

**DETERMINING EFFECT OF PERSONALITY TRAITS ON VOTER  
BEHAVIOR USING FIVE FACTOR PERSONALITY INVENTORY <sup>1</sup>**

**Ceyhan Aldemir\* Gül Bayraktaroğlu\*\***

**Abstract**

The researchers have used four sub-dimensions (rule obedience, innovativeness, reactiveness and self confidence) of the five factor personality inventory redeveloped and modified by Somer, Korkmaz and Tatar (2002) for Turkish citizens to analyze the interactions of personality and voter behavior. The intentions are examined as intentions for certain groups of parties: left, right, new, new and religious. Rule obedience is found to create significant differences among respondent's intentions to vote for a specific political orientation. The influence of demographic variables (age, gender and occupation) on personality sub-dimensions and on intentions (together with personality traits) is examined. Age is found to have interactions with rule obedience, innovativeness and self-confidence while gender and occupation had interactions only with self confidence. These three demographic factors were able to explain the intentions of voters depending on their political orientations.

**Keywords:** *Political marketing, intention, personality, five factor personality inventory*

**Öz**

Kişilik ve oy verme davranışı arasındaki ilişkileri incelemek amacıyla Türk deneklerde kullanılmak üzere Somer, Korkmaz ve Tatar (2002) tarafından geliştirilen ve adapte edilen beş faktör kişilik envanterinde yer alan dört alt boyut (kurallara bağlılık, yenilikçilik, tepkisellik ve kendine güven) kullanılmıştır. Cevaplayıcıların oy verme niyetleri politik yaklaşımlarına göre dört grupta toplanmıştır: sağ, sol, yeni, yeni ve dinci. Kişilik alt boyutlarından kurallara bağlılığın cevaplayıcıların oy verme niyetlerinde anlamlı derecede farklılık yarattığı görülmüştür. Çalışmada, demografik değişkenlerin (yaş, cinsiyet ve meslek) politik yaklaşım ve kişilik üzerindeki etkileri de araştırılmıştır. Yaşın kurallara bağlılık, yenilikçilik ve kendine güven ile ilişkili olduğu; cinsiyet ve mesleğin ise sadece kendine güven ile ilişkili olduğu görülmüştür. Bunun yanı sıra, üç demografik değişkenin oy verenlerin oy verme niyetlerini açıklayabildiği ortaya konmuştur.

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** *Politik pazarlama, oy verme niyeti, kişilik, beş faktör kişilik envanteri*

---

<sup>1</sup> This study is part of a broader study that was conducted before 2002 Turkish General Elections held on November the 3<sup>rd</sup>.

\* *Prof.Dr.*, DEU, Department of Business Administration, Dokuz Eylül University, Faculty of Business, İzmir, TURKEY. E-mail: [ceyhan.aldemir@deu.edu.tr](mailto:ceyhan.aldemir@deu.edu.tr)

\*\* *Assist.Prof.Dr.*, DEU Department of Business Administration, Dokuz Eylül University, Faculty of Business, İzmir, TURKEY. E-Mail: [gul.bayraktar@deu.edu.tr](mailto:gul.bayraktar@deu.edu.tr)

## 1. Introduction

Voter behavior is supposed to be affected from the psychological attributes of the individual voter, besides the individual voter's social and cultural environment (Books and Prysby, 1988:211; Eulau, 1986). Researchers who consider the psychological perspective believe that the main determinants of voter behavior are voter's personal characteristics and his/her value system. Voters instinctively make choices under psychological forces like fear, aggressiveness and selfishness. Psychological drives hinder the usage of rationality in voting behavior. One of these psychological determinants of voter behavior is personality.

Personality can be defined as "those inner psychological characteristics that both determine and reflect how a person responds to his/her environment" (Wilkie, 1994:109). Personality "involves systems of distinctive self-regulatory mechanisms and structures for guiding cognitive, affective, and motivational processes toward achieving individual and collective goals, while preserving a sense of personal identity" (Bandura, 1997; Caprara, 1996; Caprara, Barbaranelli and Zimbardo, 1997; Mischel and Shoda, 1995). Kassarian and Sheffet (1991) define personality as "consistent responses to environmental stimuli".

Personality has been a debated issue among marketing scholars since no consensus has been reached about not only how personality influences consumer behavior but also whether it influences consumer behavior or not. Some of the marketing researchers (like Bruce and Witt, 1970; Gruen, 1960; Kassarian and Sheffet, 1991; Massy, Frank and Lodahl, 1968; Robertson, 1970; Robertson and Myers, 1969) had a more negative attitude towards the area of personality within the field of marketing. On the other hand, there are researchers like Albanese (1990, 1993) Claycamp (1965), Donnely (1970a, 1970b, 1971), Foxall and Goldsmith (1989), Koponen (1960), Westfall (1962) who studied personality to explain general patterns of behavior and got positive results.

However, continuous work of marketing researchers had concluded that personality characteristics are likely to influence an individual's product choices, how they respond to promotional efforts, and how they consume products (Haugtvedt, Petty and Cacioppo, 1992; Martineau, 1975). In marketing, determining specific personality characteristics that will influence consumer behavior is specified to be very helpful for a firm to segment its market (Schiffman and Kanuk, 2004).

Kassarian and Sheffet (1991) attributed the contradictory results to the validity of the particular personality measuring instrument. They suggested "developing new definitions and designing new instruments to measure the personality variables that go to the purchase decision rather than using tools designed as part of a medical model to measure schizophrenia or mental stability."

