


10-2016

# The Political Personality of 2016 Democratic Presidential Nominee Hillary Clinton

Aubrey Immelman

St. John's University / College of St. Benedict, [aimmelman@csbsju.edu](mailto:aimmelman@csbsju.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/psychology\\_pubs](http://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/psychology_pubs)

 Part of the [American Politics Commons](#), [Leadership Studies Commons](#), [Other Political Science Commons](#), [Other Psychology Commons](#), and the [Personality and Social Contexts Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Immelman, A. (2016, October). *The political personality of 2016 Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton* (Working Paper No. 1.2). Collegeville and St. Joseph, MN: St. John's University and the College of St. Benedict, Unit for the Study of Personality in Politics. Retrieved from Digital Commons website: [http://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/psychology\\_pubs/102/](http://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/psychology_pubs/102/) (doi: 10.13140/RG.2.2.23477.27365)

**THE POLITICAL PERSONALITY  
OF 2016 DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEE HILLARY CLINTON**

Aubrey Immelman

Department of Psychology  
Saint John's University  
College of Saint Benedict  
St. Joseph, MN 56374  
Telephone: (320) 363-5481  
E-mail: [aimmelman@csbsju.edu](mailto:aimmelman@csbsju.edu)

Working Paper — Release 1.2  
Unit for the Study of Personality in Politics  
<http://personality-politics.org/>

October 2016

---

*Acknowledgment.* Jennifer Jo Hagel assisted with data collection for Study 1 (1998); Aví A. T. Bahadoor for Study 2 (1999–2000); Elizabeth Malaktaris for Study 3 (2004); Julie Seifert, Sarah Moore, Kristin Blomme, Peter Mullin, and Will Purdy II for Study 4 (2007–2008); and Joe Trenzeluk and Rylee Pool for Study 5 (2015–2016).

## *Abstract*

# **The Political Personality of 2016 Democratic Presidential Nominee Hillary Clinton**

Aubrey Immelman  
Saint John's University  
College of Saint Benedict  
St. Joseph, MN 56374, U.S.A.  
Unit for the Study of Personality in Politics  
<http://personality-politics.org/>

This paper presents the results of an indirect assessment of the personality of Hillary Rodham Clinton, Democratic nominee in the 2016 U.S. presidential election. The present report combines data from five studies conducted between 1998 and 2016 from the conceptual perspective of personologist Theodore Millon.

Psychodiagnostically relevant data about Clinton was collected from biographical sources and media reports and synthesized into a personality profile using the Millon Inventory of Diagnostic Criteria (MIDC), which yields 34 normal and maladaptive personality classifications congruent with Axis II of *DSM-IV*.

The personality profile yielded by the MIDC was analyzed on the basis of interpretive guidelines provided in the MIDC and Millon Index of Personality Styles manuals. Clinton's predominant personality patterns were found to be *Ambitious/self-serving* (a measure of narcissism) and *Dominant/controlling*, infused with secondary features of the *Conscientious/dutiful* and *Retiring/reserved* patterns and some indication of *Distrusting/suspicious* features.

In summary, Clinton's personality composite can be labeled *elitist narcissism*, or, in political terms, as the profile of a *deliberative high-dominance introvert* — deliberative by virtue of her substantial conscientiousness.

*Ambitious* individuals are bold, competitive, and self-assured; they easily assume leadership roles, expect others to recognize their special qualities, and often act as though entitled. *Dominant* individuals enjoy the power to direct others and to evoke obedience and respect; they are tough and unsentimental and often make effective leaders. *Conscientious* leaders are dutiful and diligent, with a strong work ethic and careful attention to detail, and often excel in crafting public policy. On the downside, conscientious leaders often lack the retail political skills required to consummate their policy objectives. In short, they are more technocratic than visionary. *Retiring* (introverted) individuals tend not to develop strong ties to others, are somewhat deficient in the ability to recognize the needs or feelings of others, and may lack spontaneity and vitality. In American politics, introverted leaders face serious challenges in attaining high-level public office because of their difficulty in connecting emotionally with voters and the media.

Clinton's major personality strengths in a political role are her confident assertiveness and commanding demeanor. Her major personality-based shortcomings are uncompromising assertiveness, a lack of empathy and congeniality, and cognitive inflexibility.

The major implication of the study is that it offers an empirically based personological framework for identifying Clinton's major personal strengths and limitations as a candidate and anticipating her likely leadership style as president.

## Introduction

“Can you be a misanthrope and still love and enjoy some individuals? How about a compassionate misanthrope?” That enigmatic thought, expressed in the spring of 1967 by Wellesley sophomore Hillary Rodham in a letter to a friend (cited by Sheehy, 1999, p. 53), provides a valuable clue to the character of Hillary Rodham Clinton.

Popular psychobiographies such as Gail Sheehy’s *Hillary’s Choice* (1999) offer a smattering of legitimate psychological insights into Hillary Rodham Clinton’s political ambitions and leadership potential — for example, her externalization of blame, her combativeness and tendency to crucify opponents, her toughness and lack of empathy, and her persistence in the face of adversity. However, a major difficulty with biographies in this genre is that personality insights are not grounded in a coherent, integrated theory of personality. Systematic analysis of the relationship between personality variables and political behaviors requires a dual theory of personality and politics.

That conceptual problem provides the context for the present study, whose object was to conduct a systematic, theoretically grounded empirical assessment of the personality of Hillary Clinton and to examine its political implications. The study combines data from five separate studies conducted between 1998 and 2016 against the backdrop of her election campaigns for U.S. Senate in the state of New York in 2000 and for president in 2008 and 2016.

Conceptually, the study is informed by Theodore Millon’s (1969, 1986a, 1986b, 1990, 1991, 1994, 1996, 2003; Millon & Davis, 2000; Millon & Everly, 1985) model of personality as adapted (Immelman, 1993, 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005) for the study of personality in politics.

I employ the terms *personality* and *politics* in Fred Greenstein’s (1992) narrowly construed sense. Politics, by this definition, “refers to the politics most often studied by political scientists — that of civil government and of the extra-governmental processes that more or less directly impinge upon government, such as political parties” and campaigns. Personality, as narrowly construed in political psychology, “excludes political attitudes and opinions ... and applies only to nonpolitical personal differences” (p. 107).

Personality may be concisely defined as:

a complex pattern of deeply embedded psychological characteristics that are largely nonconscious and not easily altered, expressing themselves automatically in almost every facet of functioning. Intrinsic and pervasive, these traits emerge from a complicated matrix of biological dispositions and experiential learnings, and ultimately comprise the individual’s distinctive pattern of perceiving, feeling, thinking, coping, and behaving. (Millon, 1996, p. 4)

Greenstein (1992) makes a compelling case for studying personality in government and politics: “Political institutions and processes operate through human agency. It would be remarkable if they were *not* influenced by the properties that distinguish one individual from another” (p. 124).

The methodology employed in this study involves the construction of a theoretically grounded personality profile derived from empirical analysis of biographical source materials (see Immelman, 2003, 2005, 2014).

A comprehensive review of Millon's personological model and its applicability to political personality has been provided elsewhere (e.g., Immelman, 1993, 2003, 2005). Briefly, Millon's model encompasses eight attribute domains: expressive behavior, interpersonal conduct, cognitive style, mood/temperament, self-image, regulatory mechanisms, object representations, and morphologic organization (see Table 1).

**Table 1**  
*Millon's Eight Attribute Domains*

Attribute	Description
Expressive behavior	The individual's characteristic behavior; how the individual typically appears to others; what the individual knowingly or unknowingly reveals about him- or herself; what the individual wishes others to think or to know about him or her.
Interpersonal conduct	How the individual typically interacts with others; the attitudes that underlie, prompt, and give shape to these actions; the methods by which the individual engages others to meet his or her needs; how the individual copes with social tensions and conflicts.
Cognitive style	How the individual focuses and allocates attention, encodes and processes information, organizes thoughts, makes attributions, and communicates reactions and ideas to others.
Mood/temperament	How the individual typically displays emotion; the predominant character of an individual's affect and the intensity and frequency with which he or she expresses it.
Self-image	The individual's perception of self-as-object or the manner in which the individual overtly describes him- or herself.
Regulatory mechanisms	The individual's characteristic mechanisms of self-protection, need gratification, and conflict resolution.
Object representations	The inner imprint left by the individual's significant early experiences with others; the structural residue of significant past experiences, composed of memories, attitudes, and affects that underlie the individual's perceptions of and reactions to ongoing events and serves as a substrate of dispositions for perceiving and reacting to life's ongoing events.
Morphologic organization	The overall architecture that serves as a framework for the individual's psychic interior; the structural strength, interior congruity, and functional efficacy of the personality system (i.e., ego strength).

*Note.* From *Disorders of Personality: DSM-IV and Beyond* (pp. 141–146) by T. Millon, 1996, New York: Wiley; *Toward a New Personology: An Evolutionary Model* (chapter 5) by T. Millon, 1990, New York: Wiley; and *Personality and Its Disorders: A Biosocial Learning Approach* (p. 32) by T. Millon and G. S. Everly, Jr., 1985, New York: Wiley. Copyright © 1996, © 1990, © 1985 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Adapted by permission of John Wiley & Sons, Inc. and Theodore Millon.

## Method

### Materials

The materials consisted of biographical sources and the personality inventory employed to systematize and synthesize diagnostically relevant information collected from the literature on Hillary Clinton.

**Sources of data.** Diagnostic information pertaining to Clinton was collected from a broad array of nearly 100 media reports and several book-length biographies that offered useful, diagnostically relevant psychobiographical information.

**Personality inventory.** The assessment instrument, the Millon Inventory of Diagnostic Criteria (MIDC; Immelman & Steinberg, 1999; Immelman, 2015), was compiled and adapted from Millon's (1969, 1986b; 1990, 1996; Millon & Everly, 1985) prototypical features and diagnostic criteria for normal personality styles and their pathological variants. Information concerning the construction, administration, scoring, and interpretation of the MIDC is provided in the Millon Inventory of Diagnostic Criteria manual (Immelman, 2014).<sup>1</sup> The 12-scale (see Table 2) instrument taps the first five "noninferential" (Millon, 1990, p. 157) attribute domains previously listed in Table 1.

The 12 MIDC scales correspond to major personality patterns posited by Millon (1994, 1996), which are congruent with the syndromes described on Axis II of the fourth edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV)* of the American Psychiatric Association (APA; 1994) and coordinated with the normal personality styles in which these disorders are rooted, as described by Millon and Everly (1985), Millon (1994), Oldham and Morris (1995), and Strack (1997). Scales 1 through 8 (comprising 10 scales and subscales) have three gradations (a, b, c) yielding 30 personality variants, whereas Scales 9 and 0 have two gradations (d, e) yielding four variants, for a total of 34 personality designations, or types. Table 2 displays the full taxonomy.

---

<sup>1</sup> Inventory and manual available to qualified professionals upon request from the author.

**Table 2**  
***Millon Inventory of Diagnostic Criteria: Scales and Gradations***

---

Scale 1A:	Dominant pattern a. Asserting b. Controlling c. Aggressive (Sadistic; <i>DSM-III-R</i> , Appendix A)
Scale 1B:	Dauntless pattern a. Adventurous b. Dissenting c. Aggrandizing (Antisocial; <i>DSM-IV</i> , 301.7)
Scale 2:	Ambitious pattern a. Confident b. Self-serving c. Exploitative (Narcissistic; <i>DSM-IV</i> , 301.81)
Scale 3:	Outgoing pattern a. Congenial b. Gregarious c. Impulsive (Histrionic; <i>DSM-IV</i> , 301.50)
Scale 4:	Accommodating pattern a. Cooperative b. Agreeable c. Submissive (Dependent; <i>DSM-IV</i> , 301.6)
Scale 5A:	Aggrieved pattern a. Unpresuming b. Self-denying c. Self-defeating ( <i>DSM-III-R</i> , Appendix A)
Scale 5B:	Contentious pattern a. Resolute b. Oppositional c. Negativistic (Passive-aggressive; <i>DSM-III-R</i> , 301.84)
Scale 6:	Conscientious pattern a. Respectful b. Dutiful c. Compulsive (Obsessive-compulsive; <i>DSM-IV</i> , 301.4)
Scale 7:	Reticent pattern a. Circumspect b. Inhibited c. Withdrawn (Avoidant; <i>DSM-IV</i> , 301.82)
Scale 8:	Retiring pattern a. Reserved b. Aloof c. Solitary (Schizoid; <i>DSM-IV</i> , 301.20)
Scale 9:	Distrusting pattern d. Suspicious e. Paranoid ( <i>DSM-IV</i> , 301.0)
Scale 0:	Erratic pattern d. Unstable e. Borderline ( <i>DSM-IV</i> , 301.83)

---

*Note.* Equivalent *DSM* terminology and codes are specified in parentheses.

