

Big Five plus H and Political Orientation

H in HEXACO model stands for

- "Honesty-Humility" (Michael Ashton and Kibeom Lee) and
- *Hubris* (Peter Schmolck, this poster), unfavorable but better defined pole of the same dimension

Adding *Hubris* as Number Six in personality taxonomy has provided a useful slot for Clinical, Social, and I/O Ψ already. Related to or explained by *Hubris* are, among others:

- "Dark Triad" (Psychopathy, Narcissism, and Machiavellism (Lee & Ashton, 2005))
- Sexual Harassment (Lee, Gizzarone, & Ashton, 2003)
- Workplace Integrity (Lee, Ashton, & De Vries, 2005)

What about Political Ψ ? Do the Big Five suffice for mapping prejudice and political ideology into the personality-trait domain?

Two Core Dispositions in Political Ψ (Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski, & Sulloway, 2003)	Counterpart in Personality Taxonomy
1) Resistance to Change / Right-Wing-Authoritarianism (RWA)	✓ low Openness to New Experiences ?? Disagreeableness (e.g., mistrust and hostility)
2) Acceptance and Support of Inequality / Social Dominance Orientation (SDO)	?? Disagreeableness (e.g., competitiveness) ✓ <i>Hubris</i> is the self-view counterpart to the socio-political world view of SDO.

Goals and Research Questions

Validation of an extended BFI-short version that contains

- Four new *Hubris* items that proved uncorrelated with the existing BFI-Agreeableness scale in preceding studies
- Another candidate item in a series of trials to define the negative pole of Openness: "Prefers practical solutions to theoretical discussions"

Does addition of Humility as a sixth dimension improve fit of political variables within the personality taxonomy? – Hypotheses:

- Low Openness is correlated more strongly with RWA than with SDO
- *Hubris* is correlated more strongly with SDO than with RWA
- *Hubris* significantly contributes to explaining variance in political variables, independent of and above that attributable to Disagreeableness

Method

Sample

N = 311 (75% male) students who are at the same time (prospective) officers of the German Armed Forces.

Measures – Overview

Personality – Big Five plus H

- 21-item adapted, short version of Oliver John's BFI (John & Srivastava, 1999; Rammstedt, 1997)
- plus a new Four-item "BFI-like" *Hubris* scale

Political Variables

- *Right-Wing-Authoritarianism*: 12-Item scale RWA3D (Funke, 2003, 2005)
- *Social Dominance Orientation*: Adapted German version of a balanced SDO scale (Jost & Thompson, 2000)
- *Left/Right-Orientation*: principal component, based on a 10-step left-right rating scale and 7-step sympathy ratings for eight German political parties.

Composition of Critical Personality Measures

BFI-Openness

Problem:

Lack of empirically verified descriptors for low Openness other than "uncreative", "unimaginative", "unreflective", "unanalytical", etc. (cf. Goldberg, 1992). People high in "Un-Openness" should be down-to-earth, practical, unsentimental, simple, and routine-lovers. But such descriptions do not fare well in item analysis.

Four-item version and tentative fifth item ($\alpha_{4\text{Items}} = .74$; $\alpha_{5\text{Items}} = .70$)

I see myself as someone who ...

- Likes to reflect, play with ideas
- Has an active imagination
- Values artistic, aesthetic experiences
- Has few artistic interests *
- Prefers practical solutions to theoretical discussions *

* reverse scored

BFI-Agreeableness

Summary of content (cf. Ashton & Lee, 2005):

Kindness and pleasantness vs. rudeness and harshness

Four-item short version ($\alpha = .55$)

I see myself as someone who ...

- Is considerate and kind to almost everyone
- Likes to cooperate with others
- Often has a tiff with others *
- Is sometimes rude to others *

* reverse scored

Hubris (aka "lack of" Honesty-Humility, Lee & Ashton, 2004)

Facets:

- Manipulativeness (aka "sincerity avoidance")
- Slyness (aka "fairness avoidance")
- Greed (aka "lack of greed avoidance")
- Pretentiousness (aka "modesty avoidance")

Four-item "BFI-like" *Hubris* scale ($\alpha = .53$)

Item selection was based on orthogonality with BFI Agreeableness in previous studies. The four items selected represent two of the four H facets only, Greed and Pretentiousness.

I see myself as someone who ...

