

“Are political “culture wars” really political “type wars”? Certain type preferences are moderately related to measures of political self-concept and opinions about specific political issues, but not, in this study, to specific political party membership.”

The Relationship of Psychological Type to Political Self-Perceptions, Political Opinions, and Political Party Membership

Robert W. Boozer
Stetson University

Monique Forte
Stetson University

ABSTRACT

This research sought to replicate and extend prior research that explored the relationship between psychological type preferences and a variety of political topics. Participants from three different samples ($n = 454$) provided information about their psychological type and completed questionnaires that measured political self-concept, opinions about political issues, and party membership. A preference for Sensing correlated with a conservative orientation and lower political interest than did a preference for Intuition, which correlated

with a liberal orientation and greater political interest. The E-I dichotomy correlated significantly with a measure of political alienation, with Introverts reporting greater political alienation than Extraverts. The results also indicated correlations between type preferences and opinions about specific political issues, but no relationship was found between type and political party membership. Although research on the role of psychological type in the political arena is highly undeveloped, it holds much promise in understanding ongoing political divisiveness.

Note: For the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® (MBTI®) instrument, the eight preference categories are the following: Extraversion (E) versus Introversion (I); Sensing (S) versus Intuition (N); Thinking (T) versus Feeling (F); Judging (J) versus Perceiving (P).

INTRODUCTION

Terrorism. Abortion. Taxes. Republican. Democrat. Liberal. Conservative. What do these terms have in common? They reflect the warp and woof of media chatter that daily enacts and exacerbates the divide in American politics generally labeled as the culture wars (e.g., Hunter, 1991). Clearly, the political scene in the United States has seen a growth in conservative political power over the past 20 years that has challenged a more liberal agenda established under earlier Democratic administrations (Stimson, 1999). But, there is an interesting question about these politics: Are they really culture wars; or, might they be more correctly labeled “type wars”?

This “type wars” question is not as farfetched as it might first appear. For example, psychological type researchers for years have acknowledged that type differences impact conflict dynamics and the management of such conflict (Chanin & Schner, 1984; Kilmann & Thomas, 1975). Much of this research has been directed at work situations, which by their nature are inherently political (Mintzberg, 1985). Moreover, one has but to read Jung’s *Psychological Types* (1921/1971) with a political lens to see that Jung placed type differences squarely at the center of the politics of institutional development. For example, Jung discussed the different views of leaders in the emerging Christian church and located the source of these different views in the different psychological types of the leaders. Although the discussion is an interesting story about psychological type differences, it also is instructive as to the influence that psychological type differences may have on the politics of an institution and its culture in terms of the accepted institutional values, symbols, rituals, stories, and so on.

That personality influences politics, of course, is not a new idea. Political psychologists for years have studied the relationship of personality to political topics (Immelman, 2003). Much of this literature, however, has its roots in a post World War II setting in which political psychologists were concerned with understanding the psychology of Nazi Germany and its authoritarian dynamics. Thus, much of this research has a psychopathology theme (Mehrabian, 1996). Although some aspects of political ideology and behav-

ior may indeed involve psychopathology, it seems more realistic to assume that much political psychology might be explored fruitfully within the framework of normal personality functioning as represented by the theory of psychological types.

Only a few psychological type researchers have examined the role of type in the national political arena (e.g., Elder & Kamasinski, 1992; Macdavid, 1999). Given the significant role politics plays in most aspects of life, and the prevailing sense of political divisiveness in the U.S., knowledge of the relationship of psychological type to various political constructs seems to hold promise for understanding and potentially making constructive use of differences. Our purpose in this study, therefore, is to build on and extend prior research into the relationship of psychological type to selected political topics.

TYPE AND SELECTED POLITICAL TOPICS

From the many political topics that might be studied, we chose to examine three: political self-concept, political issue opinions, and party membership.

Type and Political Self-Concept. Self-concept involves the beliefs and opinions that a person holds about himself or herself (Purkey, 1988). Political self-concept thus involves those specific beliefs and opinions about a person that are related to politics. For this study, we chose to focus on three key aspects of political self-concept: perception of self as liberal-conservative; perception of self as politically alienated; and perception of self as interested in politics.

Liberal-Conservative Self-Perceptions. Liberal-Conservative self-perceptions are characterizations of a person’s political ideology. Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary (n.d.) defines liberalism as “a political philosophy based on belief in progress, the essential goodness of the human race, and the autonomy of the individual and standing for the protection of political and civil liberties.” It defines conservatism as “a political philosophy based on tradition and social stability, stressing established institutions, and preferring gradual development to abrupt change.”

The perception of self as politically liberal, conservative, moderate, and so on is one of the most frequently researched topics in political psychology. For example, a review of the psychology of political conservatism included 88 samples from 12 countries involving more than 22,000 people (Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski, & Sulloway, 2003).

Although the psychology of the liberal-conservative orientation has been studied extensively, we found only two studies employing a psychological type perspective. Using the CAPT data bank, Macdavid (1999) examined the extent to which the 16 psychological types provided extreme responses to the item “My political views are . . .” very liberal to very conservative. SJs were overrepresented in persons reporting very conservative political views, and Ns were overrepresented in persons reporting very liberal political views (ENTJs excepted). These results support Elder and Kamasinski’s (1992) study that found a relationship between S–N preferences and a measure of political ideology. (Sensing preferences correlated positively with endorsement of the conservative orientation.)

