Psychology Faculty Publications

Psychology

7-2005

# The Political Personality of 2004 Democratic Presidential Candidate John Kerry

Aubrey Immelman
*College of Saint Benedict/Saint John's University*, aimmelman@csbsju.edu

Adam Beatty

### Recommended Citation

Immelman, A., & Beatty, A. (2005, July). The political personality of 2004 Democratic presidential candidate John Kerry. Paper presented at the 28th Annual Scientific Meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Toronto, ON, July 3-6, 2005. Retrieved from Digital Commons website: http://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/psychology_pubs/29/

# THE POLITICAL PERSONALITY OF 2004 DEMOCRATIC

# PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE JOHN KERRY

Aubrey Immelman and Adam Beatty

Department of Psychology
Saint John's University

Unit for the Study of Personality in Politics
College of Saint Benedict
St. Joseph, MN 56374
Telephone: (320) 363-5481
Fax: (320) 363-5582
E-mail: aimmelman@csbsju.edu

# Abstract

**THE POLITICAL PERSONALITY OF 2004 DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE JOHN KERRY**

Aubrey Immelman and Adam Beatty
Saint John's University
Unit for the Study of Personality in Politics
http://uspp.csbsju.edu/
College of Saint Benedict
St. Joseph, Minnesota

This paper presents the results of an indirect assessment of the personality of Sen. John Kerry, Democratic Party nominee in the 2004 U.S. presidential election, from the conceptual perspective of Theodore Millon.

Psychodiagnostically relevant information regarding Sen. Kerry was extracted 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. Sen. Kerry's primary personality pattern was found to be Ambitious/confident, with secondary features of the Dominant/asserting and Dauntless/adventurous patterns.

The amalgam of Ambitious and Dominant patterns in Sen. Kerry's profile suggests the presence of an adaptive, nonpathological variant of Millon's *elitist narcissist* syndrome. According to Millon, people with this personality composite feel privileged and empowered by virtue of their special childhood status, cultivate special status and advantages by association, are upwardly mobile, seek the good life, and tend to lay claim to greater accomplishment in life than is borne out by their actual achievements.

The major implication of the study is that it offers an empirically based personological framework for evaluating conflicting claims about John Kerry's integrity and candor, thus providing a basis for inferring his character as a presidential candidate.

# Introduction

This paper reports the results of a psychodiagnostic case study, conducted in summer 2004, of the personality of John Forbes Kerry, U.S. senator from the state of Massachusetts and Democratic Party nominee in the 2004 U.S. presidential election.

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

We 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).

That perspective provides the context for the current paper, which presents an analysis of the personality of John Kerry and examines the political implications of his 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*

| 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 John Kerry.

*Sources of data*.   Diagnostic information pertaining to John Kerry was collected from a variety of sources, including a generally admiring book-length biography by presidential historian Douglas Brinkley (2004); a more critical book-length compilation by *Boston Globe* reporters Michael Kranish, Brian C. Mooney, and Nina J. Easton (2004) who had covered Kerry extensively throughout the course of his political career; a report by psychologist Steve Rubenzer (2004); and a selection of articles or interviews by journalists (Berlau, 2004; Clift, 2004; Conan, 2004; Farrell, 2003; Gourevitch, 2004; Hewitt, 2004; Kranish, 2003; Mooney, 2003; Nagourney, 2004; Simon, 2004; Timmerman, 2004; Wolffe, 2004) that offered useful, diagnostically relevant biographical information.

*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).[1] 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.

---

[1] Inventory and manual available upon request from the first author.