- Appreciates high social status
- Loves luxury and shows that
- Should not be subject to the same rules and laws like most people
- Deserves more respect than the average person

Details on Resistance to Change vs. Support of Inequality

RWA, Right-Wing Authoritarianism (Altemeyer, 1996)

- 1) Authoritarian Submission: a high degree of submission to the established, legitimate authorities
- 2) Authoritarian Aggression: high levels of aggression in the name of the authorities
- 3) Conventionalism: a high degree of adherence to the traditions and social norms that are perceived to be endorsed by established authorities

12-Item scale RWA3D (Funke, 2003, 2005) – $\alpha = .74$

Sample Items

- The days when women are submissive should belong strictly in the past. A "woman's place" in society should be wherever she wants to be. *
- What our country really needs instead of more "civil rights" is a good stiff dose of law and order.
- The withdrawal from tradition will turn out to be a fatal fault one day.

SDO, Social Dominance Orientation (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999)

SDO is defined as the degree to which individuals desire and support group-based hierarchy and the domination of "inferior" groups by "superior" groups.

Eight-items short form based on 16-items balanced SDO scale by Jost & Thompson (2000) – $\alpha = .72$

Sample Items

- To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups
- There is no point in trying to make incomes more equal
- No group of people is more worthy than any other *
- We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups *

* reverse scored

Results and Discussion

Table 1
Partial Intercorrelations of Political Variables and BFI plus H Controlling for Sex

Variable	RWA	SDO	L/R	O	C	E	A	N
SDO	.38**							
L/R Component	.40**	.42**						
Openness	-.27**	-.10	-.15*					
Conscientiousness	.10	.00	.08	.04				
Extraversion	-.02	-.03	.00	.12*	.00			
Agreeableness	-.14*	-.21**	-.07	.16*	.05	.07		
Neuroticism	.06	-.04	-.07	.05	-.09	-.30**	-.09	
Hubris	.15*	.27**	.09	.09	-.03	.06	-.14*	-.04

Table 2
Linear Regression Weights for Sex and Big Five plus H Predicting Political Variables

	RWA	SDO	L/R
Sex (Female)	-.11	-.15*	-.16*
Openness	-.31**	-.09	-.15*
Conscientiousness	.13*	.03	.08
Extraversion	.06	-.04	-.01
Agreeableness	-.06	-.17**	-.04
Neuroticism	.10	-.08	-.06
Hubris	.17**	.25**	.10

Note: RWA: Right-Wing Authoritarianism; SDO: Social Dominance Orientation; L/R Principal component representing right-wing ideology.
*p < .05. **p < .01

Summary of Main Results

Psychometric Evaluation of the Six Personality Scales

- Low internal-consistency estimates (α) for H and A in the present sample
- Correlations of H with the other five are all close to Zero

Political Variables

- Expectedly, RWA and SDO are not quite uncorrelated: $r \approx .40$
- Both predict Left/Right orientation equally well: $r \approx .40$ ($R = .52$, not in table)

Personality and Political Variables

- Openness and *Hubris* differ as predicted in their correlation patterns:
 - O: correlation with RWA ($r = -.27$, $p < .01$) greater than correlation with SDO ($r = -.10$, n.s.)
 - H: correlation with SDO ($r = .27$, $p < .01$) greater than correlation with RWA ($r = .15$, $p < .05$)
- Correlations with SDO/RWA for Agreeableness (-.21/- .14) resemble those for *Hubris*, however, as multiple regression shows
 - The contribution of H remains highly significant after controlling for sex and the Big-Five scales (including A)
 - The beta weights of A are smaller and significant only for predicting SDO
- Except for a small relation to Openness (r and $\beta = -.15$), Left/Right political ideology is not directly related to personality traits

