

Personality traits and tolerance for democratic norm violations (#268691)

Author(s)

This pre-registration is currently anonymous to enable blind peer-review.
It has 3 authors.

Pre-registered on:

2026/01/19 11:43 (PT)

1) Have any data been collected for this study already?

No, no data have been collected for this study yet.

2) What's the main question being asked or hypothesis being tested in this study?

This study examines whether individual differences in Big Five personality traits predict tolerance for violations of democratic norms. We use a conjoint experimental design in which respondents choose between hypothetical government policy approaches that combine policy goals with varying degrees of adherence to democratic procedures. We test whether personality traits predict baseline tolerance for norm violations and whether personality moderates the congruence effects whereby ideologically preferred policies reduce sensitivity to accompanying procedural violations.

H1a. Respondents higher in Openness to Experience will show larger negative AMCEs for norm violations (i.e., stronger penalties for violations, indicating lower tolerance).

H1b. Respondents higher in Conscientiousness will show larger negative AMCEs for norm violations (lower tolerance).

H1c. Respondents higher in Agreeableness will show larger negative AMCEs for norm violations (lower tolerance).

H1d. Respondents higher in Neuroticism will show smaller negative AMCEs for norm violations (i.e., weaker penalties, indicating higher tolerance), particularly for violations framed as responses to political opposition or protest.

H1e. Extraversion will not systematically predict tolerance for norm violations (null hypothesis).

H2a. The congruence effects whereby ideologically preferred policies reduce norm-violation penalties will be attenuated among respondents high in Conscientiousness.

H2b. The congruence effects will be amplified among respondents high in Neuroticism.

3) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.

For each of 15 paired comparisons, which policy approach the respondent prefers (Option A = 1, Option B = 0, or vice versa).

4) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?

This study uses a conjoint experimental design. All participants complete the same conjoint task, but the specific attribute levels shown in each profile are randomly assigned. Each respondent evaluates 15 paired comparisons of hypothetical government policy approaches. Each profile in a pair is defined by 5 attributes, each with 3 levels, fully randomised and independently assigned.

1. Economic policy ("In the sphere of economic policy, the government intends to..."): (1) implement wealth taxes on high-income earners and large corporations to fund expanded social programs; (2) implement a tax system that imposes moderately higher rates on higher-income earners and corporations to fund social programs; (3) implement reduced corporate and personal income tax rates regardless of income, cutting social programs.
2. Socio-cultural policy ("In the sphere of sociocultural policy, the government intends to..."): (1) provide universal access to abortion services through publicly funded healthcare with no restrictions; (2) ensure legal abortion access with restrictions after 20 weeks except for maternal or foetal health reasons; (3) restrict abortion access with exceptions only for rape, incest, and maternal health.
3. Legislative control ("If parliament tries to delay or block their policies, the government will..."): (1) work through the normal legislative process, accepting delays and modifications; (2) use executive orders to implement key provisions while negotiations continue; (3) declare the policy in question a national priority and override parliamentary objections.
4. Public control ("If their policies face significant protests by interest groups, the government will..."): (1) consult with those groups to address their concerns; (2) engage in limited dialogue with some interest groups but stick to the core plan; (3) ignore these concerns and implement the policy in question anyway.
5. Judicial control ("If concerns are raised about the compatibility of their policies with the constitution, the government will..."): (1) amend the policy in question to ensure it is fully compatible with the constitution; (2) seek to amend the constitution to enable the policy in question to be implemented; (3) implement the policy in question regardless of these concerns.

5) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.

Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.

We test all hypotheses using Average Marginal Component Effects (AMCEs) as the key estimand, with interaction models and subgroup estimates to test each of the separate hypotheses. We will use the standard approach for estimating AMCEs as specified in Hainmueller, Hopkins and Yamamoto (2014).

For H1a - H1c, personality traits will be the main independent variable and will be measured using the Ten-Item Personality Index standard battery. Following standard practice, we will measure each of the big five personality traits: Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Openness, and Neuroticism, using two items per trait. All items are measured on 5-point agreement scales (1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree).

Negatively-coded items are reverse-coded before averaging. We will then estimate AMCEs for each of the five traits, regressing choice on each of the five conjoint attributes interacted with the trait in question. This will allow us to estimate the probability of making a choice conditional on the level of the trait and the policy content or democratic norm violation in question, relative to the baselines of centrist economic and socio-cultural policy and liberal-democratic procedural norms.

For H2a to H2b, we add two additional moderators. Socio-cultural self-placement is operationalised on a seven-item scale ranging from 1 (extremely

socially progressive) to 7 (extremely socially conservative), and economic self-placement similarly ranges from 1 (extremely left-wing) to 7 (extremely right-wing). Interacting these moderators separately with the personality types Conscientiousness and Neuroticism, and with the conjoint attributes, will allow us to estimate whether high Conscientiousness weakens the effects of ideology-policy congruence on toleration for norm violations (e.g. economically left-wing respondents being more tolerant of norm violations in the presence of economically left-wing policy content).

6) Describe exactly how outliers will be defined and handled, and your precise rule(s) for excluding observations.

Respondents answering "Don't know / Hard to say" on the observational variables (personality traits; economic and socio-cultural self-placement) will be excluded.

7) How many observations will be collected or what will determine sample size? No need to justify decision, but be precise about exactly how the number will be determined.

1,500 in each case (Great Britain, Poland and Spain), drawing on quota-sampled surveys representative of the adult population by gender, age group, level of education, region of residence, and level of urbanisation.

8) Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., secondary analyses, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)

Nothing else to pre-register.

BUNDLE

This pre-registration is part of a bundle which includes:

#268,686 - <https://aspredicted.org/2s49am.pdf> - Title: 'Institutional heterogeneity in democratic norm tolerance' #268,204 - <https://aspredicted.org/fs8nt5.pdf> - Title: 'Attitudes towards Absolute Freedom of Speech Online in Poland, the UK and Spain'