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Abstract

THE POLITICAL PERSONALITY OF 2007 FRENCH PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE SÉGOLÈNE ROYAL

Pascal De Sutter and Aubrey Immelman

University of Louvain-La-Neuve (UCL)
Louvain-La-Neuve, Belgium
and
St. John’s University – Unit for the Study of Personality in Politics
St. Joseph, Minn., USA

This paper presents the results of an indirect assessment of the personality of Ségolène Royal, candidate of the Socialist Party in the 2007 French presidential election. The study was conducted from the conceptual perspective of Theodore Millon’s model of personality. Information concerning Royal was collected from biographical sources and media reports and synthesized into a personality profile using the second edition of 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. Royal’s primary personality patterns were found to be Conscientious/compulsive and Ambitious/self-serving, with secondary features of the Dauntless/dissenting, Dominant/controlling, and Contentious/resolute patterns.

The amalgam of strong Conscientious and Ambitious patterns in Royal’s profile suggests the presence of Millon’s bureaucratic compulsive syndrome. According to Millon, people with this personality composite feel empowered in formal organizations, where group rules provide identity and security. They tend to be officious, high-handed, intrusive, petty, meddlesome, and closed-minded.

The major implication of the study is that it offers an empirically based personological framework for anticipating Ségolène Royal’s leadership style as chief executive, thus providing a basis for inferring the character and tenor of a prospective Royal presidency.
Introduction

This paper reports the results of a psychodiagnostic case study, conducted in summer and fall 2006, of the personality of Marie-Ségolène Royal (born September 22, 1953 in Dakar, Senegal), commonly known as Ségolène Royal. Royal, president of the Poitou-Charentes region and member of the National Assembly at the time of the study, was the Socialist Party candidate in the 2007 French presidential election, which she lost to Union for a Popular Movement candidate Nicolas Sarkozy.


Immelman employs 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).

This perspective provides the context for the current paper, which presents an analysis of the personality of Ségolène Royal and examines the political implications of her personality profile with respect to presidential leadership and executive performance.

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, 1999, 2003, 2005).

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressive behavior</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal conduct</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive style</td>
<td>How the individual focuses and allocates attention, encodes and processes information, organizes thoughts, makes attributions, and communicates reactions and ideas to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood/temperament</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-image</td>
<td>The individual’s perception of self-as-object or the manner in which the individual overtly describes him- or herself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory mechanisms</td>
<td>The individual’s characteristic mechanisms of self-protection, need gratification, and conflict resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object representations</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphologic organization</td>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### 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 Ségolène Royal.
Sources of data. Diagnostic information pertaining to Ségolène Royal was collected from a variety of sources that offered useful, diagnostically relevant biographical information.1

Personality inventory. The assessment instrument, the second edition of the Millon Inventory of Diagnostic Criteria (MIDC; Immelman & Steinberg, 1999), was compiled and adapted from Millon’s (1969, 1986b; 1990, 1996; Millon & Everly, 1985) prototypal 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, 1999). 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.

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, 1999, 2003, 2005, for a more extensive account of the procedure).

