POLITICAL HUMILITY: ENGAGING OTHERS WITH
DIFFERENT POLITICAL PERSPECTIVES

Adam Hodge

Thesis Prepared for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

December 2019

APPROVED:

Joshua N. Hook, Major Professor
Clifton E. Watkins Jr., Committee Member
Chiachih DC Wang, Committee Member
Vicki Campbell, Chair of the Department of
Psychology

Tamara L. Brown, Executive Dean of the
College of Liberal Arts and Social
Sciences

Victor Prybutok, Dean of the Toulouse Graduate
School

Hodge, Adam. *Political Humility: Engaging Others with Different Political Perspectives*.

Master of Science (Psychology), December 2019, 82 pp., 10 tables, 1 appendix, references, 83 titles.

The purpose of this study was to explore theorized predictors, intrapersonal effects, and interpersonal effects of political humility. Participants ($N = 469$) were adults recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk and undergraduate students who completed a series of measures online. First, I found that political humility is (a) positively associated with openness to experience, (b) negatively associated with political commitment, and (c) not significantly related to political diversity in one's social network. Second, regarding intrapersonal effects, I found that political humility was (a) positively associated with low emotional reactivity when presented with a different political perspective, (b) identifying positive aspects of the opposite political perspective, and (c) not significantly related to identifying negative aspects of one's own political perspective. Third, I found that both the self-reported political humility of the participant and the perceived political humility of the individual who hurt or offended the participant were positively associated with one's motivation to forgive the individual. Fourth, I found that the association between political humility and forgiveness was not significantly moderated by how close the participant felt to the offender before the hurt or offense. I conclude by discussing my findings in light of the present literature on humility.

Copyright 2019

by

Adam Hodge

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Throughout the writing of this thesis I have received a great deal of support and assistance. I would first like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Joshua Hook, whose expertise, guidance, and support were invaluable throughout this process. I am truly grateful for the experiences, encouragement, and genuine care you have provided to me since before I arrived at UNT, and it has been a privilege to study under you. I would also like to acknowledge my committee members, Dr. Wang and Dr. Watkins, for their insight and support throughout the writing of this thesis, and for taking a valued interest in my personal well-being and education. I would also like to thank my parents for their unconditional support and love. Thank you for teaching me to always give my best, to care for others well, and to work hard and with purpose. Additionally, I would like to thank my incredible wife, Paige, for her constant support, kindness, and patience. I would not be able to pursue my dreams if it was not for your unyielding love and support. Thank you for your constant commitment to care for me and our family despite the strenuous life circumstances we occasionally find ourselves in. Finally, I want to thank my beautiful daughters, Charlie and Chaney, for helping me to remember to slow down and enjoy life during this busy time. You provide me with so much passion and motivation to be diligent in my studies, knowing that I get to come home to you every night to find satisfaction and meaning

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	3
Purpose of Current Review	6
Method	6
Inclusion Criteria	6
Literature Search	7
Results	7
Review of Study Methods	8
Review of Empirical Findings	15
Discussion	19
Limitations and Directions for Future Research	21
Implications for Counseling	24
Conclusion	25
CHAPTER 3. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	27
Ideological Differences Strain Relationships	27
Political Humility	28
Purpose of the Current Study	29
CHAPTER 4. METHOD	34
Participants	34
Design	34
Measures	34
Demographic Questionnaire	34
Political Development and Relevant Information Questionnaire	35
Relational Transgression Recall and Severity Regarding Politics	38
Procedure	41
Hypotheses and Planned Analyses	42

Hypothesis 1.....	42
Hypothesis 2.....	44
Hypothesis 3.....	45
Hypothesis 4.....	46
CHAPTER 5. RESULTS	48
Data Cleaning and Preliminary Analyses	48
Hypothesis 1.....	49
Hypothesis 2.....	50
Hypothesis 3.....	51
Hypothesis 4.....	52
CHAPTER 6. DISCUSSION.....	54
Predictors of Political Humility	54
Intrapersonal Effects of Political Humility	55
Interpersonal Effects of Political Humility	56
Limitations	57
Areas for Future Research	59
Implications for Counseling.....	61
Conclusion	63
APPENDIX: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE	73
REFERENCES	77

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Political Humility: Studies Included in Literature Review.....	64
Table 2. Skewness, Kurtosis, and Range of Responses of Political Commitment, Political Humility, Forgiveness, Openness, Emotional Reactivity and Political Diversity	68
Table 3. Intercorrelations of Continuous Variables included in Analyses	68
Table 4. Comparison of Variables in MTURK & Undergraduate (SONA) Samples.....	69
Table 5. Comparison of Age in MTURK & Undergraduate (SONA) Samples	70
Table 6. Comparison of Gender on Variables	70
Table 7. Comparison of Race/Ethnicity on Variables	70
Table 8. Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Political Humility (SIHS)	71
Table 9. Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Forgiveness	71
Table 10. Hierarchical Moderation Analysis Predicting Forgiveness	72

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, research on humility has flourished, as scientists have clarified definitions, developed measures, and explored links between humility and related constructs (Worthington, Davis, & Hook, 2017). Perhaps the area of research that has received the most support has explored the role of humility in promoting positive relationship functioning (Davis et al., 2013). In particular, humility has been found to help individuals and groups develop and maintain relationships with others who may have different beliefs or values (e.g., Hook et al., 2013; Hook et al., 2015).

Although there has been quite a lot of theory and research that has explored intellectual and cultural humility, one area that has received relatively little attention from social scientists is political humility (Worthington, 2017). When conflict or disagreement regarding political views or beliefs occurs, it is often difficult to hold or communicate one's point of view in a respectful manner, or even consider the point of view of the other person. With the current polarity and divisiveness observed in the political affairs of the United States and world today, a greater understanding of political humility could potentially be an important factor in reducing the hurts and offenses that often results from political disagreements. Political humility could also help individuals and groups develop healthy working relationships with others who believe differently, which has the potential to positively impact public policy and intergroup relations.

The purpose of this thesis is to fill a gap in the literature by exploring the social construct of political humility and its impact on the self, relationships, and broader communities. In Chapter 2, I present a review of the extant literature on political humility. Specifically, I reviewed all empirical studies, including unpublished studies, that included a measure of

humility and a measure of political affiliation, orientation, or attitudes. In Chapters 3, 4, and 5, I present an empirical study that examined potential predictors and consequences of political humility on the self and one's relationships. In Chapter 6, I discuss the findings from my empirical study in the context of the existing literature, provide suggestions for future research, and discuss implications for clinical practice.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The field and study of positive psychology has flourished since its inception near the beginning of the 21st century (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). In the early stages of this movement, researchers began to explore how one might assess character strengths and virtues through rigorous empirical scientific effort (Peterson and Seligman, 2004). While research on some virtues such as forgiveness (Worthington, 2005) and gratitude (Emmons & McCullough, 2004) blossomed relatively quickly, the study of humility had a slow start compared to other virtues, due to difficulties defining and measuring this construct (Davis, Worthington, & Hook, 2010). However, in the past ten years, as definitions have consolidated and measurement has progressed, the empirical study of humility in the field of psychology has rapidly increased (Davis & Hook, 2014; Worthington, Davis, & Hook, 2017).

Humility is broadly defined as having an accurate view of one's own strengths and limitations, while also holding a relational stance that is other oriented and deflates egotistic and narcissistic emotions (e.g., pride) (Davis et. al., 2016). Davis et al. (2010) found that researchers measured humility using a variety of methods, including self-reports, social comparisons, implicit measures, and informant ratings. The measures of humility often had limitations and complications. For example, self-reports of humility were hypothesized to have a modesty effect, whereas individuals high in humility might underreport their humility, and individuals low in humility might overestimate their humility. More recent measurement strategies have advocated using a multi-method approach to assessing humility, including self-reports, other-reports, and observation of humility-relevant behavior (Worthington et al., 2017).

A key principle guiding current research on humility is that humility should be studied in

conditions and contexts in which humility is a difficult virtue to practice (e.g., receiving praise, hierarchical relationships, cultural or religious differences). This is similar to studying other virtues, such as courage. It is difficult (if not impossible) to measure one's level of courage while they are relaxing in the comfort of their own home. To truly assess one's courage, a person must be assessed in the face of danger. Similarly, to accurately assess humility, it is important to study humility in situations where it is difficult to practice.

One of the key situations in which humility may be difficult to practice humility is when engaging with people who believe differently. Engaging with people who are culturally, religiously, or ideologically different is often difficult and conflictual, and many individuals may prefer to avoid discussing these differences completely. Recent research on religious humility has revealed that there is a weak to moderate positive relationship between religion and self-reported humility; however, more research is needed (Davis et al., 2017). Davis et al. (2017) also found that religion and spirituality could strain the practice of humility due to a desire to be loyal to the particular beliefs and attitudes that are normative in their religious traditions. Additionally, research on cultural humility in psychotherapy has discovered that holding a stance of humility toward the cultural background of one's client is positively related to developing a stronger working therapeutic alliance, which suggests that it may be important to hold an interpersonal stance of humility when engaging with individuals who are culturally different (Hook et al., 2013).

Similar to the constructs of religious and cultural humility, intellectual humility, considered a subdomain of general humility (McElroy et al., 2014; Davis et al., 2015), is broadly defined as having an accurate understanding of one's own strengths and weaknesses in regard to one's own knowledge, along with an ability to negotiate and discuss one's ideas in an

interpersonally respectful manner (Zhang et al., 2015). Leary et al. (2017) recently found that intellectual humility, when controlling for religiosity and general humility, is relevant in understanding an individual's reaction to another person's belief, their judgment of people who change their views, and their sensitivity to respond to weak and strong arguments.

One area in which intellectual humility may be especially important to study is politics and political differences. Given the current socio-political climate, which involves strong political beliefs and stances, as well as a lack of openness to hearing and understanding opposing viewpoints, political humility might be essential in promoting peace and well-being in diverse societies such as the United States, as well as in the world at large.

Similar to other types of humility, political humility has both intrapersonal and interpersonal dimensions (Worthington, 2017). Intrapersonally, political humility involves accurate self-awareness about one's own beliefs and stances regarding political viewpoints. A politically humble person is aware of and acknowledges both the strengths and limitations of a particular political view and evaluates how their point of view affects others (e.g., the individuals, community, and political system). Interpersonally, political humility (a) allows a person to present their personal political views in a modest way that is not detrimental to their relationship to the listener, and (b) allows a person to hold a stance of openness and respect towards the political ideas or values of another person. A politically humble person also desires to use their political power to help others instead of hurt others. This is not to say that a politically humble individual or group holds beliefs loosely or is easily swayed to change their mind, but rather the individual or group is willing to openly listen and engage a different political view without feeling personally threatened.

Because individuals, groups, and political parties can be entrenched in their personal

beliefs about society, justice, and government (Haidt, 2012), having a stance of political humility can be difficult. Recent cross-cultural research by political and social scientists have revealed that overall political conflict varies by country, political system, and form of government (Martini & Torcal, 2016). This conflict can be expressed in a variety of forms (e.g., distrust in other parties, distrust in members of other parties, protests, riots). There have been many recent political conflicts in the United States (e.g. violence in Charlottesville, protests during the National Anthem, resurgence of alt-right political groups, the Black Lives Matter movement and its opposition, disagreement about national border control, disagreement about policy toward Syrian refugees, conflicts about abortion, LGBTQ rights.), however, very little research on political humility has been conducted. A better understanding and awareness of political humility on a personal, national, and international level could be essential in working through such conflicts without invalidating the ideals or beliefs of another individual or group.

Purpose of Current Review

This chapter aims to provide a comprehensive literature review on the empirical articles that address political humility. First, I provide a summary of the relevant research conducted on humility and politics. Then, I discuss limitations of the field, offer suggestions for potential directions of future research, and discuss implications of this research for clinical practice. By consolidating the current findings on political humility, I hope to set a course for further work in this field of study.

Method

Inclusion Criteria

This literature review included all empirical studies that focused on the constructs of humility and politics. Theoretical articles and case studies were omitted. I included both

published and non-published (e.g., dissertations, theses) studies. I define the term politics, in this review, as one's political orientation or stance, rather than the interworking dynamics of an isolated system (e.g. business companies, sports teams, etc.). Studies that did not address political orientation, or that primarily focused on prejudice or religious constructs, and how those constructs impact one's view on social issues, were not included.

Literature Search

The literature review was first conducted by searching the following computer databases for articles published up until January 25th, 2018: PsycINFO, PsycARTICLES, Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Collection, ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global, and Academic Search Complete. The search also included a combination of the following key terms: “humble” and “humility”, each paired with “politic*”, “liberal”, and “conservative”. Second, I searched a prior review of the literature on political humility (Worthington, 2017), to identify any missing articles. Third, I searched the reference list of each article to determine if there were any additional studies that met inclusion criteria for the current literature review. In total, 15 empirical articles were identified using the specified search criteria. Seven of the articles were excluded from the literature review because they either focused on politics broadly (e.g., workplace politics) and did not measure individual differences in political worldviews, values, and opinions; or primarily focused on religion as the major connection point between political views and humility. Thus, 12 studies from eight articles were included in the final literature review (see Table 1).

Results

I organize the results section in two parts. First, I review the methods of the studies included in the literature review. Second, I review the results of the studies included in the

literature review.

Review of Study Methods

Research Design

All 12 of the reviewed empirical studies were quantitative. Nine of the reviewed studies explored the relationship between political orientation and humility, whereas three studies contained a description of a scale developed to measure specific facets of intellectual humility, including political humility (Hoyle et al., 2016). The 12 studies all used cross-sectional research designs, utilizing surveys consisting of at least one measure of humility and one measure of political orientation.

Participants

Sample size was reported in all 12 studies. The total number of participants in the 12 studies was 5,681. All 12 studies included demographic information about the participants. Many of the participants were college students or community adults. Just over half of the participants were female (56.2%). Race/ethnicity was not reported in any of the studies. However, many of the articles studies included information on nationality. Of the articles that included nationality, the majority of the participants who reported nationality were Italian (34.8%). Other nationalities included United States (17.9%), Canada (3.6%), Sweden (3.6%), and South Korea (3.3%). All 12 studies reported the participants' mean age, which was 35.07 years. No information was provided in any of the 12 studies regarding sexual orientation.

