

2018

## Personality in politics

Rachael Fix  
*University of Northern Iowa*

*Let us know how access to this document benefits you*

Copyright ©2018 Rachael Fix

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/hpt>



Part of the [American Politics Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Fix, Rachael, "Personality in politics" (2018). *Honors Program Theses*. 296.  
<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/hpt/296>

This Open Access Honors Program Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Program Theses by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@uni.edu](mailto:scholarworks@uni.edu).

**Offensive Materials Statement:** Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

A Thesis Submitted  
in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Designation  
University Honors

Rachael Fix  
University of Northern Iowa  
May 2018

This Study done by: Rachael Fix

Entitled: Personality in Politics

Has been approved as meeting the thesis or project requirement for the Designation University  
Honors

---

Date

---

Professor Holmes, Honors Thesis Advisor

---

Date

---

Dr. Jessica Moon, Director, University Honors Program

## **Introduction**

Personality has always played a big part in politics. It is one of the first things voters take into account when they decide which politician to cast their votes for. While personality may certainly play into what kind of person decides to run for a public office, what about the voters? If personality impacts when candidates decide whether or not to run for office, it could also be that personality influences whom voters decide should take office. Perhaps certain personality traits could even be used as a predictor for whether or not someone will vote for a certain politician or identify as a member of a certain partisan group. Many studies have already been conducted in this area of research, but the results are mixed. While most studies agree that the Big Five Personality test, a psychological test that accesses personality traits, is currently the most accurate personality test, there are disagreements over which traits concretely correlate with which political party. This study intends to find a more concrete connection between personality and partisanship. As of right now, there is little to no research on the connection between partisanship and personality, as most research focuses on connections between ideology and personality. What this study hopes to do is to provide further investigation as to whether personality shows connections with or predictions of partisanship. If connections are found, personality may be shown as a better indicator of partisanship and could provide uses in predicting how citizens vote or join political parties.

## **Political Parties and Partisanship**

The political system in the United States revolves primarily around two political parties, the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. However, these two parties did not come into existence until a few decades after the nation's founding. The Republican Party, also known as the Grand Old Party (GOP), came into existence in 1854, after the Whig, Free-Soil, and Know-

Nothing parties decided to join forces. During the Civil war, they were joined by Northern Democrats who were against the emancipation of slaves. Since the 1960s, the more conservative members of the party have been more prominent within the Republican Party ("Party Roots," 1996). The Democratic Party, originally called the Republican Party before becoming the Democratic-Republican Party, formed in the 1790s. It was in 1828 that the Democratic-Republican Party split into the modern day Republican Party, dominated by the Whigs, and the Democratic Party. It suffered an ideological split during the Civil War, as part of the party felt the government should intervene while others believed that the government should stay out of the politics surrounding slavery. During the Great Depression, the Democrats saw unity under Franklin Delano Roosevelt, with many party members carrying on the idea of regulating and redistributing wealth ("Party Roots," 1996, p. 6). After many years of disagreements and historical events, the parties became what they are known as today.

Parties serve an important role for voters during an election. First of all, the parties structure the sets of alternatives available for citizens to choose from, mobilize, persuade, and inform citizens, while also providing citizens with a way to get active within the system (Leeper & Slothuus, 2014, p. 132). Parties also tell citizens "how they should understand the political choices before them and, by implication, what political dispositions should be applied and how" (Leeper & Slothuus, 2014, p. 133). Parties also allow for mental shortcuts in political decision-making by providing citizens with party-member and celebrity endorsements. This allows citizens to make decisions according to the party line without having to have much information, saving them the time and effort that otherwise would have been used to research political issues (Leeper & Slothuus, 2014, p. 135). This comes in handy since the average citizen often does not have the information nor training to fully navigate or understand all of the information the media gives them about politics in the United States.

There are several theories as to why parties are so prominent in the United States. One approach believes that parties serve "as an informational shortcut that helps citizens to form

‘accurate’ opinions that are consistent with their values, interests, or real-world developments” (Leeper & Slothuus, 2014, p. 134). Another school of thought believes “citizens are motivated by a ‘directional’ goal to reach a certain desired conclusion, namely forming an opinion in a particular direction that is consistent with their party identification, regardless of how the opinion fits with other considerations” (Leeper & Slothuus, 2014). A third theory is that by playing strong roles in the forming of citizens’ political identities, strong emotional bonds form between the citizens and their parties, making it more likely that they continue following the party line (Leeper & Slothuus, 2014). Parties may be prominent due to their roles as heuristics due to their labels providing small pieces of essential voting information, goals in political programming, or the coalitions of people that make them up.

Ideology also plays a major role in how the parties influence the public. One way is the ideological gap between the two parties when it comes to different social and economic issues. One study said, “[T]he claim that issue orientations are more central than partisanship is grounded in the view that due to their social and economic positions in society, people develop different interests and values which translate into preferences for different policies” (Highton, & Kam, 2011, p. 204). As time has gone by, polarization has made these differences more apparent. The same study said that differences preferences in policies between the two parties within the general public has been increasing (Highton & Kam, 2011). Two Political scientists, Kinder and Winter, claim this polarization increased due to social and racial issues (Highton, & Kam, 2011). This connection to social issues may even lead to something more. A study by Leeper and Slothuus (2014) said, “[P]olitical parties are perceived by citizens to be connected to particular societal groups, and hence party cues can help citizens reason about the consequences of a policy for those groups” (p.136). As certain societal influences, such as polarization, increases, citizens may feel a stronger attraction to one party or the other.

Several different speculations about why voters flock to either party exist. One focuses on societal groups, believing that different demographics are more likely to join either the

Republican or Democratic party than their peers. It is said that “[p]olicies favored by Democrats are generally perceived to be more favorable to blacks, female-headed families, retirees, and foreign-born persons than are policies favored by Republicans” (Levernier & Barilla, 2006, p. 437). Democrats also tend to have economic policies that are more supportive of laborers and the poor while Republicans tend to be more supportive of capitalism and businesses (Levernier & Barilla, 2006). Therefore, as commonly known, minorities, women, the poor, college graduates, and workers are more often found to be Democratic, while many Republicans tend to be older, white, Protestant, and have more wealth. Another theory believes differences, especially differences within states, may be due to moral issues (Ansolabehere et al., 2006). It may be the issues that political parties advocate that attract certain people to one side or the other.

Where voters live also is another predictor of how someone might vote. If someone lives in the South, more than likely they will vote Republican or be a member of the Republican Party. If someone lives on the coasts, they will be more likely to vote Democratic or be a member of the Democratic Party (Ansolabehere, Rodden, & Snyder, 2006). Of course, before the Civil War, it used to be that the South was dominantly Democratic while the North leaned Republican. After Lincoln had the federal government intervene in the conflict, realignment occurred, forming the North and South political division as known today (Rutland, 1995). It was not until the Great Depression that the South became solidly red and the North solidly blue (“Party Roots”, 1996). Region does not only predict voting behavior based on the state someone lives in, however. It can also predict voting behavior based on where they live within the state. Certain states, such as California and Florida, have a partisan division between their Northern and Southern halves, while states such as Tennessee and Massachusetts have a significant difference between their Eastern and Western halves (Ansolabehere et al., 2006). If a voter lives in an urban area, they are more likely to vote Democratic. If someone lives in a rural part of the state, they are more

likely to vote Republican (Ansolabehere et al., 2006). History has told us that where someone lives may strongly impact their political views.

