



Social and reputational aspects of personality

Boris Mlačić

Institute of Social Sciences Ivo Pilar, Zagreb, Croatia

Following the notion that the psycho-lexical approach in personality psychology is suboptimal if it does not encompass all the word categories potentially personality-relevant (De Raad, 2000), this paper describes the development of the Croatian taxonomy of social and reputational descriptors of personality. In the first step of the first study, a master list of social and reputational terms in the Croatian lexicon was constructed. In the second step, the personality-descriptive adjectives that were not captured by the earlier Croatian taxonomy (Mlačić & Ostendorf, 2005) were categorized by seven judges into 13 different types of descriptors, based on the classification system developed by Angleitner, Ostendorf, and John (1990). In the second study, the 532 adjectives that the majority of judges classified as prototypical for the three subcategories of interest of Social and Reputational aspects (social roles and relationships, social effects, and attitudes and worldviews) were used for self-ratings by a large sample of (N=524) University of Zagreb students and for peer-ratings by (N=502) those students' best acquaintances. Results from factor analyses are presented, as well as the relations of the underlying dimensions of Social and Reputational aspects of personality with two different measures of social attitudes and with the Big-Five factors of personality.

Keywords: reputation, social effects, attitudes, worldviews, roles, relationships, lexical approach, Big-Five

When the study of personality dispositions started developing, the issue of social and reputational aspects of personality was an integral part of it. Watson (1932), in his overview of 171 measures of personality and character, included behavior observation, laboratory tests, characterological indices, knowledge and ability tests, attitudes, opinions, and beliefs, interests, self-description, reputation, etc. In the first major study of person descriptors in the natural language, Allport & Odbert (1936) classified those descriptors into four categories, namely (1) "Neutral terms designating possible personality traits", (2) "Temporary moods or activities", (3) Social or characterial judgments of personal conduct, or designating influence on others", and (4) "Miscellaneous". The third category with "social and characterial judgments" was the largest. Terms belonging to that category were designated with expressions such as "essentially the social influence of an individual" and "social stimulus value" (Allport & Odbert, 1936, p. 27). Expressions like these were also used later by Norman (1976) in "specific effects or social stimulus values from the other's viewpoint" (p. 10), and by John, Angleitner, and Ostendorf (1988) who simply used the word "reputation" (p. 187).

Drawing on the importance of terms describing social aspects of personality, Allport and Odbert (1936) further stated: "the vocabulary of social impressions and characterial judgment has a certain intrinsic interest for social psychology, sociology and ethics" (p. 27). Since those early times, the study of the social aspects, reputations, and

personality dispositions seemed to have divorced from each other. Reputations, recently defined as "a social representation (made of a complex set of information, beliefs, judgments, and social expectations) constructed by the members of a community" (Cavazza, Guidetti, & Pagliaro, 2015, p. 164), have been studied intensively in the realm of social psychology. They were also studied in industrial-organizational psychology, as hallmarks of organizations (e.g. Ogunfowora, 2014), and even as properties of brands (DeChernatony, 1999).

The psycho-lexical approach to personality has flourished during the last two decades, producing numerous publications and giving rise to a widely shared model in personality psychology, i.e. the Big-Five (Goldberg, 1990). The psycho-lexical approach has also stimulated the growth of alternative structural personality models such as the Big-Two (Digman, 1997; DeYoung, 2006), Big-Three (Peabody & Goldberg, 1989; De Raad, Barelds, Levert et al., 2010; De Raad, Barelds, Timmerman et al., 2014), Big-Six (Ashton & Lee, 2007; Saucier, 2009) and Big-Seven (Almagor, Tellegen, & Waller, 1995; Benet-Martinez & Waller, 1997; Saucier, 2003). One more important result of the renewed interest in the psycho-lexical approach is the development of public-domain personality measures, such as the IPIP (Goldberg, 1999).

In Mlačić (2008) three directions of application of the psycho-lexical approach to personality were discerned: the development of personality descriptive taxonomies in particular languages, the development of factor markers to measure the dimensions derived from those taxonomies, and the development of a common item format (short behavior-descriptive phrases) for cross-national comparison of individual differences. In the last years, systematic cross-cultural studies using the psycho-lexical approach

have become more present (Ashton et al., 2004; De Raad, Barelds, Levert et al., 2010; De Raad, Barelds, Timmerman et al., 2014; Saucier et al., 2014), thus adding a fourth direction of application. The psycho-lexical approach's frequently mentioned rationale: "All significant individual differences are embodied in language" (De Raad, 2000, p.16) can be easily extended from the usual studies of dispositional adjectives to studies of alternative descriptive means, such as dispositional nouns, verbs, adverbs, etc., but also of different categories of person description such as physical appearance, attitudes and worldviews, social effects, and the roles people have in their family and in society. That extension was, however, rarely made. In this respect, two prominent criticisms of the psycho-lexical approach emerged during the last years: 1) the psycho-lexical approach is suboptimal if it does not encompass all the word classes potentially personality-relevant (De Raad, 2000), and 2) the psycho-lexical approach is suboptimal if it does not encompass all the personality descriptive categories (De Raad & Mlačić, in press).

In particular, the second criticism stresses the importance of the German classification system that distinguishes between four categories of person description: Dispositions, Temporary conditions, Social and reputational aspects, and Overt Characteristics and appearance (Angleitner, Ostendorf, & John, 1990). Each of these categories comprised two to four subcategories. For the third category, of special interest in the present context, the following four subcategories were distinguished: Roles and relationships, Social effects, Pure evaluations, and Attitudes and worldviews.

Notwithstanding the fact that the category of social and reputational aspects gathered the largest number of personality-relevant terms in Allport and Odbert (1936), we can find only snippets of work on the structure of those subcategories. Ostendorf (1996) analyzed the structure of the subcategory of Attitudes and Worldviews, presenting two factors independent from the Big Five: Religiousness and Conservatism versus Radicalism. A study in the Philippines (Imperio, Church, Katigbak, & Reyes, 2008) distinguished ten dimensions of social and physical attributes and concluded that those dimensions convey important information about personality traits while personality dimensions also convey important information about social attributes. Saucier (2010) analyzed the structure of terms describing social effects, distinguishing two factors that were interpreted from an evolutionary standpoint: the first one was about excitement versus boredom that a person creates in others, and the other was about aversion that a person creates in others. Saucier (2010) concluded that those two social effects factors describe the well-known pleasure versus pain effects. Benet-Martinez and Waller (2002) analysed the structure of terms related to the subcategory of pure evaluations and interpreted five factors: Distinction, Worthlessness, Depravity, Unconventionality and Stupidity. No studies were found yet on the subcategory of roles and relationships. Saucier (2010) collected ratings on familiarity and usefulness in personality description for the terms denoting social roles and relationships but later concentrated only on the structure of social effects. To the best of my knowledge, the superordinate category of social and

reputational aspects as a whole has not yet been analysed in the psycho-lexical arena.

The current study

The goal of the current study is to explore the structure of adjectives describing social and reputational aspects of personality in the Croatian lexicon. The study is primarily on the structure of the three subcategories: social effects, attitudes and worldviews, and roles and relationships. In order to find out about how meaningful the subcategories are in producing a common structure, also the overarching structure of the superordinate category of social and reputational aspects is explored.

This study is part of the project on a new Croatian taxonomy that aims to explore the structure of the Croatian personality lexicon for the whole of language through a series of "lesser-breadth" taxonomies that are aimed towards the structure of specific word classes and specific personality-descriptive categories. Those taxonomies can be viewed as complementary to De Raad and Barelds' (2008) comprehensive or "mega-taxonomic" approach. While the Dutch new taxonomy aimed to encompass the whole language at once, the Croatian new taxonomy aims to encompass the whole language step by step. The current investigation on social and reputational aspects of personality is organized in two studies, the first aiming at a full list of terms describing social and reputational aspects of personality, and the second involving the structuring of that domain. For these purposes, we follow a combined German (Angleitner et al., 1990) and Dutch (De Raad, 1992) methodology.

Study 1: Selection and classification of trait terms

The specific goal of Study 1, to arrive at a full list of terms describing social and reputational aspects, was embedded in a larger framework that involved exploiting results from a previous study (Mlačić & Ostendorf, 2005) in combination with a fresh collection of terms for the description of the various categories of personality using a more recent edition of a Croatian dictionary. This Study 1 consisted of two steps, the first involving the selection of all personality relevant words from a recent edition of a dictionary (Anić, 2000) not contained in the previously used 1991 edition; this latter one was the last edition for more than 90 years. The second step involved the classification of those new terms, combining the results with the previously published one, and selecting the set of terms describing social and reputational aspects for Study 2.

METHOD

Step 1: Construction of a comprehensive list of Croatian personality descriptors

Three judges (two psychologists and one linguist; two males, one female, $M = 31$ years) were recruited for the first step. Since this study is a part of the developing Croa-

Table 1. Classification of person characteristics in the Croatian language

Category label	Selected adjectives classified		Adjectives classified in previous study		Combination	
	<i>N</i>	α	<i>N</i>	α	<i>N</i>	%
1) Dispositions	104	.86	483	.89	587	11
1a) Temperament and character	79	.86	362	.88	441	8
1b) Abilities and talents	21	.81	63	.83	84	2
2) Temporary conditions	220	.88	668	.87	888	17
2a) Experiential states	31	.89	208	.94	239	4
2b) Physical and bodily states	11	.90	64	.92	75	1
2c) Observable activities	173	.88	260	.83	433	8
3) Social and reputational aspects	271	.83	1,141	.86	1,412	26
3a) Roles and relationships	23	.77	135	.86	158	3
3b) Social effects	17	.69	128	.83	145	3
3c) Pure evaluations	129	.86	528	.86	657	12
3d) Attitudes and worldviews	49	.88	180	.87	229	4
4) Overt characteristics and appearance	101	.94	427	.94	528	10
4a) Anatomy and constitution	61	.95	256	.94	317	6
4b) Appearance, looks, deportment	32	.88	143	.88	175	3
5) Terms of limited utility	161	.80	495	.82	656	12
5a) Context-specific or technical	105	.79	308	.78	413	8
5b) Metaphorical, vague, outmoded	32	.81	111	.82	143	3
Number of terms receiving majority classifications						
Superordinate categories	857		3,214		4,071	75.7
Subordinate categories	763		2,746		3,509	65.3
Number of terms in the total pool	1,494		3,881		5,375	100

Note: The category system with the number (and percentage in the total pool) of Croatian adjectives assigned to that category by the majority of the judges with the reliability of prototypicality scores

tian new taxonomy, the judges searched all adjectives that could be used to describe persons in the newest available edition of a Croatian dictionary (Anić, 2000). In order to be as inclusive as possible, the selections of the three judges were combined, thus leading to a total of 1,494 new personality-relevant adjectives, not covered in the earlier Croatian personality taxonomy (Mlačić & Ostendorf, 2005).

Step 2: Classification of all Croatian personality-relevant adjectives

The aim of the second step of the first study was to classify all personality-relevant adjectives using the German classification system that permits the distinction between categories of person description. The 1,494 adjectives extracted in step 1 were the subject of research in this next step.

A total of 7 judges (4 males, 3 females, $M = 28$ years), psychologists, students of psychology, and one sociologist were recruited for the classification task. The judges received written 16-pages instructions (Mlačić & Ostendorf, 2005; adapted according to Angleitner et al. 1990) with extensive definitions of each category in the taxonomy, differences between the categories as well as several adjectives per category that served as examples. The judges had to generate a synonym or a short definition of the particular adjective, in order to ensure that they know the meaning of the adjective, then to rate their familiarity with the adjective on a 3-point scale, and to rate the personality relevance of that particular adjective, also on a 3-point rating

scale. Only after the adjective had passed the ratings of familiarity and of personality relevance, the judge had to move to the classification task, i.e. to classify the adjective into one of the 13 subordinate categories. The judges received a booklet containing 1,494 adjectives.

RESULTS

Classification of a term was done on the basis of a majority rule. In accordance with the German methodology, an adjective was considered prototypical of a category if it was classified into that category by four or more of the seven judges (that is at least 57 %). Table 1 gives the category labels, the classified adjectives, the previous classification results, and the combined results. The interjudge agreements of the classifications were similar to those of the first Croatian taxonomy (Mlačić & Ostendorf, 2005). Using this 57 per cent cut-off rule on the combined results in the last column of Table 1, 75.7 per cent of the 5,375 adjectives can be considered as prototypical members of one of the superordinate categories, while 65.3 per cent represented prototypical members for the subordinate categories.

The largest superordinate category, accounting for 26 per cent of the total pool, was the category of interest for this study, the category of Social and reputational aspects. Interestingly, the category of Dispositions that had the interest of each and every psycho-lexical researcher took the next to last place in terms of the number of adjectives in

Table 2. Internal consistencies, Cronbach's alpha's, for social attitudes scales and personality, for self- and peer-ratings

	self	peer
SDI-3 ISMS (28 items)		
Alpha (tradition oriented religiousness)	.79	.75
Beta (unmitigated self-interest)	.66	.70
Gamma (protection of civil institutions)	.66	.55
Delta (subjective spirituality)	.72	.72
SAS-G (25 items)		
Religiosity	.93	.93
Sexual freedom	.81	.83
Cosmopolitanism	.87	.86
Modern technology	.93	.93
Social justice	.76	.81
Big Five IPIP-100 (100 items)		
Extraversion	.93	.91
Agreeableness	.88	.90
Conscientiousness	.89	.91
Emotional stability	.94	.93
Intellect/Imagination	.85	.89

the lexicon, thus attesting that there is more to personality than dispositional traits (De Raad & Mlačić, in press).

This category of Social and reputational aspects was also the largest one in other taxonomies that used this classification system, as in German (Ostendorf, 1990), Czech (Hřebíčkova & Ostendorf, 1995), Filipino (Church, Katigbak, & Reyes, 1996), and Polish (Szarota, Ashton, & Lee, 2007). Some taxonomists have rejected the value of this category for personality description, mainly because of the large subcategory of Pure evaluations. Allport and Odbert (1936) stated: "Since column III contains evaluative (characterial) terms, it should be avoided by psychologists..." (p. vii), and "terms like *good, bad, worthy, undesirable, disgusting, useful, or perfect*, though frequently applied to people, are purely censorial, and have absolutely no direct reference to personality" (p. 18). Norman (1967) excluded evaluative terms, referring to them as: "simply honorific or pejorative" (p.11). Benet-Martinez and Waller (2002), on the other hand, had special interest in highly evaluative terms and distinguished five evaluative factors.