Measures of Humility

Three studies described the development and validation of the Specific Intellectual Humility Scale (SIHS; Hoyle et al., 2016). The SIHS is a 9-item self-report measure of the extent

to which an individual is intellectually humble about a specific topic (e.g., “Although I have particular views about _____, I realize that I don’t know everything that I need to know about it”). Participants indicate on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not at all like me*) to 5 (*very much like me*) whether or not the test item accurately depicts their willingness to engage in thought, discuss, or consider opposing points of view. Initial evaluations of internal consistency appear to be strong, specifically when measuring humility regarding politics ($\alpha = .90$). The SIHS has only recently been developed, and therefore more research on the SIHS is needed. The General Intellectual Humility Scale (GIHS; Leary et al., 2017) was also used in this study to determine the validity of the candidate items for the SIHS. The GIHS assesses intellectual humility without regard to specific domains or topics within intellectual humility (e.g. “I accept that my beliefs and attitudes may be wrong”).

The other nine studies utilized various versions of the HEXACO measure of personality (Ashton et al., 2004, Ashton & Lee, 2007) to measure humility: HEXACO, HEXACO-100, Full-Length HEXACO-PI, 104-item HEXACO-PI, 40-item HEXACO-PI, HEXACO-PI-R, and the 100-item HEXACO-PI-R. This scale measures six factors of personality including honesty-humility, emotionality, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience. The Full-Length HEXACO-PI has acceptable ($\alpha = .79$; Ashton & Lee, 2009) to high ($\alpha = .92$; Ashton & Lee, 2008) internal reliability when measuring the Honesty-Humility facet of the HEXACO model. A 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) is utilized by the HEXACO to determine how accurately the statement defines the person. The HEXACO model of personality has provided a culturally sensitive way to quantitatively measure humility, as the model itself was conceived through cross-cultural research (Ashton & Lee, 2007). There are four facets of honesty and humility measured by the HEXACO. Many of

the studies aggregated the greed avoidance (e.g., “Having a lot of money is not especially important to me”) and modesty (e.g., “I am an ordinary person who is not better than others”) subscales to form a humility composite-measure, and aggregated the “fairness” (e.g., “I would never accept a bribe, even if it were very large”) and “sincerity” (e.g., “I wouldn't pretend to like someone just to get that person to do favors for me”) subscales to form an honesty composite-measure. This served to determine if there was a distinction in the constructs of honesty and humility and their impact on political values.

While research has shown that the humility facet of the Honesty-Humility scale has some convergence with other measures of humility (Ashton et al., 2014), there is still some debate about whether the Honesty-Humility facet of the HEXACO actually measures humility as defined by most humility researchers. For example, many researchers would argue that combining honesty and humility as a single construct runs against commonly held definitions of humility (Hill et al., 2017). In support of this distinction, a few of the articles in the present literature review separated the honesty subscales of the HEXACO from the humility subscales of the HEXACO and found different patterns of findings for the honesty and humility subscales, respectively. Furthermore, some researchers also question how much the greed avoidance subscale taps into common conceptualizations of humility due to its emphasis on the display of wealth and power. However, Davis et al. (2016) argued that humility may consist of several subdomains, one of which is modesty. They also found that the humility related facets of the HEXACO (i.e., modesty and greed avoidance) do correlate with other measures of humility. This has led some researchers to question whether the critiques of the HEXACO as a measure of humility may be overstated (Worthington et al, 2017).

Measures of Politics

Until the development of the Specific Intellectual Humility Scale (Hoyle et al., 2016), there has not been a measure developed to assess humility in a unique, political domain. Therefore, in most of the studies of the present review, political orientation was measured by various other scales addressing specific orientations or stances regarding political issues. These measures can be separated into three categories: (a) political worldviews, (b) political values and orientation, and (c) political interest.

Political worldviews: Authoritarianism and dominance. One worldview construct measured in many of the studies was right-wing authoritarianism (RWA). RWA is described as a subjection to authority in which one desires to adhere to conventional beliefs, norms, and values, and reacts negatively towards others who violate these standards (Desimoni & Leone, 2014). Five studies in the present review used the RWA scale (Altemeyer, 1996), a 30-item, self-report, agree-disagree 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). This scale measures an individual's acceptance of RWA values and beliefs (e.g., "Authorities such as parents and our national leaders generally turn out to be right about things, and the radicals and protestors are almost always wrong"). The scale measures three aspects of RWA: authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression, and conventionalism, and has strong evidence for internal consistency ($\alpha = .90$).

One study used a shortened version of the RWA scale (Zakrisson, 2005). This shortened version is a 15-item self-report measure. This author's goal of developing a shorter version of the RWA scale was to have a version that could be translated into different languages, while retaining the three aspects of RWA defined by Altemeyer (1996). The shortened version of the RWA scale also displayed reasonable internal consistency ($\alpha = .78$). Another study used a

different shortened version of the RWA scale (Weber & Federico, 2007; $\alpha = .81$). This scale utilized a 12-item self-report measure ($\alpha = .72$), containing identical questions to Altemeyer's (1996) full scale.

A second political worldview construct measured by several of the studies was social dominance orientation (SDO). SDO attempts to explain the degree to which one is concerned about group equality. The SDO scale (Pratto et al., 1994; $\alpha = .88$) was used in the same four studies that used the original RWA scale. The SDO scale is a 16-item self-report measure that uses an agree-disagree, 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) to measure acceptance of SDO values and beliefs (e.g., "This country would be better off if we cared less about how equal all people are"). A shortened SDO scale (Weber & Federico, 2007) was also used in one study. This shortened SDO scale used 8 questions from Sidanius and Pratto's sixth edition of the scale ($\alpha = .83$).

Two studies measured specific political worldviews as an added component of social values and ideologies similar to RWA and SDO. The 10-item Belief in a Dangerous World Scale (Duckett et al., 2002; $\alpha = .74$) is similar to the ideology behind RWA. Participants rate their agreement with the item on a seven-point Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). An example item of this scale is "Any day now chaos and anarchy could erupt around us. All the signs are pointing to it". The 20-item Belief in a Competitive Jungle World Scale (Duckett et al., 2002; $\alpha = .87$) was also used in this study, and the measure's theoretical framework is similar to the ideology behind SDO. Participants also rate their agreement with the item on a seven-point Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). A sample item from this scale is, "It's a dog-eat-dog world where you have to be ruthless at times". A shortened 13-item version of the Competitive Jungle World Scale (Weber & Frederico, 2007;

$\alpha = .87$), was used in one study. The worldviews measured by these scales attempt to identify what an individual believes about how others behave, what others are like, and how one should behave in response to another's behavior.

Political values and orientation. Political values were measured through a variety of measures. One study used the Schwartz Value Survey (SVS; Schwartz, 1992), to measure the participants' social values. Participants' views of various social values (e.g., power, achievement, universalism) were rated on a scale ranging from -1 (*opposed to my principles*) to 7 (*of great importance*) in regards to how the participant saw the value as being a guiding principle in his or her life. The responses are then coalesced into 10 basic value types: stimulation, hedonism, achievement, power, security, conformity, tradition, benevolence, universalism, and self-direction. These 10 types are hypothesized to reflect a single composite score reflecting a two-dimensional space that reflects the individual's political ideology, spanned by axes of conservation (opposed to openness to change) and self-enhancement (opposed to self-transcendence). Conservation and self-enhancement reflect more conservative values, whereas their opposites (i.e., openness to change and self-transcendence) reflect more liberal values.

One study conducted in Sweden utilized the Swedish Liberal Values Scale, which was constructed by the first author for the purposes of the study. This scale utilizes three statements that the participant rates on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) scale. High values on this scale refer to high liberal values. An example item from this scale is, "I want to support the cause of feminism". For the combined three items of this scale, Cronbach's alpha was .64.

One final study utilized two different scales to further assess social values and ideologies. The scales used in this study were the Humanitarian-Egalitarian Values Scale (HEVS; Kats and

Hass, 1988) and the Protestant Work Ethic Values Scale (PWEVS; Kats and Hass, 1988). Both scales apply a 5-point Likert scale on each question ranging from one (*strongly disagree*) to five (*strongly agree*). An example item from the HEVS, a 10-item questionnaire, is “One should find ways to help others less fortunate than oneself”. An example of the PWEVS, an 11-item questionnaire, is “Most people who do not succeed in life are just plain lazy”.

Political orientation was also measured in two studies. One study had participants place themselves on a seven-point liberal-conservative continuum, by first asking, “Considering the current political context in Italy, how would you describe your political orientation?”, followed by a second item asking “From a political point of view, you would describe yourself as a:”. The responses to the latter question ranged from 1 (left-winger) to 7 (right-winger). The second study also measured the participants on a spectrum of political conservatism and liberalism using a 12-item scale developed by the Pew Research Center. Participants respond to statements such as, “Abortion should be illegal in all or most cases” using a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (*completely agree*) to 4 (*completely disagree*). High scores on this scale reflect conservative responses while low scores represent liberal responses.

Political interest. Interest in politics was measured in two studies, authored by the same team of researchers using a single question, “How much are you interested in politics?” There was no theoretical or empirical foundation for this question, as the authors simply wanted a self-report item gauging the participant’s perceived value of politics.

Summary of Study Methods

Overall, the research designs applied in the reviewed studies lacked the comprehensive and varying methodologies found in other more established fields of study. This could be due to the fact that political humility is a new and relatively unexplored area of research. Many of the

studies utilized convenience samples and the snowballing procedure to collect participants. Many studies also used measures of social values, political values, and political orientation with little evidence supporting their reliability and validity. Another weakness was that the most of the studies measured humility using the HEXACO. As previously discussed, there is some disagreement as to whether the HEXACO accurately measures humility. Six of the studies looked at honesty and humility separately as measured by the HEXACO and found different patterns of correlations between the HEXACO subscales and political variables. It is possible that the modesty and greed avoidance subscales are good measures of humility, although the modesty subscale appears to be the most similar with other measures of humility. The honesty subscales, however, are probably measuring a different construct than humility.

Other weaknesses in the methodology of the present set of studies is that the studies did not report full demographic information for their sample. It should also be noted that every study on political humility, thus far, with the exception of the scale development study of the SIHS, has solely concentrated on humility as a component of personality rather than an attitude or stance toward the political perspective of another person. There are many opportunities for researchers to study political humility by bolstering research design, sampling techniques, and improving the definition and measurement of political humility.

Review of Empirical Findings

The empirical findings of the literature on humility and politics can be organized into four main areas: (a) advances in measuring political humility, (b) the relationship between humility and political worldviews, (c) the relationship between humility and political values/orientation, (d) the relationship between humility and interest in politics and (e) cultural differences regarding humility and political worldviews.

Measuring Political Humility

The study on the Specific Intellectual Humility Scale (SIHS) showed promising results in helping to measure the construct of political humility. The SIHS showed strong evidence of measurement invariance among the different domains of intellectual humility, indicating that it accurately measures the specific construct of intellectual humility when tailored to different topics and domains. Overall, the findings of this study suggest that intellectual humility with respect to specific views is more than just a reflection of an individual's overall general intellectual humility. For example, the study found that people approach specific intellectual opinions, beliefs, and positions with a similar level of humility when compared with their general level of intellect humility, however, a significant proportion of the variance can be attributed to specific views that the individual may be unwilling to reconsider when presented with contradicting evidence. Therefore, specific intellectual humility not only reflects a person's general intellectual humility, but it also considers personal characteristics and the individual's view on a specific topic along with the basis for holding that position.

To determine initial construct validity for the SIHS, researchers explored the relationships between specific intellectual humility and (a) dogmatism and (b) openness to experience (Hoyle et al., 2016). Consistent with hypotheses, specific intellectual humility was negatively correlated with dogmatism (r s ranged from $-.22$ to $-.53$) and positively correlated with openness to experience (r s ranged from $.11$ to $.21$). At this point in time, the SIHS is the only scale that has been used to accurately measure an individual's level of political humility as a unique, specific construct.

Humility and political worldviews. Five studies found that Honesty-Humility, overall, was negatively associated with RWA. However, the results were mixed (r 's ranged from $-.22$ to

.17). Although the majority of the studies reported a significant negative relationship between Honesty-Humility and the political constructs of RWA, three studies separated the subscales of Honesty and Humility, and found a different pattern of correlations between these constructs and humility. One study (Desimoni & Leone, 2014) found that Honesty was positively associated with RWA ($r = .07$), whereas Humility was negatively associated with RWA ($r = -.11$). Another study (Leone et al., 2012) found similar results, and also discovered that higher scores on Honesty-Humility were negatively associated with a Belief in a Dangerous World ($r = -.20$), which assesses a similar construct as RWA. Yet another study (Silvia et al., 2014) also found that the construct of Fairness, which is an aspect of honesty, was positively associated with RWA ($\beta = .17$), but this finding was not significant.

Five studies found that SDO and similar ideologies were negatively associated with Honesty-Humility (r 's ranged from $-.33$ to $-.48$). The results of the studies measuring SDO tended to show a greater negative correlation between Honesty-Humility and SDO when compared to Honesty-Humility and RWA (r 's ranged from $-.22$ to $.17$). For example, one study (Lee et al., 2010) found that Honesty-Humility showed strong negative correlations with SDO (r 's ranged from $-.30$ to $-.48$). Interesting, one study (Desimoni & Leone, 2014) looked at individual subscales of the HEXACO and found that SDO was negatively associated with both constructs of humility (i.e., modesty and greed avoidance) as measured by the HEXACO (r 's ranged from $-.14$ to $-.40$).

Thus, the majority of the studies in this review revealed that there were significant negative correlations between humility and the political constructs of RWA and SDO; however, there were some differences when authors looked at the overall Honesty-Humility score compared to when they analyzed the honesty and humility subscales separately. When authors

examined the honesty and humility subscales separately, there was some evidence that honesty was positively correlated with RWA, whereas humility continued to be negatively correlated with both constructs.

Humility and political values/orientation. Various scales were used to measure political values and orientation, but each study found similar results—in general, humility was positively associated with liberal values and negatively associated with conservative values. For example, Kajonius and Dåderman (2014) used the Swedish Liberal Value Scale and found that all facets of Honesty-Humility were positively correlated with liberal values (r 's ranged from .19 to .34). Another study (Lee et al., 2010) also found that Honesty-Humility showed strong negative correlations with the Self-Enhancement axis of the Schwartz Value Survey (r 's ranged from -.47 to -.63), which indicates more conservative values regarding social issues and a hierarchy orientation. Thus, the majority of studies found a positive correlation between humility as measured by the HEXACO and more liberal political values.

One study found that Honesty-Humility, overall, was negatively associated with right-wing ideology. Chirumbolo and Leone (2010) found that Honesty-Humility was negatively correlated with both right-wing ideology ($r = -.17$) and right-wing voting ($r = -.14$) in Italy. The authors explained that higher scores on Honesty-Humility were associated with a more leftist self-description. Honesty-Humility was not seen as a significant predictor of other measures of political orientation (e.g., spectrum of political liberalism and conservatism; Silvia et al. 2014).