## Diagnostic Procedure

The diagnostic procedure, termed *psychodiagnostic meta-analysis*, can be conceptualized as a three-part process: first, an *analysis* phase (data collection) during which source materials are reviewed and analyzed to extract and code diagnostically relevant content; second, a *synthesis* phase (scoring and interpretation) during which the unifying framework provided by the MIDC prototypal features, keyed for attribute domain and personality pattern, is employed to classify the diagnostically relevant information extracted in phase 1; and finally, an *evaluation* phase (inference) during which theoretically grounded descriptions, explanations, inferences, and predictions are extrapolated from Millon's theory of personality based on the personality profile constructed in phase 2 (see Immelman, 2003, 2005, 2014 for a more detailed account of the procedure).

## Results

The analysis of the data includes a summary of descriptive statistics yielded by the MIDC scoring procedure, the MIDC profile for Hillary Clinton, diagnostic classification of the subject, and the clinical interpretation of significant MIDC scale elevations derived from the diagnostic procedure.

Clinton received 48 endorsements on the 170-item MIDC. Judging from endorsement-rate deviations from the mean (see Table 3), data on Clinton's expressive behavior (13 endorsements) were most easily obtained and may be overrepresented in the data set, whereas data on her cognitive style (7 endorsements) were most difficult to obtain and may be underrepresented in the data set.

Descriptive statistics for Clinton's MIDC ratings are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3**  
*MIDC Item Endorsement Rate by Attribute Domain for Hillary Clinton*

Attribute domain	Items
Expressive behavior	13
Interpersonal conduct	10
Cognitive style	7
Mood/temperament	9
Self-image	9
Sum	48
Mean	9.6
Standard deviation	2.0

Clinton's MIDC scale scores are reported in Table 4. The same data are presented graphically in the profile displayed in Figure 1.



**Table 4**  
*MIDC Scale Scores for Hillary Clinton*

Scale	Personality pattern	Raw	RT%
1A	Dominant: Asserting–Controlling–Aggressive (Sadistic)	21	28.8
1B	Dauntless: Adventurous–Dissenting–Aggrandizing (Antisocial)	2	2.7
2	Ambitious: Confident–Self-serving–Exploitative (Narcissistic)	24	32.9
3	Outgoing: Congenial–Gregarious–Impulsive (Histrionic)	0	0.0
4	Accommodating: Cooperative–Agreeable–Submissive (Dependent)	0	0.0
5A	Aggrieved: Unpresuming–Self-denying–Self-defeating (Masochistic)	0	0.0
5B	Contentious: Resolute–Oppositional–Negativistic (Passive-aggressive)	3	4.1
6	Conscientious: Respectful–Dutiful–Compulsive (Obsessive-compulsive)	15	20.5
7	Reticent: Circumspect–Inhibited–Withdrawn (Avoidant)	1	1.4
8	Retiring: Reserved–Aloof–Solitary (Schizoid)	7	9.6
	Subtotal for basic personality scales	73	100.0
9	Distrusting: Suspicious–Paranoid (Paranoid)	12	14.1
0	Erratic: Unstable–Borderline (Borderline)	0	0.0
	Full-scale total	85	114.1

*Note.* For Scales 1–8, ratio-transformed (RT%) scores are the scores for each scale expressed as a percentage of the sum of raw scores for the ten basic scales only. For Scales 9 and 0, ratio-transformed scores are scores expressed as a percentage of the sum of raw scores for all twelve MIDC scales (therefore, full-scale RT% totals can exceed 100). Personality patterns are enumerated with scale gradations and equivalent *DSM* terminology (in parentheses).

The MIDC profile yielded by Clinton’s raw scores is displayed in Figure 1.2


Clinton’s most elevated scale, with a score of 24, is Scale 2 (Ambitious), closely followed by Scale 1A (Dominant), with a score of 21. The primary Scale 2 elevation is at the cut-off between the *prominent* (10-23) and *mildly dysfunctional* (24-30) ranges. The secondary Scale 1A and Scale 6 (Conscientious) scales are well within the *prominent* (10-23) range. One additional MIDC scale is diagnostically significant: Scale 8 (Retiring), with a score of 7, in the *present* (5-9) range. Finally, the modest elevation of 12 on Scale 9 (Distrusting) merits note, though it fails to reach the lower threshold 20 set for *moderately disturbed* on Scales 9 and 0.

In terms of MIDC scale gradation (see Table 2 and Figure 1) criteria, supplemented by clinical judgment, Clinton was classified as primarily an Ambitious/self-serving personality complemented by strong Dominant/controlling and Conscientious/dutiful patterns. In addition, she is distinctly Retiring/reserved (introverted) and notably Distrusting/suspicious.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Solid horizontal lines on the profile form signify cut-off scores between adjacent scale gradations. For Scales 1–8, scores of 5 through 9 signify the *presence* (gradation *a*) of the personality pattern in question; scores of 10 through 23 indicate a *prominent* (gradation *b*) variant; and scores of 24 to 30 indicate an exaggerated, *mildly dysfunctional* (gradation *c*) variation of the pattern. For Scales 9 and 0, scores of 20 through 35 indicate a *moderately disturbed* syndrome and scores of 36 through 45 a *markedly disturbed* syndrome. See Table 2 for scale names.

<sup>3</sup> In each case, the label preceding the slash signifies the categorical personality pattern, whereas the label following the slash indicates the specific scale gradation, or personality type, on the dimensional continuum; see Table 2.

**Figure 1. Millon Inventory of Diagnostic Criteria: Profile for Hillary Clinton**



## Discussion

The discussion of the results examines Hillary Clinton's MIDC scale elevations from the perspective of Millon's (1994, 1996; Millon & Davis, 2000) model of personality, supplemented by the theoretically congruent portraits of Oldham and Morris (1995) and Strack (1997). The discussion concludes with a brief synthesis of the practical political implications of Clinton's personality profile.

Few people exhibit personality patterns in "pure" or prototypal form; more often, individual personalities represent a blend of two or more primary orientations. With her highly elevated scores on Scale 2 (Ambitious) and Scale 1A (Dominant), Clinton emerged from the assessment as a blend of the *self-serving* and *controlling* types — exaggerated, though adaptive, variants of the Ambitious and Dominant patterns. The Millon Index of Personality Styles manual (Millon, 1994), employing the label *Asserting*, describes Ambitious personalities as bold, competitive, and self-assured individuals who easily assume leadership roles, expect others to recognize their special qualities, and often act as though entitled (p. 32). Dominant personalities — labeled *Controlling* — enjoy the power to direct others and to evoke obedience and respect. They are tough, competitive, and unsentimental, and often make effective leaders (p. 34). This amalgam of adaptive narcissism and dominance in Hillary Clinton's personality profile parallels the recollection of a high school classmate, quoted by Sheehy (1999): "Hillary was very competitive at everything. Even pugnacious. She was very ambitious" (p. 26).

The interpretation of Clinton's profile must also account for a secondary elevation on Scale 6 (Conscientious) and subsidiary elevations on Scale 8 (Retiring) and Scale 9 (Distrusting). Conscientious personalities — which Millon (1994) labels *Conforming* — are well organized and reliable, prudent and restrained, overly self-controlled, formal and inflexible in their relationships, dislike having their work pile up, and come across to others as highly dependable and industrious. Retiring personalities tend not to develop strong ties to other people, rarely express their inner feelings or thoughts to others, are comfortable working by themselves and not easily distracted by what goes on around them, are somewhat deficient in the ability to recognize the needs or feelings of others, and may lack spontaneity and vitality (p. 33). Distrusting personalities — labeled *Vigilant* by Oldham and Morris (1995) — have a predilection to scanning people and situations around them and are finely attuned to mixed messages, hidden motivations, evasions, and distortions of the truth (p. 157).

In summary, Clinton's personality composite can be described as approximating that of an *elitist narcissist* — Millon's (1996, pp. 412–413) label for the relatively "pure" pathological variant of a highly dominant narcissistic personality; however, in political terms an apt nonpathological label for Clinton would be *deliberative high-dominance introvert* — deliberative by virtue of her substantial conscientiousness.

### Scale 2: The Ambitious Pattern

The Ambitious pattern, as do all personality patterns, occurs on a continuum ranging from normal to maladaptive. At the well-adjusted pole are confident, socially poised, assertive

personalities.<sup>4</sup> Slightly exaggerated Ambitious features occur in personalities that are sometimes perceived as self-promoting, overconfident, or arrogant.<sup>5</sup> In its most deeply ingrained, inflexible form, the Ambitious pattern manifests itself in extreme self-absorption or exploitative behavior patterns that may be consistent with a clinical diagnosis of narcissistic personality disorder.<sup>6</sup>

Normal, adaptive variants of the Ambitious pattern (i.e., confident and self-serving types) correspond to Oldham and Morris's (1995) *Self-Confident* style, Strack's (1997) *confident* style, and Millon's (1994) *Asserting* pattern. Millon's Asserting pattern is positively correlated with the five-factor model's *Extraversion* and *Conscientiousness* factors and negatively correlated with its *Neuroticism* factor (Millon, 1994, p. 82). It is associated with "social composure, or poise, self-possession, equanimity, and stability" — a constellation of adaptive traits that in stronger doses shades into its dysfunctional variant, the narcissistic personality (Millon, 1994, p. 32).

Millon (1994) summarizes the Asserting (i.e., Ambitious) pattern as follows:

An interpersonal boldness, stemming from a belief in themselves and their talents, characterize[s] those high on the ... Asserting [Ambitious] scale. Competitive, ambitious, and self-assured, they naturally assume positions of leadership, act in a decisive and unwavering manner, and expect others to recognize their special qualities and cater to them. Beyond being self-confident, those with an ... [Ambitious] profile often are audacious, clever, and persuasive, having sufficient charm to win others over to their own causes and purposes. Problematic in this regard may be their lack of social reciprocity and their sense of entitlement — their assumption that what they wish for is their due. On the other hand, their ambitions often succeed, and they typically prove to be effective leaders. (p. 32)

Oldham and Morris (1995) offer the following portrait of the normal (*Self-Confident*) prototype of the Ambitious pattern:

Self-Confident [Ambitious] individuals stand out. They're the leaders, the shining lights, the attention-getters in their public or private spheres. Theirs is a star quality born of self-regard, self-respect, self-certainty — all those *self* words that denote a faith in oneself and a commitment to one's self-styled purpose. Combined with the ambition that marks this style, that ... self-regard can transform idle dreams into real accomplishment. ... Self-Confident [Ambitious] men and women know what they want, and they get it. Many of them have the charisma to attract plenty of others to their goals. They are extroverted<sup>7</sup> and intensely political. They know how to work the crowd, how to motivate it, and how to lead it. (p. 85)

Strack (1997) provides the following description of the normal (*confident*) prototype of the Ambitious pattern, based on Millon's theory, empirical findings from studies correlating his Personality Adjective Check List (PACL; 1991) scales with other measures, and clinical experience with the instrument:

---

<sup>4</sup> Relevant to Hillary Clinton.

<sup>5</sup> Relevant to Hillary Clinton.

<sup>6</sup> Marginally applicable to Hillary Clinton in some situational contexts.

<sup>7</sup> Not the case with Hillary Clinton, who is an introvert.

