



# The Normative Judgment Test of Honesty-Humility: A Novel Implicit Instrument

Dan Asfar

15-10-2021



# Honesty-Humility

- ▶ ‘New’ major trait since the HEXACO
  - ▶ The **Sincerity** scale assesses a tendency to be genuine in interpersonal relations.
  - ▶ The **Fairness** scale assesses a tendency to avoid fraud and corruption.
  - ▶ The **Greed Avoidance** scale assesses a tendency to be uninterested in possessing lavish wealth, luxury goods, and signs of high social status.
  - ▶ The **Modesty** scale assesses a tendency to be modest and unassuming.
- ▶ Correlation with Lee et al., 2019
  - ▶ Integrity tests:  $\rho = .55$
  - ▶ GMA:  $\rho = .05$

# The importance of Honesty-Humility (H-H) at work

- ▶ Counterproductive work behavior Pletzer, Oostrom, Bentvelzen, & De Vries, 2020
- ▶ Organizational citizenship behavior Pletzer, Oostrom, & De Vries, 2021
- ▶ Predicts unethical decision making Heck, Thielmann, Moshagen, & Hilbig, 2018
- ▶ Task performance? Wendler, Liu, & Zettler, 2018





# A new implicit measure of H-H?

- ▶ Self-report measures are prone to social desirability
- ▶ Self-report measures rely on the assumption that people can introspect and accurately report on their thought processes and behaviors
- ▶ Other implicit measures Uhlmann et al., 2012
  - ▶ Thematic Apperception Test (TAT; or PSE)
  - ▶ Implicit Association Test (IAT)
  - ▶ Conditional Reasoning Test (CRT)
- ▶ The partially-structured attitude measure Vargas, von Hippel, and Petty, 2004

# Example item

Jane works in a lunchroom. In front of the lunchroom, there are usually two product promoters, distributing products like chocolate and drinks. Jane gives them a free lunch, and in return, they give her many of the products that they are supposed to distribute to the people outside. Jane takes these products home with her.

How dishonest do you consider Jane to be?

- 1 = not at all dishonest  Indicates low Honesty-Humility
- 2 = a little dishonest
- 3 = moderately dishonest
- 4 = very dishonest
- 5 = completely dishonest  Indicates high Honesty-Humility

# Theory and evidence

- ▶ Self as an anchor in social judgment Dunning, 2012
- ▶ Studiousness, math ability, athleticism Dunning & Cohen, 1992; Dunning & Hayes, 1996; Eidelman & Biernat, 2007
- ▶ Honesty, religiousness, political orientation Vargas et al., 2004
  
- ▶ The Normative Judgment Test of Honesty-Humility (The NJT-H)



# Test development

- ▶ Iterative process
  - ▶ Expert review
  - ▶ MTurk pilot studies
  - ▶ Adjusted items
  - ▶ Final set of items: 17
- 
- ▶ Two studies conducted, Study 2 here presented

# Predictions

- ▶ The NJT-H ...
  - ▶ Is modestly positively correlated with HEXACO H-H **(H1)**
  - ▶ Is not significantly correlated with the other HEXACO dimensions **(H2)**
  - ▶ Is negatively correlated with CWB **(H3)** and positively correlated with OCB **(H4)**
  - ▶ Explains unique variance in CWB **(H5)** and OCB **(H6)** above and beyond HEXACO H-H
  - ▶ RQ: does the NJT-H predict task performance?



# Study 2: Method (1)

- ▶ Procedure and participation criteria
- ▶  $N_{\text{dyads}} = 93$
- ▶  $M_{\text{age-employee}} = 32,77$  (SD = 10,52) en  $M_{\text{age-supervisor}} = 38,35$  (SD = 8,49)
- ▶ % women: Employees: 64,8%, supervisors: 40,9%

# Study 2: Method (2)

Scale	Items	α	
		Employee	Supervisor
HEXACO	60	(.71)(.68)(.81)(.67)(.79)(.74)	
NJT-H	17	.77	
CWB (Bennett & Robinson, 2000)	19	.85	.82
OCB (Lee & Allen, 2002)	16		.89
Task performance (Goodman & Svyantek, 1999)	9		.86
Interaction frequency (McAllister, 1995)	4		.86