Humility and political interest. Finally, the association between interest in politics and humility was assessed in two studies. The first study (Desimoni & Leone, 2014) found that the relationship between humility and SDO was impacted by the individual's level of interest in politics as a moderator. Higher levels of political interest were associated with a stronger

negative relationship between humility and SDO. The second study (Leone et al. 2012) attempted to determine if there was a main effect between humility and interest in politics. However, the results from this study did not find a significant relationship between humility and interest in politics.

Cultural differences in humility and political worldview. Only two studies examined the impact of cultural differences (i.e., gender and age) on humility and political worldview. The first study (Leone et al., 2012) found that age was positively correlated with humility, females scored higher than males on humility, and that females scored lower than males on Competitive Jungle Worldview, RWA, and SDO. The second study (Leone et al., 2012) also found that females had higher levels of humility than did males.

Discussion

In this chapter, I conducted a literature review of the empirical studies that explored humility in the context of politics. All of the studies explored humility and politics empirically through quantitative designs, although one paper attempted to measure other subcomponents of intellectual humility as well.

In sum, there appears to be a dearth of empirical research regarding political humility and how to measure it. This could be due to a lack of definition and measurement consensus in the field, as many of the researchers who study political humility consider humility to be a personality trait rather than a stance or position a person is able to take. While there have been recent attempts to better define and measure intellectual humility (McElroy et al., 2014), cultural humility (Hook et al., 2013) and specific intellectual humility (Hoyle et al. 2016), very few works of literature have been published identifying political humility as a topic that is measurable and can stand alone as a facet of a specific human virtue.

Several key findings emerged from the literature review. First, several studies assessed the relationship between humility and political stance or orientation. Overall, the results found that individuals who scored high on a measure of humility often tend to hold political views or stances that are more liberal, and less aligned with right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation. The one caveat to this finding was that when studies measured honesty and humility separately, humility was negatively correlated with RWA, but honesty was actually positively correlated with RWA. This may provide more evidence that the honesty subscale of the HEXACO is measuring something different than humility.

The fact that humility is related to liberal political values and lower levels of RWA and SDO could be due to the interpersonal aspect of humility. For example, a humble person, in general, would typically have an accurate understanding of their own value and worth in society, and believe that this intrinsic value resides in others as well. Regarding social issues in politics, liberal values are more aligned with providing services for disenfranchised individuals and attempting to equalize the distribution of wealth and resources. Therefore, humility may be more likely to be associated with political positions that place individuals at a similar level of power or privilege.

Although these studies measured humility and political orientation in a general sense, they did not examine how humility impacts the stance or dialogue one uses on political views or in political discussion. There were three studies that created a scale to measure intellectual humility about a particular area (e.g., politics). The key findings of these studies were that political humility (both generally and about specific issues) was related to, and could be measured similarly to, other domains of specific intellectual humility. The SIHS was found to be negatively correlated with dogmatism and positively correlated with openness to experiences, in

an initial attempt to evaluate evidence for construct validity. Another key finding was that specific intellectual humility explains more of the variance among intellectual humility regarding a specific topic, view, or opinion as the construct takes into account personal characteristics of the individual as well as their basis for holding the specific view. Although this study provided a good start in assessing humility about political views or opinions, more research is necessary to explore the specific correlates and predictors of political humility specifically.

Finally, some studies explored possible moderator variables of the link between humility and politics. Interest in politics appeared to increase the negative relationship between humility and SDO in one study. It may be that interest in politics may exacerbate the effect of certain political stances on humility, because the political issues may be more central to the person's sense of self or interests. Individuals who are personally invested in particular issues may find it more difficult to be open to different political perspectives and points of view. For instance, an individual may score higher on political humility in regard to federal healthcare if they are not interested in the politics surrounding healthcare, but may score low on political humility in regard to gun control if they have strong opinions and interest in how the distribution and registration of firearms is handled. In regard to demographic information, gender and age were found to have main effects on one's level of humility and on political worldviews. Females generally scored higher than males on humility, and lower than males on social dominance and right-wing authoritarian worldviews. Also, age was found to be positively correlated with humility. Thus, it may be important for demographic information to be accounted for in future studies that attempt to determine the relationship between politics and humility.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Several limitations were found in this literature review. First, the nine studies that

measured the association of humility and political constructs and values only used the HEXACO model of personality to assess humility. As stated earlier, there is some disagreement among humility scholars that the HEXACO (especially the honesty subscales and greed avoidance subscale) is a good measure of humility. The HEXACO may have limitations in how it measures humility. One limitation is that honesty and humility are treated as similar constructs. Three of the articles showed different patterns of correlations between honesty vs. humility. It may be that the honesty subscales of the HEXACO do not accurately reflect the construct of humility, and therefore this could impact many of the findings. Future research needs to separate the honesty facet of the HEXACO model from the humility facet to see how humility correlates with political orientation specifically.

Second, there are different aspects of humility (e.g., relational humility, cultural humility, intellectual humility, etc.), and there is little research on the relationship between these aspects of humility and politics. Ideally, future research will consider measuring political humility using other validated and reliable measures of humility (e.g., SIHS) and in a variety of different contexts such as political dialogue between family and friends, differences of an individual's level of political humility depending on the topic, and how to increase a person's level of humility regarding political topics.

Third, there were several limitations in the methods of the reviewed studies. All of the studies were cross-sectional; thus, causal conclusions should not be made. The convenience sampling methods also make it less likely for the results to be generalized to the entire population. More robust experimental designs and sampling procedures would help to confirm the results discovered in the field thus far. As of now, the current literature has not provided a model for the causal direction between politics and humility. Therefore, it is impossible to

discern if humility causes changes in one's political views or if a person's level of political humility is caused by the particular political views they may hold. To better understand the construct of political humility and the impact it has on various relationships, it is critical that researchers use more advanced experimental methods.

Fourth, research could explore the effect of political humility (or lack thereof) on human relationships and society. It would be interesting to see if a person exhibits more or less political humility when they view a political leader as being more or less humble in their political stance. It would also be interesting to identify the internal process of a person who engages in a discussion in which one or both parties exhibit a lack of personal humility.

Finally, research has yet to explore how political humility can be used in applied settings. Future research could attempt to identify the characteristics of politically humble psychologists and therapists, doctors and hospitals, professors and teachers, religious and community leaders, and identify the effects that political humility may have on the receiver of these services. Future research could also attempt to identify predictors of political humility to determine if there is a way to teach others to be more political humble. Along with this, researchers may also consider testing gender and age as potential moderator variables. One study (Leone et al. 2012) showed that there were main effects for gender and age on Honesty-Humility and various political constructs. Interpersonal and intrapersonal consequences of political humility also need to be identified to determine if holding a certain level of humility regarding political views is beneficial (or perhaps problematic in some contexts) for individuals and groups. The field is still in its infancy, so there are many questions to be explored, with the goal of being able to better define the construct of political humility and to understand the impact it could have on individuals, relationships, and communities.

Implications for Counseling

Based on what is known from the current research on political humility, there are several ways that an understanding of political humility, and its effects on human relationships, can impact therapy and the relationship that is developed in the counseling room. One example of how political humility could impact therapy would be through recognizing that political orientation could be an important aspect of diversity that needs to be considered in therapy. Hook et al. (2013) found support for a hypothesis that client's perceptions about a therapist's level of humility in relation to their cultural background was positively correlated with working alliance and perceived improvement in therapy. If a person's political orientation is considered an important aspect of diversity, then it would be important for the therapist to be sensitive to their political views in order for a more positive working alliance to be established.

With the assumption that a higher level of political humility on the part of the therapist could increase the working alliance in the counseling room, it is important for a therapist to continually develop their level of political humility so that they can better work with clients who have different political views. Considering political orientation as an aspect of diversity, political humility could potentially be developed similarly to that of other cultural competencies. Sue and Sue (2013) suggest that therapist's multicultural training include (a) gaining knowledge of another's culture, (b) examining one's own attitudes and beliefs about another culture, and (c) gaining skills in implementing culturally sensitive interventions in therapy. Therapists are encouraged to hold a stance of humility about the client's political worldview in order to best serve the client, and to also refrain from imposing their values on the client. Therapists should consistently engage in self-reflection about their political views to greater develop an ability to look at situations from multiple perspectives, in order to decide which interventions or strategies

to better care for the client's well-being.

Developing a greater level of political humility could also directly impact how a therapist works with various cases. For instance, a couple may come to therapy seeking help for marital problems. Through the course of therapy, it is revealed that the couple has different political views, and many of the couple's conversations end in one, or both partners feeling devalued for their thoughts about a specific issue. A therapist who has a high level of political humility could potentially help this couple by (a) modeling a stance of political humility in the midst of political discourse, and (b) validating the development and position that each partner holds regarding a particular issue.

Therapists who work in other applied settings could also benefit from exhibiting a high level of political humility. For example, a community psychologist could potentially be more effective in advocating for improvements in various services benefiting disenfranchised groups by being open to consider the opposite stance on a particular issue. A psychologist working in government, for another example, could help to assess group dynamics from various political parties to facilitate productive conversation that allows all groups to feel heard and understood. Both of these examples show how peacemaking and better conflict resolution in situations involving large groups of people could be facilitated by practitioners who are aware of and have a high level of political humility. However, as stated earlier, more research is necessary in order to draw conclusions on just how impactful political humility could be in the therapy room and in other applied settings.

Conclusion

Political differences and conflict saturate the current global climate, and research has only recently begun to consider the relationship between humility and politics. Thus, many of the

questions regarding the implications and effects of political humility on individuals, relationships, and communities remain unanswered. Measurements of humility have advanced in recent years, and only recently has there been the opportunity to examine humility in a variety of contexts. Considering how broad the topic of politics is, there are many areas in which researchers can examine the effects of humility regarding politics more generally, as well as about specific topics, issues, and points of view. Having a greater understanding of the effects of political humility could potentially help counselors better connect with their clients and provide interventions to impact important relationships in the client's life to further develop feelings of connection and support.

CHAPTER 3

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The empirical study of humility, an important topic in the field of positive psychology, has increased in the past decade (Worthington et al., 2017). Recent research on humility has examined the theory that humility plays an important role in human relationships, social bonds, and in predicting prosocial behavior (Davis et al., 2013, Krumrei-Mancuso, 2017). In general, positive associations have been found between humility with satisfaction in relationships (Farrell et al., 2015) and prosocial behaviors (e.g., altruism, generosity, helpfulness; Exline & Hill, 2012; LaBouff et al., 2012).

Davis et al. (2010) proposed a relational model of humility that examines an observer's judgment of a target person's level of humility. Relational humility assesses (a) whether the target person is able to maintain an accurate view of self, including an awareness of one's limitations and (b) whether the target person is other-oriented rather than self-focused in one's relationships. However, an individual's level of humility may best be observed or judged in contexts in which humility is difficult to practice. This has led to an increase in humility being studied in various subdomains (e.g., religious, cultural, political; McElroy et al., 2014).

Ideological Differences Strain Relationships

One of the most difficult contexts for people to feel connected in relationship occurs when individuals or groups have ideological differences about a certain subject that they both feel very strongly about. The topics of religion and culture are two examples of topics in which it may be difficult to maintain strong connection in relationship if ideological differences arise. For example, Davis et al. (2017) found that religion and spirituality could strain the practice of humility due to a desire to be loyal to the normative beliefs and values of their religious

traditions, rather than focusing on the connection with the other person. Additionally, research on cultural humility in psychotherapy has discovered that a stance of cultural humility on the part of the therapist is related to a stronger therapeutic working alliance (Hook et al., 2013).

Similarly, studies on general intellectual humility have also shed light on how ideological differences impact relationships. Leary (2015) found that studying intellectual humility is relevant in understanding an individual's reaction to another person's belief, their judgment of people who change their views, and their sensitivity to respond to weak and strong arguments. These findings lend evidence to the social bond hypothesis (Davis et al., 2013; Davis et al. 2017), which proposes that humility plays a significant role in regulating social bonds and commitment. Furthermore, these findings also support the social oil hypothesis, which proposes that humility can buffer against the expected wear-and-tear of social relationships caused by difficult personality traits (e.g., competitiveness, perfectionism) or conflict (Davis et al. 2017). While there has been initial evidence for these theories and the benefits of the utility of humility in social relationships, more research is needed in understanding how humility impacts relationship in other areas of ideological differences.

Political Humility

One understudied area may be to explore humility in the context of politics. Given the current turbulent political climate in the United States and around the world (e.g., the increase in protests, riots, violence, and the polarization between political leaders and citizens of different political views), it is of great need to understand the protective role that political humility could play in strengthening the bonds of individuals and groups who engage with each other about politics and political issues.

The current research on political humility is scarce. Most of the extant research examines how humility as a personality trait may impact how an individual may vote and what their political ideology may be. However, more recent research appears to consider the measurement and implications of humility in various intellectual domains. For example, Hoyle et al. (2016) developed and validated the Specific Intellectual Humility Scale (SIHS). They define specific intellectual humility as the recognition that a particular personal opinion about a subject may be fallible, along with an attentiveness to the limitations of that view and to the limitations in obtaining and evaluating information relevant to that idea.

One of the most important findings in the study was that intellectual humility regarding specific views was more than just a reflection of the individual's general intellectual humility. This finding suggests that general intellectual humility may describe the disposition of a person regarding intellectual topics, but it is important to understand a person's level of humility regarding specific subjects to get a better understanding of their humility in particular contexts and relationships. This study revealed that a significant portion of the variance found in the level of intellectual humility regarding a specific topic is due to personal characteristics about the individual and the basis for which they hold that view.

Purpose of the Current Study

Since research on political humility is in its beginning stages, the aim of this project is to explore some basic groundwork in this area. The present study has four primary aims. First, this study seeks to expand the scientific literature on political humility by examining various theorized predictors of political humility. These predictors include personality variables, political commitment, and an individual's exposure to different political ideologies.

Personality has often been used to predict different behaviors or virtues. As seen in the literature review, most of the previous research on political humility examines humility as a personality trait itself. However, other humility researchers (Hook et al., 2013; Rowatt et al., 2014) have explored other measures of personality (e.g., measures of the five-factor model of personality) to attempt to identify what aspects of a person are more likely to make them more or less humble. Understanding how personality impacts a person's level of humility when could help to identify what interventions may be helpful for individuals to grow in their ability to be humble when discussing political topics or issues. Consistent with prior research on personality and humility (Leone et al., 2012), I hypothesize that political humility will be positively associated with the personality facet of openness to experience.

