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This study explored how the epistemological position of therapists is related to the important personal qualities of humility and universal orientation. It also investigated how the psychological measures of humility and universal orientation are related.

Findings of this study provide provisional support for the notion that there are differences in the personal quality of humility of therapists according to therapists’ epistemic assumptions (rationalist versus constructivist). In addition a therapist’s epistemology was partially a predictor of a therapist’s personal quality of universal orientation. Finally, the Honesty-Humility measure correlated positively with the Universal Orientation Scale.

Our study is the first and only empirical research on the relationship between therapists’ epistemic styles and therapists’ personal qualities of humility and universal orientation. Our study extends the developing literature investigating the relationship of epistemic style, therapist personal qualities and practice. It contributes to the development of a measure of humility. Further work is needed to develop such a measure and to investigate how humility and universal orientation of therapists affect the outcomes of therapy work.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The relationship between personal epistemology and personal qualities has been investigated by a number of researchers (Johnson et al., 1988; Babbage & Ronan, 2000; Berzonsky, 1990; Neimeyer et al., 1993; Mahoney, 1995; Aksoy, 2005). The work of such researchers, along with the study of humility, suggests that constructivist therapists would value humility as an important quality and that constructivist epistemology invites greater humility.

In order to appreciate the studies linking personal epistemology with personal qualities it is helpful to be acquainted with the groundings of their research. The work of these researchers is based on two classification systems. One is the classification of worldviews established by Pepper (1942), and the second is the classification of epistemologies by Royce (1964). Pepper (1942) perceived four worldviews, including formism, mechanism, contextualism, and organism. Formism is the view that there are predetermined forms in the universe, and that meaning comes from contrasting these forms. Mechanism views the world as working by cause and effect. Contextualism is the idea that meaning is dependent on context. Finally, in organism meaning follows a developing dialectic process. Royce (1964) and Royce and Powell (1983) propose three ways of knowing. These are empiricism, rationalism and metaphorism. Empiricists rely on sense perception and public consensus for validation. Rationalists rely on logic for validation. Metaphorists base their validation on the generalizability of knowledge.

Mahoney and Gabreil (1987) subsume all of these epistemologies under rationalism and constructivism. Rationalism includes mechanistic and objectivist worldviews. These epistemologies uphold reality as independent of the observer. In addition, reality is seen as stable and knowable. For the rationalist the knower has a passive role. Constructivism includes both contextualist and organismic worldviews, and sees reality as being interactional and
constructed within relationships and contexts. For the constructivist the knower is an active participant in the making of reality. In this view reality is not stable, nor is it independent of the knower. Later, Botella and Gallifa (1995) augmented this understanding by finding a positive correlation between rationalism and cognitive simplicity and a similar relationship between constructivism and cognitive complexity.

**Therapist Qualities Are Linked to Therapist Epistemology**

In view of the above-mentioned categories of worldviews and epistemologies, Johnson, J., Germer, C., Efran, J., and Overton, W. (1988) studied the relationship between epistemology and personality. The results of their study showed that people with the mechanistic worldview tend to be conventional and conforming, while persons with organismic worldview tend to be efficient, flexible, imaginative, empathic, tolerant, and feminine. In addition, they exhibit more of a social presence, self-acceptance, and are responsible and autonomous. Babbage and Ronan (2000) found that scientists with organismic epistemologies tended to be women. In addition, many were social scientists. These scientists exhibited imagination, compassion, a good-natured personality, an eagerness to cooperate, and tended to have broad interests. In contrast, they found that scientists with a mechanistic epistemology tended to be men. These scientists took more traditional approaches to their disciplines, were seen as hardheaded, skeptical, proud, and competitive.

Berzonsky (1990) proposed that people’s construction of identity could be categorized into three groups, including information-oriented self-theorists, normative-oriented self-theorists, and diffuse-oriented self-theorists. Individuals in the first group actively seek information, elaborate and evaluate it for their self-construction. The second group consider others expectations and points of view and often comply and use these for their self-identity. The third group depends on immediate environmental cues in the form of reward and punishment for their self-definition.
Following Berzensky’s (1990) conceptualization, Neimeyer et al. (1993) found that both constructivist (metaphorist) and rationalist epistemologies correlates positively with information-oriented self-theory. However, the constructivist epistemology also correlates significantly and negatively with normative-oriented self-theory and correlates positively with diffuse-oriented self-theory. This indicates openness for alternative constructions and also an autonomous interpersonal style for an individual with a constructivist epistemology.

Berzonsky (1994) went on to find that persons with contextual, organismic and constructivist epistemologies act like scientists because they regularly gather data, analyze information, and then make changes in their constructions of self. On the other hand, persons with mechanistic and social-deterministic epistemologies tend to submit to the orders and expectations of others. Berzonsky also found a correlation between epistemology and coping styles of people. For example, he found that constructivists are more likely to cope with problems by seeking social support.

These conceptual and empirical works suggest that the personal epistemologies of therapists are linked to their personal qualities. Mahoney (1995) agrees with such a conclusion and offers some examples of how constructivist epistemology is linked to therapist quality and character. An instance would be the constructivist assumption that humans actively construct their own reality. A therapist working from a constructivist epistemology is more than likely going to be very open to and respectful of many versions of reality. In addition, s(he) would also likely be very aware of her/his own personal constructions, inner processes and emotions, as not to interfere with another’s equally valuable construction of reality. In the face of such a multiplicity of reality, such a therapist would probably also be both highly tolerant of ambiguity and accepting of diversity. As mentioned previously, therapists working from a constructivist
stance can be contrasted with the character traits and behavioral tendencies of rationalist therapists. Such rationalist therapists assume a singular, stable and external reality. This assumption has the implication that in order to be healthy, the self and others need to overcome all impediments to the perception of that reality.

Aksoy (2005) investigated exactly such contrasts between therapists working from constructivist and rationalist epistemologies. She found constructivist therapists to be significantly more tolerant of ambiguity and in pursuit of self-awareness than therapists who subscribe to a rationalist epistemology. In agreement with the suggestion from these studies that epistemologies held by therapists are linked to their personal qualities, the present study investigates the personal quality of humility, its importance for and congruence with constructivist epistemology.

The Personal Quality of Humility

A number of researchers have investigated the construct of humility and have delineated the qualities of such a person. In an extensive review of many literature sources, Tangney (2000) found that humble individuals are open-minded, seek advice, and are open to learning. She also found that the humble tend to be highly self-aware and knowing their own limits. They have a contextual and holistic worldview and a respect toward themselves and others. They do not see self, others or the world in simplistic terms, but, rather, they exhibit an appreciation for complexity.

In an empirical investigation, Exline and Geyers (2004) came to several conclusions about humility, some of which overlap and support Tangney’s (2000) findings. They found that humble persons are perceived as honest, empathic, caring, gentle, unselfish and patient. In addition, they are seen as self-respecting, self-accepting people who know their own strengths. Humble people are not necessarily passive or submissive, but rather active and autonomous. The
humble are also perceived as being non-defensive and secure. Like Tangney (2000), Exline and Geyers found the humble to be open-minded, aware of their own limits, willing to seek advice, and focused on learning and growing. They also found that humble people are perceived as having a complex worldview.

In proposing a model of forgiveness that integrates empathy, humility and forgiveness, Worthington (1998) suggests that the humble are highly self-aware, and they know their own weaknesses, needs and wants. They see the fallibility of self and others. They empathize and understand the points of view of others. In Worthington’s model humility is seen on a par with empathy, which is a highly espoused quality within the therapeutic community.

In a conceptual work on this topic, humility is equated with self-awareness, self-acceptance, self-respect, equanimity and even-mindedness, as well as with the giving up of idolatry (Sandage et al., 2001). These researchers also associated humility with having universal consciousness, and conceptualized humility as knowing that everyone is subject to time and change. In other words, humility is more closely tied to contextual awareness, rather than to self-centeredness.

Rowatt et al. (2002) found that humility is linked to an openness to change, as well as to flexibility, an eagerness to listen to others, and openness to facing doubts and multiple points of view. Humility is not over- or undervaluing self and others. Finally, they found that humility is not related to simplistic worldviews, but rather is related to an appreciation of complexity and a willingness to face existential questions.

Analyzing many interviews and citing numerous real life examples, Vera and Rodriguez-Lopez (2004) conceptualize that a humble person is open to new paradigms, is eager to learn, acknowledges personal limits and mistakes, asks for advice, asks for critique of ideas, and
accepts help. The humble person is not over-confident or stubborn. Rather, s(he) is flexible, open to change, and is not attached to one way of doing things. The humble individual respects others, listens, cooperates, integrates others’ ideas into decisions, and helps in the development and learning of others. S(he) appreciates complexity within the world. The humble person is honest, genuine, sincere, caring, and acknowledges the strengths of others.

Constructivist Epistemology and the Quality of Humility

The above-mentioned studies show the complex construct of humility and the characteristics of a humble person. The characteristics of the humble, such as self-awareness, open-mindedness, flexibility, appreciation of complexity and diversity, the dynamic position of asking for help and advice and integrating new information, contextual awareness are qualities that many constructivist therapists accept as important for therapy (Mahoney, 1995; Babbage & Ronan, 2000; Berzonsky, 1990, 1994; Neimeyer et al., 1993; Aksoy 2005). The work of these researchers, suggest constructivist epistemology invites a greater degree of humility, which is consistent with other qualities linked with constructivism. Constructivist epistemology is associated with flexibility, empathy, tolerance, self-acceptance and autonomy (Johnson et al., 1988). These are the qualities that Exline and Geyers (2004) found to be true of the humble person. Johnson, et al. (1988) also found that persons with a mechanistic worldview and a rationalist epistemology tend to be conventional and conforming. This is not true of a humble person. According to Exline and Geyers (2004), the humble person is not necessarily conforming, submissive or passive, as some imagine, but is, in fact, autonomous and active.

Babbage and Ronan (2005) found that persons with an organismic (constructivist) epistemology are compassionate and good-natured, eager to cooperate, and have broad interests. The work of Exline and Geyers (2004) and Vera and Rodriguez-Lopes (2004) also shows the humble to be kind, gentle, caring, open to new paradigms, unattached to one way of doing
things, and active in generating new knowledge. According to Babbage and Ronan (2005), persons subscribing to the mechanistic (rationalist) epistemology were shown to be hardheaded and proud. As Vera and Rodriguez-Lopez (2004) indicate, the humble are not over-confident or stubborn. This suggests that rationalists are not so humble.

More recently, Aksoy (2005) found a positive relationship between constructivist epistemology and therapists’ personal characteristics, such as openness to experience, tolerance of social diversity, tolerance for ambiguity, pursuit of self-awareness, and attendance to emotions. As mentioned previously, these are the qualities Tangney (2000), Rowatt et al. (1998) and Vera and Rodriguez-Lope (2004) show to be true of the humble person. Aksoy (2005) found a negative correlation between rationalist epistemology and the therapist qualities in her investigation mentioned above. In all, there seems to be enough evidence to warrant the proposition that constructivist epistemology invites greater humility than does the rationalist epistemology. The present study sets out to empirically demonstrate this relationship between humility and constructivist and rationalist epistemologies.

It is not yet clear as to why, but in the field of psychology there has been little research focusing on the personality characteristic of humility. This study found a handful of studies between 1960 and 2006. They are mostly in the 2000-2006 period. The trend is encouraging but in the same period there were more than 35,000 studies on depression and 25,895 on anxiety. This study seeks to contribute to the remedy of the paucity of research on humility.

The Second Chapter (2) of this study of relationship between epistemological position and humility will comprise of three sections:

1. A review of literature establishing the relationship between epistemology and therapists’ qualities concluding with a summary.

2. A review of the literature on humility concluding with a summary and review of literature about development of a measure of humility and universal orientation.
3. Based on the above literature reviews and summaries, a comparison of humility with qualities linked to constructivist and rationalist epistemologies concluding with an outline of a set of predictions on how epistemological positions might relate to humility.

   This will be followed in Chapter Three (3) by a description of methods used to test the above-mentioned predictions. The results of the study will then be presented in Chapter Four (4). Finally, the implications of the findings for counseling psychology will be discussed in Chapter Five (5).

   Since there is no known theory of humility, this study contributes vital information to the formulation of one by clarifying its interaction with the complex domain of epistemological positions of therapists. Ultimately, this study hopes to help counselors better their therapeutic relationships and outcomes.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Research has demonstrated that the personal epistemologies of therapists are linked to therapists’ personal characteristics and qualities. A review of psychological literature reveals that humility is an important quality for therapists to possess. A study of therapists’ epistemologies and their related qualities, in conjunction with a study of literature on the topic of humility, suggest that constructivist epistemology values humility and is particularly congenial and supportive of the personal quality of humility. In this chapter, three areas of the research literature will be reviewed. These areas pertain to the epistemologies of therapists, how such epistemologies relate to therapist qualities, and the specific personal quality of humility. The literature on humility will include a discussion regarding the development of a measure for humility and the related construct of universal orientation. The chapter is divided into three sections and will incorporate the above-mentioned areas in the following order: First, it is shown that therapists’ personal qualities are linked to the epistemologies that they hold. Second, conceptions of humility will be outlined and the development of a measure of humility and universal orientation will be discussed. Third, the importance of humility will be underlined and compared with constructivist and rationalist epistemologies. There it is suggested constructivist epistemology invites greater humility for therapists. Then, the hypotheses of the present study will be presented.

Section One: Therapists’ Qualities are linked to Therapists’ Epistemology

Bhaskar (1989) states that epistemology is the theory of knowledge. It is “concerned with the nature, varieties, origins, objects and limits of knowledge” (p. 450). In recent times attention is being paid to epistemology and how the epistemologies held by therapists relate to psychotherapeutic theories, preferences and practices. Some researchers have investigated the
relationship between therapist epistemology and personal qualities (Johnson et al., 1988; Babbage & Ronan, 2000; Berzonsky, 1990, 1994; Neimeyer et al., 1993; Mahoney, 1995; Aksoy, 2005). In order to have a better understanding of their work, it is necessary to study the foundation upon which such work is based.

**Epistemic Style**

If we trace the development of research in the field of therapist epistemology and its relation to therapist variables we come to conceptualizations by Pepper (1942) in his book, *World Hypothesis* as well as to Royce (1964). Pepper (1942) formulates the following four ways of seeing the world: formism, mechanism, contextualism, and organism.

1. Formism holds that there are predetermined forms in the universe, and that meaning comes from comparison and contrasting of objects.

2. Mechanism is a deterministic view that sees the universe as working by cause and effect.

3. Contextualism holds that meaning is not predetermined, but changes with context.

4. Organism suggests that meaning follows an ever-developing dialectic process.

Therefore, in formism and mechanism meaning is static and deterministic, while in contextualism and organism meaning is fluid and process-oriented. Mechanism and organism stand opposite each other.

Royce (1964) and Royce and Powell (1983) propose that there are three ways of knowing, which include empirism, rationalism and metaphorism. Empirists rely on sense perception, as well as public consensus and validation. Rationalists rely on logic for validation. Metaphorists base their validation on the workability and generalizability of knowledge.

Mahoney and Gabreil (1987) conceptualized rationalism and constructivism as standing opposite each other and discussed the implication of each for therapy and therapeutic relationships. Their work contributes insights to the work on relation of therapist epistemology
and therapist qualities. They underline the parallels between realism and rationalism: “Realism assumes a single, stable, external reality that is accurately perceived by the organism’s sensory receptors” (p 45). Realism sharply distinguishes between internal and external realms. About rationalism they state: “Rationalism has argued that thought is superior to sensation in determining experience and validating knowledge.” Rationalism emphasizes thought over bodily processes. From this perspective knowledge is the brain accurately copying the external world.

Mahoney and Gabreil (1987) go on to discuss parallels between constructivism and recent findings in various approaches and disciples, such as motor metatheories, developmental and systems approaches, autopoiesis, social learning and attachment theories. They delineate the implications of such parallels as follows.

In congruence with motor metatheories, constructivism challenges realism and rationalism. Constructivism holds that humans actively construct reality. From this perspective knowledge involves meaning-making processes that are complex and creative, rather than a simple act of the brain accurately copying the external world. For constructivism reality is not basically external and stable and human thought is not separate from bodily processes, feelings and actions. Constructivism stands against “linear models of causality,” and the view that experience can be compartmentalized into cognitive, affective, and behavioral components. It stands against “billiard-ball determinism” (p. 46-47). In agreement with developmental theories, constructivism stands for change throughout the lifespan and competes “with the longstanding preoccupation with outcome alone.” In agreement with systems theory, constructivism is conscious of the “dynamic (versus static) equilibrium evident in spontaneously self organizing complex phenomenon” (p.47).
Mahoney and Gabreil (1987) relate that “Autopoieses refers to self-organizing or self-developing processes in complex, open systems” (page 36). Seeing humans as self-organizing complex systems, constructivism conceives disorder as a natural phenomenon, calling the organism to reorganize in a more viable manner. In congruence with social learning and attachment theory, a constructivist therapist perceives early social interaction, beliefs and expectations about self, emotional attachments and separations as powerful influences on behavior, adjustment and development. Considering the above, the authors hold that there are substantial differences between rationalist and constructivist traditions. They categorize the implications of the differences between rationalist and constructivist traditions for therapy as follows.

- **Intervention emphases:** Rationalists are problem-focused and control-focused. Constructivists are process-focused and development-focused.

- **Conceptualization of problems:** Rationalists conceive problems as dysfunctions, or deficits that should be controlled and eliminated. Constructivists conceive problems as discrepancies between environmental demands and current personal capabilities.

- **Conceptualization of emotions:** Rationalists perceive emotion as the problem and irrational thinking is the cause. Constructivists perceive emotions as powerful ways of knowing and that emotional experiences and their exploration need be encouraged.

- **Resistance:** Rationalists perceive resistance as lack of motivation or avoidance that must be overcome. Constructivists perceive resistance as self-protection of the system against rapid change and an attempt to keep integrity. It should be worked “with,” rather than “against.”

- **Therapeutic relationship:** Rationalists conceive the therapeutic relationship as requiring instruction and guidance. Constructivists conceive the therapeutic relationship as providing a safe, caring, and intense environment for the client to develop relationships with self and the world.

Studying this work of Mahoney and Gabreil (1987), one can infer the personality and qualities of a rationalist or constructivist therapist. For example, the constructivist would be open to many versions of reality, considering each to be as valuable as the other. A rationalist
believing in a singular external reality might not be open to such multiplicity. The constructivist would be more aware of one’s own and other’s emotions, considering them important inroads to development and growth. The rationalist perceiving emotions as problems caused by irrational thinking might be less attentive to them, choose not to delve deeply into them, and even be dismissive of them. Mahoney and Gabreil’s work is foundational to the link between epistemology and therapist qualities.

Botella and Gallifa (1995) consider rationalism a simple worldview and constructivism a complex worldview. In terms of Pepper’s (1942) conceptualization rationalists would be mechanistic and constructivists would be organismic.

**Personal Epistemology and Therapist Qualities**

As mentioned previously, a number of researchers have related epistemology with personality, character and qualities. Johnson et al. (1988) investigated the relation between scientists’ worldviews and personalities. They proposed that scientists’ characters and qualities are reflected in their worldviews. They tested this idea within four groups of personality psychologists, behaviorists, human developmentalists and sociobiologists. They considered two worldviews of organism and mechanism and the assumptions of these worldviews. These assumptions are as follows.