The interest of this study was in exploring the descriptive rather than evaluative aspects of social and reputational terms, and because the German classification system permits a distinction between pure evaluations and other terms that describe the social and reputational aspects, the pure evaluations were excluded from further analyses. For Study 2, this leaves us with 532 adjectives prototypical of social effects (145), attitudes and worldviews (229), and roles and relationships (158).

Since the adjectives describing the social and reputational aspects of personality can be seen as a product of social stimuli, but also tend to be dispositional in nature, for purposes of validation also additional measures were employed in Study 2. Those additional measures were chosen for their relevance to the main construct of this study and as a possible help in interpreting the factors derived from the analyses of social and reputational adjectives.

Study 2: Structure of Croatian adjectives describing social and reputational aspects

METHODS

Participants

For the purposes of this study, two samples of participants were recruited, one for self-ratings and the other for peer-ratings. The self-ratings were provided by 524 students from the University of Zagreb (258 females, 264 males, two did not report gender), their ages ranged from 18 to 28 years (Mean age 20 years, SD 1.7). The peer ratings were provided by 502 close acquaintances of the participants from the self-report sample (291 females, 198 males, 13 did not report gender). Their ages ranged from 13 to 75 years (Mean age 25.6 years, SD 11.0). Each peer rated one target person, and the mean period of target-peer acquaintanceship was 10 years. Altogether, there were 478 matched pairs of self- and peer-ratings.

Measures

The measures included the list of social and reputational adjectives, a Big Five measure, and, because of the "dispositional-social" ambiguity in social aspects of personality, two measures of social attitudes.

Social and reputational adjectives

The raters were given the 532 social and reputational adjectives, presented in random order, and provided with a 5-point rating scale, ranging from (1 = very inaccurate, 2 = moderately inaccurate, 3 = neither inaccurate nor accurate, 4 = moderately accurate, 5 = very accurate). In case the participants were not familiar with the meaning of an adjective, they were instructed to respond with a "0".

Social attitudes and personality measures

All three additional measures used the same response format: a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 = very inaccurate, to 5 = very accurate. All of these measures demonstrated acceptable reliabilities. The internal consistencies are given in Table 2.

SDI-3 ISMS. The SDI-3 (Saucier, 2008) is a 28-item social attitudes inventory targeted to measure Saucier's four factors of psycho-lexically based ISMS: Alpha factor or Tradition-Oriented Religiousness, Beta factor or Unmitigated Self-Interest, Gamma factor or Protection of Civil Institutions and Delta factor or Subjective Spirituality.

SAS-G. The General Social Attitudes Scale (Milas, Mlačić, & Mikloušić, 2013) is a 25-item social attitudes scale developed using the catch-phrase approach (Wilson & Patterson, 1968), and consisting of five scales: Religiosity, Sexual Freedom, Cosmopolitanism, Modern Technology, and Social Justice, each represented with five catch phrases.

IPIP-100. This Big-Five measure (Mlačić & Goldberg, 2007) consisted of short behavior-descriptive sentences, with 20 items per dimension.

Table 3. Eigenvalues of factors of social and reputational aspects of personality

Factor	Social Effects		Attitudes & Worldviews		Roles & Relationships		Social & Reputational aspects	
	self	peer	self	peer	self	peer	self	peer
1	17.39	14.73	17.61	14.16	12.78	11.03	31.10	29.82
2	7.93	6.46	11.33	11.14	5.03	5.53	21.01	18.84
3	3.99	4.33	6.07	5.28	4.69	4.20	16.73	11.93
4	3.81	4.07	4.66	5.04	3.51	3.98	10.60	10.12
5	3.32	3.69	4.37	4.56	3.31	3.67	8.26	8.80
6	2.78	2.83	3.79	3.73	2.92	2.75	7.70	7.74
7	2.34	2.75	3.50	3.12	2.88	2.71	6.59	6.42
8	2.13	2.30	3.14	2.81	2.71	2.51	6.02	5.96
9	2.01	2.19	2.88	2.68	2.35	2.32	5.46	5.21
10	1.95	2.13	2.76	2.58	2.15	2.16	5.05	4.87
Total amounts of variance explained	21.24	18.50	17.95	15.69	16.67	15.39	16.94	15.08

Procedures

The 532 list of adjectives were always administered first, followed by the social attitudes and Big-Five measures. The participants in the self-report sample were approached at the beginning of the semester, and asked to participate in the study. They were also instructed to choose the person who “knows them best.”

The self-raters were instructed to describe themselves as accurately as possible, using the four instruments. The peer-raters were asked to describe the target person with the same instruments, now put in the third-person format. The raters were given the instruments in separate envelopes (for self-ratings and peer-ratings) and were asked to deliver them back in a week. There were no financial incentives for the participants. Although the participation was anonymous, the participants were offered with an incentive of getting the interpretation of their scores, provided they sent the identification number from the envelope to the researchers.

Analyses

Since the participants had the option to indicate whether they were familiar with the meaning of an adjective or not, it was decided to exclude all adjectives from the total set that were unfamiliar to at least 25 per cent of the participants. This led to the exclusion of 63 adjectives from further analyses. Of these, 22 were from the subcategory roles and relationships, leaving 136 adjectives for that subcategory. From social effects, seven adjectives were excluded, leaving 138 for that subcategory. Finally, from the subcategory of attitudes and worldviews, 34 were excluded, leaving 195. Other psycho-lexical studies also excluded terms that were unfamiliar to a substantial percentage of the sample (Hřebíčková, 1995; Mlačić & Ostendorf, 2005; Saucier & Ostendorf, 1999) in order to strengthen the generalizability of the results.

The self- and peer-ratings on the remaining 469 adjectives were separately submitted to principal components analyses followed by Varimax rotation. In order to control for response bias, the participants' responses were ipsatized (Ten Berge, 1999) prior to the analyses.

Because the category of social and reputational aspects has rarely been systematically investigated, and because this is one of the first studies on the subcategories of social effects, roles and relationships, and attitudes and worldviews in a single research, it was decided to use different guidelines for the determination of the optimal number of factors to be retained. Two to eight principal components were extracted for inspection of factor content for each of the three subcategories, as well as for the whole category of social and reputational aspects. We used scree tests (Cattell, 1966), congruence coefficients between the factors from self- and peer-ratings, and the so-called “bass-ackwards” method (Goldberg, 2006) to arrive at the final sets of factors.

In addition to this, the social and reputational factors were correlated with the remaining three measures (i.e., SDI-3, SAS-G, and IPIP100). As in other psycho-lexical studies, participants' responses to items in these latter three instruments were not ipsatized.

RESULTS

Social effects subcategory

The eigenvalues of the first ten principal-components for the 138 adjectives describing the subcategory of social effects in the self-ratings and in peer-ratings are given in Table 3. Solutions with two to eight factors were inspected, while the scree tests suggested no more than four or five factors. Congruence coefficients (Tucker's phi, 1951) calculated between the self-based and peer-based components amounted to .95, .94, and .81 for solutions three factors; with more factors congruencies for additional factors tended to get lower than .80. Therefore, three factors were accepted. The three factors accounted for 21.24 per cent of the total variance in the self-ratings, and 18.50 per cent in the peer-ratings. The two factor structures are represented by the adjectives with loadings of at least |.30| in Tables 4 and 5, respectively. The three factors respectively had 45, 43, and 14 adjectives with such loading for self-ratings, and 42, 36, and 15 for peer-ratings, with on average more than four times as many on the positive pole than on the negative pole, in some cases resulting in unipolar factors.

Table 4. Social Effects, self-ratings; Varimax-rotated three-factor structure of the 145 adjectives ($N = 524$)

	Social Effects Components		
	Attractiveness-Popularity	Mysteriousness-Irritation	Likeability
Neodoljiv (Irresistible)	.64*	-.03	.03
Primjetljiv (Noticeable)	.64*	-.08	-.08
Interesantan (Interesting)	.63*	-.07	.14
Impresivan (Impressive)	.63*	-.03	-.04
Zapažen (Noticed)	.61*	-.08	-.06
Primamljiv (Alluring)	.61*	-.07	.10
Privlačan (Attractive)	.61*	-.14	.17
Nezaboravan (Unforgettable)	.59*	-.01	.03
Upečatljiv (Remarkable)	.59*	.03	-.13
Zamaman (Enticing)	.59*	.05	.14
Popularan (Popular)	.58*	-.22	-.05
Zanimljiv (Interesting)	.57*	-.08	.17
Poželjan (Desirable)	.56*	-.21	.14
Zavodljiv (Seductive)	.56*	-.03	.16
Dojmljiv (Convincing)	.56*	-.10	.10
Primjetan (Perceptible)	.55*	-.09	-.04
Uzbudljiv (Exciting)	.54*	.05	.14
Magnetičan (Magnetic)	.54*	.02	.01
Zamamljiv (Alluring)	.53*	.05	.20
Zabavan (Amusing)	.53*	-.13	.23
Nezapažen (Unnoticed)	-.60*	.30	.12
Neprimjetan (Unnoticeable)	-.58*	.23	.10
Nezanimljiv (Uninteresting)	-.56*	.30	.00
Nepopularan (Unpopular)	-.47*	.37	.09
Neutjecajan (Uninfluential)	-.40*	.21	.24
Neiskusani (Inexperienced)	-.35*	.26	.16
Neuvjerljiv (Unpersuasive)	-.33*	.25	.06
Neafirmiran (Unestablished)	-.33*	.32	.21
Suhoparan (Platitudinous)	-.32*	.27	-.09
Neshvaćen (Misunderstood)	-.23	.57*	-.07
Uznemiravajući (Disturbing)	.02	.54*	-.09
Iritantan (Irritating)	-.16	.52*	-.19
Nedokučiv (Incomprehensible)	-.07	.51*	-.12
Bizaran (Bizarre)	.10	.49*	-.08
Nelagodan (Uneasy)	-.21	.49*	-.23
Nepodnosiv (Unbearable)	-.26	.47*	-.16
Začudojući (Astonishing)	.06	.46*	-.05
Nepristupačan (Inaccessible)	-.16	.45*	-.22
Zagonetan (Enigmatic)	.07	.45*	-.03
Zapleten (Intricate)	-.19	.45*	.08
Uznemirujući (Disturbing)	-.13	.45*	-.03
Tragičan (Tragic)	-.16	.43*	.04
Odbojan (Repulsive)	-.37	.43*	-.14
Tragikomičan (Tragicomic)	-.06	.43*	.01
Neprijatan (Unpleasant)	-.22	.43*	-.22
Umarački (Wearisome)	-.26	.42*	-.06
Dalek (Aloof)	-.20	.41*	-.09
Poguban (Baleful)	.04	.41*	-.33
Začudan (Wondrous)	.08	.40*	.03
Razumljiv (Articulate)	.11	-.40*	.12
Poštovan (Respected)	.23	-.38*	.13
Ugodan (Agreeable)	.26	-.38*	.32
Dostupan (Accessible)	.04	-.34*	.27
Ugledan (Respectable)	.31	-.32*	-.10
Pristupačan (Approachable)	.10	-.31*	.21
Raspoloživ (Available)	.19	-.31*	.22
Mio (Lovable)	.27	-.22	.58*

Table continued next column

Table 4 continued

Dragi (Dear)	.26	-.18	.57*
Umiljat (Amiable)	.13	-.13	.55*
Drag (Dear)	.27	-.24	.48*
Umilan (Likeable)	.05	-.05	.47*
Bezopasan (Harmless)	-.17	-.10	.44*
Simpatičan (Likeable)	.42	-.23	.43*
Milozvučan (Melodious)	.19	-.15	.43*
Dirljiv (Touching)	.05	-.10	.41*
Damski (Ladylike)	.17	-.02	.39*
Prijatan (Pleasant)	.09	-.35	.38*
Superioran (Superior)	.29	.02	-.40*
Zastrašujući (Scary)	.15	.31	-.35*
Nadležan (Competent)	.07	-.11	-.33*

Note: The highest factor loading of each variable is indicated by an asterisk (*). Loadings of |0.30| or higher are printed in bold.

Self-rating factors of social effects

The first self-rating factor was labeled Attractiveness-Popularity, as defined by terms like *irresistible*, *noticeable*, *interesting*, *impressive*, and *alluring* versus *unnoticed*, *uninteresting*, *unpopular*, *uninfluential* and *inexperienced*. This factor relates to Saucier's (2010) first "social effects" factor that describes excitement versus boredom that a person creates in others. The second factor was labeled Mysteriousness-Irritation, as defined by terms such as *misunderstood*, *disturbing*, *irritating*, *incomprehensible*, and *bizarre* versus *articulate*, *respected*, *agreeable*, *accessible* and *approachable*. This factor seems to relate to Saucier's (2010) second "social effects" factor on aversion that a person creates in others. The third factor was labeled Likeability, with such terms as *lovable*, *dear*, *amiable*, *likeable* and *harmless* versus *superior* and *scary*¹. With four self-rating factors, the Mysteriousness-Irritation factor split into a larger and a smaller factor, of which the latter represented aspects of mysteriousness and aloofness.

Peer-rating factors of social effects

The first factor was labeled Attractiveness-Popularity, just as for self-ratings, and defined by adjectives such as *irresistible*, *alluring*, *seductive*, *impressive*, and *unforgettable* versus *unnoticed*, *uninteresting*, *unpopular*, *uninfluential*, and *platitudinous*. The second factor was labeled Mysteriousness-Irritation, similar to the second self-rating factor, and defined by adjectives such as *misunderstood*, *incomprehensible*, *disturbing*, and *wearisome* versus *respectable*. The third factor was again labeled Likeability, and defined by adjectives such as *likeable*, *agreeable*, *dear*, *pleasant*, and *welcome* versus *competent*. With four peer-rating-factors, the Attractiveness-Popularity split into two factors, one with emphasis on features of attractiveness and the other with features of popularity or noticeability.

