

DoPL

Ithurburn, Andrew¹, Pedersen, Julie¹, & Moore, Adam¹

¹ The University of Edinburgh

Author Note

The authors made the following contributions. Ithurburn, Andrew:
Conceptualization, Writing - Original Draft Preparation, Writing - Review & Editing;
Moore, Adam: Writing - Review & Editing.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Ithurburn, Andrew,
George Square, Edinburgh, EH8 9JZ. E-mail: a.ithurburn@sms.ed.ac.uk

DoPL

Introduction

Throughout political history tyrants and despots have influenced great power over large swaths of land and communities. One common thread amongst these individuals are how they wield their great power, often through dominant tactics such as threats and political subversions. Recent history has shown with individuals like Donald Trump, Jair Bolsonaro, and Rodrigo Duterte who display authoritarian traits often wield their power through fear and threats of violence.

Dominance, Leadership, and Prestige orientation

Research in power desire motives have focused on three sub-domains: dominance, leadership, and prestige (Suessenbach, Loughnan, Schönbrodt, & Moore, 2019). Each of these three different power motives are explanations as to different ways or methods that individuals in power sought power or were bestowed upon them.

The dominance motive is one of the more researched methods and well depicted power motives. Individuals with a dominance orientation display the more primal of human behavior. These individuals will seek power through direct methods such as asserting one's dominance, control over resources, or physically assaulting someone (Johnson, Leedom, & Muhtadie, 2012; Winter, 1993). The method of attaining this power and status may not always be as direct as a physical confrontation. Use of nonverbal communication is often very common amongst humans such as body posture, facial expressions, and

Risk

Domain Specific Risk-taking

The present study

Methods

Participants were a convenience sample of 111 individuals from Prolific Academic’s crowdsourcing platform (www.prolific.io). Prolific Academic is an online crowdsourcing service that provides participants access to studies hosted on third party websites. Participants were required to be 18 years of age or older and be able to read and understand English. Participants received £4.00, which is above the current minimum wage pro-rata in the United Kingdom, as compensation for completing the survey. The Psychology Research Ethics Committee at the University of Edinburgh approved all study procedures [ref: #####]. The present study was pre-registered along with a copy of anonymized data and copy of R code is available at (<https://osf.io/s4j7y>).

Materials

Demographic Questionnaire. In a demographic questionnaire administered prior to the main survey, participants were invited to respond to questions about their self-identified demographic characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, and ethnic origin.

Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership Orientation. The 18-item Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership scale [DoPL; Suessenbach, Loughnan, Schönbrodt, and Moore (2019)], is used to measure dominance, prestige, and leadership orientation. Each question corresponds to one of the three domains. Each domain is scored across six unique items related to those domains (e.g., “I relish opportunities in which I can lead others” for leadership) rated on a scale from 0 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). Internal consistency reliability for the current sample is $\alpha = 0.86$.

Domain Specific Risk-taking Scale (DOSPRT; Weber, Blais, and Betz (2002)) is a scale assessing individuals’ likelihood of engaging in risky behaviors within 5 domain

specific risky situations: financial (“Gambling a week’s income at a casino.”), social (“Admitting that your tastes are different from those of your friends”), recreational (“Trying out bungeeing jumpng at least once”), health and safety (“Engaging in unprotected sex”), and ethical (“Cheating on an exam”) situations. Each risky situation is then rated on a five-point Likert scale (1 being very unlikely and 5 being very likely). Two additional five-point Likert scales assess risk perception and expected benefits (1 being not at all risky and 5 being extremely risky; 1 being no benefits at all and 5 being great benefits) respectively. Example risky situations are “Admitting that your tastes are different from those of a friend” and “Drinking heavily at a social function.” Internal consistency reliability for the current samples for the 3 sub-domains are $\alpha = 0.85$, $\alpha = 0.90$, $\alpha = 0.92$ respectively.

Procedure

Participants were recruited via a study landing page on Prolific’s website or via a direct e-mail to eligible participants (Prolific FAQ, 2018). The study landing page included a brief description of the study including any risks and benefits along with expected compensation for successful completion. Participants accepted participation in the experiment and were directed to the main survey (Qualtrics, Inc; Provo, UT) where they were shown a brief message on study consent.

Once participants consented to participate in the experiment they answered a series of demographic questions. Once completed, participants completed the Dominance, Prestige, and Leadership Scale and the Domain Specific Risk-taking scale. The two scales were counterbalanced to account for order effects. After completion of the main survey, participants were shown a debriefing statement that briefly mentions the purpose of the experiment along with the contact information of the main researcher (AI). Participants were compensated £4.00 via Prolific Academic.

