The Political Personality of U.S. Vice President Mike Pence

Aubrey Immelman

St. John's University / College of St. Benedict, aimelman@csbsju.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/psychology_pubs

Part of the American Politics Commons, Leadership Studies Commons, Other Political Science Commons, Other Psychology Commons, and the Personality and Social Contexts Commons

Recommended Citation

THE POLITICAL PERSONALITY

OF U.S. VICE PRESIDENT MIKE PENCE

Aubrey Immelman

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

Working Paper — Release 1.1
Unit for the Study of Personality in Politics
http://personality-politics.org/

May 2017

Acknowledgment. This paper draws from data collected for “The Personality Profile of U.S. Vice President Mike Pence” (Research poster presented by Greta Schleif, Claudia Luther, Lauren Lingenfelter, Kristie Vang, Andrew Weiler, and Olivia Musser at the 17th Annual Celebrating Scholarship & Creativity Day, College of Saint Benedict and St. John’s University, St. Joseph and Collegeville, Minn., April 27, 2017).
Abstract

The Political Personality of U.S. Vice President Mike Pence
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Saint John’s University
College of Saint Benedict
St. Joseph, MN 56374, U.S.A.
Unit for the Study of Personality in Politics
http://personality-politics.org/

This paper presents the results of an indirect assessment of the personality of U.S. vice president Mike Pence, from the conceptual perspective of personologist Theodore Millon. Information concerning Pence was collected from biographical sources and media reports and synthesized into a personality profile using the Millon Inventory of Diagnostic Criteria (MIDC), which yields 34 normal and maladaptive personality classifications congruent with Axis II of DSM–IV.

The personality profile yielded by the MIDC was analyzed on the basis of interpretive guidelines provided in the MIDC and Millon Index of Personality Styles manuals. Pence’s primary personality pattern was found to be Conscientious/dutiful, complemented by secondary Dominant/asserting, Ambitious/confident, and Accommodating/cooperative features and a minor Outgoing/congenial tendency. With the exception of the outgoing tendency, Pence’s profile is nearly identical to that of the more introverted 2012 Republican presidential nominee Mitt Romney, who has a minor Retiring/reserved tendency.

In the absence of concurrent primary personality patterns serving to moderate or offset high conscientiousness, Pence may be described as a dutiful conformist personality type with a conscientious deliberator leadership style. Leaders with this personality profile are characteristically prudent, proper, dignified, dependable, and more principled than most personality types. They are highly organized, with a strong work ethic and careful attention to detail. Dutiful and diligent, conscientious leaders excel in crafting public policy, though they are not typically regarded as visionary or transformational leaders.

The major implication of the study is that it offers an empirically based personological framework for identifying psychological attributes on the part of Pence that might serve to complement, amplify, or attenuate personality traits that drive President Donald Trump’s leadership behavior as chief executive.
Introduction

This paper reports the results of a psychodiagnostic case study of Michael Richard Pence, 48th vice president of the United States, who previously served as the 50th governor of the state of Indiana from 2013 to 2017.


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

Personality may be concisely defined as:

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

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

That perspective provides the context for the current paper, which presents an analysis of the personality of Mike Pence and examines the political implications of his personality profile with respect to leadership style 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, 2003, 2005, 2014).

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

**Millon’s Eight Attribute Domains**

<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 Mike Pence.
Sources of data. Diagnostic information pertaining to Pence was collected from a broad array of more than 100 media reports that offered useful, diagnostically relevant psychobiographical information.

Personality inventory. The assessment instrument, the Millon Inventory of Diagnostic Criteria (MIDC; Immelman & Steinberg, 1999; Immelman, 2015), was compiled and adapted from Millon’s (1969, 1986b; 1990, 1996; Millon & Everly, 1985) prototypical features and diagnostic criteria for normal personality styles and their pathological variants. Information concerning the construction, administration, scoring, and interpretation of the MIDC is provided in the Millon Inventory of Diagnostic Criteria manual (Immelman, 2014). 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 prototypical features, keyed for attribute domain and personality pattern, is employed to classify the diagnostically relevant information extracted in phase 1; and finally, an evaluation phase (inference) during which theoretically grounded descriptions, explanations, inferences, and predictions are extrapolated from Millon’s theory of personality based on the personality profile constructed in phase 2 (see Immelman, 2003, 2005, 2014 for a more detailed account of the procedure).