Research using the Five Factor Model (FFM) of personality (Costa & McCrae, 1992) provides further insight, in that the openness to experience factor correlated positively with a preference for Intuition and negatively with one for Sensing (Furnham, Moutafi, & Crump, 2003; Myers, McCaulley, Quenk, & Hammer, 1998). Individuals who score high on openness see themselves as liberal, whereas those who score low on openness see themselves as conservative (McRae, 1996).

Neither the psychological type nor FFM studies provide consistent evidence suggesting a relationship between liberal-conservative orientations and any of the other type preference dichotomies (E–I, T–F, J–P). For example, although Elder and Kamasinski’s (1992) results indicate a relationship between the E–I dichotomy and political ideology, Macdavid’s (1999) results do not indicate such a relationship. These different findings may be the result of the different measures used in the two studies as well as the different analytical methods. Further, research results from the FFM also are inconsistent and, again, such inconsistency may be caused by the varied measures used to indicate political orientation and personality (e.g., McRae, 1996; Mehrabian, 1996).

This brief review suggests that the only consistent finding is the relationship between the Sensing-Intuition dichotomy and liberal-conservative self-perceptions. That Sensing or Intuition preferences correlate with liberal or conservative political orientation, respectively,

seems reasonable, given that both sets of constructs concern issues related to change and stability (Conover & Feldman, 1981; Jost et al., 2003; Myers et al., 1998). Reimann (1972) noted, “Conservatism signifies the established order which Liberalism seeks to change” (p. 26). We thus hypothesize that Sensing preferences will correlate with self-perceptions as conservative and preference for Intuition will correlate with self-perceptions as liberal. Given the mixed results for the other type preferences in prior studies, we hypothesize that there will be no significant relationships for E–I, T–F, and J–P dichotomies.

Political Alienation Perceptions. Political alienation is defined as discontent or disconnect from the political process (Citrin, McClosky, Shanks, & Sniderman, 1975). Research on political alienation is of interest, because alienated voters may not vote at all or may favor nonmajor party candidates (Southwell, 2003).

We found no research that specifically addressed the question of whether certain psychological types are likely to feel more alienated politically than other types. Research using the FFM perspective, however, suggests that introversion correlates positively with political alienation—even when controlling for sex, age, and

education (Peterson & Maiden, 1992–1993). The positive correlation between introversion and political alienation is similar to studies showing correlations between introversion and other measures of social alienation or independence from the environment (Daugherty & Linton, 2000; Myers et al., 1998). Further, Peterson and Maiden found evidence linking the openness to experience factor (again, a correlate of Sensing preferences) with political alienation. Thus, we hypothesize that the Introversion preference of the E–I dichotomy and the Sensing preference of the S–N dichotomy will be correlated with political alienation perceptions.

Political Interest. We define political interest as awareness of or attention to the political arena. Self-reported interest in politics is of research importance, because this variable correlates with numerous indicators of political knowledge and thus is associated with factors central to the effective functioning of a democracy (Galston, 2001). Again, no research appears to exist

“ . . . there is an interesting question about these politics: Are they really culture wars; or, might they be more correctly labeled “type wars”?”

that addresses the question of whether certain psychological types are more likely than others to be interested in politics. Research using the FFM perspective, however, indicates that interest in politics is positively correlated with extraversion and openness to experience factors (Peterson & Maiden, 1992–1993). Thus, we hypothesize that the Extraversion preference of the E–I dichotomy and the Intuition preference of the S–N dichotomy will be correlated with reported interest in politics.

Type and Political Issue Opinions. Research shows that different psychological types esteem different values (Myers et al., 1998). Thus, to the extent that values influence political orientations and decisions (Hunter, 1991), it seems reasonable to assume that psychological type preferences will influence opinions about specific political issues such as abortion, gun-control, and tax policy. Our survey of the literature, however, produced no studies that addressed this issue from a psychological type perspective. Further, research in political psychology seems to have focused more on specific personality traits—authoritarianism, dogmatism, and so on—that have only a tenuous connection with general personality factors such as those in the FFM or measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® (MBTI®) instrument. We thus take an exploratory look in this paper at the relationship of type preferences to opinions about specific political issues.

Type and Party Membership. The ideological differences between Republicans and Democrats provide the primary framework in which the culture wars metaphor is enacted in the United States. Party membership thus plays an important role in how people view various political topics, often shaping the individual's opinions about specific political issues (Cohen, 2003).