In political marketing, some personality characteristics can also be expected to influence voting behavior. Voters' personalities affect how they

## **Determining Effect of Personality Traits on Voter Behavior**

process political information. Knowing the personalities of their potential and current voters' personalities, political parties might have a chance to develop campaigns and design messages that will attract these personalities. In addition, it is known that personality functions simultaneously with belief and value systems. This interrelated system affects how the voters acquire, integrate and retrieve political information about candidates and parties (Fiske and Taylor, 1991; Greenwald, 1980).

This study aims to investigate certain personality traits within the political behavior construct. The respondents having certain political orientations ("right", "left", "new", and "new and religious" party orientations) are evaluated with respect to their scores on four personality traits (innovativeness, reactivity, rule obedience and self confidence). The influence of demographic factors and personality traits on political orientations of the respondents (intentions) is explored. Moreover, the effects of demographic variables on the four personality traits and on intentions are analyzed.

### **2. Theoretical Background**

#### **2.1. Personality and Trait Theory**

Certain theories are developed to understand personality. Some of these theories (like Freudian and Neo-Freudian theories of personality) determine personality characteristics by qualitative measures like observation, analysis of dreams, projective techniques or the individual's self-reported experiences. These measures require the interpretation of the researcher which can be somewhat subjective. However, trait theory measures personality empirically by formulating personality as the sum of pre-dispositional attributes called traits. Trait is defined as "any distinguishing, relatively enduring way in which one individual differs from another" (Buss and Poley, 1976). There are mainly three assumptions related with trait theory (Blackwell, Miniard and Engel, 2001:213):

- Traits are common to many individuals and vary in absolute amounts among individuals.
- Traits are relatively stable and exert fairly universal effects on behavior.
- Traits can be understood from the measurement of behavioral indicators.

Trait theorists are concerned with the development of personality tests which are also called inventories to determine differences among individuals in terms of specific traits. Marketing researchers try to understand the relationship between personality traits and consumer behavior. The studies give complicating results due to an inadequate trait measure. Consequently, researchers work on construction, development and/or improvement of trait inventories that will give consistent results.

Political marketing scholars are also interested in investigating the impact of personality and voting behavior. In the literature, personality traits like authoritarian personality (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswilk, Levinson and Sanford, 1950), tender vs. tough mindedness (Eystenck, 1954), conservatism/dogmatism (Mc Glosky, 1958; Rokeach, 1960), alienation (Seeman, 1959), and anomy (Srole, 1965) are used to explain voter behavior. Different personality theories developed up to date can be used to identify the relationship between personality and political choice. It will be helpful for political marketers to understand the link between personality traits and voter's choice in terms of political ideology.

## **2.2. Personality Inventories and Five Factor Personality Inventory**

Personality studies dealing with traits, in general, are directed to develop scales that measure specific personality traits in depth like Goldsmith and Hofacker (1991) and Price and Ridgway (1983) who worked on developing a scale on innovativeness, Belk (1984) on materialism, Synder (1979) on self monitoring. However, the Five Factor Model of personality is a model that combines and summarizes all major individual personality traits. So it has the power to distinguish the individual personality differences (Digman, 1990; John, 1990; Wiggins, 1996). The model has five major personality dimensions which are named Extraversion; Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability and Openness to Experience.

The Five Factor Personality Model has been worked on for more than 70 years. Numerous studies support this model (Church and Burke, 1994; Digman, 1990; Goldberg, 1999; John, 1990; McCrae, 1989; McCrae and Costa, 1991; Ostendorf and Angleitner, 1992; Peabody and Goldberg, 1989; Wiggins, 1996). Cross-culturally generalizability of the model is partly proven since most of the studies were conducted in North American and European countries generally in English (De Raad, Perugoni, Hrebickova and Szarota, 1998; Piedmont and Chae, 1997). However, there are concerns about the representativeness and comprehensiveness of the model regarding the natural language of traits (Goldberg, 1992). Hence, researchers from different countries using different languages need to test and adapt the model.

A multi dimensional scale that is appropriate to Turkish people's personality structure is proposed and developed by Somer, Korkmaz and Tatar (2001, 2002). They used Five Factor Personality Model as a basis for their research. They found 15 sub-dimensions: 3 of which were identified under "Extraversion" dimension; 3 under "Agreeableness", 4 under "Conscientiousness", 2 under "Emotional Stability" and 3 under "Openness to Experience". All of the sub-dimensions had Cronbach alphas between 0.69 and 0.87 and major personality dimensions had Cronbach alphas between 0.84 and 0.91.

Our study intends to determine voters' personality traits on 4 sub-dimensions using The Five Factor Personality Inventory tested and developed by

### **Determining Effect of Personality Traits on Voter Behavior**

Somer, Korkmaz and Tatar (2002) in Turkey. The reason to use this personality inventory is that the dimensions developed are appropriate for Turkish people's perceptions of personality structures. The authors' intention is to determine connection between the personality dimensions (traits) and political intentions.

#### **2.3. Recent Political System in Turkey**

Turkey had 13 general elections since 1950 which was the transition period to multi party system. The most recent general election was held in 2002. 18 political parties were present in the elections. Only two parties were able to enter the Turkish National Assembly. AKP which was recently founded and acting as a "catch all" party got 34.43% of the total votes and was the first winner of the elections. The other party was CHP (a left party) which got 19.41 % of the total votes.

Before 2002 elections, Turkey experienced continuous economic problems like inflation, unemployment, increasing foreign debts, devaluation, high exchange and interest rates. Those problems resulted in distrust to the existing parties and previous governments. As a result, the established parties (like ANAP, DYP, DSP, and MHP) ruled the country either as one party or as a member of a coalition government. But the policies and the results were not found satisfactory by the general public since different parties came to power in each election.