- **Mechanistic Epistemology:** Reality is external to the knower (realism); the object of knowledge is separate from knower (objectivism).
- **Organismic Epistemology:** The world and knower are unified (interactionism); the known world is an active construction of the knower-in-context (constructivism).
- **Mechanistic View of Persons:** People are by nature passive, determined by the environment, have no inherent function, have no true development towards endpoints, and are separate from the social environment.
- **Organismic View of Persons:** People are seen as active, purposive, and autonomous, have inherent function, are creative, changing, progressive, and integrated into the social environment.
• Mechanistic Ontology: Existence is associated with stability and elementarism.
• Organismic Ontology: Existence is associated with change and holism.
• Mechanistic’s Ideal Explanation: Best explanation comes from a reductionistic analysis where parts are related in antecedent-consequence manner
• Organismic’s Ideal Explanation: Best explanation comes from a synthetic understanding of organization where functions served by structures are shown.

Johnson et al. (1988) noted that each of these worldviews contains assumptions about personhood that are consistent with assumptions about existence (ontology), knowledge (epistemology), and the ideal explanation of phenomenon. That is, if people were administered personality tests they would present themselves in ways that are consistent with their preferred worldview. For example, if a person subscribes to the mechanistic worldview and sees people as reactive, passive, and determined by the environment, a personality test will reveal him/her to be reactive and determined by environment. That is, there is congruence between individual’s worldview and his/her own personality.

Johnson et al. (1988) tested this hypothesis by having eight groups of students from the above-mentioned four disciplines take two psychological tests. One measured personality and the other was an inventory measuring preference for either the organismic or mechanistic worldview. They found that persons with a mechanistic worldview tend to be orderly, conventional, and conforming, while persons with an organismic worldview tend to be efficient, responsible, flexible, imaginative, empathic, tolerant, feminine, interpersonally active, and have social presence, self-acceptance, autonomy and individualism. The organismic person was found to be intuitive and perceiving, while the mechanistic person was revealed as more sensing and judging. More specifically, on various dimensions of the Bipolar Adjectives Rating Scale (BARS), the organismic and mechanistic subscription to various bipolar adjectives was as shown in Table 2-1.
Table 2-1: Comparison of Mechanistic and Organismic worldviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BARS Dimensions</th>
<th>Mechanistic</th>
<th>Organismic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentality</td>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
<td>Creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inartistic</td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeableness</td>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>Warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-centered</td>
<td>Empathic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novelty</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Unorthodox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predictable</td>
<td>Changeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>Experimenting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As an example from Table 2-1, a person with a mechanistic worldview presents the self as simple, passive, conservative, traditional, and conventional. A person with an organismic worldview presents the self as complex, active, liberal, unorthodox, changeable, and experimenting. On the likeableness dimensions the mechanistic individual is shown to be cold and self-centered and the organismic person is shown to be warm and empathic. These are in line with the assumptions associated with each of these two worldviews. That is to say that a person’s worldview and personal qualities are linked in a consistent manner.

Babbage and Ronan (2000) noted two shortcomings in the work of Johnson et al. (1988). The first was that although Johnson et al. (1988) intended to investigate the relationship between the worldviews and personalities of scientists, they had, in fact, used undergraduates from various disciplines. They had not used scientists who were actually working in their fields in a professional capacity. The second was that although Johnson et al. (1988) had intended to generalize their findings to all scientists, they had used only social scientists for their research. Babbage and Ronan (2000) remedied both shortcomings of the research of Johnson et al. (1988). They replicated that research but used “academically-based social and physical scientists.” For a measure of personality they used an instrument (NEO-PI) that is based on the five-factor model introduced by McCrea and Costa (1987). The five factors of this model are labeled: 1)
extroversion or surgency, 2) agreeableness, 3) conscientiousness, 4) emotional stability vs. neuroticism, and 5) cultural or openness to experience. They also used the BARS measure mentioned previously. They found that the social scientists are more organismic and traditional scientists, such as chemists, physicists, mathematicians and statisticians, are more mechanistic. The results from the BARS instrument showed that their findings more or less matched the finding of Johnson et al. (1988) with some additional interesting details. The additional findings for scientists with organismic and mechanistic worldviews who subscribed to one of bipolar adjectives are shown in Table 2-2.

Table 2-2: Comparison of Mechanistic and Organismic worldviews with NEO-PI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BARS Dimensions</th>
<th>Mechanistic</th>
<th>Organismic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likeableness</strong></td>
<td>Irritable</td>
<td>Good-natured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>Tactful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stubborn</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power</strong></td>
<td>Unenergetic</td>
<td>Vigorous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unambitious</td>
<td>Enterprising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Novelty</strong></td>
<td>Old fashioned</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preserving</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEO-PI Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEO-PI Factors</th>
<th>Less Open</th>
<th>More open</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Openness to Experience</strong></td>
<td>Less Agreeable</td>
<td>More Agreeable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-2 further demonstrates features of personality associated with mechanistic and organismic worldviews. As an example, on the likeableness dimensions, the mechanistic respondents were shown to be irritable and stubborn, while the organismic respondents were shown to be good-natured and cooperative. On the novelty dimension, the mechanistic individuals were found to be old-fashioned and preserving while the organismic individuals were found to be modern and progressive.

Results from NEO-PI personality inventory indicated that two factors related more positively with the organismic worldview. They were the Openness to Experience and Agreeableness factors. This is supported by conventionality and stubbornness found by the
BARS results for the mechanistic worldview. Table 2-2 shows the additional findings of Babbage and Ronan (2000). Babbage and Ronan (2000) found that scientists with an organismic epistemology tended to be women, gravitated toward the social sciences, and were imaginative, compassionate, good-natured, eager to cooperate, and held broad interests. The scientists with a mechanistic epistemology tended to be men, practiced more traditional [“hard”] sciences, and were hardheaded, skeptical, proud, and competitive.

Another study examining the relationship between epistemology and personal qualities was by Berzonsky (1994). He studied the relation between personal epistemology and the construction of self-identity. Previously, Berzonsky (1990) had conceptualized identity as a self-constructed theory about oneself, or, a “self-theory.” Self-theory is a framework for making meaning out of life experiences, which allow individuals to deal with environmental demands. The effectiveness of the self-theory depends on how it practically helps one cope with and solve life problems, as well as how open and flexible it is for revision and change.

Berzonsky (1990) proposed a model of identity development that posits that people construct their theory of self in three distinct ways or styles. These three “self-theorists” are:

1. Information-oriented self-theorists
2. Normative-oriented self-theorists
3. Diffuse/avoidant oriented self-theorists

**Information-oriented self-theorists:** are “skeptical about their self-construction and are open to environmental evidence, and willing to evaluate and accommodate self-constructs in light of discrepant information.” They act like scientists in the process self-identity. For example, they hypothesize, gather data and test their theories. This style is related to personally defined identity, introspectiveness and openness to ideas, values and actions. Berzonsky (1994)
cites research that indicates that this style is related to more self-exploration and to an internal locus of control.

**Normative-oriented self-theorist:** base their self-identity on the expectations and the dictates of significant others. It is preoccupied with protecting and conserving existing self-constructs. So it is, at times, biased, dogmatic and unyielding. It is also “associated with a collectively defined identity.”

**Diffuse/avoidant oriented self-theorists:** work in an impromptu and ad hoc manner, delaying self-identity as much as possible. Ultimately, the situation or context persuades or leads to a decision. These situation-specific acts do not lead to a stable, long-term self-theory. This self-identity needs continuous input from environment in the form of approval, pleasure, and reassurances. Berzonsky reports that this style is related to socially defined identity, external-control expectancies and negatively correlated with introspectiveness and openness to personal feelings.

Berzonsky agrees with Lakatos (1970) that a scientific research program involves three components: 1) a hard-core philosophical assumption, 2) a revisable theoretical hypothesis, and 3) a methodological procedure. From this Berzonsky argues that self-theorists also have a hard core philosophical assumption about themselves, the nature of knowledge, and life. In other words, they have an ontological and epistemological position and a theory about the self that guides their interaction with the world and their development.

Berzonsky hypothesized that information-oriented self-theorists would subscribe to a constructivist epistemology, and are active in their construction of reality including their self-identity. The normative-oriented self-theorists would subscribe to social deterministic epistemology. That is, for such individuals self identity is determined by mechanical
environmental forces. A third alternative is that self-identity reflects a formistic predetermined inner essence. People subscribing to the last two “would tend to be passive or situationally controlled; they may see themselves as having relatively less control” over their identity.

Berzonsky’s hypotheses proved to be true. Information-oriented self-theorists were related to constructivist epistemology and normative-oriented self-theorists were related to social-deterministic epistemology. That is to say, Berzonsky found that persons with contextual, organismic and constructivist epistemologies act like scientists because they gather data, analyze information and make changes in their constructions of self. In contrast, persons with mechanistic and social-deterministic epistemologies tend to submit to orders and expectations of others. Berzonsky had also used a measure of relativism/absolutism in this study and found that constructivism had a significant positive correlation with relativism, while social-determinism showed no correlation. Berzonsky also found a correlation between epistemology and coping styles of people. He found that constructivists are more likely to seek social support. A negative correlation between constructivism and normative oriented self-identity indicated an inverse relation between constructivism and dogmatism.

In the third part of his study Berzonsky (1994) related his three orientations to self-theory to constructivist epistemological assumptions and Peppers (1946) classifications of worldviews. He found that:

1. Constructivist epistemological assumptions are positively related to information-oriented self-theory and the contextual and organismic worldviews assumption.

2. Normative-dogmatic oriented self-theory is associated to mechanistic and formistic worldviews assumptions.

3. Avoidant-diffuse oriented self-theory is related to formistic worldview.

Here, constructivism is related positively with information-oriented self theory that, as Berzonsky concludes, is a context oriented style that monitors environment for effective
alternatives, revising self-views and promoting “an ongoing interchange between assimilative and accommodative processes; a dialectical process of identity development.”

In summary, constructivists are active in the construction of self-identity, are open and sensitive to environmental evidence, are open to ideas, are not absolutist or dogmatic, are open to self-exploration, have internal locus of control and so can be said to be autonomous.

Following Berzonsky’s (1990) conceptualization, the research of Neimeyer et al. (1993) found that both constructivist (metaphorist) and rationalist epistemologies correlate positively with information-oriented self-theory. However, the constructivist epistemology also correlates significantly and negatively with normative-oriented self-theory and correlates positively with diffuse-oriented self-theory. This indicates openness to alternative constructions. It also suggests that individuals with a constructivist epistemology hold an autonomous interpersonal style.

Another work that suggests therapists’ epistemologies are linked to their qualities is a conceptual work by Mahoney (1995) In that work he delineates the challenges for a constructivist therapist as opposed to challenges to a non-constructivist therapist. He organizes the challenges around four themes. One is epistemological challenge and another is the existential challenge, both of which relate to therapist qualities and behavior. Epistemologically, constructivists reject objectivism. They do not believe that there is one reality or that there is one unbiased authority. Therefore they cannot depend on one leader’s collected works as a solid base for decisions. They also cannot trust that their own experiences are unbiased. Existentially, constructivist therapists know that their experiences may come close but are not the same as another’s, such as the experiences of the client. Constructivist counselors knows there are limits how much s(he) can understand another. These epistemological positions and existential challenges lead to particular qualities for the constructivist. For example the therapist rarely
teaches. If there is any teaching and therefore learning, it is in both directions. That is, the constructivist therapists need to be open to exploration and new learning. For a constructivist every client is unique with her/his own construction of reality and so every encounter is a new opportunity for learning. This learning is personal and not the same as another’s experience.

One constructivist position is that much of our experiences organize in an unconscious manner. For example much of what is communicated in therapy session might not be on a conscious level. The same is true of learning- the learning in session might be deeper than what is recognized at the moment. Also the integration of experience takes place holistically- i.e. not in a delimited and predetermined way. The result is the constructivist therapist, other than attending to the explicit also works intuitively. It follows that such a therapist must also have developed a high tolerance for ambiguity.

Since the constructivist therapist believes individuals are active, dynamic constructors of reality s(he) does not come with prepared maps for directing the therapy session. The direction of the session “is an ever-evolving and dynamic interaction.” (p.387) That means the therapist trusts and respects the process. The therapist may lead or may follow and is not focused on her/his preconceptions. The constructivist is open to new experiences and personal change.

About values Mahoney (1995) states: “Values like objective truth, cannot be justified or otherwise univocally authorized. What is good or bad, sacred or profane, and right or wrong is always framed within individual, social, and historical contexts.”(p.389) Constructivist therapist being conscious that human activities are value-laden and interacting with multiple contexts is necessarily accepting of diversity.

Aksoy (2005) tested the relationship of personal qualities that Mahoney (1995) conceptualized as related to constructivist epistemology. In particular she focused on five
therapist qualities: Pursuit of self-awareness, attending emotions, tolerance of ambiguity, social
tolerance of diversity and openness to experience. She also tested the presence of the same set of
qualities in therapists who subscribed to rationalist epistemology. She requested a large group of
practicing therapist to answer questionnaires measuring these qualities as well as a questionnaire
indicating epistemological position. The following is a review of her work and all citations are
from that work.

Pursuit of self-awareness includes awareness of inner world, awareness of inner messages
and also personal behavior. It is awareness of discomfort and stress (Glicken, 1983; Wityk,
2002). This is awareness of own needs, past unresolved trauma (Jaffe, 1986) and awareness of
meaning of self as helper and finally being aware of own abilities and limitations (Farber and
Heifetz, 1982; Glicken, 1983).

Attending to emotions is similar to pursuit of self-awareness but focused on emotions. It is
of particular importance in close relationship with clients and facilitation of client’s emotional
expression (Mahoney, 1995).

Tolerance of ambiguity is how a person deals with unfamiliar, complex, and inconsistent
information. It is analogous with comfort with shades of gray rather than seeing things in black-
and-white terms (Beitel et al., 2004). It is related with openness to and support and appreciation
of diversity (Chen & Hooijberg, 2000). It is also related to comfort with less structure and
direction (Vasco, 1994). It is related to openness to revision of the course of therapy (Mahoney,
1995).

Social tolerance of diversity is respect and tolerance of “diverse sets of values, life-styles
and identities.” (Aksoy, 2005 p.53) It is appreciating personal and cultural differences. It
supports cooperativeness and is the tendency to accept people as they are. (Cloninger, Savkic, & Przybeck, 1993)

Openness to experience is defined as “one’s openness to fantasy, aesthetics, feelings, actions, ideas and values.” (McCrae & Costa, 1991) It reflects “active imagination, aesthetic sensitivity, receptiveness to inner feelings, preference for variety, intellectual curiosity and independence of judgment. Higher levels of openness to experience imply flexibility and tolerance of ambiguity and novelty, whereas lower levels of openness imply rigidity and intolerance of ambiguity and complexities.” (McCrae & Costa, 2003).

Based on the epistemological and ontological views of rationalists and constructivists Aksoy (2005) conceptualized that all of the above mentioned qualities to be positively related to the constructivism, contextual and organismic worldview and negatively related to a rationalistic and mechanistic worldviews. The result of her work showed such conceptualizations to be true. Her work showed that all these therapists’ qualities are significantly and positively related to constructivist epistemology and significantly and negatively related to rationalist epistemology.

**Summary of Therapist Epistemology and Qualities**

The above findings clearly demonstrate the interaction of epistemic position and personal qualities of people, in general, and of therapists, in particular. They are represented in Table 2-3 and related to the two epistemological positions of rationalism and constructivism. The table summarizes that constructivists have a contextual worldview. That is, they are aware of context in their making of meaning. They have complex cognitive processes; that is, they appreciate and see world as complex. They have broad interests and they are imaginative and creative. They are compassionate and good-natured. They are cooperative in that they work in harmony with others. They are empathic, tolerant, and flexible. They are active, efficient, autonomous, and self-accepting. They are open to other views and constructions of reality.
Table 2-3: Comparison of worldviews with Rationalism and Constructivism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Rationalism</th>
<th>Constructivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pepper (1946)</td>
<td>Formism, Mechanism</td>
<td>Contextualism, Organism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royce (1964)</td>
<td>Empiricist, Rationalist</td>
<td>Metaphorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality Mahoney and Gabreil (1987)</td>
<td>External, stable, universal, knowable</td>
<td>Internal, developing, personal, social, constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botella &amp; Gallifa (1995) View of Human Agency</td>
<td>Objectivist simple</td>
<td>Constructivist complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson et al. (1988) Qualities</td>
<td>Conventional, conforming</td>
<td>Efficient, flexible, imaginative, empathic, tolerant, feminine, have social presence, self-acceptance, responsible, autonomous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson et al. (1988) Qualities</td>
<td>Men, traditional scientists, hardheaded, skeptic, proud, competitive, traditional</td>
<td>Women, social scientist, and have imagination, compassion, a good nature, eager to cooperate, have broad interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berzonsky (1994) Self-theory</td>
<td>Normative oriented self style (+ r)</td>
<td>Information oriented self style (+ r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berzonsky (1990) Self-theory</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diffuse oriented self style (+ r): open to alternative constructions, autonomous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neimeyer et al. (1993) Self-theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aksoy (2005) Qualities</td>
<td>Negative correlation (-r) with Pursuit of self-awareness, attending to emotions, tolerance of ambiguity, social tolerance of diversity and openness to experience</td>
<td>Positive relationship (+ r) with Pursuit of self-awareness, attending to emotions, tolerance of ambiguity, social tolerance of diversity and openness to experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section Two: Conceptions of Humility

As mentioned before, the subject of humility has been granted little attention in the social and psychological sciences. A review of the psychological literature results in very few studies,
most of which do not have a focus on humility. Of the handful of studies that refer to this topic, more than half are from the year 2000 and onward. In this section the present study reviews existing articles on the subject. Also, literature on development of a measure of humility and universal orientation will be reviewed.

**Tangney (2000): Theoretical Perspectives and Empirical Findings**

Personality constructs, such as self-esteem or narcissism, have had much research devoted to them. According to Tangney (2000), there are two main factors for the lack of research on humility. One is that humility is typically perceived as being related to values and religion. She observes that mainstream psychology has stayed clear of topics that are value-laden, such as those related to virtue and morality. Psychology has also traditionally avoided the study of human experiences surrounding wisdom, gratitude and forgiveness. The second factor Tangney considers is the current lack of a measure for humility. She argues if there were measures for humility, the research might be profuse. She mentions studies of shame as a case in point. The development of a measure for shame resulted in an explosion of research on the subject in the 1990s.

To measure humility we need to be able to define what it is. Tangney invites us to look at existing conceptions and studies of humility, starting with various dictionary meanings. The American Heritage Dictionary offers synonyms for *humility*, which include “modesty, unpretentiousness, and reserve.” It also gives “self-effacement” as a synonym. For the concept of *humble*, it gives the following definition: “low in rank, quality, or station; humiliate, to give a lower condition or station to; abase.”

Tangney referred to The Oxford English Dictionary, which defines *humility* as “having a lowly opinion of oneself, meekness, lowliness.” Funk and Wagnell’s Standard College Dictionary defines *humble* as “lowly in kind, state, condition, etc.; of little worth, unimportant;
common … lowly in feeling; lacking self-esteem. Having a sense of insignificance, unworthiness, dependence, or sinfulness; meek; penitent.” Such definitions certainly do not frame humility as something to aspire for. Tangney (2000) cites a number of psychologists who have a similar conception of humility as found in the dictionaries. However, this is far from universal, as we shall see from the following viewpoints.