Aloof, calm, and confident, these personalities tend to be egocentric and self-reliant. They may have a keen sense of their own importance, uniqueness, or entitlement. Confident [Ambitious] individuals enjoy others' attention and may be quite bold socially, although they are seldom garish. They can be self-centered to a fault and may become so preoccupied with themselves that they lack concern and empathy for others. These persons have a tendency to believe that others share, or should share, their sense of worth. As a result, they may expect others to submit to their wishes and desires, and to cater to them. ... When feeling exposed or undermined, these individuals are frequently disdainful, obstructive, or vindictive. In the workplace, confident [Ambitious] persons like to take charge in an emphatic manner, often doing so in a way that instills confidence in others. Their self-assurance, wit, and charm often win them supervisory and leadership positions. (Adapted from Strack, 1997, pp. 489–490, with minor modifications)

Millon's personality patterns have well-established diagnostic indicators associated with each of the eight attribute domains of expressive behavior, interpersonal conduct, cognitive style, mood/temperament, self-image, regulatory mechanisms, object-representations, and morphologic organization. Millon's (1996) attribute domains accentuate the maladaptive range of the personality patterns in his taxonomy — in the case of the Ambitious pattern, the exploitative pole of the confident–self-serving–exploitative continuum. The major diagnostic features of the prototypal maladaptive variant of the Ambitious pattern are summarized below, along with “normalized” (i.e., de-pathologized; cf. Millon & Davis, 2000, pp. 273–277) descriptions of the more adaptive variants of this pattern.

**Expressive behavior.** The core diagnostic feature of the expressive acts of Ambitious individuals is their *confidence*; they are socially poised, self-assured, and self-confident, conveying an air of calm, untroubled self-assurance. More exaggerated variants of the Ambitious pattern tend to act in a *conceited* manner, their natural self-assurance shading into supreme self-confidence, hubris, immodesty, or presumptuousness. They are self-promoting and may display an inflated sense of self-importance. They typically have a superior, supercilious, imperious, haughty, disdainful manner. Characteristically, though usually unwittingly, they exploit others, take them for granted, and frequently act as though entitled. The most extreme variants of this pattern are *arrogant*; they are self-serving, reveal a self-important indifference to the rights of others, and are manipulative and lacking in integrity. They commonly flout conventional rules of shared social living, which they view as naive or inapplicable to themselves. All variants of this pattern are to some degree self-centered and lacking in generosity and social reciprocity. (Millon, 1996, p. 405; Millon & Everly, 1985, pp. 32, 39)

**Interpersonal conduct.** The core diagnostic feature of the interpersonal conduct of Ambitious individuals is their *assertiveness*; they stand their ground and are tough, competitive, persuasive, hardnosed, and shrewd. More exaggerated variants of the Ambitious pattern are *entitled*; they lack genuine empathy and expect favors without assuming reciprocal responsibilities. The most extreme variants of this pattern are *exploitative*; they shamelessly take others for granted and manipulate and use them to indulge their desires, enhance themselves, or advance their personal agenda, yet contributing little or nothing in return. Ironically, the sheer audacity of all variants of this pattern, rather than being clearly seen for what it is — impertinence, impudence, or sheer audacity — often conveys confidence and authority and evokes admiration and compliance from others. Indeed, these personalities are skilled at sizing up those around them and conditioning those so disposed to adulate, glorify, and serve them. (Millon, 1996, pp. 405–406; Millon & Everly, 1985, pp. 32, 39)

**Cognitive style.** The core diagnostic feature of the cognitive style of Ambitious individuals is their *imaginativeness*; they are inventive, innovative, and resourceful, ardently believing in their own efficacy. More exaggerated variants of the Ambitious pattern are cognitively *expansive*; they display extraordinary confidence in their own ideas and potential for success and redeem themselves by taking liberty with facts or distorting the truth. The most extreme variants of this pattern are cognitively *unconstrained*; they are preoccupied with self-glorifying fantasies of accomplishment or fame, are little constrained by objective reality or cautionary feedback, and deprecate competitors or detractors in their quest for glory. All variants of this pattern to some degree harbor fantasies of success or rationalize their failures; thus, they tend to exaggerate their achievements, transform failures into successes, construct lengthy and intricate justifications that inflate their self-worth, and quickly deprecate those who refuse to bend to or enhance their admirable sense of self. (Millon, 1996, p. 406; Millon & Everly, 1985, pp. 32, 39)

**Mood/temperament.** The core diagnostic feature of the characteristic mood and temperament of Ambitious individuals is their social *poise*; they are self-composed, serene, and optimistic, and are typically imperturbable, unruffled, and cool and levelheaded under pressure. More exaggerated variants of the Ambitious pattern are *insouciant*; they manifest a general air of nonchalance, imperturbability, or feigned tranquility. They characteristically appear coolly unimpressionable or buoyantly optimistic, except when their narcissistic confidence is shaken, at which time either rage, shame, or emptiness is briefly displayed. The most extreme variants of this pattern are *exuberant*; they experience a pervasive sense of emotional well-being in their everyday life — a buoyancy of spirit and an optimism of outlook — except when their sense of superiority is punctured. When emotionally deflated, their air of nonchalance and imperturbability quickly turns to edgy irritability and annoyance. Under more trying circumstances, sham serenity may turn to feelings of emptiness and humiliation, sometimes with vacillating episodes of rage, shame, and dejection. All variants of this pattern to some degree convey a self-satisfied smugness, yet are easily angered when criticized, obstructed, or crossed. (Millon, 1996, p. 408; Millon & Everly, 1985, pp. 32, 39)

**Self-image.** The core diagnostic feature of the self-perception of Ambitious individuals is their *certitude*; they have strong self-efficacy beliefs and considerable courage of conviction. More exaggerated variants of the Ambitious pattern have an *admirable* sense of self; they view themselves as extraordinarily meritorious and esteemed by others, and have a high degree of self-worth, though others may see them as egotistic, inconsiderate, cocksure, and arrogant. The most extreme variants of this pattern have a *superior* sense of self. They view themselves as having unique and special qualities, deserving of great admiration and entitled to unusual rights and privileges. Accordingly, they often act in a pompous or grandiose manner, often in the absence of commensurate achievements. In high-level leadership positions, some of these individuals may exhibit a messianic self-perception; those failing to pay proper respect or bend to their will typically are treated with scorn and contempt. (Millon, 1996, p. 406)

**Regulatory mechanisms.** The core diagnostic features of the unconscious regulatory (i.e., ego-defense) mechanisms of Ambitious individuals are *rationalization* and *fantasy*; when their subjectively admirable self-image is challenged or their confidence shaken, they maintain equilibrium with facile self-deceptions, devising plausible reasons to justify their self-centered and socially inconsiderate behaviors. They rationalize their difficulties, offering alibis to put

themselves in a positive light despite evident shortcomings and failures. When rationalization fails, they turn to fantasy to assuage their feelings of dejection, shame, or emptiness, redeem themselves, and reassert their pride and status. (Millon, 1996, p. 407)

**Object representations.** The core diagnostic feature of the internalized object representations of Ambitious individuals is their *contrived* nature; the inner imprint of significant early experiences that serves as a substrate of dispositions (i.e., templates) for perceiving and reacting to current life events consists of illusory and changing memories. Consequently, problematic experiences are refashioned to appear consonant with their high sense of self-worth, and unacceptable impulses and deprecatory evaluations are transmuted into more admirable images and percepts. (Millon, 1996, pp. 406–407)

**Morphologic organization.** The core diagnostic feature of the morphological organization of Ambitious individuals is its *spuriousness*; the interior design of the personality system, so to speak, is essentially counterfeit, or bogus. Owing to the misleading nature of their early experiences — characterized by the ease with which good things came to them — these individuals may lack the inner skills necessary for regulating their impulses, channeling their needs, and resolving conflicts. Accordingly, commonplace demands may be viewed as annoying incursions and routine responsibilities as pedestrian or demeaning. Excuses and justifications are easily mustered and serve to perpetuate selfish behaviors and exploitative, duplicitous social conduct. (Millon, 1996, pp. 407–408)

### Scale 1A: The Dominant Pattern

The Dominant pattern, as do all personality patterns, occurs on a continuum ranging from normal to maladaptive. At the well-adjusted pole are strong-willed, commanding, assertive personalities.<sup>8</sup> Slightly exaggerated Dominant features occur in forceful, intimidating, controlling personalities.<sup>9</sup> In its most deeply ingrained, inflexible form, the Dominant pattern displays itself in domineering, belligerent, aggressive behavior patterns that may be consistent with a clinical diagnosis of sadistic personality disorder.<sup>10</sup>

Normal, adaptive variants of the Dominant pattern (i.e., asserting and controlling types) correspond to Oldham and Morris's (1995) *Aggressive* style, Strack's (1997) *forceful* style, Millon's (1994) *Controlling* pattern, and the *managerial* segment of Leary's (1957) managerial–autocratic continuum. Millon's Controlling pattern is positively correlated with the five-factor model's *Conscientiousness* factor, has a more modest positive correlation with its *Extraversion* factor, is negatively correlated with its *Agreeableness* and *Neuroticism* factors, and is uncorrelated with its *Openness to Experience* factor (see Millon, 1994, p. 82). Thus, these individuals — though controlling and somewhat disagreeable — tend to be emotionally stable and conscientious. In combination with an elevated Conscientious (Scale 6) pattern (as in the

---

<sup>8</sup> Relevant to Hillary Clinton.

<sup>9</sup> Relevant to Hillary Clinton.

<sup>10</sup> It is possible that some of these more dysfunctional features are present in Hillary Clinton; however, the results suggest that any such traits would be of secondary significance and nonpervasive.

case of Clinton), an elevated Dominant pattern points to Simonton's (1988) *deliberative* presidential style. According to Millon (1994), Controlling (i.e., Dominant) individuals

enjoy the power to direct and intimidate others, and to evoke obedience and respect from them. They tend to be tough and unsentimental, as well as gain satisfaction in actions that dictate and manipulate the lives of others. Although many sublimate their power-oriented tendencies in publicly approved roles and vocations, these inclinations become evident in occasional intransigence, stubbornness, and coercive behaviors. Despite these periodic negative expressions, controlling [Dominant] types typically make effective leaders, being talented in supervising and persuading others to work for the achievement of common goals. (p. 34)

Oldham and Morris (1995) supplement Millon's description with the following portrait of the normal (*Aggressive*) prototype of the Dominant pattern:

While others may aspire to leadership, Aggressive [Dominant] men and women move instinctively to the helm. They are born to assume command as surely as is the top dog in the pack. Theirs is a strong, forceful personality style, more inherently powerful than any of the others. They can undertake huge responsibilities without fear of failure. They wield power with ease. They never back away from a fight. They compete with the supreme confidence of champions. ... When put to the service of the greater good, the Aggressive [Dominant] personality style can inspire a man or woman to great leadership, especially in times of crisis. (p. 345)

Finally, Strack (1997) offers the following description of the normal (*forceful*) prototype of the Dominant pattern, based on Millon's theory, empirical findings from studies correlating his Personality Adjective Check List (PACL; 1991) scales with other measures, and clinical experience with the instrument:

Like confident [Ambitious] persons, forceful [Dominant] individuals can be identified by an inclination to turn toward the self as the primary source of gratification. However, instead of the confident [Ambitious] personality's internalized sense of self-importance, forceful [Dominant] people seem driven to prove their worthiness. They are characterized by an assertive, dominant, and tough-minded personal style. They tend to be strong-willed, ambitious, competitive, and self-determined. Feeling that the world is a harsh place where exploitiveness is needed to assure success, forceful [Dominant] individuals are frequently gruff and insensitive in dealing with others. In contrast to their preferred, outwardly powerful appearance, these individuals may feel inwardly insecure and be afraid of letting down their guard. In work settings, these personalities are often driven to excel. They work hard to achieve their goals, are competitive, and do well where they can take control or work independently. In supervisory or leadership positions, these persons usually take charge and see to it that a job gets done. (From Strack, 1997, p. 490, with minor modifications)

Millon's personality patterns have predictable, reliable, observable psychological indicators (expressive behavior, interpersonal conduct, cognitive style, mood/temperament, self-image, regulatory mechanisms, object representations, and morphologic organization). Millon's (1996) attribute domains accentuate the maladaptive range of the personality patterns in his taxonomy — in the case of the Dominant pattern, the aggressive pole of the asserting–controlling–aggressive continuum. The diagnostic features of the Dominant pattern with respect to each of Millon's eight attribute domains are summarized below, along with “normalized” (i.e., de-pathologized; cf. Millon & Davis, 2000, pp. 514–515) descriptions of the more adaptive variants of this pattern. Nonetheless, some of the designated traits may be less pronounced and more adaptive in the case of individuals for whom this pattern is less elevated.