The value and meaning a person holds to a particular belief has been shown to impact the level of humility one holds regarding a particular topic. Hoyle et al. (2016) explain that personal characteristics and the meaning behind why an individual holds a particular view can influence their level of humility regarding that specific topic. One reason for this may be that ideological obligation or commitment impacts the meaning or value an individual has regarding a political view. For instance, one study found that ideological commitment resulted in a higher level of negative psychological symptoms in youth exposed to terror attacks regardless of their political stance (i.e. right, centrist, or left wing views), whereas the youth who did not hold a strong ideological commitment and held right wing beliefs reported less distress (Laufer & Solomon, 2009). Another study also showed that very strong beliefs in God and very strong beliefs against God were related to lower levels of religious intellectual humility, whereas moderate views of God were associated with higher levels of religious intellectual humility (Hopkin et al. 2014). These findings suggest that the ideological commitment and value one places on a certain topic

or issue may be related to lower levels of humility regarding a particular topic. Therefore, I hypothesize that ideological commitment will be negatively associated with an individual's level of political humility.

Exposure to different political views is a third hypothesized predictor of political humility. The basis for this hypothesis stems from other more thoroughly studied domains of intellectual humility (e.g., religious humility and cultural humility), and from practical considerations given to developing therapists to better connect with clients who may be different from them. Specifically, Sue and Sue (2013) suggest that therapist's multicultural training include gaining knowledge of another's culture and the opportunity to examine one's own attitudes and beliefs about another culture. Both cultural and political views contain ideological values and beliefs that separate people from one another, and these differences can often cause conflict. Considering Sue and Sue's recommendation on how to develop competency regarding various cultures, it is hypothesized that individuals who interact frequently with people that have opposing political views are more likely to be politically humble than those who have not had these same experiences.

Second, this study will explore possible intrapersonal effects of political humility. Specifically, I hypothesize that political humility will be positively correlated with low reactivity and anxiety when the participant is presented with a different political perspective, and positively correlated with an ability to recognize limitations in one's own political ideology.

Research has yet to consider the role that intellectual humility might play in regulating the emotional reactivity or anxiety an individual may feel after a political hurt or conflict. Humility is theorized to be a protective factor against the deterioration of relationship caused by the expected wear-and-tear of relational conflict or hurt (Davis et al. 2017). Also, past research

has found that individuals who are more humble about their religious views were less reactive to a religious opinion that was different from their own (Van Tongeren et al., 2016). Therefore, I hypothesize that higher levels of political humility will be associated with low reactivity and anxiety after a political disagreement.

Consistent with the definition of political humility (i.e., having an accurate understanding of one's own strengths and weaknesses in regard to one's own knowledge), I hypothesize that individuals high in political humility will be more likely to recognize that there may be flaws in their stance on a particular political issue. Individuals high in political humility should have a better sense of the limitations of their political perspective, whereas individuals low in political humility may struggle to identify any limitations of their point of view. Understanding the intrapersonal effects of political humility could help to shed light on why discussing political topics with others is often conflictual and divisive.

Third, this study will explore interpersonal effects of political humility by evaluating the perceived political humility of the participant as well as the perceived political humility of the other person in the context of a disagreement or conflict. Specifically, I hypothesize that higher levels of political humility on both the part of the participant and the other person will be associated with a higher likelihood to forgive the other person after a political conflict or hurt.

There is a large body of research that has found there is a positive relationship between humility and forgiveness (Powers, Nam Rowatt, & Hill, 2007). The research has looked at the connection between humility and forgiveness in a variety of domains, including religious (Hook et al., 2017) and intellectual disagreement and conflict (Zhang et al., 2015). To continue the expansion of literature on the relationship between humility and forgiveness, I hope to contribute empirical support for this connection in the domain of politics.

Fourth, this study will examine the impact the type of relationship (e.g., family, friend, stranger) may have on an individual's level of political humility in a political disagreement. Specifically, I hypothesize that the association between perceived political humility and forgiveness will be stronger when the relationship is closer (e.g., friend, family member) than when the relationship is less close (e.g., stranger).

Consistent with the social bonds hypothesis (Davis et al., 2013), the current hypothesis is based on the assumption that the type of relationship will significantly impact the relationship between humility and forgiveness. For instance, humility may be more valued in a close relationship because it can serve to deepen the commitment of the social bond and serve as a protective factor against the hurt and conflict that may arise in a political disagreement, whereas the need for humility may not be viewed as important if the relationship is not considered as valuable to the participant.

CHAPTER 4

METHOD

Participants

Participants (N = 469) were mostly cis-female (67.8%; 29.9% cis-male, 0.6% gender-queer, 0.4 % transgender-female, 0.2% transgender-male, 2 missing), ranging in age from 18 to 76 years old (M = 27.83, SD = 12.39; 5 missing). Participants were mostly White (62.3%), with others identifying as Black (7.9%), Asian/Pacific Islander (3.8%), Latinx/Hispanic (13.4%), Native American (0.2%), Multiracial/Other (12.2%). One participant did not provide their racial/ethnic identity. Regarding sexual orientation, participants identified as heterosexual (82.1%), lesbian (1.7%), gay (1.7%), bisexual (11.7%) or other (2.8%). Regarding religious affiliation, participants identified as Christian (57.8%), with others identifying as Agnostic (16.8%), non-religious (11.7%), Atheist (9.2%), Hindu (1.3%), Buddhist (1.1%), Jewish (1.1%), Muslim (0.9%), and Other (11.7%). Regarding education level, participants mostly reported having some college experience (49.7%), with others reported having a bachelor's degree (17.9%), an associate's degree (13.9%), a high school diploma or GED (11.3%), a master's degree (5.5%), less than a high school diploma or GED (0.6%), a professional degree (0.6%) and a doctoral degree (0.4%). Regarding political orientation, participants self-identified as very liberal (17.1 %), liberal (29.2%), slightly liberal (19.6%), slightly conservative (16.2%), conservative (13.4%), and very conservative (4.5%).

Design

This study used a cross-sectional, correlational design.

Measures

Demographic Questionnaire

A 15-item demographic questionnaire was used to collect relevant information from participants. Participants were asked to provide their gender at birth, current gender identity, age, current marital status, race/ethnicity, current sexual orientation, level of education, current family income, political views, family's political views, among others, in both multiple choice and short answer format.

Political Development and Relevant Information Questionnaire

A 14-item political development questionnaire was utilized to collect information from participants regarding their political development. Participants were asked to describe how their political beliefs developed, if their beliefs have changed, what contributed to their beliefs changing, who they voted for in the last presidential election, and how many hours they spent researching political candidates/issues prior to the last presidential election. Participants were also asked to describe how often spent time watching/listening/reading various news sources and how closely they agreed with/how reputable they believed these news sources to be. All answers to this questionnaire were reported in short answer format. Furthermore, participants were asked to identify negative aspects of their own political perspective as well as positive aspects of the opposing political perspective. Participants who did not provide negative aspects of their own political perspective were coded as 0, whereas participants who did were coded as 1. Similarly, participants who did not provide positive aspects of their own political perspective were coded as 0, whereas participants who did were coded as 1.

Political Orientation

Political orientation was measured with three items that assessed attitudes toward foreign policy issues, economic issues, and social issues. Participants rate items on a 7-point rating scale from 1 (*very liberal*) to 7 (*very conservative*). A mean score of these three items, higher scores

indicating higher levels of conservatism, was utilized to obtain the participant's political orientation. For the current sample, the Cronbach's alpha was .86.

Political Exposure in Social Network

To assess the participant's exposure to diverse political ideologies within their social network, participants were asked to identify their five closest friends and five closest family members. They then were asked to identify the political affiliation of each friend and family member they listed. A mean score of the absolute value of the difference between each friend and family member's political affiliation and the participant's political affiliation was utilized to determine a value for the participant's political exposure within their social network.

Openness to Experience

Openness to Experience was measured by the 100-item version (HEXACO-100) of the HEXACO-PI-R (Lee & Ashton, 2018). The HEXACO-PI-R is a self-report measure of six personality factors: Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience. Each factor of personality is measured by sixteen items. For the Openness to Experience subscale, eight items are negatively keyed and eight items are positively keyed. Participants rate how accurately each item describes them on a 5-point Likert scale ranging for 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly*). An example item is "I'm interested in learning about the history and politics of another country". The Full-Length HEXACO-PI has good internal reliability when measuring the Openness to Experience subscale of the HEXACO model ($\alpha = .81$; Lee & Ashton, 2018). Furthermore, self/observer agreement between participants and closely acquainted others for the six factors of the HEXACO averaged in the .50s, and principal components analyses revealed that the 25 distinct facets produced six distinct components of the HEXACO (Lee & Ashton, 2018). These findings speak to the

convergent and discriminant validity of the HEXACO-100. For the Openness to Experience subscale of the HEXACO-PI, the Cronbach's alpha for the present study was .81.

Political Commitment

Political commitment was measured by the Ideological Obligation Questionnaire (Solomon & Laufer, 2004). The Ideological Obligation Questionnaire is a 20-item measure designed to assess one's commitment to their political stances without reference to their specific political views. Participants rate their agreement with each item on a 5-point rating scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*very much*). An example item is "I'm willing to try to persuade other people to believe in my political views." The scale has evidence of internal consistency ($\alpha = .82$). No other information regarding reliability or validity for this scale is available at this time. In the present study, one of the items is modified to assess the participant's views of other United States citizens and their impact on the country rather than Israeli citizens beliefs and their impact on Israel, as the original questionnaire was developed for an Israeli sample. For the Ideological Obligation Questionnaire, the Cronbach's alpha for the present study was .84.

Political Humility

Political humility of the participant was measured by the Specific Intellectual Humility Scale (SIHS; Hoyle et al., 2016). The SIHS is a 9-item self-report measure designed to assess the individual's perception of their own humility regarding intellectual topics. Participants indicate on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not at all like me*) to 5 (*very much like me*) as to whether or not the test item accurately depicts their willingness to engage in thought, discuss, or consider opposing points of view. The SIHS is modified to specifically assess for humility regarding political issues/topics in general. The instructions were: "Please think about your current approach to various political issues. Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to

which you agree or disagree with the following statements about your political views.” Initial evaluations of internal consistency appear to be strong, specifically when measuring for humility regarding politics ($\alpha = .90$). Additionally, correlations among the various specific intellectual humility scores (e.g., politics, abortion, vaccination) were small and negative, and political humility had a strong negative correlation ($r = -.51$) with dogmatism, providing evidence for discriminant validity. Furthermore, correlations between the various specific humility scores and openness were modest but significant (r s ranged from .21-.11), suggesting adequate convergent validity. For the SIHS, the Cronbach’s alpha for the present study was .88.

Relational Transgression Recall and Severity Regarding Politics

Participants were asked to think about and describe a personal situation in which they felt hurt or offended in a relationship because of a political disagreement. Participants rated the degree the hurt or offense bothered them at the time of the situation and at the time the survey was administered on two separate 5-point rating scales ranging from 1 (*very little*) to 5 (*large amount*). The participants were also asked to describe the closeness of their relationship with the person who hurt or offended them prior to the misunderstanding or offense and at the time of the survey on two five-point Likert scales ranging from 1 (*negative/conflictual*) to 5 (*positive/harmonious*). Additionally, participants estimated the time that has elapsed since the offense and the nature of their relationship with the person who caused the hurt or offense.

Political Humility of the Offender

Political humility of the individual who offended or hurt the participant through a political disagreement was measured by the Cultural Humility Scale (CHS; Hook et al., 2013), adapted to assess the offender’s level of humility toward the participant’s political viewpoint. This CHS is a 12-item other-report measure designed to assess an individual’s perception of

another's humility toward their cultural background. Seven items reflect positive aspects of cultural humility, and five items reflect negative aspects of cultural humility. The instructions are: "Please think about the individual who committed the personal transgression described above. Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about that individual. Regarding my point of view, they...". Example items include "is open to explore," and "is open to seeing things from my perspective". Participants rate each item on a 5-point Likert scale, from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Prior research on the CHS shows evidence for internal consistency and construct validity. Scores on the CHS have been significantly correlated with measures of multicultural competency and therapy outcomes (Hook et al., 2013). For the CHS regarding the political humility of the offender, the Cronbach's alpha for the present study was .92.

Political Humility Toward the Offender

Political humility toward the individual who offended or hurt the participant through a political disagreement was measured by the self-report version of the Cultural Humility Scale (CHS; Hook et al., 2013), adapted to assess the participant's level of humility toward the offender's political viewpoint. This version of the CHS is a 12-item self-report measure designed to assess an individual's perception of their own humility toward the cultural background of another person. Seven items reflect positive aspects of cultural humility, and five items reflect negative aspects of cultural humility. The instructions are: "Please think about your stance toward the point of view of the person who hurt you. Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements, regarding your stance toward the point of view of the person who hurt you. Regarding my stance toward the point of view of the person who hurt, I am...". Example items include "open to explore," and "open to

seeing things from their perspective”. Participants rate each item on a 5-point Likert scale, from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Prior research on the CHS shows evidence for internal consistency and construct validity. Scores on the CHS have been significantly correlated with measures of multicultural competency and therapy outcomes (Hook et al., 2013). For the CHS regarding the political humility of the participant, the Cronbach’s alpha for the current sample was .83.

Forgiveness

Forgiveness was assessed by the Transgression-Related Interpersonal Motivations Inventory (TRIM; McCullough & Hoyt, 2002; McCullough et al., 1998). The TRIM is an 18-item measure of a victim’s motivations and responses toward an offender. Participants report their agreement with each item on a 5-point rating scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Higher scores indicated higher motivations on the three subscales of the TRIM: avoidance (seven items; e.g., “I live as if he/she doesn’t exist, isn’t around”), revenge (five items; e.g., “I wish that something bad would happen to him/her”), and benevolence (six items; e.g., “Despite what he/she did, I want us to have a positive relationship again”). McCullough et al. (1998) reported strong internal consistency, with Cronbach’s alphas ranging from .85 to .93 for the avoidance and revenge subscales. The benevolence subscale had Cronbach’s alphas ranging from .86 to .96 for the benevolence subscale (McCullough & Hoyt, 2002). Estimated test-retest reliability for the avoidance and revenge subscales was adequate in a sample of people who have difficulty forgiving, with scores ranging from .64-.86 (McCullough et al., 1998). The scale shows evidence of construct validity, with avoidance and revenge subscales being negatively correlated with other measures of forgiveness, relationship satisfaction, and commitment, whereas the benevolence subscale was positively correlated with similar measures (McCullough

et al., 1998). In this study, I will reverse code the avoidance and revenge items, and average these items with the benevolence items for a total scaled score of forgiveness. For the TRIM, the Cronbach's alpha of the current sample was .96.

