The HEXACO–60: A Short Measure of the Major Dimensions of Personality

MICHAEL C. ASHTON[1] AND KIBEOM LEE[2]

[1]*Department of Psychology, Brock University*
[2]*Department of Psychology, University of Calgary*

We describe the HEXACO–60, a short personality inventory that assesses the 6 dimensions of the HEXACO model of personality structure. We selected the 10 items of each of the 6 scales from the longer HEXACO Personality Inventory–Revised (Ashton & Lee, 2008; Lee & Ashton, 2004, 2006), with the aim of representing the broad range of content that defines each dimension. In self-report data from samples of college students and community adults, the scales showed reasonably high levels of internal consistency reliability and rather low interscale correlations. Correlations of the HEXACO–60 scales with measures of the Big Five factors were consistent with theoretical expectations, and convergent correlations between self-reports and observer reports on the HEXACO–60 scales were high, averaging above .50. We recommend the HEXACO–60 for use in personality assessment contexts in which administration time is limited.

The time available for measuring the personality traits of research participants is often sharply limited. As a consequence, many researchers often use very short instruments to assess the major dimensions of personality. For example, the well-known Big Five personality factors can be assessed reliably and validly with the 44 items of the Big Five Inventory (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991); the 40 items of the Big Five Mini-Markers (Saucier, 1994); the 50 items of the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP)–Big Five (Goldberg, 1999); or the 60 items of the NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO–FFI; Costa & Mc-Crae, 1992). However, there has not yet been any comparably short inventory that assesses the six personality factors of the HEXACO model of personality structure: Honesty-Humility (H), Emotionality (E), Extraversion (X), Agreeableness versus Anger (A), Conscientiousness (C), and Openness to Experience (O). In this article, we describe the development and psychometric properties of a 60-item version of the HEXACO Personality Inventory—Revised (HEXACO–PI–R; Ashton & Lee, 2008; Lee & Ashton, 2004, 2006), which we call the HEXACO–60.

The HEXACO framework was discovered in lexical studies of personality structure in which factor analyses are conducted on self-ratings or peer ratings of the familiar personality-descriptive adjectives of a language. Early lexical investigations, as conducted in the English language and usually with small variable sets, recovered the well-known Big Five factor structure (see history by Goldberg, 1993). However, more recent research based on large and representative sets of personality-descriptive adjectives from many diverse languages has recovered a set of six dimensions that we call the HEXACO personality factors (e.g., Lee & Ashton, 2008). The six cross-language personality dimensions are assessed in self-report or peer report format by the HEXACO–PI–R.[1]

In constructing the HEXACO–60, we decided that each of the six scales should contain 10 items that collectively cover a wide range of content, with at least 2 items representing each of the four narrow traits (i.e., facets) of each scale in the longer HEXACO–PI–R. We aimed to construct an instrument that would show strong psychometric properties when administered in self-report format to large samples of participants drawn from college student or community adult populations. Specifically, we wanted to achieve moderately high internal consistency reliability (to the extent permitted by the brevity and breadth of the scales), low interscale correlations, and a factor structure in which items (or facets) of the same scale show their primary loadings on the same factor of a six-factor solution.

In addition, we expected to observe a theoretically meaningful pattern of correlations between the HEXACO–60 scales and scales measuring the Big Five personality factors (see Ashton & Lee, 2005, 2007, for further discussion of these links). First, there should be strong correlations of the HEXACO–60 Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience scales with their respective counterparts in the Big Five framework. (Given the content of the HEXACO Extraversion factor, we also expected the HEXACO–60 Extraversion scale to show some association with the low pole of Big Five Neuroticism.) Also, HEXACO–60 Agreeableness (versus Anger) and Emotionality should show positive correlations with Big Five Agreeableness and Neuroticism, respectively, although these links should be only moderately strong given the differences in content between these factors of the two models. Finally,

---

[1]There also exists a 240-item measure of the HEXACO personality factors consisting of items from Goldberg's (1999) IPIP. As described in Ashton, Lee,