**Expressive behavior.** The core diagnostic feature of the expressive acts of Dominant individuals is *assertiveness*; they are tough, strong-willed, outspoken, competitive, and unsentimental. More exaggerated variants of the Dominant pattern are characteristically *forceful*; they are controlling, contentious, and at times overbearing, their power-oriented tendencies being evident in occasional intransigence, stubbornness, and coercive behaviors. When they feel strongly about something, these individuals can be quite blunt, brusque, and impatient, with sudden, abrupt outbursts of an unwarranted or precipitous nature. The most extreme variants of this pattern are *aggressive*; they are intimidating, domineering, argumentative, and precipitously belligerent. They derive pleasure from humiliating others and can be quite malicious. For this reason, people often shy away from these personalities, sensing them to be cold, callous, and insensitive to the feelings of others. All variants of this pattern tend to view tender emotions as a sign of weakness, avoid expressions of warmth and intimacy, and are suspicious of gentility, compassion, and kindness. Many insist on being seen as faultless; however, they invariably are inflexible and dogmatic, rarely conceding on any issue, even in the face of evidence negating the validity of their position. They have a low frustration threshold and are especially sensitive to reproach or deprecation. When pushed on personal matters, they can become furious and are likely to respond reflexively and often vindictively, especially when feeling humiliated or belittled. Thus, they are easily provoked to attack, their first inclination being to dominate and demean their adversaries. (Millon, 1996, pp. 483, 487)

**Interpersonal conduct.** The core diagnostic feature of the interpersonal conduct of Dominant individuals is their *commanding* presence; they are powerful, authoritative, directive, and persuasive. More exaggerated variants of the Dominant pattern are characteristically *intimidating*; they tend to be abrasive, contentious, coercive, and combative, often dictate to others, and are willing and able to humiliate others to evoke compliance. Their strategy of assertion and dominance has an important instrumental purpose in interpersonal relations, as most people are intimidated by hostility, sarcasm, criticism, and threats. Thus, these personalities are adept at having their way by browbeating others into respect and submission. The most extreme variants of this pattern are *belligerent*; they reveal satisfaction in intimidating, coercing, and humiliating others. Individuals with all gradations of this pattern frequently find a successful niche for themselves in roles where hostile and belligerent behaviors are socially sanctioned or admired, thus providing an outlet for vengeful hostility cloaked in the guise of social responsibility. (Millon, 1996, p. 484; Millon & Everly, 1985, p. 32)

**Cognitive style.** The core diagnostic feature of the cognitive style of Dominant individuals is its *opinionated* nature; they are outspoken, emphatic, and adamant, holding strong beliefs that they vigorously defend. More exaggerated variants of the Dominant pattern tend to be *dogmatic*; they are inflexible and closed-minded, lacking objectivity and clinging obstinately to preconceived ideas, beliefs, and values. The most extreme variants of this pattern are narrow-mindedly *bigoted*; they are socially intolerant and inherently prejudiced, especially toward envied or derogated social groups. Some of these individuals have a crude, callous exterior and seem coarsely unperceptive. This notwithstanding, all variants of this pattern are finely attuned to the subtle elements of human interaction, keenly aware of the moods and feelings of others, and skilled at using others' foibles and sensitivities to manipulate them for their own purposes. The more extreme variants of this pattern, in particular, are quick to turn another's perceived

weaknesses to their own advantage — often in an intentionally callous manner — by upsetting the other’s equilibrium in their quest to dominate and control. (Millon, 1996, pp. 484–485)

**Mood/temperament.** The core diagnostic feature of the characteristic mood and temperament of Dominant individuals is *irritability*; they have an excitable temper that they may at times find difficult to control. More exaggerated variants of the Dominant pattern tend to be *cold* and unfriendly; they are disinclined to experience and express tender feelings, and have a volatile temper that readily flares into contentious argument and physical belligerence. The most extreme variants of this pattern evince pervasive *hostility* and anger; they are fractious, mean-spirited, and malicious, with callous disregard for the rights of others. Their volcanic temper seems perpetually primed to erupt, sometimes into physical belligerence. More than any other personality type, people with this extreme variant of the Dominant pattern are willing to do harm and persecute others if necessary to have their way. All variants of this pattern are prone to anger and to a greater or lesser extent deficient in the capacity to share warm or tender feelings, to experience genuine affection and love for another, or to empathize with the needs of others. (Millon, 1996, p. 486; Millon & Everly, 1985, p. 32)

**Self-image.** The core diagnostic feature of the self-image of Dominant individuals is that they view themselves as *assertive*; they perceive themselves as forthright, unsentimental, and bold. More exaggerated variants of the Dominant pattern recognize their fundamentally *competitive* nature; they are strong-willed, energetic, and commanding, and may take pride in describing themselves as tough and realistically hardheaded. More exaggerated variants of the Dominant pattern perceive themselves as *powerful*; they are combative, viewing themselves as self-reliant, unyielding, and strong — hard-boiled, perhaps, but unflinching, honest, and realistic. They seem proud to characterize themselves as competitive, vigorous, and militantly hardheaded, which is consistent of their “dog-eat-dog” view of the world. Though more extreme variants may enhance their sense of self by overvaluing aspects of themselves that present a pugnacious, domineering, and power-oriented image, it is rare for these personalities to acknowledge malicious or vindictive motives. Thus, hostile behavior on their part is typically framed in prosocial terms, which enhances their sense of self. (Millon, 1996, p. 485; Millon & Everly, 1985, p. 32)

**Regulatory mechanisms.** The core diagnostic feature of the regulatory (i.e., ego-defense) mechanisms of highly Dominant individuals is *isolation*; they are able to detach themselves emotionally from the impact of their aggressive acts upon others. In some situations — politics being a case in point — these personalities may have learned that there are times when it is best to restrain and transmute their more aggressive thoughts and feelings. Thus, they may soften and redirect their hostility, typically by employing the mechanisms of *rationalization*, *sublimation*, and *projection*, all of which lend themselves in some fashion to finding plausible and socially acceptable excuses for less than admirable impulses and actions. Thus, blunt directness may be rationalized as signifying frankness and honesty, a lack of hypocrisy, and a willingness to face issues head on. On the longer term, socially sanctioned resolution (i.e., sublimation) of hostile urges is seen in the competitive occupations to which these aggressive personalities gravitate. Finally, these personalities may preempt the disapproval they anticipate from others by projecting their hostility onto them, thereby justifying their aggressive actions as mere counteraction to unjust persecution. Individuals with extreme, malignant variations of this

pattern may engage in group scapegoating, viewing the objects of their violations impersonally as despised symbols of a devalued people, devoid of dignity and deserving degradation. (Millon, 1996, pp. 485–486)

**Object representations.** The core diagnostic feature of the internalized object representations of highly Dominant individuals is their *pernicious* nature. Characteristically, there is a marked paucity of tender and sentimental objects, and an underdevelopment of images that activate feelings of shame or guilt. For individuals with extreme, malignant variations of this pattern, the inner imprint of significant early experiences that serves as a substrate of dispositions (i.e., templates) for perceiving and reacting to current life events is composed of aggressive feelings and memories, and images comprising harsh relationships and malicious attitudes. Consequently, their life experience is recast to reflect the expectancy of hostility and the need to preempt it. These dynamics undergird a “jungle philosophy” of life where the only perceived recourse is to act in a bold, critical, assertive, and ruthless manner. Of particular relevance to politics is the harsh, antihumanistic disposition of the more extreme variants of these personalities. Some are adept at pointing out the hypocrisy and ineffectuality of so-called “do-gooders”; they rail against the devastating consequences of international appeasement. Others justify their toughness and cunning by pointing to the hostile and exploitative behavior of others; to them, the only way to survive in this world is to dominate and control. (Millon, 1996, p. 485)

**Morphologic organization.** The core diagnostic feature of the morphologic organization of highly Dominant individuals is its *eruptiveness*; powerful energies are so forceful that they periodically overwhelm these personalities’ otherwise adequate modulating controls, defense operations, and expressive channels, resulting in the harsh behavior commonly seen in these personalities. This tendency is exacerbated by the unrestrained expression of intense and explosive emotions stemming from early life experiences. Moreover, these personalities dread the thought of being vulnerable, of being deceived, and of being humiliated. Viewing people as basically ruthless, these personalities are driven to gain power over others, to dominate them and outmaneuver or outfox them at their own game. Personal feelings are regarded as a sign of weakness and dismissed as mere maudlin sentimentality. (Millon, 1996, p. 486)

### **Formulation: The Ambitious–Dominant Composite Pattern**

Predominantly Ambitious (narcissistic) individuals who also possess prominent Dominant (aggressive, or sadistic) features, have been termed *elitist narcissists* (Millon, 1996, pp. 412–413; Millon & Davis, 2000, pp. 279–280), a personality composite akin to (but broader than) psychoanalyst Wilhelm Reich’s (1933) “phallic-narcissistic” character. Given that Clinton’s elevations on the two scales in question are not in the dysfunctional range, she is neither a pathological narcissist nor does she have a sadistic personality. Rather, she displays a more adaptive, nonpathological variant of the syndrome. Millon (1996) does not offer a description of the adaptive variant of the narcissistic–sadistic personality composite, but a “de-pathologized” manifestation may be inferred from his description of the maladaptive version of the syndrome:

Reich (1949) captured the essential qualities of what we are terming the *elitist narcissist* when he described the “phallic-narcissist” character as a self-assured, arrogant, and energetic person “often impressive in his bearing” and “ill-suited to subordinate positions among the rank and file.” As with the compensatory narcissist, elitist narcissists are more taken with their inflated self-image

than with their actual self. Both narcissistic types create a false façade that bears minimal resemblance to the person they really are. Compensatory narcissists, however, know at some level that they are a fraud in fact, and that they put forth an appearance different from the way they are. By contrast, elitist narcissists, perhaps the purest variant of the narcissistic style, are deeply convinced of their superior self-image although it is grounded on few realistic achievements. To elitists, the appearance of things is perceived as objective reality; their inflated self-image is their intrinsic substance. Only when these illusory elements to their self-worth are seriously undermined will they be able to recognize, perhaps even to acknowledge, their deeper shortcomings.

As a consequence of their sublime self-confidence, elitists feel quite secure in their apparent superiority. They achieve this in part by capturing the attentions of others and making them take note of the supposed extraordinary qualities. Most everything these narcissists do is intended to persuade others of their specialness, rather than to put their efforts into acquiring genuine qualifications and attainments. They feel privileged and empowered by virtue of whatever class status and pseudo-achievements they may have attained. Most are upwardly mobile, seeking to cultivate their sense of specialness and personal advantage by associating with those who may possess genuine achievements and recognition. Many elitists will create comparisons between themselves and others, turning personal relationships into public competitions and contests. Unrivaled in the pursuit of becoming “number one,” the grounds for this goal are not determined by genuine accomplishments, but by the degree to which they can convince others of its reality, false though its substance may be.

As just described, many narcissistic elitists are social climbers who seek to cultivate their image and social luster by virtue of those with whom they are affiliated. To them, it is not the old chestnut of “guilt by association,” but rather that of “status by association.” Idolizing public recognition, narcissists of this type get caught in the game of one-upmanship, which they strive vigorously to win, at least comparatively. Status and self-promotion are all that matter to narcissistic elitists. To be celebrated, even famous, is what drives them, rather than to achieve substantive accomplishments. In whatever sphere of activity matters to them, they invest their efforts to advertise themselves, to brag about achievements, substantive or fraudulent, to make anything they have done appear to be “wonderful,” better than what others may have done, and better than it may actually be.