---

1 References available upon request from the first author.

2 Inventory and manual available upon request from the second author.
Table 2

*Millon Inventory of Diagnostic Criteria: Scales and Gradations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1A: Dominant pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Asserting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Controlling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Aggressive (Sadistic; <em>DSM–III–R</em>, Appendix A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1B: Dauntless pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Adventurous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Dissenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Aggrandizing (Antisocial; <em>DSM–IV</em>, 301.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 2: Ambitious pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Self-serving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Exploitative (Narcissistic; <em>DSM–IV</em>, 301.81)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 3: Outgoing pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Congenial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Gregarious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Impulsive (Histrionic; <em>DSM–IV</em>, 301.50)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 4: Accommodating pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Agreeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Submissive (Dependent; <em>DSM–IV</em>, 301.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 5A: Aggrieved pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Unpresuming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Self-denying</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 5B: Contentious pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Resolute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Oppositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Negativistic (Passive-aggressive; <em>DSM–III–R</em>, 301.84)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 6: Conscientious pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Respectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Dutiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Compulsive (Obsessive-compulsive; <em>DSM–IV</em>, 301.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 7: Reticent pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Circumspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Inhibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Withdrawn (Avoidant; <em>DSM–IV</em>, 301.82)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 8: Retiring pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Aloof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Solitary (Schizoid; <em>DSM–IV</em>, 301.20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 9: Distrusting pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d. Suspicious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Paranoid (<em>DSM–IV</em>, 301.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 0: Erratic pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d. Unstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Borderline (<em>DSM–IV</em>, 301.83)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Royal received 61 endorsements on the 170-item MIDC. Descriptive statistics for Royal’s MIDC ratings are presented in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute Domain</th>
<th>Endorsement Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressive behavior</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal conduct</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive style</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood/temperament</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-image</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Royal’s MIDC scale scores are reported in Table 4. The same data are presented graphically in the profile depicted in Figure 1.
Table 4
*MIDC Scale Scores for Ségolène Royal*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Personality pattern</th>
<th>Raw</th>
<th>RT%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Dominant: Asserting–Controlling–Aggressive (Sadistic)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>Dauntless: Adventurous–Dissenting–Aggrandizing (Antisocial)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ambitious: Confident–Self-serving–Exploitative (Narcissistic)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Outgoing: Congenial–Gregarious–Impulsive (Histrionic)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Accommodating: Cooperative–Agreeable–Submissive (Dependent)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>Aggrieved: Unpresuming–Self-denying–Self-defeating (Masochistic)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>Contentious: Resolute–Oppositional–Negativistic (Passive-aggressive)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Conscientious: Respectful–Dutiful–Compulsive (Obsessive-compulsive)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Reticent: Circumspect–Inhibited–Withdrawn (Avoidant)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Retiring: Reserved–Aloof–Solitary (Schizoid)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Distrusting: Suspicious–Paranoid (Paranoid)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Erratic: Unstable–Borderline (Borderline)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal for basic personality scales</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Full-scale total</strong></td>
<td><strong>108</strong></td>
<td><strong>114.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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 the raw scores is displayed in Figure 1. Royal’s most elevated scale, with a score of 27, is Scale 6 (Conscientious), followed by a score of 15 on Scale 2 (Ambitious). Based on cut-off score guidelines provided in the MIDC manual, the Scale 6 elevation is just within the *mildly dysfunctional* (24–30) range, whereas Scale 2 (Ambitious) is in the *prominent* (10–23) range of profile elevation. Three additional scales are worthy of note: Scale 1B (Dauntless), well within the *prominent* (10–23) range; and Scale 1A (Dominant) and Scale 5B (Contentious), both at the upper boundary of the *present* (5–9) range.

---

3 See Table 2 for scale names. 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.
Figure 1. *Millon Inventory of Diagnostic Criteria: Profile for Ségolène Royal*

![Diagram showing the profile of Ségolène Royal's personality according to the Millon Inventory of Diagnostic Criteria.](image)
In terms of MIDC scale gradation (see Table 2 and Figure 1) criteria, Ségolène Royal was classified as a Conscientious/compulsive (Scale 6) and Ambitious/self-serving (Scale 2) personality, with secondary features of the Dauntless/dissenting, Dominant/controlling, and Contentious/resolute personality patterns.\(^4\)

**Discussion**

The discussion of the results examines Ségolène Royal’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 implications of Ségolène Royal’s personality profile.

With her elevated Scale 6, Royal emerged from the assessment as a highly conscientious personality in the compulsive range of profile elevation. The compulsive style is the maladaptive equivalent of obsessive-compulsive personality disorder.

The interpretation of Royal’s profile must also account for a less elevated Scale 2 (Ambitious) elevation and more modest elevations on Scale 1B (Dauntless), Scale 1A (Dominant), and Scale 5B (Contentious).

**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. Exaggerated Conscientious features occur in *dutiful*, dependable, and principled but rigid personalities. In its most deeply ingrained, inflexible form, the Conscientious pattern displays itself in moralistic, self-righteous, uncompromising, cognitively constricted, *compulsive* behavior patterns that may be consistent with a clinical diagnosis of obsessive-compulsive personality disorder.

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, 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 external demands and to a perfectionism that typifies the disordered [compulsive] state.” They “demonstrate an unusual degree of integrity, adhering as

---

\(^4\) 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.
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 . . .

The Conscientious personality style flourishes within cultures . . . in which the work ethic thrives. Conscientious traits . . . [include] hard work, prudence, [and] conventionality. (p. 62)

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 (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)