¹ It would be interesting to discuss the hierarchical structure of social effects, attitudes and worldviews, roles and relationships as well as the superordinate category of social and reputational aspects of personality. However, the length of this manuscript and the abundance of material does not permit that. Nevertheless, interested researchers can obtain the correlations among orthogonal factor scores from adjoining levels for all analyses upon request. Therefore, only the information about the next factor-structure level beyond those interpreted is provided in the text.

Table 5. Social Effects, peer-ratings; Varimax-rotated three-factor structure of the 145 adjectives ($N = 502$)

	Social Effects Components		
	Attractiveness- Popularity	Mysteriousness- Irritation	Likeability
Neodoljiv (Irresistible)	.62*	-.01	.17
Primamljiv (Alluring)	.57*	-.03	.10
Zavodljiv (Seductive)	.57*	-.06	.11
Impresivan (Impressive)	.53*	-.02	.19
Nezaboravan (Unforgettable)	.53*	.01	.14
Privlačan (Attractive)	.53*	-.09	.28
Primjetljiv (Noticeable)	.52*	-.02	-.14
Uzbudljiv (Exciting)	.52*	.02	-.04
Magnetičan (Magnetic)	.51*	.06	.06
Zamaman (Enticing)	.50*	-.01	.18
Popularan (Popular)	.50*	-.13	.04
Poželjan (Desirable)	.50*	-.12	.19
Opojan (Intoxicating)	.50*	.06	.02
Zapažen (Noticed)	.49*	.00	-.06
Interesantan (Interesting)	.48*	.04	.35
Dojmljiv (Convincing)	.47*	-.12	.25
Zanimljiv (Interesting)	.46*	.03	.33
Upečatljiv (Remarkable)	.46*	-.02	-.07
Zamamljiv (Alluring)	.44*	.04	.10
Pamtljiv (Memorable)	.42*	-.09	.08
Nezapažen (Unnoticed)	-.52*	.30	.19
Neprijetkan (Unnoticeable)	-.46*	.12	.34
Nezanimljiv (Uninteresting)	-.43*	.03	.12
Nepopularan (Unpopular)	-.41*	.30	.15
Neutjecajan (Uninfluential)	-.38*	.17	.41
Suhoparan (Platitudinous)	-.37*	.17	.04
Neuvjerljiv (Unpersuasive)	-.35*	.25	.09
Zaglušljujući (Stultifying)	-.34*	.33	-.08
Neukusan (Distasteful)	-.33*	.32	.01
Odbojan (Repulsive)	-.33*	.21	.02
Neshvaćen (Misunderstood)	-.14	.58*	.04
Nedokučiv (Incomprehensible)	-.04	.52*	.02
Uznemiravajući (Disturbing)	-.05	.50*	-.13
Umarački (Wearisome)	-.29	.45*	-.17
Bizaran (Bizarre)	-.01	.44*	-.07
Nepriступan (Inaccessible)	-.14	.43*	-.07
Poguban (Baleful)	-.04	.43*	-.18
Uznemirujući (Disturbing)	-.04	.43*	-.12
Neprijatan (Unpleasant)	-.27	.43*	-.16
Iritantan (Irritating)	-.27	.42*	-.08
Kontroverzan (Controversial)	.06	.40*	-.19
Neumjestan (Inappropriate)	-.27	.40*	-.18
Zabrinjujući (Troublesome)	-.08	.40*	.04
Zagonetan (Enigmatic)	.20	.39*	-.10
Začudjujući (Astonishing)	.16	.39*	.09
Zapleten (Intricate)	.03	.38*	.04
Dalek (Aloof)	-.15	.38*	-.20
Zapanjujući (Amazing)	.37	.37*	.00
Potresan (Agitating)	.03	.37*	-.20
Tajanstven (Mystic)	.08	.37*	.00
Zastrašujuć (Scary)	.06	.36*	-.14
Tragičan (Tragic)	.01	.36*	-.03
Ugledan (Respectable)	.24	-.34*	-.04
Simpatičan (Likeable)	.39	-.11	.62*
Ugodan (Agreeable)	.20	-.27	.58*
Dragi (Dear)	.35	-.12	.52*
Drag (Dear)	.27	-.17	.52*

Table continued next column

Table 5 continued

Mio (Lovable)	.34	-.17	.46*
Prijatan (Pleasant)	.14	-.36	.45*
Osvojiv (Conquerable)	-.07	-.02	.43*
Dobrodošao (Welcome)	.19	-.13	.37*
Umilan (Likeable)	.28	-.14	.36*
Dostupan (Accessible)	.04	-.18	.35*
Raspoloživ (Available)	.08	-.19	.34*
Podnošljiv (Tolerable)	.02	.00	.34*
Dodirljiv (Touchable)	-.04	-.09	.31*
Razumljiv (Articulate)	.02	-.27	.30*
Nadležan (Competent)	.04	-.04	-.37*

Note The highest factor loading of each variable is indicated by an asterisk (*). Loadings of |0.30| or higher are printed in bold.

Attitudes and worldviews subcategory

The eigenvalues of the first ten principal components based on ratings on the 195 pertaining adjectives are given in Table 3 for both self- and peer-ratings. Also in this case congruence coefficients were calculated between self- and peer-rating factors, resulting in the coefficients .97, .92, and .90 for three factors. With more factors the coefficients for additional factors tended to be lower than .80. Also for attitudes and worldviews three factors were accepted for both self- and peer-ratings. Those three factors accounted for 17.95 per cent of the total variance in the self-ratings and 15.69 per cent in the peer-ratings. The numbers of significant positive loading respectively were 54, 34, and 19 for self-ratings, and 41, 34, and 32 for peer-ratings; in this case the number of positive loadings on average was about twice the number of negative loadings. The structures with three factors for both self- and peer-ratings are represented in Tables 6 and 7.

Self-rating factors of attitudes and worldviews

The first factor was labeled Religiosity-Patriotism, defined by terms like *catholic*, *Christian*, *pious*, *patriotic*, *religious* versus *impious*, *anational*², *sacrilegious*, *blasphemous*, *anarchistic*. The one pole seems to gather attributes of the dominant religious and patriotic culture in Croatia, and the other pole the attributes of atheism and left-wing-liberal attitudes. This factor can be compared to the Religiousness factor in Ostendorf (1996), although Ostendorf's factor lacks the patriotism component. The second factor was labeled Totalitarianism versus Humanism-Democracy, defined by adjectives such as *totalitarian*, *discriminatory*, *militaristic*, *militant*, *racist* versus *humanistic*, *peace-making*, *democratic*, *philanthropic*, and *ethical*. This factor bears some resemblance to Ostendorf's (1996) factor Conservatism versus Radicalism, in which patriotic elements fused with conservative elements as opposed to the anti-authoritarian attitudes. The third factor was labeled Modernism, as defined by such terms as *modern*, *progressive*, *scientific*, *global*, *aware of social problems* versus *reactionary*, *unmodern*, *narrow-minded*, and *unscientific*. With four factors extracted, the fourth factor would represent a split off of the negative pole of Religiosity-Patriotism, representing left-wing attitudes.

² Not adhering to one's national culture

Table 6. Attitudes and Worldviews; Varimax-rotated three-factor structure of the 229 adjectives ($N = 524$)

	Attitudes and Worldviews Components		
	Religiosity-Patriotism	Totalitarianism vs. Humanism-Democracy	Modernism
Katolički (Catholic)	.78*	-.11	-.11
Kršćanski (Christian)	.77*	-.11	-.20
Pobožan (Pious)	.73*	-.16	-.25
Rodoljuban (Patriotic)	.72*	.04	.02
Domoljubni (Patriotic)	.72*	.09	-.03
Religiozan (Religious)	.71*	-.20	-.24
Rodoljubiv (Patriotic)	.71*	.02	.06
Domoljubiv (Patriotic)	.70*	.05	.03
Jednobožački (Monotheistic)	.68*	-.12	-.11
Vjernički (Believing)	.68*	-.17	-.24
Rimokatolički (Roman-Catholic)	.68*	-.10	-.17
Pobožnjački (Pietistic)	.67*	-.14	-.29
Domovinski (Domestic)	.67*	.09	.04
Nacionalan (National)	.59*	.21	-.01
Kroatocentričan (Croatocentric)	.56*	.31	-.01
Starokatolički (Old-Catholic)	.54*	-.02	-.35
Narodni (National)	.53*	.08	.01
Bogobojazan (God-Fearing)	.53*	-.13	-.28
Teološki (Theological)	.52*	-.14	-.23
Pravovjerman (Orthodox)	.50*	-.07	-.06
Bezbožan (Impious)	-.68*	.11	.11
Anacionalan (Anational)	-.59*	-.12	-.04
Svetogrdan (Sacrilegious)	-.52*	.25	-.07
Bogohulan (Blasphemous)	-.49*	.27	-.01
Anarhistički (Anarchistic)	-.47*	.03	-.16
Komunistički (Communitic)	-.44*	.20	-.09
Budistički (Buddhist)	-.40*	-.08	-.12
Ljevičarski (Leftist)	-.40*	-.03	.10
Liberalan (Liberal)	-.36*	-.30	.23
Istocnjački (Oriental)	-.36*	-.03	-.14
Vegetarijanski (Vegetarian)	-.36*	-.25	-.19
Nomadski (Nomad)	-.35*	.01	-.18
Politeistički (Polytheistic)	-.33*	.07	-.15
Utopijski (Utopian)	-.32*	.05	-.03
Utopistički (Utopian)	-.32*	.04	-.01
Nudistički (Nudist)	-.32*	.01	-.14
Marksistički (Marxistic)	-.31*	.00	-.02
Opozicijski (Oppositional)	-.31*	.05	.18
Socijalistički (Socialistic)	-.31*	.04	-.03
Pravoslavan (Eastern Orthodox)	-.31*	-.03	-.20
Totalitaran (Totalitarian)	-.04	.57*	.04
Diskriminacijski (Discriminatory)	-.03	.56*	-.16
Militaristički (Militaristic)	.02	.56*	-.07
Totalitaristički (Totalitaristic)	-.10	.54*	-.04
Militantan (Militant)	.05	.54*	-.11
Rasistički (Racist)	.00	.51*	-.28
Šovinistički (Chauvinistic)	-.10	.51*	-.23
Fašistoidan (Acts Like A Fascist)	-.10	.49*	-.23
Fašistički (Fascistic)	-.08	.46*	-.22
Ustaški (Right-Wing Extremists)	.20	.46*	-.12
Režimski (Pro-Regime)	.07	.43*	.08
Monarhistički (Monarchist)	-.17	.43*	-.18
Caristički (Czarist)	-.23	.42*	.01
Autoritaran (Authoritarian)	.04	.40*	.06

Continued next column

Table 6 continued

Materijalistički (Materialistic)	-.03	.40*	.11
Častohlepan (Glory-Seeking)	-.02	.39*	.13
Stranački (Partisan)	.16	.38*	.06
Predrasudni (Prejudiced)	.14	.37*	-.04
Vlastoljubiv (Power-Loving)	.01	.37*	.08
Političan (Political)	.08	.35*	.13
Humanistički (Humanistic)	.00	-.56*	.21
Mirotvoran (Peace Making)	-.01	-.49*	.06
Demokratičan (Democratic)	.04	-.46*	.26
Humanitaran (Humanitarian)	.04	-.45*	.05
Čovjekoljubiv (Philanthropic)	.23	-.45*	.02
Demokratski (Democratic)	.17	-.40*	.21
Ekološki (Ecological)	.01	-.39*	.11
Ekologijski (Ecologic)	.02	-.36*	.11
Multikulturalan (Multicultural)	-.26	-.35*	.16
Etičan (Ethical)	.08	-.35*	.12
Slobodoljubiv (Freedom-Loving)	-.06	-.33*	.19
Suvremen (Modern)	-.02	-.01	.52*
Naprednjački (Progressive)	.03	.06	.51*
Progresivan (Progressive)	-.08	.04	.46*
Znanstven (Scientific)	-.13	.06	.41*
Globalan (Global)	-.18	-.07	.40*
Osviješten (Aware Social Problems)	-.09	-.15	.37*
Futuristički (Futuristic)	-.05	.17	.37*
Progresistički (Progressive)	-.12	.07	.37*
Modernistički (Modernistic)	-.08	-.02	.37*
Racionalistički (Rationalistic)	-.02	-.12	.37*
Progresivistički (Progressive)	-.08	-.03	.33*
Slobodarski (Freedom-Loving)	-.13	-.18	.32*
Nazadan (Reactionary)	-.13	.08	-.44*
Nesuvremen (Unmodern)	-.07	-.04	-.44*
Islamski (Islamic)	-.27	.00	-.38*
Grkoistočni (Greek Orthodox)	-.26	.00	-.37*
Zatucan (Narrow-Minded)	-.08	.17	-.35*
Ruralan (Rural)	.08	.03	-.34*
Neznanstven (Unscientific)	-.09	-.15	-.33*

Note: The highest factor loading of each variable is indicated by an asterisk (*). Loadings of |0.30| or higher are printed in bold.

Peer-rating factors of attitudes and worldviews

The first factor in peer-rating data was labeled Religiosity-Patriotism, as in the case of self-ratings. The factor was defined by *Christian, pious, catholic, religious, believing* versus *impious, anational, blasphemous, sacrilegious*, and *anarchistic*. The second factor was labeled Modernism defined by *progressive, modern, futuristic, positivist, civic* versus *reactionary, narrow-minded, unscientific, fascistic*, and *petty-bourgeois*. The content of this factor aligns closely with the third factor of the self-ratings, but this peer-rating factor was larger than its self-rating counterpart and it gathered some of the totalitarianism content of the negative pole of the second self-rating factor. The third factor was labeled Totalitarianism versus Humanism-Democracy, defined by *totalitarian, power-loving, militaristic, prejudiced, extremist* versus *humanitarian, philanthropic, peace-making, ethical*, and *apolitical*. In this factor the narcissistic component was more pronounced than in the corresponding self-rating factor. With four factors, the additional factor would represent a split off of the Modernism factor, emphasizing education and ecology.