REFERENCES

- Altemeyer, B. (1998). The other "authoritarian personality." In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 30, pp. 47–91). San Diego, CA: Academic Press, Inc.
- Altemeyer, B. (1996). *The Authoritarian Specter*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2005). Honesty-Humility, the Big Five, and the Five-Factor Model. *Journal of Personality, 73*(5), 1321-1353.
- Funke, F. (2003). *Die dimensionale Struktur von Autoritarismus [The dimensional Structure of Authoritarianism]*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Friedrich-Schiller-University, Jena, Germany.
- Funke, F. (2005). The dimensionality of Right-Wing Authoritarianism: Lessons from the dilemma between theory and measurement. *Political Psychology, 26*(2).
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 102–109). New York: Guilford Press.
- Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., & Sulloway, F. J. (2003). Political conservatism as motivated social cognition. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*(3), 339-375.
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2004). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO Personality Inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 39*(2), 329-358.
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2005). Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and Narcissism in the Five-Factor Model and the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Individual Differences, 38*(7), 1571-1582.
- Lee, K., Ashton, M. C., & de Vries, R. E. (2005). Predicting workplace delinquency and integrity with the HEXACO and Five-Factor Models of personality structure. *Human Performance, 18*(2), 179-197.
- Lee, K., Gizzarone, M., & Ashton, M. C. (2003). Personality and the likelihood to sexually harass. *Sex Roles, 49*(1), 59-69.
- Rammstedt, B. (1997). *Die deutsche Version des Big Five Inventory (BFI): Übersetzung und Validierung eines Fragebogens zur Erfassung des Fünf-Faktoren-Modells der Persönlichkeit [The German version of the BIG-FIVE Inventory (BFI): Translation and validation of a questionnaire for assessing the Five-Factor-Model of Personality]*. Unpublished Diplomarbeit, Universität Bielefeld.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX – ORIGINAL, GERMAN WORDING OF ITEMS

BFI PLUS H

Dim	Polg	Nr	Ich sehe mich als jemand der ...
O	+	02	gerne Überlegungen anstellt, mit Ideen spielt
O	+	16	künstlerische und ästhetische Eindrücke schätzt
O	+	24	eine aktive Vorstellungskraft hat, phantasievoll ist
O	-	06	praktische Lösungen lieber mag als theoretische Diskussionen
O	-	08	nur wenig künstlerische Interessen hat
C	+	01	zuverlässig und gewissenhaft arbeitet
C	+	09	Aufgaben gründlich erledigt
C	-	14	bequem ist und zur Faulheit neigt
C	-	19	dazu neigt, unordentlich zu sein
E	+	03	aus sich herausgeht, gesellig ist
E	+	11	begeisterungsfähig ist, andere mitreißen kann
E	-	15	eher zurückhaltend und reserviert ist
E	-	17	eher still und wortkarg ist
A	+	18	rücksichtsvoll und einfühlsam zu anderen ist
A	+	21	lieber kooperiert als konkurriert
A	-	12	oft Krach mit anderen hat.
A	-	25	schruff und abweisend zu anderen sein kann
N	+	04	leicht nervös und unsicher wird
N	+	07	sich viele Sorgen macht
N	-	13	ruhig bleibt, selbst in Stresssituationen
N	-	22	emotional ausgeglichen und nicht leicht aus der Fassung zu bringen ist
H	+	05	nicht den selben Regeln und Gesetzen unterworfen sein sollte, wie die meisten Menschen
H	+	10	dem eine hohe gesellschaftliche Stellung etwas bedeutet
H	+	20	den Luxus liebt und das auch zeigt
H	+	23	mehr Respekt verdient als der durchschnittliche Mensch

SDO

Im Folgenden finden Sie eine Reihe von Aussagen darüber, in welcher Beziehung gesellschaftliche Gruppen zueinander stehen sollten. Gesellschaftliche Gruppen können dabei z.B. ethnische Gruppen, politische Gruppen, religiöse Gruppen, Berufsgruppen oder auch die beiden Geschlechter sein. Bitte geben Sie an, wie stark Sie persönlich den Aussagen zustimmen.

SubD ¹	Polg	Nr	
AE	+	1	Wir würden mehr Probleme schaffen als lösen, wenn wir alle Gruppen gleich behandeln würden.
AE	+	5	Es macht keinen Sinn, die Einkommen so gleich wie möglich zu gestalten.
AE	-	2	Wir sollten unser Möglichstes tun, um die Bedingungen für die unterschiedlichen Gruppen anzugleichen.
AE	-	8	Keine einzelne Gruppe sollte in der Gesellschaft dominieren.
GD	+	3	Um im Leben vorwärts zu kommen, ist es manchmal notwendig, auf anderen Gruppen herum zu treten.
GD	+	6	Wenn gewisse Gruppen unter sich bleiben würden, hätten wir weniger Probleme.
GD	-	4	Keine Gruppe von Menschen ist mehr wert als irgendeine andere Gruppe.
GD	-	7	Es ist ein echtes Problem, daß bestimmte Gruppen oben sind und andere unten.

¹ AE=Antiegalitarismus – GD=Gruppendominanz