The public started to look for a new party in hope to solve their problems. Before 2002 elections, new parties (such as AKP and GP) which realized this need had evolved in Turkish politics. Besides, some parties had inner conflicts. Especially some of the left oriented parties (like DSP and CHP) divided and new political parties (YTP and BTP) emerged within them. In addition, the well known political leaders of most of the major political parties (both the right and the left parties) of 1990's were not on the political scene any more and new leaders were perceived weaker than previous ones in their leadership abilities.

In sum, it can be concluded that there was a "political vacuum" in Turkish politics. The insufficient economic policies of the previous governments were experienced. New parties were established. These developments resemble the political situation during 1980's. Between 1980 and 1983 when Turkey was under a military rule, new parties entered the political arena to compete for the 1983 elections. ANAP (a right party) was the winner of this election and was in force for many years. ANAP was considered as a catch-all party. In the recent 2002 elections, AKP had played a catch all party approach by trying to reach different segments of the society just like ANAP did in 1983 elections. However, different from ANAP, AKP had a religious background since the leader and most of the party's deputy candidates were known to have a strong religious basis.

### 3. Research Design and Methodology

#### 3.1. Research Objectives and Questions

It is intended to determine the effect of personality on voting intentions of the respondents. Since this research was conducted before the elections, intentions of the voters are treated as the dependent variable. On the other hand, due to severe limitations in time and money, independent variables do not comprise all of the internal and external factors but only some selected personality traits of voters. It aims to assess whether certain personality traits of individual voters do make a difference in their voting intentions or not.

This study is an exploratory study. It is expected to find that the voters intending to vote for “new and religious party” (AKP) or “right parties” to score high on rule obedience, low on reactivity and innovativeness since they are conservative. On the contrary, left party voters are expected to score lower on rule obedience and high on reactivity and innovativeness. Open-minded people are politically left-oriented (McCrae, 1996; Trapnell, 1994). We can expect left-oriented people to score higher on innovativeness compared to the right oriented people since innovativeness is a trait investigated under the major personality factor openness. Left and right party voters are assumed to score almost equal on self-confidence. It is hard to predict which political orientation would score high or low on this trait (Caprara, Barbaranelli and Zimbardo, 1999).

The new party GP is mostly supported by housewives and non professional people (Aldemir and Bayraktarođlu, 2003) who might not feel self-confident so advocates of GP is thought to score low on self confidence. But this is a specific situation related only with a specific party (GP). This expectation can not be generalized for all new parties.

On the other hand, new party voters are expected to score high on reactivity. They may be willing to give their vote to a new party as a reaction to the previous governments who could not solve their problems. New party voters may also score high on innovativeness since they are open to new parties but low on rule obedience since they are not tied to any established parties.

Besides personality traits, environmental and socio-cultural factors may influence behavior. An individual’s social class, residence, income, etc may change causing a change in the voter’s behavior (Books and Prysby, 1988:211; Eulau, 1986). Hence, other factors can be used to clarify the relationship between behavior and personality traits (Wilkie, 1994: 119). Social and demographic factors may be influential not only to behavior but to personality, too (Greenstein, 1970). For instance, personality may change as the individual matures. Hence, demographic factors (like age, gender, income, occupation, residence, education, etc.) may have an effect on personality (Gülmen, 1979: 40-43). This issue is not so

### **Determining Effect of Personality Traits on Voter Behavior**

clear since contradictory results were found (Caprara, Barbaranelli and Zimbardo, 1999).

This study intends to investigate any influence of demographic factors on four personality sub-dimensions (reactiveness, rule obedience, self-confidence and openness to change) and on intentions. The authors have included only age, gender and occupation since those three characteristics were found to have significant effects on intentions (Aldemir and Bayraktaroğlu, 2003). The research questions of the study can be summarized as:

- Does a “new and religious party” (AKP) score high on rule obedience, low on reactiveness and innovativeness?
- What does a “new and religious party” (AKP) score on self-confidence?
- Do “right parties” score high on rule obedience, low on reactiveness and innovativeness?
- Do “left parties” score low on rule obedience, high on reactiveness and innovativeness?
- Do “left parties” and “right parties” score almost equal on self-confidence?
- Do “new parties” score high on reactiveness and innovativeness, low on self-confidence and rule obedience?
- Is there any influence of demographic factors (age, gender and occupation) on four personality sub-dimensions (reactiveness, rule obedience, self-confidence and openness to change) and on intentions?

### **3.2. Variables**

***Dependent variable of the research-*** Voting intentions of the respondents is the dependent variable. Schiffman and Kanuk (2004:126) stated that it would be more realistic to search the relationship of certain personality traits to “how consumers make their choices and to the purchase or consumption of a broad product category rather than a specific brand”. Regarding this recommendation, the authors examined intentions for certain groups of parties (like left, right, new, new and religious) which are grouped with respect to their political orientations or/and being a new party (like left, right, new, new and religious).

***Independent variables of the research-*** Four personality sub-dimensions (reactiveness, rule obedience, self-confidence and openness to change) chosen from the major four of the five categories in The Five Factor Model developed for Turkish citizens make up the independent variables of the study. Reactiveness is a sub-dimension under the major dimension called “Agreeableness”, rule obedience under “Conscientiousness”, self-confidence under “Emotional Stability” and openness to change under “Openness to Experience”. The internal reliabilities of these four

## Ceyhan Aldemir ve Gül Bayraktaroğlu

personality traits are found to be between 0.6282 and 0.7160 ( $\alpha_{\text{reactive}}=0,6947$ ,  $\alpha_{\text{rule obedience}}=0,6282$ ,  $\alpha_{\text{self confidence}}=0,7497$ ;  $\alpha_{\text{innovativeness}}=0,7160$ ).