---

and Goldberg (2007), the IPIP–HEXACO scales are highly correlated with the corresponding HEXACO–PI scales and generally have psychometric properties similar to those of the HEXACO–PI scales. In developing the HEXACO–60 scales, we used items from the HEXACO–PI(–R) rather than the IPIP–HEXACO for two reasons. First, the six broad HEXACO–PI(–R) scales show somewhat weaker intercorrelations than do the six broad IPIP–HEXACO scales, and this allows the construction of more nearly orthogonal HEXACO–60 scales. Also, the HEXACO–PI–R, but not the IPIP–HEXACO, contains a new facet scale within the Extraversion factor (Social Self-Esteem), and we wished to include the content of this facet in the HEXACO–60.

HEXACO–60 Honesty-Humility should show modest positive correlations with Big Five Agreeableness.

Finally, we also expected that the HEXACO–60 scales would show rather high levels of self–observer agreement. More specifically, self-reports on the HEXACO–60 scales should show fairly strong correlations with observer reports on the same scales as given by informants who are well acquainted with the target persons.

We should also mention a few features that would not be desired in the HEXACO–60. First, given the breadth and brevity of the scales, we would not expect the scales' interitem correlations or internal consistency reliabilities to be extremely high. Second, given that the items of each scale were to be drawn from four relatively distinct facets within each factor, we would not expect each of the scales to be perfectly unidimensional. Third, given the inherent factorial complexity of the personality domain and our aim of broad representation of that domain, we would not expect all items to define their intended factors univocally (i.e., without nontrivial secondary loadings).

METHOD

Selection of HEXACO–60 Items

We selected items for the HEXACO–60 from the 100-item version of the HEXACO–PI–R, with reference to the responses to these items as obtained from a large derivation sample of college student participants. Specifically, we examined the loadings of all 100 items on the six varimax-rotated factors obtained from this sample, and we rejected items whose primary loadings were relatively low or whose secondary loadings were relatively high. From the items that showed sufficiently high primary loadings and sufficiently low secondary loadings, we selected sets of 10 items such that each of the four facets within each HEXACO–PI–R factor-level scale would be represented by 2 or 3 items. We also ensured that between 4 and 6 of the items of each scale would be reverse-keyed. (All items employ a 1 to 5 response scale: 1 [*strongly disagree*] to 5 [*strongly agree*].) Table 1 shows the number of HEXACO–60 items selected from each facet scale, and the Appendix lists the items in the recommended order of administration.

Participants and Materials

The analyses of this article were based on two participant samples, one composed of college students and the other composed of community adults. The college sample consisted of a total of 936 students (645 women, 283 men, 8 not specified) at two Canadian universities who completed the 200-item version of the HEXACO–PI–R during the years 2006, 2007, and 2008. Various other measures were also administered to these students, each of whom participated in one of four different studies (e.g., Ashton & Lee, 2008; Lee et al., 2009). A subset of 464 college students also provided observer reports on the 100-item version of the HEXACO–PI–R as well as self-reports on the NEO–FFI. All observer reports were provided reciprocally between pairs of close acquaintances who responded independently. The median duration of acquaintanceship was 3 years, and the median self-rated level of acquaintanceship was 8 on a scale ranging from 0 to 10, with higher numbers indicating closer acquaintanceship.

The community sample consisted of 734 adult residents (413 women, 321 men) of Eugene-Springfield, Oregon, who completed the HEXACO–PI during 2003. Most of these residents had also completed the NEO–PI–R during 1994, and we used the NEO–PI–R responses to compute scores on the NEO–FFI scales, thereby allowing comparison with results from the college sample. Note that because this earlier version of the HEXACO–PI did not include the Social Self-Esteem items of the HEXACO–PI–R, the results reported for the HEXACO–60 Extraversion scale in the community sample are based only on the seven items that were administered to this sample.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics and Sex Differences

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics for the HEXACO–60 scales in the college and community samples. As seen in the table, the HEXACO–60 mean scores were somewhat above the scale midpoints except for the Emotionality scale among the men of both samples. Standard deviations were generally about 15% of the maximum possible range of scores. Very few participants had scores approaching the maximum or minimum possible values: Even in the most extreme case, that of the Honesty-Humility scale in the community sample, only 0.7% of participants had the highest possible score of 5.0.