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

Scale 1A:  Dominant pattern
       a.  Asserting
       b.  Controlling
       c.  Aggressive (Sadistic; *DSM–III–R*, Appendix A)
Scale 1B:  Dauntless pattern
       a.  Adventurous
       b.  Dissenting
       c.  Aggrandizing (Antisocial; *DSM–IV*, 301.7)
Scale 2:  Ambitious pattern
       a.  Confident
       b.  Self-serving
       c.  Exploitative (Narcissistic; *DSM–IV*, 301.81)
Scale 3:  Outgoing pattern
       a.  Congenial
       b.  Gregarious
       c.  Impulsive (Histrionic; *DSM–IV*, 301.50)
Scale 4:  Accommodating pattern
       a.  Cooperative
       b.  Agreeable
       c.  Submissive (Dependent; *DSM–IV*, 301.6)
Scale 5A:  Aggrieved pattern
       a.  Unpresuming
       b.  Self-denying
       c.  Self-defeating (*DSM–III–R*, Appendix A)
Scale 5B:  Contentious pattern
       a.  Resolute
       b.  Oppositional
       c.  Negativistic (Passive-aggressive; *DSM–III–R*, 301.84)
Scale 6:  Conscientious pattern
       a.  Respectful
       b.  Dutiful
       c.  Compulsive (Obsessive-compulsive; *DSM–IV*, 301.4)
Scale 7:  Reticent pattern
       a.  Circumspect
       b.  Inhibited
       c.  Withdrawn (Avoidant; *DSM–IV*, 301.82)
Scale 8:  Retiring pattern
       a.  Reserved
       b.  Aloof
       c.  Solitary (Schizoid; *DSM–IV*, 301.20)
Scale 9:  Distrusting pattern
       d.  Suspicious
       e.  Paranoid (*DSM–IV*, 301.0)
Scale 0:  Erratic pattern
       d.  Unstable
       e.  Borderline (*DSM–IV*, 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, 1999, 2003, 2005, for a more extensive 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 John Kerry, diagnostic classification of the subject, and the clinical interpretation of significant MIDC scale elevations derived from the diagnostic procedure.

Kerry received 31 endorsements on the 170-item MIDC. Descriptive statistics for Kerry's MIDC ratings are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3**
*MIDC Item Endorsement Rate by Attribute Domain*

| | |
|---|---|
| Expressive behavior | 10 |
| Interpersonal conduct | 7 |
| Cognitive style | 6 |
| Mood/temperament | 3 |
| Self-image | 5 |
| Sum | 31 |
| Mean | 6.2 |
| Standard deviation | 2.3 |

Kerry'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 John Kerry*

| Scale | Personality pattern | Raw | RT% |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1A | Dominant: Asserting–Controlling–Aggressive (Sadistic) | 6 | 17.1 |
| 1B | Dauntless: Adventurous–Dissenting–Aggrandizing (Antisocial) | 6 | 17.1 |
| 2 | Ambitious: Confident–Self-serving–Exploitative (Narcissistic) | 7 | 20.0 |
| 3 | Outgoing: Congenial–Gregarious–Impulsive (Histrionic) | 0 | 0.0 |
| 4 | Accommodating: Cooperative–Agreeable–Submissive (Dependent) | 3 | 8.6 |
| 5A | Aggrieved: Unpresuming–Self-denying–Self-defeating (Masochistic) | 0 | 0.0 |
| 5B | Contentious: Resolute–Oppositional–Negativistic (Passive-aggressive) | 3 | 8.6 |
| 6 | Conscientious: Respectful–Dutiful–Compulsive (Obsessive-compulsive) | 5 | 14.3 |
| 7 | Reticent: Circumspect–Inhibited–Withdrawn (Avoidant) | 2 | 5.7 |
| 8 | Retiring: Reserved–Aloof–Solitary (Schizoid) | 3 | 8.6 |
|  | Subtotal for basic personality scales | 35 | 100 |
| 9 | Distrusting: Suspicious–Paranoid (Paranoid) | 0 | 0.0 |
| 0 | Erratic: Unstable–Borderline (Borderline) | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | Full-scale total | 35 | 100.0 |

*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.[2] Kerry's most elevated scale, with a score of 7, is Scale 2 (Ambitious), closely followed by scores of 6 on Scale 1A (Dominant) and Scale 1B (Dauntless). Based on cut-off score guidelines provided in the MIDC manual, the Scale 2, Scale 1A, and Scale 1B elevations are all in the *present* (5–9) range. The only additional scale elevation of psychodiagnostic significance is the score of 5 on Scale 6 (Conscientious), which is on the lower threshold of the *present* range.