Emotional Reactivity

A pro-immigration essay and anti-immigration essay (adapted from Arndt et al., 1997) were written to evoke an emotional response in order to measure the participant's emotional reactivity and anxiety to the essays. Participants read the essay that was opposite of their self-reported political affiliation and then provided evaluations about the author of the essay and the views in which the author holds. Three questions measured the participant's view about the author (e.g., How much do you like this person?), and two questions measured the participant's view about the authors' position on immigration (e.g., How much did you agree with this person's opinion of immigration?). Participants reported their evaluations on a 9-point rating scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 9 (*very much*) to show their positive or negative opinions about the author of the essays and the position the author holds.

Procedure

Participants were recruited from (a) an online research marketplace (i.e., Amazon's Mechanical Turk) and (b) undergraduate courses. First, participants read an informed consent form that discussed the procedures of the study and their rights as participants. Once informed consent was obtained, participants were directed to fill out questionnaires online via Survey Monkey. After participants completed the survey, they were compensated for their participation. Participants recruited via Mechanical Turk were given a small monetary compensation (i.e., \$2.00) for their participation, and participants recruited through undergraduate courses were given a small amount of course credit or extra credit for their participation.

Hypotheses and Planned Analyses

Hypothesis 1

Statement

Political humility will be associated with (a) openness to experience, (b) exposure to different political perspectives, and (c) political commitment. Specifically, higher levels of political humility will be associated with higher levels of openness to experience, higher levels of exposure to diverse political perspectives, and lower levels of political commitment.

Justification

There is a growing body of research in personality psychology that has revealed links between socio-political attitudes and personality (Desimoni & Leone, 2014). While there is some variance in the literature as to what personality factors are correlated with which socio-political attitudes (Lee et al., 2010), the variance appears to be the result of using different measures of personality (i.e., FFM, HEXACO, NEO, etc.) and varying definitions of personality factors (Sibley & Duckitt, 2008). A meta-analysis by Sibley and Duckitt (2008) revealed that RWA was predicted by low openness to experience, as measured by the traditional Five Factor Model, and that SDO was weakly predicted by low openness to experience. These results are similar to recent studies using the HEXACO model of personality, however the Openness-Culture subscale has been shown to be negligibly related to RWA (Leone et al., 2012). As humility, as measured by the HEXACO, and openness have consistently been shown to be negatively associated with RWA and SDO, I predict that openness to experience will be a positive predictor of political humility.

Exposure to different political perspectives may also be a predictor of political humility, as previous research has shown that exposure to diversity could potentially be correlated with

humility (Hook et al., 2017). This hypothesis is also consistent with Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis, which proposes that exposure to diversity may help reduce a person's level of prejudice, at least under certain conditions. While humility and prejudice are not necessarily related constructs, it could be postulated that exposure to diversity could lead to a greater level of humility, as an individual is forced to weigh their beliefs and values against the beliefs and values of others.

Recent research has also looked at how commitment may impact an individual's level of humility in regard to various subjects. For example, Woodruff et al. (2014) theorized that it may be difficult to act humbly about different types of religious beliefs, particularly for individuals who have a high level of religious commitment. Hopkin et al. (2014) also found that very strong beliefs in God and very strong beliefs against God were related to low levels of religious intellectual humility, whereas more moderate views about God were associated with higher levels of religious intellectual humility. As religious humility is a subdomain of intellectual humility, it could also be assumed that it would be difficult to act humbly regarding political beliefs, especially for individuals who hold a high level of political commitment. In sum, while current research has not studied political commitment's impact on political humility, other research has shown similar constructs (i.e., religious commitment and intellectual humility) to be negatively correlated (Zhang et al., 2015; Hook et al., 2017).

Planned Analysis

This hypothesis will be analyzed using a multiple regression analysis with political humility as the dependent variable, and openness to experience, exposure to political diversity, and political commitment as independent variables.

Hypothesis 2

Statement

Individuals high in political humility will be less reactive when exposed to a different political perspective. Individuals high in political humility will also be able to identify the drawbacks of their own political perspective, and identify positive aspects of the opposite political perspective.

Justification

One prominent theory in the study of humility is the theory of relational humility (Davis et al., 2010). The theory of relational humility suggests that an ability to regulate self-oriented emotions and having an accurate view of self are two important qualities of a person high in humility. With this understanding of humility, it is assumed that an individual with high political humility will behave similarly to individuals who are humble in other domains. Leary et al. (2017) discovered that individuals high in intellectual humility are more likely to consider the position or stance of another, although their behavior or beliefs may not change.

However, in general, individuals tend to get anxious and reactive when they are exposed to positions that are different from their own. Individuals who exhibit humility may counteract this general tendency as they are more open to hearing and considering the experiences or positions of others. Humble individuals are more likely to be open to evaluate and challenge their own positions on political issues and recognize that there are flaws in their own positions, allowing them to identify positive aspects in the opposite political viewpoint. This unique concept of being humble regarding political beliefs and values has not been adequately studied, therefore it is important to identify whether political humility, in practice, is similar to other domains of humility (e.g., religious humility, cultural humility, intellectual humility).

Planned Analysis

This hypothesis will be analyzed by utilizing Pearson product moment correlations and two multiple logistic regressions. Specifically, I will (a) assess the correlation coefficients between political humility and emotional reactivity, (b) assess the likelihood of identifying drawbacks in their own political viewpoints, and (c) assess the likelihood of identifying positives in opposite political viewpoints.

Hypothesis 3

Statement

Following a political disagreement, individuals will be more likely to forgive another person if (a) they are high in political humility and (b) they perceive the other person to be high in political humility.

Justification

There is a large body of research that indicates there is a positive relationship between humility and forgiveness (Powers, Nam Rowatt, & Hill, 2007). Hook et al. (2015) found that individuals who were victimized during a religious conflict by a religious leader reported being able to forgive the religious leader more if the leader was perceived to have a high level of intellectual humility. Both personal intellectual humility and perceptions of the other's intellectual humility were also shown to be positively correlated with a person's ability to forgive following a religious disagreement or conflict (Zhang et al., 2015). Research has yet to show if this is also the case after a hurt or offense following a political disagreement.

Planned Analysis

This hypothesis will be analyzed using a multiple regression analysis with forgiveness as the dependent variable, and political humility of the self and political humility of the offender as independent variables.

Hypothesis 4

Statement

Following a political disagreement, the type of relationship will moderate the association between perceived political humility and forgiveness. Specifically, the association between perceived political humility and forgiveness will be stronger when the relationship is closer (e.g., friend, family member) than when the relationship is less close (e.g., stranger).

Justification

Political disagreements have varying consequences at all levels of human interactions (e.g., rupture in close relationships, riots, war); however, discussions regarding political views are a common occurrence in many different types of relationships. Social relationships and bonds serve many purposes and are typically considered a protective factor against life difficulties. Humility has been theorized to be a protective factor in social relationships and used to deepen the level of commitment and trust in the relationship (Davis et al., 2013). The current hypothesis is based on the assumption that the type of relationship will significantly impact the relationship between humility and forgiveness. For instance, humility may be more valued in a close relationship in order to deepen the commitment of the social bond and to serve as a protective factor against the hurt and conflict that may arise in a political disagreement, whereas the need for humility may not be viewed as important if the relationship is not considered as valuable or important to the individual.

Planned Analysis

This hypothesis will be tested using the steps for moderation analysis outlined by Baron and Kenny (1986), with forgiveness as the dependent variable, political humility as the continuous predictor variable, and closeness of the relationship as the moderator variable. First, I will center the continuous predictor and moderator variables to reduce multicollinearity. Second, I will create a product term by multiplying the centered predictor and moderator variables. Third, I will conduct a hierarchical regression analysis with the predictor variable and moderator variable entered into the first step, followed by the interaction term (political humility X closeness of relationship) in the second step. If the interaction is significant, I will graph the interaction and conduct simple slopes analyses (Aiken & West, 1991) to describe the interactions.

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS

Data Cleaning and Preliminary Analyses

Before conducting the primary analyses, I cleaned the data by checking for missing data, outliers, and normality. The data set had minimal amounts of missing data from the various items that formed the scales used in the analyses (less than 1.0% per variable). There were a small number of outliers on three of the scales used in the primary analyses (less than 1% per variable). Outliers were recoded to 3 standard deviations above or below the mean. I checked normality of the data by investigating skewness and kurtosis for each variable (see Table 2). The data did not display evidence of non-normality, so no data transformations were required. Means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations between all variables are in Table 3.

I conducted a preliminary analysis comparing the sample collected online through Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTURK) and the online sample of undergraduates (see Table 4). Furthermore, an independent samples t-test revealed significant differences in age between the two samples (see Table 5). Because there were some differences between samples, I included the type of sample as a covariate in the main analyses and included age in the intercorrelations matrix between all variables in Table 3. Also, to explore how demographics might impact the variables, I conducted exploratory analyses using t-tests to examine the impact of gender (see Table 6) and race/ethnicity (see Table 7) on the study variables. Previous research on humility and politics suggests that females report higher levels of humility than males (Leone, Desimoni, & Chirumbolo, 2012) and there was a lack of research that examined the role of race/ethnicity on humility. Gender was not included as a covariate as the exploratory analyses did not reveal significant differences between males and females on the study variables. Race/ethnicity was

included as a covariate in two of the main analyses as the exploratory analyses revealed differences between white participants and non-white participants on perceived political humility of self, perceived political humility of the offender, and on forgiveness, with white participants reporting lower scores on all three variables.

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 was that openness to experience and exposure to different political perspectives within one's social network would be positive predictors of political humility, whereas political commitment would be a negative predictor of political humility. This hypothesis was tested using a hierarchical regression with political humility as the dependent variable, the sample from which the participant was gathered entered in step one of the hierarchical regression as a control variable, and openness to experience, exposure to different political perspectives in one's social network, and political commitment entered in step two of the hierarchical regression.

This hypothesis was partially supported (see Table 8). The hierarchical regression analysis revealed that the sample was a significant predictor of political humility in step one, with the college sample reporting higher levels of political humility than the community sample, $F(1,467) = 26.61, p < .001$, accounting for 5.2% of the variance. Introducing openness to experience, exposure to different political perspectives, and political commitment into the second step explained an additional 16.1% of the variance in political humility and this change in R^2 was significant, $\Delta F(3,464) = 32.79, p < .001$. Supporting my hypothesis, openness to experience was a significant positive predictor of political humility ($\beta = .21, p < .001$), whereas political commitment was a significant negatively predictor of political humility ($\beta = -.38, p < .001$) in the final model. Contrary to my hypothesis, exposure to different political perspectives was not a

significant predictor of political humility ($\beta = .04, p = .336$). With all variables included in the final regression model, the sample from which the participant was gathered remained a significant predictor of self-reported political humility ($\beta = .21, p < .001$).

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 was that political humility would be (a) negatively correlated with emotional reactivity when exposed to a different political perspective and (b) positively related to identifying negative aspects of one's own political viewpoint and positive aspects of an opposing political viewpoint. This hypothesis was assessed using the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient between political humility and emotional reactivity, as well as a series of logistic regression analyses that tested whether political humility predicted one's likelihood to identify negative aspects of one's own political viewpoint and positive aspects of an opposing political viewpoint.

This hypothesis was partially supported. Supporting my hypothesis, political humility was negatively related to emotional reactivity, as individuals who were higher in political humility reported more positive views of both the author ($r = .23, p < .001$) and the viewpoint ($r = .23, p < .001$) of an essay that was antagonistic of the participant's political orientation. Furthermore, a multiple logistic regression was conducted to determine the likelihood of identifying positives in the opposite political viewpoint based on the participant's level of political humility and controlling for the sample from which the participant was gathered. The logistic regression indicated that the final model accounted for a significant amount of variance, Nagelkerke $R^2 = .07$, Model $\chi^2 (2) = 26.55, p < .001$. Both sample (Walden value = 17.23, $p < .001$) and political humility (Walden value = 3.88, $p = .049$) were significant predictors of identifying positives in the opposite political viewpoint. The odds of identifying positive aspects

in an opposing political viewpoint based on the sample and political humility were 2.29 and 1.17 respectively. Thus, individuals from the undergraduate sample were over twice as likely to identify positives in the opposite political viewpoint, and individuals higher in political humility indicated a greater likelihood of identifying positives.

Contrary to my hypothesis the likelihood of identifying negatives within one's own political viewpoint based on the political humility of the participant was non-significant. A multiple logistic regression was conducted to determine the likelihood of identifying positives in the opposite political viewpoint based on the participant's level of political humility and controlling for the sample from which the participant was gathered. The logistic regression indicated that the final model accounted for a significant amount of variance, Nagelkerke $R^2 = .03$, Model $\chi^2(2) = 10.54$, $p = .005$. Whereas sample (Walden value = 5.03, $p = .025$) was a significant predictor of identifying negatives within one's own political viewpoint, political humility (Walden value = 3.11, $p = .078$) was not a significant predictor. The odds of identifying negative aspects in one's own political viewpoint based on the sample and political humility were 1.55 and 1.24 respectively. Thus, individuals from the undergraduate sample were 1.55 times as likely to identify negatives in one's own political party, and individuals higher in political humility indicated a greater likelihood of identifying negatives, although the later finding was not statistically significant.

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 was that the political humility of self and the perceived political humility of an offender would predict higher levels of forgiveness motivations towards an individual whom participants have had an interpersonal conflict. This hypothesis was assessed using a hierarchical regression analysis with (a) forgiveness as the dependent variable, (b) the sample from which the

participant was gathered, the participant's race/ethnicity, and the participant's gender entered into step one of the hierarchical regression as control variables, and (c) the participant's political humility and perceptions of the political humility of the offender entered into the second step as predictor variables.

This hypothesis was supported (see Table 9). The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at step one, the sample from which the participant was gathered, the participant's race/ethnicity, and the participant's sex contributed significantly to the regression model, $F(2,466) = 12.03, p < .001$, and accounted for 4.5% of the variation in forgiveness. Both sample ($\beta = .17, p = .001$) and race/ethnicity ($\beta = .10, p = .032$) were significant predictors of forgiveness. Introducing the political humility of the participant and the perceived political humility of the offender in step two explained an additional 30.3% of the variance in forgiveness. This change in R^2 was significant, $\Delta F(2, 464) = 108.69, p < .001$. When all variables were included in the final regression model, the sample from which the participant was gathered remained a significant predictor of the participant's forgiveness ($\beta = .13, p = .001$), whereas race/ethnicity ($\beta = .03, p = .875$) was not a significant predictor of forgiveness. Both political humility of the participant ($\beta = .43, p < .001$) and perceived political humility of the offender ($\beta = .24, p < .001$) were positive predictors of the participant's motivations to forgive.