For example, Emmons (1999, in Tangney, 2000) gives another view:

To be humble is not to have a low opinion of oneself, it is to have an accurate opinion of oneself. It is the ability to keep one’s talents and accomplishments in perspective, to have a sense of self acceptance, an understanding of one’s imperfections, and to be free from arrogance and self-esteem (Clark 1992). (p.33)

Templeton (1997) states:

Humility is not self-depreciation…humility represents wisdom… humility is knowing you are smart but are not all knowing. It is accepting that you have personal power but not omnipotent…Inherent in humility resides an open and receptive mind…it leaves us more open to learn from others and refrain from seeing issues and people only in black and white. The opposite of humility is arrogance - the belief that we are wiser or better than others. Arrogance promotes separation rather than community. (p.162-163)

On the faith-based dimension of humility, Tangney says there is “the notion of a higher, greater power and the implication that although we may have considerable wisdom and knowledge, there are always limits to our perspective.” And, citing Hwang, 1982; Templeton 1997, adds: “Humility carries with it an open-mindedness, a willingness to admit mistakes and seek advice and learn.” Also, “Humility is the key to progress.” (Templeton 1997, p.30) Tangney continues:

Also inherent in the state of humility is a relative lack of self-focus or self-preoccupation. Templeton (1997) refers to a process of becoming ‘unselled,’ which goes hand in hand with the recognition of one’s place in the world. We are each just one person in a much larger state of affairs. A person who has gained a sense of humility is no longer phenomenologically at the center of his or her world. His or her focus is on the larger community, of which he or she, is a part. It is from this perspective that the excessively self-depreciating person can be seen in some important aspect as lacking humility.
Tangney goes on to say that in giving up ego-centricity, “persons with humility become ever more open to recognizing the abilities, potential, worth and importance of others. One important consequence of becoming ‘unselved’ is that we no longer have the need to enhance and defend an all-important self at the expense of our evaluation of others (Halling et al., 1994). Our attention shifts outward, our eyes are opened to the beauty and potential of those around us. As Means, et al. (1990) observed, humility ‘is an increase in the valuation of others and not a decrease in the valuation of oneself.’”(p.214)

Tangney summarizes humility into six principles and says “the theological, philosophical and psychological literature portray humility as a rich, multifaceted construct in sharp contrast to the dictionary definitions that emphasize a sense of unworthiness and low self regard.” The six key elements are:

1. An accurate assessment of one’s abilities and achievements (rather than low self-esteem or self-depreciation)

2. An ability to acknowledge one’s mistakes, imperfections, or gaps in knowledge (often vis-à-vis a “higher power”)

3. An openness to new ideas, contradictory information, and advice

4. A keeping one’s abilities, accomplishments, and one’s place in the world in perspective (such as seeing one’s self as just one person in the larger scheme of things)

5. A relatively low self-focus, or a “forgetting of the self,” again recognizing that one is but one part of a larger universe

6. An appreciation of the value of all things, and the many different ways that people and things can contribute to our world

After considering that humility is not constructs such as low self-esteem or absence of narcissism, Tangney turns to issues involved with constructing a measure of humility. She proposes that it may be wise to consider such a measurement on two levels. One level to consider would be situational, which is the contextual and relational aspects of the expression of
humility. Another level would be dispositional, which includes the personality traits and characteristics associated with humility.

Tangney notes that there is a “forgetting of self” involved in humility. She refers to Halling et al. (1994) who say that humility calls attention towards the other. Or, as Singh (1967) says, “true humility is freedom from all consciousness of self, which includes freedom from consciousness of humility. The true humble man never knows that he is humble.” (p.4) Tangney also looks at past failed attempts at the construction of measures for humility, as well as the despondency of those who have tried. She concludes that humility may represent one of the constructs of personality that is difficult to measure. Tangney closes her chapter by stating that the work in humility research will be “greatly enhanced by a clear and consistently articulated conceptualization” of this rich construct and “by development of theoretically informed measure(s) of humility.”

**Summary:** In essence, Tangney and scholars that she cites do not conceptualize humility as a negative trait. Specifically, they do not equate humility with self-deprecation, unworthiness, or a lack of self-respect. On the contrary, they conceptualize humility as an accurate and realistic opinion of self, which involves self-acceptance, knowing one’s own imperfections, open-mindedness, a willingness to admit to mistakes, an ability to seek advice, an openness to learning, a lack of self-focus and egocentricity, and knowing one’s place in the world. A humble person sees him/herself holistically and contextually as one of many in the larger scheme of things. A humble person does not consider him/herself as better or superior to others, but such an individual also does not see him/herself as inferior. Rather, a humble person sees equality in all human beings. This leads to an inclusive attitude whereby others are valued and appreciated, and there is a sense of and focus on community instead of isolation and
separation. Such a person has a more complex worldview, avoiding seeing others in dichotomous black and white terms.

In all, it seems a humble person is a dynamic, progressive and growing person who knows her/his own limits and takes steps to better her/himself. S(he) is realistic, non-judgmental, respectful, appreciates and values the self, others, life and the universe, and probably has good interpersonal relationships. There seems to be a strong self/other dynamic present in this respecting of others, listening, feeling of equality, valuing of others and having a holistic, inclusive and complex world view.

**Exline and Geyer (2004): Perception of Humility**

Following Tangney’s (2000) call for a conceptualization of two levels for research on humility, namely the situational and dispositional, Exline and Geyers (2004) considered the situational aspects of humility. They wanted to know how people perceived humility. They asked a group of 127 young adults what their impressions of humility were, how they saw humility manifested in others who represented various socioeconomic backgrounds and professions. They asked participants about aspects they associated with humility, how they defined humility, situations where they felt humble, examples of humble people, qualities likely to be found in humble people, and the types of people in whom humility would be seen as a weakness or strength. These researchers then correlated these responses with measures of self-esteem, religiosity, narcissism, and social desirability. Contrary to dictionary definitions of humility, participants expressed positive views toward humility, associating it with success and positive emotions. They also associated strong psychological adjustment and high self-esteem with humility.

Exline and Geyer relate that many theologians, philosophers, and some recent psychologists have written about humility as a virtue or strength. They point to Alcoholic
Anonymous (AA) and the fact that humility is considered a cornerstone of their treatment of addiction. “Within Alcoholic Anonymous, writers have referred to humility as the ability to honestly accept one’s humanity and the knowledge of one’s own imperfections—including one’s powerlessness over alcohol (Step 1) (Kurtz & Ketcham, 1993).” They add that “humility involves rejecting implicit ‘all or nothing’, instead choosing to be content about one’s status as an ordinary human being.” According to AA they say, “A lack of humility will impede recovery from alcoholism.”

Exline and Geyer also refer to a study by Hart and Hugget (2003) that revealed a negative correlation between an aspect of narcissism and the recovery from alcoholism. This implies that there may be a negative correlation between narcissism and humility. As mentioned before, they found such a relationship between the two.

Exline and Geyer, citing Mean et al. (1990), refer to various conceptualizations of humility. They say that humility implies the following four dispositions:

1. A willingness to admit one’s faults
2. A recognition that one cannot control all social encounters
3. An attitude of patience and gentleness with other people
4. A sense of empathy for other people

In addition, the authors cite Roberts (1982), who emphasizes a lack of concern with social rank as a core feature of humility. They also refer to Sandage (1999), who uses the term “ego-humility” to refer to a “realistic orientation towards self and other that includes a willingness to acknowledge one’s strengths and to face one’s limitations.”

As for psychologists who consider humility a virtue and strength, Exliner and Geyer refer to Emmons (1999), Tangney (2002) and Landrum (2002):

Emmon (1999) suggests humility involves accuracy, self-acceptance, understanding one’s imperfections, keeping one’s talents and accomplishments in perspective and freedom from both arrogance and low self-esteem.
Tangney’s (2000) definition, reviewed previously, agrees with this. Landrum (2002) adds to the construct of humility such behaviors and dispositions as open-mindedness, the seeking of advice, and a desire to learn. And, Exline et al. (2004) add a “non defensive willingness to see the self accurately, including strengths and limitations” to this list. They suggest that humility “stems from a sense of security in which feelings of personal worth are based on stable, reliable sources.”

These conceptualizations certainly do not position humility as a weakness. The reason it is frequently seen as such may be, the authors suggest, due to a North American cultural “preoccupation with positive self-views.” That is, part of humility is openness and acceptance of ones limitations and errors. This does not agree with an all positive self-view.

Considering the benefits and costs of humility, the authors enumerate a number of logical possibilities. On the positive and beneficial side, humility may be considered an alternative to boastfulness. In the case of positive psychological adjustment, it could be associated with a sense of security, an accurate self-perception, a non-defensive and open attitude, non-grandiosity and self-promotion.

On the negative side, Exline and Geyers (2005) say humility may be associated “with humiliation, low self-esteem, and harsh self-criticism.” Because being humble involves being open to accepting one’s shortcomings, it may be associated with failure. It may be perceived as risky in relationships, especially in competitive situations where domination is valued, such as in a job interview or in a place where confident and decisive self-presentation is required. While humility may be seen as positive where cooperation and sharing is valued, such as in marriage or romantic relationships, it may not be considered a positive trait in a military or business situation.
Overall, the results of this study showed that views of humility were favorable. Humility was seen as a strength rather than weakness. Most of the participants wanted to develop humility. Humility was not seen as related to low self-esteem or shortcomings. Humility overlapped considerably with modesty. Other qualities associated with humility were unselfishness and a lack of conceit. Humility was perceived as related to positive qualities and had a much lower association with shame, embarrassment, humiliation, or attitudes of submissiveness and passivity. Regarding the affect and the experience of humility, participants reported a much higher level of pleasant than unpleasant emotions. The majority reported relating humility to experiences of success or accomplishment.

Participants also named characteristics of a humble person. They identified qualities like kindness, caring towards others, refraining from bragging, success, intelligence, unselfishness, and self-sacrifice. A minority characterized humble people as timid, quiet and unassertive.

On the whole, humble people were rated positively. However adjustment ratings were higher than leadership and confidence ratings. That is, humble individuals were seen as well adjusted and kind. However, when relating the virtue of humility to leadership positions, participants offered mixed responses. Although participants saw humility as strength, it was seen more favorably in religious seekers than in close others. It was viewed as least favorable in roles associated with leadership and entertainment. So views of humility are moderated by social roles. This is also complicated by gender. More women than men see humility as a strength in leaders and religious seekers. Women, more than men, also see humility as an aspect of good psychological adjustment. However, more women than men report negative experiences when they have felt humble. This is especially true in success experiences whereby women
specifically report embarrassment in such situations. Exline and Geyer believe this is related to what research report as the social costs of women outperforming others.

Another result of this research was that the higher the narcissism of an individual, the lower was his/her positive view of humility, particularly as it was associated with strong psychological adjustment and confidence. The opposite was true of self-esteem. The higher the self esteem of a person, the more s(he) associated humility with good adjustment and confidence, and the less s(he) associated humility with shame, embarrassment or humiliation. More detailed analysis showed that the exhibitionist and vanity subscales of the narcissism measure showed consistent negative correlations with the perception of humility.

In summary most experiences of humility were recalled as situations involving success and accomplishment, rather than failure or a lowering of self. Humble individuals were described as kind, modest, able and resourceful, and having positive attributes. Humble persons were not described as harsh self-critics or low in self-respect. The humble were seen positively in terms of adjustment, confidence and leadership. Humility was seen as an asset in all social roles, but to different degrees depending on the role. Another conclusion was that narcissists are less likely to see humility positively. Self esteem defined as a positive, accepting view of self, rather than a feeling of superiority, correlates with positive views toward humility. In this aspect, Exline and Geyer conclude that a person with high self-esteem and low narcissism may be considered humble.

As for the shortcomings of their research, Exline and Geyer suggest that work with other age groups beyond early adulthood needs be undertaken. Having researched in what they identify as an an American individualistic culture, they also point out the need for research in comparatively more collectivist cultures. Finally, their research focused on how people perceive
humility. It did not interrogate the validity of these perceptions. For example, some people did not associate humility with effective leadership, but this research did not examine whether humble people actually made good leaders or not. However, their research does point to a number of important aspects of humility, including how people perceive and experience humility. This is important because if humility is such a positive quality and strength, its development, or lack thereof, depends on how it is perceived in society.

Summary: Summarizing the work of Exline and Geyers shows the humble as seen positively. People see the humble as a well-adjusted and self-respecting person. Humility is equated with honesty, lack of conceit, knowing one’s own imperfections, admitting to one’s own faults, accepting one’s self as ordinary and equal to all others. In humility an “all or nothing” mentality is absent and so it is associated with a complex worldview. The humble lacks egocentricity and a concern with social rank. Humble people have self-acceptance- they accept their own strengths and limitations, hold realistic conceptions of themselves and others, and are neither arrogant nor lacking in self-respect. They are secure, open-minded, seek advice, and continually learn. Other qualities of humble people include non-defensiveness, intelligence, successfulness, unselfishness, kindness, patience and gentleness with others, empathy for others, and care. They are neither harsh nor boastful, and they are not exhibitionists. They are neither shamed, nor embarrassed, nor humiliated. They are not necessarily submissive or passive but are, instead, perceived as autonomous, dynamic and active people.

These researchers also found that more women than men see humility as a personal strength and sign of positive psychological adjustment. In all it seems that their findings share much with Tangney’s research mentioned previously. They also found additional traits accompanying a humble person whereby humility is seen as strength and a positive experience.
Worthington (1998): The Empathy-Humility-Commitment Model of Forgiveness

In this conceptual work, Worthington proposes a model of forgiveness that has three components: empathy, humility, and commitment. He states that forgiveness requires empathy for the offender, humility in order to see the self as fallible as the offender, and an ability to commit to forgiving. For the purpose of the present research, a focus on Worthington’s conception of humility will be used. He states that “without empathy for one who hurt us we are unlikely to forgive.” But later he adds this may not be enough. He says that although we may cognitively consider the offender’s view, and even identify emotionally with this person, we may still continue to consider the offender as sinful and evil. Citing Means et al. (1990), he says there is need for humility. He offers the following thought process of a humble person:

I see my offender’s motivation and understand his or her point of view. I feel what he or she might have been feeling. Further, I have felt similar feelings. I see that I have done things or have wanted things as wicked as the other person. In those instances of my own weakness, I would like to have forgiveness extended to me. I want mercy for my own foibles. Who am I to demand justice for this person when I want mercy for myself? I know the other person is needy. I want to help this person. I want to release him or her from the hate, anger and desire for retribution that I felt. That is the decent thing to do. That is the right thing to do. (p. 5)

It seems the humble person has a clear, realistic conception of self, what is decent and wants to do the right thing. Worthington adds “such reasoning sees humans as fallible, the offender as human, and (finally) the self as one of those fallible human beings. Instead of rage-focused demand for justice, the person can respond in humility. Forgiveness is the natural response to empathy and humility.” (p. 5)

Bryant (1999), further developing the Worthington model, emphasizes the emotional component of forgiveness. She rightly states that the whole process of forgiveness starts with an emotional wound. She holds that, ultimately, cognitive and behavioral therapies will not be able to heal this wound. She suggests “forgiveness is initiated by empathy for the offender, furthered
by humility in the person who was hurt and solidified through making a public commitment to forgiveness.” (p.45) The humility Bryant talks of is based on reasoning. Examples of such reasoning might include: “I have done bad things,” “I have weaknesses,” “I have needed forgiveness,” and “I make mistakes.”

**Summary:** In essence, Worthington says a humble person is empathic and understanding of others’ points of view. The humble person sees the self and others as fallible human beings. In this way s(he) has a clear and realistic conception of self. The humble person is self-aware and accepts his/her own weaknesses, needs, wants, mistakes and faults.

**Rowatt, Ottenbreitt, Nesselroade, and Cunnigham (2002): On Being Holier-Than-Thou or Humbler-Than-Thee**

Rowatt et al. (2002) engaged in a study of humility and have defined it as “involving a genuine modesty that does not engender low self-esteem.” (p.227) In addition, they refer to Emmons (1999), who says: “Humility involves a realistic appraisal of one’s positive and negative characteristics in relation to others.” The research of Rowatt et al. looks how humility and religiousness relate to one another. They refer to Allport and Ross (1967) who conceptualized intrinsic and extrinsic varieties of religiousness. Intrinsic religiousness implies a “devout commitment to religious beliefs as an ultimate end” (p.228). They hypothesize intrinsic religiosity should correlate positively with humility. Extrinsic religiousness “involves the use of religion as a means to achieve another self-serving end” (p. 228). These self-serving ends might include comfort or social reward (Kirkpatrick, 1989). Rowatt et al. (2002) also cite research (Batson, Schoenrade, and Ventis 1993; Donahue, 1985) that has found that extrinsic religiousness correlates with prejudice and dogmatism. They suggest that an extrinsically religious person “might use religion to appear generous, selfless or humble.” (p.228)
The authors also inform us that there is a component of religiousness that is called “quest.” It “involves the degree to which a person faces complex existential questions, perceives religious doubt as positive, and remains open to religious change” (citing Batson & Schoenrade, 1991). Quest is associated with increased sensitivity to a victim’s desire for help (Darely & Batson 1973; Batson & Gray 1981), increased cognitive complexity (Batson & Raynor-Price 1983), and decreased self-righteousness (Falbo & Sheperd 1986). Increases in quest, therefore, are likely to be associated with more humility. In other words, for the purposes of the present work, humility is associated with openness to change, flexibility, seeing doubt as a positive experience, sensitivity, and, therefore, listening to the voices of victims. Humility does not involve seeing things in a simplistic manner, but rather involves an appreciation for complexity. Finally, humility requires less self-complacency.

In summary, considering the “quest” component of religiousness, the authors had three hypotheses. The first is an intrinsic-humility hypothesis which follows that the more intrinsic one’s religious orientation is, the more humble the person is. The second is an extrinsic-humility hypothesis. This hypothesis states that the more extrinsic one’s religious orientation is, the less humble this person will be. Finally, the last hypothesis suggests that the more one is oriented toward “quest,” the more humble one is.

The authors operationalized humility as being the difference between evaluation of self and other in religiosity. That is, “overvaluing the self in relation to others or undervaluing others in relation to self” (p.228). The results of the research were surprising: contrary to expectation the intrinsically oriented people were found to be less humble- i.e. the intrinsically oriented considered self as more religious. In the case of extrinsically orientated people, they were not associated with the holier-than-thou effect. But in the case of the quest orientated people they
were shown to associate with a small but significant decrease in the holier-than-thou orientation “indicating the possibility of higher relative levels of humility.” In other words the summary presented above is true. That is: humility is associated with openness to change (i.e. flexibility), seeing doubt as positive, sensitivity and therefore listening to victim’s voice, not seeing things in a simplistic manner and appreciating complexity, and finally less self-complacency.

**Summary:** These authors hold that humility does not imply low self-respect, but a realistic perception of self, which includes both positive and negative traits. They found that humility invites flexibility because it is linked to an openness to change, a lack of self-righteousness, a willingness to listen to others, an openness to doubt or multiple points of view, and an inability to see the world in simplistic terms. That is, humility is linked to an appreciation of complexity and a desire to face complex issues. Humility is not associated with being dogmatic. Nor does it suggest an over- or undervaluing of the self or others.

**Sandage, Weins, and Dahl (2001): Humility and Attention**

Sandage, Weins, and Dahl focus on the contemplative psychology and spirituality of Simone Weil. Weil was a French philosopher and political activist who died in the Second World War. In this study they find two themes in Weil’s writing, one of which highlights humility. The authors consider Weil a perfect example of “wholeness and holiness,” and mark her work and writing as relevant to clinical psychological work.