Research on psychological type and party membership suggests that personality factors may indeed predispose individuals to affiliate themselves with particular political parties. Hammer's (2001) analysis suggests that preferences for Thinking and Judging (T–J) are associated with a Republican Party affiliation, Feeling preferences are associated with a Democratic

Party affiliation, and preferences for Intuition, Thinking, and Perceiving (NTP) are associated with an Independent affiliation. Such results seem consistent with studies examining party affiliation and personality using other personality measures. For example, Constantini and Craik (1980) examined the relationship between personality and party membership for California's presidential delegation slate. Using the Adjective Check List (ACL; Gough, 1960), Republican delegates scored higher than Democratic delegates on Order and Endurance, which are correlated with Thinking and Judging preferences (Myers et al., 1998). Republican delegates scored lower than their Democratic counter-

parts on Succorance and Change, which are correlated with Feeling and Perceiving preferences, respectively (Myers et al.). Similar results have been reported for personality and political coalition affiliation among Italian voters using an FFM perspective (Caprara, Barbaranelli, & Zimbardo, 1999). Thus, we hypothesize that the Thinking preference of the T–F dichotomy and the Judging preference of the J–P dichotomy will be correlated with affiliation with the Republican Party, whereas the Feeling preference of the T–F dichotomy and the Perceiving preference of the J–P dichotomy will be correlated with

Democratic Party affiliation.

METHOD

Samples. Three samples were used for data collection. Sample 1 ($n = 221$) was surveyed over a 5-year period (1994–1998) and included undergraduate and graduate students at a university in the southeastern U.S., as well as county government managers and elected officials. The sample was 57% male.

Sample 2 ($n = 126$) was surveyed in March 2002, a time when the issue of whether or not the U.S. should go to war with Iraq was emerging. Sample members were graduate and undergraduate business students attending one of three universities in Florida, North Carolina, and Texas. The sample was 59% female, and the mean age was 22.5 years ($s = 4.4$ years).

Sample 3 ($n = 107$) was surveyed in the first 2 weeks of March 2003 before the beginning of hostilities in Iraq. Sample members were graduate and under-

... much political psychology might be explored fruitfully within the framework of normal personality functioning as represented by the theory of psychological types.

graduate business students attending a private university in the southeastern U.S. The samples was 58% male, and the average age was 24.7 years ($s = 6.8$ years).

As will be discussed, the various samples were combined for analysis. Samples 1 and 3 were combined ($n = 328$) to assess the relationship of type to liberal-conservative self-perceptions, and Samples 2 and 3 were combined ($n = 233$) for all other analyses. The type distributions for these two combined samples are shown in **TABLES 1** and **2** (SEE PAGES 22 AND 23). Both tables also compare the distribution of types in each combined sample with a National Representative Sample reported for Form M of the MBTI instrument (Myers et al., 1998).

MEASURES

Psychological Type. Form G of the MBTI instrument was used to determine type preferences for Sample 1. Participants in Samples 2 and 3 self-reported their “best-fit” type and their level of confidence for each preference dichotomy. Participants in Samples 2 and 3 had taken the MBTI instrument in at least one of their classes and had received an interpretation. Most participants were involved in education programs that integrated type concepts into various classes, and thus participants were confident about their preferences.

Liberal-Conservative Self-Perceptions. These perceptions were measured in Samples 1 and 3 using a research item from the Form G answer sheet. Participants responded to the statement “My political views are . . .” on a scale ranging from 1 (*very liberal*) to 7 (*very conservative*).

Political Alienation. Participants in Samples 2 and 3 reported their level of political alienation on three items indicating the extent to which they viewed the major political parties as being responsive to individual interests (e.g., “The major political parties don’t care what the average person thinks”). Participants responded to each item on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

Political Interest. Political interest was measured in Samples 2 and 3 with three items (e.g., “I pay attention to the political news”). Respondents again used a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

Political Issue Opinions. Participants in Samples 2 and 3 provided opinions about six different political issues that have been found to be salient for the samples involved in this study (Sax, Lindholm, Astin, Korn, &

Mahoney, 2002). The issues include opinions about gun control (e.g., “I support stricter gun control laws”), tax policy (e.g., “The wealthy should be taxed at the same rate as everyone else”), drug testing (e.g., “Organizations should not be allowed to require drug tests of prospective employees”), abortion (e.g., “Abortion is immoral”), the death penalty (e.g., “The death penalty should be abolished”), and the war on terrorism (e.g., “I support the war on terrorism”). Opinions toward each issue were measured with three items, again using a 7-point Likert scale for each item. Participants also indicated their level of trust (e.g., “I trust the Bush Administration”) using a 3-item scale of the same format.

Party Membership. Participants (Samples 2 & 3) who were registered to vote indicated party affiliation: Republican, Democrat, No Party Affiliation, Independent, Libertarian, Green Party, or Other. Party memberships were categorized using those recognized by the states from which the sample members were selected.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Reliability and Validity of Measures. Measures of political alienation, political interest, and political issue opinions were the same in the analyses of both Sample 2 and Sample 3. However, because these samples were collected a year apart, we assessed the construct validity of the measures separately before considering whether the results could be combined for analysis (to improve statistical power and flexibility in the analysis). Principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation was used to assess the factor structure of each set of responses. In both samples, a nine-factor solution (alienation, interest, trust, and six opinion scales) showed that all items had their highest loading on the intended factor. These results suggest that the nine scales possess some stability of factor structure over the two survey administrations. A two-group discriminant analysis further indicated no overall significant difference in responses (canonical $r = .19$, $p = .51$) between the two time periods. Thus, the results from the two samples were combined ($n = 233$) for analysis. **TABLE 3** (SEE PAGE 24) shows descriptive statistics, reliability coefficients, and correlations for the combined samples.