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 was that the relationship between political humility and motivations to forgive an individual for a political hurt or offence would be moderated by participant's perception of how close they felt to the offender before the offense. This hypothesis was assessed using the steps for moderation outlined by Baron and Kenny (1986), and the sample from which

the participant was gathered and the participant's race/ethnicity were included as control variables.

This hypothesis was not supported. I explored the participant's perceived level of closeness to the offender before a political hurt or offense as a moderator of the relationship between political humility and forgiveness (see Table 10). In the final model, there was a significant main effect for political humility ($\beta = .44, p < .001$) and perceived closeness to the offender ($\beta = .28, p < .001$) even when controlling for the sample the participant was gathered from ($\beta = .15, p < .001$) and the participant's race/ethnicity ($\beta = .06, p = .118$). However, the interaction between political humility and perceived closeness to the offender was non-significant ($\beta = -.04, p = .252$).

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION

As the study of political humility is in its beginning stages, the aim of the present study was to (a) examine various theorized predictors of political humility, (b) explore possible intrapersonal effects of political humility, (c) explore possible interpersonal effects of political humility (i.e., forgiveness of a political disagreement or conflict), and (d) examine the influence of the perceived closeness of a relationship on the relationship between political humility and forgiveness.

Predictors of Political Humility

The present study explored openness to experience, political commitment, and political diversity in one's social network as possible predictors of political humility. Openness to experience, as measured by the HEXACO-PI-R, was positively related to political humility, whereas political commitment, as measured by the Ideological Obligation Questionnaire, was negatively related to political humility. Political diversity in one's social network was not significantly related to political humility.

The finding that political humility was positively associated with openness to experience is consistent with prior literature indicating a positive relationship between the personality construct of honesty-humility and openness to experience (Leone et al. 2012). Research regarding humility and politics overwhelmingly operationalizes humility as a personality trait. However, the finding that openness to experience was positively related to political humility, yet not the strongest predictor of political humility, helps to establish political humility as a separate, unique construct.

The finding that political humility was negatively associated with political commitment is

consistent with prior research that found strong beliefs in God or against God were negatively related to religious intellectual humility (Hopkin et al., 2014). Results of the present study suggest that political humility may have similar attributes to other domains of intellectual humility (e.g., cultural humility, spiritual humility, religious humility). This is likely a result of the strong meaning and value an individual may garner from their strong commitment to their political beliefs (Hoyle et al., 2016).

Contrary to prior literature (Hook et al., 2017), the results of the present study suggest that political diversity in one's immediate social network is not strongly associated with political humility. One possibility for this finding could be that a variety of political perspectives saturate mainstream media and culture. For example, news sources, entertainment award shows (e.g., Academy Awards, Grammy's, etc.), and social media may provide society at large with significant exposure to different political perspectives. Thus, it may not be as important for an individual to have friends or family members who hold different political perspectives to increase their level of political humility. Also, it could be that simply having contact with individuals who are politically different does not have a strong impact on political humility. It may be that certain types of contact, if it is particularly negative or conflictual, actually cause individuals to be more entrenched in their political opinions.

Intrapersonal Effects of Political Humility

The present study explored (a) emotional reactivity to an opposite political perspective, (b) identifying negative aspects of one's own political viewpoint, and (c) identifying positive aspects of an opposite political perspective as possible intrapersonal effects of political humility. Emotional reactivity was negatively associated with political humility, whereas identifying positive aspects of an opposite political perspective was positively associated with political

humility. Identifying negative aspects of one's own political perspective was not significantly related to political humility.

The finding that political humility was negatively associated with emotional reactivity supports the theory that relational humility serves as a buffer against the deterioration of relationship caused by the wear-and-tear of relational conflict and hurt (Davis et al., 2013). Furthermore, this result is congruent with a study on humility that found that individuals who were more humble about their religious views were less behaviorally reactive to a religious opinion that was different from their own (Van Tongeren et al., 2016). The present finding suggests that holding a stance of political humility may decrease emotional reactivity or anxiety when presented with an opposing political perspective.

The result that political humility was positively associated with identifying positive aspects of an opposing viewpoint is consistent with the definition of political humility (i.e., having an accurate understanding of one's own strengths and weaknesses in regard to one's own knowledge). The result that political humility was not significantly associated with identifying negative aspects of one's own viewpoint remained positive is puzzling, yet this result may have more to do with error in measurement. However, the results of this study suggest that individuals high in political humility are more likely to identify strengths within opposing political perspective, whereas individuals low in political humility are not as likely to do so. These results may help to explain why discussing political topics can be conflictual or divisive. It is likely that political humility, as a personal virtue, is an important intrapersonal stance that is beneficial for productive, collaborative discussion regarding a political topic.

Interpersonal Effects of Political Humility

The present study explored the interpersonal effects of political humility by evaluating

the participant's likelihood to forgive another person after a political hurt or offense. Both the self-reported political humility of the participant and the perceived political humility of the individual who hurt or offended the participant were positively associated with forgiveness.

Consistent with prior literature (Hook et al., 2017; Powers et al., 2007; Zhang et al., 2015), political humility behaves similarly to other domains of humility in regard to its positive relationship with forgiveness. The present results expand the literature on the relationship between humility and forgiveness by providing further empirical support for this relationship, uniquely in regard to political disagreement.

The fourth aim of the study was to examine the influence of the perceived closeness of a relationship on the relationship between political humility and forgiveness. My results suggest that the perceived closeness of a relationship is not a significant moderator in the relationship between political humility and forgiveness.

One possible explanation for this finding is that political humility could be a virtue that is exhibited regardless of the perceived closeness of a relationship. The social bonds hypothesis (Davis et al., 2013) posits that humility helps individuals remain committed to relationships and protects the relationship from various strains. However, the perceived closeness of the relationship may not be a strong predictor for how much a person exhibits humility in the context of a political disagreement or conflict. Other variables such as type of relationship (e.g., familial, friendship, relationship with a stranger), length of relationship, and identifying other points of connection that bind two individuals within a relationship may be stronger predictors for the level of political humility displayed in a political disagreement or conflict.

Limitations

There are several limitations of the present study. First, the study used a cross-sectional

rather than a longitudinal or experimental design, so causal conclusions cannot be made. There is very little empirical research on political humility and it is possible that political humility is better understood as a more fluid virtue that changes over time and across circumstances. For instance, an individual may become more politically humble within long-term relationship as the individual may grow deeper in trust or place greater value of the opinion of the other person. Furthermore, while significant relationships between political humility and other variables are described, the results of the present study do not provide information regarding the direction of causality or rule out the possibility that an unmeasured variable resulted in some spurious correlations between the variables in our study.

Second, the variables used in the study were all self-report, apart from the other-report adaptation of the Cultural Humility Scale (CHS; Hook et al., 2013). Self-report measures have been found to be prone to socially desirable responding and other response biases (John & Robins, 1993). Furthermore, researchers have described the difficulty of accurately studying humility through self-report measures (Davis, Worthington, & Hook, 2010), indicating that evaluative traits (i.e., traits in which there is social value to be seen as virtuous) are particularly susceptible to socially desirable responding. Other self-report questions had the participant recall memories from past personal events and list positives and negatives regarding political perspectives. It is possible that participants had difficulty remembering the past (e.g., memory distortions) or simply did not want to take the time to recall and list positives and negatives regarding various political opinions. Additionally, some of the measures were created for the purposes of this study. These measures lack prior evidence of reliability and validity and the wording of some of the questions may have confused participants or have been too vague (e.g., “What negative characteristics do you see in your own political perspective?”).

Third, participants completed the measures online rather than in a controlled setting. Risks of not completing the measures in a controlled setting include the limitation that responses could have been influenced by the participant's environment and measures could have been answered haphazardly. However, to try to reduce the risk of including participants that answered questions haphazardly, five check questions were utilized to ensure the participants were paying attention to the questions.

Areas for Future Research

As the study of political humility is still in the beginning stages, there are several areas in which researchers could expand this field of study. First, future research needs to explore the potential differences between political humility and other domains of humility (e.g., general humility, religious humility, general intellectual humility). The results of this study suggest that there are nuances in political humility in regard to specific offences verses general political humility, although the two variables are positively correlated. Thus, it is likely that there are even greater nuances between political humility and other types of humility

Second, future research could explore other theorized predictors of political humility to better understand what political humility is related to, and to potentially learn ways to foster the growth of political humility. Given the current turbulent political climate, it may be important for individuals to engage in political discussions with political humility to allow for individuals to foster positive relationships with others who hold different political perspectives, and to work collaboratively through these discussions. Whereas people will always have differences in political opinion, political humility may serve as a protective factor in relationships in which two partners disagree.

Third, future research could further explore the intrapersonal and interpersonal effects of political humility. This study looked at the relationship between (a) political humility and (b) emotional reactivity, likelihood to identify positives in an opposing political perspective and negatives in one's own political perspective, and forgiveness. Future studies could explore other variables that may be related to political humility (e.g., compassion, gratitude, differentiation of self, fundamentalism).

Fourth, future studies on political humility may benefit from using different modes of assessment, such as behavioral measures (Dorn, Hook, Davis, Van Tongeren, & Worthington, 2014) or implicit measures (Rowatt et al., 2006), as well as longitudinal designs, to provide a more robust understanding of political humility and how it relates to other variables (e.g., other domains of humility, forgiveness, political commitment). For example, experimental designs could assess political humility by randomly assigned participants to interact with an individual who displays a high level of political humility, an individual who displays a low level of political humility, and a control group in which the participant interacts with a person who demonstrates genuine disinterest in politics.

Fifth, future studies may benefit from studying individuals in a variety of different contexts and demographics. Results of the present study revealed that the community sample (i.e., MTurk) was significantly different from the undergraduate sample on several variables. It may benefit future researchers to study political humility in light of this finding, recognizing that social status, race/ethnicity, gender, and developmental stage may all play a role in one's level of political humility in various contexts. Furthermore, future research may benefit from examining political humility across a variety of different relationships. For example, exploring political humility in the context of a parent-child relationship in which the child is in the developmental

stage of emerging adulthood (Arnett, 2000) could be very interesting. As emerging adulthood is characterized by exploring and challenging various worldviews, it would be interesting to examine how political humility is expressed in familial relationships when they may first begin to hold different political beliefs and values.

Implications for Counseling

There is a relative dearth of research on the role of politics in therapy, and the importance of politics in the therapeutic relationship has only recently been explored (Solomonov & Barber, 2018). There is very little research on how the political climate of a given point in time may affect client and therapist experiences in psychotherapy. Solomonov and Barber (2018) examined therapist and patient experiences in therapy following the 2016 election. Their findings suggest that patients want to discuss politics during session, and may even benefit from appropriate self-disclosure of their therapist's political stance. Furthermore, they suggest that therapists are highly likely to disclose their political orientation, explicitly or implicitly. These findings support the notion that politics do enter the therapeutic relationship, and it can be argued that clinicians need to be aware of their political biases and explore the effects of the political climate on the therapeutic alliance.

The findings of the present study have several practical implications for counseling. First, and similar to other domains of humility (e.g., cultural humility, religious humility), political humility is likely to be an important factor for positively engaging clients who may have different political perspectives. The present study helps demonstrate some of the possible benefits. Specifically, the finding that individuals high in political humility are less likely to be emotionally reactive when presented with an opposite political perspective indicates that it may be important for clinicians to engage political discussion with clients in a humble manner. As

therapists are likely to self-disclose their political stance implicitly (Solomonov & Baber, 2018), it may serve therapists well to reflect on the strengths and weaknesses of different political perspectives to gain greater empathy for clients who hold different political perspectives, and present as less reactive in therapy if they experience a hurt or offence from the client.

Second, findings of this study suggest that clinicians can positively engage with clients who have differing political perspectives. This study suggests that political humility is a valid domain of humility, and engaging a client in therapy with political humility may help clinicians remain open to their client's unique lived experiences and focus on the needs of the client. Furthermore, the social bonds theory of humility lends support that political humility could help buffer against harms or offenses that occur within the therapeutic alliance, and help the client feel safer to disclose political opinions with the clinician (Davis et al., 2012). As clients desire to discuss politics in therapy (Solomonov & Baber, 2018), clinicians are likely to benefit from exploring their attitudes and beliefs regarding various political perspectives prior to discussing politics with clients.

Third, the present findings indicate the importance of recognizing one's commitment to their political beliefs. As clinicians are often engaged in social justice efforts, it may be important for clinicians to gain greater self-awareness about how committed they are to their political beliefs. Whereas the efforts of clinicians to provide support and justice for all people, regardless of race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, etc., may not be a stance the clinician would want to change their views on, it may be of pertinent importance for clinicians to recognize that their clients may hold different viewpoints. The finding that political humility is negatively related to political commitment could directly impact the therapeutic relationship if

the therapist is unaware of how much their political commitment impacts their ability to remain respectful, open, and humble with their clients.

Conclusion

Research regarding the construct of political humility is in the very beginning stages. The current study investigated the predictors, intrapersonal effects, and interpersonal effects of political humility. This study found that political humility is positively associated with openness to experience and negatively associated with political commitment. Intrapersonally, political humility was associated with low emotional reactivity when presented with an opposing political perspective, and a greater likelihood to identify positives in an opposing political perspective. Interpersonally, both the self-reported political humility of an individual, as well as their perception of the political humility of an individual who hurt or offended them, were positive predictors of one's likelihood to forgive the individual for a hurt or offense. Further research in this area of study will help us better understand the construct of political humility and how it may serve as a buffer against the wear-and-tear of relational disagreement or conflict regarding political issues.