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, 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. The most extreme variants of this pattern are highly perfectionistic; they are characteristically pedantic, painfully fastidious or fussy, and excessively devoted to work and productivity. (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. The most extreme variants of this pattern are uncompromising; they are excessively punctilious, though supercilious and depreciatory behaviors may be cloaked behind a veil of legalities and regulations, and aggressive intent may be justified by recourse to rules, authorities, or imperatives higher than themselves. (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. The most extreme variants of this pattern are constricted; they are mechanical, inflexible, and rigid, constructing the world in terms of rules, regulations, schedules, and hierarchies. Their thinking may be constrained by stubborn adherence to
conventional rules and personally formulated schemas, and their equilibrium is easily upset by unfamiliar situations or new ideas, making them excruciatingly indecisive at times. 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. The most extreme variants of this pattern are *grave*; heavy and uptight, they are joyless, grim, and somber, keeping a tight rein on emotions — especially warm and affectionate feelings, though they may occasionally exhibit abrupt, explosive outbursts of anger aimed at subordinates. 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. The most extreme variants of this pattern view themselves as *righteous*; they overvalue aspects of themselves that exhibit virtue, moral rectitude, discipline, perfection, prudence, and loyalty, and are fearful of error or misjudgment. They are excessively devoted to work, with a corresponding tendency to minimize the importance of recreational or leisure activities. All variants of the Conscientious pattern at times experience self-doubt or guilt for failing to live up to an ideal. 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. Similarly, they dread being viewed as irresponsible, slack in their efforts, or in error, with a corresponding tendency to overvalue aspects of their self-image that signify perfectionism, prudence, and discipline. (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. More extreme variants of the Conscientious pattern repeatedly attempt to put a positive spin on their thoughts and behaviors by engaging in public displays of socially
commendable actions that may be diametrically opposed to their deeper, forbidden impulses. Conscientious individuals classically employ a greater variety of regulatory mechanisms than other personality patterns, among them identification, sublimation, isolation, and undoing. Concerning the latter, in more extreme, compulsive manifestations of the Conscientious pattern, perceived failure of these individuals to live up to their own or others’ expectations may give rise to ritualistic acts to annul the evil or wrong they feel they have wrought, which induces them to seek expiation for their imagined sins, to regain the goodwill they fear may be lost. (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, or asserting that introspection is indicative of immature self-indulgence and thus anathema to social adaptation. Consequently, highly Conscientious persons often lack insight into their 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 must be rigidly 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 usually have a history of exposure to demanding, perfectionistic parents, a potent force behind their tightly structured world is their fear of disapproval. Because their public facade of conformity and propriety often masks an undercurrent of repressed urges toward self-assertion and defiance, they must guard against “detection,” which they achieve through characteristic control mechanisms such as reaction formation, and by favoring the formalistic interpersonal behaviors described in preceding sections. (Millon, 1996, pp. 517–518)

**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. Slightly exaggerated Ambitious features occur in personalities that are sometimes

---

5 Not directly relevant to Ségolène Royal.

6 Relevant to Ségolène Royal.
perceived as self-promoting, overconfident, or arrogant. 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.

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). In combination with an elevated Outgoing pattern (Scale 3), it bears some resemblance to Simonton’s (1988) charismatic executive leadership style.

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 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:

7 Applicable to Ségolène Royal.

8 All Millon 1994 citations in this report refer to the Manual of the Millon Index of Personality Styles (MIPS). Copyright © 1994 by Dicandrien, Inc. “MIPS” is a trademark of The Psychological Corporation registered in the United States of America and/or other jurisdictions. Reproduced by permission of the publisher, The Psychological Corporation, a Harcourt Assessment Company. All rights reserved.
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. Ironically, the confident [Ambitious] individual’s secure appearance may cover feelings of personal inadequacy and a sensitivity to criticism and rejection. Unfortunately, they usually do not permit others to see their vulnerable side. 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. (From Strack, 1997, pp. 489–490, with slight 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 often conveys confidence and authority and evokes admiration and obedience 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, and ardently believe 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 1B: The Dauntless Pattern**

The Dauntless pattern, as do all personality patterns, occurs on a continuum ranging from normal to maladaptive. At the well-adjusted pole9 are adventurous, individualistic, venturesome personalities. Exaggerated Dauntless features10 occur in unconscientious, risk-taking, dissenting personalities. In its most deeply ingrained, inflexible form,11 the Dauntless pattern displays itself in reckless, irresponsible, self-aggrandizing behavior patterns that may be consistent with a clinical diagnosis of antisocial personality disorder.

Normal, adaptive variants of the Dauntless pattern (i.e., venturesome and dissenting types) correspond to Oldham and Morris’s (1995) *Adventurous* style, Millon’s (1994) *Dissenting* pattern, and the low pole of Simonton’s (1988) *interpersonal* executive leadership style. Theoretically, the normal, adaptive variant of the Dauntless pattern incorporates facets of the five-factor model’s *Extraversion* factor and the low pole of its *Agreeableness* factor; however, the Dissenting scale of the Millon Index of Personality Styles (Millon, 1994) is uncorrelated with the NEO Personality Inventory’s (Costa & McCrae, 1985) Extraversion factor, though, as expected, it is negatively correlated with its *Agreeableness* factor. In addition, the Dissenting scale is moderately correlated

---

9 Not directly relevant to Ségolène Royal.

10 Relevant to Ségolène Royal.

11 Not applicable to Ségolène Royal.
with the NEO Personality Inventory’s Neuroticism factor, has a small negative correlation with its Conscientiousness factor, and is uncorrelated with its Openness to Experience factor (see Millon, 1994, p. 82). The Dauntless pattern, as conceptualized in the MIDC, is congruent with the low poles of Simonton’s (1988) deliberative and interpersonal leadership styles and incorporates elements of his neurotic and charismatic styles.

