Social dominance orientation, right-wing authoritarianism, and willingness to carry out three domains of socially inclusive behaviors in a public campaign

Abstract: Ideological attitudes supporting group-based dominance (i.e., social dominance orientation, SDO) and in-group authority (i.e., right-wing authoritarianism, RWA) are well-established dual antecedents of prejudice. We extend classic perspectives of prejudice as an attitudinal outcome by testing this dual-antecedent model with prejudice operationalized as inclusive behavioral intentions in a nationally-representative Australian community sample (N = 2,632). An exploratory structural equation model simultaneously derived three domains of behavioral intentions in the data: small, interpersonal gestures (e.g., saying hello to people from other groups), volunteering to help the disadvantaged (e.g., mentoring people from disadvantaged groups), and political action (e.g., organising a demonstration). There was evidence for a dual-motivational basis of inclusive behavior intentions, with SDO negatively predicting all three categories of behaviors, particularly interpersonal gestures, while RWA showed a small negative relation only with political action. The findings suggest that motivations for group-based dominance are the primary barrier against behavioral intentions towards social inclusion, which can inform the design of public interventions for reducing prejudice and discrimination.
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A socially inclusive society based on fundamental principles of tolerance and diversity (UNESCO, 2012) is a key priority for human development and policy. Inclusive growth underpins the United Nations commitment to “leave no one behind” in their implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals.
Development Goals (United Nations, 2018) as well as the World Bank Group Strategy to end poverty and boost shared prosperity in a sustainable and inclusive manner (World Bank Group, 2014). These priorities have seen the rise of large-scale initiatives targeting social inclusion, such as *Equally Ours* (Equally Ours, 2019) in the United Kingdom and *Racism. It Stops with Me* (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2019) in Australia. In addition to advocacy and education targeting attitude change, many initiatives aim to change behavior at the individual level. These include encouraging people to engage in daily interpersonal gestures such as extending a greeting or listening to the stories of a marginalized group (e.g., the roadside breakfast bus—*Frühstücksbus*—which invites passers-by to get to know each other; https://www.fruehlingserwachen.org/unsere-formate/), volunteer to assist the disadvantaged (https://www.inclusion.melbourne/get-involved/inclusion-melbourne-volunteer/), and participate in collective action (https://www.womensmarch.com/).

Despite the popularity of these public initiatives and media campaigns, there is little research examining the distinct domains of behaviors targeted by these campaigns and the motivations associated with people’s willingness to carry out these behaviors. While social psychology to date has shown robust evidence for motivations driving prejudicial attitudes (McFarland, 2010; Sibley & Duckitt, 2008), it is necessary to consider both shifts in attitudes and behaviors for the success of social movements promoting equality and inclusion (Fisher & Purcal, 2017). Moreover, attitude change has a relatively weak correspondence with behavior change (Wicker, 1969) and may be a less malleable precursor to behavior given that attitudes take time to develop and are often embedded in personal experiences and longstanding beliefs (Paluck, 2009; Tankard & Paluck, 2017). Here, we develop an exploratory model of different domains of socially inclusive behaviors and draw on the dual process motivational model (DPM; Duckitt, 2001) of prejudice as a framework to understand how ideological attitudes and personality traits differentially predict intentions to carry out these behaviors (relative to the established dual-motivational basis of prejudiced attitudes).
Dual process motivational model (DPM) of prejudice

The DPM (Duckitt, 2001; Duckitt & Sibley, 2009) describes individual differences in prejudice and political ideology as cognitive processes of socialization and motivation. According to the model, two broad ideological attitudes, right-wing authoritarianism (RWA; Altemeyer, 1981) and social dominance orientation (SDO; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994), capture distinct motivational goals for collective security and group-based dominance, respectively (Duckitt, Wagner, Du Plessis, & Birum, 2002). These ideological attitudes are thought to be the product of broad personality traits and exposure to particular social contexts, which interact to produce stable worldviews. Ideological attitudes can be considered motivated responses to these chronic perceptions of the social world, which can result in prejudicial attitudes. In the case of RWA, individuals low on trait openness to experience (the tendency to be curious, imaginative, and creative; hereafter referred to as openness) are less tolerant of unstable or unfamiliar environmental cues and consequently develop beliefs that this ever-changing world is dangerous, leading to motivational goals for social cohesion and submission to in-group authorities that promise to restore order (Duckitt & Sibley, 2010). In the case of SDO, individuals low on trait agreeableness (the tendency to be prosocial and altruistic) are more likely to perceive ambiguous environmental cues as competitive, therefore developing perceptions of the world as a ruthless, winner-takes-all jungle. The consequent response is an endorsement of social hierarchy and motivational goals for group-based dominance (Duckitt & Sibley, 2010).