---

[2] 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 John Kerry**

| Scale: | 1A | 1B | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5A | 5B | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 0 |
|--------|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|
| Score: | 6  | 6  | 7 | 0 | 3 | 0  | 3  | 5 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |

In terms of MIDC scale gradation (see Table 2 and Figure 1) criteria, John Kerry was classified as primarily an Ambitious/confident (Scale 2) personality, with secondary features of the Dominant/asserting (Scale 1A) and Dauntless/adventurous (Scale 1B) personality patterns.[3]

# Discussion

The discussion of the results examines John Kerry'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 John Kerry's personality profile.

With his elevated Scale 2, Kerry emerged from the assessment as a highly confident personality type. The confident style is an adaptive variant of the Ambitious (narcissistic) pattern. The interpretation of Kerry's profile must also account for more modest elevations on Scale 1A (Dominant) and Scale 1B (Dauntless).

## *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[4] are confident, socially poised, assertive personalities. Slightly exaggerated Ambitious features[5] occur in personalities that are sometimes perceived as self-promoting, overconfident, or arrogant. In its most deeply ingrained, inflexible form,[6] 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)[7] summarizes the Asserting (i.e., Ambitious) pattern as follows:

---

[3] 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.

[4] Relevant to John Kerry.

[5] It is possible that some of these slightly exaggerated features are present in John Kerry; however, the results suggest that these traits are not deeply ingrained or pervasive across broad domains of Kerry's personality.

[6] Not applicable to John Kerry.

[7] All Millon 1994 citations in this report refer to the Manual of the *Millon Index of Personality Styles* (MIPS).

> 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:

> 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 c*onceited* 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 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 gall — 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 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[8] are strong-willed, commanding, assertive personalities. Slightly exaggerated Dominant features[9] occur in forceful, intimidating, controlling personalities. In its most deeply ingrained, inflexible form,[10] 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:

---

[8] Relevant to John Kerry.

[9] It is possible, but not highly likely, that some of these slightly exaggerated features are present in John Kerry; however, the results suggest that any such traits would be secondary and nonpervasive.

[10] Not applicable to John Kerry.

> 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 concede 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 flares readily 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, are 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)

## 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 pole[11] are adventurous, individualistic, adventurous personalities. Exaggerated Dauntless features[12] occur in unsconscientious, risk-taking, dissenting personalities. In its most deeply ingrained, inflexible form,[13] 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., adventurous 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 — this scale is negatively correlated with its *Agreeableness* factor. In addition, the Dissenting scale is moderately correlated 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

---

[11] Relevant to John Kerry.

[12] It is possible, but not very likely, that some of these slightly exaggerated features are present in John Kerry; however, any such traits would be secondary and nonpervasive and will have been considerably attenuated since middle adulthood.

[13] Not applicable to John Kerry.

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.
2. *Challenge*.  Routinely engage in high-risk activities.
3. *Mutual independence*.  Not overly concerned about others; expect each individual to be responsible for him- or herself.
4. *Persuasiveness*.  "Silver-tongued" charmers talented in the art of social influence.
5. *Wanderlust*.  Like to keep moving; live by their talents, skills, ingenuity, and wits.
6. *Wild oats*.  History of childhood and adolescent mischief and hell-raising.
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)

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. The diagnostic features of the Dauntless pattern with respect to each of these attribute domains are summarized below. Owing to the clinical emphasis of his model, Millon's (1996) attribute domains accentuate the maladaptive range of the personality patterns in his taxonomy — in the case of the Dauntless pattern, the aggrandizing pole of the adventurous–dissenting–aggrandizing continuum. The "normalized" (i.e., de-pathologized; cf. Millon & Davis, 2000, pp. 107–109) diagnostic features of the Dauntless pattern are summarized below; nonetheless, some of the designated traits may be attenuated or less pronounced, and more adaptive in the case of well-functioning political leaders — especially in cases where dauntlessness constitutes a less elevated or secondary pattern in the leader's overall personality profile.