According to Oldham and Morris (1995, pp. 227–228), the following eight traits and behaviors are reliable clues to the presence of an Adventurous style:

1. Nonconformity. Live by their own internal code of values; not strongly influenced by the norms of society.
3. Mutual independence. Not overly concerned about others; expect each individual to be responsible for him- or herself.
5. Wanderlust. Like to keep moving; live by their talents, skills, ingenuity, and wits.
7. True grit. Courageous, physically bold, and tough.
8. No regrets. Live in the present; do not feel guilty about the past or anxious about the future.

Oldham and Morris (1995) provide the following description of the Adventurous style:

Throw caution to the winds — here comes the Adventurer. Who but Adventurers would have taken those long leaps for mankind — crossed the oceans, broken the sound barrier, walked the moon? The men and women with this personality style venture where most mortals fear to tread. They are not bound by the same terrors and worries that limit most of us. They live on the edge, challenging boundaries and restrictions, pitting themselves for better or for worse in a thrilling game against their own mortality. No risk, no reward, they say. Indeed, for people with the Adventurous personality style, the risk is the reward. (p. 227)

Ultimately, adventurous types “are fundamentally out for themselves” (Oldham & Morris, 1995, p. 228); they “do not need others to fuel their self-esteem or to provide purpose to their lives, and they don’t make sacrifices for other people, at least not easily” (p. 229). Furthermore, they believe in themselves and do not require anyone’s approval; they have “a definite sense of what is right or wrong for them, and if something is important to them, they’ll do it no matter what anyone thinks” (p. 229). In spite of their self-centeredness, however, adventurous people are capable of advancing a cause incidentally in the service of their personal desires or ambition; but, fundamentally, what matters is the momentary excitement, emotional vitality, or sense of aliveness that they experience, not love of person, country, or cause (p. 229). Technically, Oldham & Morris’s Adventurous style appears to be a more adaptive variant of Millon’s “risk-taking psychopath,” a composite of his aggrandizing (antisocial) and gregarious (histrionic) personality patterns (see Millon, 1996, p. 452; Millon & Davis, 1998, p. 164).

Millon (1994), who uses the term Dissenting as a label for the normal, adaptive variant of the aggrandizing, antisocial pattern, asserts that these individuals tend to “flout tradition,” “act in a notably autonomous fashion,” “are not social-minded,” and “are not inclined to adhere to conventional standards, cultural mores, and organizational regulations” (p. 32). They are
unconventional persons who seek to do things their own way and are willing to take the consequences for doing so. They act as they see fit regardless of how others judge them. Inclined at times to elaborate on or shade the truth, as well as ride close to the edge of the law, they are not conscientious — that is, they do not assume customary responsibilities. Rather, they frequently assert that too many rules stand in the way of people who wish to be free and inventive, and that they prefer to think and act in an independent and often creative way. Many believe that persons in authority are too hard on people who don’t conform. Dissenters dislike following the same routine day after day and, at times, act impulsively and irresponsibly. They will do what they want or believe to be best without much concern for the effects of their actions on others. Being skeptical about the motives of most people, and refusing to be fettered or coerced, they exhibit a strong need for autonomy and self-determination. (p. 33)

It should be noted that Adventurous (Oldham & Morris, 1995) and Dissenting (Millon, 1994) personalities are adaptive variants of antisocial personality disorder. Perhaps by dint of more favorable socialization experiences these more adaptive styles express themselves “in behaviors that are minimally obtrusive, especially when manifested in sublimated forms, such as independence strivings, ambition, competition, risk-taking, and adventuresomeness” (Millon, 1996, p. 449). It must be emphasized, however, that antisocial-spectrum personality patterns commonly become less pervasive, intrusive, and maladaptive by early middle age. According to DSM–IV, “Antisocial Personality Disorder has a chronic course but may become less evident or remit as the individual grows older, particularly in the fourth decade of life” (APA, 1994, p. 648).