Roles and relationships subcategory

The eigenvalues of the first ten principal-components of both self- and peer-ratings on the 136 adjectives describing

Table 7. Attitudes and Worldviews, peer-ratings; *Varimax-rotated three-factor structure of the 229 adjectives (N = 502)*

	Attitudes and Worldviews Components		
	Religiosity-Patriotism	Modernism	Totalitarianism vs. Humanism-Democracy
Kršćanski (Christian)	.77*	-.14	-.17
Pobožan (Pious)	.74*	-.25	-.17
Katolički (Catholic)	.71*	-.21	-.09
Religiozan (Religious)	.69*	-.24	-.16
Vjernički (Believing)	.69*	-.24	-.18
Rimokatolički (Roman-Catholic)	.67*	-.12	-.13
Pobožnjački (Pietistic)	.67*	-.23	-.15
Domoljubni (Patriotic)	.66*	.11	.07
Domoljubiv (Patriotic)	.66*	.11	.07
Rodoljubljan (Patriotic)	.63*	.13	.07
Domovinski (Domestic)	.61*	.09	.11
Rodoljubiv (Patriotic)	.61*	.13	.09
Jednobožački (Monotheistic)	.55*	-.13	-.13
Kroatocentričan (Croatocentric)	.53*	-.10	.27
Bogomoljački (Ultrareligious)	.52*	-.26	-.07
Bogobojazan (God-Fearing)	.50*	-.26	-.12
Nacionalan (National)	.47*	-.06	.22
Teološki (Theological)	.46*	-.32	-.02
Starokatolički (Old-Catholic)	.46*	-.25	.00
Teologijski (Theological)	.46*	-.27	-.06
Bezbožan (Impious)	-.65*	.04	.14
Anacionalan (Anational)	-.49*	-.05	-.11
Bogohulan (Blasphemous)	-.42*	-.19	.21
Svetogrdan (Sacrilegious)	-.41*	-.16	.10
Nudistički (Nudist)	-.40*	-.18	.09
Anarhistički (Anarchistic)	-.38*	-.13	.11
Komunistički (Communitic)	-.35*	-.13	.22
Budistički (Buddhist)	-.33*	-.23	.01
Ljevičarski (Leftist)	-.32*	.04	.07
Marksistički (Marxistic)	-.30*	-.04	.20
Utopistički (Utopian)	-.30*	-.15	.07
Nomadski (Nomad)	-.30*	-.09	-.01
Naprednjački (Progressive)	-.03	.45*	-.05
Suvremen (Modern)	.00	.44*	-.05
Futuristički (Futuristic)	-.02	.38*	.24
Progresivan (Progressive)	-.10	.37*	-.02
Pozitivistički (Positivist)	.18	.37*	-.13
Građanski (Civic)	.08	.37*	-.20
Znanstven (Scientific)	-.03	.36*	.11
Slobodouman (Free-Minded)	-.14	.35*	-.09
Globalan (Global)	-.08	.35*	.04
Progresistički (Progressive)	-.07	.34*	.01
Progresivistički (Progressive)	.04	.34*	-.05
Zapadnjački (Westernized)	-.06	.34*	-.01
Naučan (Scientific)	.05	.34*	-.04
Prosvjetiteljski (Enlightening)	-.02	.33*	-.09
Racionalistički (Rationalistic)	-.01	.33*	-.10
Osviješten (Aware Social Problems)	-.06	.33*	-.17
Prosvjetilački (Enlightening)	.00	.31*	.00
Internacionalan (Internationalist)	-.15	.31*	-.07
Suveren (Top Gun)	-.02	.30*	-.03
Nazadan (Reactionary)	-.09	-.51*	.12
Zatucan (Narrow-Minded)	-.11	-.40*	.14
Neznanstven (Unscientific)	-.22	-.38*	-.10

Continued next column

Column 7 continued

Fašistički (Fascistic)	-.12	-.38*	.27
Islamski (Islamic)	-.21	-.38*	.00
Malograđanski (Petty-Bourgeois)	-.05	-.36*	.21
Nesuvremen (Unmodern)	-.13	-.34*	.02
Grkoistočni (Greek Orthodox)	-.20	-.33*	.03
Amoralan (Amoral)	-.26	-.31*	.24
Nazadnjački (Reactionary)	-.04	-.31*	-.02
Fašistoidan (Acts Like A Fascist)	-.12	-.30*	.29
Pravoslavan (Eastern Orthodox)	-.24	-.30*	-.04
Zadrt (Bigoted)	-.09	-.30*	.15
Fašokomunistički (Fascist-Com)	-.22	-.30*	.21
Totalitaran (Totalitarian)	-.09	-.12	.51*
Totalitaristički (Totalitarianistic)	-.13	-.19	.46*
Vlastoljubiv (Power-Loving)	-.05	-.02	.42*
Militaristički (Militaristic)	.02	-.21	.41*
Jednopartijski (One-Party Supporter)	-.01	-.16	.39*
Desničarski (Right Wing)	.34	-.16	.39*
Predrasudni (Prejudiced)	.02	-.20	.38*
Ekstremistički (Extremistic)	-.11	-.20	.38*
Materijalistički (Materialistic)	-.14	.05	.38*
Diskriminacijski (Discriminatory)	-.04	-.15	.37*
Častohlepan (Glory-Seeking)	-.03	-.02	.37*
Ustaški (like Right-Wing Extremists)	.19	-.16	.36*
Stranački (Partisan)	.15	.02	.36*
Kapitalistički (Capitalistic)	.06	.05	.35*
Megalomanski (Megalomaniacal)	-.15	.02	.35*
Centralistički (Centralistic)	-.05	-.04	.35*
Političan (Political)	.08	.13	.34*
Ekstreman (Extreme)	-.13	-.17	.34*
Monarhistički (Monarchist)	-.04	-.17	.34*
Režimski (Pro-Regime)	-.01	-.10	.34*
Humanitaran (Humanitarian)	.11	.15	-.43*
Čovjekoljubiv (Philanthropic)	.26	.15	-.40*
Mirotvoran (Peace Making)	.04	.17	-.39*
Etičan (Ethical)	.04	.18	-.38*
Nepolitički (Unpolitical)	-.17	-.05	-.36*
Apolitičan (Apolitical)	-.25	-.11	-.32*
Moralan (Moral)	.09	.22	-.30*
Ekologijski (Ecologic)	.04	.25	-.30*

Note: The highest factor loading of each variable is indicated by an asterisk (*). Loadings of |0.30| or higher are printed in bold.

roles and relationships are given in Table 3. Congruence coefficients were calculated between self- and peer-factors for solutions with two to eight factors. It turned out that with three factors the congruence coefficients amounted to .90, .93, and .59. Upon examining the factor content and the hierarchical structure, it was, however, found useful to accept a three-factor solution. Three factors accounted for 16.67 of the total variance in the self-ratings and 15.39 per cent in the peer-ratings. In this case the numbers of positive loadings on average was close to three times the number of negative loadings. The three-factor structures of roles and relationships based on self-ratings is presented in Table 8 and the one based on peer-ratings is presented in Table 9.

Self-rating factors of roles and relationships

The first factor in the self-rating data was labeled Friendliness-Closeness, defined by *friendly, congenial, equal, companionable, close to everyone* versus *unfaithful, disobligning, warring, disloyal, cliquish*. The second factor was named Family Roles, defined by adjectives such as *parent-*

Table 8. Roles and Relationships, self-ratings; Varimax-rotated three-factor structure of the 136 adjectives ($N = 524$)

	Roles and Relationships Components		
	Friendliness-Closeness	Family Roles	Leadership vs. Subordination
Prijateljski (Friendly)	.63*	.02	-.07
Gostoprimljiv (Congenial)	.52*	.12	-.13
Ravnopravan (Equal)	.49*	-.16	.09
Družbenički (Companionable)	.47*	.10	-.01
Bližnji (Next Of Kin)	.47*	.22	-.27
Blizak (Close To Everyone)	.46*	.21	-.26
Složan (In Concert With Others)	.46*	.06	-.07
Odan (Devoted)	.46*	.09	-.22
Gostoljubiv (Hospitable)	.45*	.14	-.19
Drugarski (Comradely)	.45*	.02	-.11
Solidaran (Solidary)	.45*	-.01	-.26
Suradujuć (Cooperative)	.44*	-.01	-.13
Kolegijalan (Collegial)	.42*	.01	-.10
Privržen (Attached)	.41*	.14	-.38
Lojalan (Loyal)	.40*	.03	-.26
Intiman (Intimate)	.39*	.04	-.20
Prisan (Intimate)	.37*	.14	-.34
Sporazuman (Agreeing)	.37*	-.10	-.20
Usrećiteljski (Makes Others Happy)	.36*	.15	-.05
Slobodan (Free)	.35*	-.22	.16
Neprijateljski (Hostile)	-.51*	-.27	.05
Stran (Strange)	-.49*	-.14	-.18
Stranjski (Alien)	-.41*	-.13	-.11
Udaljen (Distant)	-.41*	-.14	-.15
Tuđ (Foreign)	-.39*	-.10	-.22
Tuđinski (Foreign)	-.37*	-.22	-.14
Nesložan (Discordant)	-.36*	-.24	-.07
Nevjeran (Unfaithful)	-.34*	-.25	.06
Najamni (Hack)	-.33*	.09	.11
Neuslužan (Disobliging)	-.33*	-.26	.01
Udovičin (Widow's Pet)	-.32*	.15	-.03
Zaraćen (Warring)	-.32*	-.13	.06
Mačehinski (Stepmotherly)	-.32*	.21	-.02
Nelojalan (Disloyal)	-.32*	-.24	.05
Sektaški (Cliquish)	-.32*	-.10	-.12
Vjeroloman (Faithless)	-.31*	-.28	-.05
Roditeljski (Parental)	.06	.59*	-.01
Supružnički (Spousal)	-.04	.54*	.06
Bračni (Marital)	-.01	.51*	-.03
Materinski (Maternal)	.06	.51*	-.09
Majčinski (Motherly)	.06	.51*	-.16
Obiteljski (Familial)	.39	.49*	-.13
Familijaran (Familiar)	.37	.47*	-.10
Rodbinski (Kinship-Like)	.35	.46*	-.05
Porodični (Familial)	.22	.45*	-.12
Zaručnički (Fiance-Like)	.01	.45*	-.04
Materinji (Motherly)	.12	.44*	-.03
Maternji (Motherly)	.07	.44*	-.07
Očinski (Fatherly)	-.18	.43*	.20
Domaćinski (Genial)	.27	.41*	-.08
Očev (Father's Pet)	-.01	.40*	.10
Rodovski (Clan-Like)	.20	.39*	.11
Ćaćin (Daddy's Pet)	.07	.39*	-.02
Kućevan (Homebody)	.04	.36*	-.18
Pokoran (Obedient)	-.03	.35*	-.24
Zavjetnički (Vow-Taker)	.01	.34*	-.08
Negostoljubiv (Inhospitable)	-.35	-.35*	-.01

Continued next column

Table 8 continued

Protivan (Antagonistic)	-.20	-.32*	.13
PoglavarSKI (Bossy)	-.16	.10	.59
Poglavički (Acts Like A Boss)	-.03	-.09	.57
Rukovodeći (Leading)	.05	.06	.57
Naredbodavan (Commanding)	-.08	-.10	.50*
Čelni (Frontman)	.11	-.08	.43*
Nadzornički (Supervisory)	-.02	-.02	.42*
Gospodarski (Masterful)	-.12	.08	.39*
Muški (Manful)	-.18	-.03	.37*
Suparnički (Competitory)	-.13	-.17	.34*
Vlasnički (Proprietary)	.03	.11	.32*
Rivalski (Rival)	-.10	-.21	.31*
Podređen (Subordinate)	-.15	.03	-.37*
Podčinjen (Inferior)	-.24	.09	-.36*
Blagonaklon (Benignant)	.22	.10	-.35*
Ovisan (Dependent)	-.17	.03	-.35*
Zavisan (Dependent)	-.09	.12	-.34*
Kćerinski (Daughterly)	.17	.22	-.30*
Potčinjen (Subordinate)	-.24	.12	-.30*

Note: The highest factor loading of each variable is indicated by an asterisk (*). Loadings of |0.30| or higher are printed in bold.

al, spousal, marital, motherly, familial versus *inhospitable* and *antagonistic*. The third factor was named Leadership versus Subordination, defined by *bossy, leading, commanding, front man, masterful* versus *subordinate, inferior, benignant and dependent*. With four factors, the additional factor would gather only about a dozen adjectives referring to various social roles, with no clear basis for interpreting that factor.

Peer-rating factors of roles and relationships

The first factor in peer-rating data was labeled Friendliness-Closeness, just like its self-rating counterpart, and defined by such terms as *cooperative, friendly, solidary, close to everyone, devoted* versus *alien, bossy, strange, hostile, disobliging*. It may be noted that this peer-rating factor took some of the content of the self-rating factor Leadership versus Subordination. The second factor was labeled Family roles, defined by *parental, familial, motherly, spousal, marital* versus *inhospitable*. The third factor was labeled Leadership versus Subordination, defined by terms such as *leading, front man* and *masterful* versus *inferior, subordinate* and *dependent*. This was the least congruent among the three factors across self- and peer-ratings, possibly because some of the content migrated to other factors, mostly to Friendliness-Closeness. With four factors, Friendliness-Closeness split into two factors, one with more emphasis on friendliness, intimacy and devotion, and the other with more emphasis on hospitality and cooperation.

Superordinate category of social and reputational aspects of personality

One goal of this study was to explore the overarching structure of the superordinate category of social and reputational aspects, and to check how meaningfully the sub-categories play a role in producing that common structure.

Therefore, the final factoring was done using all 469 adjectives. Eigenvalues of the first ten principal components for both self- and peer-ratings are given in Table 3.