Correlation analysis was used to further examine the construct validity of the scales. Using the data from Sample 3, responses to the political alienation, interest, and issue opinion scales were correlated with liberal-conservative self-perceptions. As can be seen in

Table 1. Type Distribution of Grouped Sample Used in Liberal-Conservative Self-Perceptions Analysis and SRTT Comparison With Population Norms From the 1998 MBTI Manual.

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences			
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 41 (12.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.08 +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 25 (7.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.55** +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 7 (2.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.46 ++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 17 (5.2%) <i>I</i> = 2.51*** +++++	E <i>n</i> = 178 (54.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.10	I <i>n</i> = 150 (45.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.90	S <i>n</i> = 179 (54.6%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.74	N <i>n</i> = 149 (45.4%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.70
ISTP <i>n</i> = 13 (4.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.74 +++++	ISFP <i>n</i> = 7 (2.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.24*** ++	INFP <i>n</i> = 14 (4.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.97 +++++	INTP <i>n</i> = 26 (7.9%) <i>I</i> = 2.43*** +++++	J <i>n</i> = 188 (57.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.06	P <i>n</i> = 140 (42.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.93	Pairs and Temperaments	
ESTP <i>n</i> = 17 (5.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.21 +++++	ESFP <i>n</i> = 13 (4.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.47** +++++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 20 (6.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.75 +++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 30 (9.2%) <i>I</i> = 2.87*** +++++	IJ <i>n</i> = 90 (27.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.95	IP <i>n</i> = 60 (18.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.84	EP <i>n</i> = 80 (24.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.01	EJ <i>n</i> = 98 (29.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.19
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 44 (13.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.55** +++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 19 (5.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.47*** +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 16 (4.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.98* +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 19 (5.8%) <i>I</i> = 3.23*** +++++	ST <i>n</i> = 115 (35.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.17	SF <i>n</i> = 64 (19.5%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.45	NF <i>n</i> = 57 (17.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.06	NT <i>n</i> = 92 (28.1%) *** <i>I</i> = 2.72
				SJ <i>n</i> = 129 (39.3%) * <i>I</i> = 0.85	SP <i>n</i> = 50 (15.2%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.57	NP <i>n</i> = 90 (27.4%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.45	NJ <i>n</i> = 59 (18.0%) *** <i>I</i> = 2.31
				TJ <i>n</i> = 121 (36.9%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.53	TP <i>n</i> = 86 (26.2%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.63	FP <i>n</i> = 54 (16.5%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.55	FJ <i>n</i> = 67 (20.4%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.68
				IN <i>n</i> = 64 (19.5%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.75	EN <i>n</i> = 85 (25.9%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.67	IS <i>n</i> = 86 (26.2%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.66	ES <i>n</i> = 93 (28.4%) * <i>I</i> = 0.84
				ET <i>n</i> = 110 (33.5%) <i>I</i> = n.a.	EF <i>n</i> = 68 (20.7%) <i>I</i> = n.a.	IF <i>n</i> = 53 (16.2%) <i>I</i> = n.a.	IT <i>n</i> = 97 (29.6%) <i>I</i> = n.a.

Jungian Types (E)

	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>
E-TJ	63	19.2	n.a.
E-FJ	35	10.7	n.a.
ES-P	30	9.1	n.a.
EN-P	50	15.2	n.a.

Jungian Types (I)

	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>
I-TP	39	11.9	n.a.
I-FP	21	6.4	n.a.
IS-J	66	20.1	n.a.
IN-J	24	7.3	n.a.

Dominant Types

	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>
Dt. T	102	31.1	n.a.
Dt. F	56	17.1	n.a.
Dt. S	96	29.3	n.a.
Dt. N	74	22.6	n.a.

N = 328 + = 1% of *N* *I* = Selection Ratio Index **p*<.05 ***p*<.01 ****p*<.001

Robert W. Boozer and Monique Forte

Table 2. Type Distribution of Samples 2 and 3 Combined, With SRTT Comparison to Population Norms From the 1998 MBTI Manual.