# Study 2: Results (1)

	H	E	X	A	C	O	CWB-e	CWB-s	OCB-s	Task-s
NJT-H	.43** <i>H1</i>	.01	.18	.14	.19*	-.08 <i>H2</i>	-.31**	-.46** <i>H3</i>	.48** <i>H4</i>	.25*
H	(.71)	.01	.07	.33**	.34**	-.02	-.41**	-.45**	.37**	.04
E		(.68)	-.11	-.02	.09	-.09	.00	.05	.08	.10
X			(.81)	.01	.09	.05	-.15	-.21*	.24*	.10
A				(.67)	.05	.19*	-.20*	-.11	.15	.05
C					(.79)	-.03	-.28**	-.30**	.17	.18
O						(.74)	.12	-.24*	-.01	.09
CWB-e							(.85)	.46**	-.12	.03
CWB-s								(.82)	-.41**	-.33**
OCB-s									(.89)	.44**
Task-s										(.86)

# Study 2: Results (2)



	CWB				OCB				Task performance			
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 1		Model 2		Model 1		Model 2	
	$\beta$	p	$\beta$	p	$\beta$	p	$\beta$	p	$\beta$	p	$\beta$	p
H	-.453	<.001	-.312	.001	.374	<.001	.205	.028	.044	.833	-.073	.274
NJT-H			-.32	.001			.392	<.001			.264	.017
R <sup>2</sup>	.200		.285		.202		.395		.002		.058	
Sig.	<.001		<.001		.003		<.001		.487		.127	

# Discussion

- ▶ The findings provide initial support for the construct- and criterion-related validity and the incremental validity of the NJT-H.
- ▶ Supplement to personality self-reports in selection
- ▶ More research is necessary
  - ▶ High stake context
  - ▶ Applicant reactions
  - ▶ Cross-cultural validity



**Thanks!**  
**Any questions?**

# Study 1: Method

- ▶ Sample of employees (N = 230)
- ▶ Demographics (68% male,  $M_{\text{age}} = 34.99$ ,  $SD = 13.30$ )
- ▶ HEXACO
- ▶ NJT-H: 12 items ( $\alpha = .69$ )
- ▶ CWB Spector, Bauer, & Fox, 2010
- ▶ OCB Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983

# Study 1: Results (1)

Variable	H	E	X	A	C	O	CWB	OCB
NJT-H	.26** <sub>H1</sub>	.12	.03	.10	.09	-.07 <sub>H2</sub>	-.32**	.21** <sub>H3</sub>
Honesty-Humility (H)	(.81)	-.03	.25**	.07	.34**	.12	-.41**	.09
Emotionality (E)		(.49)	-.09	-.08	-.03	-.05	.06	-.12
eXtraversion (X)			(.60)	-.07	.37**	.24**	.13	.35**
Agreeableness (A)				(.34)	-.02	-.08	-.13	.02
Conscientiousness (C)					(.82)	.18**	-.31**	.40**
Openness to Experience (O)						(.38)	-.06	.08



# Study 1: Results (2)



CWB

	Model 1		Model 2	
	$\beta$	p	$\beta$	p
H	-.34	<.001	-.28	<.001
E	.04	.49	.07	.23
X	.03	.66	.03	.68
A	-.10	.10	-.08	.18
C	-.21	.002	-.20	.002
O	.01	.90	-.01	.84
NJT-H			-.23	<.001
R <sup>2</sup>		.22	.27	H5

OCB

	Model 1		Model 2	
	$\beta$	p	$\beta$	p
H	-.10	.14	-.15	.02
E	-.09	.14	-.12	.05
X	.26	<.001	.26	<.001
A	.05	.43	.03	.63
C	.34	<.001	.33	<.001
O	-.03	.64	-.01	.86
NJT-H			-.22	<.001
R <sup>2</sup>		.23	.27	H6