



The prediction of Honesty–Humility-related criteria by the HEXACO and Five-Factor Models of personality

Michael C. Ashton ^{a,*}, Kibeom Lee ^{b,*}

^a Department of Psychology, Brock University, 500 Glenridge Avenue, St. Catharines, ON, Canada L2S 3A1

^b Department of Psychology, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada T2N 1N4

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Available online 30 March 2008

Keywords:

Personality structure
Observer reports
Validity
Honesty–Humility
HEXACO
Five-Factor Model

ABSTRACT

We examined two questions involving the relative validity of the HEXACO and Five-Factor Models of personality structure. First, would the HEXACO model outpredict the Five-Factor Model (FFM) with regard to several diverse criteria that are conceptually relevant to the Honesty–Humility dimension of personality? If so, would the addition of a proxy Honesty–Humility scale—as computed from relevant facets of the FFM Agreeableness domain—allow the FFM to achieve predictive validities matching those of the HEXACO model? Results from self- and observer ratings in three samples (each $N > 200$) indicated that the HEXACO model showed considerable predictive validity advantages over the FFM. When a measure of Honesty–Humility derived from the FFM was added to the original five domains of that model, the predictive validity reached that of the HEXACO model for some criteria, but remained substantially below for others.

© 2008 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

An important recent development in personality psychology has been the finding that human personality variation is best summarized by a set of six broad dimensions. During the 1980s and 1990s, many researchers had adopted the Big Five or Five-Factor Model (FFM) of personality structure, but the results of more recent investigations have converged on a six-factor structure that we have called the HEXACO framework (e.g., Ashton & Lee, 2007). This six-dimensional space has emerged repeatedly in lexically-based studies of personality structure conducted in diverse languages, and supersedes the Five-Factor structure that was observed in early studies of the English personality lexicon. In this article, we examine the incremental validity provided by the HEXACO model—beyond the level of validity provided by the traditional Five-Factor structure—in predicting several important variables.

1.1. The Big Five and the FFM

The classic Big Five factors as observed in English-language lexical studies of personality structure are generally known as Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability (versus Neuroticism), and Intellect/Imagination (see Digman & Takemoto-Chock, 1981; Goldberg, 1990; Hofstee, de Raad, & Goldberg, 1992; Saucier & Goldberg, 1996). The findings from these lexical investigations, and from analyses of personality questionnaire scales that had also been inspired by lexical research, led to the development of the FFM (e.g., McCrae & Costa, 1985; see history by McCrae, 1989). The Big Five

* Corresponding author. Fax: +1 905 688 6922.

E-mail addresses: mashton@brocku.ca (M.C. Ashton), kibeom@ucalgary.ca (K. Lee).

and the FFM are in most ways almost identical, but there are at least two noteworthy differences between these five-dimensional structures.

First, the Big Five Intellect/Imagination factor incorporates an element of intellectual ability that is not incorporated within the corresponding dimension of the FFM. The latter factor, called Openness to Experience (e.g., Costa & McCrae, 1992; McCrae & Costa, 1985), is instead defined by a rather broad array of traits, most of which are associated with imagination. Second, the Big Five Agreeableness factor is somewhat less broadly defined than is its counterpart in the FFM. The Big Five and FFM variants of Agreeableness share traits of kindness and cooperation, but FFM Agreeableness also incorporates some other traits, such as straightforwardness and modesty, which are not central aspects of Big Five Agreeableness (see detailed discussion in Ashton & Lee, 2005).

Although the Big Five—and ultimately, the FFM—were derived from lexical findings in the English language, the popularity of these five-dimensional systems is in large part attributable to the questionnaire-based research conducted by Costa and McCrae during the 1980s and 1990s. Their investigations showed that a wide variety of personality inventory scales had substantial associations with one or more of the dimensions of the FFM (e.g., McCrae, 1989). In addition, translated versions of FFM marker variables—specifically, the scales of the NEO Personality Inventory—Revised (NEO-PI-R; Costa & McCrae, 1992)—were found to define the same five-dimensional space in countries around the world (e.g., McCrae & Costa, 1997).