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences			
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 23 (9.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.85 +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 11 (4.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.34*** +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 8 (3.4%) <i>I</i> = 2.35* +++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 10 (4.3%) <i>I</i> = 2.08* +++++	E <i>n</i> = 159 (68.2%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.39	I <i>n</i> = 74 (31.8%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.63	S <i>n</i> = 127 (54.5%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.74	N <i>n</i> = 106 (45.5%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.70
ISTP <i>n</i> = 5 (2.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.40* ++	ISFP <i>n</i> = 4 (1.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.20*** ++	INFP <i>n</i> = 7 (3.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.68 +++	INTP <i>n</i> = 6 (2.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.79 +++	T <i>n</i> = 113 (48.5%) * <i>I</i> = 1.21	F <i>n</i> = 120 (51.5%) * <i>I</i> = 0.86	J <i>n</i> = 142 (60.9%) * <i>I</i> = 1.13	P <i>n</i> = 91 (39.1%) * <i>I</i> = 0.85
ESTP <i>n</i> = 15 (6.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.50 +++++	ESFP <i>n</i> = 17 (7.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.86 +++++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 26 (11.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.38 +++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 11 (4.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.48 +++++	J <i>n</i> = 52 (22.3%) * <i>I</i> = 0.77	IP <i>n</i> = 22 (9.4%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.43	EP <i>n</i> = 69 (29.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.23	EJ <i>n</i> = 90 (38.6%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.53
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 26 (11.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.29 +++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 26 (11.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.91 +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 21 (9.0%) <i>I</i> = 3.66*** +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 17 (7.3%) <i>I</i> = 4.06*** +++++	ST <i>n</i> = 69 (29.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.99	SF <i>n</i> = 58 (24.9%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.57	NF <i>n</i> = 62 (26.6%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.62	NT <i>n</i> = 44 (18.9%) *** <i>I</i> = 1.83
				SJ <i>n</i> = 86 (36.9%) ** <i>I</i> = 0.80	SP <i>n</i> = 41 (17.6%) ** <i>I</i> = 0.65	NP <i>n</i> = 50 (21.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.13	NJ <i>n</i> = 56 (24.0%) *** <i>I</i> = 3.09
				TJ <i>n</i> = 76 (32.6%) ** <i>I</i> = 1.35	TP <i>n</i> = 37 (15.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.98	FP <i>n</i> = 54 (23.2%) * <i>I</i> = 0.78	FJ <i>n</i> = 66 (28.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.94
				IN <i>n</i> = 31 (13.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.19	EN <i>n</i> = 75 (32.2%) *** <i>I</i> = 2.07	IS <i>n</i> = 43 (18.5%) *** <i>I</i> = 0.47	ES <i>n</i> = 84 (36.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.07
				ET <i>n</i> = 69 (29.6%) <i>I</i> = n.a.	EF <i>n</i> = 90 (38.6%) <i>I</i> = n.a.	IF <i>n</i> = 30 (12.9%) <i>I</i> = n.a.	IT <i>n</i> = 44 (18.9%) <i>I</i> = n.a.

Jungian Types (E)

	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>
E-TJ	43	18.5	n.a.
E-FJ	47	20.2	n.a.
ES-P	32	13.4	n.a.
EN-P	37	16.9	n.a.

Jungian Types (I)

	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>
I-TP	11	4.7	n.a.
I-FP	11	4.7	n.a.
IS-J	34	14.6	n.a.
IN-J	18	7.7	n.a.

Dominant Types

	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>
Dt. T	54	23.2	n.a.
Dt. F	58	24.9	n.a.
Dt. S	66	28.3	n.a.
Dt. N	55	23.6	n.a.

N = 233 += 1% of *N* *I* = Selection Ratio Index **p* < .05 ***p* < .01 ****p* < .001

Robert W. Boozer and Monique Forte

Table 3. Means, Standard Deviations, Intercorrelations, and Internal Consistency Coefficients for Scales.^{1,2}

Variable	Mean	SD	Variable									
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
1. Politically Interested	4.78	1.45	(.92)									
2. Politically Alienated	4.28	1.17	-.16*	(.72)								
3. Support Death Penalty	5.78	1.42	-.02	-.06	(.91)							
4. Support Tax Wealthy	3.61	1.62	-.11	.29**	-.13	(.87)						
5. Support Drug Testing	2.74	1.50	.00	-.14*	.27**	-.10	(.81)					
6. Support War	5.41	1.40	.19**	-.19**	.35**	-.13	-.22**	(.86)				
7. Trust Administration	4.84	1.61	.09	-.37**	.26**	-.22**	-.30**	.58**	(.96)			
8. Pro-Choice	4.88	1.83	-.19**	.23**	.08	.18**	.17*	-.08	-.25**	(.85)		
9. Support Gun Control	4.92	1.83	-.28**	.08	-.14*	-.20**	.11	-.10	-.08	-.09	(.88)	
10. Liberal-Conservative	4.28	1.56	.05	-.38**	.30**	-.32**	.54**	.48**	.61**	-.27**	-.24*	

¹ Correlation coefficients are for Samples 2 and 3 combined ($n = 233$) except for row 10, which presents coefficients for Sample 3 only ($n = 107$).

² Reliability coefficients (coefficient alpha) are presented in the diagonal. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ (two-tailed tests).

TABLE 3, all opinion scales were significantly correlated ($p < .05$) in a predictable manner with the item measuring liberal-conservative self-perceptions. For example, more conservative self-perception scores tended to correlate positively with political opinions such as support for the war on terrorism ($r = .48, p < .01$) and negatively with political opinions such as pro-choice attitudes toward abortion ($r = -.27, p < .01$).

Political Self-Perceptions. The relationship of psychological type to liberal-conservative self-perceptions ($n = 328$) was assessed using a full-model univariate ANOVA. The results indicated a significant overall effect ($p < .05$) produced primarily by a significant ($p < .001$) main effect for the S–N dichotomy. No other effects were significant.