Millon (1996), in examining the developmental background of these so-called “socially sublimated antisocials” (p. 462), asserts that their experiential history is often characterized by secondary status in the family. He writes:

It is not only in socially underprivileged families or underclass communities that we see the emergence of antisocial individuals. The key problem for all has been their failure to experience the feeling of being treated fairly and having been viewed as a person/child of value in the family context. Such situations occur in many middle- and upper-middle class families. Here, parents may have given special attention to another sibling who was admired and highly esteemed, at least in the eyes of the “deprived” youngster. (p. 462)

Millon and Davis (2000) specifically address the relevance of the Dauntless pattern to leadership — notably the intermediate range of the continuum, where normality shades into the more aggrandizing, antisocial variant of this pattern. They suggest that within this range “we find persons [e.g., some very successful industrialists, entrepreneurs, and corporate executives] who have never come into conflict with the law, but only because they are very effective in covering their tracks” (p. 107).

For many politicians, the deception of doublespeak is a talent necessary for survival. Skirting the edge of deceitfulness, they “spin” objective events by minimizing negatives and exaggerating positives. When cornered, they focus attention on mitigating circumstances and lie by omission by failing to report the total circumstances and full motives of their actions. Moreover, they deliberately create public policy so complex that any particular aspect might be singled out to impress the special interest of the moment. (p. 107)
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\textsuperscript{12} are strong-willed, commanding, assertive personalities. Slightly exaggerated Dominant features\textsuperscript{13} occur in forceful, intimidating, controlling personalities. In its most deeply ingrained, inflexible form,\textsuperscript{14} the Dominant pattern displays itself in domineering, belligerent, aggressive behavior patterns that may be consistent with a clinical diagnosis of sadistic personality disorder.

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 the Conscientious (Scale 6) and Contentious (Scale 5B) patterns, 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. Their 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)

---

\textsuperscript{12} Relevant to Ségolène Royal.

\textsuperscript{13} It is possible that some of these exaggerated features are present in Ségolène Royal; however, the results suggest that these traits are not deeply ingrained or pervasive across broad domains of Royal’s personality, given that the scale elevation just fails to reach the threshold for prominence.

\textsuperscript{14} Not applicable to Ségolène Royal.
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 exploitative 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)

**Scale 5B: The Contentious Pattern**

The Contentious pattern, as do all personality patterns, occurs on a continuum ranging from normal to maladaptive. At the well-adjusted\(^{15}\) pole are cynical, headstrong, resolute personalities. Exaggerated Contentious features\(^{16}\) occur in complaining, irksome, oppositional personalities. In its most deeply ingrained, inflexible form,\(^{17}\) the Contentious pattern displays itself in caustic, contrary, negativistic behavior patterns that may be consistent with a clinical diagnosis of negativistic or passive-aggressive personality disorder.

Normal, adaptive variants of the Contentious pattern (i.e., resolute and oppositional types) correspond to Strack’s (1997) sensitive style and Millon’s (1994) Complaining pattern. Empirically, Millon’s (1994) Complaining pattern has a high positive correlation with the five-factor model’s Neuroticism factor, is negatively correlated with its Agreeableness factor, has a small negative correlation with its Extraversion factor, and is uncorrelated with the remaining two factors (Millon, 1994, p. 82). Millon (1994) describes the Complaining (i.e., Contentious) pattern as follows:

Those scoring high on the Complaining [Contentious] scale often assert that they have been treated unfairly, that little of what they have done has been appreciated, and that they have been blamed for things that they did not do. Opportunities seem not to have worked out well for them and they “know” that good things don’t last. Often resentful of what they see as unfair demands placed on them, they may be disinclined to carry out responsibilities as well as they could. Ambivalent about their lives and relationships, they may get into problematic wrangles and disappointments as they

\(^{15}\) Relevant to Ségolène Royal.

\(^{16}\) It is possible that some of these exaggerated features are present in Ségolène Royal; however, the results suggest that these traits are not deeply ingrained or pervasive across broad domains of Royal’s personality, given that the scale elevation just fails to reach the threshold for prominence.

\(^{17}\) Not applicable to Ségolène Royal.
vacillate between acceptance one time and resistance the next. When matters go well, they can be productive and constructively independent-minded, willing to speak out to remedy troublesome issues. (p. 34)

According to Millon (1996, p. 554), the normal, adaptive variant of the Contentious pattern corresponds to Oldham and Morris’s (1995) *Mercurial* style; however, the case can be made that its normal, *discontented* variant has more in common with Oldham and Morris’s (1995) *Leisurely* style. Moreover, the *Mercurial* style appears to be a better fit for the less maladaptive (*unstable*) form of the Erratic pattern (Scale 0). Oldham and Morris (1995) describe the *Leisurely* style as follows:

> These men and women play by the rules and fulfill their responsibilities and obligations. But once they’ve put in their time, they will let no person, institution, or even culture deprive them of their personal pursuit of happiness, for to the Leisurely person, this is what life is all about . . . . If threatened, these normally easygoing individuals will vigorously defend their fundamental right to do their “own thing.” (p. 203).