*Expressive behavior*.  Dauntless personalities are typically adventurous, fearless, and daring, attracted by challenge and undeterred by personal risk. They do things their own way and are willing to take the consequences. Not surprisingly, they often act hastily and spontaneously, failing to plan ahead or heed consequences, making spur-of-the-moment decisions without carefully considering alternatives. This penchant for shooting from the hip can signify boldness and the courage of one's convictions as easily as it may constitute shortsighted imprudence and poor judgment. (Millon, 1996, pp. 444–445, 449–450; Millon & Davis, 1998, p. 164)

*Interpersonal conduct*.  Dauntless personalities are rugged individualists, not compromisers or conciliators. They take clear stands on the issues that matter, backed up by the self-confidence and personal skills and talents to prevail. Though generally jovial and convivial, they become confrontational and defiant when obstructed or crossed. (Millon, 1996, pp. 445–446, 449–450; Millon & Davis, 1998, p. 164)

*Cognitive style*.   Dauntless personalities are original, independent-minded, and unconventional. At their best, these personalities are enterprising, innovative, and creative. They are nonconformists first and foremost, disdainful — even contemptuous — of traditional ideals and values. Moreover, Dauntless personalities shirk orthodoxy and typically believe that too many rules stand in the way of freedom. In politics, these individuals may be described as "mavericks." (Millon, 1996, pp. 446–447, 449–450; Millon & Davis, 1998, p. 164)

*Mood/temperament*.  Dauntless personalities are untroubled and easygoing, but quickly become irritable and aggressive when crossed. They are cool, calm, and collected under pressure, restless and disgruntled when restricted or confined. They are tough-minded and unsentimental. They display their feelings openly and directly. (Millon, 1996, pp. 448–449, 449–450; Millon & Davis, 1998, p. 164)

*Self-image*.  Dauntless personalities are self-confident, with a corresponding view of themselves as self-sufficient and autonomous. They pride themselves on their independence, competence, strength, and their ability to prevail without social support, and they expect the same of others (Millon, 1996, pp. 447, 449–450; Millon & Davis, 1998, p. 164)

*Regulatory mechanisms*.   Dauntless personalities are unconstrained. They express their impulses directly, often in rash and precipitous fashion, and generally without regret or remorse. They rarely refashion their thoughts and actions to fit a socially desirable mold. (Millon, 1996, p. 448)

*Object representations*.   Dauntless personalities are driven by restive impulses to discredit established cultural ideals and mores, yet are skilled in arrogating for themselves what material spoils they can garner from society. Though fundamentally driven by self-serving motives, they are capable of incidentally advancing social causes in the service of their own ambition. (Millon, 1996, p. 447)

*Morphologic organization*.   The inner drives and impulses of Dauntless personalities are unruly, recalcitrant, and rebellious, which gives rise to unfettered self-expression, a marked intolerance of delay or frustration, and low thresholds for emotional discharge, particularly those of a hostile nature. (Millon, 1996, p. 448)

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

Predominantly Ambitious (narcissistic) individuals who also possess prominent Dominant (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. However, given his modest elevations on the two scales in question, John Kerry is neither a pathological narcissist nor a sadistic personality. Instead, he displays a generally adaptive, nonpathological variant of the syndrome. Millon (1996) does not offer a description of the adaptive variant of the narcissistic–sadistic personality composite, but it 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 John Kerry's elevations on the Ambitious and Dominant scales are quite modest, which suggests a much attenuated, generally adaptive variant of the pathological syndrome described by Millon and Davis.

## 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) 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 domain of government.

From Simonton's perspective, Kerry's slightly 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, Kerry's Scale 1A (Dominant) elevation suggests that he is moderately dominant in orientation. His slight elevation on Scale 8 (Retiring), in conjunction with a flat Scale 3 (Outgoing), offers convincing evidence of introversion. Thus, Kerry 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 evaluating conflicting claims about John Kerry's integrity and candor, thus providing a basis for inferring his character as a presidential candidate.