---

1 Inventory and manual available to qualified professionals upon request.
Table 2

*Millon Inventory of Diagnostic Criteria: Scales and Gradations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1A: Dominant pattern</th>
<th>a. Asserting</th>
<th>b. Controlling</th>
<th>c. Aggressive (Sadistic; DSM–III–R, Appendix A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale 1B: Dauntless pattern</td>
<td>a. Adventurous</td>
<td>b. Dissenting</td>
<td>c. Aggrandizing (Antisocial; DSM–IV, 301.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 2: Ambitious pattern</td>
<td>a. Confident</td>
<td>b. Self-serving</td>
<td>c. Exploitative (Narcissistic; DSM–IV, 301.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 3: Outgoing pattern</td>
<td>a. Congenial</td>
<td>b. Gregarious</td>
<td>c. Impulsive (Histrionic; DSM–IV, 301.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 4: Accommodating pattern</td>
<td>a. Cooperative</td>
<td>b. Agreeable</td>
<td>c. Submissive (Dependent; DSM–IV, 301.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 5B: Contentious pattern</td>
<td>a. Resolute</td>
<td>b. Oppositional</td>
<td>c. Negativistic (Passive-aggressive; DSM–III–R, 301.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 6: Conscientious pattern</td>
<td>a. Respectful</td>
<td>b. Dutiful</td>
<td>c. Compulsive (Obsessive-compulsive; DSM–IV, 301.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 7: Reticent pattern</td>
<td>a. Circumspect</td>
<td>b. Inhibited</td>
<td>c. Withdrawn (Avoidant; DSM–IV, 301.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 8: Retiring pattern</td>
<td>a. Reserved</td>
<td>b. Aloof</td>
<td>c. Solitary (Schizoid; DSM–IV, 301.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 9: Distrusting pattern</td>
<td>d. Suspicious</td>
<td>e. Paranoid (DSM–IV, 301.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 0: Erratic pattern</td>
<td>d. Unstable</td>
<td>e. Borderline (DSM–IV, 301.83)</td>
<td></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 Mike Pence, diagnostic classification of the subject, and the clinical interpretation of significant MIDC scale elevations derived from the diagnostic procedure.

Pence received 30 endorsements on the 170-item MIDC. Judging from endorsement-rate deviations from the mean (see Table 3), data on Pence’s interpersonal conduct (9 endorsements) and expressive behavior (8 endorsements) were most easily obtained and may be overrepresented in the data set, whereas data on his cognitive style (3 endorsements) and self-image (4 endorsements) were most difficult to obtain and may be underrepresented in the data set.

Descriptive statistics for Pence’s MIDC ratings are presented in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute domain</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressive behavior</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal conduct</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive style</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood/temperament</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-image</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pence’s MIDC scale scores are reported in Table 4. The MIDC profile yielded by Pence’s raw scores is displayed in Figure 1.²

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.
Table 4

MIDC Scale Scores for Mike Pence

<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>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>Dauntless: Adventurous–Dissenting–Aggrandizing (Antisocial)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ambitious: Confident–Self-serving–Exploitative (Narcissistic)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Outgoing: Congenial–Gregarious–Impulsive (Histrionic)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Accommodating: Cooperative–Agreeable–Submissive (Dependent)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>Aggrieved: Unpresuming–Self-denying–Self-defeating (Masochistic)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>Contentious: Resolute–Oppositional–Negativistic (Passive-aggressive)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Conscientious: Respectful–Dutiful–Compulsive (Obsessive-compulsive)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Reticent: Circumspect–Inhibited–Withdrawn (Avoidant)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Retiring: Reserved–Allof–Solitary (Schizoid)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal for basic personality scales</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Distrusting: Suspicious–Paranoid (Paranoid)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Erratic: Unstable–Borderline (Borderline)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-scale total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</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).