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

> Sensitive [Contentious] personalities tend to be unconventional and individualistic in their response to the world. They march to the beat of a different drummer and are frequently unhappy with the status quo. They may be quick to challenge rules or authority deemed arbitrary and unjust. They may also harbor resentment without expressing it directly and may revert to passive-aggressive behavior to make their feelings known. Many sensitive people feel as if they don’t fit in, and view themselves as lacking in interpersonal skills. In fact, to others they often appear awkward, nervous, or distracted, and seem angry or dissatisfied with themselves and others. They can be indecisive and have fluctuating moods and interests. An air of uncertainty and general dissatisfaction may reflect an underlying dependency and sense of personal inadequacy. With their best side forward, sensitive persons can be spontaneous, creative, and willing to speak out for what they believe in. These qualities make them especially suited to jobs that are not rule-bound, that give them a certain independence from supervision, and that require unusual duties or creative expression. (From Strack, 1997, pp. 490–491, with minor modifications)

**Scale 6–2: The Conscientious–Ambitious Composite Pattern**

Predominantly Conscientious (compulsive; Scale 6) personalities who also possess significant Ambitious (narcissistic; Scale 2) features, have been labeled *bureaucratic compulsives* (Millon, 1996, pp. 521–522; Millon & Davis, 2000, p. 179). Leaders with this composite character complex are noted for their officious, high-handed bearing, intrusive, meddlesome interpersonal conduct, unimaginative, meticulous, closed-minded cognitive style, grim, imperturbable mood, and scrupulous if grandiose sense of self.

A controlling, virtuous but moralistic upbringing with high expectations for perfection can breed adults who “displace anger and insecurity by seeking out some position of power that allows them to become a socially sanctioned superego for others,” whose “swift judgment . . . conceals a sadistic and self-righteous joy” cloaked in the mantle of social virtue (Millon & Davis, 2000, p. 184).
The bureaucratic compulsive character complex is rooted in the highly conscientious personality’s deep ambivalence between obedience and defiance, modulated by the ambitious, narcissistic personality’s overinflated ego. It is strongly characterized by the regulatory mechanism of sadistic *displacement* of hostile impulses. Parental (or surrogate) overcontrol in early childhood, combined with substantial overvaluation or overindulgence (i.e., noncontingent reinforcement), stemming, for example, from only child status or “teacher’s pet” treatment, which engenders a sense of entitlement, is hypothesized to be the critical early influences in the formation of compulsive–narcissistic character structures.

To compensate for their internal ambivalence, bureaucratic compulsives “fuse their identity with the system as a means of achieving place, purpose, and protection” (Millon & Davis, 2000, p. 179); the formalized external structures of the party and the state may become an embodiment of the self. To relinquish control is to obliterate the self. Political opponents are to their personal psychology what invasive organisms are to the body’s immune system — and the self-protective response equally swift and ruthless.

Millon and Davis (2000) describe the bureaucratic compulsive as follows:

Bureaucratic compulsives ally themselves with traditional values and established authorities. They flourish in organizational settings, feeling comforted, strengthened, and empowered by clearly defined superior and subordinate relationships, definite roles, and known expectations and responsibilities. Once established, they function loyally and dependably. In effect, these individuals use highly developed and formalized external structures to compensate for the internal sense of ambivalence and indecisiveness that plague the average compulsive pattern. Many fuse their identity with the system as a means of achieving place, purpose, and protection. Their superiors know them as trustworthy, diligent, and faithfully committed to the goals and values of the institution, which fortifies their self-esteem and gives them a direction. Be it church, police, union, university, or business, without the organization most would feel lost or aimless in life. Punctual and meticulous, they adhere to the work ethic like worker ants in a colony, appraising their own and others’ tasks with black-and-white efficiency, as done or not done.