By making excessive claims about themselves, these narcissists expose a great divide between their actual selves and their self-presentations. In contrast to many narcissists who recognize this disparity, elitists are convinced and absolute in their belief in self. Rather than backing off, withdrawing, or feeling shame when slighted or responded to with indifference, elitist narcissists speed up their efforts all the more, acting increasingly and somewhat erratically to exhibit deeds and awards worthy of high esteem. They may present grandiose illusions about their powers and future status; they may puff up their limited accomplishments; they may seek competitively to outdo those who have achieved in reality. (pp. 412–413)

Following is a more concise portrait of pathological elitist narcissism, adapted from Millon and Davis (2000, pp. 279–280):

Elitist narcissists are self-assured, energetic, have a grand, imposing (even majestic) bearing, tend to be arrogant, and are poorly suited to subordinate positions. They have a truly superior self-image, which is *not merely a false façade of superiority serving to compensate for deep feelings of inferiority* (as in the case of the compensatory narcissistic–avoidant personality composite). Unlike compensatory narcissists, who fear being inadequate, elitist narcissists fear being ordinary. As Reich noted, the cardinal trait of this narcissistic variant is aggressive courage. Not surprisingly then, elitist narcissism is prevalent among top military leaders, star athletes, famed lawyers, eminent surgeons, highly successful entrepreneurs, and powerful

politicians. In extreme cases, these individuals fancy themselves as demigods who stand apart from ordinary human beings, vying for victory on the world stage with but a handful of worthy competitors. Napoleon and Mussolini provide real-world historical examples. Beneath a veneer of idealistic concern, many elitist narcissists hold common people in utter contempt — a tendency that increases proportionately with concurrent dominant (sadistic) traits. Whereas elitist narcissists revel in displays of power, the exhibitionism of self-assertion may also be focused on intellectual ability or the privilege of accumulated wealth; aggressive courage expresses itself in many ways. Such individuals attend the most prestigious schools and academies, join exclusive fraternities, and preferentially associate only with members of their own social class. Elitist narcissists flaunt symbols of their personal status and achievement. Most covet recognition and engage vigorously in self-promotion. They advertise themselves, boast about their achievements (whether substantive or fraudulent), puff up their accomplishments, and make everything they have done seem extraordinary and impressive. By making impressive claims about themselves, most elitist narcissists expose a great divide between their actual selves and their public self-presentation; indeed, they may harbor grandiose illusions about their future power and status.

It should be reiterated, however, that Clinton’s elevations on the Ambitious and Dominant scales do not rise to pathological levels, which suggests a much attenuated, generally adaptive variant of the syndrome described by Millon and Davis.

### Scale 6: The Conscientious Pattern

The Conscientious pattern, as do all personality patterns, occurs on a continuum ranging from normal to maladaptive. At the well-adjusted pole are earnest, polite, *respectful* personalities.<sup>11</sup> Exaggerated Conscientious features occur in *dutiful*, dependable, and principled but rigid personalities.<sup>12</sup> In its most deeply ingrained, inflexible form, the Conscientious pattern displays itself in a moralistic, self-righteous, uncompromising, cognitively constricted, *compulsive* behavior pattern that may be consistent with a clinical diagnosis of obsessive-compulsive personality disorder.<sup>13</sup>

Normal, adaptive variants of the Conscientious pattern (i.e., respectful and dutiful types) correspond to Oldham and Morris’s (1995) *Conscientious* style, Millon’s (1994) *Conforming* pattern, Strack’s (1997) *respectful* style, and the *responsible* segment of Leary’s (1957) *responsible–hypernormal* interpersonal continuum. Millon’s Conforming pattern is correlated with the five-factor model’s *Conscientiousness* factor, has a modest positive correlation with its *Extraversion* factor, a modest negative correlation with its *Neuroticism* factor (signifying emotional stability), and is uncorrelated with its *Agreeableness* and *Openness to Experience* factors (see Millon, 1994, p. 82). Adaptive variants of the Conscientious pattern have “a well-disciplined and organized lifestyle that enables individuals to function efficiently and successfully in most of their endeavors,” in contrast to “the driven, tense, and rigid adherence to

---

<sup>11</sup> Relevant to Hillary Clinton.

<sup>12</sup> Relevant to Hillary Clinton.

<sup>13</sup> Not applicable to Hillary Clinton.

external demands and to a perfectionism that typifies the disordered [compulsive] state.” They “demonstrate an unusual degree of integrity, adhering as firmly as they can to society’s ethics and morals” (Millon, 1996, pp. 518–519).

As stated by Oldham and Morris (1995):

Conscientious-style people ... [have] strong moral principle[s] and absolute certainty, and they won’t rest until the job is done and done right. They are loyal to their families, their causes, and their superiors. Hard work is a hallmark of this personality style; Conscientious types *achieve*. ... Conscientious traits ... [include] hard work, prudence, [and] conventionality. (p. 62)

Millon (1994) summarizes the Conscientious pattern (which he labels *Conforming*) as follows:

[Conscientious individuals possess] traits not unlike Leary’s [1957] responsible–hypernormal personality, with its ideal of proper, conventional, orderly, and perfectionistic behavior, as well as bearing a similarity to Factor III of the Big-Five, termed Conscientiousness. Conformers are notably respectful of tradition and authority, and act in a reasonable, proper, and conscientious way. They do their best to uphold conventional rules and standards, following given regulations closely, and tend to be judgmental of those who do not. Well-organized and reliable, prudent and restrained, they may appear to be overly self-controlled, formal and inflexible in their relationships, intolerant of deviance, and unbending in their adherence to social proprieties. Diligent about their responsibilities, they dislike having their work pile up, worry about finishing things, and come across to others as highly dependable and industrious. (p. 33)

Strack (1997) provides the following portrait of the normal (*respectful*) prototype of the Conscientious pattern, based on Millon’s theory, empirical findings from studies correlating his Personality Adjective Check List (PACL; 1991) scales with other measures, and clinical experience with the instrument:

Responsible, industrious, and respectful of authority, these individuals tend to be conforming and work hard to uphold rules and regulations. They have a need for order and are typically conventional in their interests. These individuals can be rule abiding to a fault, however, and may be perfectionistic, inflexible, and judgmental. A formal interpersonal style and notable constriction of affect can make some respectful [Conscientious] persons seem cold, aloof, and withholding. Underneath their social propriety there is often a fear of disapproval and rejection, or a sense of guilt over perceived shortcomings. Indecisiveness and an inability to take charge may be evident in some of these persons due to a fear of being wrong. However, among co-workers and friends, respectful [Conscientious] personalities are best known for being well organized, reliable, and diligent. They have a strong sense of duty and loyalty, are cooperative in group efforts, show persistence even in difficult circumstances, and work well under supervision. (From Strack, 1997, p. 490, with minor modifications)

Being principled, scrupulous, and meticulous, conscientious individuals “tend to follow standards from which they hesitate to deviate, attempt to act in an objective and rational manner, and decide matters in terms of what they believe is right.” They are often religious, and maintaining their integrity “ranks high among their goals” while “voicing moral values gives them a deep sense of satisfaction.” The major limitations of this personality style are (a) its “superrationality,” leading to a “devaluation of emotion [which] tends to preclude relativistic judgments and subjective preferences”; and (b) a predilection for “seeing complex matters in black and white, good and bad, or right or wrong terms” (Millon, 1996, p. 519).

Millon's personality patterns have predictable, reliable, observable psychological indicators (expressive behavior, interpersonal conduct, cognitive style, mood/temperament, self-image, regulatory mechanisms, object-representations, and morphologic organization). Millon's (1996) attribute domains accentuate the maladaptive range of the personality patterns in his taxonomy — in the case of the Conscientious pattern, the compulsive pole of the respectful–dutiful–compulsive continuum. The major diagnostic features of the prototypal maladaptive variant of the Conscientious pattern are summarized below, along with “normalized” (i.e., de-pathologized; cf. Millon & Davis, 2000, pp. 174–176) descriptions of the more adaptive variants of this pattern.

**Expressive behavior.** The core diagnostic feature of the expressive acts of Conscientious individuals is a sense of *duty*; they do their best to uphold conventional rules and standards, follow regulations closely, and are typically responsible, reliable, proper, prudent, punctual, self-disciplined, well organized, and restrained. They are meticulous in fulfilling obligations, their conduct is generally beyond reproach, and they typically demonstrate an uncommon degree of integrity. More exaggerated variants of the Conscientious pattern tend to be *rigid*; they are typically overcontrolled, orderly, and perfectionistic. Though highly dependable and industrious, they have an air of austerity and serious-mindedness and may be stubborn, stingy, and possessive. They are typically scrupulous in matters of morality and ethics, but may strike others as prudish, moralistic, and condescending. They exhibit a certain postural tightness; their movements may be deliberate and dignified and they display a tendency to speak precisely, with clear diction and well-phrased sentences. Emotions are constrained by a regulated, highly structured, and carefully organized lifestyle. Clothing is characteristically formal or proper, and restrained in color and style. (Millon, 1996, pp. 513–515)

**Interpersonal conduct.** The core diagnostic feature of the interpersonal conduct of Conscientious individuals is *politeness*; they are courteous, proper, and dignified. They strongly adhere to social conventions and proprieties and show a preference for polite, formal, and “correct” personal relationships. With their strong sense of duty, they feel that they must not let others down or engage in behaviors that might provoke their displeasure. They are loyal to their families, their causes, and their superiors. More exaggerated variants of the Conscientious pattern are *exacting*; they are scrupulous in matters of morality and ethics and unbending in their relations with subordinates, insisting that they adhere to personally established rules and methods. In marked contrast, they treat superiors with deference, are obsequious, and may ingratiate themselves, striving to impress authorities with their loyalty, efficiency, and serious-mindedness. (Millon, 1996, pp. 514–515, 516; Millon & Everly, 1985, p. 33)

**Cognitive style.** The core diagnostic feature of the cognitive style of Conscientious individuals is *circumspection*; they are cautious, prudent, deliberate, systematic, and attentive to detail. Wary of new or untested ideas, they are risk avoidant. More exaggerated variants of the Conscientious pattern are *unimaginative*; they are methodical, structured, pedestrian, uninspired, or routinized. Perfectionism may interfere with decision making and task completion, and they may have difficulty dealing with new ideas. All variants of this pattern are concerned with matters of propriety and efficiency and tend to be rigid about regulations and procedures — though, ironically, all too often getting mired in minor or irrelevant details. They judge others by “objective” standards and time-proven rules of an orderly society and are inclined to disdain

frivolity and public displays of emotion, which they view as irresponsible or immature. Though industrious, tidy, meticulous, practical, realistic, and diligent, their thinking may be deficient in flexibility, creativity, and imagination, and lacking in vision. (Millon, 1996, pp. 515–516; Millon & Everly, 1985, p. 33)

**Mood/temperament.** The core diagnostic feature of the characteristic mood and temperament of Conscientious individuals is *restraint*; they are serious, reasonable, and rarely display strong emotions. More exaggerated variants of the Conscientious pattern are characteristically *solemn*; they are emotionally controlled, tense, or unrelaxed. Because of their dignified, serious-minded, solemn demeanor, all variants of the Conscientious pattern may at times be viewed as grim and cheerless. This, however, is due to disdain for frivolity rather than humorlessness per se; thus, although these individuals often come across as reserved, even stiff, “wooden,” or “heavy,” they may exhibit a dry, self-effacing sense of humor. Few, however, have a lively or ebullient manner; most are rigidly controlled and tight, and their failure to release pent-up energies may predispose them to psychophysiological disorders. (Millon, 1996, p. 518; Millon & Everly, 1985, p. 33)