Pence’s most elevated scale is Scale 6 (Conscientious), with a score of 11. In addition, Pence obtained secondary elevations on Scale 1A (Dominant), with a score of 5, and Scales 2 (Ambitious) and 4 (Accommodating), both with scores of 4. The only other scale elevation of note is scale 3 (Outgoing), with a score of 3. The primary Scale 6 elevation is just within the prominent (10–26) range, while the secondary elevations on Scales 1A, 2, and 4 are at or just below the threshold for the present (5–9) range. The Scale 3 elevation approaches the lower threshold of the present (5–9) range. No other scale elevation is psychodiagnostically significant.

Based on the cut-off score guidelines provided in the MIDC manual, all of Pence’s scale elevations (see Figure 1) are within normal limits, though the spike on Scale 6 (Conscientious) is noteworthy by virtue of its moderate elevation and singular prominence in Pence’s overall personality configuration. In terms of MIDC scale gradation (see Table 2 and Figure 1) criteria, supplemented by clinical judgment, Pence was classified as primarily a Conscientious/dutiful personality, complemented by secondary Dominant/asserting, Ambitious/confident, and Accommodating/cooperative features and a minor Outgoing/congenial tendency. The prominence of the Conscientious pattern, in conjunction with the absence of other primary personality patterns that might serve to modify or offset high conscientiousness, dictates that Pence is best described as a prototypical dutiful conformist personality type with a conscientious deliberator leadership style.

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.
Figure 2. *Millon Inventory of Diagnostic Criteria: Profile for Mike Pence*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5A</th>
<th>5B</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Discussion

The discussion of the results examines Pence’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 political implications of Pence’s personality profile.

With his moderately elevated Scale 6, Pence emerged from the assessment as a dutiful type, an adaptive, slightly exaggerated variant of the Conscientious pattern. His slight secondary elevation on Scale 1A (Dominant) is not of great consequence, being at the lower threshold of what would typically be expected in an individual in a high-level leadership position. Similarly, Pence’s modest secondary elevations on Scale 2 (Ambitious) and Scale 4 (Accommodating) are unremarkable, reflecting, respectively, an adaptive level of self-confidence and cooperativeness.

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.4 Exaggerated Conscientious features occur in dutiful, dependable, and principled but rigid personalities.5 In its most deeply ingrained, inflexible form, the Conscientious pattern displays itself in a moralistic, self-righteous, uncompromising, cognitively constricted, compulsive behavior pattern that may be consistent with a clinical diagnosis of obsessive-compulsive personality disorder.6

In the case of Pence, only the normal (associated with earnest, polite, respectful personalities) and intermediate (associated with dutiful, dependable, relatively principled though somewhat rigid, personalities) variants have any relevance, given Pence’s moderate Scale 6 elevation.

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

4 Relevant to Mike Pence.
5 Marginally relevant to Mike Pence.
6 Not applicable to Mike Pence.
“demonstrate an unusual degree of integrity, adhering as firmly as they can to society’s ethics and morals” (Millon, 1996, pp. 518–519).

As stated by Oldham and Morris (1995):

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

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

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

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

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

Being principled, scrupulous, and meticulous, conscientious individuals “tend to follow standards from which they hesitate to deviate, attempt to act in an objective and rational manner, and decide matters in terms of what they believe is right.” They are often religious, and maintaining their integrity “ranks high among their goals” while “voicing moral values gives them a deep sense of satisfaction.” The major limitations of this personality style are (a) its “superrationality,” leading to a “devaluation of emotion [which] tends to preclude relativistic judgments and subjective preferences”; and (b) a predilection for “seeing complex matters in black and white, good and bad, or right or wrong terms” (Millon, 1996, p. 519).
Millon’s personality patterns have predictable, reliable, observable psychological indicators (expressive behavior, interpersonal conduct, cognitive style, mood/temperament, self-image, regulatory mechanisms, object-representations, and morphologic organization). Millon’s (1996) attribute domains accentuate the maladaptive range of the personality patterns in his taxonomy — in the case of the Conscientious pattern, the compulsive pole of the respectful–dutiful–compulsive continuum. The major diagnostic features of the prototypal maladaptive variant of the Conscientious pattern are summarized below, along with “normalized” (i.e., de-pathologized; cf. Millon & Davis, 2000, pp. 174–176) descriptions of the more adaptive variants of this pattern.