Like the conscientious compulsive [Conscientious–Accommodating subtype], the bureaucratic subtype shades gently into normality. However, bureaucratic compulsives run the spectrum from nearly normal to completely sadistic. At a moderately disordered level, their rigid adherence to policies and rules makes them seem officious, high-handed, close-minded, and petty. At a severely disordered level, they may use their knowledge of the rules, effectiveness with red tape, and ingratiating attitude with superiors to terrorize subordinates or anyone else that crosses their path without paying them the proper dues and respect. (p. 179)

*Theoretical Links Between Personality Patterns and Leadership Style*

Because high-level leaders, like all human beings, tend to exhibit more than one significant or predominant personality pattern, it is useful to begin an examination of the links between personality patterns and leadership style by serially hypothesizing about the influence of each personality prototype on leadership style. In the case of Royal, we will examine hypothesized linkages between her primary Conscientious and Ambitious personality patterns and his likely leadership style (adapted from Steinberg, 2008).
1. Motivation for leading

Leaders whose personality profile is dominated by **Conscientiousness** are less likely to be motivated by ideology or personal validation, and more likely to be motivated by **power** and **pragmatism**. Being overly controlling, rigid, and perfectionistic, they are likely to try to concentrate power in themselves as a way of preventing matters from spinning out of control. Because this personality type tends to be characterized by a lack of imagination and a structured, pedestrian form of cognition, they eschew new or untested ideas; ideological notions tend to be anathema and they are more comfortable with a pragmatic approach to political problems.

Leaders with prominent **Ambitious** personality traits are likely to be motivated by **power**, **pragmatism**, **ideology**, and **self-validation**, in descending order of importance. As extremely confident, often arrogant, individuals with a strong belief in their talents and their leadership ability, **power** is an obvious motivator for their leadership behavior. Their ambition, which is largely in the service of their own personal needs, may also dictate a policy of **pragmatism** as a way of ensuring their continued success. At the same time, given that their personality patterns demonstrate cognitive expansiveness, that is, displaying extraordinary confidence in their own ideas and potential for success, they may be motivated by **ideology** and the wish to transform their societies. Those ranking very high on the Ambitious scale have a strong narcissistic component to their personalities, with a corresponding need for affirmation of their self-esteem; thus, they are likely to be motivated by the need for **personal validation**.

2. Task orientation

**Conscientious** leaders are inclined to be interested both in accomplishing their **goals** — demonstrating their hard-work ethic — and in the **process** itself — keeping the machinery of government oiled. They are notably respectful of tradition and authority, and unbending in their adherence to social proprieties.

Leaders who rank high on the **Ambitious** scale are more likely to be **goal**- rather than process oriented. Motivated by factors that involve their own advancement and success, their interest in maintaining good relations with their colleagues is much less important than their ability to achieve their goals.

3. Investment in job performance

Because of their work ethic, attention to detail, and managerial competence, the leadership style of **Conscientious** leaders pivots around the need for productivity in the form of policy implementation and in the proper types of relationships among members of the government and the civil service.

The strong desire of **Ambitious** leaders to prove themselves means that they are more likely to be **tireless** in the amount of effort they will expend in their jobs.
4. Staff management strategy

Predominantly Conscientious leaders are more likely to act as advocates within their administration and less likely to be consensus builders or arbitrators. Having displayed due deference to their superiors when they served in lower-level political office, they now expect to be treated in the same way by their associates and are inclined to be unbending in their relations with them. Since such leaders tend to lack imagination and to be somewhat rigid, policy choices will often take on a black-or-white quality — a situation in which the building of consensus plays a secondary role to the implementation of the morally “correct” or the most efficient policy.

Ambitious leaders are more likely to act as advocates within their administration than as consensus builders or arbitrators. Given that their personalities stress self-promotion, persuasiveness, and substantial arrogance and entitlement, they are less likely to take on a constrained role for themselves.

5. Information management strategy

Given this personality’s penchant for overcontrol, orderliness, and perfectionism, Conscientious leaders are likely to exhibit a high degree of involvement in managing information, as a way of protecting themselves from possible error. At the same time, however, their respect for order and hierarchy is likely to be reflected in a preference for obtaining that information in-house (from administration officials and the civil service) rather than from independent sources.

Because they are activist, Ambitious leaders are more likely to exhibit a high degree of involvement in managing information and to prefer to obtain their information from a variety of independent sources so that they can make up their own minds.

6. Personnel relations – degree and type of involvement

In terms of relations with personnel, Conscientious leaders are expected to be highly interactive with aides, assistants, and staff, lest something important escape their notice. And, their treatment of their subordinates is likely to be mixed. At the lower end of the prominent range, Conscientious leaders are likely to treat subordinates in a polite and courteous fashion; at the higher end of that range, their perfectionistic tendencies are more evident, leading to uncompromising and demanding/domineering behavior. They are less likely to engage in attention-seeking/seductive behavior with their aides, since they are motivated by duty, not vanity.