Mean scores on the HEXACO–60 scales were generally similar to those of the corresponding scales from the longer versions of the inventory (cf. Lee & Ashton, 2006). However, the means for some scales (Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience) were about 0.15 raw-score units higher for the 60-item scales than for the longer scales; this result reflects the fact that the items of the short scales were not selected to be a perfectly representative subset of the items in the longer scales.[2]

TABLE 1.—Summary of items selected for HEXACO–60 scales.

HEXACO–60 Scales	Items From Each HEXACO–PI–R Facet
Honesty-Humility (6 reversed)	Sincerity (6, 30, 54), Fairness (12, 36, 60), Greed-Avoidance (18, 42), Modesty (24, 48)
Emotionality (4 reversed)	Fearfulness (5, 29, 53), Anxiety (11, 35), Dependence (17, 41), Sentimentality (23, 47, 59)
Extraversion (4 reversed)	Social Self-Esteem (4, 28, 52), Social Boldness (10, 34, 58), Sociability (16, 40), Liveliness (22, 46)
Agreeableness versus Anger (4 reversed)	Forgiveness (3, 27), Gentleness (9, 33, 51), Flexibility (15, 39, 57), Patience (21, 45)
Conscientiousness (6 reversed)	Organization (2, 26), Diligence (8, 32), Perfectionism (14, 38, 50), Prudence (20, 44, 56)
Openness to Experience (5 reversed)	Aesthetic appreciation (1, 25), Inquisitiveness (7, 31), Creativity (13, 37, 49), Unconventionality (19, 43, 55)

Note. HEXACO–PI–R = HEXACO–Personality Inventory–Revised. In the original HEXACO–PI, the Extraversion factor contained a facet-level scale called Expressiveness. That scale was replaced in the HEXACO–PI–R by the Social Self-Esteem facet scale. No items of the HEXACO–PI–R interstitial facet scale of Altruism versus Antagonism were selected for the HEXACO–60. Numbers in parentheses after facet scale names are item numbers in HEXACO–60; see Appendix for inventory and for reverse-scored items.

---

[2]Note that this situation also applies to the short forms of other well-validated inventories. For example, in the community sample, scores on the NEO–FFI Agreeableness and Conscientiousness scales (computed as means across items based on a 5-point response scale) are about 0.20 raw score units higher than those of the longer NEO–PI–R scales.

TABLE 2.—Descriptive and internal consistency statistics for the HEXACO–60 scales in self-report.

	r	α	Women M (SD)	Men M (SD)	d(W−M)
College sample					
Honesty-Humility	.27	.79	3.30 (0.66)	3.04 (0.71)	0.38
Emotionality	.27	.78	3.64 (0.55)	2.93 (0.61)	1.23
Extraversion	.29	.80	3.49 (0.62)	3.47 (0.63)	0.02
Agreeableness	.25	.77	3.10 (0.58)	3.19 (0.65)	−0.15
Conscientiousness	.26	.78	3.58 (0.59)	3.31 (0.62)	0.46
Openness to Experience	.26	.77	3.54 (0.64)	3.51 (0.68)	0.05
Community sample					
Honesty-Humility	.23	.74	3.98 (0.50)	3.76 (0.55)	0.41
Emotionality	.21	.73	3.37 (0.54)	2.87 (0.49)	0.96
Extraversion[a]	.28	.73	3.32 (0.65)	3.26 (0.59)	0.10
Agreeableness	.23	.75	3.38 (0.54)	3.23 (0.56)	0.28
Conscientiousness	.24	.76	3.73 (0.51)	3.73 (0.52)	0.00
Openness to Experience	.28	.80	3.59 (0.65)	3.62 (0.64)	−0.04

Note. W = women; M = Men. For college sample, $N_W = 645$, $N_M = 283$. For community sample, $N_W = 413$, $N_M = 321$.