Weil said that humility is the “crowns all virtues,” and she linked humility to the ability to honestly face and accept own vulnerability. She wrote: “Humility consists of knowing that in this world the whole soul, not only what we term the ego in its totality, but also the supernatural part of the soul, which is God present in it, is subject to time and the vicissitudes of change” (Weil, 1951/1973, p.225) Humility for Weil involves the appreciation of our smallness as compared to the cosmos and to the totality of creation. From what Sandage et al. relate, it seems humility
requires an open and wide vision of life an universe. It requires an inclusive, holistic vision. In the context of humility, Weil also asks that we have an attitude of equanimity, an even-mindedness and calmness, or as the authors quote, an “accepting (of) things the way they are.”

Weil makes a distinction between feelings of inadequacy, deficiency, lack, ineptitude and the disposition of humility. She says, “I am not saying this out of humility, for if I possessed humility, the most beautiful of all the virtues perhaps, I should not be in this miserable state of inadequacy” (Weil, 1973, p.46) Sandage (1999), himself, had mentioned that at times humility is mistaken as low self-esteem or the shame of ineptitude. But, as the authors suggest, it could be that Weil knew that humility and inadequacy should not be confused. Therefore, humility, it seems, is not a negative emotion or self-perception.

The authors note that some of Weil’s writing may confuse us regarding the difference between humility and failure because she recommends that we carefully study our own failings. The authors speculate that this may be due to her strong ego, or due to her perfectionism, marked by how she tortured herself with the details of her failings. The answer could be quite to the contrary. It may be found in what the authors had mentioned previously concerning Weil’s thoughts on intellectual idolatry. This type of idolizing of one’s self leads to becoming intellectually prideful. It could be that Weil intended to mean that an increased awareness of our fallibility could help us maintain a more modest perception of ourselves. In congruence with the review of other literature, Weil implies that humble people are open to and inviting of criticism and correction.

Sandage et al. (2001) also quote Springfield (1998): “Humility involves a stripping away of the false self and illusions about the world” (p.111). It seems that here, again, that being humble calls for a realistic perception of self and world. Humility requires openness to the world
and to others. However, as opposed to a self-centeredness that keeps us from attending to world
and to others, this openness must not exclude the self. Humility, therefore, can be seen as the
opposite of egotism or narcissism.

**Summary:** Sandage et al. (2001) considers humility the topmost virtue. They see humility
as knowing that the self and others are subject to time and change. Humility means knowing one
is small compared to the universe. Humility is accepting things as they are. The humble have
equanimity and even-mindedness. Humility means being aware of one’s own failings while not
disrespecting one’s self, or feeling shame, inadequacy or ineptitude. Humility allows one to
remain realistic and give up false ideas about the self and the world. Humility also allows one to
give up idolatry and worship of self-made images. Here again, humility is equated with a
realistic conception of self, as well as a holistic, inclusive perspective.

**Vera and Rodriguez-Lopez (2004)**: Strategic Virtues

and positively effects firm performance. Their work refers to positive psychology and is
conceptually one of the richest writing on the subject of humility. Their work concludes with the
offering of suggestions to help managers develop the individual and organizational virtue of
humility. Looking at humility from the point of view of organizational dynamics, these authors
note that humility in the minds of many people is associated with “shyness, lack of ambition,
passivity and lack of confidence” (p.393). They argue against this popular perception and posit
that humility provides persons with “a realistic perspective of themselves, the firm and the
environment” (p.393). They believe humility is an indispensable facet of corporate leadership.
In fact, a lack of humility in business leaders is actually dangerous to the health of such
organizations.
Vera and Rodriguez-Lopez (2004) bring examples from many companies and their leaders to establish their proposition. One founder and chairman of a company with 36,000 employees worried that his company, enjoying outstanding performance, would fall into “the success trap.” He advised his staff that they needed to remember that humility was what had made them successful to begin with. Another example of a corporate leader who attributes success to humility is Mr. Matsushita, the founder of a huge electric company in Japan. He is famous for “his determination to eradicate complacency and arrogance in his company” (p.393). Both of these leaders believe humility is critical for success. Other examples are from founders of Mary Kay Inc., Southwest Airlines, Kimberly Clark Corporation, the IKEA group, and others.

With so many current corporate scandals people are reminded of the virtues of humility, integrity, and honesty. But humility has been little discussed. Martin Seligman and Christopher Peterson are two of the exceptions to this. Their work stems from the positive psychology movement, which aims to focus on what is right with people, rather than what might be wrong with them. Positive psychology helps people develop their human strengths and potentials, rather than attend to their weaknesses. The authors report that some business schools have started integrating positive psychology principles into their program. The University of Michigan is one such example. The goal of such programs is to “promote a positive vision of humility as a virtue with strategic value for organizations” (p. 394).

Although such a trend has started that seeks to appreciate and develop humility as a human asset, it is still not well understood. In his book, *Good to Great*, Jim Collins (2001) found that contrary to popular expectation, greatness was not a quality related to effective, high level CEOs. Rather, humility was the quality associated with such people. Vera and Rodriguez-Lopez (2004) report that: “in contrast to humble leaders, those who are arrogant, narcissistic, egotistical,
prideful, or hubristic are a threat to their firms” (p.394). For example, the word *arrogance* is used when people talk about leaders of Enron Corp or People Express Airline. People such as Lee Iacocca of the Chrysler Corporation and Michael Saylor of MicroStrategy, Inc. are described as lacking in humility and exhibiting great hubris. In doing so, Vera and Rodriguez-Lopez say these leaders are endangering their respective companies.

Definition of Humility: As for a definition for humility in corporate management, Vera and Rodriguez-Lopez quote Robert Solomon, who says that humility is “a realistic assessment of one’s own contribution and the recognition of the contributions of others, along with luck and good fortune that made one’s own success possible” (p.394). The authors go on to say that “Humble individuals have a down-to-earth perspective of themselves and of the events and relationships in their lives. Humility involves a capability to evaluate success, failure, work, and life without exaggeration” (p.395). Humility makes it possible to distinguish between “healthy self-confidence, self-esteem, and self assessment and those of over-confidence, narcissism, and stubbornness. Humility is the midpoint between the two negative extremes of arrogance and lack of self-esteem” (p.395). The authors further say that humility tends to be silent as compared with the visibility of gratitude, justice or compassion.

The authors delineate thirteen characteristics describing a humble leader. They compiled this from various journals, books and magazines. In addition, they conducted thirty-three interviews with managers from seven countries. Their findings identified a humble leader as:

1. Is open to new paradigms
2. Is eager to learn from others
3. Acknowledges his or her own limitations and mistakes, and attempts to correct them
4. Accepts failure with pragmatism
5. Asks for advice
6. Develops others
7. Has genuine desire to serve
8. Respects others
9. Shares honors and recognition with collaborators
10. Accepts success with simplicity
11. Is not narcissistic and repels adulation
12. Avoids self-complacency
13. Is frugal

These characteristics refer to personal humility. The authors hold that organizations, as whole entities, may exhibit similar behavioral tendencies. They propose that the manifestation of humility within organizations is a function of three factors. These include the depth of humility demonstrated by strategic leaders, the humility of individual members, and the emphasis placed on the development of humility as a key factor for success within the organization’s culture, systems, procedures, and structure.

Cultural Aspects of Humility: Vera and Rodriguez-Lopez (2004) ask whether or not humility is a universal virtue. They ponder that perhaps collectivist cultures may be more naturally inclined to uphold humility as opposed to more individualistic cultures that associate success with competition. They refer to Seligman and Martin who identified a set of core virtues that are cross-culturally valued. These included the virtue of humility.

The authors believe that attitudinal differences associated with humility come from a general misunderstanding of its meaning. They hold that people from any culture will likely reject humility when it is associated with self-denial or abasement. The opposite is true when humility is associated with a “down-to-earth perspective of one’s self in relation to all other beings and accurate and realistic self-knowledge” (p.396).

Vera and Rodriguez-Lopez (2004) make the observation that in Western countries where a particular and narrow view of “success” is highly valued, a lack of humility is at times overlooked. That is to say that humility is sacrificed for success. However, “the apparent charm of narcissists soon wears thin, leaving others with impressions of superficiality and hostility” (p.
Arrogance is not attractive and is seen as a threat. They add “we only tolerate arrogance while success lasts” (p.397). In an example of the popular link between arrogance and success or competence, such as in the case of Donald Trump, the authors contend that such a link is a false one. They believe that this popular association is actually due to the increased visibility of such successful people due to exposure by the media. The same is true of narcissistic managers who put a lot of energy into making the headlines. As opposed to the idea that arrogant leaders are more successful, the authors propose that humility is a much more stable source for success, and “that success built on humility is more sustainable than success built on arrogance” (p.397).

The authors also contend that compared to the organizational virtues of cost consciousness and innovation, humility is a virtue that is strategic for all because it is of competitive advantage. That is to say that humility is a resource that is valuable, rare, irreplaceable and difficult to imitate. In short it is beneficial and unique. The authors discuss each of its advantages.

Humility is valuable because it enhances the understanding and response to external threats. It helps avoid self-complacency and overconfidence. It is fundamental to learning, which is the ability to generate new knowledge and “to capture organizational repositories such as procedures, systems, and culture” (page 397). Humility provides high quality service, which is improved through learning. Finally, humility is valuable because it facilitates the development of resiliency, which means “how effectively a firm adapts to change and how likely it is to achieve growth and survival in the long run” (p.397).

Humility is rare in many companies, which tend to overemphasize charisma, power and pride. The authors hold that there are degrees to humility. The low and moderate levels may be common, but higher levels of humility are rare and associated with exceptional performance.
Humility is *irreplaceable* according to the authors, who say that the “Lack of humility tends to weaken other virtues. For example, courage without humility may become rashness” (p.397). Nothing can compensate for a lack of humility. Hard work and convincing people to invest may make an arrogant, narcissistic manager tolerable, but then the company is open to the dangers that result from arrogance and narcissism.

Humility is *difficult to imitate*. Faking humility may work only for a short while. This is because “humility represents a certain attitude towards life and the world around us” (p.398). Humility needs to be authentic, honest and genuine. Developing humility is hard “because it involves an effort and a commitment to change rooted in personal preferences, and may lead to radical transformation of personal paradigms” (p.398).

The authors pose the following question: If humility helps leaders and companies achieve “outstanding performance,” then why do some companies and leaders lacking in humility continue to be successful? The answer they provide is that humility exists in a continuum. A minimum level of humility is needed for firms to remain successful in the long run. However, dropping below this minimum level will place that the company in jeopardy.

The authors divide the thirteen characteristics of humble organizational leaders mentioned above into the three domains of *learning*, *service* and *resiliency*, and then they elaborate on them. This is illuminating for the purposes of the present research. Their comments follow.

**Learning:** In the domain of learning the authors include the following characteristics: an openness to new paradigm, an eagerness to learn from others, the acknowledgment of their own limitations and mistakes, as well as the ability to correct them, the pragmatic acceptance of failure, an ability to ask for advice, and the development of others.
Openness to new paradigm: Accepting a new paradigm “is more painful for egocentric leaders than humble ones because the latter do not consider themselves to be the holders of truth, are not afraid of knowing the truth and are not fearful of losing their status or control. Humble leaders have a more realistic perspective of the complexity of the world and acknowledge the limitations of their current paradigm and strategies. They are not anchored to told solutions” (p. 399). In summary, the humble are not egocentric and do not feel they have a monopoly on the truth. They are fearless, realistic, and unattached to social positions or one way of doing things. They appreciate complexity and they know their own limits.

Eagerness to learn from others: Since the humble know there are other views of reality, they have a multifaceted perspective. They welcome ways to discover and discuss different views. The humble “recognize that they do not know everything and that they have much to learn; they develop a true capacity to admire and learn from others” (p.399). In other words, the humble know that they do not know. They do their research and they respect others.

Acknowledgment of their own limitations and mistakes, and ability to correct them: Humble people correctly assess their own strengths and weaknesses and learn from their experiences. Therefore, they grow. There is much evidence in support of the fact that arrogant leaders have made overconfident assessments, have overpaid to buy out other companies, and have overestimated their own company’s capacity to integrate with a new company. The humble know their limits. On the other hand, the proud hide, deny and defend their errors. They think that admitting mistakes takes away from their authority. Ironically they lose authority when eventually they are found out. The humble admit mistakes, accept help, try to overcome and correct errors. They are open to criticism.
**Pragmatic acceptance of failure:** The humble are not afraid of failure. One great leader’s perspective is described as follows: “Many of the biggest lessons he drew from his own life were related to growth: even the poorest can achieve much if they are willing to relentlessly stretch themselves; do not view difficult times as threats, see them as opportunities to learn; in hardship and failure one can be reborn stronger; success can stop personal development if it leads to arrogance and risk aversion; a willingness to humbly and honestly assess your action is at the heart of the personal development” (p.400). The humble are honest, they take risks, they learn from failure, and so they stretch and grow.

**Ability to ask for advice:** Those who think they “know it all” and are superior to others do not ask for advice. In contrast, the humble ask for criticism and for the testing of their ideas. They take advice and integrate others’ ideas into their decisions. Company founder, Mary Kay, recommended to her collaborators to: “Listen long enough and the person will generally come up with an adequate solution” (p.400). The humble listen. The founder of Dell admitted his own errors in front of his workers and established the principle that every decision needs be made by at least two people. In contrast, the CEO of Rubbermaid was known as a manager who “knows everything about everything.” The Rubbermaid Company failed.

**Development of others:** “While narcissistic or arrogant managers want others to be dependent on them, humble leaders are committed to training those who might actually surpass them in learning” (p.401). The humble do not stymie other’s growth and do not keep people down. The humble see themselves as replaceable. They know they are not indispensable. The universe will go on without them. They prepare for that. “Humble executives do not become attached to their posts, since they see their jobs as an opportunity for service and recognize that their final duty is to prepare, help and clear the path for their successors” (p.401)
At this point, Vera and Rodriguez-Lopez (2004) summarize the humility components of the learning domain in terms of “performance outcomes.” Humility helps innovation, enables an open attitude towards experimentation, and supports multiple learning opportunities. It contributes to high productivity because people can openly discuss better ways. Finally, it helps the workplace become a learning organization, and is the basis for a concept called “servant-leadership.” Such humble leaders support others in managing and learning.

**Service:** In the domain of service the authors include four characteristics. They are: genuine desire to serve, respect towards other, ability to share, and unwillingness to monopolize honor.

**Genuine desire to serve:** Service stands in stark contrast to manipulation. Service is not something one learns in seminars. “Genuine attitude of service demands a certain degree of humility. People lacking humility believe they are better than others; consequently their service is conditioned upon personal benefit” (p.402). The humble care for the needs of others and have a sincere desire to serve. Firms and organizations that have a service attitude and who care about their customers and employees have “flexible schedules and structures and high mobility inside the company” (p.402). As one leader put it, “the leader is at the service of others, not to be served” (p.402). Firms that refuse to take on projects that will be detrimental to a customer have been known to later attract the same customer, who then becomes loyal.

**Respect towards others:** The humble respect others and know they are not superior to others. Humility in this sense means: “trusting the potential of each human being, listening with empathy, and acknowledging the strengths of others. Indeed harmony within a company demands great respect” (p.402). Research shows that the major cause of dissatisfaction within a company is not based on salary, but due to feeling disrespected. One CEO did not accept a
dinner invitation at the White House because she had promised to take part in a workshop with her employees. Another head of an international company “considered humility and respect for other cultures to be superior qualification over language acquisition and international experiences” (p.402).

**Ability to share and not monopolize honor:** Wanting to be the center of attention is opposite of humility. The humble do not look for fame and attention. The humble “down-play honor, not neglecting to recognize the contributions of their collaborators… ‘level 5’ leaders never aspired to be put on a pedestal or become an unreachable icons, but were seemingly ordinary people quietly producing extraordinary results” (p.402).

**Resiliency:** In the domain of resiliency, Vera and Rodriguez-Lopez include these characteristics: acceptance of success with simplicity, pragmatic acceptance of failure, avoidance of narcissism and resilience against adulation, avoidance of self-complacency, and frugality.

**Acceptance of success with simplicity:** The authors caution that success may turn to liability. Citing a number of cases they add, “Success assimilated inappropriately turns into arrogance and superiority” (p.403). The hubris of a dot.com company brought it to collapse. Its CEO has a new mantra: “Be humble because in success humility will win, and in failure, humility will win” (p.403). As an example, the founder of IBM emphasizes a humble perspective on success: “We want you to feel that you are aiming for success but you are never going to catch up with it, for if you do, you are finished” (p.403). The humble do not think they have made it.

**Pragmatic acceptance of failure:** Humble managers do not blame others for failures but try to learn, instead. A humble leader does not try to fix his or her damaged ego but tries to reduce the damage to the company and others. Quite the opposite, the arrogant leader cannot
manage failure. Instead, s(he) gets irritated and looks to blame someone. One learns and corrects any harm while the other only increases the damage. As an example of an arrogant leader the authors cite the case of a bank manager who could not manage failure to such a degree that he went into a depression and soon passed away. Others in the company felt that his depression was due to the shame he felt for his mistake. In times of difficulty, humility seems to be a positive adaptive character.

**Avoidance of narcissism and resilience against adulation:** Humble managers, the authors observe, use their self-confidence and ambition in service of others. A healthy sense of self make managers adapt and cope while “an exaggerated sense of self-worth can make them promise more than they can deliver and ignore words of warning or advice” (p.404). A *Fortune* magazine report argues that huge egos make CEOs “deaf, blind and dumb.” That article quotes case after case of egotistic blunders.

**Avoidance of self-complacency:** The humble are not self-righteous. “Humility comprises an attitude of constant improvement, which includes the acknowledgement of one’s limitations, low levels of self complacency, and the desire to serve better. Humble leaders seek perfection serenely, with calmness, and at the same time with perseverance and determination”(p.404). So humility is accompanied by peace and calmness. The authors later comment that humility protects individuals from self-righteous complacency, “which leads them to become comfortable and satisfied with their achievements” (p.404). The authors offer a case for the opposite for the Johnson and Johnson company. This company displayed self-complacency regarding medical supplies. They produced a product that was first to be introduced to the market, but they failed to adapt to doctor’s requirements. Therefore, they lost the market for that product.
Frugality: Some managers live very extravagantly and luxuriously. Humble managers shun status symbols. Temperance is a key element of humility. The founder of the large Matashushita Electric Company argued, “No matter how large Matashushita Electric might become in the future, never forget to have a modest attitude of a merchant. Think of yourself as being employed in a small store, and carry out your work with simplicity, frugality and humility” (p.405).

Finally, the authors go on to make suggestions about how to develop humility in organizations. They conclude by defining humility “as accurate self-knowledge and a realistic perspective of the self in the context of others” (p.406). The findings of this article are very informative, conceptually very rich, and have contributed greatly to the present work, as we shall see. A technical note about presentation of this article is that it was published in the Organizational Dynamics Journal and did not follow the APA referencing standards. So the reader may not find references to sources within the text.