Data analysis

Demographic characteristics were analyzed using a multiple regression for continuous variables (age) and Chi-square tests for categorical variables (gender, race, ethnicity, ethnic origin, and education). Means and standard deviations were calculated for the relevant scales (i.e., DoPL and DOSPERT). All analyses were done using (R Core Team, 2021) along with (Stan Development Team, 2020) package.

*Note: discuss and explain the use of Bayesian Statistics

All relevant analyses were conducted in a Bayesian framework using the brms package (Bürkner, 2017) along with the rstan package (Stan Development Team, 2020)

Results

One hundred and eleven individuals completed the main survey. Of these individuals, 111 completed all sections without incomplete data and were therefore retained in most data analyses. In later analyses to account for outliers two participants had to be excluded from the dataset. Table 1 shows the demographic information for the participants. Average completion time for participants was 16M 49S ($SD = 43.79$).

Preregistered Analyses

We first investigated DoPL orientation on general risk preference (Figure 1). General risk preference was anecdotally explained by dominance orientation, participant gender, and participant age (see table 2).

Demographic and DoPL

All participants completed the dominance, leadership, and prestige scale (Suessenbach, Loughnan, Schönbrodt, and Moore (2019)). Empirically, men have generally been more dominance oriented in their behavior (citation). Following the literature, men

104 tended to be more dominant oriented than women. The marginal posterior distribution of
105 each parameter is summarized in Table #. Interestingly, older individuals tended to be

106 **Domain Specific Risk-Taking**

107 **Interactions**

108 **Discussion**

109 **Limitations**


110 **Future Implications**

References


- Bürkner, P.-C. (2017). brms: An R package for Bayesian multilevel models using Stan. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 80(1), 1–28.
<https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v080.i01>
- Johnson, S. L., Leedom, L. J., & Muhtadie, L. (2012). The Dominance Behavioral System and Psychopathology: Evidence from Self-Report, Observational, and Biological Studies. *Psychological Bulletin*, 138(4), 692–743.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027503>
- R Core Team. (2021). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from <https://www.R-project.org/>
- Stan Development Team. (2020). *RStan: The R interface to Stan*. Retrieved from <http://mc-stan.org/>
- Suessenbach, F., Loughnan, S., Schönbrodt, F. D., & Moore, A. B. (2019). The dominance, prestige, and leadership account of social power motives. *European Journal of Personality*, 33(1), 7–33. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2184>
- Weber, E. U., Blais, A.-R., & Betz, N. E. (2002). A domain-specific risk-attitude scale: Measuring risk perceptions and risk behaviors. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 15(4), 263–290. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.414>
- Winter, D. G. (1993). Power, affiliation, and war: Three tests of a motivational model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65(3), 532–545.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.65.3.532>


133

Figures and Tables



134








Table 1

Variables	
NA	n = 111
Age	
Mean (SD)	26.8 (9.2)
Median [Min, Max]	24 [18, 61]
Gender	
Female	54 (48.6%)
Gender Non-Binary	2 (1.8%)
Male	55 (49.5%)
Ethnicity	
Scottish	2 (1.8%)
English	10 (9.0%)
European	77 (69.4%)
Latin American	2 (1.8%)
Asian	6 (5.4%)
Arab	0 (0.0%)
African	8 (7.2%)
Other	6 (5.4%)
Prefer not to respond	0 (0.0%)
Education	
Primary School	4 (3.6%)
GCSEs or Equivalent	8 (7.2%)
A-Levels or Equivalent	32 (28.8%)
University Undergraduate Program	44 (39.6%)
University Postgraduate Program	21 (18.9%)
Doctoral Degree	1 (0.9%)

Table 2

Parameter	CI	CI_low	CI_high
b_Intercept	0.95	1.37	5.81
b_dominanceSum	0.95	1.07	4.91
b_leadershipSum	0.95	-3.88	-0.02
b_Gender1	0.95	-4.95	-1.09
b_Age	0.95	-4.80	-0.96

Table 3

	Estimate	Est.Error	Q2.5	Q97.5
Intercept	3.62	1.13	1.41	5.86
dominanceSum	3.00	0.99	1.08	4.93
prestigeSum	0.09	0.99	-1.84	2.02
leadershipSum	-1.91	0.98	-3.85	0.02
Gender1	-3.02	0.99	-4.95	-1.08
Age	-2.86	0.99	-4.78	-0.93