A third speculation lies within the family. An article in *The Sociological Quarterly* says, “One possible explanation might be that voters are rendered more or less receptive to the Republican’s ‘strict father’ or the Democrat’s ‘nurturant parent’ moralities...due to the family context in their states as well as well as their own family characteristics and group memberships” (Monson & Mertens, 2011, p. 263). If someone grew up in a strict, conservative family that had emphasis on parental authority, or an area where strict or conservative families were the norm, they may be more likely to be Republican. On the other hand, if they grew up in a family or an area where children had more freedom and parents focused more on allowing the creativity and liberty of their kids, they may be more likely to be Democratic. Also, because parents often times share the same economic situation, same race, religion, etc., of their children, these situational similarities may also increase children’s tendency to become more like their parents (Monson & Mertens, 2011). The way someone is raised impacts them in multiple ways and one of these ways may be politically.

This is somewhat similar to the social learning theory of partisanship, which believes the reinforcement or punishment of certain behaviors by parents will shape their children’s tendencies toward a certain party or ideology (Jennings, Stoker, & Bowers, 2009). Of course, the more parents are politically engaged and discuss politics with or around their children, the more likely their children will share their traits (Monson et al., 2009). In fact, children are more likely to share or adopt the partisan ideology of their parents than any other political trait (Monson et al., 2009). The more time someone spends around a person with certain mannerisms as they grow up, the more likely they will share those mannerisms, to some extent, when they reach adulthood.

However, many scientists peg the similarities between family members in political traits as being a function of genetics. These researchers “consider political traits to be influenced by



thousands of genetic markers both directly and through interactions with numerous environmental stimuli and other genes in complex genomic, epigenetic, and neural pathways” (Hatemi & McDermott, 2012, p. 527). Some of these studies found that “variants of dopamine (DRD2 and DRD4) and serotonin (5HTT) genes influenced voter turnout and general political participation” (Hatemi & McDermott, 2012, p. 529). However, no one gene controls a specific personality trait. Instead, the influences of genes “probably operate through those emotional, cognitive, or rational processes that are instigated when individuals are asked particular questions about their attitudes” (Hatemi & McDermott, 2012, p. 528). More and more studies are finding reason to suspect that genetics somehow has an impact on things such as partisanship.

Different experiments have confirmed this as well. According to one study, identical twins, twins with nearly identical DNA, correlated more highly than fraternal twins, twins with DNA as similar to each other as those of siblings born years apart, on a scale measuring attitudes on various controversies (Hatemi & McDermott, 2012). Twins studies among other studies carried across different cultures confirmed that the “relative importance of genetic influences remains common across cultures, but the relative influence of family and personal environments varies greatly across societies, time, and measures in explaining the variance in attitudes” (Hatemi & McDermott, 2012, p. 526). Some scientists believe that genes are a stronger influence on children than social learning. One study says, “In essence, parent and adult child concordance appeared to be a function of genetic transmission and personal experience rather than of social learning in the home” (Hatemi & McDermott, 2012, p. 526). DNA may someday become an indicator of political party identification in voters.

Another factor that has not been as thoroughly investigated using modern scientific methods, is personality. Personality, if proven to be an accurate predictor of partisanship, may provide political scientists with a more consistent way of measuring partisanship. One reason for this is that personality would have less factors to take into consideration than a demographic or regional approach. It would also be easier to test than the genetic approach. Another reason

why personality would be helpful is that personality is stable at the age a child enters preschool and increases in stability until they are middle aged (Borghuis et al., 2017). The reason why preschoolers are only moderately stable when it comes to personality is because during adolescence, there are “mean-level decreases in conscientiousness, openness, extraversion, and emotional stability (among girls) in early adolescence...[and] mean-level increases in conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness in late adolescence and early adulthood” (Borghuis et al., 2017). There was also “evidence for U-shaped change in agreeableness” (Borghuis et al., 2017). Using this information, political scientists may become able to predict a child’s future partisanship years before they vote.

### **Personality Evolutions and Test**

Personality tests have evolved over the years, especially the Big Five Personality Test used in this study. The idea of the Big Five Personality Test started with the question as to whether unlimited numbers of personality traits existed or if different traits could be contained within more comprehensible categories (Smith & Snell, 1996). This question led to studies in the 1930s asking participants to use adjectives to describe people and then psychologists categorizing those adjectives. One study in 1936 catalogued 18,000 adjectives and came up with 171 bipolar scales measuring whether someone has or does not have a certain trait (Goldberg, 1990). A 1940 study had the same idea, but instead created 35 bipolar groupings, which in the 1980’s were found to be further filtered into five categories (Goldberg, 1990). These five traits have traditionally been considered to be “(I) Surgency (or Extraversion), (II) Agreeableness, (III) Conscientiousness (or Dependability), (IV) Emotional Stability (vs. Neuroticism), and (V) Culture. Alternatively, Factor V has been interpreted as Intellect and as Openness” (Goldberg, 1990, p. 1217). Early studies of personality seem to focus on ways to describe a personality before focusing on facets of personality.

The idea of using core traits to assess personality has manifested differently in various tests over the past few decades. In 1968, the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) decided to use two major scales, with one measuring neurotic tendencies, such as anxiety, and another scale measuring extraversion (Smith & Snell, 1996). The Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) came about in the 1970's, using self-descriptive measures of bipolar pairs in an attempt to find a difference between genders (Smith & Snell, 1996). This line of testing was continued in the 1980's Masculine Behavior Scale (MBS). This scale looked at how much people engage in behaviors stereotypical of their gender using measures such as dedication to success, inhibited affection, and restrictive emotionality (Smith & Snell, 1996). A fourth test, the Symptom Checklist-90 Revisited (SCL-90-R), used self-reporting as an attempt to "measure symptoms of clinical psychopathology" (Smith & Snell, 1996, p. 289). Like anything dealing with science, the measurements used to assess personality have evolved over the past few years.

More modern versions of the Big Five Personality test have focused more on the core traits of personality. One of them, the NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI), measures Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness. Its 60 item-instrument provides a short version of the previous Revised NEO Personality Inventory, which used 240 items (Sharpe, Martin, & Roth, 2011). The Big-Five Factor Markers (BFM) uses a "100-item adjective-based measure of the Big Five Factors of Personality. The BFM is scored for Surgency, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, and Intellect" (Sharpe et al., 2011, p. 948). The test used by the National Election Study, a nationally conducted study that collects data regarding various different variables of interest to Political Science, and the Ten Item Personality Inventory (TIPI), measures the Big Five using "five 2-item scales assessing Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, and Openness to Experience" (Sharpe et al., 2011, p. 948). The most recent test, the International Personality Item Pool Big Five Domain Scales (IPIP-BFD), uses five 10-item scales and brief statements to assess "Emotional Stability, Extraversion, Intellect, Agreeableness, and

Conscientiousness” (Sharpe et al., 2011, p. 948). Because of its shorter length, it is likely the TIPI was used by the NES to conserve time with participants along with its accuracy and popularity.

### **Politics’ Interest in Personality**

Political psychology has been interested in personality’s effects on where people fall on the political spectrum since the early 20th century. A famous Nazi psychologist, Erich Jaensch, proposed a theory of two different politically associated personality types in the 1930s.