Table 9. Roles and Relationships, peer-ratings; Varimax-rotated three-factor structure of the 136 adjectives ($N = 502$)

	Roles and Relationships Components		
	Friendliness-Closeness	Family roles	Leadership vs. Subordination.
Suradujući (Cooperative)	.56*	-.04	.12
Prijateljski (Friendly)	.54*	-.04	.03
Solidaran (Solidary)	.53*	.10	.08
Sporazuman (Agreeing)	.52*	-.05	.01
Blizak (Close To Everyone)	.51*	.10	.00
Odan (Devoted)	.50*	.04	.20
Gostoprimljiv (Congenial)	.49*	.14	.00
Gostoljubiv (Hospitable)	.49*	.17	.00
Drugarski (Comradely)	.47*	-.05	-.01
Vjerman (Faithful)	.46*	.15	.00
Složan (In Concert With Others)	.46*	.01	-.05
Uslužan (Accommodating)	.44*	.18	-.05
Prisan (Intimate)	.41*	.07	.06
Družbenički (Companionable)	.41*	.05	.05
Kolegijalan (Collegial)	.41*	-.01	.06
Zastitnički (Protective)	.41*	.25	.25
Bliz (Close To Others)	.41*	.05	.05
Slobodan (Free)	.40*	-.21	.16
Ravnopravan (Equal)	.40*	-.09	.11
Lojalan (Loyal)	.39*	-.03	.02
Stranjski (Alien)	-.43*	-.17	-.26
Poglavarski (Bossy)	-.42*	.03	.38
Stran (Strange)	-.37*	-.20	-.23
Neprijateljski (Hostile)	-.37*	-.25	-.16
Tuđ (Foreign)	-.37*	-.14	-.26
Zaraćen (Warring)	-.35*	-.15	-.04
Neuslužan (Disobliging)	-.35*	-.26	-.14
Nesložan (Discordant)	-.35*	-.25	-.13
Nelojalan (Disloyal)	-.35*	-.16	-.28
Naredbodavan (Commanding)	-.35*	-.16	.28
Ministarski (Ministerial)	-.34*	.10	.16
Protivnički (Adversarial)	-.34*	-.22	.02
Najamni (Hack)	-.33*	-.09	-.10
Roditeljski (Parental)	.05	.61*	.00
Obiteljski (Familial)	.24	.53*	.01
Materinji (Motherly)	-.02	.52*	-.05
Majčinski (Motherly)	-.08	.52*	-.05
Supružnički (Spousal)	-.17	.50*	.14
Bračni (Marital)	-.05	.50*	.19
Zaručnički (Fiance-Like)	-.07	.48*	.19
Familijaran (Familiar)	.23	.47*	-.01
Materinski (Maternal)	.02	.46*	-.07
Porodični (Familial)	.11	.41*	.01
Rodbinski (Kinship-Like)	.15	.40*	.04
Domaćinski (Genial)	.27	.39*	-.05
Maternji (Motherly)	.03	.38*	-.04
Kćerinski (Daughterly)	-.07	.38*	-.04
Skrbnički (Custodial)	.22	.37*	.28
Štitenički (Protege-Like)	.13	.35*	.23
Pripadan (Associating)	.06	.34*	.06
Udomiteljski (Like A Foster-Parent)	.14	.34*	.12
Rodovski (Clan-Like)	.06	.32*	.03
Očinski (Fatherly)	-.15	.32*	-.08
Negostoljubiv (Inhospitable)	-.26	-.35*	-.13
Rukovodeći (Leading)	-.22	.05	.50*
Čelni (Frontman)	-.09	-.02	.43*
Poglavički (Acts Like A Chief, Boss)	-.37	-.08	.42*

Continued next column

Column 9 continued

Nadzornički (Supervisory)	-.27	-.09	.41*
Neovisan (Independent)	.21	-.09	.38*
Gospodarski (Masterful)	-.21	.12	.31*
Podčinjen (Inferior)	-.16	.06	-.45*
Podređen (Subordinate)	-.08	-.01	-.43*
Pokoran (Obedient)	.10	.16	-.38*
Potčinjen (Subordinate)	-.18	-.02	-.37*
Zavisan (Dependent)	.03	-.07	-.33*
Malodoban (Underage)	-.10	.05	-.32*

Note: The highest factor loading of each variable is indicated by an asterisk (*). Loadings of |0.30| or higher are printed in bold.

Congruencies between self- and peer-rating factors were above .80 with four factors (.94, .84, .83, and .86) but tended to go below .80 with additional factors. Therefore, four factors for both self- and peer-ratings were extracted. The four factors accounted for 16.94 per cent of the total variance in the self-ratings and 15.08 per cent of the total variance in the peer-ratings. In agreement with the repeated frequencies of positive and negative loadings for the subcategory factors, the numbers of positive loadings exceeded the numbers of negative loadings. The self- and peer-factors are represented in Tables 10 and 11.

Self-rating factors of social and reputational aspects

The first factor in the self-ratings was labeled Religiosity-Patriotism, defined by terms like *Christian, catholic, patriotic, pious, religious* versus *impious, anational, sacrilegious, anarchistic, and faithless*. Most of the content covered that of the Religiosity-Patriotism factor based on the subcategory of attitudes and worldviews, but now complemented with some Family roles content that is associated with religious and patriotic themes. The second factor was labeled Nurturance or, alternatively, Tendermindedness versus Toughmindedness, defined by adjectives like *attached, philanthropic, humanistic, peace-making, solidary* versus *militaristic, discriminatory, totalitarian, bossy, and superior*. The content of this factor is related to the attitudes and worldviews factor Totalitarianism versus Humanism-Democracy, but also to the roles and relationship factor Friendliness-Closeness; the factor can serve as an example of how the content of social and reputational aspects of personality may transcend subordinate categories to produce meaningful common factors. The third factor was labeled General Social Effects, defined by *attractive, popular, desirable, irresistible, noticeable* versus *unnoticed, uninteresting, unpopular, repulsive, and distant*. This General Social Effects factor gathered adjectives from all three social effects factors: Attractiveness-Popularity, Mysteriousness-Irritation, and Likeability. Finally, the fourth factor was labeled Modernism, defined by *informative, modern, progressive, free, and equal* versus *reactionary, stultifying, unfree, unmodern, and narrow-minded*. This factor aligned closely to the attitudes and worldview factor Modernism. With five factors extracted, the additional factor was too difficult to label.

Peer-rating factors of social and reputational aspects

The first factor in peer-rating data again was labeled Religiosity-Patriotism, also with aspects of Family roles, and defined by adjectives such as *Christian, pious, believing, re-*

Table 10. Social and Reputational aspects, self-ratings; Varimax-rotated four-factor structure of the 469 adjectives ($N = 524$)

	Components of Social and Reputational aspects			
	Religiosity and Patriotism	Nurturance	General Social Effects	Modernism
Kršćanski (Christian)	.73*	.09	-.06	-.04
Katolički (Catholic)	.72*	.10	-.03	.02
Rodoljuban (Patriotic)	.70*	.01	-.02	.08
Domoljubni (Patriotic)	.70*	-.04	-.03	.03
Pobožan (Pious)	.69*	.09	-.04	-.06
Rodoljubiv (Patriotic)	.68*	.04	-.04	.11
Religiozan (Religious)	.66*	.12	-.03	-.05
Domoljubiv (Patriotic)	.66*	.00	-.03	.10
Pobožnjački (Pietistic)	.65*	.08	-.05	-.09
Vjernički (Believing)	.65*	.12	-.02	-.05
Domovinski (Domestic)	.64*	-.04	-.01	.09
Jednobožjački (Monotheistic)	.64*	.12	-.08	.01
Rimokatolički (Roman-Catholic)	.63*	.09	-.08	-.03
Nacionalan (National)	.59*	-.17	.01	.04
Kroatocentričan (Croatocentric)	.57*	-.22	.04	.02
Starokatolički (Old-Catholic)	.56*	.01	-.08	-.19
Tradicionalistički (Traditionalistic)	.54*	-.01	-.06	-.17
Narodni (National)	.54*	-.02	-.02	.06
Tradicionalan (Traditional)	.51*	.08	-.08	-.03
Teološki (Theological)	.50*	.04	-.07	-.05
Bezbožan (Impious)	-.64*	-.07	-.04	.00
Anacionalan (Anational/No National Feelings)	-.57*	.05	-.14	-.04
Svetogrdan (Sacrilegious)	-.46*	-.20	-.01	-.16
Anarhistički (Anarchistic)	-.45*	-.13	-.11	-.13
Nekonvencionalan (Unconventional)	-.45*	-.06	-.19	.10
Bogohulan (Blasphemous)	-.42*	-.19	-.04	-.11
Vjeroloman (Faithless)	-.41*	-.17	-.13	-.09
Liberalan (Liberal)	-.40*	.29	.06	.17
Bizaran (Bizarre)	-.39*	-.16	-.13	.00
Budistički (Buddhist)	-.37*	.00	-.10	-.10
Vegetarijanski (Vegetarian)	-.35*	.14	-.02	-.17
Kontroverzan (Controversial)	-.35*	-.30	-.06	-.08
Ljevičarski (Leftist)	-.35*	.04	-.12	.05
Tuđinski (Foreign)	-.34*	-.11	-.24	-.08
Stran (Strange)	-.34*	-.12	-.31	-.20
Opozicijski (Oppositional)	-.33*	-.12	-.13	.14
Individualistički (Individualist)	-.33*	-.06	-.03	.21
Istocnjački (Oriental)	-.33*	-.02	-.10	-.14
Nomadski (Nomad)	-.33*	-.11	-.07	-.14
Komunistički (Communitic)	-.32*	-.16	-.10	-.13
Privržen (Attached)	.07	.53*	.09	.02
Čovjekoljubiv (Philantropic)	.21	.50*	.12	.06
Humanistički (Humanistic)	-.08	.50*	.01	.27
Bližnji (Next Of Kin)	.24	.49*	.11	.07
Mirotvoran (Peace Making)	-.04	.49*	-.05	.14
Solidaran (Solidary)	.03	.49*	.02	.24
Prisan (Intimate)	.06	.47*	.12	-.01
Blizak (Close To Everyone)	.12	.47*	.29	.00
Mio (Lovable)	.05	.45*	.37	.09
Dragi (Dear)	.03	.44*	.37	-.05
Bezopasan (Harmless)	-.01	.44*	-.10	.02
Humanitaran (Humanitarian)	.02	.43*	.01	.10
Odan (Devoted)	.15	.43*	.04	.20
Kćerinski (Daughterly)	.05	.41*	.11	-.21
Dobrosusjedski (Neighborly)	.20	.41*	.02	.00
Lojalan (Loyal)	.06	.40*	-.02	.20
Gostoprmljiv (Congenial)	.16	.40*	.20	.14
Demokratski (Democratic)	-.04	.39*	-.06	.30
Prijateljski (Friendly)	.18	.39*	.24	.30
Intiman (Intimate)	.06	.38*	.17	.06
Militaristički (Militaristic)	.09	-.50*	.01	-.09
Diskriminacijski (Discriminatory)	.04	-.50*	-.04	-.20

Table 10 continued next page

Table 10 continued

Totalitaran (Totalitarian)	.02	-.49*	.04	-.02
Poglavarski (Bossy)	.12	-.48*	.05	.07
Militantan (Militant)	.11	-.48*	.02	-.15
Superioran (Superior)	-.06	-.47*	.24	.09
Totalitaristički (Totalitarianistic)	-.03	-.45*	.03	-.10
Autoritaran (Authoritarian)	.10	-.43*	.12	.07
Muški (Manful)	.10	-.43*	-.16	.21
Šovinistički (Chauvinistic)	-.02	-.42*	.05	-.27
Rasistički (Racist)	.07	-.42*	.03	-.30
Poglavički (Acts Like A Chief, Boss)	-.01	-.42*	.16	.17
Neprijateljski (Hostile)	-.28	-.41*	-.18	-.21
Poguban (Baleful)	-.18	-.41*	-.13	-.21
Fašistoidan (Acts Like A Fascist)	-.03	-.41*	.09	-.25
Ustaški (Ustasha-Like Right-Wing Extremists)	.24	-.40*	.06	-.12
Častohlepan (Glory-Seeking)	.00	-.40*	-.06	.06
Naredbodavan (Commanding)	-.03	-.39*	.00	.18
Caristički (Czarist)	-.17	-.38*	.09	-.07
Ekstremistički (Extremistic)	-.16	-.38*	.04	-.04
Privlačan (Attractive)	-.12	.08	.62*	-.09
Popularan (Popular)	-.02	-.07	.61*	-.01
Poželjan (Desirable)	-.04	.08	.60*	-.06
Neodoljiv (Irresistible)	-.13	-.07	.59*	-.08
Primjetljiv (Noticeable)	-.13	-.11	.59*	-.07
Primamljiv (Alluring)	-.12	.01	.58*	-.06
Interesantan (Interesting)	-.15	.02	.58*	.04
Omiljen (Beloved)	.06	.08	.56*	.01
Zapažen (Noticed)	-.23	-.07	.56*	.06
Zavodljiv (Seductive)	-.10	.07	.55*	-.16
Impresivan (Impressive)	-.17	-.06	.55*	.03
Zabavan (Amusing)	-.11	.11	.55*	.04
Zanimljiv (Interesting)	-.11	.05	.54*	-.01
Nezaboravan (Unforgettable)	-.08	-.06	.54*	-.07
Zamaman (Enticing)	-.17	.02	.52*	-.09
Dojmljiv (Convincing)	-.13	.00	.52*	.14
Primjetan (Perceptible)	-.16	-.03	.51*	.13
Upečatljiv (Remarkable)	-.20	-.16	.50*	-.01
Viden (Prominent)	.04	.04	.49*	.04
Simpatičan (Likeable)	.00	.32	.48*	.11
Nezapažen (Unnoticed)	-.05	.10	-.65*	-.07
Nezanimljiv (Uninteresting)	-.10	.05	-.62*	-.07
Neprijetan (Unnoticeable)	-.06	.09	-.61*	.03
Nepopularan (Unpopular)	-.18	.11	-.57*	-.09
Odbojan (Repulsive)	-.21	-.10	-.53*	.00
Udaljen (Distant)	-.22	-.11	-.49*	-.04
Neshvaćen (Misunderstood)	-.29	-.11	-.46*	-.07
Nepodnosiv (Unbearable)	-.23	-.14	-.43*	-.16
Neutjecajan (Uninfluential)	-.02	.19	-.43*	-.12
Neafirmiran (Unestablished)	-.16	.11	-.41*	-.09
Neiskusn (Inexperienced)	-.01	.06	-.41*	-.11
Dalek (Aloof)	-.22	-.06	-.41*	-.01
Umarački (Wearisome)	-.14	-.11	-.40*	-.17
Nelagodan (Uneasy)	-.23	-.23	-.40*	-.20
Suhoparan (Platitudinous)	-.05	-.11	-.39*	-.15
Neuvjerljiv (Unpersuasive)	-.03	.01	-.38*	-.13
Neprijatan (Unpleasant)	-.26	-.22	-.37*	-.18
Iritantan (Irritating)	-.28	-.18	-.37*	-.09
Zamoran (Tiresome)	-.09	-.12	-.35*	-.08
Nepristupačan (Inaccessible)	-.30	-.22	-.35*	-.14
Informativan (Informative)	-.05	-.07	.15	.49*
Suvremen (Modern)	-.10	-.03	.07	.49*
Naprednjački (Progressive)	-.05	-.09	.09	.49*
Slobodan (Free)	.04	.05	.06	.46*
Ravnopravan (Equal)	-.01	.22	.16	.45*
Progresivan (Progressive)	-.12	-.07	.02	.41*
Znanstven (Scientific)	-.18	-.18	-.07	.41*
Racionalistički (Rationalistic)	-.09	.06	-.04	.40*