These pathways have been supported by a wealth of experimental (Cohrs & Asbrock, 2009; Dru, 2007; Duckitt & Sibley, 2010), longitudinal (Asbrock, Sibley, & Duckitt, 2010; Sibley & Duckitt, 2010, 2013; Sibley, Wilson, & Duckitt, 2007), and meta-analytical (Perry, Sibley, & Duckitt, 2013; Sibley & Duckitt, 2008) studies demonstrating consistent differential effects of RWA and SDO on distinct dimensions of prejudicial attitudes. In one experiment, for example, RWA (but not SDO) predicted prejudice towards ethnic groups following a cover story in which in-group values and norms were primed, whereas SDO (but not RWA) predicted prejudice when competitive in-group orientation for resources and winning were made salient (Dru 2007; see also Cohrs & Asbrock, 2009; Duckitt &
Sibley, 2010). In another study of a list of “typically disliked” social groups, RWA was related only to attitudes towards so-called dangerous groups—people traditionally seen as threatening (e.g., violent criminals, drug dealers)—while SDO was related only to attitudes towards so-called derogated groups—people typically stigmatized or seen as inferior (e.g., physically unattractive people, people with a mental disability) (Duckitt & Sibley, 2007). Foundational research has indicated that no other psychological constructs explained additional variance in generalized prejudice when modelled alongside RWA and SDO (Altemeyer, 1998; McFarland, 1998; McFarland & Adelson, 1996).

The role of broad Big Five personality trait domains is central to the DPM, in line with the widely-held view that prejudice and ideological attitudes are influenced by personality. This has been supported by robust meta-analytical associations between low openness ($r = -.36$) and to a lesser extent, high conscientiousness ($r = .15$) with RWA, and low agreeableness ($r = -.29$) with SDO (Sibley & Duckitt, 2008). This may be understood given that agreeableness is the primary Big Five trait concerning prosocial or other-regarding behavior (Graziano & Tobin, 2009), while openness reflects the tendency to seek and engage with complex and novel information, and is the primary Big Five trait associated with political conservatism (DeYoung, 2014).

While openness and agreeableness are consistently linked to RWA and SDO (Sibley & Duckitt, 2008), neuroticism and extraversion are not, and, consequently, these traits are not typically modelled in DPM research. The role of conscientiousness as an independent predictor of RWA may be explained by its links with preferences for order, structure, and hierarchy, although evidence for this association is less consistent than for openness (Sibley & Duckitt, 2008). Longitudinal evidence supports cross-lagged effects of openness on dangerous world beliefs and RWA, and agreeableness on competitive world beliefs and SDO (Sibley & Duckitt, 2010, 2013; Sibley et al., 2007).

Although the DPM is well established using a variety of approaches, there are two shortcomings when drawing on this literature for its practical use in designing a public behavior change intervention to reduce prejudice and promote social inclusion. First, as demonstrated above, the lion’s share of research has focused on prejudicial attitudes with only a handful of preliminary
behavioral studies examining voting intentions and policy support (Duckitt & Sibley, 2016; Perry & Sibley, 2013). Moreover, behaviors and behavioral intentions in previous studies have typically been measured using single items (e.g., Study 1, Saeri, Iyer, & Louis, 2015) or a small number of related behaviors (Mancini, Bottura, & Caricati, 2017).

Recent exceptions have examined DPM bases of behavioral intentions, looking specifically at collective actions that aim to improve the status of a group (e.g., mass political actions; Van Zomeren & Iyer, 2009). For example, Choma, Hodson, Jagayat, and Hoffarth (2019) found that both RWA and SDO were associated with reduced willingness to take collective action to equalize race relations (see also Stewart, 2017; Stewart & Tran, 2018, which looked at the role of SDO but not RWA in activism for racial and gender equality), but with increased willingness to take action when it was aimed at reducing the moral breakdown of society. Similarly Saeri, Iyer, and Louis (2015) found that both SDO and RWA of uninvolved outsiders positively predicted identification with the advantaged group (and negatively predicted identification with the disadvantaged group) and, through this, their willingness to take collective action in support of the corresponding group.

Yet collective action represents only one subset of possible inclusive behaviors that are typically targeted in public campaigns. Questions remain as to whether there are domains of inclusive behaviors independent from collective actions, and whether SDO and RWA would differentially predict some or all of these domains as previous research as shown with dimensions of generalized prejudice (e.g., Duckitt & Sibley, 2007). For instance, these may include individual actions such as interpersonal acts or forms of helping and volunteering (e.g., Neighbourhood Renewal; Shield, Graham, & Tacket, 2011), which may be effective and high-impact targets but may also involve drivers and barriers that are differentially associated with the two ideologies.

Related studies have found that prosocial behaviors can be meaningfully classified into different domains or dimensions. These include norm-motivated, altruistically-motivated, or self-reported behaviors (Böckler, Tusche, & Singer, 2016, 2018), costly vs. costless behaviors (Ferguson, Zhao, O’Carroll, & Smillie, 2018), or planned vs. spontaneous, serious vs. non-serious, and giving vs.
doing behaviors (Pearce & Amato, 1980). These different behavioral components have been found to correspond with distinct personality traits and motivations (Ferguson et al., 2018). Given their separate motivational bases, RWA and SDO may also differentially predict intentions to carry out different domains of prejudice-reducing behaviors. Importantly, developing an exploratory model can identify the motivational barriers to inclusion, as well as informing the design of social inclusion initiatives about the types of behaviors impacted by differences in SDO and RWA.