Political Alienation, Interest, and Issue Opinions. We examined the relationship of type preferences to alienation, interest, trust, and issue opinion responses using nine hierarchical multiple regression analyses—one for each of the dependent variables. Each analysis followed a two-step process. In the first step, we regressed age, sex, and voter registration status on the dependent variable. These variables are significant determinants of a variety of political opinions and

orientations (e.g., Alvarez & McCaffery, 2003; Krosnick & Milburn, 1990) and thus were used as control variables in the current study. The second step involved testing for main effects of type preferences (coded as dichotomous variables) by entering the four sets of dichotomies (E–I, S–N, T–F, J–P) as a block, thus examining the ability of psychological type preferences to predict political opinions beyond what might be predicted by the control variables.

Shown in TABLE 4 (SEE PAGE 25), the results indicate a significant R^2 for the control variables in only three of the analyses, with respondents' sex being the only consistent predictor. The results also indicate a significant change in R^2 for the block of type preferences in only three of the nine analyses. In each case, only one preference dichotomy was responsible for the significant overall effect. The S–N dichotomy was correlated significantly with interest in politics (people with a preference for Intuition reporting greater interest than those with a preference for Sensing), the T–F dichotomy was correlated significantly with support for the death penalty (people with a preference for Thinking reporting greater support than those with a preference for Feeling), and the J–P dichotomy correlated significantly

Table 4. Summary Results for Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses.

Independent Variable	R^2 , R^2 Change, and Significant Variables for Each Step			
	Step I		Step II	
	R^2	Variables	R^2 Change	Variables
Politically Interested	.12***	Registered, Age, Sex	.04*	Registered, Age, Sex, S–N
Politically Alienated	.01		.03	E–I
Support Death Penalty	.01		.04*	T–F
Support Tax Wealthy	.01		.01	
Support Drug Testing	.04*	Sex	.03	Sex, S–N
Support War	.02		.01	
Trust Administration	.02		.03	
Pro-Choice	.01		.05*	J–P
Support Gun Control	.08**	Sex	.02	Sex

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ (two-tailed tests).

with pro-choice opinions toward abortion (with a preference for Perceiving reporting greater support than those with a preference for Judging).

The results also indicated a significant main effect for E–I and S–N dichotomies in two cases in which the change in R^2 was not significant. The E–I dichotomy correlated significantly with political alienation (with Is reporting more alienation than Es), and S–N preferences correlated significantly with support for drug testing by organizations (with Sensing types reporting more support than those with Intuition). Four of the regression analyses produced no significant results for type preferences.

Type and Party Membership. The relationship of type preferences to political party membership was examined using SRTT analyses, with combined responses from Samples 2 and 3. The first analysis compared registered Democrats ($n = 47$) against registered Republicans ($n = 101$). No significant results were found. Given the relatively small number of registered Democrats in the sample, we also compared registered Republicans with all other party affiliations combined ($n = 93$). Again, no significant differences resulted.

DISCUSSION

The results provide at least three propositions for discussion. First, type preferences are moderately related to individuals' political self-concepts in a manner that supports prior research. Second, the relationship of type preferences to opinions about specific political issues seems somewhat sporadic. Third, the results provide no support for a relationship between political party registration status and type preferences. We will discuss each of these findings in order.

What is the relationship between type preferences and political self-concept? We found moderate support for a relationship between these two constructs, but the relationship is multifaceted and selective. That is, only selected type preferences are related to selected aspects of political self-concept; S–N preferences are significantly correlated with liberal-conservative orientation and political interest, and E–I preferences are significantly correlated with political alienation.

Our findings that individuals with Sensing preferences see themselves as politically conservative and that individuals with Intuition preferences see themselves as politically liberal generally support prior research with the MBTI instrument (Elder & Kamasinski, 1992;

Macdaid, 1999) as well as results from the FFM perspective (McCrae, 1996). These findings also have face validity in that many Sensing attributes are consistent with the characterizations of conservatives, and many Intuitive attributes are consistent with characterizations of liberals. Thus, it seems safe to conclude that S–N preferences are correlated with liberal-conservative political orientations, although the full nature of this relationship needs further examination—particularly in light of our failure to replicate Macdaid’s finding suggesting an S–N x J–P interaction.

The results also support prior research from the FFM perspective suggesting a relationship between S–N preferences and self-reported interest in politics (Peterson & Maiden, 1992–1993). Individuals with Intuition preferences report greater interest in politics. These results are all the more interesting given that this significant finding was produced after other control variables were included in the analysis, particularly voter registration status, which itself is a significant indicator of political interest. A key question, of course, is why Ns would rate themselves as more interested in politics than Ss. One possibility is that interest in politics—and particularly news about politics—can be seen as more of an intuitive endeavor given that much political behavior and information is symbolic and concerns changing future possibilities. Regardless, these results do not indicate that people with a preference for Intuition are more knowledgeable about politics than people with a preference for Sensing, but rather that Ns see themselves as more interested in politics. Further research is needed to explore this phenomenon more fully.