MANCOVA analysis is used to determine whether there are any significant interactions between personality traits and some of the demographic variables,. Hence, personality traits are used as dependent variables while intentions and age, gender and occupation are grouped as independent variables (either covariates or fixed factors) in this analysis. Using this general linear model procedure, the effects of independent variables on the means of personality traits (dependent variables) and interactions between independent variables as well as the effects of individual factors are aimed to be investigated.

### 3.3. Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire is composed of three sections. The first section consists of demographic questions about age, gender, education, occupation, the district the respondent lives, total monthly household income<sup>2</sup>, family size, number of children and social class. In the second section of the questionnaire, the voting intentions of the respondents are asked. The responses are grouped under 4 categories regarding their political orientations.

The third part of the questionnaire includes 49 statements to determine the personality attributes of each individual respondent. The statements are taken from the study of Somer, Korkmaz and Tatar (2001). The questionnaire was applied two weeks before the elections.

### 3.4. Sample

The date of the general election was declared just one month before the elections which caused a severe time limitation to conduct a country wide research. Hence, the research was carried out in one city, Izmir. The authors intentionally had chosen two districts varying in their socio-economic structures since the impact of demographic variables was intended to be analyzed. All the voters listed in two randomly chosen ballot boxes (one from each district) were visited to interview. The lists of the voters belonging to the chosen ballot boxes were obtained from the Election Council. The questionnaires were applied face-to-face by twenty volunteering senior students from Faculty of Business of Dokuz Eylul University.

Some of the voters could not be reached due to movement to another place, death, being on a trip, etc. Moreover, some of the voters refused to answer

---

<sup>2</sup> Income was asked as the total monthly household income. However, the evaluation of the household income depends on the number of individuals in the household. Therefore, questions asking the family size and the number of children are included in the questionnaire as well. Monthly personal income is calculated by dividing the total monthly household income by family size.

## **Determining Effect of Personality Traits on Voter Behavior**

the questions. As a result, only 142 questionnaires were properly filled out of 412 respondents listed in two ballot boxes.

### **3.5. Statistical Analysis**

SPSS 11.0 computer statistical program was utilized to analyze the data obtained. First of all, the internal reliabilities of the personality trait statements were investigated. To analyze the properties of the sample, frequency analysis was conducted. To see whether political orientation differs with respect to the selected personality traits, ANOVA test was used.

MANCOVA (multivariate analysis of covariance) is conducted to see the effects of gender, occupation, age and political intentions on personality traits. In other words, MANCOVA is conducted to see how much each of these variables explains the variance in personality trait differences. Four personality trait dimensions are treated as dependent variables. On the other hand, political intentions and age are classified as independent variables while gender and occupation are treated as covariates. The reason for selecting age and political intentions as independent variables is that personality traits are thought to change directly with age and political intentions.

Moreover, stepwise (backward) logistic regression is conducted to examine the effect of personality traits and demographic variables on the two categories of political intentions: Intentions towards political orientation. Intentions for certain political orientation were the dependent variable of the regression analysis. Four personality traits and the demographic variables (age, gender, and occupation) were the independent variables.

## **4. Results**

### **4.1. Results Related to the Sample**

#### **4.1.1. The Profile of the Respondents**

The demographic characteristics of the sample are illustrated in Table 1. 62% of the sample lives in a low socio-economic surrounding. 40.0% of the sample is middle aged while nearly one third is younger. The respondents are almost equally distributed with respect to gender. "Literate people and primary school graduates" are slightly more than 40% of the sample. One third of the sample consists of secondary school graduates while respondents with university and higher degrees make up the 22.6% of the sample.

"Housewives" comprise the largest occupation group which is followed by "workers and civil servants", "self-employed", and "retired", respectively. Nearly 80% of the sample has monthly personal income less than 300 YTL which is below the poverty limit announced in January 2003 (KESK Research Center, 2003; Türk-İş, 2003). Most of the respondents in the sample perceived themselves in the middle social class (n=100; %=71.9).

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Characteristics		Total		Characteristics		Total	
		n	%			n	%
District (n=142)	Low	88	62,0	Monthly Personal Income (YTL) (n=107)	300 and less	84	78.5
	High	54	38,0		301-450	7	6.5
Age (n=140)	18-35	44	31,5	Occupation (n=141)	451-600	7	6.5
	36-55	56	40,0		601 and more	9	8.4
	≥ 56	40	28,5		Housewife	52	36.9
Gender (n=142)	Female	73	51.4	Social Class (n=139)	Unemployed	12	8,5
	Male	69	48.6		Retired	20	14.2
Education (n=141)	Illiterate	4	2.8	Self-employed	Workers and Civil Servants	24	17.0
	Primary	57	40.5		Upper	14	10.1
	Secondary	48	34.0		Middle	100	71.9
	≥ University	42	22.6		Lower	25	18.0

#### 4.1.2. Voting Intentions of the Respondents

The intentions for certain parties are grouped with respect to the political orientations. Advocates of CHP, DSP, and YTP are grouped under left political orientation while the ones for ANAP, DYP, and MHP are grouped under the right political orientation. GP fits neither of these two groups. In their election campaign, the leader was not clear about their ideology. Hence, GP is categorized only as a new party. In addition, AKP is not put into any group. Most people consider AKP as a political Islam party although there is no clear cut evidence proving that they are so. Hence the authors have classified AKP as a new and religious party. By categorizing parties under “left”, ”right”, “new” and “new and religious” groups, the findings related with voters’ intentions and their personality traits are expected to give clearer results.