Second, the studies that have investigated the DPM in relation to prejudice-reducing behaviors and behavioral intentions have done so in the context of specific marginalized groups or political issues. Louis and colleagues (2007), for example, found that SDO had a small—though inconsistent—effect in predicting the likelihood of speaking out against asylum seekers and voting for more restrictive measures against asylum seekers a month later. Mancini, Bottura, and Caricati (2017) looked at SDO, RWA, and behavioral intentions including hosting an asylum seeker, donating money, or volunteering in an association that supports asylum seekers. Collectively, these intentions were associated with both SDO and RWA but were both fully mediated by prejudice towards asylum seekers. As these studies looked at group-specific intentions towards asylum seekers, it is difficult to isolate the role of RWA and SDO in behavioral intentions without contamination from attitudes towards this same group. This is an important concern given that key DPM studies (e.g., Duckitt & Sibley, 2007; Sibley & Duckitt, 2008) have emphasized the generality of the two motivational bases across domains of prejudice as inspired by Gordon Allport’s (1954) original observation that prejudice tends to generalize across targets.

Taken together, the emerging work suggests the need for a more comprehensive framework capturing heterogeneity in socially inclusive behaviors that are not bound to a given social group. Because the DPM was developed as a model of generalized prejudicial attitudes, it remains to be seen whether RWA and SDO are simultaneously associated with generalized behavioral intentions toward social inclusion. While Duckitt and Sibley (2007) reported that the DPM corresponded with differential prejudicial attitudes towards “derogated” versus “dangerous” outgroups, there has been no analogous model of distinct domains of prejudice-reducing behavior.
The current research

This study examined the motivational bases of social inclusion by developing a model of different domains of socially inclusive behaviors and testing this against the dual antecedent processes of prejudice (RWA, SDO, and broad personality traits). The study was part of a broader project which aimed to design a public campaign to create a movement of social inclusion and to monitor diversity and inclusion in Australia. This involved a nationally-representative survey in which participants were asked about their willingness to take part in a range of real-world behaviors in order to select a target behavior for this public campaign. In line with existing evidence of the predominance of RWA and SDO in predicting dimensions of generalized prejudice (Duckitt & Sibley, 2007; Perry & Sibley, 2013), we proposed that these constructs should be strongly negatively associated with intentions to carry out socially inclusive behaviors. Specifically, SDO should be negatively associated with behavioral intentions given that it indexes motivational goals for group dominance and superiority, and presumably high-SDO individuals would be more likely to exclude disadvantaged groups as a justifiable consequence of the intergroup hierarchy that necessitates inclusion efforts in the first place. In contrast, RWA should be negatively associated with behavioral intentions to the extent that inclusion efforts are viewed as threatening to social security and stability. We also looked at broad personality traits antecedent to SDO and RWA to provide a more complete estimation of the DPM. Consistent with previous research (Sibley & Duckitt, 2008), we expected Big Five agreeableness and openness to be respectively associated with SDO and RWA, and that these traits would be associated indirectly with behavioral intentions via those ideological attitudes.

Method

Data for this study came from the first two waves of the Inclusive Australia Social Inclusion Index Survey, a repeated cross-sectional survey designed to track progress in social inclusion in Australia over time. Funding for data collection was provided by Australia Post for Inclusive Australia, an alliance of organizations and individuals working to drive social inclusion and influence change (https://www.inclusiveaustralia.com.au). Data were collected through an Australian online
panel provider and quota-random sampling was used to reflect the key demographic characteristics of the Australian population based on age, gender, and state/territory. Data from Wave 1 \( (N = 1,200) \) were collected in May 2017 and data from Wave 2 \( (N = 1,432) \) were collected in December 2017. The two datasets were combined due to identical data collection methods and the relatively short interval between waves.

**Note about sample size and statistical power**

As the *Inclusive Australia Social Inclusion Index Survey* is an ongoing survey that was initiated well before the aims and hypotheses of the current study were established, the sample size was pre-determined and power analysis was not conducted. Apart from those described below, there were no data exclusions and the reasonably large sample size \( (N = 2,632) \) is appropriate for structural equation modelling (Wolf, Harrington, Clark, & Miller, 2013). A post-hoc sensitivity analysis indicated that this sample offered 90% power to detect an effect size of \( r = .06 \), well below small effect size guidelines in individual differences research (i.e., \( r = .10 \); Gignac & Szodorai, 2016).

**Participants**

The final sample consisted of 2,632 members of the community (49.4% female, 50.5% male, 0.1% indeterminate/intersex; \( M_{age} = 45.5 \) years, \( SD = 16.30 \)). Participants identified predominantly as White/Caucasian (82%), with 5.8% of the sample identifying as more than one ethnicity. Sixty percent had completed a tertiary qualification or higher, 5.6% had completed an apprenticeship, 15% had completed high school, and 19% had not completed high school or did not report their education.