Table 10 continued next page

Table 10 continued

Osviješten (Aware Of Social Problems)	-.17	.11	-.02	.40*
Slobodarski (Freedom-Loving)	-.18	.09	-.01	.37*
Egzaktan (Exacting)	-.07	-.03	-.07	.35*
Progresistički (Progressive)	-.15	-.09	-.10	.35*
Futuristički (Futuristic)	-.09	-.21	-.09	.33*
Informiran (Informed)	-.10	-.06	.12	.33*
Globalan (Global)	-.21	.02	-.03	.32*
Razumljiv (Articulate)	.04	.21	.24	.31*
Progresivistički (Progressive)	-.11	.00	-.09	.31*
Slobodouman (Free-Minded)	-.26	.06	-.05	.31*
Podnošljiv (Tolerable)	.02	.21	.12	.31*
Samoupravljački (Self-managing)	-.12	-.19	.02	.30*
Nazadan (Reactionary)	-.07	-.06	-.16	-.42*
Islamski (Islamic)	-.18	.00	-.03	-.40*
Zaglušljujući (Stultifying)	-.15	-.05	-.19	-.39*
Neslobodan (Unfree)	-.19	.00	-.18	-.38*
Nesuvremen (Unmodern)	-.01	.08	-.22	-.38*
Udovičin (Widow's Pet)	-.13	-.06	-.03	-.35*
Zatucan (Narrow-Minded)	-.02	-.15	-.20	-.34*
Grkoistočni (Greek Orthodox)	-.20	-.05	-.01	-.34*
Neznanstven (Unscientific)	-.07	.26	-.10	-.32*
Sektaški (Cliquish)	-.27	-.10	-.08	-.32*
Mačehinski (Stepmotherly)	-.05	-.04	.03	-.31*
Zadrt (Bigoted)	-.02	-.24	-.11	-.30*

Note: The highest factor loading of each variable is indicated by an asterisk (*). Loadings of |0.30| or higher are printed in bold.

ligious, catholic versus impious, anational, sacrilegious, blasphemous, misunderstood, and anarchistic. The second factor was again labeled Nurturance, defined by *agreeable, friendly, likeable, pleasant, close to everyone* versus *bossy, totalitarian, competent, commanding, and leading*. The third factor was labeled General Social Effects, defined by *irresistible, seductive, alluring, desirable, enticing* versus *unnoticed, platitudinous, unpopular, uninteresting, and inhospitable*. Finally, the fourth factor was labeled Modernism, defined by adjectives such as *informative, informed, modern, progressive, and scientific* versus *reactionary, stultifying, unscientific, narrow-minded, and inferior*. With five factors, the additional factor was again hard to label.

Correlations between factors of social and reputational aspects and measures of social attitudes and the Big-Five

The correlation matrices of the two measures of social attitudes, Saucier's (2008) SDI-3 ISMS, and SAS-G or General Social Attitudes Scale (Milas et al., 2013) as well as the measure of the Big-Five dimensions, IPIP-100 (Mlačić & Goldberg, 2007), were each submitted to principal component analysis followed by Varimax rotation, for self- and peer-ratings, respectively³. The relationships between the Croatian emic factors of social and reputational aspects of personality and factors derived from measures of social attitudes and Big-Five are given in the Tables 12-15.

Social effects subcategory in relation to social attitudes and personality

Table 12 shows the correlations for both self- and peer-ratings between the three social effects factors, the SAS-G attitudes factors, the SDI-3 ISMS attitudes factors, and the IPIP Big Five factors. As the table shows, the factors describing social effects were rather moderately related to social attitudes. Interestingly, for both self- and peer-ratings, the social effects factor Mysteriousness-Irritation correlated negatively with Religiosity from both social attitudes measures. It is also interesting that the largest factor, Attractiveness-Popularity was virtually unrelated to measures of social attitudes. The lower correlation of .11 between Likeability and Cosmopolitanism for peer-ratings in comparison to the .35 for self-ratings is possibly due to the fact that the peer-ratings Likeability factor was less clear and less strong.

The correlations between the social effects factors and the Big Five IPIP-factors, especially for self-ratings, were generally stronger. This finding is immediately visible when comparing the rows with Multiple R's in Table 12.

Most prominent relations were those between Attractiveness-Popularity and IPIP-Extraversion and IPIP-Intellect, and between Likeability and IPIP-Agreeableness.

Attitudes and worldviews subcategory in relation to social attitudes and personality

Table 13 gives the correlations between the three attitudes and worldviews factors, the SAS-G attitudes factors, the SDI-3 ISMS attitudes factors, and the Big Five IPIP factors. The factor Religiosity-Patriotism correlated strongly with Religiosity from both measures of social attitudes, for both self- and peer-ratings, which attests to the religious content of this attitudes and worldviews factor. It had also

³ In order to avoid correlated scale scores, factor scores were used for the correlations with the present social and reputational factors. The items of the three measures virtually all loaded highest on the corresponding factors.

Table 11. Social and Reputational aspects, peer-ratings; Varimax-rotated four-factor structure of the 469 adjectives ($N = 502$)

	Components of Social and Reputational aspects			
	Religiosity and Patriotism	Nurturance	General Social Effects	Modernism
Kršćanski (Christian)	.72*	.05	-.05	-.06
Pobožan (Pious)	.69*	-.04	.08	-.17
Vjernički (Believing)	.65*	-.04	.11	-.19
Religiozan (Religious)	.65*	-.05	.04	-.18
Pobožnjački (Pietistic)	.64*	-.06	.08	-.16
Katolički (Catholic)	.63*	-.01	-.07	-.18
Domoljubni (Patriotic)	.63*	.05	-.06	.07
Domoljubiv (Patriotic)	.62*	.05	-.08	.11
Rimokatolički (Roman-Catholic)	.60*	.04	-.11	-.07
Rodoljubiv (Patriotic)	.60*	-.01	-.10	.11
Rodoljuban (Patriotic)	.60*	.03	-.07	.11
Domovinski (Domestic)	.59*	-.05	-.05	.05
Kroatocentričan (Croatocentric)	.49*	-.15	-.02	-.11
Bogomoljački (Ultrareligious)	.49*	-.09	.06	-.19
Tradicionalan (Traditional)	.49*	.06	-.04	-.15
Jednobožački (Monotheistic)	.49*	.08	-.08	-.08
Starokatolički (Old-Catholic)	.48*	-.13	.08	-.20
Tradicionalistički (Traditionalistic)	.48*	-.05	-.03	-.14
Obiteljski (Familial)	.47*	.20	.10	.03
Narodni (National)	.47*	-.03	-.08	.04
Bezbožan (Impious)	-.58*	.03	-.03	-.04
Anacionalan (Anational/No National Feelings)	-.45*	.07	-.16	-.05
Svetogrdan (Sacrilegious)	-.38*	-.05	-.05	-.20
Bogohulan (Blasphemous)	-.38*	-.08	-.11	-.20
Neshvaćen (Misunderstood)	-.37*	-.01	-.27	-.21
Anarhistički (Anarchistic)	-.37*	-.13	-.04	-.09
Nekonvencionalan (Unconventional)	-.36*	.08	-.04	.11
Vjeroloman (Faithless)	-.35*	-.14	-.08	-.09
Kontroverzan (Controversial)	-.34*	-.24	.00	-.16
Nudistički (Nudist)	-.34*	-.12	.11	-.25
Nepristupačan (Inaccessible)	-.32*	-.13	-.21	-.18
Neformalan (Informal)	-.32*	.26	-.10	.08
Zapanjujući (Amazing)	-.32*	-.06	.23	-.03
Začudujuć (Astonishing)	-.31*	.00	-.04	.08
Utopistički (Utopian)	-.31*	-.05	.09	-.13
Intrigantan (Intriguing)	-.31*	.01	.15	-.01
Ugodan (Agreeable)	-.02	.53*	.19	.24
Prijateljski (Friendly)	.00	.52*	.10	.15
Simpatičan (Likeable)	-.11	.51*	.34	.17
Prijatan (Pleasant)	.11	.50*	.18	.22
Blizak (Close To Everyone)	.10	.48*	.27	.04
Solidaran (Solidary)	.11	.46*	.13	.21
Dragi (Dear)	-.05	.45*	.37	.05
Drag (Dear)	-.02	.45*	.25	.16
Sporazuman (Agreeing)	.08	.43*	.00	.24
Gostoljubiv (Hospitable)	.21	.42*	.16	.06
Mirotvoran (Peace Making)	.11	.42*	.07	.16
Vjerman (Faithful)	.18	.42*	.11	.06
Suradujuć (Cooperative)	.07	.41*	.10	.29
Složan (In Concert With Others)	.10	.41*	-.03	.12
Uslužan (Accommodating)	.18	.40*	.07	.09
Drugarski (Comradely)	.02	.40*	-.01	.21
Gostoprmljiv (Congenial)	.22	.40*	.15	.08
Bliz (Close To Others)	.00	.40*	.27	.05
Odan (Devoted)	.06	.39*	.15	.28
Blagonaklon (Benignant)	.01	.39*	.14	.02
Poglavarski (Bossy)	.09	-.51*	.05	.05
Poglavički (Acts Like A Chief, Boss)	-.01	-.45*	.05	.08
Totalitaran (Totalitarian)	-.09	-.43*	-.10	-.10
Nadležan (Competent)	-.01	-.39*	.05	.13
Naredbodavan (Commanding)	-.04	-.38*	-.13	.09
Rukovodeći (Leading)	.07	-.38*	.15	.27
Vlastoljubiv (Power-Loving)	-.07	-.38*	-.09	-.02

Table 11 continued next page

Table 11 continued

Ekstremistički (Extremistic)	-.15	-.37*	-.07	-.18
Ministarski (Ministerial)	.09	-.37*	-.04	.00
Totalitaristički (Totalitaristic)	-.11	-.37*	-.07	-.15
Državotvoran (Nation-Building)	.26	-.36*	-.02	.09
Nadzornički (Supervisory)	-.06	-.36*	.00	.18
Jednopartijski (One-Party System Supporter)	.00	-.33*	-.12	-.12
Ekstreman (Extreme)	-.19	-.33*	-.01	-.16
Autoritaran (Authoritarian)	.15	-.32*	.05	.07
Caristički (Czarist)	-.16	-.30*	.03	-.07
Militaristički (Militaristic)	.06	-.30*	-.10	-.16
Superioran (Superior)	-.11	-.30*	.14	.17
Militantan (Militant)	.02	-.30*	-.05	-.20
Neodoljiv (Irresistible)	-.18	.16	.60*	.02
Zavodljiv (Seductive)	-.11	.15	.59*	-.02
Primamljiv (Alluring)	-.13	.13	.58*	-.01
Poželjan (Desirable)	-.05	.18	.54*	.03
Zamaman (Enticing)	-.15	.15	.53*	-.04
Privlačan (Attractive)	-.08	.26	.52*	.10
Opojan (Intoxicating)	-.18	.01	.51*	-.02
Zamamljiv (Alluring)	-.16	.12	.49*	-.09
Egzotičan (Exotic)	-.13	-.08	.47*	.06
Uzbudljiv (Exciting)	-.16	-.06	.46*	.10
Magnetičan (Magnetic)	-.17	.03	.45*	.09
Milozvučan (Melodious)	.09	.27	.44*	-.08
Nezaboravan (Unforgettable)	-.17	.14	.43*	.13
Umiljat (Amiable)	.12	.29	.43*	.03
Damski (Ladylike)	.01	.02	.43*	-.14
Mio (Lovable)	.09	.41	.42*	.05
Impresivan (Impressive)	-.15	.15	.40*	.24
Ljubavnički (Loverly)	-.03	.06	.39*	-.10
Usrećiteljski (Makes Others Happy)	.05	.28	.39*	.09
Primjetljiv (Noticeable)	-.13	-.03	.38*	.13
Nezapažen (Unnoticed)	-.14	.08	-.47*	-.30
Muški (Manful)	.02	-.04	-.45*	.09
Suhoparan (Platitudinous)	-.04	.06	-.42*	-.12
Neprijetetan (Unnoticeable)	-.05	.25	-.40*	-.10
Nepopularan (Unpopular)	-.16	.08	-.39*	-.21
Nezanimljiv (Uninteresting)	.05	.14	-.38*	-.11
Negostoljubiv (Inhospitable)	-.27	-.12	-.38*	-.02
Neukusan (Distasteful)	-.15	-.06	-.38*	-.20
Materijalistički (Materialistic)	-.19	-.18	-.37*	.04
Umaracki (Wearisome)	-.20	-.14	-.37*	-.25
Iritantan (Irritating)	-.18	-.05	-.36*	-.29
Odbojan (Repulsive)	-.12	.01	-.35*	-.12
Nelagodan (Uneasy)	-.14	-.25	-.34*	-.28
Udaljen (Distant)	-.26	.00	-.33*	-.06
Neprijatan (Unpleasant)	-.23	-.13	-.32*	-.31
Predrasudni (Prejudiced)	-.02	-.22	-.32*	-.20
Neafirmiran (Unestablished)	-.20	.10	-.32*	-.17
Zamoran (Tiresome)	-.20	-.07	-.32*	-.16
Nesuvremen (Unmodern)	-.11	.06	-.31*	-.28
Informativan (Informative)	-.06	.09	.02	.49*
Informiran (Informed)	-.04	.17	.00	.45*
Suvremen (Modern)	-.03	.18	-.05	.43*
Naprednjački (Progressive)	-.03	.15	-.04	.41*
Znanstven (Scientific)	-.03	-.17	-.10	.40*
Progresivistički (Progressive)	.00	.02	-.06	.38*
Slobodan (Free)	-.04	.31	-.08	.38*
Naučan (Scientific)	.04	-.01	.12	.37*
Progresivan (Progressive)	-.11	.03	-.04	.36*
Futuristički (Futuristic)	-.03	-.14	-.13	.36*
Racionalistički (Rationalistic)	-.03	.09	.01	.35*
Prosvjetiteljski (Enlightening)	.00	-.13	.14	.35*
Suveren (Top Gun)	-.03	-.09	.09	.35*
Efektan (Effective)	-.08	.03	.27	.34*
Poštovan (Respected)	.10	.26	.23	.34*