According to Jaensch, there was the J-Type, which was associated with masculinity, patriotism, persistence, toughness, and reliability, and the S-Type. S-Types were thought to be space-cases, dirty, careless, eccentric, and uncertain (Carney et al., 2008). This research was biased and inconsistent with the scientific method, making it scientifically unreliable in the political science sphere. Members of the Frankfurt School of social theory and philosophy continued this line of research. One member, Theodor Adorno, built on Jaensch’s work and labeled the right-wing personality type as “rigid, conventional, intolerant, xenophobic, and obedient to authority figures” (Carney et al., 2008, p. 810). These works did not utilize modern science methodology, they did bring attention to the idea of personality possibly being connected with partisanship. This continued interest in the connection in both personality and its connection to politics, thus encouraging more research.

One of these researchers was Sigmund Freud, famous for method of psychoanalysis. Freud, being Freud, came up with the “anal character,” a series of traits including “orderliness, parsimony, and obstinacy” (Carney et al., 2008, p. 811). This lead to the ideas of the ‘Stability’ and ‘Conscientiousness’ traits that will be introduced with the later explained Big Five Personality test. Freud’s idea acted as a foundation for other researchers. Erich Fromm built on the anal character, calling his own conception of it the “hoarding orientation,” by suggesting conservatives as more interested in security, saving, faithfulness, sterility, rigidity, and orderliness (Carney et al., 2008, p. 812). Here be seen one of the first links to one of the

modernly recognized political ideologies. Note also the less agenda-serving adjectives used here compared to those used to describe Jaensch's traits. In 1968, Fromm and Michael Maccoby started creating questionnaires to see how partisan members fit into this idea of rigidity versus eccentricity. In this study, supporters of liberal candidates were found to be more "life-loving" while supporters of conservative candidates were found to be more "mechanistic" (Carney et al., 2008, p. 813). While the traits used here still show a bit of bias, studies shift to comparing the two ideologies, liberalism and conservatism, side by side. From here on, many more studies were done to look into the relationship between politics and personality over the years but to varying degrees of accuracy. The problem with previous studies "is that previous research on personality and political orientation over the last 75 years has been far from systematic, coordinated, or cumulative" (Carney et al., 2008, p. 815). Because of the lack of consistency between previous studies due to the varying methodology, it becomes important to investigate this topic with more concise tools.

There are many reasons why studying the relationship between personality and political behavior is worth looking into. One is that "variance in personality may correspond *directly* to variance in political behaviour. Much as voting behaviour, information acquisition, and group membership may vary with such individual-level characteristics...political attitudes and behaviour are expected to vary systematically as a function of differences in personality" (Mondak & Halperin, 2008, p. 339). If small individual characteristics like age, education, race, gender, and religion can have an effect on voters' political identity, personality might impact political identity just as much, if not more, than these variables. Even if this impact is not direct, it may affect identity indirectly. Recent research has started looking into this and has found that "the impact of [personality] on political judgements is conditional on other factors such as the level of situational threat. Many more conditional effects of personality of this sort are easily imagined" (Mondak & Halperin, 2008, p. 339). Looking into personality may help better unravel the mystery as to why people vote the way they do or join one party instead of another.

### **Modern Personality Tests and Potential Links**

The Big-Five personality test is the one of the most widely used personality tests, though it has not been accepted universally (Gosling et al., 2003). The test uses a “hierarchical model” that investigates different facets of one’s personality, looking at the facets as being bipolar (Gosling et al., 2003, p. 506). These facets are thought as the following:

[C]ore aspects of what people are like that affect what ideas and experiences they find appealing and which they see as less attractive in both political and non-political settings. Research finds that these personality traits are strongly influenced by genetics and are highly stable through the life cycle. (Gerber et al., 2012, p. 654)

The five traits analyzed by the Big Five test are Agreeableness, Openness, Emotional Stability, Conscientiousness, and Extraversion (Gerber et al., 2012). Instead of measuring personality on several different facets, the Big-Five makes the measurement more manageable by narrowing personality to five core traits.

Each core facet represents a series of characteristics that can be tied to voter’s political preferences and behavior. “[Agreeableness] refers to co-operative, sympathetic and altruistic tendencies, and has been shown to predict membership in coalitions and strategic alliances, social trust, conflict avoidance, and conflict resolution” (Mondak & Halperin, 2008, p. 346). According to one article, Agreeableness is intriguing because it may lead people to be more inclined to join political parties, rallies, and interest groups, but because each of these groups can easily run into conflict, people high in this trait may also be less likely to join these groups (Mondak & Halperin, 2008). High Openness to Experience scores are creativity, exploration, open mindedness, impulsion, and imagination (Mondak & Halperin, 2008). Due to the explorative qualities of individuals high openness scores, they may be more likely to be politically engaged and informed (Mondak & Halperin, 2008). Emotional Stability, or Neuroticism, refers to reactivity and overall emotional stability (Mondak & Halperin, 2008).

“Individuals with low levels of emotional stability view many developments as unfair and often unsatisfactory, tendencies that may influence political perceptions” (Mondak & Halperin, 2008, p. 345).

High Conscientiousness tends to correlate with such characteristics as being “dutiful, organized, and reliable” (Mondak & Halperin, 2008, p. 343). Political scientists believe that conscientiousness suggests a lesser willingness to embrace change (Mondak & Halperin, 2008). Carl Jung used the terms of “extraversion” and “introversion” to describe whether people tend to focus their energy more internally or if they radiate that energy outwardly (Mondak & Halperin, 2008, p. 344). In other words, introverts have the tendency to be more shy and withdrawn while extroverts are more outgoing and social (Mondak & Halperin, 2008). Scientists suspect that the level of extroversion a voter portrays influences how opinionated that voter is and whether or not they are politically active (Mondak & Halperin, 2008). Each trait of the Big Five model may possibly help develop ways to predict partisanship and voter behavior.

Not only do these traits seem like they should predict political behavior, but studies suggest that they do. Several studies have found that extraversion and agreeableness are linked to voter participation, high conscientiousness lowers likeliness to vote, higher neuroticism correlates with increased turnout, and openness to experience, when a scientifically significant predictor, is linked to a higher turnout as well (Wang, 2016). Not only do they correlate with specific behavioral tendencies, but studies suggest that specific traits can predict where someone falls on the political spectrum. People scoring low in openness to experiences tend to be conservative and those who score high in this area tend to be more liberal. If a voter scores high in extraversion, they are more likely to be more conservative with liberals being less extroverted. Higher consciousness is linked to conservatism and high agreeableness is linked to liberalism (Chirumbolo & Leone, 2010). It seems reasonable to suspect that personality may somehow correlate with partisanship in some way.

Two studies support the idea that personality traits seem to come into play when citizens vote or run for office. According to a 2004 study, voters who had higher levels of agreeableness and openness to experiences were more likely to vote for John Kerry, the Democratic candidate, while voters with higher levels of conscientiousness and neuroticism were more likely to vote for George W. Bush, the Republican Candidate (Wang, 2016). In addition to this study, a 1980 study of Californian party leaders found that Republican leaders scored higher on self-control and order while Democrats scored higher on openness to experiences (Dietrich et al., 2012). The 1980 study, however, does not use the Big Five personality model in order to study the party leaders. Instead, the researchers studied participants based on a series of traits that could be covered by the Big Five.