The respondents’ intentions to vote for the political parties that participated in 2002 Turkish General Elections are given in Table 2. Half of the sample (50,0%) mentioned that they were planning to vote for a left party, while 13,7% stated that they were planning to vote for a right party. Respondents intending to vote for a new party comprise the third largest group of the sample (9.8%). The voters intending to vote for a new and a religious based party is only 6.1% of the sample.

## Determining Effect of Personality Traits on Voter Behavior

**Table 2: Voting Intentions of the Respondents in 2002 Turkish General Elections**

Political Orientations	Total	
	n	%
<b>“New and Religious Party”</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6.1</b>
AKP (Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi- Justice and Development Party)	8	6.1
<b>“Left Party”</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>50,0</b>
CHP (Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi- People’s Republican Party)	56	42.4
DSP (Demokratik Sol Parti- Democratic Left Party)	3	2.3
YTP (Yeni Türkiye Partisi- New Turkey Party)	7	5.3
<b>“Right Party”</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13,7</b>
ANAP (Anavatan Partisi- Motherland Party)	3	2.3
DYP (Doğru Yol Partisi- True Path Party)	12	9.1
MHP (Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi-Nationalist Action Party)	3	2.3
<b>“New Party”</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>9.8</b>
GP (Genç Parti- Young Party)	13	9.8
<b>Others</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>20,5</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>100.0</b>

### 4.2. Results Related to Political Orientation and the Personality Traits

#### 4.2.1. Personality Traits with respect to Respondents’ Political Orientation

Voters of “new” and “left” parties are more reactive compared to “new and religious” and “right” party voters as was expected although, this difference is not significant (see Table 5). However, “right” and “new and religious” party voters are most rule obedient respondents. This result was expected as the advocates of these two groups are more conservative. On the other hand, the “left” party voters have the lowest rule obedience mean scores followed by “new” party voters. On self confidence sub-dimension, “left” party voters got the highest mean scores followed by the right parties. This indifference between right and left parties on self confidence score was expected before. The voters for a “new” party have lower self confidence mean score.

Voters for “left” parties are most open to change followed by “new and religious” and “new” party voters. It was not expected for “new and religious” party voters to score high on innovativeness thinking that they are more conservative and do not welcome changes very easily. However, if we consider that this party is a new party as well as being a religious party, it is not surprising to reach such a result.

**Table 3: Political Orientation and Personality Traits**

Personality Traits	Political Orientations	n	Mean	s.d.	F Value	p
<b>Reactiveness</b>	New and religious	8	2,3437	,6098	,683	,564
	New	13	2,6346	,6876		
	Left	65	2,4718	,7535		
	Right	18	2,2824	,6674		
	Total	104	2,4495	,7191		
<b>Rule Obedience</b>	New and religious	7	4,5143	,4981	3,323	<b>,023</b>
	New	12	4,2667	,5959		
	Left	65	4,0031	,5807		
	Right	18	4,3444	,4743		
	Total	102	4,1294	,5796		
<b>Self Confidence</b>	New and religious	8	3,8125	,7123	,684	,564
	New	12	3,6806	,7669		
	Left	64	3,9583	,6665		
	Right	18	3,8241	,6598		
	Total	102	3,8905	,6775		
<b>Innovativeness</b>	New and religious	7	3,9351	,5885	,797	,499
	New	13	3,8112	,7371		
	Left	64	3,9460	,6489		
	Right	18	3,6869	,6520		
	Total	102	3,8824	,6554		

On the other hand, “right” party voters scored lowest on this dimension. We can also conclude that voters for “left” parties are more open to change compared to the voters for “right” parties.

#### 4.2.2. Logistic regression results

Intentions to vote for “new and religious” and “new” parties are explained by rule obedience. In addition to rule obedience, innovativeness and age also contribute to the voters’ intention to vote for a “new” party (GP). With respect to the political orientation, both the left and the right parties are explained by two personality traits: rule obedience and innovativeness. However, when only voters intending to vote for a certain orientation (right or left) is considered, rule obedience is the dominant factor to explain the choice behavior. ANOVA results (see Table 5) support rule obedience as an important personality trait to explain voters’ political orientations.

## Determining Effect of Personality Traits on Voter Behavior

### 4.2.3. MANCOVA results explaining the multivariate effects of demographic and political orientations on personality traits

MANCOVA is an analysis which enables the researcher “to test the effects of one or more independent variables on several dependent variables simultaneously” (George and Mallery, 2003: 294). Different from logistic regression and ANOVA, all the personality traits are tested at once to see which independent variables significantly affect all of the personality traits. The results point out significant multivariate effects due to gender [ $F(4,83)=2.949$ ,  $p<0.05$ ], age [ $F(8,168)=2.292$ ,  $p<0.05$ ], and political orientation [ $F(12,255)=1.888$ ,  $p<0.05$ ]. Neither of the independent variables -age and political orientation together- have significant effect on personality [ $F(20,344)=1.178$ ,  $p=0.271$ ], nor the covariate occupation [ $F(4,83)=0.811$ ,  $p=0.522$ ].

Gender ( $p=0.023$ ) and occupation ( $p=0.088$ ) have significant univariate interactions with self-confidence. On the other hand, age ( $p=0.026$ ) has significant interactions with innovativeness. Political orientation has a significant univariate interaction with rule obedience ( $p=0.001$ ).