[a]Extraversion scores in the community sample are based on seven items only (see text for details); r is mean interitem correlation; d is difference (Cohen's d) between mean scores of men and women.

With regard to sex differences, results from both samples indicated that women averaged substantially higher than men on Emotionality and somewhat higher on Honesty-Humility. The sex differences for the HEXACO–60 scales were generally similar in size to those observed for the longer HEXACO–PI(–R) scales (cf. Lee & Ashton, 2006), with women averaging about a full standard deviation higher than men on Emotionality.

Internal Consistency

Also given in Table 2 is information about the internal consistency of the HEXACO–60 scales. As seen in the table, the mean interitem correlations ranged from .25 to .29 in the college sample and from .21 to .28 in the community sample. The internal consistency reliabilities ranged from .77 to .80 in the college sample and from .73 to .80 in the community sample.

As would be expected, the HEXACO–60 scales have levels of internal consistency reliability lower than those of the full-length HEXACO–PI–R scales, which ranged from .88 to .91 in the college sample and from .87 to .90 in the community sample. The higher reliability of the HEXACO–PI(–R) scales is attributable to their greater length; on an item-for-item basis, the HEXACO–60 scales were somewhat more reliable, as the mean interitem correlations for the HEXACO–PI–R scales ranged from .19 to .25 in the college sample and from .17 to .23 in the community sample.

Correlations Among the HEXACO–60 Scales

Table 3 shows correlations among the HEXACO–60 scales for each of the two samples. In neither sample did any of the HEXACO–60 scale intercorrelations reach .30, and only two pairs of scales showed intercorrelations reaching .25: Honesty-Humility and Agreeableness (in both samples) and Extraversion and Openness to Experience (in the community sample only). Note that these scale intercorrelations are somewhat lower than those observed for the full-length HEXACO–PI(–R) scales; in both samples, the highest correlation was .37, between Honesty-

TABLE 3.—Correlations among the HEXACO–60 scales in self-report.

HEXACO–60 Scale	H	E	X	A	C	O
Honesty-Humility (H)		.04	−.09	.25	.13	−.03
Emotionality (E)	.12		−.07	−.04	−.06	−.08
Extraversion[a] (X)	−.11	−.13		.00	.13	.26
Agreeableness (A)	.26	−.08	.05		−.05	.08
Conscientiousness (C)	.18	.15	.10	.01		.09
Openness to Experience (O)	.21	−.10	.08	.03	.03	

Note. Correlations below the diagonal are for the college sample ($N = 936$); correlations above the diagonal are for the community sample ($N = 734$).

[a]Extraversion scores in the community sample are based on seven items only (see text for details).

Humility and Agreeableness. The part–whole correlations between the HEXACO–60 scales and the corresponding 200-item HEXACO–PI(–R) scales were very high, ranging from .91 to .94 in the college sample and from .89 to .93 in the community sample.

Factor Structure

We conducted an item-level factor analysis in each sample using principal axis extraction with varimax rotation of six factors. In the college sample, the eigenvalues of the first 10 factors derived from the 60 items were 5.07, 4.73, 3.99, 3.56, 2.95, 2.13, 1.72, 1.61, 1.45, and 1.28. In the community sample, the eigenvalues of the first 10 factors derived from the 57 items were 4.72, 4.40, 3.61, 3.11, 2.64, 2.27, 1.73, 1.55, 1.45, and 1.34. The first 6 common factors accounted for 37.4% and 29.1% of the item variance in the college and community samples, respectively. When we rotated the factors to a varimax solution, every item had its primary loading on the factor defined by the other items of its scale, and all primary loadings exceeded .30. Factor analyses of the 24 facets also produced a clean six-factor structure; details are available from the authors.

