the whole career.

Let us remind you that *iAPS* was calculated for six politicians who belong to three generations of political leaders of Ukraine. Table 3 presents *iAPSs* and their correlation with direct assessments of political success.

**Table 3****Actual Political Success Indices (iAPS) of Ukrainian Leaders**

<i>Political leaders</i>	<i>iAPS, an average as to the scale: -10 — +10</i>	<i>Standard deviation</i>	<i>Correlation between iAPS and direct assessment of political success</i>
V. Scherbyts'kyi	2.60	3.28	0.54**
V. Chornovil	2.33	2.51	0.50**
L. Kravchuk	1.57	2.78	0.41**
L. Kuchma	-1.19	3.62	0.22
V. Yuschenko	2.27	2.51	0.19
V. Medvedchuk	1.30	2.02	0.38*

\* —  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\* —  $p < 0.01$

In these data, it is obvious that the leaders who passed away gained the highest assessments of political success. That is right — “they can love only the dead!” V. Scherbyts'kyi has better figures of political success though most experts were political analysts of the “right orientation”. This fact is a good evidence that assessments of political success hardly depend on specific political positions of experts. It means that while choosing experts, this factor should not be determining. As to the APS index, V. Yuschenko is the closest to successful politicians of the old generation. Leadership of those three people was registered by direct assessments of political success too (see Table 1). The only one who has negative results (an evidence that failures prevail over success in his political career) is L. Kuchma. It may seem strange — he won the two Presidential Elections. However, these victories probably have determined the total negative assessment of his political career as a whole. High position demands much of the one who occupies it. So, it would be wrong to limit political success by only, even the highest, electoral achievements. There is no objective criterion of political success without regard for its public assessment. This conclusion confirms the necessity of evaluation criteria to be chosen for development of any methods of political success measurement.

The methods presented in this article gave us the outcomes that could be applied in political theory and practice. There are unsolved problems too. For instance, I cannot explain the fact that in some cases there is a connection between direct and indirect assessments of political success, and in other ones there is no such a connection (see correlation coefficients in Table 3). There is no explanation for the phenomenon of widely disseminated assessments of political success, lack of agreement in expert assessments as to a number of persons. However, the main conclusion is optimistic. The criterion of political success evaluation and analysis of indices related to political realization and actual political success make it possible not only to study hierarchy of political success evaluation in society but also find a way to political practice, taking sociological imagination of politicians out of the limits where they simply compare and interpret pre-electoral political ratings.

## Questionnaire for the Expert Questioning

Dear participant of the expert questioning,

Department of Socio-Political Processes, Institute of Sociology of the NAS of Ukraine, studies peculiarities of **evaluation of political success**. We ask you to assess political success (or failure) of Ukrainian politicians.

<i>Politicians</i>	You assess political success (or failure) achieved by Ukrainian politicians for their whole career according to the scale +5 +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4 -5 (where +5 is the maximum success, and -5 is the maximum failure)	On the scale 0–10, you assess political prospects of politicians (where 0 is no prospects in political success, and 10 means the maximum prospects in the future)
V. Scherbyts'kyi	<b>+5 +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4 -5</b>	_____
L. Kravchuk	<b>+5 +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4 -5</b>	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
V. Chornovil	<b>+5 +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4 -5</b>	_____
V. Gryniiov	<b>+5 +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4 -5</b>	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
V. Yavorivs'kyi	<b>+5 +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4 -5</b>	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
L. Kuchma	<b>+5 +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4 -5</b>	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Ye. Marchuk	<b>+5 +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4 -5</b>	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
I. Pliusch	<b>+5 +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4 -5</b>	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
P. Lazarenko	<b>+5 +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4 -5</b>	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
O. Moroz	<b>+5 +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4 -5</b>	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
O. Tkachenko	<b>+5 +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4 -5</b>	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
P. Symonenko	<b>+5 +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4 -5</b>	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
V. Pustovoitenko	<b>+5 +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4 -5</b>	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
H. Udovenko	<b>+5 +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4 -5</b>	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
L. Luk'ianenko	<b>+5 +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4 -5</b>	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Yu. Kostenko	<b>+5 +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4 -5</b>	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
V. Medvedchuk	<b>+5 +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4 -5</b>	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
N. Vitrenko	<b>+5 +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4 -5</b>	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
S. Tyhypko	<b>+5 +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4 -5</b>	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Yu. Tymoshenko	<b>+5 +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4 -5</b>	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
V. Yuschenko	<b>+5 +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4 -5</b>	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
A. Kinakh	<b>+5 +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4 -5</b>	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
V. Lytvyn	<b>+5 +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4 -5</b>	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10



1. Success of politicians could be evaluated differently in different periods of their activity but we are interested in the **most general assessment** — quantitative characteristics (in points) of the whole political career of a certain politician.