Age has negative association with rule obedience ( $\beta= -0.682$ ,  $p=0.000$ ). Sampling units younger than 35 years of age are less rule obedient. Together with age, the political orientations of voters have positive associations with rule obedience ( $\beta= 1.235$ ,  $p=0.002$ ). The voters having right party orientations who are younger than 35 are more rule obedient. This finding contradicts with the finding regarding the association of age with rule obedience.

Self confidence is found to have positive associations with gender ( $\beta= 0.342$ ,  $p=0.023$ ), occupation ( $\beta= 0.0044$ ,  $p=0.088$ ) and age ( $\beta= 0.430$ ,  $p=0.038$ ). Voters younger than 35 years of age are more self confident. In addition to self confidence and rule obedience, age is also associated with innovativeness. Voters younger than 35 ( $\beta= 0.568$ ,  $p=0.009$ ) and between ages of 35-55 ( $\beta= 0.336$ ,  $p=0.089$ ) rate higher on innovativeness.

In sum, the independent variables and covariates explain 30.3% of the variance in rule obedience, 27.0% of the variance in self confidence, 17.4 % of the variance in innovativeness, and 10.4% of the variance in reactivity.

## 5. Conclusion

The sample is generally composed of people living in a lower socio-economic district with low incomes, who have got low or middle level of education and who perceive themselves in the middle social class. Slightly, more than half of the sample is female and the majority of the women in the sample are housewives (not working) which make up the largest occupation group in the sample. Respondents, in general, have political orientations of either left or right.

Table 4: Logistic Regression Results Related with Political Orientation

Political Orientation	Explaining Variables	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp.(B)
New and Religious Party	Rule Obedience	1,742	,936	3,464	1	,063	5,710
	Constant	-10,385	4,225	6,041	1	,014	,000
New Party	Rule Obedience	1,225	,599	4,183	1	,041	3,403
	Innovativeness	-,875	,539	2,634	1	,105	,417
	Age	-1,470	,530	7,707	1	,006	,230
	Constant	13,250	6,633	3,990	1	,046	567843,757
Right Orientation	Rule Obedience	1,110	,529	4,406	1	,036	3,035
	Innovativeness	-,729	,427	2,921	1	,087	,482
	Constant	-3,725	2,494	2,231	1	,135	,024
Left Orientation	Rule Obedience	-1,015	,371	7,476	1	,006	,363
	Innovativeness	,511	,302	2,873	1	,090	1,667
	Age	,512	,274	3,486	1	,062	1,669
	Constant	-4,032	3,435	1,378	1	,240	,018
Right or Left Orientation	Rule Obedience	1,247	,555	5,050	1	,025	3,479
	Constant	-6,444	2,385	7,300	1	,007	,002

Respondents are more rule obedient, innovative and self confident while they score low on reactiveness. This finding is similar to the general Turkish citizens' personality. Turkish citizens are generally seen as rule obedient and not reactive. They do not react to unsuccessful governments or they do not go after their rights. They keep silent against issues happening around them.

Rule obedience scores significantly change among different political orientations. Rule obedience is highest for "new and religious" party oriented people followed by "right", "new" and "left" party oriented people. These findings are supported by logistic regression results which point out that the respondents' political orientations are explained by rule obedience.

Innovativeness on the other hand, has the second highest average score among respondents. "Left" party oriented respondents have the highest innovativeness score followed by "new and religious", "new" and "right" party oriented respondents, respectively. However, it was expected that "new" party advocates would score higher on innovativeness. On the other hand, authors' expectation related to the "right" political oriented respondents to score lower on innovativeness dimension is supported by the findings of the study. Innovativeness has a significant role in explaining the voter behavior (intentions) of right parties, left parties and new parties. However, it is found that there is no significant difference between respondents having different political orientations regarding their innovativeness scores. In other words, the innovativeness scores of the respondents having different political orientations do not differ significantly.

### **Determining Effect of Personality Traits on Voter Behavior**

The average self confidence score of the sample is the third highest among the four personality traits. In general, the left party voters are the most self confident. However, the right party voters score very close to the left party voters on self confidence. The right and the left party advocates score very close to each other on this dimension. The new party voters scored the lowest on self confidence. This is because the new party voters are generally housewives and non-professionals. This may have an effect on their self confidence. However, this finding may not be generalized to other countries. This is a specific case for Turkey. Self confidence is not found to create significant differences among party choices and political orientations. In addition, this trait is not capable of explaining the voting intentions of any party or political orientation advocates.

The sample scores the lowest on reactivity. Voters of new party and left parties are more reactive while voters of new and religious party and right parties are less reactive. This confirms our expectations about politically different oriented voters. However, the reactivity scores show no significant difference among political orientation groups. In addition, reactivity is not a significant factor to explain respondents' intentions (political orientation).

In summary, the voters' intentions to vote for left, right, new or new and religious parties are related with their personality traits. "Left" party voters are least rule obedient, most self confident, most innovative. Voters of the "right" parties are least reactive and least innovative since they are more conservative people. "New and religious" party voters obey rules the most. This is usual since religion involves rules. "New" party voters are the most reactive, least self confident individuals. This is why they try new parties.

Demographic factors besides personality traits are found to have effects on political intentions. Age is found to explain intentions to vote for left and new parties. Age, gender, occupation have significant interactions with self confidence; age with innovativeness and rule obedience. When voters are younger, they are more innovative, but less rule obedient.