Summary of Conceptions of Humility

Overall, these scholars conceptualize humility as realistic and accurate self-knowledge. The humble are non-egotistical, non-narcissistic, and they are not self-righteous. They have a realistic view of their own contributions, they value and recognize the contributions of others, and they are “down-to-earth.” The humble are neither in self-denial, nor do they engage in self-abasement. They exaggerate neither success nor failure, and they are not over-confident or stubborn. They do not see the self as the all-important center because they recognize themselves as replaceable and dispensable. They do not exaggerate their self-worth in a posture of superiority. They do not engage in extravagance or luxury, but are frugal, instead. The humble assimilate success without arrogance and never ultimately conclude that they “have made it.”
The humble person is open to new paradigms, is eager to learn, acknowledges personal limitations and mistakes, accepts and learns from failure, asks for advice, and demonstrates resiliency, flexibility, and openness to both change and the generation of new knowledge. Such a person is not attached to one way of doing things. S/he does not think that anyone has a monopoly on truth. S/he appreciates the complexity of world. The humble person does not think s/he knows “all the answers,” and so s/he does research and engages in experimentation, asks for criticism and the testing of his/her ideas, listens to and respects the opinions of others, avoids over-estimating self, admits mistakes, accepts help, and tries to overcome and correct errors. The humble is open to criticism and is not afraid of failure. S/he admires and learns from others, is ever-stretching, -growing, and -developing, and s/he is authentic, honest, genuine, and unattached to social position.

The humble are committed to facilitating the learning and development of others by honoring their contributions and strengths, sharing, reaching out and taking risks, and integrating others’ ideas into collaborative decisions. The humble are open to discuss better ways and support various paths to learning and multiple perspectives. They are non-manipulative and sincerely focused on service. They care for and trust others, exhibit empathy, harmonize and cooperate with others, respect other cultures, refrain from blame, and effectively manage failure. Humble people are not easily agitated or depressed, but are peaceful, calm and fearless. They are adaptive, constantly improving, and they are not self-complacent.

Humility is an attitude toward life and the world. Humility is a way of being. It is a critical source for success and is related to perceptions associated with a “great person.” Humility is a virtue highly valuable within organizations. It is not experienced as a threat. Rather, humility is universally valued, attractive, and related to exceptional human performance.
The Honesty-Humility Measure: Development of the HEXACO Personality Inventory

In their research Ashton and Lee establish the existence of a sixth factor of personality, Honesty-Humility, and propose a six-factor model of personality in place of the prevailing five-factor model of Costa and McCrea (1992). They accomplish this through a series of research undertakings. They first proposed an Honesty factor (Ashton, Lee & Son 2000; Ashton & Lee, 2001) then established it as the Honesty-Humility Factor (Lee & Ashton, 2004) reported its validity across several languages (Ashton, Lee & Perugini, 2004), and then correlated it with the Big Five Personality Factors and other personality inventories (e.g. Ashton & Lee 2005, Lee, Ashton & Shin, 2005). Here is a review of their work.

Ashton, Lee and Son (2000) first reported the existence of a sixth factor in addition to the Big Five Factors. The Big Five are usually called 1) Extraversion, 2) Agreeableness, 3) Conscientiousness, 4) Emotional Stability, and 5) Intellect. These factors are the result of psycholexical studies of personality structure. Lee, Ashton and Shin (2005) say that the lexical hypothesis states: “The major dimensions of personality variation will tend to be represented by the largest numbers of personality adjectives in human language.” Studies based on these lexical studies across several languages have yielded a sixth factor very similar in form. Aston, Lee, and Son (2000) report that the sixth factor has been interpreted as, e.g., “integrity” in Hungarian, “truthfulness” in Korean, “Values” In English, “Morality-Values” in German, “trustfulness” in Italian. They offer a list of adjectives that define this sixth factor in various languages; “truthful, honest, fair/just, sincere, and faithful/loyal versus haughty, greedy, and sly.” Based on these, they suggest the name “Honesty” for the sixth factor.

In a later work, Ashton and Lee (2001) report a more elaborate list of adjectives from international studies describing the sixth factor. They cite Goldberg (1990, 1993) for a better description of lexical hypothesis that is befitting to represent here:
An important goal of personality psychology is to discover the factor structure of personality characteristics, but attempts to find that structure must be based on representative samples of the universe of those characteristics. The only recognized basis for obtaining such sample is derived from Lexical Hypothesis, which states that the most important personality traits are encoded as single terms in natural language. Based on this assumption, the lexical approach to personality structure attempts to identify the major dimensions of personality by factor analyzing ratings (usually self- or peer ratings) on comprehensive sets of personality adjectives. (p.328)

Some of the defining terms of the new sixth factor from international studies are as follows

(present author’s underlining):

- German: Honest, sincere, humane, truth-loving, truthful, modest, just/fair versus dishonest, corrupt, boastful, grasping, arrogant.
- Hungarian: veracious, just, trustworthy, secret-keeping, humane versus hypocritical, swell-headed, greedy, overbearing, show-off
- Italian (Rome): sincere, modest, unpretentious, loyal, honest versus egocentric, narcissistic, arrogant, megalomaniac, presumptuous.
- Italian (Trieste): sincere, loyal, trustworthy, altruistic, natural versus liar, untruthful, hypocrite, greedy, stingy
- Polish: Sincere, honest, noble-minded, disinterested, faithful, gentlemanly versus crafty, dishonest, sly
- Korean: truthful, frank, conscientious, honest, unassuming versus cunning, sly, calculating, hypocritical, pompous
- French: true/genuine, sincere, honest, just/fair, loyal/faithful versus dishonest, false/not genuine, lying, unjust/unfair, hypocritical

Studying the above adjectives defining the sixth factor and review of literature about humility it is no wonder that Ashton and Lee later on decided to name this factor as Honesty-Humility. Other than the obvious adjectives related to modesty and humility the adjectives associated with honesty and truthfulness are prominent

After their review of international lexical studies of personality structure, Ashton and Lee conclude that the six dimensional model of personality structure is “the most parsimonious and comprehensive model.” And, the majority of the studies they reviewed, i.e. seven out of nine,
have come up with a six dimensional model and no additional factor has emerged in these studies.

Following the abovementioned studies Aston and Lee (2004) introduced their HEXACO Personality Inventory designed to measure six major dimensions of personality. In that article they begin by a short history of studies to discover the structure of human personality and its basic dimensions. They report that by the 1980s many researchers agreed that there were five dimensions to personality. These came to be known as the “Big Five” (Goldberg, 1990). Costa and McCrea (1985) incorporated these into a personality research questionnaire. They proposed a Five-Factor Model (FFM) similar but not quite the same as the Big Five. The names of the dimensions are: 1) Extraversion, 2) Agreeableness, 3) Conscientiousness, 4) Neuroticism and 5) Openness to Experience. Later, various scales were developed and evolved based on the Big Five or the FFM such as the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP) or NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI) that have various versions.

Ashton and Lee hold that although such instruments are widely used and have psychometric quality the five-factor model has limitations. Research reports and repeated results from around the world and from various languages point to a sixth factor. And so it is the Ashton and Lee propose their six dimensional model with the following nomenclature: Honesty-Humility (H), Emotionality (E), eXtraversion (X), Agreeableness (A), Conscientiousness (C), and Openness to Experience (O)- The HEXACO Model. The questionnaire developed from this model is the HEXACO Personality Inventory (HEXACO-PI). The measure has 24 facet-level personality trait scales. That is 4 for each of the six dimensions. It also has 32 items for each dimension. What follows is a description of Honesty-Humility dimension in particular and the HEXACO-IP in general.
Honesty-Humility and its Facets

Ashton et al. (2004) report that a factor defined by honesty, fairness, sincerity, modesty and lack of greed has been observed in several studies. As mentioned above Ashton, Lee and Son (2000) named this Honesty but here they hold that name did not completely cover the domain and suggest Honesty-Humility. They consider this “one of the most important characteristics of the HEXACO model, and represents a major departure from the Big Five Model or the Five-Factor Model.”

They conceptualize the Honest-Humility dimension in terms of four distinct facets: 1) Sincerity, 2) Fairness, 3) Greed Avoidance and 4) Modesty. A brief definition of these scales is as follows:

- Sincerity: assesses a tendency to be genuine in interpersonal relationships. Low scores will flatter others or pretend to like them in order to obtain favors, whereas high scores are unwilling to manipulate others.

- Fairness: assesses a tendency to avoid fraud and corruption. Low scores are willing to gain by cheating or stealing, whereas high scores are unwilling to take advantage of other individuals or society at large.

- Greed Avoidance: assesses a tendency to be uninterested in possessing lavish wealth, luxury goods, and signs of high social status. Low scorers want to enjoy and to display wealth and privilege, whereas high scores are not especially motivated by monetary or social-status considerations.

- Modesty: assesses a tendency to be modest and unassuming, low scorers consider themselves as superior and as entitled to privileges that others do not have, whereas high scorers view themselves as ordinary people without claim to special treatment.

For the HEXACO-PI, Lee and Ashton (2004) report high internal consistency reliabilities and adequate convergent validities with external variables. They tested the HEXACO-PI against five scales of Goldberg’s (1999) International Personality Item Pool (IPIP).
Internal Consistency Reliabilities of the HEXACO-PI (Coefficient alpha) were found to be: Honesty-Humility Scale (.92), and for the four subscales: Sincerity (.79), Fairness (.85), Greed Avoidance (.87), Modesty (.83).

Aston and Lee had expected to find significant gender difference in Honesty-Humility and found a “consistent pattern of sizable gender difference (d = .59) in the same direction. This was highest in the subscale of Fairness (d = .62) and Modesty (d = .71).” It is noteworthy that HEXACO-PI also showed a high gender difference (d = 1.01); women being higher than men in all these.

Factor Analysis of HEXACO-PI

Aston and Lee report: “All the scales showed their highest loading on the designated factors, and the sizes of the corresponding factor loadings were large, ranging from .54 to .73. The factor loadings of the scale on non-loading factors were generally small; none of the secondary loadings exceeded an absolute value of .30 in this sample.”

Inter-Correlations among the factor-Level Scales: The low correlation among the factor-level scales of HEXACO-PI indicate that the scales are independent. This includes the low correlation of Honesty-Humility scale with the other scales and shows that the other factors do not represent this factor. Highest correlation (.28) was between Honest-Humility and conscientiousness. One important fact is the correlation between the factor-level scales of HEXACO-PI is lower than Costa and McCrea’s (1992) NEO-PI-R and Goldberg’s (1999) IPIP-NEO or IPIP-Big Five scales.

Convergent Validities of the HEXACO-PI Scales

Ashton and Lee (2004) tested the convergent validities of the HEXACO-PI scales against the scales of the established Measure IPIP (Goldberg, 1999) and The results showed high convergent validity of between .86 to .68. This shows that the scales have theoretically
meaningful relations with IPIP. The HEXACO-IP and IPIP scales correlated strongly with each other’s conceptually similar scales and not strongly with others showing discriminant validity.

The HEXACO-IP was also tested against the Primary Psychopathy (Levenson et al., 1995). For the purposes of the present research it needs be reported here that the Honesty-Humility showed high negative correlation of (-0.75) with Primary Psychopathy. Primary Psychopathy scale measures “superficial charm, egocentricity, pathological lying, manipulation and lack of sincerity” (Aston, Lee & Son, 2000). Interestingly, when their Honesty- Humility scale was only “Honesty” the negative correlation with Primary Psychopathy was lower (-0.45). In summary the HEXACO-PI shows good levels of internal consistency reliability and convergent and discriminant validity.

Regarding Honesty-Humility as a marker, Aston and Lee state, “High levels of Honesty-Humility are associated with a tendency to cooperate even when one could exploit another individual who seems relatively unlikely to retaliate.”

Aston and Lee (2005) report that many researchers have conceptualized interpersonal behavior within two dimensions, that gradually came to be equated with the Extraversion/Agreeableness plane of the Big Five. Ashton and Lee point to other less known researchers and hold that personality and interpersonal relationships are not so simple. They say that several lexical studies have found there are more than two factors involved in the interpersonal circle. These studies point to four: Extraversion, Honesty-Humility, Agreeableness, and Emotionality.

**Advantages of HEXACO-PI**

Ashton and Lee hold that although the agreeableness scale of NEO-PI-R has some of the content of the Honesty-Humility scale there are areas that NEO-PI-R does not detect- i.e. Fairness and Greed-Avoidance. These facets have no similar representation in the NEO-PI-R are
likely to have strong correlation with constructs like integrity, Materialism, status seeking. Honesty-humility may better explain exploitive or deceptive behavior than the Five Factor Model. There is evidence of this in resent research. Honesty-Humility factor relates more strongly than the Big Five Factors to workplace deviance and sexual harassment (Lee, Ashton & Son, 2005; Lee, Gizzarone, & Ashton 2003). This predictive gain was mainly due to inclusion of Honesty-Humility Factor in the measurement.

There may be a concern that the facet scales of Honesty-humility- i.e. sincerity, fairness, modesty and greed avoidance- are desirable in some social contexts and therefore respondents may fake good on these and so the scores may increase when self report is for purpose of selection. There may be concern that the variance in personality reported by Honesty-Humility may be due to response style. This may not be a concern where there is no particular motivation to make a good impression.

For example, in a study (Lee et al., 2003) participants provided self and peer ratings in the Honesty- Humility scale and the IPIP-Big Five scale. The correlation for Honesty-Humility was .43, which is within the range of typical personality trait reports. The self/peer report for the Five Factor was between .27 (emotional stability) and .48 (Extraversion). Ashton and lee state that “In terms of cross-source correlations, HEXACO Honesty-Humility was the second highest, surpassed only by IPIP-Big Five Extraversion.”

Aston et al. (2004) conducted a more exhaustive review of studies reporting a six factor. This review is new version of their aforementioned cross-language study but after the introduction of the HEXACO-PI. Their review shows that a similar six-factor model emerged across eight independent studies from seven different languages. They also report that number of studies have tried to come up with a seven-factor solution to personality structure. They report
“These results suggest there is little consistency overall in the seven-factor solutions in these psycholexical studies.” In other words, although international lexical studies have reported a sixth factor instead of five factors non was able to show existence of a seventh factor.

The seven languages included three from Indo-European language family (Germanic, Romance, and Slavic) and two Non-Indo-European languages (Hungarian and Korean). They conclude “The fact that a similar solution has occurred so many times, in such highly diverse languages, makes inconceivable that this pattern is merely due to chance.”

**Honesty- Humility Factor’s Relations with other Variables**

Ashton et al. (2000) report that some personality traits do not correlate strongly with any of the Big Five dimensions, but they do so strongly with Honesty-Humility. “Specifically Honesty-Humility substantially increased the explained variance in such traits as Primary Psychopathy, Machiavellianism and social adroitness beyond the level that the Big Five factors could achieve.” (p.338)

Finally, I will report on a study by Ashton and Lee (2005) that investigated the relations of the Honest-Humility Factor with dimensions of the English Big Five and Five-Factor Model (FFM). The results showed that Honesty-Humility was substantially correlated with the Agreeableness of FFM. And this correlation was largely due to Straightforwardness and Modesty facets of the Agreeableness factor.

As mentioned previously the Big Five Model was operationalized by Goldberg (1992) into the IPIP inventory and the FFM was operationalized by Costa and McCrea (1985, 1992) via the Neo-PI-R.

The Agreeableness dimension of NEO-PI-R contains two facets straightforwardness and Modesty. Straightforwardness assesses frankness, sincerity, avoidance of manipulation, flattery, and trickery while Modesty assesses being unassuming, self-effacing, avoiding bragging and
expressing feelings of superiority. These two facets of NEO-PI-R are suggestive of the Honesty-Humility Factor and, and the authors hypothesize, should correlate strongly with that. The authors also hypothesize “these two facets correspond to traits that are weakly loaded on the Big Five Agreeableness factor …and would be expected to correlate rather weakly with the markers of that factor.

The results of the study showed both hypotheses to be correct; all Honesty-Humility subscales correlated significantly with the Agreeableness of NEO-PI-R. Honesty-Humility Factor (.58), and the facets: Sincerity (.35), Fairness (.43), Greed-Avoidance (.36), and Modesty (.51). Agreeableness of IPIP Big Five did not correlate significantly with Honesty-Humility (.28).

NEO-PI-I Agreeableness has six facets: Trust, Straightforwardness, Altruism, Compliance, Modesty, and Tender-mindedness. The highest correlation between these and Honesty-Humility Factor and its facets were: Honesty-Humility and Straightforwardness (0.55), Honesty-Humility and Modesty (facet of Agreeableness) (0.42). The NEO-PI-R Straightforwardness also correlated well with Honesty-Humility Sincerity facet (.49), Fairness facet (.47).

The authors also correlated Honesty-Humility with Social Adroitness scale (Jackson, 1970) that “describes a style of social interaction that is intended to influence others indirectly, for example by flattering others or by pretending to like things.” And, The Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974), that describes social confidence, conformity, and—of particular interest to the present research—a deceptive and affected style of interpersonal interaction.” Most of the Honesty-Humility facets showed stronger negative correlation with Social adroitness than did NEO-PI-R. Honesty-Humility also showed a much stronger negative correlation with Self-
Monitoring than did the NEO-PI-R. This shows the importance and utility of the Honesty-Humility factor as an independent measure.

**The Universal Orientation Scale**

In view the above-mentioned qualities of a humble person there seems to be a strong self and other dynamics at work. Whether it be seeing self and other as equally valuable, appreciating diversity, having a focus on community, cooperating and harmonizing with others, not being judgmental, or lastly not being dogmatic. The Honesty-Humility measure does not seem to explicitly and with more nuances represent these qualities. This is the reason that the present work deems it proper to enlist the assistance of another measure the Universal Orientation Scale (Phillips & Ziller, 1997). It is a measure of perception of similarities between self and other rather than the differences. It is a measure of non-prejudice and correlates with a number of other measures of personal character such as open-mindedness, appreciation of multiplicity and dogmatism. Prejudice is taken as “prior negative judgment of the members of a race or religion or occupants of any other social role.” (cited from Jones 1981). Phillips and Ziller (1997) say: “The study prejudice is a negative approach to the study of interpersonal relations.” (p.420) They say prejudice stands against inclusiveness. Their definition of non-prejudice is in line with Allport’s idea of “habitual open-mindedness” (cited from Billing, 1985). The non-prejudiced person is a tolerant personality who “has no special need to categorize quickly, nor persist in categorizations once made.” (Allport, 1954, p 427) Such people are “highly suspicious of labels, categories, and ethnic generalizations because of an awareness of the complexity and variety of human nature.” (Phillips & Ziller, 1997)

The authors points to the fact that in studies of prejudice “the perception of differences between self and other(s) is assumed to be a universal and primary cognitive process that ultimately results in prejudice.” (Phillips & Ziller, 1997, p 421) They object to this and hold that
there is nothing more basic in our thinking and language than our sense of similarities between us. They hold that classification according to similarities is fundamental to learning, judgment, connecting information and forming more holistic ideas and essential for integration. They quote Woike (1994) as conceptualizing integration as “the process of connecting oneself to others by seeing perceiver-object similarity.” The authors also point to research that suggest “perceived similarity rather than actual similarity is the fundamental link to liking, helping, understanding, and even reduced prejudice. In other words, similarity is in the eyes of the perceiver. Moreover, the perceiver is agentic in the sense that he or she can create the social environment to a degree by orienting towards, or selectively attending to similarities rather than differences between self and other. We refer to this interaction of personality and cognitive processes that are linked to the perception of similarities between self and other as universal orientation.” (p. 421)

According to the authors, universal orientation is a habitual orientation to seeing similarities and commonalities between self and others and underlining or accenting those similarities. The authors developed a valid measure of universal orientation- the Universal Orientation Scale (UOS). The authors also tested the relation ship of the UOS with a number of other psychological instruments namely Dogmatism scale (Rokeach, 1960), Modern Racism (McConahay et al., 1981), Social Desirability (Crowne & Marlowe, 1966), Humanitarianism-Egalitarianism Scales (Katz & Hass, 1988), Self Complexity Scale (Ziller, Martell & Morrison, 1977), and Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Davis, 1983).