We also computed varimax-rotated factors for the items of the longer versions of the HEXACO–PI(–R) in both samples. The resulting six factor scores were very strongly correlated with those of the six HEXACO–60 item factors described previously, with convergent correlations ranging from .87 to .93 in the college sample and from .83 to .92 in the community sample.

Correlations With NEO–FFI Scales

Table 4 shows the correlations of the HEXACO–60 scales with those of the NEO–FFI in the college and community samples.

In both samples, the highest correlations were those between the HEXACO–60 and NEO–FFI measures of Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience, respectively. HEXACO–60 Extraversion also showed moderate negative correlations with NEO–FFI Neuroticism, even though the former scale was missing the three social self-esteem items in the community sample. HEXACO–60 Emotionality showed moderate positive correlations with NEO–FFI Neuroticism, and HEXACO–60 Agreeableness showed moderate positive correlations with NEO–FFI Agreeableness. Finally, HEXACO–60 Honesty-Humility showed only modest positive correlations with NEO–FFI Agreeableness.

Table 4 also shows the correlations of the longer HEXACO–PI(–R) scales with the scales of the NEO–FFI. As seen in the table, those correlations were generally very close to those

TABLE 4.—Correlations between the HEXACO–60 and NEO–FFI scales in self-reports.

HEXACO–60 Scale	NEO–FFI Scale				
	Neuroticism	Extraversion	Openness	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness
College sample					
Honesty-Humility	.07 (.08)	−.13 (−.16)	.24 (.25)	.41 (.48)	.14 (.15)
Emotionality	.53 (.58)	−.01 (−.04)	−.03 (.00)	.26 (.28)	.07 (.04)
Extraversion	−.51 (−.55)	.74 (.81)	.08 (.09)	.13 (.18)	.22 (.22)
Agreeableness	−.17 (−.22)	.14 (.12)	.06 (.12)	.57 (.59)	.10 (.10)
Conscientiousness	−.09 (−.13)	.11 (.15)	.06 (.04)	.24 (.27)	.75 (.83)
Openness to Experience	.05 (.01)	.02 (.04)	.80 (.82)	.06 (.06)	−.05 (−.03)
Community sample					
Honesty-Humility	−.09 (−.08)	−.09 (−.11)	−.06 (−.05)	.34 (.44)	.15 (.12)
Emotionality	.40 (.43)	−.06 (−.03)	−.05 (−.02)	.10 (.11)	−.06 (−.07)
Extraversion[a]	−.27 (−.32)	.66 (.71)	.20 (.19)	.07 (.10)	.15 (.18)
Agreeableness	−.20 (−.22)	.16 (.16)	.06 (.03)	.51 (.53)	.00 (−.03)
Conscientiousness	−.12 (−.15)	.08 (.12)	.05 (−.03)	.08 (.09)	.58 (.66)
Openness to Experience	−.08 (−.07)	.15 (.13)	.71 (.74)	.03 (−.05)	−.09 (−.11)

Note. $N = 464$ (college sample); $N = 734$ (community sample). NEO–FFI = NEO Five-Factor Inventory. Values in parentheses are for the HEXACO–Personality Inventory(–Revised) scales.

[a]HEXACO–60 Extraversion scores in the community sample are based on seven items only (see text for details). In the college sample, HEXACO–60 and NEO–FFI items were administered in the same session; in the community sample, HEXACO–60 and NEO–FFI items were administered 9 years apart (see text for details).

produced by the HEXACO–60 scales, but the HEXACO–PI(–R) scales tended to produce somewhat stronger correlations with the theoretically relevant NEO–FFI scales, a result that would be expected given the higher reliability of the full-length HEXACO–PI(–R) scales.

Correlations Between Self-Reports and Observer Reports

Table 5 shows the correlations between self-reports and observer reports on each of the HEXACO–60 scales and on each of the HEXACO–PI(–R) scales as obtained from the college sample. (Recall that the self-report HEXACO–PI[–R] scales are based on the 200-item inventory, whereas the peer report HEXACO–PI[–R] scales are based on the 100-item inventory.) As shown in the table, the correlations ranged from .47 to .62 for the HEXACO–60 scales and from .48 to .62 for the HEXACO–PI–R scales. Thus, the HEXACO–60 scales showed levels of self-observer agreement similar to those yielded by the longer HEXACO–PI–R scales.