Table 1

Political Humility: Studies Included in Literature Review

Study	Study Design	Sample	Measure of Humility	Measure of Politics	Summary of Findings
Chirumbolo & Leone (2010)	Quantitative-Cross-Sectional	517 Italian citizens (264 f, 252 m, one missing) age range = 20-65; $M = 34.62$, $SD = 10.41$. 26.3% students. Snowballing procedure. First year psychology students received extra credit by recruiting up to five adult non-student individuals equally distributed by gender.	HEXACO	Ideological Orientation and Voting in the Italian national elections held in 2006	(1) Honesty-Humility was negatively associated to right-wing ideological orientation, indicating that higher scores in Honesty-Humility are associated with a more leftist self-description (2) Honesty-Humility was negatively related to right-wing voting. (3) HEXACO variables can predict political criteria at least as well as the FFM does, and arguably better.
Desimoni & Leone (2014): Study 1	Quantitative-Cross-Sectional	820 Italian individuals (501 f, 319 m), 54% students. Snowballing procedure. First year psychology students received extra credit by recruiting up to five adult non-student individuals. Age $M = 32.57$, $SD = 14.39$, range 18-80.	HEXACO-100 (Separated Honesty from Humility)	Right Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) Scale (Altemeyer, 1996), Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) scale (Pratto et al., 1994).	(1) RWA was weakly negatively correlated with humility, and SDO was negatively correlated with Humility (2) Divergent associations between Honesty and Humility, with Honesty being positively associated with RWA and Humility being negatively associated with RWA.
Desimoni & Leone (2014): Study 2	Quantitative-Cross-Sectional	586 individuals (311 f, 275 m, 28.8% students). Recruited by introductory psychology students in exchange for course credit. Age $M = 34.25$, $SD = 12.74$, range 19-73.	104-item HEXACO-PI.	4-point scale asking “How much are you interested in politics?”, RWA and SDO scales.	(1) RWA was negatively associated to Humility and SDO was negatively associated with Modesty and Greed Avoidance facets of humility (2) The effect of humility on SDO scores was impacted by level of interest in politics. Low interest associated with a weak effect, high interest associated with a greater effect.
Hoyle, Davisson, Diebels, & Leary (2016): Study 1	Quantitative-Scale Development, Cross-Sectional	N=804 (455 f, $M = 33.4$, $SD = 12.1$) and received \$1.	Utilized Confirmatory Factor Analysis.	Not Applicable	(1) Specific Intellectual Humility Scale had strong evidence of measurement invariance across domains and across topics, and abbreviated 3 question scale is also validated.

Study	Study Design	Sample	Measure of Humility	Measure of Politics	Summary of Findings
			General Intellectual Humility Scale (Leary et al., 2017)		
Hoyle, Davisson, Diebels, & Leary (2016): Study 2	Quantitative-Scale Development, Cross-Sectional	N=410 (209 f, $M = 34.0$, $SD = 12.0$) and received \$1.	Specific Intellectual Humility Scale, General Intellectual Humility Scale	Not Applicable	(1) Small to moderate negative correlations were found between dogmatism and intellectual humility, with the highest correlations found in religion ($r = -.53$) and politics ($r = -.51$). (2) Specific intellectual humility is a construct that can be more focused than what can be measured when focusing on general intellectual humility.
Hoyle, Davisson, Diebels, & Leary (2016): Study 3	Quantitative-Scale Development, Cross-Sectional	N=156 (78 f, $M = 31.7$, $SD = 8.3$) and received \$30.	Six-item General Humility Scale, Specific Intellectual Humility Scale	Not Applicable	(1) The correlations between views on specific issues across domains generally were small. An individual's level of general intellectual humility is correlated with their level of specific intellectual humility. However, it is a modest effect. As specific intellectual humility takes into consideration personal characteristics and the persons basis for a specific view.
Kajonius & Dåderman (2014)	Quantitative-Cross-Sectional Correlational	202 Swedish university students 34.6 (119 f, freshman with no previous experience in higher education (university or college) age $M = 25.1$, $SD = 7.2$	Modified original 40-item version of HEXACO-PI focusing on Honesty-Humility, preliminary Swedish version.	Swedish Liberal Values Scale (constructed by the first author).	(1) All facets of Honesty-Humility were positively correlated with liberal values, with differences in feminism, minorities and resources. (2) Honesty-Humility and its facets are more important predictors of Liberal Values than Agreeableness.
Lee, Ashton, Ogunfowora, Bourdage, & Shin (2010)	Quantitative-Cross-Sectional	207 Canadian university students (142 f, $M = 21.1$, $SD = 4.2$) who received course credit. 185 Korean university students (152 f, $M = 21.9$, $SD = 2.4$) who received payment. 672 US community adults from	Full-length HEXACO-PI for the US sample, HEXACO-PI-R for Canadian and Korean university students.	RWA and SDO scales. Schwartz Value Survey (SVS; e.g., Schwartz, 1992)	(1) Honesty-Humility is negatively correlated among all samples with the variables representing Hierarchy Orientation. (2) Honesty-Humility showed strong negative correlations with SVS Self-Enhancement and with SDO. In US, there was a modest positive

Study	Study Design	Sample	Measure of Humility	Measure of Politics	Summary of Findings
		Goldberg's (1999) Eugene/Springfield (Oregon) Community Sample (384 f, $M = 50.5$, $SD = 12.3$, 57.1% had some college education.			association of Honesty-Humility with the Social Conformity Orientation variables. (3) Honesty-Humility had (negative) main effect on SDO and RWA. (4) Higher level of interest in politics strengthened the specific associations between Honesty-Humility and SDO. (5) Humility, rather than honesty, was significantly related to SDO.
Leone, Chirumbolo, & Desimoni (2012)	Quantitative-Cross-Sectional	344 Italian citizens (180 f, 162 m, 14.4% students. Snowballing procedure. First year psychology students received extra credit by recruiting up to five adult non-student individuals equally distributed by gender. age $M = 39.48$, $SD = 14.38$, range 21-86)	HEXACO-PI-R,	RWA Scale, SDO scale, Interest in politics measured by single question: "How much are you interested in politics?"	(1) Interest in politics was negatively associated with RWA and uncorrelated with SDO. (2) Honesty-Humility was negatively correlated with both RWA and SDO. (3) Higher level of interest in politics strengthened the specific associations between Honesty-Humility and SDO. (4) Humility, rather than honesty, was significantly related to SDO.
Leone, Desimoni, & Chirumbolo (2012): Study 1	Quantitative-Cross-Sectional	297 Italian individuals (137 f, 158 m, 2 missing information, 26% students.) Snowballing procedure. First year psychology students received extra credit by recruiting up to five adult non-student individuals equally distributed by gender. Age $M = 38.65$, $SD = 15.43$, range = 18-85).	HEXACO-PI-R,	Belief in a Dangerous World Scale (Duckett et al., 2002), Belief in a Competitive Jungle World Scale (Duckett et al., 2002), RWA Scale, SDO Scale.	(1) Females scored higher than males in Honesty-Humility and scored lower in Competitive jungle, RWA and SDO. (2) Competitive jungle was strongly negatively associated with Honesty-Humility. Dangerous world was negatively associated with Honesty-Humility. (3) Honesty-Humility was negatively associated with RWA.
Leone, Desimoni, & Chirumbolo (2012): Study 2	Quantitative-Cross-Sectional	344 US individuals (170 f, 174 m). $M = 48.65$, $SD = 15.78$, range = 18-88.	Honesty-Humility and Openness Items of 104 item of HEXACO-PI	Dangerous World scale, shortened Competitive Jungle scale (Weber & Federico, 2007), Shortened RWA and	(1) Age correlated positively with Humility and females scored higher than males. (2) SDO was negatively correlated with humility and competitive jungle beliefs were strongly negatively associated with humility.

Study	Study Design	Sample	Measure of Humility	Measure of Politics	Summary of Findings
				SDO scales (Weber & Federico, 2007).	(3) Honesty was positively associated to RWA whereas Humility was significantly negatively correlated with RWA.
Silvia, Nusbaum, & Beaty (2014)	Quantitative-Cross-Sectional	137 undergraduate students (92 f, 45 m). Age $M = 18.9$, $SD = 1.87$, range = 18-38 and diverse.	100-item version of HEXACO-PI-R	RWA scale (Zakrisson, 2005), Humanitarian-Egalitarian values scale (Katz and Hass, 1988), Protestant Work Ethic Values scale (Katz and Hass, 1988), Spectrum of political liberalism and conservatism (Pew Research Center, 2012).	(1) Honesty-Humility was associated with religious constructs. It significantly predicted higher global religiosity, intrinsic religious orientation fundamentalism, and lower rejection of Christianity. (2) The only significant finding suggested that H-Fairness, a construct of honesty, is positively associated with RWA.

Table 2

Skewness, Kurtosis, and Range of Responses of Political Commitment, Political Humility, Forgiveness, Openness, Emotional Reactivity and Political Diversity

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skewness (standard error)	Kurtosis (standard error)	Range
1. Political Commitment	2.97	0.59	-0.01 (.11)	0.30 (-.23)	3.26
2. Political Humility (SIHS)	3.52	0.80	0.56 (.11)	0.38 (-.23)	1.08
3. Political Humility – Self (CHS-Adapted)	3.64	0.65	-0.39 (.11)	0.11 (.23)	3.30
5. Political Humility – Offender (CHS-Adapted)	2.59	0.90	0.24 (.11)	-0.24 (.23)	4.00
6. Forgiveness	4.09	0.91	-0.66 (.11)	-0.82 (.23)	3.50
7. Openness	3.57	0.60	-0.25 (.11)	-0.37 (.23)	3.50
8. Positive Attitudes toward Author	38.87	25.15	0.26 (.11)	-0.52 (.23)	100.00
9. Positive Attitudes toward Viewpoint	33.44	26.84	0.61 (.11)	-0.41 (.23)	100.00
10. Political Diversity	1.59	0.65	0.29 (.11)	0.20 (.23)	3.58

Table 3

Intercorrelations of Continuous Variables included in Analyses

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Political Commitment	2.97	.59	-									
2. Political Humility (SIHS)	3.51	0.80	-.37**	-								
3. Political Humility – Self (CHS-Adapted)	3.64	0.65	-.24**	.20**	-							
4. Political Humility – Offender(CHS-Adapted)	2.59	.90	-.19**	.03	.33**	-						

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5. Forgiveness	4.09	0.91	-.28**	.22**	.53**	.39**	-					
6. Openness	3.57	0.60	.17**	.14**	.20**	-.07	-.14**	-				
7. Positive Attitudes towards Author	38.87	25.15	-.27**	.23**	.05	.16**	.05	-.18**	-			
8. Positive Attitudes towards Viewpoint	33.44	26.84	-.27**	.23**	.01	.12**	-.00	-.18**	.77**	-		
9. Political Diversity in Social Network	1.59	0.65	-.00	.08	-.03	-.19**	-.01	.12**	-.02	-.07	-	
10. Age	27.83	12.39	.04	-.19**	-.07	-.05	.12**	.10*	-.08	-.04	-.01	-

*correlation significant at .05 level. **correlation significant at .05 level.

Table 4

Comparison of Variables in MTURK & Undergraduate (SONA) Samples

Variable	MTurk <i>M</i>	MTurk <i>SD</i>	SONA <i>M</i>	SONA <i>SD</i>	<i>t</i> -statistic
1. Political Commitment	3.04	0.56	2.92	0.60	2.07
2. Political Humility (SIHS)	3.29	0.84	3.67	0.74	-5.16**
3. Political Humility – Self (CHS-Adapted)	3.54	0.66	3.70	0.63	02.59*
4. Political Humility – Offender (CHS-Adapted)	2.54	0.94	2.62	0.88	0.834
5. Forgiveness	3.87	0.98	4.24	0.82	-4.24**
6. Openness	3.61	0.64	3.54	0.57	1.20
7. Positive Attitudes toward Author	4.26	2.22	4.49	1.75	-.40
8. Positive Attitudes toward Viewpoint	3.53	2.49	3.31	1.98	.20
9. Political Diversity	1.55	0.74	1.63	0.67	-1.26

*significant at .05 level. **significant at .001 level

Table 5

Comparison of Age in MTURK & Undergraduate (SONA) Samples

MTurk	SONA	<i>t</i> -statistic
N = 184	N = 280	19.45**
<i>M</i> = 39.04	<i>M</i> = 20.46	
(<i>SD</i> = 12.54)	(<i>SD</i> = 3.55)	

**significant at the .001 level. *Note.* Four participants from the undergraduate sample and one participant from MTurk did not provide their age.

Table 6

Comparison of Gender on Variables

Variable	Male <i>M</i>	Male <i>SD</i>	Female <i>M</i>	Female <i>SD</i>	<i>t</i> -statistic
1. Political Commitment	2.94	0.59	2.97	0.58	-0.46
2. Political Humility (SIHS)	3.49	0.78	3.53	0.82	-.53
3. Political Humility – Self (CHS-Adapted)	3.56	0.65	3.67	0.64	-1.77
4. Political Humility – Offender (CHS-Adapted)	2.70	0.79	2.54	0.95	1.87
5. Forgiveness	4.01	0.96	4.12	0.89	-1.16
6. Openness	3.60	0.58	3.55	0.60	0.77
7. Positive Attitudes toward Author	4.38	1.89	4.45	1.98	-.34
8. Positive Attitudes toward Viewpoint	3.53	2.27	3.37	2.17	0.74
9. Political Diversity	1.62	.66	1.57	0.71	0.69

*significant at .05 level

Table 7

Comparison of Race/Ethnicity on Variables

Variable	White <i>M</i>	White <i>SD</i>	Non-White <i>M</i>	Non-White <i>SD</i>	<i>t</i> -statistic
1. Political Commitment	3.00	0.58	2.91	0.59	1.71
2. Political Humility (SIHS)	3.47	0.82	3.60	0.76	-1.66

(table continues)

Variable	White <i>M</i>	White <i>SD</i>	Non-White <i>M</i>	Non-White <i>SD</i>	<i>t</i> -statistic
3. Political Humility – Self (CHS-Adapted)	3.58	0.68	3.74	0.57	-2.73*
4. Political Humility – Offender (CHS-Adapted)	2.52	0.91	2.71	0.87	-2.23*
5. Forgiveness	3.99	0.96	4.27	0.79	-3.27*
6. Openness	3.56	0.62	3.59	0.55	-0.43
7. Positive Attitudes toward Author	4.33	1.91	4.52	2.02	-1.33
8. Positive Attitudes toward Viewpoint	3.24	2.12	3.65	2.30	-1.84
9. Political Diversity	1.71	0.65	1.40	0.62	5.12**

*significant at .05 level. **significant at .001 level

Table 8

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Political Humility (SIHS)

	Predictor	ΔR^2	β	sr^2
Step 1	Sample	.05	.23**	.05
Step 2	Sample	.17	.21**	.04
	Openness to Experience		.21**	.04
	Political Diversity Social Network		.04	.00
	Political Commitment		-.38**	.14

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$. The sample variable was dummy coded with MTurk serving as the reference group.

Table 9

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Forgiveness

	Predictor	ΔR^2	β	sr^2
Step 1	Sample	.05	.17*	.03
	Race/Ethnicity		.10*	.01
Step 2	Sample	.30	.13*	.02
	Race/Ethnicity		.03	.00
	Political Humility – Self (CHS-Adapted)		.43**	.16
	Political Humility – Offender (CHS-Adapted)		.24**	.05

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$. The sample variable was dummy coded with MTurk serving as the reference group. Race/Ethnicity was dummy coded with whites serving as the reference group.