The results from the Social desirability showed participants did not try to reflect a positive image of self. The other results showed that UOS correlated negatively with dogmatism and modern racism. UOS correlated positively with Humanitarianism-Egalitarianism. Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Davis, 1983) in general correlated positively with UOS, but specifically three
of its subscales, that is, Empathic Concern, Perspective-Taking, and Fantasy also correlated positively with UOS.

The Self Complexity Scale (Ziller, Martell & Morrison, 1977) “measures the number of facets a person identifies as representative of the self.” It has five self-social schemas. They are as follows: Openness, Marginality, Heterogeneity, Non-hierarchy, and Self-Other unity.

*Openness* refers to “Perception of similarity between self and other presents fewer barriers between self and others and a greater probability of connections between self and others.” *Marginality* refers to “the tendency to perceive self as between separated groups rather than within either group. A marginal person does not perceive the self as belonging to one group to the exclusion of another.” *Heterogeneity* refers to the preference to perceive self within a heterogeneous as opposed to homogeneous group of persons.” This suggests: “universally oriented persons are not threatened by diversity and may actually be attracted to it.” *Non-hierarchy* refers to less concern with status. This is manifested operationally as “the tendency to avoid arranging people schematically in a vertical order of social importance, category or rank and instead arranging people in terms of equal status.” *Self-Other Unity* refers to “integration of self and other.” (p.425)

The results showed positive relationship between UOS and all these subscales the highest correlation being with openness, heterogeneity and non-hierarchy- in that order. As we have seen before, these qualities and others such as empathy, perspective taking and lack of dogmatism are qualities related to humility.

In view of the previously mentioned studies, the present study considers the HEXACO-PI’s Honesty-Humility Scale in combination with Universal Orientation Scale most appropriate for its purposes. What follows is a comparison of the findings from the literature on therapist
Section Three: Importance of Humility

In this section the importance of humility for therapy will be delineated. Also in this section the relationship of humility to rationalism and constructivism will be discussed. Included in this section are the descriptions of qualities of a humble person. Finally the hypothesis of the present work will be presented.

Humility is an Important Quality for Therapists that is Supported by Constructivism

The above studies of humility reveal it to be a complex construct. A humble person displays many characteristics such as self-awareness and open-mindedness. He/she is flexible and holds an appreciation of complexity and diversity. He/she is active in his or her self-construction, maintains contextual awareness, takes the dynamic position of asking for help and advice and integrating new information, is cooperative, warm and empathic. A humble person does not feel superiority, is not boastful and is honest. But, is humility important and supported by therapists? The answer is yes. Corey (1996) studied the personal characteristics of effective counselors. He came up with a list of personal qualities and characteristics that are optimal for therapeutic work and personal growth of both therapists and clients. His findings support each and every characteristic of a humble person mentioned above. Since his approach was considerate of many perspectives in therapy it can be concluded the qualities of a humble person is widely accepted by therapists but, as the following comparison suggests, humility is particularly supported by constructivist epistemology and not by rationalist epistemology. Let us look at some of the qualities of a humble person and compare it with qualities related to constructivist and rationalist epistemologies.
Humility compared with Constructivist and Rationalist Qualities

Self-awareness: Self-awareness as a characteristic of humility will be examined first. Self-awareness is seen as awareness of one’s own stress and frustration (Glicken, 1983; Wityk, 2002) and how one handles pressure (Jaffe, 1986). It entails the knowledge of one’s own needs (Farber, 1990) and being aware of one’s own boundaries and limitations (Farber & Heifetz, 1982). As the humility literature shows, the humble person is highly conscious of his or her own strengths and limits and is aware of personal imperfections (Exline & Geyers, 2004). The humble individual knows her or his own limits and takes steps to better her/himself (Tangney, 2000).

Therapists are called to be aware of their thoughts and emotions as they interact with clients (Mahoney, 1995). Mahoney states that amongst various theories of psychotherapy, constructivist theory places a particularly high demand on therapists to be self-aware and conscious of their power as they engage in therapy in order for client to achieve deep levels of change and self-understanding. Aksoy (2005) found that rationalist therapists are generally not so inclined in the pursuit of self-awareness. In fact, she found a negative relationship between therapists with rationalist epistemology and this pursuit.

Openness: Openness is another quality associated with humility. Costa and McCrea (1991) conceptualize this as openness to feelings, actions and values. It is receptiveness to inner feelings. It includes intellectual curiosity. The work of McCrea and Costa (2003) suggests that openness is related to flexibility and tolerance of ambiguity. Low levels of openness are related to rigidity and an intolerance of ambiguity. The humility literature shows the humble display this quality to a high degree. The humble have an openness to change (Rowatt et al., 2002). They have an open and receptive mind, they are open to learning, open to admitting to mistakes, and they seek advice (Tangney, 2000). They are open to both change and generations of new knowledge (Vera & Rodriguez-Lopez, 2004). In regard to how openness is related to flexibility,
inflexibility can be related to closed-mindedness, stubbornness and dogmatism. Berzonsky (1994) found the rationalist to be dogmatic and unyielding and the constructivist to be explorative and open to alternative ideas. One of the qualities of a humble person is a lack of stubbornness (Vera & Rodriguez-Lopez, 2004). Aksoy (2005) demonstrated that constructivist therapists value and display this quality while rationalist therapists showed a negative association with this quality. Since openness also means being open to different people and different values (Berzosky, 1990), this implies that therapists who are more open to different values are more likely to be more tolerant of ambiguity and appreciative of human diversity (Aksoy, 2005).

Appreciation of complexity and diversity: An appreciation of complexity and diversity is related to tolerance for ambiguity when ambiguity is defined as how a person handles unfamiliar, complex and inconsistent information (Furham & Richester, 1995). Tolerance of ambiguity also means how a person deals with the presence of multiple meanings, and “dealing with shades of gray in life” (Beitel et al., 2004). Chen and Hooijberg (2000) suggest that tolerance for ambiguity is positively associated with a tolerance of diversity. In other words, the less a person tolerates ambiguity, the less the person supports diversity. Tolerating ambiguity is highly valued by constructivist therapists (Mahoney, 1995). This is because constructivist therapists rely less on structure, preplanned goals and direction. Rather, such therapists view the course of therapy to be in a constant state of revision. The humility literature shows the humble to have a complex worldview because they avoid seeing others in dichotomous black and white terms (Tangney, 2000). In humility an “all or nothing” mentality is absent (Exline & Geyers, 2004). The humble appreciate the complexities of the world and do not shy away from complex issues. S(he) is open to new paradigms. S(he) is open to facing doubt and multiple points of view (Rowatt et al., 2002). In contrast to constructivist therapists and humble individuals, the rationalist therapist
does not seem to appreciate diversity. Aksoy (2005) found a negative relationship between therapists with a rationalist epistemology and their tolerance for diversity.

Active: The work of Babbage and Ronan (2000) suggests that those who subscribe to a constructivist epistemology tend to be active in their self-constructions. In comparison, the humility literature shows that the humble is not passive, but very active and dynamic in pursuit of personal development and growth (Exline & Geyers 2004). In contrast, Johnson et al. (1988) showed that rationalists view the person to be determined by circumstance, and as a passive reactor to his/her environment.

Contextual awareness and holism: As Mahoney (1995) has conceptualized, for the constructivist therapist the integration of experience takes place holistically, rather in a delimited and predetermined manner. Such a therapist considers the individual as part of a social and historical context. As Berzonsky (1994) found, constructivists are “open to environmental evidence.” The constructivists have a holistic and contextual approach where the known world is an active construction of the knower-in-context (Johnson et al., 1988). The humble are the same. The humble have a holistic and inclusive worldview and see the self holistically and contextually (Tangney, 2000). The humble are actively engaged with the environment for self-betterment (Vera & Rodriguez-Lopez, 2004). In contrast, the rationalists perceive a sharp distinction between internal and external worlds (Mahoney & Gabreil, 1987). For them, the person is separate from the social environment (Johnson et al., 1988). Their awareness of environment is not holistic or unified.

The dynamic position of asking for help and advice and integrating new information: Berzonsky (1994), as mentioned before, found that constructivists act like scientists in the pursuit of self-identity. That is, they hypothesize, gather data and test their theories. This is the
way the humble lead their life; they are open to and invite criticism, they are not attached to one way of doing things, they are open to change, and they support the generation of new knowledge and varied paths of learning (Vera & Rodriguez-Lopez, 2004). Such a dynamic, active, creative and purposive view of humans is absent in rationalist epistemology. They are less energetic, and uninterested in novel ways of being or knowing (Babbage & Ronan, 2000). They are conservative, “traditional” and have a negative view regarding the power of human agency (Johnson et al., 1988).

Cooperativeness and acceptance of people: There are a number of other qualities of a humble person that are valued by therapists. For example, Cloninger, Svrakic and Pryzbeck (1993) conceptualized social tolerance as a basis for a person’s cooperativeness, and linked it to accepting people as they are. Cooperation (Vera & Rodriguez-Lopez, 2004) and accepting people as they are (Sandage, 2001) both constitute qualities of a humble person. Rationalists are non-cooperative but rather adamant (Babbage & Ronan, 2000).

Warmth and empathy: Johnson et al. (1988) found that the individual adhering to mechanistic (rationalist) epistemology to be cold and self-centered, while the individual adhering to the organismic (constructivist) epistemology was found to be warm and empathic. The humble are perceived as kind and caring (Tangney, 2000, Vera & Rodriguez-Lopez, 2004)) and they have empathy for others (Worthington, 1998; Exline & Geyers, 2004; Vera & Rodriguez-Lopez, 2004). In contrast, rationalists were found to be cold, not empathic but rather self-centered (Johnson et al., 1988).

Honesty, non-boastfulness and not feeling superiority: As the work for the development of the HEXACO-PI personality measure shows, honesty and humility are inseparable. As mentioned before, Babbage and Ronan (2000) used the NEO-PI personality measure for their
investigation. One of the five factors therein is Agreeableness. Agreeableness contains two subscales that have items pertaining to sincerity, avoidance of bragging, and experiences of superiority. Babbage and Ronan found a positive relation for the constructivists and the Agreeableness factor and a negative relation for the rationalists. That is, the constructivists are more sincere, less inclined to bragging, and do not experience themselves as superior to others in comparison to rationalists. The humility literature shows the humble to be honest (Exline & Geyers, 2004; Vera & Rodriguez-Lopez, 2004), not boastful (Exline & Geyers, 2004) and having less feelings of superiority to others (Tangney, 2000; Vera & Rodriguez-Lopez, 2004).

The above review and comparison of research literature seem to suggest that the qualities linked to constructivist epistemology are consistent with the important quality of humility and that constructivist epistemology supports greater humility. This does not seem to be true of rationalist epistemology. Such conclusions bring the present study to propose a number of hypotheses and offer methods of testing these hypotheses.

The Hypotheses

In view of the literature about relationship of therapist epistemic style and personal qualities, the literature studying humility, and the recent development of a measure of humility and a related measure of universal orientation, the present study propose three hypotheses as follows: 1) Therapists’ higher commitment to constructivist epistemology is related to more humility and therapists’ higher commitment to rationalist epistemology is related to less humility, 2) Therapists’ higher commitment to constructivist epistemology is related to more universal orientation and therapists’ higher commitment to rationalist epistemology is related to less universal orientation, and 3) The Honesty-Humility measure correlates positively with the Universal Orientations Scale. The next chapter discusses the method of testing these three hypotheses.
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Participants

The sample consisted of 586 therapists (345 female, 241 male) with a mean age of 36.86 (SD = 8.28). The sample was primarily Caucasian, 84.0% (N = 521), followed by Hispanic, 3.5% (N = 22), African American, 2.3% (N = 14), Asian American, 1.0% (N = 6), Multiracial, 1.1% (N = 7), and American Indian/Native American, 0.2% (N = 1), and other, 2.3% (N = 14). The majority of the participants were from U.S., 91.1% (N = 565), whereas 2.4% (N = 15) were from Canada and 0.2% (N = 4) were from other countries.

Participants were asked to indicate the level of their highest degree, which consisted of primarily Ph.D., 64.5% (N = 400), followed by Psy.D., 15.0% (N = 93), M.A./M.S., 7.6% (N = 47), Ed.D., 1.9% (N = 12), M.S.W., 1.3% (N = 8), BA/BS, 0.2% (N = 1), and Other, 3.1% (N = 19).

Participants were additionally asked about their specialty areas with the majority indicating that they were psychologists, 83.4% (N = 517) followed by mental health counselors, 3.9% (N = 24), marriage and family therapists, 2.3% (N = 14), social workers, 1.0% (N = 6), psychiatrist, 0.2% (N = 1), and other, 3.9% (N = 24). Mean number of years in clinical practice was 19.74, and ranged between 1 and 52 (SD = 11.01).

When asked about their primary employment setting, the largest percentage of participants indicated they were in private practice, 45.0% (N = 279), followed by a hospital, 10.6% (N = 66), mental health care, 9.7% (N = 66), university academic department, 7.3% (N = 45), university service delivery department, 5.8% (N = 36), community center, 3.2% (N = 20), school, 2.3% (N = 14), correctional facility, 1.6% (N = 10), research, 0.5% (N = 3), and other, 11.7% (N = 134).
Procedures

Members from these divisions or organizations were sent an online survey containing an informed consent, a brief demographics sheet, and the three instruments (HEXACO-PI H-H, UOS, TAQ-SF). Participants were asked to read and sign the informed consent form. Once participants completed the questionnaires and submitted their responses, they were directed to read a short debriefing that described the nature of the study.

Instruments

Honesty-Humility Scale: HEXACO-PI

As mentioned previously, this scale assesses the closely related constructs of Honesty and Humility. It measures tendencies such as being genuine or fraudulent, pretending to like other or unwillingness to manipulate, tendency to live simply or luxuriously, Motivation for social status, considering self superior to others and entitled to privileges or viewing self as ordinary. The scale has 32 items- 8 for each subscale. The participants are asked to determine the degree to which they endorse the statements on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Sample Items include “If there is some chance of improving my social status I take big risks” And “Sometimes I feel laws should not apply to someone like me.” Internal consistency reliabilities of the HEXACO-PI (Coefficient alpha) were found to be: Honesty-Humility Scale (.92), and for the four subscales: Sincerity (.79), Fairness (.85), Greed Avoidance (.87), Modesty (.83).

Universal Orientation Scale

The Universal Orientation Scale (UOS), developed by Phillips and Ziller (1997), consists of twenty verbal items. Participants rate each item on a 5-point Likert scale 1 (Does not describe me well) to 5 (Describes me well). The internal reliabilities coefficient (Cronbach’s alpha) was reported to be .76 and a six-week test-retest reliability check was .75 (Phillips & Ziller, 1997). It
has items that indicate seeing no difference between self and other coupled with a universal expansive vision (e.g. “At one level of thinking we all of a kind,” or “The same spirit dwells in everyone”) and the opposite (e.g. “Little difference amongst people means a lot”). The UOS has correlated significantly but negatively with Dogmatism and Modern Racism and positively with Davis measure of empathy (Davis, 1983). It was shown that the UOS is associated with being less evaluative of others and preferring heterogeneous to homogeneous composition (Phillips and Ziller, 1997). Construct validity studies of the instrument conclude that the UOS is a valid measure of non-prejudice and tolerance or, even more generally of the peace personality.

**Therapist Attitudes Questionnaire-Short Form**

The TAQ-SF, developed by G. Neimeyer and Morton (1997), is a revision of the Therapist Attitudes Questionnaire (TAQ) developed by DisGiuseppe and Linscott (1993). The TAQ-SF measures philosophical, theoretical, and technical dimensions of rationalist and constructivist therapies. The instrument is self-administered, contains 16 items, eight items pertaining to a Rationalist commitment (e.g., “Reality is singular, stable and external to human experience”) and eight items pertaining to a Constructivist commitment, (e.g., “Reality is relative. Realities reflect individual or collective constructions of order to one’s experiences”), and requires approximately 5 minutes to complete. Respondents are asked to rate the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each item on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The TAQ-SF replicates the basic factor structure of the original TAQ and has shown its predictive validity by predicting the therapeutic identifications and descriptions of a group of practicing professionals (G. Neimeyer & Morton, 1997). TAQ-SF scores in the present study yielded a Cronbach’s alpha of .72 for rationalist scale and a Cronbach’s alpha of .63 for the constructivist scale.
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RESULTS

Results from the current study are described below. First, measurement issues are discussed. This is followed by descriptive information regarding the psychometrics and relationship among the variables of interest, next is the multiple regression analyses that address each of the predictions concerning the relation of humility and universal orientation to epistemic style. Finally, the relationship between humility and universal orientation is described.

Descriptive and Preliminary Analyses

Multivariate analyses of variance were conducted on the 3 measures used in the current study (TAQ-SF, H-H, and UOS) suggested that there were no differences in the mean scores of the variables of interest among the six types of questionnaire forms (all $ps > .001$). Thus for all analyses, the data from six different forms were combined. Analyses of Variance conducted to test for gender difference in H-H and UOS suggested there is gender difference for the H-H measure. Females scored significantly higher than males for H-H. This is consistent with previous reports (Lee & Ashton, 2004). For the TAQ-SF, t-test analyses revealed gender differences in constructivism and rationalism scores. Males scored higher than females for rationalism and females scored higher than males for constructivism. This is also consistent with previous reports (Aksoy, 2005).

Measurement Reliability

Measurement reliabilities for the TAQ-SF, H-H, and UOS scores appear in Table 4-1. Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for the TAQ-SF was .70 for the rationalist subscale and .64 for the constructivist subscale. This is comparable to previous reports (G. Neimeyer & Morton, 1997).

Reliability for the H-H indicated an alpha level of .85 for the whole Honesty-Humility scale, and an alpha level of .67 for the Sincerity subscale, .66 for the Fairness subscale, .80 for
the Greed subscale, .77 for the Modesty subscale. This is somewhat comparable with Lee and Ashton (2004) report of reliabilities for the HEXACO-PI: the Honesty-Humility Scale (.92), and for the four subscales: Sincerity (.79), Fairness (.85), Greed Avoidance (.87), and Modesty (.83).

Reliability findings for the UOS revealed a Cronbach’s coefficient alpha of .79 for the scale. This is also comparable to Phillips and Ziller (1994) finding Cronbach’s coefficient alpha of .76 and a test-retest reliability check that yielded an alpha of .75.

**Correlational Analyses**

Person Product Moment correlations, using a criterion level of .05 (2-tailed), were computed between the two epistemology subscales (Rationalist and Constructivist) and each of the criterion variables in an attempt to confirm that the relationships were in the predicted directions.

A Pearson Product Moment correlation was first conducted between the H-H and the TAQ-SF to verify that therapists with higher scores on the rationalist epistemology subscale scored lower on the H-H compared to therapists with higher scores on the constructivist epistemology subscale. Most results were in the predicted directions, revealing a negative and modest correlation between the TAQ-SF rationalist subscale and all of the H-H subscales, and a positive correlation between the TAQ-SF constructivist subscale and two of the H-H subscales. Additionally, a Pearson Product Moment correlation was conducted on the TAQ-SF rationalist and constructivist subscales to justify their use as two separate continuous subscale scores, $r = -0.17$, $P < .001$.

For H-H Subscales, the TAQ-SF rationalist subscale was negatively, although modestly, correlated with the Sincerity ($r = -0.14$, $p < .001$) and Fairness ($r = -0.16$, $p < .007$) subscales. The rationalist subscale was also negatively correlated with the Greed ($r = -0.19$, $p < .001$), Modesty ($r = -0.20$, $p < .001$) subscales.
The TAQ-SF constructivist subscale was positively, although modestly, correlated with the sincerity \((r = 0.16, P = .001)\), and modesty \((r = -0.18, p < .001)\). The constructivist subscale was not positively correlated with the Fairness \((r = 0.04, p < .23)\) and Greed \((r = 0.06, p < .14)\) subscales. These two correlations were not significant. See Table 4-2.