The results that showed a significant relationship between preferences for Introversion and the perception of political alienation seem consistent with psychological type theory that suggests that Introverts, more than Extraverts, are likely to seek independence from the environment as well as experience more discomfort with the environment (Myers et al., 1998). Such a relationship, however, raises important questions that need further study. For example, other research relating political alienation to personality variables suggests that

political alienation is correlated with poor personal and social adjustment, such as low self-esteem (e.g., McClosky & Scharr, 1965), although this viewpoint is not universally accepted (e.g., Geyer, 1990). Given this perspective, what are we to presume about the role of Introversion in someone’s adjustment to political society? Is the alienation associated with less participation as suggested by studies employing a FFM perspective (Peterson & Maiden, 1992–1993)? Or, is this relationship more an Introverted expression of the tendency for politics to be seen as an Extraverted dynamic, both in an organizational context (Boozer, Forte, Maddox, & Jackson, 2000) as well as in the broader political arena (Caprara, Barbaranelli, & Zimbardo, 1997)? Again, further research can help answer these questions.

Are a person’s type preferences related to opinions about specific political issues? The answer to this question depends on a variety of considerations. First, the fact that only a few significant findings resulted from 24 separate tests (6 opinion variables x 4 type variables) suggests that some of the significant results may be caused by chance. This concern about experiment-wise error rate requires us to accept only tentatively the assumption that there may be any general relationship between type preferences

and opinions about specific political issues. On the other hand, the sporadic results reported here appear to be interpretable in terms of type theory. For example, the finding that Thinking types report more support for the death penalty than do Feeling types seems congruent with descriptions of Ts as impersonal, critical, and tough-minded, in contrast to Fs, who are described as nurturing, warm, sympathetic, and generally concerned about others (Myers et al., 1998).

Do particular psychological types self-select into certain political parties more than into other parties? In contrast to Hammer’s (2001) research showing that type is associated with political party affiliation, our results suggest that type has no effect on registering to vote as a member of a particular political party, at least when Republicans are compared with Democrats or with non-Republicans. Although these results appear to contradict previous findings, the different outcomes may be

“ . . . knowledge of the relationship of psychological type to various political constructs seems to hold promise for understanding and potentially making constructive use of differences.”

caused by the different methods used to assess party affiliation. In particular, Hammer's results appear to examine party affiliation in terms of party identification and not actual registration status, as was done in this study. Again, further research could help clarify the relationship of type to party affiliation and registration status.

LIMITATIONS

The primary limitation of the study concerns the nature of the samples used in the two analyses. In particular, the majority of sample members came from college programs focused on the study of business and management (particularly at the MBA level) as well as upper-level managers in public administration. The bias toward N and T preferences often displayed by these groups can be seen in the results (TABLE 1) for the SRTT analysis involving the sample members whose responses were used to examine liberal-conservative self-perceptions: Both N and T preferences are over-represented in this group compared with norms for the general population (Myers et al., 1998). Further, the bias toward a preference for Feeling shown in the group combining Samples 2 and 3 (TABLE 2) possibly reflects the inclusion of sample members from a private

women's college. These results generally suggest that the findings of the current study are limited to the particular makeup of the samples included. Replication of the results in more diverse settings is needed to further solidify an understanding of the relationship between type preferences and political dynamics.

CONCLUSIONS

Two general conclusions seem appropriate. First, research on the role of psychological type in the political arena is sparse, to say the least. Although psychological type enthusiasts clearly enjoy typing politicians, only three studies could be found that addressed empirically the relationship of psychological type to political topics. Second, results from the present study—when combined with results from the other three studies—indicate that type preferences are indeed related to political topics in theoretically meaningful and consistent ways. This conclusion seems particularly appropriate for the relationship between type preferences and political self-concept. Given the ongoing political divisiveness in the United States, we can only wonder if further research on type and politics might not provide some added insights into the sources of this divisiveness, and thus some means for the constructive use of differences.

REFERENCES

- Alvarez, R. M., & McCaffrey, E. J. (2003). Are there sex differences in fiscal political preferences? *Political Research Quarterly*, 56(10), 5–17.
- Boozer, R. W., Forte, M., Maddox, N., & Jackson, W. T. (2000). An exploration of the perceived psychological type of the office politician. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 55, 5–13.
- Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., & Zimbardo, P. G. (1997, February 6). Politicians' uniquely simple personalities. *Nature*, 385, 493.
- Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., & Zimbardo, P. G. (1999). Personality profiles and political parties. *Political Psychology*, 20, 175–197.
- Chanin, M. N., & Schmeer, J. A. (1984). A study of the relationship between the Jungian personality dimensions and conflict-handling behavior. *Human Relations*, 37, 863–879.
- Citrin, J., McClosky, H., Shanks, J. M., & Sniderman, P. M. (1975). Personal and political sources of political alienation. *British Journal of Political Science*, 5, 1–31.
- Cohen, G. L. (2003). Party over policy: The dominating impact of group influence on political beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(5), 808–822.
- Conover, P. J., & Feldman, S. (1981). The origins and meaning of liberal/conservative self-identification. *American Journal of Political Science*, 25(4), 617–645.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *The revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Constantini, E., & Craik, K. H. (1980). Personality and politicians: California party leaders, 1960–1976. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 641–661.
- Daugherty, T. K., & Linton, J. M. (2000). Assessment of social alienation: Psychometric properties of the SACS-R. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 28(4), 323–328.
- Elder, R. E., Jr., & Kamasinski, R., Jr. (1992). *The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and political ideology*. Paper presented at the meeting of the APT Canada II Conference of the Association for Psychological Type, Toronto, Canada.
- Furnham, A., Moutafi, J., & Crump, J. (2003). The relationship between the revised NEO-Personality Inventory and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 31(6), 577–584.
- Galston, W. A. (2001). Political knowledge, political engagement, and civic education. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4, 217–234.
- Geyer, F. (1990). Political alienation and environmental complexity. *Kybernetes*, 19(2), 11–31.
- Gough, H. (1960). The Adjective Check List as a personality assessment research technique. *Psychological Reports*, 6, 107–122.