In the arena of personnel management, Ambitious leaders are likely to be highly interactive with civil servants and personal staff and to treat their subordinates in a manipulative/exploitive, even arrogant fashion. They are also more likely to engage in attention-seeking/seductive behavior than other personality types, except for the Outgoing personality, because they require a good deal of self-validation to maintain their somewhat fragile self-esteem.
7. Party-political relations

In their dealings with members of their own party in the legislative branch of government, their national party organization, and opposition parties, Conscientious leaders can be expected to behave in dutiful fashion. They will treat those whom they consider as subordinates in either a cooperative/harmonious or a competitive/oppositional, even domineering, fashion (depending on the intensity of their Conscientious tendency). By the same token, if they view political allies and associates as equals, they will be more likely to behave in a cooperative/harmonious fashion.

In their dealings with members of their party in the legislative branch of government, their national party organization, and opposition parties, Ambitious leaders are likely to be involved and to exhibit a broad range of behaviors. When it appears that behaving in a cooperative/harmonious manner will further their interests, they will do so for instrumental reasons. But their self-involved and entitled disposition will more frequently produce behavior that is competitive/oppositional and controlling/overbearing. However, because Ambitious personality types are more likely than their Dominant counterparts to exhibit both cooperative and competitive behavior with their staff, the expectation is that the latter will demonstrate a greater percentage of controlling and overbearing behavior in this area.

8. Media relations

In their relations with the media, Conscientious leaders are likely to behave in a reasonably open, reasonably cooperative, yet polite, formal manner.

In the arena of media relations, Ambitious leaders may enjoy some degree of harmonious relations with the press, if they feel the press can be manipulated. However, the combination of a critical press and the sensitivity of the Ambitious personality to narcissistic wounding means that their relationship is more likely to be closed, characterized by a lack of cooperation and even outright hostility.

9. Public relations

In relating to the public, the behavior of Conscientious leaders can be expected to be somewhat mixed. They are likely to be more active than passive in view of their strong sense of duty and responsibility; however, given their rigid, perfectionist personalities, they are unlikely to enjoy this aspect of governing and may be prepared to allow their senior officials some role in articulating and defending their administration’s policies.

In their relations with the public, Ambitious leaders can be expected to be more active than passive. Given their self-confidence and their certitude about themselves and their persuasiveness, such leaders will more probably prefer to articulate and defend their policies themselves rather than relying on others.
Leadership Implications

There may be some utility in coordinating the present findings with alternative models of political personality. Dean Keith Simonton (1988), for example, has proposed five empirically derived presidential styles (charismatic, interpersonal, deliberative, neurotic, and creative). Given the fidelity with which they 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.

Similarly, Lloyd Etheredge (1978) and Margaret Hermann (1987) have developed personality-based models 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 affairs.

From Simonton’s perspective, Royal’s elevated Scale 6 (Conscientious) score suggests a deliberative leadership style, which conceptually corresponds to the “Big Five” Conscientiousness factor. According to Simonton (1988), the deliberative leader commonly “understands implications of his decisions; exhibits depth of comprehension” . . . , is “able to visualize alternatives and weigh long term consequences” . . . , “keeps himself thoroughly informed; reads briefings, background reports” . . . , is “cautious, conservative in action” . . . , and only infrequently “indulges in emotional outbursts.” (p. 931)

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, Royal’s Scale 1A (Dominant) elevation suggests that she is highly dominant in orientation. She also has a modest Scale 3 (Outgoing) elevation; however, this extraverted tendency is equivocal, given Royal’s equally similar elevation on Scale 7 (Reticent) and minimal Scale 8 (Retiring) features. On balance, Royal seems more introverted than extraverted.

Thus, Royal is provisionally classified as a high-dominance introvert in Etheredge’s (1978) typology of personality-based foreign policy role orientations. According to Etheredge, high-dominance introverts (in American politics, presidents such as Woodrow Wilson and Herbert Hoover) are quite willing to use military force, tending 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 foreign policies are often characterized by the tenaciousness with which they advance one central idea . . . [These leaders] 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)

Etheredge’s high-dominance introvert appears to be most similar in character to Hermann’s (1987) expansionist orientation to foreign affairs. These leaders have a view of the world as being “divided into ‘us’ and ‘them,’ ” based on a belief system in which conflict is viewed as inherent in
the international system. This world view prompts a personal political style characterized by a “wariness of others’ motives” and a directive, controlling interpersonal orientation, resulting in a foreign policy “focused on issues of security and status,” favoring “low-commitment actions” and espousing “short-term, immediate change in the international arena.” Expansionist leaders “are not averse to using the ‘enemy’ as a scapegoat” and their rhetoric often may be “hostile in tone” (pp. 168–169).

In conclusion, major implication of the study is that it offers an empirically based personological framework for anticipating Ségolène Royal’s leadership style as chief executive, thus providing a basis for inferring the character and tenor of a prospective Royal presidency.
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