As for the UOS, the TAQ-SF rationalist subscale did not correlate with it \((r = -0.06, p < .112)\). This relationship was not a significant. The TAQ-SF constructivist subscale was positively, although modestly, correlated with UOS \((r = 0.16, p < .001)\) in the predicted direction. See Table 4-2.

Finally, all the H-H subscales and UOS were positively, and modestly, correlated:
- Sincerity and UOS \((r = 0.09, p < .02)\) and Fairness and UOS \((r = 0.16, p < .000)\) the Greed Avoidance and UOS \((r = 0.15, p < .000)\), Modesty and UOS \((r = 0.19, p < .000)\).

**Regression Analyses**

In order to assess the capacity of the data to be in line with the normality assumptions of multiple regression, the data was subjected to tests of skewness and kurtosis. Results of these analyses indicate that the assumptions for multivariate normalcy were met. All skewness and kurtosis estimates for the variables fell between 1 and -1 except for the Fairness subscale, which had a kurtosis value of 1.84. Please see Table 4-3 for overall means and standard deviations for each of the measures.

**Hypothesis 1**

The first hypothesis concerned therapist epistemology as a predictor of Honesty-Humility. More specifically, it posited that a therapist’s higher commitment to constructivist epistemologies would be related to tendency to more sincerity, fairness, less greed and more modesty and a therapist’s higher commitment to rationalist epistemology would be related to a lower tendency to these four qualities. Thus, for the first hypothesis, a multiple linear regression
analysis was conducted to determine if therapist epistemology was a significant predictor of the criterion variables using the four subscales of the Honesty-Humility (sincerity, fairness, greed, and modesty). Separate regression analyses were conducted for each of the four H-H scores measuring honesty-humility. Please see Table 4-4. As was previously described, epistemology was operationalized as two separate continuous subscale scores (rationalist and constructivist) in all regression analyses.

Sincerity: The epistemology scores accounted for a modest variation in sincerity scores, $F(2, 564) = 11.58, p < .001 (R^2 = .039)$. The standardized beta coefficient for the rationalist epistemology ($\beta = -.116$) was in the negative direction, although modest, for the sincerity subscale, $t(564) = -2.75, p < .006$. The standardized beta coefficient for the constructivist epistemology ($\beta = 0.142$) was modest and in the positive direction for the sincerity subscale, $t(564) = 3.39, p < .001$. The direction of effect suggested that the more a therapist was inclined toward rationalist epistemology, the less likely that therapist was inclined toward sincerity and the more a therapist was inclined toward constructivist epistemology, the more likely that therapist was inclined toward sincerity. This tentatively supported the hypothesis that a therapist’s leaning toward rationalist epistemology tends less towards Honesty-Humility and a therapist’s leaning to ward constructivist epistemology tends more towards Honesty-Humility.

Fairness: Epistemology was partially a significant predictor of the Honesty-Humility along the Fairness subscale, $F(2, 567) = 7.98, p < .000 (R^2 = .027)$. The standardized beta coefficient ($\beta = -0.162$) was significant and modest for the rationalist epistemology $t(567) = -3.85, p < .000$ and in the negative direction, whereas the standardized beta coefficient for the constructivist epistemology ($\beta = 0.017$), was not significant $t(567) = 0.40, p < .69$ along the Fairness subscale.
This supported the hypothesis that a therapist leaning toward rationalist epistemology tends less towards fairness on the Fairness subscale, whereas, it did not support the hypothesis that a therapist leaning toward constructivist epistemology tends towards greater fairness on the Fairness subscale. The prediction regarding the direction for constructivist epistemology was not correct.

Greed Avoidance: Epistemology was partially a significant predictor of Honesty-Humility along the Greed Avoidance subscale, $F(2, 566) = 12.13, p < .001 (R^2 = .041)$. The significant but modest standardized beta coefficient ($\beta = -0.195$) for the rationalist epistemology, $t(566) = -4.65, p < .001$, was in the negative direction whereas the standardized beta coefficient ($\beta = 0.030$) for the constructivist epistemology was not significant, $t(566) = .70, p < .48$, along the Greed Avoidance subscale. This provided provisional support for the hypothesis that a therapist’s leaning toward rationalist epistemology tends towards more Greed on the Greed Avoidance subscale but it did not support the hypothesis that a therapist’s leaning toward constructivist epistemology tends towards less Greed on the Greed Avoidance subscale. The prediction regarding the direction for constructivist epistemology was not correct.

Modesty: Epistemology was a significant predictor of Honesty-Humility along the Modesty subscale, $F(2, 565) = 19.24, p < .000 (R^2 = .064)$. The significant but modest standardized beta coefficient ($\beta = -0.171$) for the rationalist epistemology $t(565) = -4.14, p < .000$, was in the negative direction; whereas the significant but modest standardized beta coefficient ($\beta = 0.157$) for the constructivist epistemology $t(565) = 3.78, p < .000$, was in the positive direction along the Modesty subscale. This provided provisional support for the hypothesis that a therapist’s leaning toward rationalist epistemology tends less toward modesty.
on the Modesty subscale, and a therapist’s leaning toward constructivist epistemology tends more toward modesty on the Modesty subscale.

**Hypothesis 2**

According to the second hypothesis, a therapist’s greater commitment to rationalist epistemologies would be related to less tendency towards universal orientation whereas a greater commitment to the constructivist epistemologies would be related to more tendency to universal orientation. Another multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to determine if the same predictor variable (therapist epistemology) would influence therapists’ ratings of the criterion variables (universal orientation).

Epistemology was partially a significant predictor of therapist emphasis on the Universal Orientation, $F(2, 536) = 9.06, p < .001 (R^2 = .03)$. The standardized beta coefficient for the rationalist epistemology ($\beta = -0.05$) was not significant $t(536) = -1.18, p < .23$. The significant but modest standardized beta coefficient ($\beta = 0.16$) for the constructivist epistemology, $t(536) = 3.82, p < .000$, was in the positive direction. The results were inconsistent with the hypothesis that the therapist’s higher commitment to rationalist epistemology would be related to a significantly less emphasis on universal orientation. However, the direction of the effect for the constructivist epistemology was according to the hypothesis. That is, a therapist’s higher commitment to constructivist epistemology would be related to an emphasis on universal orientation.

**Hypothesis 3**

The third and final analysis was designed to address the prediction that Honesty-Humility measure correlates positively with Universal Orientation. More specifically, that a therapist’s higher commitment to Universal Orientation would be related to a therapist’s higher leaning toward the Sincerity, Fairness, Greed and Modesty subscales of the Honest-Humility measure.
Person Product Moment correlations, using a criterion level of .05 (2-tailed), were computed between the Honesty-Humility subscales (Sincerity, Fairness, Greed and Modesty) and Universal Orientation Scale in an attempt to confirm that the relationships were in the predicted directions.

As mentioned previously the results were in the predicted directions suggesting a modest and positive correlation between the Honesty-Humility subscales and the Universal Orientation Scale. The results were as follows: Sincerity and UOS \((r = 0.09, p < .02)\) and Fairness and UOS \((r = 0.16, p < .000)\) the Greed Avoidance and UOS \((r = 0.15, p < .000)\), Modesty and UOS \((r = 0.19, p < .000)\). Please see Table 4-2 for all correlation analyses.

Table 4-1: Internal consistencies for the TAQ-SF, H-H, and UOS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAQ-Rational</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAQ-Constructivist</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-H-Sincerity</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-H-Fairness</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-H-Greed Avoid.</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-H-Modesty</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-H-Total</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOS</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-2: Pearson correlations for therapist epistemology, honesty-humility, and universal orientation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.TAQ-R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.TAQ-C</td>
<td>-.174**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.H-H-S</td>
<td>-.147**</td>
<td>.163**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.H-H-F</td>
<td>-.160**</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.310**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.H-H-G</td>
<td>-.194**</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.329**</td>
<td>.318**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.H-H-M</td>
<td>-.200**</td>
<td>.183**</td>
<td>.300**</td>
<td>.388**</td>
<td>.460**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.UOS</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>.164**</td>
<td>.099*</td>
<td>.161**</td>
<td>.156**</td>
<td>.193**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P<.05, ** P<.01
Table 4-3: Means and standard deviations for therapist epistemology, honesty-humility, and universal orientation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>N of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.TAQR</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>22.46</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.TAQC</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>33.48</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.H-HS</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>29.84</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>-1.77</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.H-HF</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>34.67</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>2.047</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.H-HG</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>29.87</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.H-HM</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.UOS</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>72.64</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 4-4: Results of Multiple regression analyses on the five dependent variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df₁</th>
<th>df₂</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>f²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable: Honesty Humility scale- Sincerity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAQ-R</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-2.75*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAQ-C</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>3.39**</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable: Honesty Humility scale- Fairness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAQ-R</td>
<td>-0.162</td>
<td>-3.85*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAQ-C</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable: Honesty Humility scale- Greed Avoidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAQ-R</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-4.65**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAQ-C</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable: Honesty Humility scale- Modesty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAQ-R</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-4.14**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAQ-C</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>3.78*</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>19.24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable: Universal Orientation Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAQ-R</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAQ-C</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>3.82**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: TAQ-R = Therapist Assumption Questionnaire - Rationalism; TAQ-C = Therapist Assumption Questionnaire - Constructivism

*p < .01   **p < .001
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

This discussion section is divided into three parts. In the first part the hypotheses and findings of the study are reviewed. In the second part explanations of the findings are presented. These findings are presented within the context of the current literature on therapists’ epistemologies in relation to therapist qualities, as well as the literature on the qualities of humility and universal orientation. The importance and implications of the findings are also discussed there. Finally, strengths and limitations of the present study are reported along with suggestions for future research.

Summary of the Results

This study investigated the relationship between therapists’ epistemological assumptions (rationalist versus constructivist) and therapists’ qualities of humility and universal orientation. The specific questions in this study included: 1) Is therapists’ greater commitment to constructivist epistemology supportive of the quality of humility while therapist’s commitment to rationalist epistemology less supportive of the quality of the humility? That is, does a therapist’s epistemology predict a therapist’s humility? 2) Is therapists’ greater commitment to constructivist epistemology supportive of the quality of universal orientation while therapists’ commitment to rationalist epistemology less supportive? That is, does a therapist’s epistemology predict a therapist’s universal orientation? 3) Is the Honesty-Humility measure related positively with the Universal Orientation Scale? Each of these three questions will now be discussed in more detail in relation to the findings of the present study.

Overall, therapists’ epistemologies (rationalist versus constructivist) were found to be a significant but modest predictor of therapists’ humility and universal orientation. In particular, the findings provide provisional support for the idea that there are specific differences in the
humility and universal orientation of the therapist according to his or her epistemic assumptions. More specifically, the current study found significant but modest support for the notion that therapists who were committed more to rationalist epistemology tended toward the negative direction of the Sincerity, Fairness, Greed Avoidance and Modesty subscales on the Honesty-Humility Measure. At the same time, therapists that committed more to constructivist epistemology tended toward the positive direction of the Sincerity and Modesty subscales of the Honesty-Humility Measure. Additionally, there was significant but modest support for the idea that therapists who committed more to constructivist epistemologies tended to be more universally oriented.

Finally, it was found that the Honesty-Humility measure is positively related to the Universal Orientation Scale and what it represents. More specifically, the Sincerity, Fairness, Greed Avoidance and Modesty subscales of the Honesty-Humility Measure positively, although modestly, related to the Universal Orientation Scale that represents constructs such as non-prejudice, non-dogmatism, and open-mindedness. The sum of these findings are valuable when considering the differences between a therapist’s rationalist versus constructivist epistemologies that are, in turn, related to important qualities for a therapist to have, such as humility and universal orientation.

**Discussion of Results within the Context of Current Literature**

In this section the relationship between therapist epistemology and therapist qualities will be discussed first. Then the relationship between rationalist epistemology and the quality of humility will be considered followed by a discussion of the importance and implications of these findings for therapy. After that the relationship between constructivist epistemology and the quality of humility will be discussed followed by a discussion of the relationship between
humility and universal orientation. Finally, the importance and implication of the findings regarding the relationship of constructivist epistemology and humility will be discussed.

Relationship between Therapist Epistemology and Therapist Qualities

One goal of the present study was to investigate the relationship between therapists’ epistemology and personal qualities of humility and universal orientation according to the asserted hypotheses. These hypotheses were informed by relevant literature.

As mentioned before, a number of studies have established the link between the epistemological orientations and qualities of therapists (Johnson et al., 1988; Babbage & Ronan, 2000; Berzonsky, 1990; Neimeyer et al., 1993; Mahoney, 1995; Aksoy, 2005). The present study reviewed this literature linking therapist epistemology and therapist personal qualities. The literature regarding the quality of humility was then reviewed (Tangney, 2000; Exline & Geyers, 2004; Sandage, et al., 2001; Rowatt et al., 2002; Vera & Rodriguez-Lopez, 2004; Ashton & Lee 2004). In addition, the literature about the personal qualities of effective therapists was studied. As mentioned previously, Corey (1996) has assembled a list of sixteen therapist qualities that are optimal for the therapeutic work and personal growth of therapists. This was reported in the second chapter of this work. These qualities support and fit the qualities of a humble person and underline the fact that humility is an important quality for therapists to possess.

The literature addressing the relationship between therapist epistemology and therapist qualities lends itself to the results of this study. A comparison of the results about the relationship of therapist epistemology, therapist qualities and the quality of humility suggested that there might be a negative relationship between therapists’ commitments toward rationalist epistemology and the quality of humility. In addition, the comparison suggested that there might be a positive relationship between therapists’ commitment towards constructivist epistemology and the quality of humility.
Relationship between Rationalist Epistemology and the Quality of Humility

Some of the qualities related to the rationalist epistemology included being rigid, hardheaded, skeptical, competitive and proud (Babbage & Ronan, 2000), as well as conventional and conforming (Johnson et al., 1988). In addition, rationalist qualities included submission to the orders, explanations and dictates of others, and an adherence to social determinism (Berzonsky, 1990; 1994). They also included being “normative-oriented” and evaluative (Berzonsky, 1990; Neimeyer et al., 1993), less tolerant of ambiguity, and less accepting of diversity (Mahoney, 1995; Aksoy 2005).

In contrast, some of the qualities linked to humility were being willing to accept one’s mistakes, being open-minded, and not being boastful (Tangney, 2000). They also included a lack of self-righteousness (Rowatt et al., 1998), an avoidance of passivity or submissiveness, autonomy, a knowledge of one’s imperfections, and an absence of “all-or-nothing” mentality (Exline & Geyers, 2004). Finally, these qualities also included an openness to change, an openness to facing doubts, non-attachment to one way of doing things, and an appreciation of complexity (Vera & Rodriguez-Lopez, 2004).

In the present study the hypothesis for the link between rationalist epistemology and the quality of humility was that the more a therapist adheres to a rational epistemology, the less s(he) leans towards humility. The prediction of the hypothesis was modestly supported by the data. The relationship between therapist’s rationalist epistemology and all four components of the Honesty-Humility measure was in the negative direction. The strongest of these relationships was between rationalist epistemology and the two subscales of the Honesty-Humility measure that represented humility. These were the Modesty and Greed Avoidance subscales. Modesty is reversely represented by items such as: “I deserve more influence and authority than most other people do,” “I am special and superior in many ways,” and, “Sometimes I feel that laws should
not apply to someone like me.” The results suggested that the more a therapist tended toward a rationalist epistemology, the more the therapist tended to subscribe to these items.

Greed Avoidance is *reversely* represented with items such as: “I prefer to have high-status, successful people as my friends,” “I would get a lot of pleasure from owning expensive luxury goods,” and, “If there is some chance of improving my social status, I take big risks.” The results again suggested that the more a therapist was oriented toward a rationalist epistemology, the more a therapist tended to subscribe to these items.

The two other subscales of the Honesty-Humility measure are the Sincerity and Fairness subscales. The Sincerity subscale assesses the tendency to be genuine in interpersonal relationships, to avoid flattering or pretending to like others in order to obtain favors, and to be unwilling to manipulate others. The Fairness subscale assesses a tendency to avoid fraud and corruption. Low scorers on this subscale are willing to gain by cheating or stealing, whereas high scorers are unwilling to take advantage of other individuals, or society at large. Sincerity is *reversely* represented by items such as: “I don’t see anything wrong with flattery,” and, “I sometimes make people feel guilty so that they will do what I want.” Fairness is *reversely* represented by items such as: “I wouldn’t feel bad about deceiving people who allow themselves to be deceived,” and, “I would be tempted to buy stolen property if I were financially tight.” Therapists’ rationalist epistemology related negatively, although modestly with these two subscales.

**Importance and Implications for Therapy**

What are the implications when a therapist is not humble? What if a therapist is hardheaded, proud, conforming, submitting to the dictates of others, believing in social determinism, intolerant of ambiguity and unaccepting of diversity? One of the most basic skills in therapy is the ability to listen. As Vera and Rodriguez-Lopez (2004) indicated, not being
humble and having an inflated ego makes one “deaf, dumb and blind” (p. 404). Being hardheaded and stubborn does not allow learning to take place. As Corey (1996) suggests openness is one of the important qualities that an effective counselor needs to possess. Costa and McCrea (2003) suggest that openness is related to flexibility and a tolerance for ambiguity. Tolerance for ambiguity means how a person deals with multiple meanings, such as “dealing with shades of gray in life” (Beitel et al., 2004). As most therapists will agree there are many “shades of gray” in therapy situations. Tolerance for ambiguity is also related to tolerance for diversity (Chen & Hooijberg, 2000). Appreciation of diversity is one of the qualities enumerated by Corey (1996) as a desired quality for therapists. This is particularly important when considering that demographic diversity is a hallmark of today’s world. Multiculturalism is now a required course of study and integrated in most, if not all, current psychology textbooks and university programs. Aksoy (2005) reports that rationalist epistemology does not positively relate to the acceptance of diversity.

Another quality important for therapists is openness to asking for help and advice (Corey, 1996). As reported above, pride is positively related with rationalist epistemology (Babbage & Ronan, 2000). Pride will prevent a person from admitting ignorance or asking for help. This stands against the importance of consultation with other therapists, which is a tenet of counseling psychology. This tenet is taught and emphasized repeatedly in all training programs for therapists.

Honesty is another one of the qualities highly valued in a therapist. Honesty, as the research of Ashton and Lee (1999) has shown, is inseparable from humility. Babbage and Ronan (2000) reported a negative relationship between rationalist epistemology and sincerity, and the present research confirms this finding by the negative relationship between rationalist
epistemology and Sincerity and Fairness subscales of the Honesty-Humility measure. These findings highlight what the current literature suggests regarding differences between rationalist and constructivist epistemology in relation to important qualities for a therapist to possess, and the quality of humility, in particular. They can guide therapist to more carefully consider their epistemological orientation and how it affects their therapy work.