Lastly, another area where personality and politics appears to intersect is in predicting tendencies to participate in political activities. The Big Five has already been found to predict behaviors such as “job performance, school performance, juvenile delinquency, health, musical tastes, dress, and a variety of other behaviors and attitudes” (Gerber et al., 2011, p. 694). Some of the traits have been linked to certain activities in previous studies. High extraversion scores show a greater tendency for participation through campaign events, petitions, letters to editors, community meetings, and contacting representatives. This research, however, shows that in some cases Extraversion is not significant when predicting participation (Gerber et al., 2011). This will be a factor that will need to be further investigated as this may indicate a possible impact on the results of this study as well. Agreeableness also showed connections, in that there were negative associations with turnout in some samples along with positive correlations between activities such as petitioning, attending local meetings, but not participating in campaigns (Gerber et al., 2011). Because this result is significant, this study will need to pay particular attention to trends in significance for both Agreeableness as well as in Extraversion. This study may also need to identify factors that impact significance of these traits if the patterns from earlier research do not continue in this research. A study by Gerber et al. (2011) shows



that Agreeableness showed negative correlations with forms of participation that were most likely to involve conflict.

Conscientiousness correlates positively with attending local meetings and contacting representatives, negatively with donating to candidates or parties and working for campaigns. One study, however, did not find a statistically significant relationship between this trait and contacting representatives (Gerber et al., 2011). Gerber et al. (2011) also shows that Conscientiousness respondents are less likely to turn out to vote. Openness shows positive correlations with a various forms of political activity, including turning out to vote (Gerber et al., 2011). Stability, on the other hand, showed a lower tendency toward contributing money, to party or candidate, contacting representatives, or turning out to the polls to vote (Gerber et al., 2011). As can be seen, the Big Five Personality test also holds promise not just in predicting partisanship but also in predicting the likelihood of someone participating in a variety of political activities.

Using a data set from the American National Election Study (ANES), done nationally by the collaboration between Stanford University and the University of Michigan, should hopefully allow for a higher volume of accurate data. If past studies are correct, my study will also find a link between political ideology and openness to experiences, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and extraversion. Because the ANES is nationwide and contains more variables than any of the studies used in this paper, it could possibly find a link between neuroticism and political ideology, something that has not been confirmed in any past studies. Since many of the past studies have not conclusively found links between partisanship and personality, by using a widely acknowledged and available data set such as the American National Election Study, this investigation will allow for a more reliable comparison for future studies.

### **Research Questions**

1. Are there any significant correlations between neuroticism (emotional stability) and either of the two political parties or perhaps those who self-identify as independents?
2. Do voters who identify as independents score near the mid-ranges of each of the five core traits of the Big Five model?
3. Do certain core traits correlate with other political behaviors, such as voting or volunteering?
4. Do different age groups differ in how they score in different personality traits?

### **Methodology**

As previous studies have done, this study also uses a quantitative approach to analyzing data. Data was collected through the 2016 American National Election Study (ANES), which is an academically held series of studies done before and after each election. The study has been held since 1948 and repeats several questions every year, making it easier to accurately notice shifts in answers or changes in opinions. Because the ANES does contain questions relevant to the Big Five model, data was derived from this study due to its reliability, accuracy, and national recognition. The ANES used a sample of United States citizen aged 18 years old or older. The sample was recruited through the mail based on their addresses before being interviewed via Internet. After recruiting a sample, researchers used experimental manipulation of incentives, invitations, and screening modes. There were two waves of interviews, one before and one after the 2016 election. Data relevant to this study on personality was pulled from the 2016 ANES's vast reserved before being entered into IBM's SPSS software.

### **Results**

The results of the data analysis are promising when it comes to investigating the research questions. Though significance values for some traits and some relationships between variables were not as high as one would hope, the data was significant and revealed several correlations that suggested a possible link between personality and different aspects of

partisanship and political participation. Unfortunately, two questions remained unanswered. Due to the way the data was run, Independents were not specifically included in the results. However, this is not much of a loss due to the nature of Independents as strength of partisanship was measured and can be used to infer relationships between Independents and voters who lean toward either party. The second question left unanswered was whether different age groups had a tendency toward certain personalities. Because the ANES does not break age groups into specific ranges, the data does not specifically list age groups but instead shows the tendencies of older or younger respondents. Despite this, the last two research questions were answered.

Table 1: Demographics and the Big Five

	Extraversion	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Stability	Openness
Gender	.070***	.241***	.101***	-.042***	.032+
Household Income	.062**	.062***	.162***	.099*	.061**
Age	.013+	.167***	.127***	.133***	-.095***
Education	.015+	.036*	.072***	.074***	.097***
Black	-.008+	-.008+	.025+	.073***	.042*
Latino	.000***	-.043*	-.024+	.014+	.011+
Asian	-.008+	-.010+	-.049**	.008+	-.028+
Other Race	.026+	.003+	-.031*	-.002+	.040**
Adjusted R Squared	.007	.094	.064	.037	.025

Now that the methodology and anticipated results have been reviewed, it is time to move on to analyze the data outcome. The first set of data was analyzed using OLS Regression. In Table 1, it can be seen how the various races, along with the age, education, gender, and

household income, switch back and forth between the different personality traits. It can also be seen that although these various demographics combined do explain a decent amount of why people score highly in each of the various personality traits, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Stability, and Openness, they do not provide an exhaustive explanation. According to the data, there appears to be various other variables not explored here that explain why people find themselves more likely to score higher in one trait or another.

In terms of Extraversion, the lowest indicator is gender, with more men scoring higher in this area. Household income is only slightly more significant, with a score indicating a stronger correlation with Extraversion when the respondent has a lower income. How young or old someone does affect how they score in different personality traits. Age does show becomes incredibly significant for Extraversion, as the younger participants is associated with the higher scores in this area. Lower amounts of education also has a positive relationship with more Extraversion. Each of the races, Black, Latino, Asian, and Other, are incredibly significant, though there are other factors that come into play such as country of ethnic origin, education, income, region, and other background factors. Another trend to note is that Blacks have only a slight negative correlation with Extraversion. Asians also follow this trend with the same score, both of which were the only negative correlations found within this trait. What is surprising here is that although these variables all lead to an Adjusted R Squared higher than 0.20 for other personality traits, they only lead to a 0.07 for Extraversion.

Agreeableness, however, seems relatively unimpacted by age, gender, or household income, though lower income, older respondents, and women tend to score higher in this trait with scores of 0.241, 0.062, and 0.167 respectively. An interesting occurrence regarding age is that its highest score falls within the Agreeableness trait. Education is slightly less significant within this trait than in Extraversion, though its score is the second lowest score. This indicates a lower level of education corresponds with Agreeableness. All of the races are statistically significant; however, Agreeableness is also the only trait where Latinos' scores are slightly less

significant in comparison to the others. All of the races also tend to have a negative correlation with this core trait, though Other Races was the only one to have a slight positive correlation while Latinos had the strongest negative correlation. The adjusted R squared here was the highest of all of the personality traits.

Gender, income, and age continue to be fairly insignificant for Conscientiousness with the addition of education. More women, people with higher incomes, older people, and people with more education tend to score higher on the Conscientiousness scale. Latinos, Asians and Other Races scored lower on the statistical significance scale. These three racial groups also had negative correlations with this trait, having scores of -0.024, -0.049, and -0.031 respectively. This time, Blacks were the outliers of the racial groups, having a positive correlation with Conscientiousness that scores higher than the scores other outlying races had. Other Races also had substantial negative correlations instead of the slight scores they had with other traits, such as Other Races correlation with Agreeableness. Of all these factors, education had the strongest positive correlation with Agreeableness while Asians had the strongest negative correlation.