Generally speaking, it can be said that rule obedience is an important personality trait which determines voter intention. Innovativeness can also be considered as an important personality trait for political choice. Although Caprara, Barbaranelli and Zibardo (1999) concluded that personality is the only determinant factor of political behavior, the authors found out that for some parties and for some political orientations demographic factors might have an effect on the political choice behavior.

### **6. Recommendations**

This study includes four personality traits in the five factor personality inventory. Only one trait (rule obedience) is found to have very significant effects on political intentions. In the future studies, all of the general five personality dimensions

### Ceyhan Aldemir ve Gül Bayraktaroğlu

together with the sub-dimensions are suggested to be analyzed to see exactly which general personality dimensions and traits affect political choice.

It is also recommended to test the universal five factor personality inventory in similar studies. This may provide researchers to compare the results cross-culturally to reach a conclusion about whether this five factor personality inventory works on political behavior or not.

New and religious party which is more of a conservative party has very close and similar results with the right parties. Since parties having religious backgrounds have more conservative voters, religious parties can be evaluated under right parties. In the future studies, it is recommended to consider only left and right political orientations to evaluate voters' personality effects on intentions or behavior.

#### References

- Adorno, T.E. Frenkel - Brunswilk, L.D. & Sanford, R. (1950). The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper.
- Albanese, P.J. (1990). Personality, Consumer Behavior and Marketing Research: A New Theoretical and Empirical Approach. In E.C. Hirschman (Ed.), Research in Consumer Behavior (pp. 1-49). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- (1993). Personality and Consumer Behavior: An Operational Approach. European Journal of Marketing, 27 (8), 28-37.
- Aldemir, C. & Bayraktaroğlu, G. (2003). Impact of Demographic Factors on Voting Intentions in Izmir, Turkey. Political Marketing Conference.18-20 September 2003. London, Great Britain: Middlesex University Business School.
- Bandura, A. (1997). Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control. New York: Freeman.
- Belk, R.W. (1984). Three Scales to Measure Constructs Related to Materialism: Reliability, Validity and Relationships to Measure Happiness. In T. Kinnear (Ed.), Advances in Consumer Research (p. 291), Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research.
- Blackwell, R.D., Miniard, P.W. & Engel, J.F. (2001). Consumer Behavior. Ohio: South-Western.
- Books, J. & Prysby, C. (1988). Studying Contextual Effects or Political Behavior: A Research Inventory Agenda. American Politics Quarterly, 16 (2), 211-238.
- Bruce, G.D. & Witt, R.E. (1970). Personality Correlates of Innovative Buying Behavior. Journal of Marketing Research, 7 (May), 259-260.
- Buss, A.R. & Poley, W. (1976) Individual Differences: Traits and Factors. New York: Halsted Press.
- Caprara, G.V (1996). Structures and Processes in Personality Psychology. European Psychologist, 1, 14-26.
- Barbaranelli, C. & Zimbardo, P.G. (1997), Politicians' Uniquely Simple Personalities. Nature, 385- 493.

### Determining Effect of Personality Traits on Voter Behavior

- \_\_\_\_\_, & \_\_\_\_\_ (1999). Personality Profiles and Political Parties. Political Psychology, 20 (1), 175-197.
- Church, A.T. & Burke, P.J. (1994) Exploratory and Confirmatory Tests of the Big Five and Telegen's Three and Four Dimension Models. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66 (1), 93-114.
- Claycamp, H. J. (1965). Characteristics of Owners of Thrift Deposits in Commercial Banks and Savings and Loan Associations. Journal of Marketing Research, 2(May), 163-170.
- De Raad, B., Perugoni, M., Hrebickova, M. & Szarota, P. (1998). Lingua Franca of Personality: Taxonomies and Structures Based on the Psycholexical Approach. Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology, 29, 212-232.
- Digman, J.M. (1990). Personality Structure: Emergence of the Five Factor Model. Annual Review of Psychology, 41, 417-440.
- Donnelly, J.H., Jr. (1970a). Social Character and Acceptance of New Products, Journal of Marketing Research, 7 (February), 111-3.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1970b). A Multiple Indicant Approach for Studying Innovators. Purdue Papers in Consumer Psychology, 108, Purdue University.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1971). Personality and Innovation Proneness. Journal of Marketing Research, 8 (May), 244-247.
- Eulau, H. (1986). Politics, Self, and Society: A Theme and Variations. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Eystenck, H. (1954). The Psychology of Politics. New York: Doubleday.
- Fiske, S. & Taylor, S. (1991). Social Cognition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Foxall, G.R. & Goldsmith, R.E. (1989). Personality and Consumer Research: Another Look. Journal of the Market Research Society, 30, 111-25.
- George, D. & Mallery, P. (2003). SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference 11.0 Update. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Goldberg, L.R. (1992) The Development of Markers for the Big-Five Factor Structure. Psychological Assessment, 4 (1), 26-42.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1999). A Broad-Bandwidth, Public Domain, Personality Inventory Measuring the Lower Level Facets of Several Five-Factor Model. In I. Mervielde, I. Deary, F. De Fruyt, & F. Ostendorf (Eds.), Personality Psychology in Europe (Vol.7, pp.7-28). Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.
- Goldsmith, R.E. & Hofacker, C.F. (1991). Measuring Consumer Innovativeness. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 19 (3), 209-21.
- Greenstein, F.I. (1970). Personality and Politics. Chicago: Markham Publishing Comp.
- Greenwald, A. (1980). The Totalitarian Ego: Fabrication and Revision of Personality History. American Psychologists, 35, 603-618.