- Hammer, A. L. (2001). *Snapshots of the 16 types*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
- Hunter, J. D. (1991). *Culture wars: The struggle to define America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Immelman, A. (2003). Personality in political psychology. In T. Millon & M. J. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Personality and social psychology* (Vol. 5, pp. 599–625). New York: Wiley.
- Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., & Sulloway, F. J. (2003). Political conservatism as motivated social cognition. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 339–375.
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Original work published 1921)
- Kilmann, R. H., & Thomas, K. W. (1975). Interpersonal conflict-handling behavior as reflections of Jungian personality dimensions. *Psychological Reports*, 37, 971–980.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Milburn, M. A. (1990). Psychological determinants of political opinionation. *Social Cognition*, 8(1), 49–72.
- Macdaid, G. P. (1999, February). *Facts from the CAPT databank*. Paper presented at the Second Biennial Clinical Conference of the Center for the Applications of Psychological Type, Gainesville, FL.
- McClosky, H., & Scharr, J. H. (1965). Psychological dimensions of anomie. *American Sociological Review*, 30, 14–41.
- McCrae, R. R. (1996). The social consequences of experiential openness. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120(3), 323–337.
- Mehrabian, A. (1996). Relations among political attitudes, personality, and psychopathology assessed with new measures of libertarianism and conservatism. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 18(4), 469–491.
- Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. (n.d.). Retrieved June 15, 2004, from <http://www.m-w.com/>
- Mintzberg, H. (1985). The organization as a political arena. *Journal of Management Studies*, 22(2), 133–154.
- Myers, I. B., McCaulley, M. H., Quenk, N. L., & Hammer, A. L. (1998). *MBTI manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* (3rd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
- Peterson, S. A., & Maiden, R. (1992–1993). Personality and politics among older Americans: A rural case study. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 36(2), 157–169.
- Purkey, W. (1988). *An overview of Self-Concept Theory for counselors*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Personnel Services, Ann Arbor, MI. (An ERIC/CAPS Digest: ED304630)
- Reimann, G. A. (1972). A rational explanation. *Life Lines*, 14(24). As cited in D. L. Bender & B. Leone (1985), *The political spectrum: Opposing viewpoints*. St. Paul, MN: Greenhaven Press.
- Sax, L. J., Lindholm, J. A., Astin, A. W., Korn, W. S., & Mahoney, K. M. (2002). *The American Freshman: National norms for Fall 2002*. Los Angeles: Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California; and American Council on Education.
- Southwell, P. L. (2003). The politics of alienation: Nonvoting and support for third-party candidates among 18–30-year-olds. *Social Science Journal*, 40(1), 99–108.
- Stimson, J. A. (1999). *Public Opinion in America* (2nd ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview.

Robert W. Boozer, D.B.A. is Professor of Management in the School of Business Administration at Stetson University in DeLand, Florida. Bob also serves as a member of the Association for Psychological Type's training faculty for the MBTI qualifying program and a member of the APT Review Board of the *Journal of Psychological Type*. His research and teaching focus on the relationship of psychological type to various organizational and group processes, including political dynamics. Bob holds a BSBA degree in finance from the University of Florida and a DBA degree in management from Mississippi State University.

Monique Forte, Ph.D. is Associate Professor of Management at Stetson University. She teaches undergraduate courses in management and the first-year business experience program. Her research interests include psychological type, political dynamics, strategic change, and experiential learning. She has published in the *Journal of Psychological Type*, the *Journal of Management Education*, and the *Strategic Management Journal*. Monique holds BBA and MBA degrees from the University of Georgia and a Ph.D. from Florida State University.

CONTACT

Robert W. Boozer, D.B.A.
 Management Department
 School of Business, Unit 8398
 Stetson University
 421 N. Woodland Blvd.
 DeLand, FL 32723
 (386) 822-7433
 bboozer@stetson.edu

This *Journal* is being made available through the collaborative efforts of Dr. Tom Carskadon, Editor of the *Journal of Psychological Type*, and the Center for Applications of Psychological Type, Inc., CAPT, worldwide publisher. Dr. B. Michael Thorne serves as Executive Editor of the *Journal of Psychological Type*.

Journal of Psychological Type is a trademark or registered trademark of Thomas G. Carskadon in the United States and other countries.

CAPT is a not-for-profit organization dedicated to the meaningful application and ethical use of psychological type as measured through the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator instrument.

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, Myers-Briggs, and MBTI are trademarks or registered trademarks of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Trust in the United States and other countries.

Center for Applications of Psychological Type, Inc. and CAPT are trademarks or registered trademarks of the Center for Applications of Psychological Type in the United States and other countries.

Copyright © 2007 by Thomas G. Carskadon, Editor.

ISSN 0895-8750.