**Relationship between Constructivist Epistemology and the Quality of Humility**

The qualities related to constructivist epistemology included being efficient, flexible, imaginative, empathic, tolerant, as well as having social presence, self-acceptance, and being autonomous (Johnson et al., 1988). They also included being good-natured, being eager to cooperate, and having broad interests (Babbage & Ronan, 2000). Qualities related to a constructivist epistemology also included being “normative-oriented” while also being “diffuse-oriented,” being open to alternative constructions, and having an autonomous interpersonal style (Berzonsky, 1990; Neimeyer et al., 1993). Regarding self concept, constructivists tend to gather data, analyze and change the self, and cope by seeking social support (Berzonsky, 1994). They are open to many versions of reality, accept diversity, tolerate ambiguity, are aware of their own constructs, inner processes and emotions, and they avoid interfering with others (Mahoney, 1995). Finally, they pursue self-awareness, attend to emotions, have a social tolerance for diversity, and are open to experience (Aksoy, 2005).

The qualities linked to humility were flexibility, empathy, eagerness to listen to others (Rowatt et al., 2002; Worthington, 1998), self-acceptance, autonomy (Exline & Geyers, 2004), and having a universal consciousness (Sandage et al., 2001). Other qualities included an ability to ask for advice, cooperation, openness to change, acknowledgement of one’s own limits, a respect for others, and an openness to new paradigms (Vera & Rodriguiz-Lopez 2004).
In the present study the hypothesis for the link between constructivist epistemology and the quality of humility posited that a therapist’s tendency toward constructivist epistemology meant that s/he tended to be more oriented toward humility. The prediction of the hypothesis was partially supported. The relationship between Therapists’ constructivist epistemology and two components of the Honesty-Humility measure were in the predicted positive direction. The results were significant, although provisional. The strongest of these relationships was between Therapists’ constructivist epistemology and one subscale of the Honesty-Humility measure. This subscale representing humility was the Modesty subscale. The second strongest relationship between Therapists’ constructivist epistemology and a subscale of the Honesty-Humility measure was with the subscale representing honesty. This was represented by the Sincerity subscale. Here again the findings highlight what the current literature suggests regarding differences between rationalist and constructivist epistemology in relation to important qualities for therapists to possess, and particularly for the quality of humility.

**Relationship between Therapist Epistemology and the Quality of Universal Orientation**

The literature review on humility and the Honesty-Humility measure revealed that there are many nuances among certain characteristics of a humble person that the Honesty-Humility measure does not capture. For example, humility contains the sense of seeing the self and other as equal. Humility tends to be related to non-hierarchy, and focuses on community, inclusiveness (Tangney, 2000) and cooperation (Vera & Rodriguiz-Lopez, 2004). A humble person tends to connect information to form holistic ideas, is integrative (Sandage, et al., 2001), non-judgmental, aware and appreciative of complexity, and avoids dogmatism (Rowatt et al., 2002). Universal orientation is positively related to all of these qualities (Phillips & Ziller, 1997; Ziller, Martell & Morrison, 1997), and this is the reason the Universal Orientation Scale was utilized to assist in this research.
A comparison of the results about the relationship of therapist epistemology and therapist qualities, as well as the qualities related to universal orientation, suggested that there might be a negative relationship between therapists’ rationalist epistemology and the quality of universal orientation. The comparison also suggested a positive relationship between therapists’ constructivist epistemology and the quality of universal orientation. The hypothesis in this case was that the higher a therapist’s commitment to a rational epistemology, the less s(he) would lean towards a universal orientation. In addition, the hypothesis stated that the higher a therapist’s commitment to constructivist epistemology, the more s(he) would lean towards a universal orientation. The prediction of the hypothesis was partially supported by the results. Therapists’ rationalist epistemology was unrelated to universal orientation while therapists’ constructivist epistemology related positively to universal orientation.

**Relationship between Humility and Universal Orientation**

The comparison between the qualities related to humility and universal orientation suggested that there might be a positive relationship between qualities and characteristics related to humility and those related to universal orientation. Philip and Ziller (1997) have reported that a universal orientation includes the inclination to see similarities and commonalities between self and other. They report that such an orientation is related to open-mindedness, an appreciation of multiplicity, an appreciation of complexity, being agentic, inclusive and integrative. They reported that it correlates positively with non-hierarchy, egalitarianism, empathic concern, perspective-taking, and has less correlation with an emphasis on status. Again, these are qualities associated with a humble person. The hypothesis in this case was that the Honesty-Humility measure and its subscales would correlate positively with the Universal Orientation Scale. The prediction of the hypothesis was suggested by the results.
Importance and Implications for Therapy

What are the implications of a therapist being humble? As mentioned previously, Corey (1996) studied the personal characteristics of effective therapists which are optimal for therapeutic work. He compiled a list of sixteen qualities, which included self-awareness, appreciation of complexity, contextual awareness, and holism (see Chapter Two for the complete list). And, as emphasized previously, each and every one of those qualities are the qualities that the present research found to be the characteristics of a humble person. In other words, a humble person possesses self-awareness (Exline & Geyers, 2004; Tangney, 2000). The humble person possesses openness, including an openness to change (Rowatt et al., 2002). S/he is open to learning and is open to seeking advice (Tangney, 2000). S/he is open to the generation of new knowledge (Vera & Rodriguez-Lopez, 2004). The humble person does not see others in dichotomous black and white terms (Tangney, 2000), but appreciates complexities of the world and is open to multiple points of view (Rowatt et al., 2002).

The humble person is active and pursues personal development and growth (Exline & Geyers 2004) by holding a holistic and inclusive worldview, and by perceiving the self holistically and contextually (Tangney, 2000). S/he is actively engaged with the environment for self-betterment (Vera & Rodriguez-Lopez, 2004). Humble people are open to and invite criticism. That is, they are not attached to one way of doing things and they support varied paths of learning (Vera & Rodriguez-Lopez, 2004). Cooperativeness (Vera & Rodriguez-Lopez, 2004) and the acceptance of people as they are (Sandage, 2001) constitute two other qualities of humble people. The humble are perceived by others as kind, caring (Tangney, 2000; Vera & Rodriguez-Lopez, 2004) and empathic (Worthington, 1998; Exline & Geyers, 2004; Vera & Rodriguez-Lopez, 2004). The humility literature describes humble people as honest (Exline &
Geyers, 2004; Vera & Rodriguez-Lopez, 2004), not boastful (Exline & Geyers, 2004) and having less feelings of superiority toward others (Tangney, 2000; Vera & Rodriguez-Lopez, 2004).

What is the importance and implications of these findings? Humility as a personal trait supports and contains all of the important and valuable characteristics of an effective therapist. Therapists and scholars in counseling psychology can design programs to develop these myriads of qualities in separation from one another, or they can simply work to develop humility. The question then becomes how to develop a program that nurtures the development of humility. One way would be to study any of the wisdom traditions, such as Buddhist, Taoist, Sufi, Judeo-Christian, or Vedic traditions. These traditions are rich and hold within them thousands of years of experience and know-how in the personal development of such qualities as humility. Another way, or in conjunction with the study of such traditions, this study proposes that one may adopt a constructivist epistemology. Constructivism has very rich and robust philosophical underpinnings, as well as extensive literature from which to draw. The findings from this study suggest that in order to develop the important quality of humility, therapists should consider studying constructivist epistemology, and focus particularly on the literature on the practical application of constructivist epistemology to counseling and therapeutic work.

**Limitations and Future Research**

The limitations within this study will now be addressed. To begin, the procedure of data collection was conducted online. Users of the Internet constitute a particular audience, which may bias the sample. Another possible threat to the external validity of the current study regarded the fact that all of the participants were volunteers. Rosenthal and Rosnow (1975) suggest that there may be a difference between volunteers and non-volunteers, which could impact research studies. For example, volunteerism is associated with a particular level of education and a desire for social approval. However, parallel to these limitations, we must
consider that having an overall sample size of more than five hundred practicing psychologists from across the United States may have increased the significance of the finding. However, it must be emphasized that sample size does not increase the representativeness in this particular case, and so the generalizability of the findings should be considered with caution.

It must be added that the sample of psychologists in the present study approximates the demographic characteristics (e.g., gender, ethnicity, and age) of the members of the American Psychological Association. This increases the confidence in the representativeness of the sample in the present study. For example, in the current study, 64% of the sample was female and 36% of the sample was male, which is somewhat comparable to APA members who are reported to be approximately 53% female and 47% male. In the current study the mean age of participants was 45.09 (SD = 12.54), which is again roughly comparable to the mean age reported by APA as being 53.30 (SD = 13.6). The ethnicities in the current study were Caucasian (84.0%), Multiracial (1.1%), Hispanic (3.5%), African American (2.3%), and Asian American (1.0%). Again, this is somewhat close to APA membership, which reports ethnicities as Caucasian (67.6%), Multiracial (0.3%), Hispanic (2.1%), African American (1.7%), and Asian American (1.9%) (http://research.apa.org/profile2007t1.pdf, 2007).

There may be a concern that the variance in personality reported by Honesty-Humility measure might be affected by social desirability. That is, there may be a particular motivation to make a good impression. This was addressed by Lee et al. (2003). In their study participants provided self and peer ratings for the Honesty-Humility measure and the IPIP-Big Five scale. The correlation for Honesty-Humility was .43, which is within the range of typical personality trait reports. These researchers state that “In terms of cross-source correlations, HEXACO Honesty-Humility was the second highest, surpassed only by IPIP-Big Five Extraversion.”
A final limitation to the present study is the fact that it used questionnaires in the form of self-reports. This may have impacted the generalizability of the findings. Self-reports may be influenced by social desirability effects, according to Rosenthal and Rosnow (1991). Also participants’ actual behavior may not be in accord with their own self-reports.

The findings in the current study do not imply causal relationships. Rather, they suggest relationships between the variables of interest. For example, therapists with constructivist epistemologies may tend to subscribe to humility or to a universal orientation, but this does not mean that therapists’ constructivist epistemologies cause them to be more humble or universally oriented. It may be that a therapist’s emphasis on humility inclines him/her towards endorsing greater constructivist epistemological assumptions. Or, it may be that a third variable influences the relationship between humility and constructivist inclinations. This is why it is important to consider that the current results do not suggest causality but only relationships.

Further research could prioritize the development of a better measure for humility. Although the results supported the hypotheses, the effect sizes were relatively small. One reason for this small effect size could be due to the constitution of the measure of humility used in this study. The review of literature on humility revealed it to be a very complex construct. In comparison, a study of items, constituent of the Honesty-Humility measure, show it to be quite narrow. It does not contain all of the dimensions of humility. Amalgamation of the Honesty-Humility measure with the Universal Orientation Scale may be a first step towards developing a more comprehensive measure of humility that respects its complexity. Research utilizing qualitative research methods may also be a good next step towards shedding additional light on the construct of humility.
One important point needs to be emphasized here. The research question and the findings of this study should not suggest that there is a division among therapists who fall into two camps or categories - that of rationalists and of constructivists. Rather, one should conceptualize these epistemologies along a continuum existing within each therapist. That is to say, therapists possess various shades of these tendencies and epistemologies and apply them according to situation and context. The intent of the present study is not to divide, but rather to integrate. The purpose of this study is to increase the awareness of the fact that therapists’ qualities and behaviors are related to their epistemologies. This awareness may increase understanding and control over therapists’ behavior and assist in their personal and professional development.

The findings of the present study provide a promising but modest contribution to the literature addressing the relationship between epistemology and practice. This study tentatively supports the idea that therapists who lean predominantly toward rationalist epistemologies are consistently different from therapists who lean predominantly toward constructivist epistemologies, particularly in regard to their personal characteristics of humility and universal orientation. Since epistemology has been linked with therapist qualities and therapeutic interventions, it can be assumed that this work will contribute to increasing clarity and enlightenment regarding the dynamics and workings of therapeutic interventions.

These findings are important because (1) they demonstrate the relationship between therapist epistemology and the qualities of humility and universal orientation; (2) they provide information about the important quality of humility and universal orientation and how these may be useful for therapy, education, and the training of therapists; (3) they provide information about the relationship between humility and universal orientation and the constructs and characteristics involved in each; (4) they assist in the development of a measure for humility.
Conclusion

The present study examined the relationship between therapists’ epistemic styles, humility and universal orientation. Results of the study suggested that therapists’ epistemologies were associated with an inclination toward humility and universal orientation. Therapists’ stronger commitments to rationalist epistemology tended toward the negative direction on the Honesty-Humility Measure and its subscales. Therapists’ stronger commitments to constructivist epistemology tended toward the positive direction on two subscales of the Honesty-Humility Measure. They also tended toward the positive direction on the Universal Orientation Scale.

Results of the study also showed that the Honesty-Humility Measure correlates positively with the Universal Orientation Scale. The present study suggests that humility and universal orientation are very important qualities for a therapist to possess. This study furthered the developing literature on therapists’ epistemologies as factors relating to therapists’ qualities. From there it contributes to the practice of therapy. Further outcome-related research is required to understand how humility and universal orientation of therapists affects work with clients.

This study was the first and only empirical investigation of the relationship between therapist epistemology and the quality of humility. It was also the first and only empirical investigation of the relationship between therapist epistemology and the quality of universal orientation. Finally, it was the first and only empirical investigation of the relationship between humility and universal orientation. Most of the results of this study (nine out of eleven) supported the predicted direction of the interaction of therapist epistemic style with the psychological measures used. They tentatively supported the consistency between epistemological commitments of therapists with their personal qualities of humility and universal orientation. Further work may benefit from focusing on how the humility and universal
orientation of therapists, in accordance with their epistemic commitments, might impact the effectiveness of practicing psychotherapy.
APPENDIX A
HONESTY-HUMILITY MEASURE: HEXACO-PERSONALITY INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. If I want something from a person I dislike, I will act very nicely toward that person in order to get it.
2. I don't see anything wrong with using flattery to get ahead in life.
3. I sometimes try to make people feel guilty so that they will do what I want.
4. I wouldn't use flattery to get a raise or promotion at work, even if I thought it would succeed.
5. If I want something from someone, I will laugh at that person's worst jokes.
6. I wouldn't pretend to like someone just to get that person to do favors for me.
7. If I want something from someone, I ask for it directly, instead of manipulating them into giving it.
8. I often get people to do favors for me by making them feel that they owe me.
9. If I knew that I could never get caught, I would be willing to steal a million dollars.
10. I wouldn't cheat a person even if he or she was a real "sucker".
11. I wouldn't feel bad about deceiving people who allow themselves to be deceived.
12. I would be tempted to buy stolen property if I were financially tight.
13. I would still pay my taxes even if I would not get caught for avoiding them.
14. I would never accept a bribe, even if it were very large.
15. I would like to know how to smuggle things across the border.
16. I'd be tempted to use counterfeit money, if I were sure I could get away with it.
17. Having a high level of social status is not very important to me.
18. Having a lot of money is not especially important to me.
19. I prefer to have high-status, successful people as my friends.
20. I would like to live in a very expensive, high-class neighborhood.
21. I would like to be seen driving around in a very expensive car.
22. I would enjoy being a member of a fancy, high-class casino.
23. I would get a lot of pleasure from owning expensive luxury goods.
24. If there is some chance of improving my social status, I take big risks.
25. I deserve more influence and authority than most other people do.
26. I am an ordinary person who is no better than others.

27. I wouldn’t want people to treat me as though I were superior to them.

28. I am special and superior in many ways.

29. Sometimes I feel that laws should not apply to someone like me.

30. I think that I am entitled to more respect than the average person is.

31. Some people would say that I have an over-inflated ego.

32. I want people to know that I am an important person of high status.

APPENDIX B
UNIVERSAL ORIENTATION SCALE

The following statements inquire about your thoughts and feelings in a variety of situations. For each item, indicate how well it describes you by choosing the appropriate letter on the scale at the top of the page: 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5. When you have decided on your answer, fill in the letter on the answer sheet next to the item number. READ EACH ITEM CAREFULLY BEFORE RESPONDING. Answer as honestly and as accurately as you can. Thank you.

ANSWER SCALE:

1  2  3  4  5
1. The similarities between males and females are greater than their differences.
2. I tend to value similarities over differences when I meet someone.
3. At one level of thinking we are all of a kind.
4. I can understand almost anyone because I’m a little like everyone.
5. Little differences among people mean a lot.
6. I can see myself fitting into many groups.
7. There is potential for good and evil in all of us.
8. When I look into the eyes of others I see myself.
9. I could never get accustomed to living in another country.
10. When I first meet someone I tend to notice the differences between myself and the other person.
11. “Between” describes my position with regard to groups better than do “in” and “out.”
12. The same spirit dwells in everyone.
13. Older persons are very different than I am.
14. I can tell a great deal about people by knowing their gender.
15. There is a certain beauty in everyone.
16. I can tell a great deal about a person by knowing his or her age.
17. Men and women will never totally understand each other because of their inborn differences.
18. Everyone in the world is very much alike because in the end we all die.

19. I have difficulty relating to persons who are much younger than I am.

20. When I meet someone I tend to notice similarities between myself and the other person.

APPENDIX C
THE THERAPIST ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE SHORT-FORM (TAQ-SF)


1. Reality is singular, stable and external to human experience.

2. Knowledge is determined to be valid by logic and reason.

3. Learning involves the contiguous or contingent chaining of discrete events.

4. Mental representations of reality involve accurate, explicit and extensive copies of the external world which are encoded in memory.

5. It is best for psychotherapists to focus treatment on clients’ current problems and the elimination or control of these problems.

6. Disturbed affect comes from irrational, invalid, distorted or/and unrealistic thinking.

7. Clients’ resistance to change reflects a lack of motivation, ambivalence or motivated avoidance and such resistance to change is an impediment to therapy which the psychotherapist works to overcome.

8. Reality is relative. Realities reflect individual or collective constructions of order to one’s experiences.

9. Learning involves the refinement and transformation (assimilation and accommodation) of mental representation.

10. Cognition, behavior and affect are interdependent expressions of holistic systemic processes. The three are functionally and structurally inseparable.

11. Intense emotions have a disorganizing effect on behavior. This disorganization may be functional in that it initiates a reorganization so that more viable adaptive constructions can be formed to meet the environmental demands.

12. Psychotherapists should encourage emotional experience, expression, and exploration.

13. Clinical problems are current or recurrent discrepancies between our external environmental challenges and internal adaptive capacities. Problems can become powerful opportunities for learning.

14. Awareness or insight is one of many strategies for improvement, however, emotional and/or behavioral enactments are also very important.
15. Therapists’ relationship with clients is best conceptualized as a professional helping relationship which entails the service and delivery of technical, instructional information or guidance.

16. Psychotherapists’ relationship with clients can best be conceptualized as a unique social exchange which provides the clients a safe supportive context to explore and develop relationships with themselves and the world.

APPENDIX D
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please tell us a little about yourself. This Information will be used to describe the sample as a group.

1. Gender: Male ____ Female____

2. Age:

3. Ethnic background: White/Caucasian, Black/African-American, Hispanic/Latino/a-Black, Hispanic/Latino/a-White, Asian-American, Asian or Pacific Islander, American Indian/Native American, Multi-racial_______, Other________

4. Name of your highest degree: BA/BS, MA/MS, MSW, PsyD, PhD, Other_______

5. Years of Education

6. The Year you obtained your highest degree (e.g. 1985):

7. Total number of years you spent in clinical practice:

8. Specialty area: Psychologist, Mental Health Counselor, Marriage and Family Therapist, Social Worker, Psychiatrist, Other ________

9. Primary job responsibility: Practice/Clinical work, Research, Academic, Administrative, Other_______

10. Primary employment setting: Private practice, University academic department, University service delivery department, Hospital, Mental Health care, School setting, Research setting, Community Center, Other ________

11. Average number of clients you see weekly:

12. Country you live in: US, Canada, Other ________
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American Psychological Association Website, Demographic characteristics of APA members by membership status. (http://research.apa.org/members.html).
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