**Ceyhan Aldemir ve Gül Bayraktarođlu**

- Gruen, W. (1960). Preference for New Products and Its Relationship to Different Measures of Conformity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 44 (December), 361-366.
- Gülmen, Y. (1979). Türk Seçmen Davranışında Ekonomik ve Sosyal Faktörlerin Rolü: 1960-1970. İstanbul: Güryay Matbaacılık.
- Haugtvedt, C., Petty, R.E. & Cacioppo, J.T. (1992). Need for Cognition and Advertising: Understanding the Role of Personality Variables in Consumer Behavior. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 1, 239-260.
- John, O.P. (1990). The "Big Five" Factor Taxonomy: Dimensions of Personality in Natural Language and in Questionnaires. In L.A. Pervin (Ed.), Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research (pp. 66-100). New York: Guilford.
- Kassarjian, H.H. & Sheffet, M.J. (1991). Personality and Consumer Behavior : An Update. In H.H. Kassarjian & M.J. Sheffet. Perspectives in Consumer Behavior. (pp. 281-303), Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
- KESK (Turkish Confederation of Public Labor Unions) Research Center (2003, January 29), Poverty Limit is Announced, [Announcement Posted on the World Wide Web], Ankara. Retrieved December 1, 2004, from the <http://www.kesk.org.tr/kesk.asp?sayfa=haber&id=107>
- Koponen, A. (1960). Personality Characteristics of Purchasers. Journal of Advertising Research. 1 (September). 6-12.
- Martineau, P. (1975). Motivation in Advertising: Motives That Make People Buy. New York: McGraw-Hill Book, Co.
- Massy, W.F., Frank, R.E. & Lodahl, T.M. (1968). Purchasing Behavior and Personal Attributes. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- McCrae, R.R. (1989). Why Advocate the Five Factor Model: Joint Analysis of the Neo-Pi and Other Instruments. In D.M. Buss & N. Cantor (Eds.). Personality Psychology: Recent Trends and Emerging Directions. (pp.237-245). New York: Springer Verlag.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1996). Social Consequences of Experiential Openness. Psychological Bulletin, 120, 323-337.
- McCrae, R.R. & Costa, P.T. (1991). Adding Liebe and Arbeit: The Full Five-Factor Model and Well-Being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 817 (2), 227-232.
- McGlosky, H. (1958). Conservatism and Personality. American Political Science Review, 52, 27-45.
- Mischel, W. & Shoda, Y. (1995). A Cognitive-Affective System Theory of Personality: Reconceptualizing Situations, Dispositions, Dynamics and Variance in Personality Structure. Psychological Review, 102, 246-268.
- Ostendorf, F. & Angleitner, A. (1992). On the Generality and Comprehensiveness of the Five-Factor Model of Personality: Evidence of Five Robust Factors in Questionnaire Data. In G.V. Caprara & G. Van Heck (Eds.). Modern Personality Psychology. (pp.73-109). London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

### **Determining Effect of Personality Traits on Voter Behavior**

- Peabody, D. & Goldberg, L.R. (1989). Some Determinants of Factor Structures from Personality-Trait Descriptors. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57 (3). 552-567.
- Piedmont, R.L. & Chae, J.H (1997). Cross-Cultural Generalizability of the Five-Factor Model of Personality. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 28(2), 131-155.
- Price, L.L. & Ridgway, N. (1983). Development of a Scale to Measure Innovativeness. In R.P. Bagozzi & A.M. Tybout (Eds.). Advances in Consumer Research (pp. 679-84). Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research.
- Robertson, T.S. & Myers J.H. (1969). Personality Correlates of Opinion Leadership and Innovative Buying Behavior. Journal of Marketing Research, 6 (May), 164-168.
- Robertson, T.S. & Myers J.H. (1970). Personality Correlates of Innovative Buying Behavior: A Reply. Journal of Marketing Research, 7 (May), 260-261.
- Rokeach, M. (1960). The Open and Closed Mind: Investigations into the Nature of Belief Systems and Personality Systems. New York: Basic Books.
- Schiffman, L.& Kanuk, L.L. (2004). Consumer Behavior. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Seeman, M. (1959). On the Meaning of Alienation. American Sociological Review, 24. 783-791.
- Snyder, M. (1979). Self-Monitoring Processes. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.). Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (pp. 85-128). New York: Academic Press.
- Somer, O., Tatar, A. & Korkmaz, M. (2001) Çok Boyutlu Kişilik Ölçeğinin Geliştirilmesi. Ege Üniversitesi Rektörlüğü Araştırma Projesi Raporu. 98/EDB./02
- \_\_\_\_\_, Korkmaz, M. & Tatar, A. (2002). Beş Faktör Kişilik Envanterinin Geliştirilmesi: Ölçek ve Alt Ölçeklerin Oluşturulması. Türk Psikolojisi Dergisi, 17 (49). 21-33.
- Srole, L. (1965). A Comment on “Anomy”, American Sociological Review, 30. 757-762.
- Trapnell, P.D. (1994). Openness versus Intellect: A Lexical Left Turn. European Journal of Personality, 8. 273-290.
- Türk-İş (Confederation of Trade Unions of Türkiye) (2003, 25 January) Poverty Limit has Reached 400 Million. [Announcement Posted on the World Wide Web]. Ankara. Retrieved December 1, 2004, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.ozgurpolitika.org/2003/01/25/hab05.html>
- Westfall, R. (1962). Psychological Factors in Predicting Product Choice. Journal of Marketing, 26 (April). 34-40.
- Wiggins, J.S. (Eds.) (1996). The Five-Factor Model of Personality: Theoretical Perspectives. New York: Guilford.
- Wilkie, W. (1994). Consumer Behavior. Boston: John Wiley& Sons.