Quality control checks by the online panel provider automatically excluded participants who completed the survey too quickly (< 60% of the median time to complete the entire survey), completed more than 30% of the questions too quickly, provided nonsense open-ended responses, or provided contradicting responses. The panel management system also checked across several variables (e.g., IP address) to identify and remove duplicates across the two waves.
Measures

Ideological attitudes. RWA and SDO were measured using versions of the scales adapted for the New Zealand Attitudes and Values Survey (Sibley, 2018), each of which consisted of six items selected from Altemeyer’s (1996) RWA scale and Pratto et al.’s (1994) SDO scale, respectively. Items on the short-form SDO scale measured attitudes towards inequality and competition between groups (e.g., “It is OK if some groups have more of a chance in life than others”). Items on the short-form RWA scale measured attitudes towards tradition, authority, and group cohesion (e.g., “Our country will be destroyed someday if we do not smash the perversions eating away at our moral fibre and traditional beliefs”). For each of these items, participants indicated their agreement on Likert-type scales (1 = Strongly disagree, 6 = Strongly agree). Cronbach’s alphas were 0.62 and 0.79 for RWA and SDO, respectively. These less-than-optimal internal consistencies are similar to those in other studies using short-form measures of RWA and SDO (Milfont & Sibley, 2016; Osborne, Milojev, & Sibley, 2017). We therefore modelled SDO and RWA as latent variables to address measurement error in the current study.

Broad trait domains of personality. The five broad domains of personality were measured with the Ten-Item Personality Inventory (TIPI; Gosling, Rentfrow, & Swann, 2003). For each domain, participants indicated their agreement with two items featuring trait descriptors (e.g., agreeableness: “critical, quarrelsome” and “sympathetic, warm”, openness: “open to new experiences, complex” and “conventional, uncreative”, conscientiousness: “disorganized, careless” and “dependable, self-disciplined”) on Likert-type scales (1 = Strongly disagree, 6 = Strongly agree). Spearman-Brown coefficients of test reliability were 0.39, 0.54, and 0.37 for agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness, respectively. These relatively low values are due to the fact that the TIPI was designed to optimize content validity over internal consistency given the constraints of a short instrument (Gosling et al., 2003).

Willingness to undertake inclusive behaviors. Fifteen socially inclusive behaviors were developed for this study from a series of workshops, stakeholder discussions, and focus groups with
practitioners and researchers working in diversity and inclusion. To avoid issues with vague or aggregated behaviors, specific examples of tangible and face-valid behaviors were selected to target in a public campaign. These behaviors referred to a broad range of marginalized groups, or excluded references to a single group to assess generalized inclusion intentions. An example item is: “Volunteer to teach skills to people from disadvantaged groups (e.g., immigrants, disabled people, elderly people, minorities).” A subset of the items were drawn from Leach, Iyer, and Pedersen’s (2006) list of political actions (e.g., “Send a letter to the government [to ensure that all people in Australia are treated equally]”). Participants were asked to indicate their willingness to take each of the actions on Likert-type scales (1 = Very unwilling, 6 = Very willing). See Tables 1 and 2 for a list of all behaviors.

Demographic information. Information regarding sex, age, religion, income, sexual orientation, ethnicity, education, and disability status was collected from all participants.

Other measures. The survey also consisted of additional questionnaires beyond the scope of the current research or which are reported elsewhere (Faulkner, Zhao, & Saeri, 2020). These included experiences of discrimination, prejudice towards specific marginalized groups (e.g., the elderly), contact and friendship with these groups, identification with community, nation, and humanity, personal wellbeing, and political party support.

Results

Because of the large sample size, conventional 5% or 1% statistical tests were not used, as very small effects would be statistically significant. Following Duckitt and Sibley (2016) and based on Cohen (1988), we instead interpret effect sizes (correlations or standardized path coefficients) of at least 0.10 as weak effects or larger.

Preliminary statistics

Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations between broad personality traits, ideological attitudes, and the 15 inclusive behaviors are presented in Table 1. In line with meta-analytical evidence (Sibley & Duckitt, 2008), SDO was moderately negatively associated with agreeableness (r
IDEOLOGICAL ATTITUDES AND INCLUSIVE BEHAVIORS

= -.31), and to a lesser degree with conscientiousness and openness ($rs = -.21, -.23$), while RWA was negatively associated with only openness ($r = -.14$).

Mean scores for participants’ willingness to engage in socially inclusive behaviors varied from those in the slightly/moderately unwilling range (2.51–2.89) for political action and costly behaviors such as Demonstration and Invite home to slightly/moderately willing (4.57–5.01) for everyday gestures such as Say hello and Say something. All but two socially inclusive behaviors were moderately negatively associated with SDO. In contrast, associations were considerably weaker for socially inclusive behaviors and RWA, at most reaching $r = -.16$ for Read, Say something, and Talk.