Table 11 continued next page

Table 11 continued

Globalan (Global)	-.07	-.04	-.09	.34*
Gradanski (Civic)	.08	.25	.00	.34*
Pozitivistički (Positivist)	.20	.23	-.01	.34*
Osviješten (Aware Of Social Problems)	-.07	.18	.11	.34*
Internacionalan (Internationalist)	-.12	-.04	.04	.33*
Nazadan (Reactionary)	-.06	-.04	-.25	-.46*
Zaglugljujući (Stultifying)	-.15	-.04	-.29	-.44*
Neznanstven (Unscientific)	-.20	.19	-.17	-.40*
Zatucan (Narrow-Minded)	-.10	-.12	-.22	-.38*
Podčinjen (Inferior)	-.03	.04	-.15	-.38*
Neumjestan (Inappropriate)	-.20	-.22	-.25	-.38*
Neuvjerljiv (Unpersuasive)	-.09	.03	-.30	-.36*
Nepodnosiv (Unbearable)	-.17	-.19	-.26	-.36*
Sektaški (Cliquish)	-.23	-.16	-.11	-.34*
Malogradanski (Petty-Bourgeois)	-.04	-.12	-.21	-.34*
Islamski (Islamic)	-.12	-.05	.00	-.33*
Neslobodan (Unfree)	-.14	-.06	-.15	-.33*
Amoralan (Amoral)	-.24	-.13	-.20	-.31*
Udovicin (Widow's Pet)	-.09	-.07	-.02	-.31*
Malodoban (Underage)	-.12	.09	-.02	-.30*
Neuljuden (Uncivilized)	-.16	-.18	-.25	-.30*
Stranjski (Alien)	-.24	-.29	-.18	-.30*
Mačehinski (Stepmotherly)	-.07	-.09	-.09	-.30*

Note: The highest factor loading of each variable is indicated by an asterisk (*). Loadings of |0.30| or higher are printed in bold.

a positive correlation with IPIP-Conscientiousness and a negative one with IPIP-Intellect. The factor Totalitarianism versus Humanism-Democracy correlated negatively with Cosmopolitism and positively with Unmitigated self-interest. The latter correlation suggests that Totalitarianism has tough-minded and egotistic connotations. This was corroborated in the negative correlation with IPIP-Agreeableness. Especially in self-ratings, the factor Modernism in correlated positively with Modern Technology and negatively with religiousness in both attitude measures. The peer-ratings show the same patterns, but less strongly so.

The multiple correlations in Table 13 generally tell that the attitudes and worldviews factors are substantially related to both social attitudes and personality dispositions.

Roles and relationships subcategory in relation to social attitudes and personality

Table 14 shows the correlations between the three roles and relationships factors, the SAS-G factors, the SDI-3 ISMS factors, and the IPIP factors. The roles and relationships factors only moderately related to both social attitudes and personality. Friendliness-Closeness correlated with Cosmopolitism, with Protection of Civil Institutions, and especially with the IPIP-Agreeableness. The Family Roles factor correlated positively with Religiosity (both measures), negatively with Sexual Freedom, and positively with IPIP-Agreeableness and also with IPIP-Conscientiousness. The correlations with the two Big Five IPIP factors suggest that Family Roles may be related to values of Integrity (Peabody & De Raad, 2002). The pattern of correlations for Family Roles suggests that in Croatia family roles have a traditional orientation, related to religiosity, with skepticism toward sexual freedom. Finally, in self-ratings, the factor Leadership versus Subordination correlated negatively with Cosmopolitism, positively with Unmitigated Self-Interest, and negatively with IPIP-Agree-

ableness. This latter correlation with Agreeableness corroborated the self-centeredness interpretation of this factor. The peer-ratings did not repeat that pattern of correlations for Leadership versus subordination, which is possibly due to the fact that the Leadership versus Subordination factor lost some of its content in the peer-ratings; moreover, it was least congruent among the three roles and relationships factors across self- and peer-ratings.

Superordinate category of social and reputational aspects in relation to social attitudes and personality

The correlations between the four general social and reputational factors, the two sets of attitude factors, and the Big Five factors are given in Table 15. The highest correlations show a recurrent pattern across self- and peer-ratings, although in peer-ratings those correlations are generally lower. Religiosity-Patriotism showed strong positive correlations with the two Religiousness factors and negative correlations with Cosmopolitism, Sexual Freedom, and Protection of Civil Institutions. This pattern shows a traditional foundation of this superordinate factor. The positive correlation with IPIP-Conscientiousness and the negative correlation with IPIP-Intellect very well agree with this. The Nurturance factor correlated positively with Cosmopolitism, with Subjective Spirituality, and with IPIP-Agreeableness, and negative with Unmitigated Self-Interest, suggesting a benevolent flavor of this factor. The factor General Social Effects correlated most strongly with IPIP-Extraversion and less so with IPIP-Intellect. The factor hardly correlated with attitude factors, thus suggesting a more dispositional nature of this factor. Modernism correlated with IPIP-Emotional Stability, IPIP-Intellect, and Modern Technology, thus replicating the findings for the Modernism factor in the subordinate category of attitudes and worldviews.

Table 12. Correlations between Social Effects factors and measures of social attitudes and of Big Five; self and peer

	Self-ratings (<i>N</i> =524)			Peer-ratings (<i>N</i> =502)		
	Attractiveness- Popularity	Mysteriousness- Irritation	Likeability	Attractiveness- Popularity	Mysteriousness- Irritation	Likeability
SAS-G						
Religiousness	-.10*	-.32**	.02	-.13**	-.33**	-.14**
Sexual Freedom	.09	.10*	-.04	.02	.26**	.01
Cosmopolitanism	-.01	.02	.35**	.20**	-.08	.11*
Modern Technology	.06	-.14**	-.10*	.00	-.16**	.05
Social Justice	-.10*	-.01	.02	-.04	-.09*	.04
multiple R	.17	.36	.36	.25	.46	.19
SDI-3 ISMS						
Tradition oriented religiousness (α)	-.11*	-.27**	-.09	-.17**	-.30**	-.20**
Unmitigated self-interest (β)	.09*	.02	-.22**	-.16**	.12*	-.14**
Protection of civil institutions (γ)	.05	-.30**	-.13**	-.01	-.29**	.02
Subjective spirituality (δ)	.09	.08	.26**	.22**	.06	-.07
multiple R	.17	.41	.38	.32	.44	.25
Big Five						
Extraversion	.56**	-.35**	-.02	.34**	-.20**	-.15**
Agreeableness	-.04	-.22**	.48**	.17**	-.30**	.16**
Conscientiousness	-.02	-.37**	.02	-.04	-.36**	-.06
Emotional Stability	.04	-.25**	.13**	-.08	-.19**	.14**
Intellect	.35**	.15**	-.15**	.35**	.05	-.07
multiple R	.66	.63	.51	.52	.54	.28

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$ (two-tailed)

Table 13. Correlations between Attitudes and Worldviews factors and measures of social attitudes and of Big Five; self and peer

	Self-ratings (<i>N</i> =524)			Peer-ratings (<i>N</i> =502)		
	Totalitarianism			Totalitarianism		
	Religiosity- patriotism	Humanism- Democracy	Modernism	Religiosity- patriotism	Humanism- Democracy	Modernism
SAS-G						
Religiousness	.73**	-.07	-.21**	.70**	-.05	-.25**
Sexual Freedom	-.23**	.12**	.12**	-.23**	.20**	-.13**
Cosmopolitanism	-.21**	-.58**	.10*	-.15**	-.36**	.14**
Modern Technology	.03	.22**	.29**	.09	-.10*	.22**
Social Justice	.02	-.09*	.02	.11*	-.07	.12**
multiple R	.79	.64	.39	.76	.43	.40
SDI-3 ISMS						
Tradition oriented religiousness (α)	.73**	.07	-.30**	.72**	-.03	-.24**
Unmitigated self-interest (β)	-.09*	.42**	.04	-.03	.39**	.09*
Protection of civil institutions (γ)	-.31**	-.01	-.20**	.33**	.05	-.21**
Subjective spirituality (δ)	.13**	-.35**	-.04	-.11*	-.18**	.01
multiple R	.81	.55	.36	.80	.43	.34
Big Five						
Extraversion	.05	.08	.05	.02	.12**	.10*
Agreeableness	.14*	-.51**	-.07	.14**	-.46**	-.08
Conscientiousness	.31**	-.09*	.03	.32**	-.02	.05
Emotional Stability	.05	-.03	.16**	.08	.02	.06
Intellect	-.27**	.04	.28**	-.17**	.00	.38**
multiple R	.44	.53	.34	.39	.48	.41

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$ (two-tailed)

Table 14. Correlations between Roles and Relationship factors and measures of social attitudes and of Big Five; self and peer

	Self-ratings (N=524)			Peer-ratings (N=502)		
	Friendliness- Closeness	Family Roles	Leadership vs. Subordination	Friendliness- Closeness	Family Roles	Leadership vs. Subordination
SAS-G						
Religiousness	.17**	.37**	.06	.01	.30**	.00
Sexual Freedom	.00	-.17**	.06	-.13**	-.14**	-.04
Cosmopolitanism	.22**	-.04	-.34**	.16**	.10*	.08
Modern Technology	.06	-.05	.19**	.10*	.05	.08
Social Justice	.04	.03	-.04	.14**	.03	.03
multiple R	.29	.42	.40	.27	.35	.12
SDI-3 ISMS						
Tradition oriented religiousness (α)	.06	.40**	.14**	.06	.33**	-.01
Unmitigated self-interest (β)	-.13**	-.02	.24**	-.21**	-.12**	.15**
Protection of civil institutions (γ)	-.20**	-.23**	-.05	-.22**	-.19**	.07
Subjective spirituality (δ)	.10*	-.02	.22**	.03	.01	-.04
multiple R	.27	.46	.36	.31	.40	.17
Big Five						
Extraversion	.31**	.07	.24**	.04	.06	.29**
Agreeableness	.44**	.27**	-.41**	.42**	.44**	-.02
Conscientiousness	.18**	.21**	.05	.07	.26**	.19**
Emotional Stability	.23**	-.06	.14**	.22**	-.05	.00
Intellect	-.02	-.23**	.17**	.01	-.14**	.30**
multiple R	.61	.42	.52	.48	.54	.46

Note: *p < .05, **p < .01 (two-tailed)

Table 15. Correlations between superordinate Social and Reputational factors, social attitudes, and Big Five; self and peer

	Self-ratings (N=524)				Peer-ratings (N=502)			
	Religiosity & Patriotism	Nurturance	General Social Effects	Modernism	Religiosity & Patriotism	Nurturance	General Social Ef- fects	Modernism
SAS-G								
Religiousness	.70**	.04	.05	-.09	.68**	-.10*	.06	-.17**
Sexual Freedom	-.21**	-.09*	.06	.03	-.25**	-.08	-.01	-.16**
Cosmopolitanism	-.26**	.52**	-.02	.09	-.10*	.17**	.26**	.11*
Modern Technology	.04	-.17**	.11*	.22**	.08	.04	-.10*	.25**
Social Justice	.02	.08	-.10*	.05	-.11*	.08	-.03	.11*
multiple R	.78	.57	.17	.26	.74	.23	.29	.37
SDI-3 ISMS								
Tradition oriented religiousness (α)	.74**	-.11*	.03	-.16**	.69**	-.16**	.03	-.20**
Unmitigated self-interest (β)	-.01	-.34**	.11*	-.08	.05	-.19**	-.20**	-.15**
Protection of civil institutions (γ)	-.31**	-.10*	-.08	-.14**	-.34**	.10*	.01	-.17**
Subjective spirituality (δ)	.16**	.30**	.05	-.04	.11*	-.03	.26**	.00
multiple R	.82	.48**	.15	.23	.78	.27	.33	.30
Big Five								
Extraversion	.06	-.04	.69**	-.03	.03	-.12*	.35**	.10*
Agreeableness	.13**	.63**	.11*	-.06	.24**	.35**	.43**	-.13*
Conscientiousness	.32**	.10*	.12*	.10*	.36**	-.02	.09	.10*
Emotional Stability	.05	.04	.11*	.29**	.11*	.13**	-.11*	.14**
Intellect	-.34**	-.16**	.19**	.26**	-.22**	-.14**	.17**	.43**
multiple R	.49	.66	.74	.40	.50	.42	.60	.49

Note: *p < .05, **p < .01 (two-tailed)

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The taxonomy of social and reputational aspects of personality resulted in interesting factors, in general replicated across self- and peer-ratings. These factors are relevant for the understanding of personality and individual differences, and may represent a link between personality dispositions and social attitudes. This study has shown that the psycho-lexical factors describing social and reputational aspects of personality are partly related to social attitudes and partly to dispositions, or "personality proper", here represented by the Big Five. Moreover, some of the psycho-lexically based social and reputational factors were unrelated to social attitudes, while all were in some way related to Big Five personality factors, which may attest to a more lasting and dispositional nature of this category, too.