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

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

**Cognitive style.** The core diagnostic feature of the cognitive style of Conscientious individuals is *circumspection*; they are cautious, prudent, deliberate, systematic, and attentive to detail. Wary of new or untested ideas, they are risk avoidant. More exaggerated variants of the Conscientious pattern are *unimaginative*; they are methodical, structured, pedestrian, uninspired, or routinized. Perfectionism may interfere with decision making and task completion, and they may have difficulty dealing with new ideas. All variants of this pattern are concerned with matters of propriety and efficiency and tend to be rigid about regulations and procedures — though, ironically, all too often getting mired in minor or irrelevant details. They judge others by “objective” standards and time-proven rules of an orderly society and are inclined to disdain frivolity and public displays of emotion, which they view as irresponsible or immature. Though
industrious, tidy, meticulous, practical, realistic, and diligent, their thinking may be deficient in flexibility, creativity, and imagination, and lacking in vision. (Millon, 1996, pp. 515–516; Millon & Everly, 1985, p. 33)

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

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

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

**Object representations.** The core diagnostic feature of the internalized object representations of highly Conscientious individuals is concealment; there is a tendency for only those internalized representations that are socially acceptable, with their corresponding inner affects, memories, and attitudes, to be permitted into conscious awareness or to be expressed. Thus, personal difficulties and social conflicts anchored to past experiences are defensively denied, kept from conscious awareness, and maintained under the most stringent of controls. These individuals devalue self‐exploration, claiming that it is antithetical to efficient behavior and that introspection only intrudes on rational thinking and self-control. Consequently, highly Conscientious persons often have limited insight into their deeper motives and feelings. (Millon, 1996, p. 516)
**Morphologic organization.** The core diagnostic feature of the morphological organization of highly Conscientious individuals is *compartmentalization*; to keep contrary feelings and impulses from affecting one another, and to hold ambivalent images and contradictory attitudes from spilling forth into conscious awareness, the organization of their inner world tends to be compartmentalized in a tightly consolidated system that is clearly partitioned into numerous, distinct, and segregated constellations of drive, memory, and cognition, with few open channels to permit interplay among these components. Thus, a deliberate and well-poised surface quality may belihe an inner turmoil. To prevent upsetting the balance they have so carefully wrought throughout their lives, highly Conscientious individuals strive to avoid risk and to operate with complete certainty. Their toughest challenge, however, is to control their emotions, which they do by extensive use of intrapsychic defenses. Because they typically have a family history of exposure to demanding, perfectionistic parents, a potent force behind their tightly structured world is their fear of disapproval. By the same token, their public facade of conformity and propriety may mask an undercurrent of repressed urges toward self-assertion and defiance. (Millon, 1996, pp. 517–518)

**Scale 1A: The Dominant Pattern**

As noted earlier, it is doubtful that the Dominant pattern (Scale 1A) plays a central role in Pence’s personality functioning beyond accounting for a threshold level of assertiveness and competitiveness. That is to say, the Dominant pattern plays a secondary role in Pence’s overall personality functioning. As do all personality patterns, the Dominant pattern occurs on a continuum ranging from normal to maladaptive. In the case of Pence, only the normal variant — associated with assertive, strong-willed personalities — has any bearing.