Table 10

Hierarchical Moderation Analysis Predicting Forgiveness

	Predictor	ΔR^2	β	sr^2
Step 1	Sample	.05	.17*	.03
	Race/Ethnicity		.10*	.01
Step 2	Sample	.33	.15**	.02
	Race/Ethnicity		.06	.00
	Political Humility – Self (CHS-Adapted)		.44**	.17
	Perceived Closeness to Offender		.28**	.07
Step 3	Sample	.00	.15**	.02
	Race/Ethnicity		.06	.00
	Political Humility – Self (CHS-Adapted)		.44**	.17
	Perceived Closeness to Offender		.28**	.07
	Political Humility – Self x Perceived Closeness		-.04	.00

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$. The sample variable was dummy coded with MTurk serving as the reference group. Race/Ethnicity was dummy coded with whites serving as the reference group.

APPENDIX
DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What was your gender assigned to you at birth?
 - a. Male
 - b. Female
 - c. Other _____
2. What is your current gender?
 - a. Male
 - b. Female
 - c. Transgender Male
 - d. Transgender Female
 - e. Gender Queer
 - f. Other _____
3. What is your age? _____
4. What is your current marital status?
 - a. Single
 - b. Married
 - c. Separated
 - d. Divorced
 - e. Widowed
 - f. Other _____
5. What is your race/ethnicity?
 - a. White/Caucasian
 - b. Black/African-American
 - c. Asian/Pacific Islander
 - d. Latinx/Hispanic
 - e. Native American
 - f. Multiracial _____
 - g. Other _____
6. What is your current sexual orientation?
 - a. Heterosexual
 - b. Gay
 - c. Lesbian
 - d. Bisexual
 - e. Other _____
7. What is your current religious affiliation?
 - a. Christian – Catholic
 - b. Christian – Evangelical Protestant
 - c. Christian – Mainline Protestant
 - d. Christian - Black Protestant
 - e. Latter-day Saints
 - f. Muslim
 - g. Buddhist
 - h. Hindu
 - i. Jewish
 - j. Atheist

- k. Agnostic
- l. None
- m. Other _____

8. Have you ever had a previous religious affiliation that is different from your current religious affiliation?
- a. Yes
 - b. No

9. If yes, what was your previous religious affiliation?
- a. Christian – Catholic
 - b. Christian – Evangelical Protestant
 - c. Christian – Mainline Protestant
 - d. Christian - Black Protestant
 - e. Latter-day Saints
 - f. Muslim
 - g. Buddhist
 - h. Hindu
 - i. Jewish
 - j. Atheist
 - k. Agnostic
 - l. None
 - m. Other _____

10. What is your highest level of education?
- a. Less than HS diploma or GED
 - b. HS diploma or GED
 - c. Some college
 - d. Associate's degree
 - e. Bachelor's degree
 - f. Master's degree
 - g. Professional degree
 - h. Doctoral degree

11. What is your current occupation? (If none, type unemployed) _____

12. Please estimate your current family annual income? _____

13. Use one of the following numbers to indicate your political views in the accompanying categories.

	Very liberal (1)	Liberal (2)	Slightly liberal (3)	Slightly conservative (4)	Conservative (5)	Very conservative (6)
1. Foreign policy issues	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Economic issues	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Social issues	1	2	3	4	5	6

14. Use one of the following numbers to indicate your family's political views in the accompanying categories.

	Very liberal (1)	Liberal (2)	Slightly liberal (3)	Slightly conservative (4)	Conservative (5)	Very conservative (6)
1. Foreign policy issues	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Economic issues	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Social issues	1	2	3	4	5	6

REFERENCES

- Aiken, L. S., West, S. G., & Reno, R. R. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Sage.
- Altemeyer, B. (2002). Dogmatic behavior among students: Testing a new measure of dogmatism. *Journal of Social Psychology, 142*, 713-721.
- Altemeyer, B. (1996). *The authoritarian specter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Arndt, J., Grennberg, J., Soloman, S., Pyszczynski, T., & Simon, L. (1997). Suppression, accessibility of death-related thoughts, and cultural worldview defense: Exploring the psychodynamics of terror management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*(1), 5-18.
- Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist, 55*(5), 469-480.
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2007). Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 11*(2), 150-166.
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2008). The prediction of honesty-humility-related criteria by the HEXACO and five factor models of personality. *Journal of Research in Personality, 42*, 1216-1228.
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2009). The HEXACO-60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 91*, 340-345.
- Ashton M. C., Lee, K., & de Vries, R. E. (2014). The HEXACO honesty-humility, agreeableness, and emotionality factors: A review of research and theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 18*, 139-152.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*(6), 1173.
- Costa, P. T. Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *NEO-PI-R professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1985). *The NEO personality inventory manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- 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, 40*, 43-48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.03.004>

- Davis, D. E., & Hook, J. N. (2014). Humility, religion, and spirituality: An endpiece. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 42(1), 111-117.
- Davis, D. E., Hook, J. N., McAnnally-Linz, R., Choe, E., & Placeres, V. (2017). Humility, religion, and spirituality: A review of the literature. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 9(3), 242-253.
- Davis, D. E., McElroy, S. E., Rice, K. G., Choe, E., Westbrook, C., Hook, J. N., Van Tongeren, D. R., DeBlaere, C., Hill, P., Placares, V., & Worthington, E. L., Jr. (2016). Is modesty a subdomain of humility? *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 11, 439-446.
- Davis, D.E., Rice, K., McElroy, S., DeBlaere, C., Choe, E., Van Tongeren, D. R., & Hook, J. N. (2016). Distinguishing intellectual humility and general humility. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 11(3), 215-224.
- Davis, D. E., Worthington, E. L., Jr., & Hook, J. N. (2010). Humility: Review of measurement strategies and conceptualization as personality judgment. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 5(4), 243-252.
- Davis, D. E., Worthington, E. L., Jr., Hook, J. N., Emmons, R. A., Hill, P. C., Bollinger, R. A., & Van Tongeren, D. R. (2013). Humility and the development and repair of social bonds: Two longitudinal studies. *Self and Identity*, 12, 58-77.
- Desimoni, M., & Leone, L. (2013). Openness to experience, honesty-humility, and ideological attitudes: A fine-grained analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 59, 116-119.
- Donnellan, M. B., Oswald, F. L., Baird, B. M., & Lucas, R. E. (2006). The mini-IPIP scales: Tiny-yet-effective measures of the big five factors of personality. *Psychological Assessment*, 18(2), 192-203.
- Dorn, K., Hook, J. N., Davis, D. E., Van Tongeren, D. R., & Worthington, E. L., Jr. (2014). Behavioral methods of assessing forgiveness. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 9, 75-80.
- Duckitt, J., Wagner, C., du Plessis, I., & Birum, I. (2002). The psychological bases of ideology and prejudice: Testing a dual process model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 75-93.
- Emmons, R.A., & McCullough, M. E. (Eds.) (2004). *The psychology of gratitude*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Exline, J. J., & Hill, P. C. (2012). Humility: A consistent and robust predictor of generosity. *The Journal of positive psychology*, 7, 208-218.
- Farrell, J. E., Hook, J. N., Ramos, M., Davis, D. E., Van Tongeren, D. R., Ruiz, J. M. (2015). Humility and relationship outcomes in couples: The mediating role of commitment. *Couple and Family Psychology: Research and Practice*, 4(1), 14-26.

- Heidt, J. (2012). *The righteous mind: Why good people are divided by politics and religion*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Hill, P. C., Laney E. K., Edwards K. J., Wang, D. C., Orme, W. H., Chan, A. C., & Wang, F. L. (2017). A few good measures: Colonel Jessup and humility. In Worthington, E. L., Jr. Davis, D. E., & Hook, J. N. (Eds.), *Handbook of humility: Theory, research, and applications* (76-90). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hopkin, C. R., Toner, R. H., & Toner, K. (2014). Intellectual humility and reactions to opinions about religious beliefs. *Journal of Psychology & Theology*, 42(1), 50-61.
- Hook, J. N., Davis, D. E., Owen, J., Worthington, E. L., Jr., & Utsey, S. O. (2013). Cultural humility: Measuring openness to culturally diverse clients. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 60(3), 353-366.
- Hook, J. N., Farrell, J. E., Johnson, K. A., Van Tongeren, D. R., Davis, D. E., & Aten J. D. (2017). Intellectual humility and religious tolerance. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 12(1), 29-35.
- Hoyle, R., Davisson, E., Diebles, K., & Leary, M. (2016) Holding specific views with humility: Conceptualization and measurement of specific intellectual humility. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 97, 165-172.
- John, O. P., & Robins, R. W. (1993). Determinants of interjudge agreement on personality traits: The Big Five domains, observability, evaluativeness, and the unique perspective of the self. *Journal of Personality*, 61, 521–551. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1993.tb00781.x
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The big five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. IN L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., 102-138). New York: Guilford Press.
- Kajonius, P., & Dåderman, A. (2014). Exploring the relationship between honesty-humility, the big five, and liberal values in Swedish students. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 10(1), 104-117.
- Katz, I., & Hass, R. G. (1988). Racial ambivalence and American value conflict: Correlational and priming studies of dual cognitive structures. *Jouranal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 893-905.
- Krumrei-Mancuso, E. J. (2017). Intellectual humility and prosocial values: Direct and mediated effects. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 12(1), 13-28.
- Labouff, J. P., Rowatt, W. C., Johnson, M. K., Tsang, J., & Willerton, G. M. (2012). Humble persons are more helpful than less humble persons: Evidence from three studies. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 7, 16-19.
- Laufer, A., & Solomon, Z. (2009). Political ideology and psychological symptoms following terror. *Youth and Society*, 41(3), 414-433.

- Leary, M. R., Diebels, K. J., Davisson, E. K., Jongman-Sereno, K. P., Isherwood, J. C., Raimi, K. T., Deffler, S. A., & Hoyle, R. H. (2017). Cognitive and interpersonal features of intellectual humility. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 43(6), 793-813.
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2018). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO-100. *Assessment*, 25, 543-556.
- Lee, K., Ashton, M., Ogunfowora, B., Bourdage, J., Shin, K. (2010). The personality bases of socio-political attitudes: The role of honesty–humility and openness to experience. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44(1), 2010, 115-119.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2009.08.007>.
- Leone, L., Chirumbolo, A., & Desimoni, M. (2012). The impact of the HEXACO personality model in predicting socio-political attitudes: The moderating role of interest in politics. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52(3), 416-421.
- Leone, L., Desimoni, M., & Chirumbolo, A. (2012). HEXACO, social worldviews and socio-political attitudes: A mediation analysis. *Personality and Individual Difference*, 53, 995-1001.
- Martini, S., & Torcal, M. (2016). Trust across political conflicts: Evidence from a survey experiment in divided societies. *Party Politics*, 1-14.
- McCullough, M. E., & Hoyt, W. T. (2002). Transgression-related motivational dispositions: Personality substrates of forgiveness and their links to the Big Five. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(11), 1556-1573.
- McCullough, M. E., Rachal, K. C., Sandage, S. J., Worthington Jr, E. L., Brown, S. W., & Hight, T. L. (1998). Interpersonal forgiving in close relationships: II. Theoretical elaboration and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75(6), 1586.
- PBS Newshour. (2012). *Where do you fit? The political party test*. Retrieved from <http://www.pbs.org/newshour/vote2012/quiz/>
- Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. (2004) *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification*. Oxford: American Psychological Association / Oxford University Press.
- Pew Research Center (2012, August 24). *Political party quiz: How we placed you*. Retrieved from <http://www.people-press.org/2012/08/24/political-party-quiz-how-we-placed-you/>.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L., & Malle, b. (1994). Social Dominance Orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 741-763.
- Roberts, R. C., & Cleveland, W. S. (2017). Humility from a philosophical point of view. In Worthington, E. L., Jr., Davis, D. E., & Hook, J. N. (Eds.), (2017) *Handbook of humility: Theory, research, and applications* (76-90). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Rowatt, W. C., Kang, L. L., Haggard, M. C. (2014). A social-personality perspective on humility, religiousness, and spirituality. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 42(1), 31-40.
- Rowatt, W. C., Powers, C., Targhetta, V., Comer, J., Kennedy, S., & Labouff, J. (2006). Development and initial validation of an implicit measure of humility relative to arrogance. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 1, 198-211.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 1-65.
- Seligman, M., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 5-14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.5>
- Sibley, C. G., & Duckitt, J. (2008). Personality and prejudice: A meta-analysis and theoretical review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 12(3), 248-279.
- Solomon, Z., & Laufer, A. (2004). In the shadow of terror: Changes in world assumptions in Israeli youth. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, and Trauma*, 9, 353-364.
- Solomonov, N., & Baber, J. P. (2018). Patients' perspectives on political self-disclosure, the therapeutic alliance, and the infiltration of politics into therapy. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 74(5), 779-787
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2013). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory & practice* (6th ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Sylvia, P., Nusbaum, E., & Beaty, R. (2014). Blessed are the meek? Honesty-humility, agreeableness, and the HEXACO structure of religious beliefs, motives, and values. *Personality and Individual Difference*, 66, 19-23.
- Van Tongeren, D. R., Stafford, J., Hook, J. N., Green, J. D., Davis, D. E., & Johnson, K. A. (2016). Humility attenuates negative attitudes and behaviors toward religious outgroup members. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 11, 199-208.
- Weber, C. W., & Federico, C. M. (2007). Interpersonal attachment and patterns of ideological belief. *Political Psychology*, 28, 389-416.
- Woodruff, E., Van Tongeren, D. R., McElroy, S., Davis, D. E., & Hook, J. N. (2014). Humility and religion: Benefits, difficulties, and a model of religious tolerance. In C. Kim-Prieto (Ed.), *Positive psychology of religion and spirituality across cultures* (271-285). New York, NY: Springer.
- Worthington, E. L., Jr. (Eds.). (2005). *The Handbook of forgiveness*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Worthington, E. L., Jr., Davis, D. E., & Hook, J. N. (Eds.). (2017). *Handbook of humility: Theory, research, and applications*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Worthington, E. L., Jr., Davis, D. E., & Hook, J. N. (2017). Epilogue: What we have learned, where we are likely to go. In Worthington, E. L., Jr. Davis, D. E., & Hook, J. N. (Eds.), *Handbook of humility: Theory, research, and applications* (76-90). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Worthington, E. L., Jr. (2017). Political humility: A post-modern reconceptualization. In Worthington, E. L., Jr. Davis, D. E., & Hook, J. N. (Eds.), *Handbook of humility: Theory, research, and applications* (76-90). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Zhang, H., Farrell, J. E., Hook, J. N., Davis, D. E., Van Tongeren, D. R., Johnson, K. A. (2015). Intellectual humility and forgiveness of religious conflict. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 43(4), 255-262.