In regards to Stability, income actually becomes a somewhat meaningful player. Another surprise is that gender shows a negative correlation with this trait. Age and education continue being somewhat insignificant, though this time Blacks join the group. This race was only one point behind education in correlation, Blacks having a lower correlation of 0.073. Latinos, Asians, and Other Races all have some significance as well with Other Races being the only one of the racial groups with a slight negative correlation. Neither Latinos nor Asians show a particularly strong positive correlation. It also seems that the older a person is, the more educated they are, and if they are Black, they are more likely to score higher on the Stability scale, with age being the strongest indicator of all these variables.

Openness, though mentioned last of the core traits, also has some interesting patterns. Education and Age were the only two variables with low statistical significance levels. Education

had the strongest positive correlation of the demographics. Age had the strongest negative correlation. Gender was also particularly significant here and had a positive correlation with this trait. The second highest positive correlation was, surprisingly, income. Of all the races, Asians and Latinos have weaker correlations. Asians have a negative correlation of -0.028 and Latinos have a positive correlation of 0.011. Blacks have a positive correlation of 0.042 and Other Races have a positive correlation of 0.040. Openness has the second lowest Adjusted R Squared of all the personality traits. Agreeableness had an Adjusted R score of 0.094, Conscientiousness had a score of 0.064, Stability had a score of 0.037, and Extraversion had an Adjusted R score of 0.007.

Table 2: Variables and Relationship to Partisanship and Ideology

	Predictor of Partisanship	Strength of Partisanship	Ideology
Extraversion scale	.041*	.066***	.057**
Agreeable scale	-.034+	.038**	-.040*
Conscientious rescale	.057**	.059**	.114***
Stable scale	.064***	.010+	.080***
Open scale	-.179***	-.029+	-.264***
Household Income	.038*	.066***	-.023+
Age	-.002+	.116***	.104***
Education	-.024++	.034**	-.035+

Black	-.278***	.114***	-.102***
Latino	-.132***	.011+	-.023+
Asian	-.044**	-.042*	-.028+
Other	-.032**	-.050**	-.009+
Adjusted R Squared	.124	.048	.106

The results for the data in this section was ran using OLS Regression as well. Looking at Table 2, it can be seen that all five measurements of the Big Five, the first five variables listed in the left column, are significant not only for predicting partisanship and ideology, but also for the strength of partisanship. Ideology was scored with low values liberal, and high values conservative, and partisanship with low values Democratic and High values Republican. Negative coefficients mean that an independent variable tends to make a respondent more liberal and positive coefficients indicate that it tends to make a respondent more conservative. Other variables, such as Household Income, Age, Education, and the various races, once again broken into Blacks, Latinos, Asians, and Other Races, all are associated with partisanship, strength of said partisanship, and ideology to different degrees and levels of significance. The Adjusted R Squared states that all of these variables, in combination with the measurement scales for the Big Five Personality Test, help describe a why people vote the way they vote, their ideologies, and why they choose to join one party over another.

In regards to partisanship, each of the core traits has a relationship with one party or another with varying degrees of statistical significance. As can be seen with the Republican Party, certain traits show noteworthy correlations with partisanship. Extraversion has a positive relationship with partisanship, the high number indicating a greater tendency toward being a Republican. It also is statistically significant. The strength of partisanship is also worth noting here, as Extraversion seems to be highly associated with stronger partisanship, in this case a

stronger Republican. Conscientiousness also reflects a Republican tendency. The last value that corresponds with being a Republican is Stability. This is a higher correlation than the two other personality traits, possibly suggesting that Stability is a stronger indicator of being a Republican than Conscientiousness or Extraversion, though Conscientiousness still scores higher than Extraversion. However, this trait does not show a high tendency toward strong partisanship. All three scores, Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and Stability, are the highest indicator of being a Republican with all the other variables, including racial groups and Age, considered. Thus, Stability (Neuroticism) does not show a tendency toward being Independent or leaning. The only other non-personality trait variable that indicates a tendency toward being a Republican is Income, which is still lower than the three personality traits.

However, when looking at the individual strengths in partisanship, the patterns slightly change. Extraversion becomes the highest indicator of a strong partisan member, with a score of 0.066, while Stability indicates a weak partisan. These three traits, all strong in predicting partisan strength, also show a tendency toward conservatism, though their ranking in terms of strength changes. Conscientiousness becomes the strongest indicator of having a conservative ideology when compared to the other personality traits. After Conscientiousness, Stability becomes the second highest indicator for conservatism, which is followed by Extraversion. Conscientiousness, when considering the other variables of age, race, and income, is the highest indicator of conservatism, with age close behind.

Other personality traits support stronger tendencies toward being a member of the Democratic Party. Agreeableness has a score of -.034, indicating that respondents scoring higher in this trait are more likely to be Democrats. Openness also indicates a stronger tendency for being a Democrat. What is intriguing here is that neither Agreeableness nor Openness were the strongest indicators of being a Democrat when other variables, such as race, were taken into consideration. The variables that were the strongest predictors of this were being Blacks and Latinos. Openness came in third, behind Latinos, and Agreeableness



came in fifth place right behind Asians. Agreeableness also shows a tendency of being a strong Democratic Partisan. A high score in Openness may also show a stronger tendency of being a Democratic Leaner.

In regards to Ideology, Agreeableness and Openness both indicate a strong liberal leaning, an ideology consistent with Democrats. This is a bit surprising as Openness was not a particularly strong indicator for the Democratic Party and seems to indicate more of a tendency to be an Independent Leaning toward the Democratic Party or a weak partisan member. In fact, out of all of the variables studied, Openness was the strongest indicator for being a liberal. Agreeableness was the third strongest indicator. Its score of -0.040 fell behind the -0.102 score of Blacks. It may be that Blacks have more of a tendency to score high on other indicators of liberalism, but this would have to be further investigated.

Table 3: Participation and Personality

	Talk about Campaign	Wears a Button	Attend Meeting	Campaign Work	Donate to Campaign
Extraversion	.065***	.073***	.042+	.135**	.023
Agreeableness	.006	-.028	-.028	-.017	-.037
Conscientiousness	.007	-.009	-.018	-.095+	-.024
Stability	-.016	-.038	-.027	-.043	.002

Openness	.095***	.074**	.146***	.104*	.141***
Gender	-.096	-.076	-.128	-.328	-.092
Household Income	.012*	-.009	.010	.017	.044***
Age	.009***	.004	-.007	.008	.033***
Education	.018+	.008	.010	.026	.050***
Black	-.128	.104	.178	.611+	.043
Latino	-.089	-.020	-.073	.326	.053
Asian	-.433**	-1.195*	-1.382+	.306	-.110
Other Race	-.020	.152	-.224	.140	.490*
Nagelkerke R <sup>2</sup>	.049	.024	.031	.040	.107
% correctly classified	57.9	87.8	93.0	96.9	87.8