[Table 1 here]

[Table 2 here]

Relations between broad traits, ideological attitudes, and socially inclusive behaviors

To examine relations between traits, attitudes, and inclusive behaviors, we used an exploratory structural equation modelling (ESEM) framework. ESEM is a multivariate analysis technique which combines an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) measurement model with a structural equation model (SEM; Asparouhov & Muthén, 2009). It was selected for the current data over the more restrictive SEM (which uses confirmatory factor analysis to estimate latent factor loadings) because it allows for greater modelling flexibility and a more realistic representation of complex measurement structure (Marsh, Morin, Parker, & Kaur, 2014). This was important given that the 15 inclusive behaviors had not been categorized a priori and identifying them as independent clusters could potentially lead to distorted factors and structural relations. ESEM therefore allowed us to simultaneously model confirmatory factor loadings and model pathways as predicted in the DPM. All analyses were performed using MPlus Version 7 with maximum likelihood estimation and robust standard errors.

We estimated a model with latent variables for ideological attitudes (SDO and RWA), which were predicted by broad personality traits (openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness), and

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.
which predicted willingness to engage in socially inclusive behaviors. By including personality trait variables in our model, we seek to demonstrate that prosocial behavioural intentions are not simply associated with RWA and SDO, but are a product of established DPM cognitive processes by which prejudiced attitudes and behaviours are also expected to form (Duckitt, 2001; Sibley & Duckitt, 2008). The three broad personality traits were selected based on previous meta-analytical evidence on the relationship between the DPM and the Big Five framework (Sibley & Duckitt, 2008). This model is presented in Table 2 and Figure 1, with residual variances and manifest indicators for latent variables removed for ease of presentation. Ideological attitudes were estimated using six manifest item scores each. As the Big Five traits were assessed with only two items, they were modelled as manifest variables to avoid risk of model misspecification. Based on inspection of item content, we applied an EFA measurement model to the 15 inclusive behaviors and allowed the items to load on three main factors. By using oblique rotation, cross-loadings were not forced to be zero. We allowed the model to freely estimate pathways between these three categories of behavior and ideological attitudes. Criteria for model fit were based on Hu and Bentler (1999), who suggested that reasonably well-fitting models should have a standardized root mean square residual (sRMR) below 0.08 and a root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) below 0.06. The model provided adequate fit to the observed data: $\chi^2 (365) = 3532.60$, sRMR = 0.06, RMSEA = 0.057, 90% CI [0.056, 0.059], comparative fit index (CFI) = 0.89.

![Figure 1 here](image)

The three factors on which the 15 behaviors loaded were labelled interpersonal connection, volunteering, and political action, based on our interpretation of commonalities between the highest-loading items within each factor. For interpersonal connection, these were: Say hello (.71), Say something (.64), Listen (.56), Talk (.51), and Read (.48). For volunteering, these were: Teach skills .

---

1 For clarity, we also conducted an EFA on the 15 items independently of the SEM to examine whether our three-factor model fit the data best. EFA results consisted of a 1-factor ($\chi^2 (90) = 5339.74$, sRMR = 0.08, RMSEA = 0.15, CFI = 0.79), 2-factor ($\chi^2 (76) = 1596.06$, sRMR = 0.04, RMSEA = 0.09, CFI = 0.94), 3-factor ($\chi^2 (63) = 274.26$, sRMR = 0.01, RMSEA = 0.04, CFI = 0.99), and 4-factor ($\chi^2 (51) = 170.02$, sRMR = 0.01, RMSEA = 0.03, CFI = 0.995) solutions. Along with parallel analysis and inspection of eigenvalues, this indicated that the 3-factor model provided a good fit to the data along with an interpretable structure.
(93), Mentoring (.88), Volunteer time (.83), Modelling (.72), and Invite home (.51). For political action, these were: Demonstration (.93), Social media (.74), Letter (.61), Donate (.59), and Employment (.52). We posit that these domains can be distinguished from one another based on costs involved (e.g., time, money) and whether the behavior occurs at an interpersonal vs. cultural-political level. Specifically, political action behaviors, such as taking part in demonstrations, support social inclusion by seeking to enact inclusive cultural or political change. In contrast, connection and volunteering behaviors are inclusive on an interpersonal basis and—in isolation—would be unlikely to lead to broader cultural change. Connection and volunteering may be further distinguished by their relative cost to the individual: Volunteering behaviors such as mentoring imply an active and ongoing commitment of personal resources, while connection behaviors such as saying hello can be integrated into one’s existing social behavior with little cost.