For leaders who are still involved in the current politics we ask to assess their political prospects too — possibility of political success in the future.

2. For the following politicians (alive or passed away), we ask you to assess some events (results of their political activity) that were frequently mentioned by the experts who took part in our previous expert questioning as success or failures.

**On the scale from 0 to 10 points, evaluate an impact (positive or negative) of each event (result of political activity) on political career and biography of the given politician (where 10 points is the maximum possible impact, 0 is no impact at all).**

ASSESSMENT

**V. Scherbyts'kyi**

- First person in the party-governmental hierarchy of the UkrSSR. . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
- Authority position in the Central Committee Politburo of CPSU. . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
- Stable social and economic situation in Ukraine . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
- Chornobyl catastrophe . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
- The role of “Kremlin hand”, neglect of Ukrainian interests. . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
- Persecution of the dissenters . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_

**L. Kravchuk**

- Won the Presidential Elections in 1991. . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
- Participation in the establishment of independent country . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
- Chosen to be Chairman of the Supreme Counsel of the UkrSSR. . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
- Economic crisis during his presidential term. . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
- Lost the Presidential Elections in 1994. . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
- Personnel policy based on the old nomenclature . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_

**V. Chornovil**

- Establishment of Rukh and leadership in it. . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
- Activity in the Verkhovna Rada as a leader of national and democratic forces \_\_\_\_\_
- Dissident activity and protection of rights. . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
- Split of Rukh. . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
- Inconsistent opposition to the power . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
- “Removal” of Rukh from raising and solution of economic problems . . . . \_\_\_\_\_

**L. Kuchma**

- Winning the Presidential Elections . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
- Overcome of political crises . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
- Relative stability in society . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
- Cassette scandal . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
- Failures in economy. . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
- Selection of personnel with reshuffle and oligarchs' influence . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_

**V. Yuschenko**

Participation in economic stabilization (hryvnia, paid salaries and pensions) . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_  
Prime-Minister of Ukraine . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_  
Head of the National Bank of Ukraine . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_  
Undetermined political position . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_  
Dismissal from the post of Prime-Minister of Ukraine . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_  
Formation of electoral list for the elections in 2002. . . . . \_\_\_\_\_

**V. Medvedchuk**

Formation of the majority in the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_  
Post of the Vice Speaker in the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. . . . . \_\_\_\_\_  
Activity for establishment of SDPU (u) . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_  
Resignation from the post of the Vice Speaker of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_  
Oligarch image and lobbying of oligarch interests. . . . . \_\_\_\_\_  
Dismissal of Victor Yushchenko as Prime-Minister . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_

**3. Your sex:** 1 — male; 2 — female

**Your age** \_\_\_\_\_ years

**Your political position as to the scale “left-right”:**

- 1 — left
- 2 — left-center
- 3 — center
- 4 — right-center
- 5 — right
- 6 — difficult to say

**Mother tongue:**

- 1 — Ukrainian
- 2 — Russian
- 3 — other

**Are you a member of a political party:**

- 1 — yes
- 2 — no

Thank you for taking part in the expert questioning!

**References**

1. Psikhologiiia zhiznennogo uspekha. Opyt sotsial'no-psikhologicheskogo analiza preodoleniia kriticheskikh situatsii (Life Success Psychology. The Experience of Social and Psychological Analysis in Overcoming Critical Situations). — Kiev, 1995.

2. *Farnen R.* Chto oznachaiet "politicheskii uspek" na Zapade i Vostoke // *Sotsiologiya: teoriia, metody, marketing* (What Does Political "Success" Mean in the West and East? // *Sociology: Theory, Methods, Marketing*). — 2001. — № 2. — P. 105–107.

3. *Bakhtanovskii B., Sogomonov Yu., Churilov V.* Etika politicheskogo uspekha (Political Success Ethic). — Tiumen. — M., 1997.

4. *Karevina Ye.* Ekonomicheskie faktory politicheskogo uspekha: analiz na primere poslednikh prezidentskikh vyborov v Ukraine // *Sotsiologiya: teoriia, metody, marketing* (Economic Factors of Political Success: Analysis of the Last Presidential Elections in Ukraine // *Sociology: Theory, Methods, Marketing*). — 2001. — № 2. — P. 90–104.

5. Politychnyi uspikh u suspil'stvi, scho transformuiet'sia: sub'iekty, kryterii, faktory (Political Success in the Transforming Society: Subjects, Criteria, Factors). — Report on the Results of Scientific Work Conducted by the Department of Socio-Political Processes, Institute of Sociology, NAS of Ukraine. — Kyiv, 2002.