# References

American Psychiatric Association. (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Berlau, J. (2004, March 15). Kerry embodies new left ideals [Electronic version]. *Insight on the News*, p. 18. Retrieved May 3, 2004, from Lexis-Nexis.

Brinkley, D. (2004). *Tour of duty: John Kerry and the Vietnam War*. New York: William Morrow/HarperCollins.

Clift, E. (2004, March 5). Capitol letter: Shadow president. *Newsweek* [Web exclusive]. Retrieved May 3, 2004, from Lexis-Nexis.

Conan, N. (Host). (2004, April 26). John Kerry biography [Electronic transcript]. *Talk of the Nation*. Washington, DC: National Public Radio. Retrieved May 3, 2004, from Lexis-Nexis.

Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (Eds.). (1985). *The NEO Personality Inventory manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

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.

Farrell, J. A. (2003, June 20). With probes, making his mark (Part 6 of 7-part series "John F. Kerry: Candidate in the making") [Electronic version]. *The Boston Globe*, p. A1. Retrieved May 3, 2004, from Lexis-Nexis.

Gourevitch, P. (2004, February 9). The shakeout: Reversals of fortune in a high-stakes race [Electronic version]. *The New Yorker*, p. 28. Retrieved May 3, 2004, from Lexis-Nexis.

Greenstein, F. I. (1992). Can personality and politics be studied systematically? *Political Psychology*, *13*, 105–128.

Hewitt, H. (2004, March 18). Kerry's uncommon touch [Electronic version]. *The Daily Standard* (Daily Standard Section). Retrieved May 3, 2004, from Lexis-Nexis.

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. (1999). *Millon inventory of diagnostic criteria manual* (2nd ed.). Unpublished manuscript, St. John's University, Collegeville, MN.

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., & Steinberg, B. S. (Compilers) (1999). *Millon inventory of diagnostic criteria* (2nd ed.). Unpublished research scale, St. John's University, Collegeville, MN.

Kranish, M. (2003, June 15). A privileged youth, a taste for risk (Part 1 of 7-part series "John F. Kerry: Candidate in the making") [Electronic version]. *The Boston Globe*, p. A1. Retrieved May 3, 2004, from Lexis-Nexis.

Kranish, M., Mooney, B. C., & Easton, N. J. (2004). *John F. Kerry: The complete biography by the* Boston Globe *reporters who know him best*. New York: PublicAffairs/Perseus Books.

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* (2nd 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. (1998). Ten subtypes of psychopathy. In T. Millon, E. Simonsen, M. Birket-Smith, & R. D. Davis (Eds.), *Psychopathy: Antisocial, criminal, and violent behavior* (pp. 161–170). New York: Guilford.

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.

Mooney, B. C. (2003, June 18). First campaign ends in defeat (Part 4 of 7-part series "John F. Kerry: Candidate in the making") [Electronic version]. *The Boston Globe*, p. A1. Retrieved May 3, 2004, from Lexis-Nexis.

Nagourney, A. (2004, February 22). Leading candidates take different tacks for showdown [Electronic version]. *The New York Times*, Section 1, p. 18. Retrieved May 3, 2004, from Lexis-Nexis.

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* (3rd ed.).New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Rubenzer, S. (2004, March 17). Candidate traits matter, too [Electronic version]. *USA Today*, p. 13A. Retrieved May 3, 2004, from Lexis-Nexis.

Simon, R. (2004, March 15). The run of his life [Electronic version]. *U.S. News & World Report*, *136*(9). Retrieved May 3, 2004, from Lexis-Nexis.

Simonton, D. K. (1988). Presidential style: Personality, biography, and performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *55*, 928–936.

Strack, S. (1991). *Personality Adjective Check List manual* (rev.). South Pasadena, CA: 21st 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.

Timmerman, K. R. (2004, March 29). Kerry will abandon war on terrorism [Electronic version]. *Insight on the News*, p. 30. Retrieved May 3, 2004, from Lexis-Nexis.

Wolffe, R. (2004, March 3). Into the fray [Electronic version]. *Newsweek* [Web exclusive]. Retrieved May 3, 2004, from Lexis-Nexis.