In the structural model, agreeableness was negatively associated with SDO ($b^* = -.23, SE = .02, 95% CI [-.27, -.18], p < .001), and to a lesser extent, positively associated with RWA ($b^* = .13, SE = .01, 95% CI [07, .18], p < .001). Openness was negatively associated with both SDO ($b^* = -.18, SE = .02, 95% CI [-.22, -.14], p < .001) and RWA ($b^* = -.24, SE = .03, 95% CI [-.30, -.18], p < .001), while conscientiousness was neither related to SDO nor RWA. SDO was negatively associated with all three domains of inclusive behavior, and especially for interpersonal connection ($b^* = -.66, SE = .03, 95% CI [-.71, -.61], p < .001), followed by volunteering ($b^* = -.35, SE = .03, 95% CI [-.40, -.29], p < .001), and political action ($b^* = -.30, SE = .03, 95% CI [-.37, -.24], p < .001). Estimates of bivariate correlations between SDO and interpersonal connection, volunteering, and political action were largely consistent with this (-.67, -.34, and -.36, respectively). That is, compared with their low SDO counterparts, individuals high on SDO were less willing to engage with others different to themselves through interpersonal gestures, volunteer to help the disadvantaged, and to take part in political action for social inclusion.

In contrast, RWA was weakly negatively associated with political action ($b^* = -.14, SE = .04, 95% CI [-.22, -.07], p < .001) and unrelated to the other two domains. Estimates of bivariate correlations between RWA and interpersonal connection, volunteering, and political action were
slightly higher (-.30, -.14, -.27, respectively). That is, accounting for SDO, people high on RWA were less willing to take part in political action for social inclusion compared with their low RWA counterparts, but did not differ in their willingness for interpersonal connection and volunteering.

Indirect effects of agreeableness and openness on willingness to carry out the three domains of behaviors via ideological attitudes are provided in Table 3. They show that agreeableness and openness both have positive indirect effects on interpersonal connection and volunteering intentions via SDO only. However, when it comes to willingness to take part in political action, openness has a positive indirect effect via both ideological attitudes, while agreeableness has mixed effects through its opposing relations with RWA and SDO.

Discussion

We examined ideological attitudes and personality traits associated with the willingness to carry out three different domains of socially inclusive behaviors in a nationally-representative Australian community sample. These consisted of interpersonal connection (such as extending a greeting to people from other groups), acts of volunteering or helping people from disadvantaged groups, and political action. Ideological attitudes capturing preferences for group dominance and superiority (SDO) were negatively associated with all three domains of behaviors, and most strongly for interpersonal connection. In contrast, ideological attitudes capturing preferences for group authority and traditional norms (RWA) were weakly negatively associated only with behaviors involving political action.

This is the first study to develop a model of a differentiated set of inclusive behaviors and which examines the drivers and barriers of these behaviors against the framework of the DPM. This is an important step that extends and translates the contributions from the DPM to the practical world of behavior change interventions targeting prejudice reduction and social inclusion. The results also highlight the utility of taking an individual differences approach for inferring motivations behind
socially inclusive behaviors (see Underwood, 1975). The consistent effects of SDO suggest that motivations for social hierarchy vs. egalitarianism—which characterize this ideological attitude—are drivers of inclusive behaviors in general. This is of critical importance as policy and programme initiatives often promote social inclusion in terms of equality and fairness (United Nations, 2016; World Bank Group, 2014).

Overall, these findings are broadly consistent with the motivational bases and correlates of SDO and RWA. It is interesting that SDO was most strongly (negatively) predictive of behaviors involving face-to-face interpersonal contact. This might be explained by the fact that SDO has long been (negatively) associated with individual differences relating to altruism and prosociality (Lee, Ashton, Ogunfowora, Bourdage, & Shin, 2010; Pratto et al., 1994), and linked to lower empathic concern (Graziano & Tobin, 2013; Sidanius et al., 2013). Therefore its effect might be most pronounced for small, relatively costless interpersonal gestures where there are fewer barriers (i.e., time, cost, personal reputation). On the other hand, RWA appeared to be rather unrelated to socially inclusive behaviors at the interpersonal level, but predicted opposition to political action. Authoritarians may not be resistant to the idea of social inclusion per se, especially when it involves prosocial behaviors, but are averse to its by-products which challenge the status quo and threaten cultural stability. In fact, preferences for social cohesion—which are linked to RWA—may in some circumstances encourage inclusive behaviors such as volunteering (Stukas, Hoye, Nicholson, Brown, & Aisbett, 2016).

Our results are in line with recent findings showing that SDO is the more intractable of the two when behaviors or behavioral intentions are at stake. For example, it was a stronger negative predictor than RWA of people’s willingness to carry out environmentally-friendly behaviors (Stanley, Milfont, Wilson, & Sibley, 2019). In contrast with the DPM literature on prejudicial attitudes (see Sibley & Duckitt, 2013), these and the current findings indicate that SDO may be more relevant than RWA in determining follow-through when it comes to behaviors (at least those with little direct bearing on societal change). Similarly in another study, people high on RWA benefited from contact experiences in reducing their prejudice, while those high on SDO refrained from engaging in contact
and benefited less from such experiences (Asbrock, Christ, Duckitt, & Sibley, 2012; Asbrock, Gutenbrunner, & Wagner, 2013; cf. Kteily, Hodson, Dhont, & Ho, 2019).