**Self-image.** The core diagnostic feature of the self-perception of Conscientious individuals is *reliability*; they view themselves as dependable, disciplined, responsible, industrious, efficient, and trustworthy. More exaggerated variants of the Conscientious pattern accurately perceive themselves as highly *conscientious*, even to a fault; they view themselves as scrupulous, meticulous in fulfilling obligations, and loyal, despite often being viewed by others as high minded, overperfectionistic, and fastidious. All variants of the Conscientious pattern value aspects of themselves that exhibit virtue, moral rectitude, self-discipline, prudence, and loyalty, and are wary of error or misjudgment. Given their strong sense of duty and their view of themselves as reliable, conscientious, or righteous, these individuals are particularly sensitive to charges of impropriety, which may be devastating to their sense of self. (Millon, 1996, p. 516)

**Regulatory mechanisms.** The core diagnostic feature of the unconscious regulatory (i.e., ego-defense) mechanisms of highly Conscientious individuals is *reaction formation*; they display reasonableness when faced with circumstances that would typically be expected to evoke irritation, anger, or dismay and may engage in public displays of socially commendable actions that may be diametrically opposed to their deeper impulses. (Millon, 1996, pp. 516–517)

**Object representations.** The core diagnostic feature of the internalized object representations of highly Conscientious individuals is *concealment*; there is a tendency for only those internalized representations that are socially acceptable, with their corresponding inner affects, memories, and attitudes, to be permitted into conscious awareness or to be expressed. Thus, personal difficulties and social conflicts anchored to past experiences are defensively denied, kept from conscious awareness, and maintained under the most stringent of controls. These individuals devalue self-exploration, claiming that it is antithetical to efficient behavior and that introspection only intrudes on rational thinking and self-control. Consequently, highly Conscientious persons often have limited insight into their deeper motives and feelings. (Millon, 1996, p. 516)



**Morphologic organization.** The core diagnostic feature of the morphological organization of highly Conscientious individuals is *compartmentalization*; to keep contrary feelings and impulses from affecting one another, and to hold ambivalent images and contradictory attitudes from spilling forth into conscious awareness, the organization of their inner world tends to be compartmentalized in a tightly consolidated system that is clearly partitioned into numerous, distinct, and segregated constellations of drive, memory, and cognition, with few open channels to permit interplay among these components. Thus, a deliberate and well-poised surface quality may belie an inner turmoil. To prevent upsetting the balance they have so carefully wrought throughout their lives, highly Conscientious individuals strive to avoid risk and to operate with complete certainty. Their toughest challenge, however, is to control their emotions, which they do by extensive use of intrapsychic defenses. Because they typically have a family history of exposure to demanding, perfectionistic parents, a potent force behind their tightly structured world is their fear of disapproval. By the same token, their public facade of conformity and propriety may mask an undercurrent of repressed urges toward self-assertion and defiance. (Millon, 1996, pp. 517–518)

### **Formulation: The Dominant–Conscientious Composite Pattern**

Predominantly Dominant (aggressive, or sadistic) individuals who also possess prominent Conscientious (compulsive) features may be characterized as *hostile enforcers* (following Millon, 1996, pp. 490–491; Millon & Davis, 2000, p. 517, whose characterization of the “enforcing sadist” provides the basis for the following adaptation). Given that Clinton’s elevations on the two scales in question are not in the dysfunctional range, she is neither sadistic nor compulsive. Rather, she may display a more adaptive, nonpathological variant of the syndrome. Millon (1996) does not offer a description of the adaptive variant of the sadistic–compulsive personality composite, but a “de-pathologized” manifestation may be inferred from his description of the more maladaptive version of the syndrome:

Hostile enforcers are characterized by deep-seated hostility, permeated by a moralistic conscience. A stickler for rules and propriety, they are unrestrained in discharging their hostile impulses against the weak, the powerless, and the contemptible — ostensibly in the public interest. Not only do they act as though they have a monopoly on divining right and wrong; these personalities also believe they have a right and the obligation to control and punish violators, and that they are uniquely qualified to determine how punishment should be meted out.

Although hostile enforcers operate under the guise of socially endorsed roles to serve the public interest, the deeper motives that spur the aggressive enforcing actions of leaders with this personality style are of questionable legitimacy, given the extraordinary force with which they mete out their condemnation and punishment. In the realm of public service, the trademark characteristic of hostile enforcers is first to search out rule-breakers and perpetrators of incidental infractions that fall within the purview of their socially sanctioned role, and then to exercise their legitimate powers to the fullest extent.

The *modus operandi* of the hostile enforcer invariably provokes opposition and resistance, which in turn incites and perpetuates ever-stronger countermeasures against real and perceived enemies. Their resulting “bunker mentality” may mimic a paranoid orientation, but more likely is

simply a manifestation of hardball politics in the service of an obdurate, relentless, uncompromising, no-holds-barred striving to preserve and consolidate personal power and control.

In public life the fatal flaw of this personality type is that, in carrying out their duties, they cannot restrain the emotions that drive their vindictively hostile behaviors. Ultimately, dominating everything and everyone becomes their goal, at the expense of exercising their responsibilities in a fair and balanced manner. The essence of this personality pattern in its most extreme form is vividly captured in the following sketch by Millon (1996), who employs the label *enforcing sadist* for the maladaptive variant of the Dominant–Conscientious personality composite:

Some of these personalities swagger about as prideful enforcers of the law; the more they dominate and discharge their venom, the more pridefully they swagger, and the more they feel righteously empowered. The more they discharge their hostility and exercise their wills, the more they display their dominance and feed their sadistic urges, the more they feel justified in venting their anger. Power has gone to their heads. Many begin to dehumanize their victims, further enlarging the sphere and intensity of their aggressive destructiveness. ... Beneath their ostensible good intentions may lie a growing deceptive viciousness, a malicious inclination that eventually produces the very destructiveness they have been authorized to control. (pp. 490–491)

Millon and Davis (2000) describe the enforcing sadist as follows:

Every society charges certain agents with the power to enforce its rules to protect the common good. At their best, such individuals recognize the weight of their mission and balance social and individual needs, consider extenuating circumstances, and dispassionately judge intentions and effects before rendering a final verdict. In contrast, the enforcing sadist is society's sadistic superego, vested in punishment for its own sake, unable to be appeased. Military sergeants, certain cops, university deans, and the harsh judge all feel that they have the right to control and punish others. Cloaked within socially sanctioned roles, they mete out condemnation in the name of justice with such extraordinary force that their deeper motives are clear. Ever seeking to make themselves seem important, these sticklers for rules search out those guilty of some minor trespass, make them cower before the power of their position, and then punish them with a righteous indignation that reeks of repressed anger and personal malice. Despite their responsibility to be fair and balanced, such individuals are unable to put limits on the emotions that drive their vicious behaviors. Though not as troublesome, many minor bureaucrats also possess such traits. The enforcing sadist represents a combination of the sadistic and compulsive personalities. (p. 517)

The label *enforcing sadist* — or even its nonpathological *hostile enforcer* variant — should be used with circumspection. It is not an apt characterization for leaders with moderately elevated Dominant and Conscientious scales. In less pronounced cases, consistent with the principle of syndromal continuity (see Immelman, 2005), the above description at best serves as an informative caricature for contextualizing the “true believer” ideological zeal typically found in these personality composites. Nonetheless, Clinton's Scale 1A (Dominant) and Scale 6 (Conscientious) elevations are relatively high compared with other candidates in U.S. presidential elections since 1996, closely approximating the scale elevations of former New York mayor Rudy Giuliani (Immelman, 2007).

## Scale 8: The Retiring Pattern

The Retiring pattern, as do all personality patterns, occurs on a continuum ranging from normal to maladaptive. At the well-adjusted pole are self-contained, unsociable, *reserved* personalities.<sup>14</sup> Exaggerated Retiring features occur in stolid, unobtrusive, *aloof* personalities.<sup>15</sup> In its most deeply ingrained, inflexible form, the Retiring pattern displays itself in unanimated, asocial, *solitary* behavior patterns that may be consistent with a clinical diagnosis of schizoid personality disorder.<sup>16</sup>

Normal, adaptive variants of the Retiring pattern (i.e., reserved and aloof types), characterized by low levels of sociability and companionability (Millon, 1994, p. 31), correspond to Oldham and Morris's (1995) *Solitary* style, Strack's (1997) *introversive* style, and Millon's (1994) *Retiring* pattern. Millon's Retiring pattern is negatively correlated with the five-factor model's *Extraversion* factor, positively correlated with its *Neuroticism* factor, has modest negative correlations with its *Openness to Experience* and *Agreeableness* factors, and is uncorrelated with its *Conscientiousness* factor (see Millon, 1994, p. 82).

According to Oldham and Morris (1995), these "solitary-style" individuals are self-contained people without a need for external guidance, admiration, or emotional sustenance. They feel no need to share their experiences and draw their greatest strength and comfort from within. According to Oldham and Morris (1995),

Solitary men and women need no one but themselves. They are unmoved by the madding crowd, liberated from the drive to impress and to please. Solitary people are remarkably free of the emotions and involvements that distract so many others. What they may give up in terms of sentiment and intimacy, however, they may gain in clarity of vision. (p. 275)

Millon (1994) summarizes the Retiring pattern as follows:

[Retiring individuals] evince few social or group interests. ... Their needs to give and receive affection and to show feelings tend to be minimal. They are inclined to have few relationships and interpersonal involvements, and do not develop strong ties to other people. They may be seen by others as calm, placid, untroubled, easygoing, and possibly indifferent. Rarely expressing their inner feelings or thoughts to others, they seem most comfortable when left alone. They tend to work in a slow, quiet, and methodical manner, almost always remaining in the background in an undemanding and unobtrusive way. Comfortable working by themselves, they are not easily distracted or bothered by what goes on around them. Being somewhat deficient in the ability to recognize the needs or feelings of others, they may be seen as socially awkward, if not insensitive, as well as lacking in spontaneity and vitality. (p. 31)

Strack (1997) provides the following portrait of the normal (*introversive*) prototype of the Retiring pattern, based on Millon's theory, empirical findings from studies correlating his

---

<sup>14</sup> Relevant to Hillary Clinton.

<sup>15</sup> Not applicable to Hillary Clinton.

<sup>16</sup> Not applicable to Hillary Clinton.

Personality Adjective Check List (PACL; 1991) scales with other measures, and clinical experience with the instrument:

Aloof, introverted, and solitary, these persons usually prefer distant or limited involvement with others and have little interest in social activities, which they find unrewarding. Appearing to others as complacent and untroubled, they are often judged to be easy-going, mild-mannered, quiet, and retiring. They frequently remain in the background of social life and work quietly and unobtrusively at a job. At school or in the workplace these people do well on their own, are typically dependable and reliable, are undemanding, and are seldom bothered by noise or commotion around them. They are often viewed as levelheaded and calm. However, these individuals may appear unaware of, or insensitive to, the feelings and thoughts of others. These characteristics are sometimes interpreted by others as signs of indifference or rejection, but reveal a sincere difficulty in being able to sense others' moods and needs. Introversive [Retiring] persons can be slow and methodical in demeanor, lack spontaneity and resonance, and be awkward or timid in social or group situations. They frequently view themselves as being simple and unsophisticated, and are usually modest in appraising their own skills and abilities. At the same time, their placid demeanor and ability to weather ups and downs without being ruffled are traits frequently prized by friends, family members, and co-workers. (From Strack, 1997, p. 488, with minor modifications)

Millon's personality patterns have predictable, reliable observable psychological indicators (expressive behavior, interpersonal conduct, cognitive style, mood/temperament, self-image, regulatory mechanisms, object-representations, and morphologic organization). Millon's (1996) attribute domains accentuate the maladaptive range of the personality patterns in his taxonomy — in the case of the Retiring pattern, the solitary pole of the reserved–aloof–solitary continuum. The major diagnostic features of the prototypal maladaptive variant of the Retiring pattern are summarized below, along with “normalized” (i.e., de-pathologized; cf. Millon & Davis, 2000, pp. 313–315) descriptions of the more adaptive variants of this pattern. Because of the intense social and interpersonal demands of political office, it is hypothesized that high-level leadership emergence is severely restricted for more extreme variants of the Retiring pattern.