The normal, adaptive variant of the Dominant pattern corresponds to Strack’s (1997) *forceful* style and the *managerial* segment of Leary’s (1957) managerial–autocratic continuum. According to Millon (1994, p. 82), Controlling (i.e., Dominant) individuals tend to be emotionally stable and conscientious. In combination with the Conscientious (Scale 6) pattern (as is the case with Pence), an elevated Dominant pattern points to a presidential style that Simonton (1988) has labeled *deliberative*. Strack (1997) provides 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. … 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. (Adapted from Strack, 1997, p. 490, with minor modifications)
Scale 2: The Ambitious Pattern

The Ambitious pattern, as do all personality patterns, occurs on a continuum ranging from normal to maladaptive. In the case of Pence, only the normal variant — well-adjusted, confident, and socially poised — has any bearing on his overall personality functioning and executive performance.

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” (Millon, 1994, p. 32).

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

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

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. … In the workplace, confident [Ambitious] persons like to take charge in an emphatic manner, often doing so in a way that instills confidence in others. Their self-assurance, wit, and charm often win them supervisory and leadership positions. (Adapted from Strack, 1997, pp. 489–490, with minor modifications)

It should be emphasized, however, that the Ambitious pattern plays a very limited role in Pence’s overall personality functioning.

Scale 4: The Accommodating Pattern

As noted earlier, clinical judgment, informed by considerations of theoretical coherence, suggests that Pence’s Dominant (Scale 1A) features are offset by a secondary Accommodating tendency. The Accommodating pattern, as do all personality patterns, occurs on a continuum ranging from normal to maladaptive. In the case of Pence, only the normal variant — associated with cooperative, conciliatory personalities — has any significance.
The normal, adaptive variant of the Accommodating pattern corresponds to Strack’s (1997) *cooperative* style and Millon’s (1994) *Agreeing* pattern. The Accommodating pattern also overlaps with the *docile* and *cooperative* segments of Leary’s (1957) *docile–dependent* and *cooperative–overconventional* interpersonal styles. Millon’s Agreeing pattern is highly correlated with the five-factor model’s * Agreeableness* factor. The Accommodating style is equivalent to Simonton’s (1988) *interpersonal* executive leadership style.

According to Millon (1994) the Accommodating pattern (which he labels * Agreeing*)

is akin to the normal “cooperative” segment of Leary’s [1957] * cooperative–overconventional* interpersonal style, representing an accommodating, participatory, compromising, and agreeing pattern of behavior. … [The Accommodating pattern] corresponds … to the Big-Five’s Factor II, * Agreeableness* … in conveying a self-respecting concordance with others; a congenial obligingness is voluntary rather than being coerced or being a product of self-derogation. Those who fit the congenial/Agreeing [Accommodating] pattern are notably cooperative and amicable. Disinclined to upset others, they are willing to adapt their preferences to be compatible with those of others. Trusting others to be kind and thoughtful, they are also willing to reconcile differences and to achieve peaceable solutions, as well as to be considerate and to concede when necessary. Cordiality and compromise characterize their interpersonal relationships. (p. 34)

Millon (1996) further notes that Accommodating personalities in the adaptive range of the pattern tend to demand little from others, are relatively uncritical, and are invariably gracious, even to those they may dislike (p. 335).

Strack (1997) provides the following portrait of the interpersonal style of the normal (cooperative) prototype of the Accommodating 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:

Cooperative [Accommodating] persons are often cooperative, reliable, considerate of others, and deferential. They may appear even-tempered, docile, obliging, or self-effacing. When faced with difficult or stressful situations, cooperative persons may seek others to provide authority, leadership, and direction. (Adapted from Strack, 1997, p. 489)

It should be reiterated, however, that the Accommodating pattern plays a very limited role in Pence’s overall personality functioning.