1.2. The HEXACO model of personality structure

The Big Five and FFM became widely accepted during the 1980s and 1990s as the optimal structural model of personality variation. Meanwhile, however, the question of personality structure was still being examined in lexically-based investigations within several language communities. These lexical studies of personality structure are generally based on factor analyses of self- or observer ratings on familiar personality-descriptive adjectives of a language. Such investigations have the crucial advantages of being based on variable sets that are *indigenous* to the culture in question (rather than imported or imposed from outside) and *representative* of the personality domain (rather than pre-selected to define any hypothesized structure). In contrast, studies in which a pre-selected set of factor markers is translated and imported into other languages and cultures will be biased toward the recovery of the hypothesized factor structure.

As researchers began to conduct lexical studies of personality structure in various languages other than English, they often focused on the question of whether or not they would recover the Big Five structure as obtained in the early English lexical investigations. But the results of these lexical investigations have produced the surprising result that the Big Five is not the largest widely-replicated space underlying the domain of personality dispositions. Instead, a set of six dimensions—but so far, not more than six—has been replicated across many languages (see reviews by Ashton & Lee, 2007; Ashton et al., 2004), including several non-Indo-European languages (e.g., Filipino, Hungarian, Korean, Turkish) as well as languages of several branches of the Indo-European family (e.g., Romance, Germanic, Slavic, Hellenic).

Three of these six cross-language factors are very similar to the Big Five Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and Intellect/Imagination dimensions. Two other factors roughly represent rotated variants of Big Five Agreeableness and Emotional Stability. The cross-language Agreeableness factor blends the gentleness of Big Five Agreeableness with the even temper of Big Five Emotional Stability, whereas the cross-language Emotionality factor blends the vulnerability of (low) Big Five Emotional Stability with the sentimentality of Big Five Agreeableness. Finally, the remaining factor of the six-dimensional structure, Honesty–Humility, is defined by such traits as sincerity and fairness versus conceit and greed. We have called this set of six dimensions the HEXACO structure, on the basis of the number and names of the factors: Honesty–Humility (H), Emotionality (E), eXtraversion (X), Agreeableness (A), Conscientiousness (C), and Openness to Experience (O).¹

The recovery of this six-dimensional structure from the indigenous and representative personality descriptors of diverse languages establishes this solution as the best available summary of the domain of human personality dispositions. In addition to its empirical accuracy, the HEXACO framework also has some advantages in terms of theoretical interpretability. As we have discussed elsewhere (e.g., Ashton & Lee, 2007), the Honesty–Humility and Agreeableness factors correspond to two complementary aspects of reciprocal altruism, whereas the Emotionality factor corresponds to kin altruistic tendencies. In addition, the Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience factors can be viewed as dimensions of social engagement, task-related engagement, and idea-related engagement, respectively. Several important phenomena—such as the mapping between the HEXACO dimensions and theoretical biologists' altruism constructs, or the defining content of (and sex differences on) the Emotionality factor—are explained parsimoniously within this theoretical framework, but cannot be readily explained in terms of the Big Five or FFM. (See Ashton & Lee, 2007, for further details, and also for discussions of the adaptive trade-offs associated with higher and lower levels of each dimension.)

1.3. Incremental validity of the HEXACO framework beyond the big five and FFM

The research summarized above indicates that the HEXACO structure provides advantages over the Big Five or FFM both as an empirical summary and as a theoretical interpretation of human personality variation. But from the point of view of

¹ The content of the lexical Intellect/Imagination factor sometimes favors intellectual ability and sometimes favors unconventionality, depending on adjective selection guidelines. In the HEXACO acronym, we use the name of the corresponding FFM dimension.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/951865>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/951865>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)