

Social psychologists have long studied the factors that underlie prejudice, including personality and ideological variables. The fascinating interpretation of antisemitism in the USA, based on the concept of authoritarian personality (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950), strongly influenced the subsequent research on prejudice and personality. Since then, other individual difference variables have been proposed, such as empathy/altruism (e.g., Batson & Ahmad, 2009), social dominance orientation (SDO; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), meritocratic ideology (Major, Kaiser, O'Brien, & McCoy, 2007). Their effects on prejudice and discrimination have been extensively investigated. In this special issue, some papers consider personality variables never or little analyzed in the context of intergroup relations, such as the hypo-egoic identity and need for cognitive closure. Others report novel findings on the effects of SDO and authoritarianism in different social settings.

In the first paper, Mark Leary presents the construct of hypo-egoicism and investigates its possible application in the field of intergroup relations. As hypo-egoic identities are related to the perception of more commonalities and fewer differences between oneself and others, Leary proposes that people whose identities are characterized by hypo-egoic features should endorse less prejudiced views toward outgroup members and show fewer manifestations of ingroup-bias. The paper presents evidence coming from existing literature that supports this theoretical conjecture and opens the possibility to empirically investigate its assumptions.

Boin and Voci's paper focuses on two individual dispositions that involve the perception of the self in relation to others: quiet ego and noisy ego. The reported empirical findings confirm their associations with individual well-being and offer new evidence on their relationships with intergroup perceptions and emotions. Overall, the results suggest that quiet ego, differently from noisy ego, is related to both individual well-being and societal harmony.

The following three articles analyze social dominance orientation. Tesi, Aiello, Pratto, and Pierro provide an empirical test of Social Dominance Theory asymmetry hypothesis, stating that subordinate group members with high levels of SDO should favor the dominant group to a greater extent compared with group members with low SDO. They conduct a study focused on members of the subordinate group within a hierarchy-enhancing for-profit organization. Their results demonstrate that the perception that supervisors use harsh power tactics in order to maintain the status hierarchy is associated with greater compliance with these tactics more among high- than low-subordinate employees.

Aiello, Passini, Tesi, Morselli, and Pratto present an Italian version of the Social Dominance Orientation scale (SDO<sub>7</sub>). Their analysis provides support for both a one-

dimensional and a two-dimensional structure. Concerning the latter, the distinction in two factors is consistent with Ho et al.'s (2015) original scale. The first dimension, SDO-Dominance (SDO-D), measures individual support for dominant-submissive forms of intergroup relationships. The second dimension, SDO-Anti-Egalitarianism (SDO-E), measures the desire to support intergroup inequalities.

Finally, Trifiletti and colleagues report the findings of a study with Italian high-school students, testing the longitudinal associations between SDO, dispositional empathy, intergroup contact, and behavioral intentions. Results show longitudinal negative effects of SDO on dispositional empathy and behavioral intentions (approach, avoidance). They also show that, although it is a rather stable construct, SDO can change over time, being longitudinally predicted by dispositional empathy and (marginally) by contact.

Contributions regarding authoritarianism evaluate different social problems and different contexts. Sibley and colleagues conduct a latent profile analysis considering both right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) and SDO in a New Zealand national probability sample. They observe that, although the majority of individuals express similar levels of RWA and SDO, a smaller part of the population is characterized by asymmetry between the two variables: authoritarian leaders (high-SDO/low-RWA) support same-sex marriage but are less concerned with human rights and the environment; authoritarian followers (low-SDO/high-RWA) oppose same-sex marriage but support human rights.

Russo, Roccatò, and Mosso investigate the concept of authoritarianism in the context of political psychology. In a quasi-experimental study, they discover that social threat and authoritarianism lead people to endorse antidemocratic systems. Findings highlight the importance of considering individual-context interactions in explaining crucial attitudes, such as the support for democracy.

The relationship between conservatism and antiabortion attitudes is re-examined by Prusaczyk and Hodson. They find that, although both sexism and shared reality mediate the relationship between conservatism and abortion support when included separately in the model, shared reality's effects override those of sexism when the two mediators are tested simultaneously. These findings provide special support for the role of individual differences in ideology and epistemic motivations as explanatory variables for antiabortion positions.

The last two contributions focus on variables that have been little investigated in the field of intergroup relations, namely, need for cognitive closure and the Dark Triad (psychopathy, Machiavellianism, narcissism). In a review paper, Baldner, Jaume, Pierro, and Kruglanski examine how the desire for epistemic certainty can lead to accepting stereotypes and endorsing prejudicial attitudes. However, they note that, if the source of knowledge is positive (i.e., not prejudiced), need for closure can be associated with reduced prejudice. Authors trace the development of these new ideas and propose novel research directions.

The most malevolent personality traits (psychopathy, Machiavellianism, narcissism) are the focus of Capozza, Colledani, and Falvo's paper. In a cross-sectional study, the Authors find that the three personalities are related to outgroup dehumanization through the mediation of SDO. Dehumanization, in turn, is uniquely associated with negative behavioral

inclinations toward the outgroups. Future studies should investigate whether it is possible to mitigate the negative effects of the three personalities, and how.

Overall, this special issue shows that individual difference variables play an important role in the processes related to prejudice and discrimination. A challenge for future research is to find ways to attenuate the negative effects of variables, such as SDO and authoritarianism, and enhance the positive effects of endorsing, for instance, an altruistic or hypo-egoic identity.

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Batson, C. D., & Ahmad, N. Y. (2009). Using empathy to improve intergroup attitudes and relations. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 3, 141-177.  
doi:10.1111/j.1751-2409.2009.01013.x
- Ho, A. K., Sidanius, J., Kteily, N., Sheehy-Skeffington, J., Pratto, F., Henkel, K. E., Foels, R., Stewart, A. L. (2015). The nature of social dominance orientation: Theorizing and measuring preferences for intergroup inequality using the new SDO<sub>7</sub> scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 109, 1003-1028.  
doi:10.1037/pspi0000033
- Major, B., Kaiser, C. R., O'Brien, L. T., & McCoy, S. K. (2007). Perceived discrimination as worldview threat or worldview confirmation: Implications for self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92, 1068-1086.  
doi:10.1037/0022-3514.92.6.1068
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory on social hierarchy and oppression*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.