As Allport and Odbert (1936), John et al. (1990), and Norman (1967) stated, the concepts belonging to the category of social roles, relationships, effects, attitudes, and worldviews are important for psychology, sociology, and ethics. Arguably, one might add political sciences and possibly other scientific disciplines.

One additional contribution of this study to the knowledge of social influence that a person leaves on his or her milieu may be in the comparison of self- and peer-ratings. The social and reputational factors were not always identical across self- and peer-ratings, some even lacked congruence, as in the case of the subcategory of Roles and relationships. The factors hold, however, a certain level of generality, especially when considering the relations with social attitudes and personality measures. The amounts of variance accounted for in the factor analyses in this study were in general somewhat lower than the amounts of variance explained in taxonomies exploring personality dispositions. This may point to the complexity of social and reputational aspects of personality, especially in relation to the less immediate relevance of the pertaining concepts for the description of personality.

The structure of Social effects with the three factors of Attractiveness-Popularity, Mysteriousness-Irritation, and Likeability not only replicated Saucier's (2010) two factors regarding the excitement or the aversion that a person creates in others, but also gave the additional factor of Likeability. The explanation could be in the smaller selection of (32) variables in Saucier (2010), as compared to the 138 terms in the present study. The Social effects factors were more strongly related to personality dispositions than to social attitudes. Therefore, the footprint that a person leaves on his social world (Saucier, 2010), might be a reflection of his/her personality, for the most part. Especially pronounced were the relations between Attractiveness-Popularity and IPIP-Extraversion, between Likeability and IPIP-Agreeableness, and between Mysteriousness-Irritation and IPIP-Conscientiousness. There were, however, important relations between Social effects and social attitudes, too. Mysteriousness-Irritation was negatively related to measures of religiosity. Likeability in the self-ratings was positively related to Cosmopolitanism and to Subjective Spirituality and negatively to Unmitigated Self-interest.

The structure of Attitudes and worldviews with the three factors of Religiosity-Patriotism, Totalitarianism versus Humanism-Democracy, and Modernism seem to touch

on themes well known in psychology, sociology, and political sciences. These factors can partly be related to Ostendorf's (1996) factors of Religiosity and Conservatism versus Radicalism; yet, facets of the factors were differently distributed in the two studies. For instance, the facet of patriotism in the present study was connected to Religiosity while in Ostendorf's (1996) study it was associated Conservatism.

As one might have expected, Attitudes and worldviews factors were more strongly related to measures of social attitudes than to personality. Especially strong was the relation of Religiosity-Patriotism with the two social attitudes measures of Religiosity, but also of Totalitarianism versus Humanism with Cosmopolitanism and Unmitigated Self-interest. Also, the positive relation between Modernism and Modern Technology and the negative ones with measures of Religiosity were pronounced. The strong relations between Attitudes and worldviews factors did not preclude significant relations with personality. Especially marked was the relation between Totalitarianism versus Humanism and IPIP-Agreeableness, of Religiosity-Patriotism and IPIP-Conscientiousness, and of Modernism and IPIP-Intellect. Therefore, the category of Attitudes and worldviews could be the space where social attitudes and personality dispositions meet most strongly.

The structure of Roles and relationships with the three factors of Friendliness-Closeness, Family Roles, and Leadership versus Subordination was the hardest to interpret, due to lack of previous studies, the lack of congruence between self- and peer-ratings, and the mere lack of items, such as at the negative pole of the Family Roles factor. Therefore, this subcategory needs replication in other studies.

Curiously enough, the Roles and relationship factors were about equally strong related to social attitudes and to personality, maybe a little more to personality. Family roles was moderately positively related to two measures of Religiosity, and less strongly with personality, while Friendliness-Closeness was especially related to personality (Extraversion and Agreeableness), and Leadership versus Subordination was positively related to Unmitigated Self-interest and negatively (though only in the self-ratings) to Cosmopolitanism, but also negatively with IPIP-Agreeableness.

Finally, the analyses of the overarching superordinate category of Social and Reputational aspects of personality with the four factors of Religiosity-Patriotism, Nurturance, General Social Effects, and Modernism showed that some of the factors from the subcategories recurred in the structure of the superordinate category, but not completely and not uniformly. Nurturance, for example, seemed to combine the Attitudes and worldviews factor Totalitarianism versus Humanism, and the Roles and relationship factor Friendliness-Closeness. This Nurturance factor reminisces of Eysenck's (1954) social attitudes dimension of Tender-mindedness versus Tough-mindedness.

Of the superordinate factors of social and reputational aspects, especially the factors Nurturance and General Social Effects were more strongly related to personality dispositions than to social attitudes. Those two superordinate factors relate to IPIP-Agreeableness and IPIP-Extraversion, respectively, thus covering semantics of the interper-

sonal circumplex. Religiosity-Patriotism was strongly related to the two social attitudes measures of Religiosity, and Modernism was weakly and positively related to the Modern Technology attitudes factor.

Finally, the limitation of this study is that it was conducted in a single-language, yet using well-educated samples. Therefore, this study is in need of a replication in other languages or cultures, possibly in a wide cross-cultural context and using more representative samples with a broader age range, and with more variation in educational and social status. Especially important would be also the inclusion of other measures possibly important for the social and reputational aspects of personality, such as Social Dominance Orientation (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) or the Dark Triad (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Comparisons with these and other measures would provide an important test of the findings and conclusions reported in this study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Gratitude is expressed to Dr. Goran Milas who provided help to an earlier version of this manuscript and to Tina Ban Mlačić who helped with the graphic design of the tables in this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Allport G.W., & Odbert, H.S. (1936). Trait names: a psycho-lexical study. *Psychological Monographs*, 47, (Whole No. 211).
- Almagor, M., Tellegen, A., & Waller, N. (1995). The Big Seven model: A cross-cultural replication and further exploration of the basic dimensions of natural language of trait descriptions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 300–307.
- Angleitner, A., Ostendorf, F., & John, O.P. (1990). Towards a taxonomy of personality descriptors in German: a psycho-lexical study. *European Journal of Personality*, 4, 89–118.
- Anić, V. (2000). *Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*. [Dictionary of Croatian language]. Zagreb: Novi Liber.
- Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., Perugini, M., Szarota, P., de Vries, R.E., Di Blas, L., Boies, K., & De Raad, B. (2004). A six-factor structure of personality-descriptive adjectives: Solutions from psycholexical studies in seven languages. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86, 356–366.
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2007). Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 11, 150–166.
- Benet-Martinez, V., & Waller, N. G. (1997). Further evidence for the cross-cultural generality of the Big Seven factor model: Indigenous and imported Spanish personality constructs. *Journal of Personality*, 65, 567–598.
- Benet-Martinez, V., & Waller, N.G. (2002). From adorable to worthless: Implicit and self-report structure of highly evaluative personality descriptors. *European Journal of Personality*, 16, 1–41.
- Cattell, R. B. (1966). The scree test for the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 1, 245–276.
- Cavazza, N., Guidetti, M., & Pagliaro, S. (2015). Who cares for reputation? Individual differences and concern for reputation. *Current Psychology*, 34, 164–176.
- Church, A.T., Katigbak, M.S. & Reyes, J.A.S. (1996). Toward a taxonomy of trait adjectives in Filipino: comparing personality lexicons across cultures. *European Journal of Personality*, 10, 3–24.
- DeChernatony, L. (1999). Brand management through narrowing the gap between brand identity and brand reputation. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 15, 157–179.
- De Raad, B. (1992). The replicability of the Big-Five personality dimensions in three word-classes of the Dutch language. *European Journal of Personality*, 6, 15–29.
- De Raad, B. (2000). *The Big Five personality factors: The psycholexical approach to personality*. Göttingen: Hogrefe & Huber Publishers.
- De Raad, B., & Barelds, D.P.H. (2008). A new taxonomy of Dutch personality traits based on a comprehensive and unrestricted list of descriptors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 347–364.
- De Raad, B., Barelds, D.P.H., Levert, E., Ostendorf, F., Mlačić, B., Di Blas, L., ... Katigbak, M.C. (2010). Only three factors of personality description are fully replicable across languages: A comparison of 14 trait taxonomies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98, 160–173.
- De Raad, B., Barelds, D.P.H., Timmerman, M.E., De Roover, K., Mlačić, B., & Church, A.T. (2014). Towards a pan-cultural personality structure: Input from 11 psycho-lexical studies. *European Journal of Personality*, 28, 497–510.
- De Raad, B. & Mlačić, B. (in press). The lexical foundation of the Big-Five factor model. In: T. Widiger (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Five Factor Model*. Oxford University Press.
- DeYoung, C.G. (2006). Higher-order factors of the Big Five in a multi-informant sample. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 1138–1151.
- Digman, J.M. (1997). Higher-order factors of the Big Five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 1246–1256.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1954). *The psychology of politics*. New York: Praeger.
- Goldberg, L.R. (1990). An alternative "Description of personality": The Big-Five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 1216–1229.
- Goldberg, L.R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public-domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. In: I. Mervielde, I. Deary, F. De Fruyt, & F. Ostendorf (Eds.), *Personality Psychology in Europe*, Vol. 7. (pp. 7–28). Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.
- Goldberg, L. R. (2006). Doing it all backwards: The development of hierarchical factor structures from the top down. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40, 347–358.
- Hřebíčková, M. (1995). *The structural model of personality based on the lexical analysis: A Czech replication of the five-factor model based on a comprehensive taxonomy of personality-descriptive adjectives*. Unpublished manuscript, Institute of Psychology, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Brno.
- Hřebíčková, M., Ostendorf, F. (1995). Lexikalni pristup k osobnosti V: Klasifikace pridavných jmen do kategori osobnosti deskripce [Lexical Approach to Personality V: Classification of Adjectives into Categories of Personality Description]. *Ceskoslovenska psychologie*, 39, 265–267.
- Imperio, S. M., Church, A. T., Katigbak, M. S., & Reyes, J. A. S. (2008). Lexical studies of Filipino personality descriptors: Adding personality-relevant social and physical attributes. *European Journal of Personality*, 22, 291–321.
- John, O.P., Angleitner, A., & Ostendorf, F. (1988). The lexical approach to personality: A historical review of trait taxonomic research. *European Journal of Personality*, 2, 171–203.
- Milas, G., Mlačić, B., Mikloušić, I. (2013). Construct validation of a general social attitudes scale. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 34, 203–213.
- Mlačić, B. (2008). National Taxonomies, Adjective Markers and Inventories: Three Directions of Application of the Lexical Approach to Personality. *Roczniki Psychologiczne*, XI, 152–160.

- Mlačić, B., & Goldberg, L. R. (2007). An Analysis of a Cross-Cultural Personality Inventory: The IPIP Big-Five Factor Markers in Croatia. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 88, 168-177.
- Mlačić, B., & Ostendorf, F. (2005). Taxonomy and Structure of Croatian Personality-descriptive Adjectives. *European Journal of Personality*, 19, 117-152.
- Norman, W.T. (1967). *2800 personality trait descriptors: Normative operating characteristics for a university population*. Ann Arbor, MI: Department of Psychology, University of Michigan.
- Ogunfowora, B. (2014). The impact of ethical leadership within the recruitment context: The roles of organizational reputation, applicant personality, and value congruence. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25, 528-543.
- Ostendorf, F. (1990). *Sprache und Persönlichkeitstruktur: Zur Validität des Fünf-Faktoren-Modells der Persönlichkeit*. [Language and personality structure: Towards the validity of the Five-Factor model of personality] Regensburg, Germany: Roderer-Verlag.
- Ostendorf, F. (1996). *The structure of attitudes and its relation to the Big-Five factors of personality*. Paper presented at the Symposium "Current Research on the Big-Five Factors of Personality on an International Scale", XXVI. International Congress of Psychology, Montréal, Canada, August 16 - 22.
- Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K.M. (2002). The Dark Triad of Personality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 36, 556-563.
- Peabody, D., & De Raad, B. (2002). The substantive nature of psycho-lexical personality factors: A comparison across languages. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 983-997.
- Peabody, D. & Goldberg, L.R. (1989). Some determinants of factor structures from personality-trait descriptors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 552-567.
- Saucier, G. (2003). An alternative multi-language structure for personality attributes. *European Journal of Personality*, 17, 179-205.
- Saucier, G. (2008). Measures of the personality factors found recurrently in human lexicons. In G. J. Boyle, G. Matthews, & D. Saklofske (Eds.), *Handbook of personality theory and testing: Vol. 2 – Personality measurement and assessment* (pp. 29-54). London: Sage.
- Saucier, G. (2009). Recurrent personality dimensions in inclusive lexical studies: Indications for a Big Six structure. *Journal of Personality*, 77, 1577-1614.
- Saucier, G. (2010). The structure of social effects; Personality as impact on others. *European Journal of Personality*, 24, 222-240.
- Saucier, G. & Ostendorf, F. (1999). Hierarchical subcomponents of the Big-Five personality factors: A cross-language replication. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 613-627.
- Saucier, G., Thalmayer, A.G., Payne, D.L., Carlson, R., Sanogo, L. Ole-Kotikash, L., Church, A.T., Katigbak, M.S., Somer, O., Szarota, P., Szirmak, Z., & Zhou, X. (2014). A basic bivariate structure of personality attributes evident across nine languages. *Journal of Personality*, 82, 1-14.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An inter-group theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press
- Szarota, P., Ashton, M.C., & Lee, K. (2007). Taxonomy and structure of the Polish personality lexicon. *European Journal of Personality*, 21, 823-852.
- Ten Berge, J.F.M. (1999). A legitimate case of component analysis of ipsative measures, and partialling the mean as an alternative to ipsatization. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 34, 89-102.
- Tucker, L. J. (1951.) *A method for synthesis of factor analysis studies*. Personnel Research Section Report No. 984, Department of the army, Washington, DC.
- Watson, G.B. (1932). Measures of character and personality. *Psychological Bulletin*, 29, 147-176.
- Wilson, G. D., & Patterson, J. R. (1968). A new measure of conservatism. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 7, 264-269.

Received February 29, 2016

Accepted July 15, 2016