One explanation for this is that prejudice may serve the function of *hierarchy enhancement* for those high on SDO, thereby helping maintain and even increase hierarchy and inequality between social groups (Pratto et al., 1994). As a result, high-SDO individuals may see inclusive behavior—even at an interpersonal level—as *hierarchy attenuating* and would therefore be resistant to it. Other research has similarly found that SDO negatively predicted support for inclusive actions (i.e., intergroup apologies) that serve to attenuate hierarchy between groups (Karunaratne & Laham, 2019). This means that SDO may play a more *proactive* motivational role in preserving group-based dominance, leading those high on SDO to eschew all socially inclusive behaviors toward outgroup members. RWA, on the other hand, may only play a *reactive* role when group authorities and stability are threatened by inclusive behavior.

Furthermore, developments in personality research have revealed an intermediate level of personality description below the broad Big Five domains (DeYoung, Quilty, & Peterson, 2007). These studies show that RWA is associated with the lower-order *politeness* sub-trait of agreeableness, which captures adherence to social norms, but not its lower-order *compassion* sub-trait, which captures emotional concern for others (Osborne, Wootton, & Sibley, 2013). These studies have also shown that RWA is related to moral values for order and traditionalism (Hirsh, DeYoung, Xu, & Peterson, 2010). Accordingly, people high on RWA may be motivated to preserve group norms and social order, but may not necessarily violate social rules associated with overt (i.e., impolite) expressions of prejudice (e.g., by refusing to say hello). This also resonates with evidence that while both SDO and RWA contribute to outgroup prejudice, RWA was associated with condemnation of hate speech—which may be interpreted as an extreme form of norm violation—while the opposite was found for SDO (Bilewicz, Soral, Marchlew ska, & Winiewski, 2017).

**Implications for behavioral interventions**
How might these findings inform the design of the current campaign to promote social inclusion in the Australian community? At first glance, the relatively greater willingness to carry out acts of interpersonal connection followed by volunteering and political action highlights which of these behaviors might be better candidates for interventions. Given that a basic principle for effective behavior change is to make the target behavior easy and to reduce any friction costs (Behavioural Insights Team, 2014), one approach for a social inclusion campaign is to focus on small, everyday gestures (e.g., read more about and listen to the experiences of minority groups) that may lead to prejudice-reducing contact (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) as well as the potential to spill-over to related behaviors (Thøgersen & Ölander, 2003).

However, the ideological attitudes and personality traits contributing to inclusive behaviors can further guide campaign design by accounting for individual differences in motivations toward inclusive behaviors. Even in light of findings that high-SDO people who report positive contact experiences also report less intergroup hostility (Kteily et al., 2019), our results suggest that there may be significant barriers preventing these people to seek contact to begin with. Therefore, even focusing on relatively costless interpersonal gestures as a target behavior for a public campaign may mean that the intervention may not impact the population in a uniform manner. For high-SDO people, interventions may be better focused on indirect forms of hierarchy attenuation that de-emphasize intergroup relationships characterized by competitive threat, such as re-framing normative contexts to suggest that inclusion is widely accepted (Levin et al., 2012). Persuasive messaging for promoting social inclusion may also be more effective when they address the precursors of SDO and help dispel world-view beliefs of a competitive, zero-sum situation (e.g., the popular internet quote: “Equal rights for others does not mean less rights for you. It’s not pie.”).

Meanwhile, and consistent with the intergroup contact literature (Brune, Asbrock, & Sibley, 2016; Dhont & Van Hiel, 2009), traditional conservative values linked with RWA do not appear to affect prejudice-reducing behavior at a more interpersonal level. The current results show that those high on RWA were no more averse to engaging in everyday interpersonal gestures and volunteering to help the disadvantaged than their low RWA counterparts. This is also corroborated by evidence
from New Zealand showing that when residing in multi-ethnic neighbours compared with predominantly white neighbourhoods, high-RWA people do not avoid contact, but rather engage in more frequent intergroup contact with Asian friends (Brune et al., 2016).

**Limitations and future directions**

The primary limitation in this study is the relatively short measures of broad personality traits and ideological attitudes, which have contributed to lower estimates of internal consistency and prevented further analysis at the facet level (Duckitt, Bizumic, Krauss, & Heled, 2010). These lower reliability estimates for SDO and RWA have been similarly observed in other studies using the same short-form scales (Milfont & Sibley, 2016; Osborne et al., 2017). While we modelled both ideological attitudes as latent variables to address measurement error, these lower reliabilities do challenge the validity of these measures and some caution in interpreting these findings is advised. In particular, these may have contributed to RWA’s weaker correlations with openness and with socially inclusive behaviors. Moreover, both SDO and RWA are multifaceted constructs and further work could disentangle whether it is the conservatism, traditionalism, or authoritarianism facet of RWA (Duckitt et al., 2010), or the dominance or anti-egalitarianism facet of SDO (Ho et al., 2012), that is driving these relationships. Future research could also focus on the prosocial domains of personality and how the politeness and compassion sub-traits of agreeableness—which have already been found to have differential relations with SDO and RWA (Hirsh et al., 2010; Osborne et al., 2013)—contribute to different types of inclusive behaviors.