Table 3A: Participation and Personality

	Donate to Group	March/ Protest	Contact Representative	Vote for President	Discuss Politics	Attend Community Meeting
Extraversion	.033	.022	-.005	-.096	.012	.030*
Agreeableness	-.051	.031	-.012	.036	.020	.086***
Conscientiousness	-.074	-.126**	-.007	.109	.053*	.001
Stability	-.010	-.038	.003	-.047	.035+	.012
Openness	.082+	.289***	.153***	.050	.098***	.049*
Gender	-.253	.200	-.177	.185	-.050	.182*
Household Income	.063***	.006	.036***	-.012	.040***	.022***
Age	.013*	-.023**	.013***	.008	.005*	.005*
Education	.033*	.039**	.037**	.161*	.053*	.056**
Black	-.606	.911**	-.328	-1.129*	-.119	.380**
Latino	-.279	.329	-.708**	-.261	-.142	.071
Asian	.031	-.377	-.136	-1.610*	-.682**	-.189
Other Race	-1.062	.284	.327	-1.348*	-.087	-.042
Nagelkerke R <sup>2</sup>	.062	.093	.066	.069	.084	.057
% correctly classified	96.2	96.8	88.7	98.6	81.4	70.5

The data in both of the tables above were analyzed using Logistic Regression. Within the different scales measuring personality, some strong positive and negative correlations between certain personality traits and political activities exist. The highest positive correlation is Openness's with marching and protesting. The second highest positive correlation is a correlation between contacting a representative and Openness. The third highest positive correlation for participation once again falls within Openness, with a correlation with attending meetings. It seems as though Openness shows the highest tendency of participating when compared to the other Big Five core traits. However, despite the strong correlations, the significance of each of these values falls below 0.001. Two other members of the Big Five traits take first and second place for the strongest negative correlations between personality and participation. Conscientiousness takes first and third place in this category. According to the data, the more Conscientious a person is, the less likely they are going to march or protest or do campaign work. Extraversion takes second place with a -0.096 negative correlation with voting for president. Unlike Openness, these scores have a higher significance, with the score having a significance score less than 0.01.

Extraversion shows a positive correlation with all of the different types of participation except in voting for president and contacting representatives, with the highest score being in campaign work. Agreeableness shows a bit more fluctuation. It has negative correlations in every area except for marching and protesting, talking about the campaign, voting for president, attending community meetings, and discussing politics. Agreeableness's highest score is a 0.086 in attending community meetings with the lowest score being a -0.051 for donating to a group. Conscientiousness has a positive correlation with the likelihood of talking about the campaign, voting for president, discussing politics, and attending community meetings, with negative correlations in all other categories. The highest score in conscientiousness is the correlation with voting for president with the lowest correlation being the correlation with marching and protesting.

Stability shows the lowest amounts of positive correlation in categories such as contacting representatives, donating to campaigns, attending community meetings, and discussing politics. The highest correlation is in discussing politics while the lowest score was in voting for president. Unlike Stability, Openness does not share this pattern. Openness has no negative correlations shown in the data as mentioned before. Openness also has the lowest significance values for its data out of all of the traits analyzed. It also has the lowest significance overall when other variables are taken into consideration.

### **Discussion**

The first section of the results describes how different demographics showed different tendencies for certain personality traits. The highest indicator for Extraversion is gender, with men scoring higher in this area. This could possibly be due to the different ways that men and women express themselves as well as potential differences in upbringing between these sexes that may encourage men to be more outgoing than women. Extraversion's second highest indicator was income, with higher income showing a greater tendency for this trait. It could be that as someone gets more money, they have more money to spend on different social activities that causes them to have more interaction with other people. It can also be that people who score high in Extraversion are more likely to get jobs that allows them more free time to socialize. Although, this relationship may be a situation where it is uncertain if income caused the circumstances necessary for Extraversion or if Extraversion is the reason why people were chosen for higher paying jobs. Age also shows some significance here, as the younger a person is, the more extraverted they tend to be. As people get older, there is a tendency for people become so busy due to work and the daily grind that it becomes harder to socialize, especially as they take on new responsibilities. This may explain the age difference.

Agreeableness's highest indicator is gender, with women being more likely to receive high scores in this trait. This could be due to women's communication and problem solving skills

being focused more on collaboration rather than competition, setting a predisposition for the tendency to be more agreeable. Older respondents also show a tendency for this trait, possibly due to them growing more reserved as they get older and facing less stress and responsibilities as they near or surpass retirement age. Poorer people may also show a higher inclination for this trait due to a lower level of education, as lower levels of education also is associated with higher traits of agreeableness. The various racial groups, other than Other Races, show a negative correlation with Agreeableness. This could possibly be attributed to the dominant discourse of media and campaigns being predominantly white with few if any other racial views included. Because of this, minority groups could be less Agreeable due to the lack of representation they have within this discourse.

Women, people with higher levels of education, people with higher levels of income, and older respondents, show a tendency for having higher Conscientiousness scores. For women, this might be attributed to their collaboration-oriented mindsets. As for respondents with higher levels of education, it could be that as they become more educated they become more aware of issues and problems in their communities and want to find ways to solve these issues and problems. Also, a certain level of Conscientiousness may be necessary in order to work oneself into the higher levels of education. Income may also be a similar situation, as it may take a certain level of Conscientiousness and work ethic in order to get a higher paying job. Older respondents may show a tendency for Conscientiousness due to the various experiences and wisdom they have collected throughout their lives and as different experiences, such as marriage or having children, impact them.

The data shows that as one gets older, this person is likely to show stronger scores in Stability. As people get older, they are more likely to be exposed to less stress and responsibility as they get older as children become more and more independent and as they slowly enter retirement. This may cause a tendency for older people to become more emotionally stable. Higher income also is related to Stability, though this may be for the same

reasons. As people get better paying jobs, they get more free time and more money to use in order to enjoy that free time. This could allow for more mood Stability as they may have less stress due to these two things. Gender is the only demographic, other than Other Races, to also show a negative correlation with Stability. It seems as if men are less likely to have high scores in this trait. This may be due to different reasons, though in this case, I wonder what the mean age of the men in the ANES is. The age of a male respondent may cause a major difference in how he scores in this area.

Education is the highest indicator for Openness. As people get more education, they are more likely to be exposed to different point of views and issues, which could be the reason for the higher score in Openness. Household income, Blacks, Latinos, and Gender also show positive correlations with Openness. It could be that Blacks and Latinos are more open to new ideas due to possible experiences of marginalization. Men also show a tendency for Openness, though more investigation may be needed in order to see why there is such a significant relationship with Openness. It may be that since men are more extroverted, this extraversion causes a tendency to be more open, though this also needs to be researched. Higher household income may allow for more free time and money to travel or involvement with one's community, which could lead to one being more open to new ideas. Lastly, the only two negative correlations with Openness are with age and Asians. It seems as if the younger someone is, the less likely they are to be open, though more research may be needed to investigate this as well. Asians also are less likely to be open, but this may be due to the more conservative culture of this race.

When it comes to predicting partisanship, Extraversion shows a strong correlation with being a Republican. This could possibly be explained due to the number of men who score high in this area, as a large volume of past research will tell us that men tend to be more likely to be Republicans. Extraversion also corresponds with stronger partisanship, though this makes some sense as people who are more outgoing may be more likely participate in more party

activities where other party activists would be able to have a higher influence on volunteers. Conscientiousness also shows a correlation with Republican membership. As the Republican Party has many religious conservatives, it could be that the religious right's influence on social issues is what is being reflected by the high scores in Conscientiousness. It could also be that the religious right has a stronger tendency for extreme views, which could possibly translate into stronger partisanship. Stability is the last trait that predicts tendencies toward the Republican Party, but it does not show a high tendency toward strong partisanship. Since conventional wisdom also tells us that older voters are more likely to be Republicans, and since the data here shows that older voters also show higher tendencies for Stability, it could be possible that older voters are a major contributing factor for this trait in Republicans. However, Stability may be less of a predictor for strong partisanship due to the shifting demographics of the older voters of the Republican Party, though it could be that the partisan strengths of other Republican coalitions are stronger than older voters in contributing to the high scores in Stability.