TABLE 5.—Correlations between self-reports and observer reports on the HEXACO–60 and HEXACO–PI–R scales.

Scale	HEXACO–60	HEXACO–PI–R[a]
Honesty-Humility	.54	.55
Emotionality	.62	.62
Extraversion	.52	.54
Agreeableness	.50	.50
Conscientiousness	.47	.48
Openness to Experience	.55	.52

Note. $N = 462$. HEXACO = Honesty-Humility (H), Emotionality (E), Extraversion (X), Agreeableness versus Anger (A), Conscientiousness (C), and Openness to Experience (O); HEXACO–PI–R = HEXACO Personality Inventory–Revised.

[a]Correlations of self-reports on full-length HEXACO–PI–R scales with observer reports on half-length HEXACO–PI–R scales.

DISCUSSION

Summary

We examined the psychometric properties of the HEXACO–60 scales in samples of college students and community adults. When administered in self-report form, the scales showed internal consistency reliabilities in the .70s despite their brevity and breadth of content: Each scale contained only 10 items, which collectively represented four distinct narrow traits. Scale intercorrelations were all below .30 and thus compare favorably with measures of the Big Five factors. When six factors were extracted and rotated, all items (or all facets) of a given scale showed their primary loadings on the same factor.

Correlations of the HEXACO–60 scales with the scales of the NEO–FFI were also consistent with expectations: The HEXACO–60 Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience scales correlated strongly with their NEO–FFI counterparts; the HEXACO–60 Emotionality and Agreeableness scales showed moderately strong relations with NEO–FFI Neuroticism and Agreeableness, respectively; and HEXACO–60 Honesty-Humility was only weakly related to the NEO-FFI scales, showing only modest correlations even with NEO–FFI Agreeableness.[3] In addition, the levels of self-observer agreement were found to be reasonably high for all six HEXACO–60 scales, with all values exceeding .45. Finally, the properties of the HEXACO–60 were generally very similar to those of the longer versions of the HEXACO–PI–R, showing only a

---

[3]As measured by the NEO–FFI and some other short instruments, the Big Five Neuroticism and Agreeableness factors differ substantially in their breadth. Big Five Neuroticism items tend to be highly intercorrelated; collectively, they correlate strongly with the Anxiety facet of HEXACO Emotionality and with the low pole of the Social Self-Esteem facet of HEXACO Extraversion. Big Five Agreeableness items tend to be modestly intercorrelated; collectively, they correlate moderately with many facets of the HEXACO Agreeableness, Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, and Extraversion factors.

modest loss in internal consistency reliabilities and in external correlations and maintaining approximately equal levels of self-observer agreement.

Recommended Use of the HEXACO–60

The administration time for the HEXACO–60 is relatively brief: For example, most college students require less than 10 min to complete the inventory. We therefore recommend the HEXACO–60 for use in any research context in which the researcher would like to measure the major dimensions of personality but in which time constraints permit only a short inventory. In such contexts, the use of the HEXACO–60 provides several advantages over the use of short measures of the Big Five: First, the HEXACO–60 Honesty-Humility scale assesses an important personality construct that is only partially and peripherally represented in measures of the Big Five. Second, the HEXACO–60 scales of Honesty-Humility, Agreeableness (versus Anger), and Emotionality assess dimensions that are interpreted parsimoniously in terms of theoretical biologists' constructs of reciprocal and kin altruism; in contrast, there is no such integrated interpretation of the Big Five Agreeableness and Neuroticism dimensions (see detailed explanation in Ashton & Lee, 2007). Third, and most generally, the HEXACO–60 scales—but not the scales of Big Five instruments—correspond to the largest set of personality dimensions that is consistently obtained from the indigenous personality lexicons of diverse human languages (see, e.g., Lee & Ashton, 2008).