Another consideration is that we used behavioral intentions as a proxy for actual behavior, which may be problematic given the intention–behavior gap or the phenomenon in which people do not take action to follow through on decisions to change their behavior (Sheeran & Webb, 2016). Nevertheless, compared with the existing DPM literature that has focused on prejudiced attitudes, intentions remain the best and most proximal predictor of actual behavior, accounting for 19% to 38% of variation in the latter (Klöckner, 2013; Sutton, 1998). Furthermore, as the list of inclusive behaviors was developed around the aim of prioritizing behaviors to target in a public campaign, we
cannot presume that this is an exhaustive list of all behaviors and behavioral categories relevant to social inclusion. Future research could clarify these issues by studying whether the current findings for SDO and RWA can be replicated for different operationalizations of a detailed assortment of behaviors (i.e., intentions, observed behavior, reported behaviors).

**Concluding remarks**

There are different routes to social inclusion, ranging from everyday interpersonal gestures to political action, although these have not been systematically examined in the prejudice literature to date. We provided initial evidence for three domains of inclusive behavior and demonstrated individual differences in intentions to carry out these behaviors. Applying an established model of prejudice motivations—the DPM framework of ideological attitudes—our findings revealed that SDO (i.e., motivations for group dominance and hierarchy) was a major barrier against all three observed categories of behaviors promoting social inclusion. Despite the established role of RWA in prejudicial attitudes, motivations for group cohesion and safety were only a weak barrier when it came to behavior and only against political action. By specifically examining behavioral intentions, the current study supports the utility of the DPM in revealing *who* target audiences should be and *what* messages are most effective when it comes to social inclusion campaigns.
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Figures and Tables

Figure 1. Exploratory structural equation model (ESEM) with standardized path coefficients predicting individual differences in willingness to carry out three domains of socially inclusive behaviors—interpersonal connection, volunteering, and political action. Factor loadings for behavioral domains are presented in Table 2. Standard error values are provided in parentheses. Pathways significant at the 0.01 level are shown in black (positive) or dark grey (negative); non-significant pathways are in light grey. Fit indices are reported in the results section. SDO = Social dominance orientation. RWA = Right-wing authoritarianism. A = Agreeableness. C = Conscientiousness. O = Openness to experience.
Table 1. Descriptive Statistics and Spearman Bivariate Correlations Between Key Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say something</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say hello</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modellin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Invite home</td>
<td>0.1 - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.5 4.1 4.7 4.3 4.4 4.0 3.3 4.0 3.5 5.4 5.9 3.3 3.3 3.7 3.3 3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.9 1.0 1.9 1.5 1.9 1.5 1.6 1.9 1.3 1.2 1.6 0.9 0.9 1.0 1.0 0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 2,632. All correlations above .05 are significant at the .01 level. SDO = Social dominance orientation. RWA = Right-wing authoritarianism.
Table 2. List of Socially Inclusive Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full item in survey</th>
<th>Shortened term</th>
<th>Factor loading for interpersonal connection</th>
<th>Factor loading for volunteering</th>
<th>Factor loading for political action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What actions would you be willing to take to ensure that all people in Australia – regardless of race, gender, age, sexuality, disability, class, or religion – are treated equally?</td>
<td>Talk</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk to other Australians about the issue</td>
<td>Talk</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say something when you see discrimination occurring</td>
<td>Say something</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read more about the experiences of minority groups</td>
<td>Read</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say “hello” to people from other groups</td>
<td>Say hello</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen to and validate people who claim to be victims of discrimination</td>
<td>Listen</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help organise a demonstration*</td>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate money to the cause*</td>
<td>Donate</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get employment with an organisation that works to support this position*</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share information on social media</td>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How willing or unwilling are you to take each of the following actions?

| Volunteer to teach skills to people from disadvantaged groups (e.g. immigrants, disabled people, elderly people, minorities) | Teach skills | 0.03 | 0.93 | -0.04 |
| Provide mentoring to people from disadvantaged groups (e.g. immigrants, disabled people, elderly people, minorities) | Mentoring | 0.05 | 0.88 | 0.002 |
| Participate in modelling programs to help people from disadvantaged groups | Modelling | -0.03 | 0.72 | 0.24 |
Volunteer time to help people from disadvantaged groups | Volunteer time | 0.02 | **0.83** | 0.08

Invite foreign visitors to stay at your home | Invite home | -0.03 | **0.51** | 0.16

**Note.** Factor loadings refer to standardized estimates from the exploratory structural equation model in Figure 1. Bolded items indicate highest factor loading for a given item. *Political action items adapted from Leach et al. (2006).*
Table 3. Indirect Associations of Big Five Trait Domains with Willingness to Carry Out Socially Inclusive Behaviors via Ideological Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Mediator</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>b*</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% Confidence Intervals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal connection</td>
<td>SDO</td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RWA</td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>SDO</td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RWA</td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political action</td>
<td>SDO</td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RWA</td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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