**Expressive behavior.** The core diagnostic feature of the expressive acts of Retiring individuals is their *reserved* nature; they are private, unsociable, introverted, undemonstrative, and undiplomatic. More exaggerated variants of the Retiring pattern are characteristically *solitary*; they seem indifferent, express a preference for being alone, and are phlegmatic, stolid, colorless, or bland, and deficient in expressiveness and spontaneity. The most extreme variants of the Retiring pattern are *impassive*; they are stoical and detached, with a strong preference for being alone. They are deficient in activation, motoric expressiveness, and spontaneity and are seemingly apathetic and unmoved, with an unexcited, lifeless quality, lacking in apparent energy and vitality. Their physical movement may be languid, lumbering, or lacking in rhythm, and their speech slow, monotonous, and deficient in affective expressiveness. They rarely “perk up” or respond animatedly to the feelings of others, which may be wrongly perceived as a lack of kindness or compassion. Being underresponsive to stimulation, they are neither quickly provoked to anger nor easily humored, and rarely report feelings of anger or anxiety, sadness or joy. They are often perceived as passive and lacking in enthusiasm, initiative, or vigor, and others may experience them as boring, unanimated, and wooden, if not robotic. Leisure-time preferences tend toward mental activities such as reading or television watching, or low energy-expenditure physical activities such as sketching, playing electronic games, or Internet surfing. (Millon, 1996, pp. 230–231)

**Interpersonal conduct.** The core diagnostic feature of the interpersonal conduct of Retiring individuals is *unobtrusiveness*; they are private, self-contained, prefer solitary activities, and often fade into the background or go unnoticed. More exaggerated variants of the Retiring pattern are socially *disengaged*; they are aloof and indifferent to others, neither desiring nor enjoying close relationships, and are socially remote and interpersonally detached. The most extreme variants of the Retiring pattern are *asocial*; they are reclusive and unresponsive to the emotions and behaviors of others, exhibiting minimal interest in the lives of others. All variants of the Retiring pattern, where possible, avoid social activities or leadership roles. In mandatory (e.g., occupational) settings, their social communications are expressed in a perfunctory, formal, or impersonal manner. Their primary social motive is to remain interpersonally unattached, but this is a preferred, comfortable state rather than a driving need. When pushed beyond their limits or comfort zone in interpersonal relations, they tend to retreat or withdraw into themselves. (Millon, 1996, p. 231; Millon & Everly, 1985, p. 33)

**Cognitive style.** The core diagnostic feature of the cognitive style of Retiring individuals is *vagueness*; their thoughts are often fuzzy or unclear and communication with others tends to be digressive or unfocused. More exaggerated variants of the Retiring pattern display considerable *impoverishment*; their ideas tend to be sparse, meager, or infertile and their thought processes obscure. Their communication often loses its purpose or intention, particularly in the social and personal spheres — a tendency that does not necessarily hold true for the intellectual domain. The most extreme variants of the Retiring pattern are cognitively *barren*; they are inarticulate or incomprehensible and deficient across broad spheres of knowledge to a degree that is incompatible with their intellectual level. Their communication is easily derailed, conveyed in a convoluted, complex, or rambling fashion, and complicated by circuitous logic or loss of thought sequence. All variants of the Retiring pattern have a diminished capacity to convey articulate or relevant ideas in the realm of interpersonal phenomena. They may grasp grammatical, mathematical, or technical symbols with infallible precision yet falter in their comprehension of nonverbal communication, including facial expressions, gestures, and voice timbre — those affect-laden metacommunicative qualities that suffuse the formal structure of communication. A related cognitive trait is their difficulty in attending to, selecting, and regulating perceptions of the socioemotional environment, which may at times result in inaccurate person perception and imbue their interactions with a socially “tone-deaf” quality. (Millon, 1996, pp. 231–232; Millon & Everly, 1985, p. 33)

**Mood/temperament.** The core diagnostic feature of the characteristic mood and temperament of Retiring individuals is *unexcitability*; they are unemotional and dispassionate, disinclined to express strong feelings and seem mildly agreeable yet somewhat bland. More exaggerated variants of the Retiring pattern are emotionally *flat*; they are temperamentally impassive, gloomy, or apathetic, rarely display warm or intense feelings, and seem unable to experience most affects — pleasure, sadness, or anger — in any depth. The most extreme variants of the Retiring pattern are affectively *bleak*; they are emotionally inert, numb, and affectless, exhibiting an intrinsic unfeeling, cold, stark quality. All variants of the Retiring pattern display a deficit in the range and subtlety of emotionally relevant words. Furthermore, they experience only mild or meager affective and erotic needs. (Millon, 1996, pp. 232–233; Millon & Everly, 1985, p. 33)

**Self-image.** The core diagnostic feature of the self-perception of Retiring individuals is its *dispassionate* quality; they are placid and view themselves as uninvolved and unaffected. More exaggerated variants of the Retiring pattern are *complacent*; though recognizing themselves as somewhat unfeeling and socially unresponsive or insular, they view themselves as content and satisfied. They are little affected by others, and respond minimally to either praise or criticism. Their limited interest in the lives of others, in the interpersonal domain, is mirrored in the self-domain by low levels of self-awareness or introspection. Reluctant to engage in self-descriptions, they may be vague or superficial; if pressed they may describe themselves as ordinary, reflective, uninteresting, or introverted. The most extreme variants of the Retiring pattern are affectively *impervious*; they reveal minimal introspection and awareness of self, seem unconcerned by the emotional and personal implications of everyday social life, and are unresponsive or indifferent to praise or criticism. The apparent lack of candor in self-analysis displayed by most manifestations of the Retiring pattern is not indicative of elusiveness or protective denial, but merely reflects an inherent deficit in pondering social and emotional processes. When adequately formulated and accurately articulated, these personalities will perceive and report themselves as being socially reserved and emotionally distant, somewhat lacking in empathy. It is noteworthy that with regard to campaigning for high-level elective office, the social indifference of Retiring personalities tends to elicit a reciprocal reaction in voters, which is likely to be reflected in relatively unenthusiastic public support. (Millon, 1996, p. 232; Millon & Everly, 1985, p. 33)

**Regulatory mechanisms.** The core diagnostic feature of the unconscious regulatory (i.e., ego-defense) mechanisms of highly Retiring individuals is *intellectualization*. They describe the interpersonal and affective character of their social and emotional experiences and memories in a somewhat impersonal and mechanical manner. They tend to be abstract and perfunctory about their emotional and social lives, and when they do formulate a characterization, they pay primary attention to the more objective and formal aspects of their experiences rather than to the personal and emotional significance of these events. They engage in few complicated unconscious processes; being relatively untroubled by intense emotions, all but insensitive to interpersonal relationships, and difficult to arouse and activate, they have little reason to devise complicated intrapsychic defenses and strategies. (Millon, 1996, p. 232)

**Object representations.** The core diagnostic feature of the internalized object representations of highly Retiring individuals is their *meagerness*; the inner imprints of significant early experiences that serve as a substrate of dispositions (i.e., templates) for perceiving and reacting to current life events appear to be few in number and diffusely articulated. Low in arousal and emotional reactivity, as well as relatively imperceptive with regard to ongoing events (particularly in the social sphere), the inner life of these individuals remains largely homogeneous, undifferentiated, and unarticulated. Because Retiring personalities have less of the natural variety of experiences and dynamic interplay among drives, impulses, and conflicts that compose the minds of most people, they are less able to change and evolve as a consequence of their intrapsychic interactions. (Millon, 1996, p. 232)

**Morphologic organization.** The core diagnostic feature of the morphological organization of highly Retiring individuals is its *lack of differentiation*. The structural composition of their intrapsychic world is more diffuse and less dynamically active than that of most personality patterns. Relative to other personalities, they have minimal drives to fulfill their needs. The most

extreme variants of the Retiring pattern demonstrate an inner barrenness, a feeble drive to fulfill needs, and minimal pressure either to defend against or resolve inner conflicts or to deal with external demands. (Millon, 1996, p. 232)

### **Scale 9: The Distrusting Pattern**

Hillary Clinton's elevation on the Distrusting scale is unusually high relative to other U.S. presidential candidates studied since 1996. However, it should be noted that Clinton's Scale 9 elevation is only modestly elevated, below the threshold for significant personality disturbance. Nonetheless, Clinton's scale elevation may be indicative of an above average level of suspiciousness and secretiveness for a presidential candidate.

Oldham and Morris (1995) offer the following portrait of the Vigilant (i.e., Distrustful) style:

Nothing escapes the notice of ... [people who have a] Vigilant [Distrustful] personality style. These individuals possess an exceptional awareness of their environment. ... Their sensory antennae, continuously scanning the people and situations around them, alert them immediately to what is awry, out of place, dissonant, or dangerous, especially in their dealings with other people. Vigilant [Distrustful] types have a special kind of hearing. They are immediately aware of mixed messages, the hidden motivations, the evasions, and the subtlest distortions of the truth that elude or delude less gifted observers. With such a focus, Vigilant [Distrustful] individuals naturally assume the roles of social critic, watchdog, ombudsman, and crusader in their private or our public domain, ready to spring upon the improprieties — especially the abuses of power — that poison human affairs. (p. 157)

Oldham and Morris's reference to the "crusader role" is of particular interest, as those traits can be potentiated or exacerbated by simultaneous scale elevations on the Conscientious and Dominant patterns (as in the case of Hillary Clinton), resulting in an orientation that Millon and Davis (2000) call the "puritanical compulsive" — self-righteous, judgmental, dogmatic, uncompromising individuals with a grim and prudish morality (pp. 177; 178–179).

### **Hillary Clinton's Leadership Prospects**

The present study offers an empirically based framework for anticipating Hillary Clinton's performance as chief executive. It seems difficult to reconcile Clinton's personality profile with her "it takes a village" (1996) persona. Part of the problem may be that character can be difficult to discern beneath a polished political persona. In one sense, Clinton has learned to soften her public self-presentation; as Bruck (1994) puts it, what others have viewed as the "hard edges" of her nature (p. 66). But more important, clear perception of Clinton's character can be easily confounded by her embrace of humanitarian political issues as a vehicle for political expression. Had she remained a Goldwater Republican and subscribed to the agenda of, say, a Margaret Thatcher, the character traits that drive her political ambitions might well have been more transparent. The point is that character largely remains a constant, even as ideological values evolve under the press of political socialization.

Gail Sheehy (1999), in particular, has commented on Hillary Clinton's apparent lack of empathy. She writes:

On August 13, [1998] Bill and Hillary had the dour duty of comforting bereaved families at a memorial ceremony honoring the return of the coffins of Americans killed in the African embassy bombings. Normally, at such emotional events, the First Couple holds hands. But that Thursday [in the wake of the Lewinsky scandal] they stood apart on the rain-soaked tarmac of Andrews Air Force Base and “she seemed as cold as a fish to him,” observed a former White House staffer. A tear leaked onto Bill Clinton’s cheek, and he let it sit there as the cameras rolled. Hillary was stiff as a wooden soldier. (p. 309)

In similar vein, Sheehy (1999) describes how, during Bill Clinton’s 1992 presidential campaign while traveling with Hillary for several days on the campaign trail, she watched Hillary respond to Gennifer Flowers’s allegations about an extramarital affair with Gov. Clinton. As she watched Flowers on television playing tapes of her telephone conversations with the governor, “Hillary’s eyes took this in with the glittering blink of a lizard. Not a tremor of emotion crossed her face” (p. 12). Sheehy recounts how, later on a flight to South Dakota, she “listened as Hillary rehearsed a retaliation,” recalling “an earlier aside [in which] she had seethed to me, ‘If we’d been in front of a jury ... I would crucify her’.” Sheehy’s thoughts: “Her. Not him. Never him” (pp. 12–13).

Hillary Clinton’s “it takes a village” persona notwithstanding, the present assessment shows that she is a fundamentally ambitious, predominantly narcissistic, highly dominant, power oriented individual who is very private (if not aloof), with little inclination for kindness, yet highly disciplined and dedicated to her causes, if somewhat closed-minded, inflexible, distrusting, and secretive.