When the time available for administering personality items is not sharply limited, the 100- or 200-item forms of the HEXACO–PI–R would likely be preferred over the HEXACO–60. The longer instruments allow a more reliable assessment of the broad factors and also provide scores for the narrower traits (or facets) that define those factors (including the Altruism facet, which represents a blend of Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, and Agreeableness). Facet-level scales can be computed from the HEXACO–60, but these are very short, consisting of only two or three items per scale, and thus rather unreliable. The use of facet-level scores for the HEXACO–60 is recommended only for analyses that require a few indicator variables for each factor as, for example, in the case of confirmatory factor analyses.

Regarding the utility of the Honesty-Humility scale, we note that many investigations of recent years have assessed the Big Five factors along with the "Dark Triad" traits (Paulhus & Williams, 2002) of psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and narcissism. The Dark Triad variables are a worthwhile addition to the Big Five insofar as the former variables capture some important personality variance that is not fully represented in the Big Five framework. Given that the Dark Triad variables collectively correspond very closely to low Honesty-Humility (Lee & Ashton, 2005), researchers who wish to assess the Big Five and Dark Triad could use the HEXACO–60 scales as an efficient means of capturing the same personality variance.

REFERENCES

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2005). Honesty-Humility, the Big Five and the Five-Factor model. *Journal of Personality, 73,* 1321–1353.

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2007). Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 11,* 150–166.

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2008). The prediction of Honesty-Humility-related criteria by the HEXACO and Five-Factor models of personality. *Journal of Research in Personality, 42,* 1216–1228.

Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., & Goldberg, L. R. (2007). The IPIP–HEXACO scales: An alternative, public-domain measure of the personality constructs in the HEXACO model. *Personality and Individual Differences, 42,* 1515–1526.

Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *NEO Personality Inventory–Revised (NEO–PI–R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO–FFI) professional manual.* Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist, 48,* 26–34.

Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public-domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. In I. Mervielde, I. Deary, F. De Fruyt, & F. Ostendorf (Eds.), *Personality psychology in Europe* (Vol. 7, pp. 7–28). Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.

John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *The Big Five Inventory—Versions 4a and 54.* Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2004). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO personality inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 39,* 329–358.

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2005). Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and narcissism in the Five-Factor model and the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Individual Differences, 38,* 1571–1582.

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2006). Further assessment of the HEXACO Personality Inventory: Two new facet scales and an observer report form. *Psychological Assessment, 18,* 182–191.

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2008). The HEXACO personality factors in the indigenous personality lexicons of English and 11 other languages. *Journal of Personality, 76,* 1001–1053.

Lee, K., Ashton, M. C., Pozzebon, J. A., Visser, B. A., Bourdage, J. S., & Ogunfowora, B. (2009). Similarity and assumed similarity in personality reports of well-acquainted persons. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96,* 460–472.

Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality, 36,* 556–563.

Saucier, G. (1994). Mini-markers: A brief version of Goldberg's unipolar Big-Five markers. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 63,* 506–516.

APPENDIX*

Instructions, Items, and Scoring of the HEXACO–60

HEXACO–60

On the following pages, you will find a series of statements about you. Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement. Then indicate your response using the following scale:

> 5 = strongly agree
> 4 = agree
> 3 = neutral (neither agree nor disagree)
> 2 = disagree
> 1 = strongly disagree

Please answer every statement, even if you are not completely sure of your response.

_____

*Copyright Kibeom Lee and Michael C. Ashton. Reprinted with permission.