**Summary and Formulation**

Predominantly conscientious (Scale 6) personality types that are not highly aggressive (Scale 1A) — and, in fact, somewhat agreeable (Scale 4), as in the case of Pence — may be characterized as *dutiful conformers*. These personalities are duty-bound, earnest, rule-bound, and hardworking. They have a greater fear of failure or error than most personality types, which makes them more risk-averse than most types and may predispose them to self-doubt and indecisiveness.
Leadership Implications

The present study offers an empirically based framework for anticipating Pence’s performance as vice president. The prominence of the Conscientious pattern in Pence’s profile, in conjunction with the absence of other primary personality patterns that might serve to modify or offset his high conscientiousness, suggests a dutiful conformist personality prototype, forming a personological substrate (i.e., psychological driver) for a conscientious deliberator leadership style.

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

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

In an executive role, Pence’s greatest strength, by dint of his high conscientiousness, is orchestration. Consequently, Pence can be expected to display superior organizational skill in conjunction with the sustained focus and attention to detail necessary to excel in formulating specific policies.

Dean Keith Simonton (1988) 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 have heuristic value for establishing links between personality and political leadership.

From Simonton’s perspective, Pence’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 the hypothesized links between Millon’s personality patterns and concomitant leadership styles (Steinberg, 2008; Steinberg & Immelman, 2008), the following generalized expectancies regarding Pence’s likely executive leadership style (in the event he succeeded Donald Trump as president) can be inferred from his personality profile:
Motivation for leading. Leaders with a personality profile dominated by conscientiousness are less likely to be motivated by ideology or personal validation, and more likely to display a tendency to centralize power in the executive branch, generally guided by pragmatism. Tending to be substantially controlling, rigid, and perfectionistic, they are likely to try to concentrate power in themselves as a way of preventing matters, to their way of thinking, from spinning out of control. Because conscientious types are relatively lacking in imagination, with a structured, pedestrian form of cognition, they eschew new or untested ideas, which makes them wary of ideologically driven proposals and more comfortable with a pragmatic approach to politics.

Task orientation. Conscientious leaders are inclined to be interested both in accomplishing their goals — demonstrating their strong work ethic — and in the process itself. As a result, they are notably respectful of tradition and authority and may be unbending in their adherence to social proprieties.

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 their insistence on maintaining propriety in relationships among members of the government and the civil service.

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. Because conscientious 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.

Information management strategy — degree of involvement and source of information. Given the conscientious personality’s penchant for overcontrol, orderliness, and perfectionism, these 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 outside of government.

Personnel relations — degree and type of involvement. In terms of relations with personnel, conscientious leaders can be relied on to be highly interactive with aides, assistants, and staff, lest something important escapes their notice. Their treatment of subordinates is likely to be mixed: At the lower end of the prominent range (as in the case of Pence), conscientious leaders are likely to treat subordinates in a polite and courteous fashion; at the higher end of that range (not the case with Pence), perfectionistic tendencies become more evident, leading to uncompromising and demanding or domineering behavior. Unlike narcissistic or highly extraverted leaders, they are unlikely to engage in attention-seeking or seductive behavior with their aides, because they are motivated by duty, not vanity.
**Party-political relations.** In their dealings with members of their own party in the legislative branch of government, their national party organization, and the opposition party, conscientious leaders can be expected to behave in a dutiful fashion. Thus, they are likely to treat those whom they consider subordinate in either a cooperative/harmonious or a competitive/oppositional fashion depending on the intensity of their conscientious tendency. Given Pence’s moderate scale elevation on conscientiousness, he is more likely to behave in a cooperative/harmonious manner.

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

**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 somewhat rigid, perfectionist personalities, they are unlikely to enjoy this aspect of governing and may be prepared to allow senior officials some role in articulating and defending their administration’s policies.

**In summary,** the present assessment of Mike Pence’s personal psychology points to the following stylistic elements with respect to executive leadership:

- Generally guided by pragmatism, not ideology or personal validation
- Favors centralization of power in the executive branch
- Strong task orientation, with an emphasis on managerial competence and job productivity
- Consensus building secondary to implementing the most efficient or morally “correct” policy
- High involvement in information management
- Highly interactive, cooperative/harmonious staff relations
- Generally open, relatively cooperative, yet formal and polite media relations
- Low affinity for public relations, preferring to delegate articulation and defense of administration policies to senior officials
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