A public veneer of idealistic concern can be particularly troubling in highly dominant, controlling character types. According to Millon (1996), these individuals are prone to perceptual and cognitive distortion; a demeaning of affection and cooperative behavior; and the creation of realistic antagonisms (reminiscent of Richard Nixon with his “enemies list” and scores to settle).

Beneath their controlled exterior, these individuals may harbor an undercurrent of anger and resentment that renders them quite thin-skinned and sensitive to others’ reactions. Moreover, these personalities are short on spontaneity and reluctant to express warm or tender feelings. Fundamentally, they are not compassionate. Rather, they are inherently antagonistic and easily provoked to anger.

There is utility in coordinating the present findings with alternative models of personality in politics. Stanley Renshon (1996), for example, in developing a psychologically grounded theory of political performance, proposed “three distinct aspects” (p. 226) of political leadership shaped by character: *mobilization*, the ability to arouse, engage, and direct the public; *orchestration*, the organizational skill and ability to craft specific policies; and *consolidation*, implementing one’s policy proposals (pp. 227, 411).

Clinton’s most serious personality-based limitation as a presidential candidate is the ability to arouse, engage, and direct the public (i.e., mobilization), which is more commonly the preserve of highly outgoing, less conscientious candidates like Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, and Donald Trump.



As a chief executive, Clinton's greatest strength, by dint of her high conscientiousness, is orchestration. Consequently, Clinton can be expected to display superlative organizational skill in conjunction with the sustained focus and attention to detail necessary to excel in the minutiae of political campaigning (e.g., fundraising, assembling an effective "ground game") and in presidential performance with respect to crafting specific policies.

Regarding the third element of personality-driven political leadership, consolidation, the picture is more opaque. Although the ability to implement one's policy proposals is partially dependent on the same qualities that favor orchestration — Clinton's strong suit — Hillary Clinton may be severely hampered by her lack of outgoing personality traits, with its attendant deficits in the requisite retail political skills necessary for consummating her policy objectives.

James David Barber (1972/1992), focusing more narrowly on temperament, developed a simple model of presidential character that has some utility in predicting successful (active-positive) and failed (active-negative) presidencies. Clinton bears greater similarity to active-negative presidents such as Woodrow Wilson and Richard Nixon, who were rigid and highly driven, compulsively expending great energy on task performance yet seemingly deriving little inherent joy from the office of president and using power primarily as a means to self-realization.

Dean Keith Simonton has written extensively about historical greatness in general (e.g., 1994) and presidential success in particular (e.g., 1987). Simonton (1988), who has proposed five empirically derived presidential styles (charismatic, interpersonal, deliberative, neurotic, and creative), offers another promising frame of reference. Given the fidelity with which his leadership styles mirror the currently popular five-factor model, whose correlates with Millon's personality patterns have been empirically established (Millon, 1994, p. 82), Simonton's stylistic dimensions may have considerable heuristic value for establishing links between personality and political leadership.

Simonton's "charismatic" leadership style conceptually corresponds to the "Big Five" Extraversion factor, which incorporates aspects of Millon's Outgoing, Ambitious, and — to a lesser extent — Dauntless and Dominant patterns. Keeping in mind that Clinton was found to be highly Ambitious but substantially Reserved and not at all Outgoing, Simonton's description of the charismatic style can be stripped of its more outgoing elements to read as follows:

Ambitious types are skilled and self-confident negotiators, use rhetoric effectively, are energetic and determined, exhibit artistry in manipulation, are not shy or awkward in public, rarely permit themselves to be outflanked, are innovative, and initiate new legislation and programs. (Adapted from Simonton, 1988, pp. 930, 931)

The transposition of Clinton's Dominant personality pattern to Simonton's stylistic dimensions poses a greater challenge. Given that Millon's (1994) Controlling pattern is positively correlated with the "Big Five" Conscientiousness factor and negatively correlated with its Agreeableness and Neuroticism factors (see Millon, 1994, p. 82), and considering that Clinton obtained a moderately elevated score on the MIDC Conscientious scale, it may be hypothesized that a leader with Hillary Clinton's personality profile configuration would display leadership traits associated with Simonton's "deliberative" style and the low pole of his "interpersonal" style. According to Simonton (1988), the deliberative leader

commonly “understands [the] implications of his [or her] decisions; exhibits depth of comprehension” ..., is “able to visualize alternatives and weigh long term consequences” ..., “keeps himself [or herself] thoroughly informed; reads briefings [and] background reports” ..., is “cautious, conservative in action” ..., and only infrequently “indulges in emotional outbursts.” (p. 931)

Furthermore, a leader located on the low pole of Simonton’s (1988) interpersonal style — as clearly is the case with Hillary Clinton — typically

“accepts recommendations of others only under protest” ..., “believes he [or she] knows what is best for the people” ..., “is emphatic in asserting his [or her] judgments” ..., is “suspicious of reformers” ..., is “impatient, abrupt in conference” ..., “bases decisions on willfulness, nervousness, and egotism” ... [and] “tends to force decisions to be made prematurely” (p. 931)

By the same token, the leader low on interpersonality typically will *not*

“[encourage] the exercise of independent judgment by aides” ..., “[give] credit to others for work done” ..., “[endear him- or herself] to staff through his [or her] courtesy and consideration” ..., “[be] flexible” ..., “[emphasize] teamwork” ..., “[be frequently] in contact with his [or her] advisers” ..., “[maintain] close relationships with a wide circle of associates” ..., [be] “willing to make compromises” ..., “[rely] on working in a staff system, deciding among options formulated by advisers” ..., “[and keep] members of his [or her] staff informed on matters concerning other departments” (Simonton, 1988, pp. 929, 931)

Lloyd Etheredge (1978) developed a personality-based model of foreign policy leadership orientation that can be employed rationally and intuitively to enhance and complement the predictive utility of Millon’s model with respect to leadership performance in the arena of international relations.

In terms of Etheredge’s (1978) fourfold typology of personality-based foreign policy role orientations, which locates policymakers on the dimensions of dominance–submission and introversion–extraversion, Clinton’s Scale 1A (Dominant) elevation suggests that she is highly dominant in orientation. Her elevation on Scale 8 (Retiring), in conjunction with a flat Scale 3 (Outgoing), offers convincing evidence of introversion. Thus, Clinton is best classified as a *high-dominance introvert* in Etheredge’s (1978) typology of personality-based foreign policy role orientations. According to Etheredge, high-dominance introverts tend

to divide the world, in their thought, between the moral values they think it ought to exhibit and the forces opposed to this vision. They tend to have a strong, almost Manichean, moral component to their views. They tend to be described as stubborn and tenacious. They seek to reshape the world in accordance with their personal vision, and their ... policies are often characterized by the tenaciousness with which they advance one central idea. ... [They] seem relatively preoccupied with themes of *exclusion*, the establishment of institutions or principles to keep potentially disruptive forces in check. (p. 449; italics in original)

In conclusion, the major implication of the study is that it offers an empirically based personological framework for inferring Hillary Clinton’s major personal strengths and limitations as a presidential candidate and anticipating her likely leadership style as president.

## References

- American Psychiatric Association. (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Barber, J. D. (1992). *The presidential character: Predicting performance in the White House* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. (Originally published 1972)
- Bruck, C. (1994, May 30). Hillary the pol. *The New Yorker*, pp. 58–96.
- Clinton, H. R. (1996). *It takes a village and other lessons children teach us*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Etheredge, L. S. (1978). Personality effects on American foreign policy, 1898–1968: A test of interpersonal generalization theory. *American Political Science Review*, 72, 434–451.
- Greenstein, F. I. (1992). Can personality and politics be studied systematically? *Political Psychology*, 13, 105–128.
- Immelman, A. (1993). The assessment of political personality: A psychodiagnostically relevant conceptualization and methodology. *Political Psychology*, 14, 725–741.
- Immelman, A. (1998). The political personalities of 1996 U.S. presidential candidates Bill Clinton and Bob Dole. *Leadership Quarterly*, 9, 335–366.
- Immelman, A. (2002). The political personality of U.S. president George W. Bush. In L. O. Valenty & O. Feldman (Eds.), *Political leadership for the new century: Personality and behavior among American leaders* (pp. 81–103). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Immelman, A. (2003). Personality in political psychology. In I. B. Weiner (Series Ed.), T. Millon & M. J. Lerner (Vol. Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Vol. 5. Personality and social psychology* (pp. 599–625). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Immelman, A. (2005). Political psychology and personality. In S. Strack (Ed.), *Handbook of personology and psychopathology* (pp. 198–225). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Immelman, A. (2007, July). *The political personalities of 2008 Republican presidential contenders John McCain and Rudy Giuliani*. Paper presented at the Thirtieth Annual Scientific Meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Portland, Oregon.
- Immelman, A. (2014). *Millon inventory of diagnostic criteria manual* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., rev.). Unpublished manuscript, Unit for the Study of Personality in Politics, College of St. Benedict and St. John's University, St. Joseph and Collegeville, MN.
- Immelman, A. (Compiler) (2015). *Millon inventory of diagnostic criteria* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., rev.). Unpublished research scale, Unit for the Study of Personality in Politics, College of St. Benedict and St. John's University, St. Joseph and Collegeville, MN.
- Immelman, A., & Steinberg, B. S. (Compilers) (1999). *Millon inventory of diagnostic criteria* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Unpublished research scale, St. John's University, Collegeville, MN.

- Leary, T. (1957). *Interpersonal diagnosis of personality: A functional theory and methodology for personality evaluation*. New York: Ronald Press.
- Millon, T. (1969). *Modern psychopathology: A biosocial approach to maladaptive learning and functioning*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders. (Reprinted 1985 by Waveland Press, Prospect Heights, IL)
- Millon, T. (1986a). A theoretical derivation of pathological personalities. In T. Millon & G. L. Klerman (Eds.), *Contemporary directions in psychopathology: Toward the DSM-IV* (pp. 639–669). New York: Guilford.
- Millon, T. (1986b). Personality prototypes and their diagnostic criteria. In T. Millon & G. L. Klerman (Eds.), *Contemporary directions in psychopathology: Toward the DSM-IV* (pp. 671–712). New York: Guilford.
- Millon, T. (1990). *Toward a new personology: An evolutionary model*. New York: Wiley.
- Millon, T. (1991). Normality: What may we learn from evolutionary theory? In D. Offer & M. Sabshin (Eds.), *The diversity of normal behavior: Further contributions to normatology* (pp. 356–404). New York: Basic Books.
- Millon, T. (with Weiss, L. G., Millon, C. M., & Davis, R. D.). (1994). *Millon Index of Personality Styles manual*. San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corporation.
- Millon, T. (with Davis, R. D.). (1996). *Disorders of personality: DSM-IV and beyond* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Millon, T. (2003). Evolution: A generative source for conceptualizing the attributes of personality. In I. B. Weiner (Series Ed.), T. Millon & M. J. Lerner (Vol. Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Vol. 5. Personality and social psychology* (pp. 3–30). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Millon, T., & Davis, R. D. (2000). *Personality disorders in modern life*. New York: Wiley.
- Millon, T., & Everly, G. S., Jr. (1985). *Personality and its disorders: A biosocial learning approach*. New York: Wiley.
- Oldham, J. M., & Morris, L. B. (1995). *The new personality self-portrait* (Rev. ed.). New York: Bantam Books.
- Reich, W. (1933). *Charakteranalyse* [Character analysis]. Leipzig, Germany: Sexpol Verlag.
- Reich, W. (1949). *Character analysis* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Renshon, S. A. (1996). *The psychological assessment of presidential candidates*. New York: New York University Press.
- Simonton, D. K. (1987). *Why presidents succeed: A political psychology of leadership*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Simonton, D. K. (1988). Presidential style: Personality, biography, and performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 928–936.

Simonton, D. K. (1994). *Greatness: Who makes history and why*. New York: Guilford Press.

Strack, S. (1991). *Personality Adjective Check List manual* (rev.). South Pasadena, CA: 21<sup>st</sup> Century Assessment.

Strack, S. (1997). The PACL: Gauging normal personality styles. In T. Millon (Ed.), *The Millon inventories: Clinical and personality assessment* (pp. 477–497). New York: Guilford.