As for the Democratic Party, Agreeableness and Openness both show a relationship with this party as well as a tendency for strong partisanship. Agreeableness is not the strongest indicator for the Democratic Party, but it does show a higher rate of strong partisanship. This may be due to the tendency for the Democratic Party to have a more racially and economically diverse set of voters and members. This diversity can possibly explain the high tendency for Agreeableness and Openness. As people are exposed to different ideas than those they are used to, they are more likely to be open to the experiences that come with those ideas. Due to this same exposure, people may find themselves better able to see things from others' point of views, causing them to be a bit more likely to agree to new ideas. Openness may also be strongly impacted by the more progressive stance that Democrats take on social issues. It could be that the Democrats took on more progressive stances, during a time where social issues were becoming prominent, in order to attract voters of a more progressive stance. Because progressive issues tend to deal with nontraditional ideas, such as same sex marriage, voters



who prefer this stance may be more open to new or different types of ideas, thus explaining the high score for Democrats in this area. As for why these both associate with strong partisanship, it could be that being more open to new experiences and more likely to agree with new ideas causes people who score high in this area to be more willing to engage in party work where they are exposed to stronger partisans.

It makes sense that Openness is the highest overall predictor for different forms of political participation, as participation requires someone to be open to new experiences and open to spending time and money. What is surprising here is that Openness was only the second highest predictor for the likelihood that a participant would attend a community meeting. It could be Openness is a better predictor for matters of large scale forms of participation and politics, such as those pertaining to state or national elections. It could also be that respondents with high scores of Openness do not want to exert higher the amounts of effort necessary to be involved in local politics, where partisan lines and information could require more work to understand and be harder to obtain. Conscientiousness has positive correlations with Attending a Community Meeting, Discussing Politics, Voting for President, and Talking about the Campaign. It could be that people with higher scores in this area feel as if doing some of the more basic political tasks, i.e., voting for president or even showing concern for local issues, are necessary parts of their civic duties. Other forms of participation, in which people who score high in Conscientiousness do not show the tendency of doing, are activities that require more work. Due to the higher levels of effort required to properly engage in these activities, people with higher scores in this trait may not fall within what those with high Conscientiousness scores consider the basic realm of civic duty.

Extraversion shows negative correlations in only two areas, Voting for President and Contacting Representatives. All of the areas that Extraversion shows strong tendencies toward are areas that allow people to directly interact with other people, with the possibility of this being within a more social setting than that of Contacting a Representative. Other areas of positive

correlation with Extraversion also allow the ability for extroverts to express themselves and appear as part of a group, such as wearing a button or donating to a specific group or party. Voting, at least nowadays, is no longer a public event where others know for sure if one voted or how they voted. Contacting Representatives is also more of a one on one act. It would be extremely interesting to see if petitions, another form of expressing ideas directly to a representative or government, also has a negative correlation with this personality trait.

Agreeableness shows negative correlations with every form of participation analyzed here except for Voting for President, Talking about Campaigns, Marching and Protesting, Discussing Politics, and Attending Community Meetings. All of the areas where Agreeableness shows a lower tendency for participation, such as Donating, Attending a meeting, Campaign Work, and Contacting Representatives, are areas requiring more effort and time in participation. The areas showing positive correlations are a bit more social, such as Marching, Discussing Politics, Attending Meetings, where people in this area may be better able to encounter others who share their way of viewing things and intensity. It can also be that when people are asked to participate in these more social acts, people scoring higher in this trait are more likely to agree to do so. Lastly, it could be that those high in Agreeableness avoid situations that cause division or could provoke confrontation, thus causing them to avoid outright expressions of partisanship in areas where they may not be surrounded by likeminded people, such as wearing a campaign button at a voting poll or while going about their day-to-day lives.

What is also worth noting is that Stability only shows positive correlations with Donating to Campaigns, Contacting Representatives, Discussing Politics, and Attending Community Meetings. Two of these are somewhat less social forms of participation in areas that, when compared to wearing possibly provoking campaign buttons or partaking in protests, have lower chances of encountering high emotions. The other two forms of participation, Discussing Politics and Attending Community Meetings, still have the potential to be less confrontational or social as well. When discussing politics, people can choose whom they talk to and how many people

with whom they want to do so. People who score high in Stability may be more likely to only discuss politics with people who either share their views or they know would not be too confrontational or emotional when it comes to the topic at hand. As for community meetings, it could be that people who with higher scores in this area go out of a sense of duty or as a way to stay in touch with local issues. It could also be that the community meetings they attend have lower amounts of attendees, creating a more comfortable situation for those high in Stability as less people may mean a lower chance of high emotions.

### **Limitations**

There are some limitations to this study, however. As there are few other studies that have been found to research the connection between partisanship and personality, as opposed to ideology and personality, it cannot be said if this study is upholding or denying any known statistical precedence. Whether this data will show the same consistent patterns if replicated is also unknown. Another limitation is that the data is secondhand. It is unknown how the original researchers selected their samples or exactly how participants were organized. Lastly, due to the amount of data, many participant groups and variables were reorganized in a way that was deemed more appropriate to this study. An example of this is that Other Races is the category where there were few racial respondents from certain demographics, such as Native Americans or Pacific Islanders.

### **Conclusion**

Political Scientists have been studying and theorizing about links between different demographics and both partisanship and ideology for decades; however, this fewer research has been done regarding personality and partisanship. Research so far has focused more on the link between personality and ideology, though this research has lacked in scientific consistency until very recently. While ideology and partisanship do share some common grounds, it cannot be assumed that conservatism can automatically be attributed to being a

Republican or that liberalism automatically can be attributed to being a Democrat. This study hopes to bring a new element to the conversation by looking at how personality ties into partisanship and how certain traits might be able to predict certain political tendencies.

All the traits of the Big Five Personality test do show strong tendencies toward one party or the other while also showing tendencies toward or against different forms of participation. Not only do Conscientiousness, Stability, Agreeableness, Extraversion, and Openness show tendencies toward a political party, these personality traits are also able to show the strength of partisanship for respondents with high scores in each area. Demographics still play a part with personality, as each demographic (age, race, amount of education, income, etc.) also showed correlations with different personality traits. Certain factors, however, need to be further investigated. Due to the various significance levels found in some of these correlations, it would be beneficial to run the data again from different samples and see if the patterns found in this paper are found in other similar studies focusing specifically on partisanship.

Personality may provide the political science field with new possibilities. Certain traits may be further proven to be reliable predictors of membership to different political parties as well as predict the likelihood of someone participating in a certain form of political activity. If this occurs, it could be that the Big Five Personality test may someday be used as a form of analyzing voters in the same manner that different demographics are used for advertising and getting out the vote drives. Personality may provide political scientists with ways of analyzing how citizens vote and determine whether or not if voter personalities correlate with the candidate's affects those votes. If a relationship determined, this could lead to more research into the relationship with personality and politics in order to add to the ability of political scientists to track and predict trends in voting and advertising. The possibilities are endless.