1. I would be quite bored by a visit to an art gallery.
2. I plan ahead and organize things, to avoid scrambling at the last minute.
3. I rarely hold a grudge, even against people who have badly wronged me.
4. I feel reasonably satisfied with myself overall.
5. I would feel afraid if I had to travel in bad weather conditions.
6. I wouldn't use flattery to get a raise or promotion at work, even if I thought it would succeed.
7. I'm interested in learning about the history and politics of other countries.
8. I often push myself very hard when trying to achieve a goal.
9. People sometimes tell me that I am too critical of others.
10. I rarely express my opinions in group meetings.
11. I sometimes can't help worrying about little things.
12. If I knew that I could never get caught, I would be willing to steal a million dollars.
13. I would enjoy creating a work of art, such as a novel, a song, or a painting.
14. When working on something, I don't pay much attention to small details.
15. People sometimes tell me that I'm too stubborn.
16. I prefer jobs that involve active social interaction to those that involve working alone.
17. When I suffer from a painful experience, I need someone to make me feel comfortable.
18. Having a lot of money is not especially important to me.
19. I think that paying attention to radical ideas is a waste of time.
20. I make decisions based on the feeling of the moment rather than on careful thought.
21. People think of me as someone who has a quick temper.
22. On most days, I feel cheerful and optimistic.
23. I feel like crying when I see other people crying.
24. I think that I am entitled to more respect than the average person is.
25. If I had the opportunity, I would like to attend a classical music concert.
26. When working, I sometimes have difficulties due to being disorganized.
27. My attitude toward people who have treated me badly is "forgive and forget."
28. I feel that I am an unpopular person.
29. When it comes to physical danger, I am very fearful.
30. If I want something from someone, I will laugh at that person's worst jokes.
31. I've never really enjoyed looking through an encyclopedia.
32. I do only the minimum amount of work needed to get by.
33. I tend to be lenient in judging other people.
34. In social situations, I'm usually the one who makes the first move.
35. I worry a lot less than most people do.
36. I would never accept a bribe, even if it were very large.
37. People have often told me that I have a good imagination.

38. I always try to be accurate in my work, even at the expense of time.
39. I am usually quite flexible in my opinions when people disagree with me.
40. The first thing that I always do in a new place is to make friends.
41. I can handle difficult situations without needing emotional support from anyone else.
42. I would get a lot of pleasure from owning expensive luxury goods.
43. I like people who have unconventional views.
44. I make a lot of mistakes because I don't think before I act.
45. Most people tend to get angry more quickly than I do.
46. Most people are more upbeat and dynamic than I generally am.
47. I feel strong emotions when someone close to me is going away for a long time.
48. I want people to know that I am an important person of high status.
49. I don't think of myself as the artistic or creative type.
50. People often call me a perfectionist.
51. Even when people make a lot of mistakes, I rarely say anything negative.
52. I sometimes feel that I am a worthless person.
53. Even in an emergency I wouldn't feel like panicking.
54. I wouldn't pretend to like someone just to get that person to do favors for me.
55. I find it boring to discuss philosophy.
56. I prefer to do whatever comes to mind, rather than stick to a plan.
57. When people tell me that I'm wrong, my first reaction is to argue with them.
58. When I'm in a group of people, I'm often the one who speaks on behalf of the group.
59. I remain unemotional even in situations where most people get very sentimental.
60. I'd be tempted to use counterfeit money, if I were sure I could get away with it.

Scoring of HEXACO–60 Scales (see Table 1 for Facet-Level Scales):

Honesty-Humility:	6, 12R, 18, 24R, 30R, 36, 42R, 48R, 54, 60R
Emotionality:	5, 11, 17, 23, 29, 35R, 41R, 47, 53R, 59R
Extraversion:	4, 10R, 16, 22, 28R, 34, 40, 46R, 52R, 58
Agreeableness (versus Anger):	3, 9R, 15R, 21R, 27, 33, 39, 45, 51, 57R
Conscientiousness:	2, 8, 14R, 20R, 26R, 32R, 38, 44R, 50, 56R
Openness to Experience:	1R, 7, 13, 19R, 25, 31R, 37, 43, 49R, 55R

(R indicates reverse-scored item.)

Note. The HEXACO–60 items may be used free of charge for nonprofit research purposes. Researchers who wish to use the observer report form of the HEXACO–60 or to use other-language translations of the HEXACO–60 are advised to contact the authors to obtain the authorized observer report form and the authorized translations.