## Appendix

## V161126 (Ideology)

PRE: 7pt scale Liberal conservative self-placement

examples: 3 3. Slightly liberal

4 4. Moderate, middle of the road

6 6. Conservative

## V161127 (Ideology)

PRE: If R had to choose liberal or conservative self-placement

tabulation: Freq. Numeric Label

315 1 1. Liberal

485 2 2. Conservative

## V161019 (Party Identification)

PRE: Party of registration

tabulation: Freq. Numeric Label

924 1 1. Democratic party

682 2 2. Republican party

471 4 4. None or 'independent'

22 5 5. Other SPECIFY

## V162333 (Extraversion)

POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI extraverted, enthusiastic

examples: 2 2. Somewhat poorly

4 4. Neither poorly nor well

5 5. A little well

6 6. Somewhat well

V162334 (Lack of Agreeableness)

POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI critical, quarrelsome

examples: 1 1. Extremely poorly

2 2. Somewhat poorly

4 4. Neither poorly nor well

5 5. A little well

V162335 (Conscientiousness)

POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI dependable, self-disciplined

examples: 4 4. Neither poorly nor well

6 6. Somewhat well

6 6. Somewhat well

7 7. Extremely well

V162336 (Lack of Stability)

POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI anxious, easily upset

examples: 1 1. Extremely poorly

2 2. Somewhat poorly

4 4. Neither poorly nor well

5 5. A little well

V162337 (Openness to Experiences)

POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI open to new experiences

examples: 3 3. A little poorly

5 5. A little well

6 6. Somewhat well

6 6. Somewhat well

V162338 (Introversion)

POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI reserved, quiet

examples: 1 1. Extremely poorly

3 3. A little poorly

5 5. A little well

6 6. Somewhat well

V162339 (Agreeableness)

POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI sympathetic, warm

examples: 3 3. A little poorly

5 5. A little well

6 6. Somewhat well

7 7. Extremely well

V162340 (Lack of Conscientiousness)

POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI disorganized, careless

examples: 1 1. Extremely poorly

1 1. Extremely poorly

2 2. Somewhat poorly

4 4. Neither poorly nor well

V162341 (Stability)

POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI calm, emotionally stable

examples: 3 3. A little poorly

5 5. A little well

6 6. Somewhat well

6 6. Somewhat well

V162342 (Lack of Openness to Experiences)

POST: FTF CASI/WEB: TIPI conventional, uncreative

examples: 1 1. Extremely poorly

2 2. Somewhat poorly

3 3. A little poorly

4 4. Neither poorly nor well



## References

- Ansolabehere, S., Rodden, J., & Snyder, J. M. Jr. (2006). Purple America. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 20 (2), 97-118. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30033652>.
- Borghuis, J., Denissen, J.J.A., Oberski, D., Sijtsma, K., Meeus, W.H.J., Branje, S., ... & Bleidorn, W. (2017). Big Five Personality Stability, Change, and Codevelopment Across Adolescence and Early Adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspp000013>
- Carney, D. R., Jost, J. T., Gosling, S. D., & Potter, J. (2008). The Secret Lives of Liberals and Conservatives: Personality Profiles, Interaction Styles, and the Things They Leave Behind. *Political Psychology*, 29(6), 807-840. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/20447169.pdf>.
- Chirumbolo, A., & Leone, L. (2010) Personality and politics: The role of the HEXACO model of personality in predicting ideology and voting. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49(1), 43-48. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0191886910001182>.
- Dietrich, B. J., Lasley, S., Mondak, J. J., Rempel, M. L., & Turner, J. (2012). Personality and Legislative Politics: The Big Five Trait Dimensions Among U.S. State Legislators. *Political Psychology*, 33 (2), 195-210. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/23260330.pdf>
- Gerber, A. S., Huber, G. A., Doherty, D., & Dowling, C. M. (2012). Personality and the Strength and Direction of Partisan Identification. *Political Behavior*, 34(4), 653-688. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11109-011-9178-5>.
- Gerber, A. S., Huber, G. A., Doherty, D., Dowling, C. M., Raso, C., & Ha, S. E. (2011). Personality Traits and Participation in Political Processes. *The Journal of Politics*, 73(3), 692-706. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1017/s0022381611000399>.

- Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An Alternative "Description of Personality": The Big-Five Factor Structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(6), 1216-1229.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.6.1216>
- Gosling, S. D., Rentfrow, P. J., & Swann Jr., W. B. (2003). A very brief measure of the Big-Five personality domains. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37(6), 504-528.  
Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0092656603000461>.
- Hatemi, P. K., & McDermott, R. (2012). The genetics of politics: discovery, challenges, and progress. *Trends in Genetics*, 28(10), 525-533. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tig.2012.07.00>
- Highton, B., & Kam, C. D. (2011). The Long-Term Dynamics of Partisanship and Issue Orientations. *The Journal of Politics*, 73(1), 202-214. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1017/s0022381610000964>.
- Jennings, M. K., Stoker, L., Bowers, J. (2009). Politics across Generations: Family Transmission Reexamined. *The Journal of Politics*, 71(3), 782-799.  
doi:10.1017/S002238160909071
- Leeper, T. J., & Slothuus, R. (2014). Political Parties, Motivated Reasoning, and Public Opinion Formation. *Advances in Political Psychology*, 35(1), 129-156. doi:  
10.1111/pops.12164
- Levernier, W., & Barilla, A. G. (2006). The Effect of Region, Demographics, and Economic Characteristics on County-Level Voting Patterns in the 2000 Presidential Election. *The Review of Regional Studies*, 36(3), 427-447. Retrieved from  
<http://search.proquest.com/openview/f13135757a5bfb8b665f716342483827/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=2028849>.
- Mondak, J. J., & Halperin, K. D. (2008). A Framework for the Study of Personality and Political Behaviour. *British Journal of Political Science*, 38(2), 335-362. Retrieved from  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/27568348.pdf>.
- Monson, R. A., & Mertens, J. B. (2011). All in the Family: Red States, Blue States, and

- Postmodern Family Patterns, 2000 and 2004. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 52(2), 244-267. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23027555>.
- Party Roots. (1996). *Canada and the World Background*, 62(1), 6. Retrieved from [http://go.galegroup.com.proxy.lib.uni.edu/ps/i.do?&id=GALE%7CA18710642&v=2.1&u=uni\\_rodit&it=r&p=AONE&sw=w&authCount=1](http://go.galegroup.com.proxy.lib.uni.edu/ps/i.do?&id=GALE%7CA18710642&v=2.1&u=uni_rodit&it=r&p=AONE&sw=w&authCount=1).
- Rutland, Robert. (1995). *The Democrats: From Jefferson to Clinton*. Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press.
- Sharpe, J. P., Martin, N. R., & Roth, K. A. (2011). Optimism and the Big Five factors of personality: Beyond Neuroticism and Extraversion. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51, 946-951. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.07.033>
- Smith, D. R., & Snell, W. E. Jr. (1996). Goldberg's bipolar measure of the Big-Five personality dimensions: reliability and validity. *European Journal of Personality*, 10, 283-299. Retrieved from [http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.proxy.lib.uni.edu/doi/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-0984\(199611\)10:4%3C283::AID-PER264%3E3.0.CO;2-W/epdf](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.proxy.lib.uni.edu/doi/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0984(199611)10:4%3C283::AID-PER264%3E3.0.CO;2-W/epdf).
- Wang, Ching-Hsing. (2016). Personality traits, political attitudes and vote choice: Evidence from the United States. *Electoral Studies*, 44, 26-34. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0261379415301153>.